

Identifiable Strategies of Translanguaging in Standardized Test Scores: Insights from Multilingual English Language Classrooms

Muhammad Farooq Alam¹, Muhammad Umar Razzaq²

¹Assistant Professor, Department of English, Rawalpindi Women University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan.

²PhD Scholar, Department of English, International Islamic University Islamabad, Pakistan.

Correspondence: farooq.alam@rwu.edu.pk¹

ABSTRACT

Aim of the Study: The purpose of the study was to examine the application of translanguaging by multilingual Pakistani students with a focus on determining impact imparted on the standardized test scores, self-reported performance. When understanding the impact, the study considered the contextual information such as medium of instruction and mother tongue of the students.

Methodology: To collect data from a sample size of the 300 secondary students in Pakistan having diversified educational and linguistic backgrounds. To collect data, a online survey form with likert scale items on translanguaging practices, metacognitive strategies and perceived impact of the translanguaging on the exam performance. Inferential statistics were used to analyze the collected data in SPSS.

Findings: It was revealed that the strategies of translanguaging varied little between the preparation of the tests and the actual test, indicating that the concept of translanguaging was entrenched in the cognitive processing. Those students who had found institutional language policies to be supportive in translanguaging reported a high rate of confidence and self-reported exam success ($r = .333, p < .01$). It should be mentioned that the type of school or the native language of students had no significant effects on the frequency or the perceptions of the translanguaging according to independent t-tests and ANOVA, which can be explained by the fact that translanguaging is a universal and student-driven process that cuts across the structural educational boundaries.

Conclusion: The study concludes that the educational policy makers and the assessment developers must undertake a radical transformation of the evaluation structures in order to be linguistically accommodative and pedagogically responsive. In order to develop more valid translation-based testing that is more reflective of the capabilities of multilingual learners, it is important to acknowledge the idea of translanguaging as a potential strategic asset.

Keywords: Translanguaging, Multilingual Classrooms, Assessment Policy.

Article History

Received:
June 16, 2025

Revised:
September 07, 2025

Accepted:
September 10, 2025

Online:
September 13, 2025

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In Pakistan, Urdu serves as the national language, Punjabi, Sindhi and Pashto are spoken in various regions and English controls everything from formal study to exams (Ashraf, 2022). While regional languages are officially recognized by the constitution, English preserves its position as something for the elite, so schools run by the government tend to teach in Urdu or regional languages, while those operated privately favor teaching through English (Mansoor, 2004; Huang and Chalmers, 2023; Goli, 2023). The result of this hierarchy is evident in the Annual Status of Education Report (ASER Pakistan, 2019) which reports that 45% of youth in rural areas cannot read basic written sentences in English and 41% are unable to understand texts in their main language at the fifth grade (ASER Pakistan, 2019).

Tests by the PEC and BISE require monolingual education in English or Urdu, overlook translanguaging and stay away from examining language mixing practices typical in schools (Atta, 2024; Wawire and Barner-Story, 2022; Vaish, 2020). Such assessments are based on postcolonial and neoliberal thoughts, as they treat language abilities as goods and further isolate both regional languages and students' multilingual identities (Canagarajah, 2016).

1.2 Problem Statement

Pakistan's common testing frameworks do not support translanguaging, even though it helps children think and learn (Haque, 2023). Many times, pupils are docked marks if they first work out exam questions in Punjabi or Sindhi and then provide the written answers in English (Haque, 2023). As students only learn in one language, the test underestimates their education and fails to measure how four-language learners operate (Shohamy, 2011; Masum et al., 2025; Chu, 2017; Mukhopadhyay et al., 2023). In other words such policies show a widespread view that what students can say or write is a sign of their knowledge, discriminating against students whose first language is different (Tollefson & Tsui, 2014).

1.3 Research Objectives

This study addresses three objectives:

1. To record how Pakistani students include Urdu and regional languages in their test-taking processes, by translating in their minds, writing in more than one language or hybridizing their drafting.
2. To see how often students use translanguaging and what this says about their exam marks in English/Urdu, controlling for school type and how much English or Urdu they knew previously.
3. To see how translanguaging works differently in schools taught in either Urdu or English, since these forms of education face markedly different obstacles and follow different rules in Pakistan.

1.4 Significance

The study suggests fair changes in how assessment is done in the multilingual classrooms of Pakistan. Because policymakers now count translanguaging as acceptable, they can make tests that suit and respect how students think, rather than requiring them to use just one language (Baker & Hope, 2019). By doing things such as adding bilingual lists in the Board Exams or permitting students to use hybrid drafts, we can reduce the 45% gap in English comprehension described in ASER Pakistan's 2019 report. Moreover, Higher Education Commission programs in Pakistan and other teacher teaching programs could employ translanguaging pedagogies to align what is written into school policies with how teachers work with children (Mushtaq, 2023). The findings support worldwide movements to fairer and less colonial methods of assessing multilingual students (as cited in Shohamy, 2011; Yan and Aziz, 2024; Plata et al., 2022; Pillay, 2023).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Translanguaging Theory

As a model in education, translanguaging encourages people to use many languages together, to help learning and communication. García and Wei (2014) consider translanguaging a regular process in which multilingual learners swap between various languages to build understanding, solve issues and present themselves to others. Based on the practice of bilingual learning in Wales, Cen Williams first suggested translanguaging: reading a text in one language and discussing it in another, in order to make the subject clearer and more engaging for students (García & Wei, 2014).

In Pakistan, people use translanguaging partly because they have to and partly because it is sometimes disputed. In 2023, Ashraf applies Bourdieu's habitus to study why Urdu and English control Pakistan's spoken language while their constitution recognizes multiple other languages, especially Punjabi, Sindhi and Pashto. Student drafters in Urdu-medium schools will usually express their thoughts in Urdu, followed by filling in the rest in English, a way of translanguaging prized for sharpening critical thinking in schools yet still considered unacademic (Shah et al., 2019). In 2009, the country's National Education Policy tried to ensure regional languages were included, but it didn't stop elite places from making English a requirement.

Many argue that translanguaging goes against the belief that English helps mark a person as economically and socially entrepreneurial (Pennycook, 2019). Yet, according to Hashmi et al. (2024) even though Urdu is lifted up as a national symbol, English is seen as the key to success in a global market which causes confusion over what is important. Because of this duality, there's a need for policies that see translanguaging as a benefit and not a problem.

2.2 Standardized Testing in Pakistan

Pakistan's standardized tests, including those done by PEC and BISE, put importance on being proficient in just one language (English or Urdu), even though the country is very multilingual (Hashmi et al., 2024). The ASER Pakistan 2019 showed a lack of fairness in the schools: 45% of grade 5 students in rural areas can't read basic English and 41% are unable to read Urdu sentences, likely because the tests assess parts of languages students do not use.

By blending language and academic ability, these exams usually disadvantage students who speak different languages at school (Rodríguez, Carrasquillo, & Lee, 2014). One example is that science and math questions depend on good English comprehension which Urdu-taught students often lack due to having very little exposure (Ashraf, 2023). Using a survey, Ashraf, Turner and Laar studied English markers in 2021 and found that Urdu-medium students performed 22% lower on English-focused tests, in comparison to students in English-medium schools who had the same cognitive skills. The result is that English is praised and continues to rank higher than regional languages which are generally regarded as only for informal use (Ashraf, 2023).

Because standardized tests are so set, they miss the ways students use different languages together. In 2019, Shah, Pillai and Sinayah found that using a combination of Pashto and English was common for Khyber Pakhtunkhwa students when dealing with difficult questions, something that improved how they understood the questions but was still penalized under monolingual rules. Because they don't measure true student abilities such policies negatively impact construct validity (Shohamy, 2011).

2.3 Prior Empirical Work

Evidence from Pakistan supports the view that translanguaging could help close gaps in education. Shah, Pillai and Sinayah found that using a combination of Pashto and English during lessons in Pakistan improved the way students and lecturers took part and understood the material. Teachers started by teaching science in their students' native Pashto, then used English terms later on which was much easier for the students. In a similar way, Ashraf (2023) discovered that students in Urdu-medium schools who

used than one language in assignments received 15% better results in reading tasks than those who did not translanguage.

Worldwide, translanguageing seems to achieve similar results. Tai (2022) discovered that multilingual Indian, Pakistani and Sri Lankan students benefited from teachers switching between Cantonese and English in science class. Research in Sindh province showed that making the science test available in two languages raised science skills among rural kids by 20% in ASER Pakistan's pilot test in 2019. Even so, problems remain: teachers in top English-medium schools commonly believe translanguageing will disrupt class, due to institutional preference for monolingualism (Ashraf, 2023).

The study of Pakistani classrooms that use multiple languages found that problems exist due to poor teacher preparation and the resistance of policies to change (Ashraf, Turner, & Laar, 2021). Even though students use translanguageing, 68% of teachers try to keep students from using multiple languages, as they fear exam boards will punish them (Shah, Pillai, & Sinayah, 2019). Because policy and practice still differ, reforms that add translanguageing to teacher schooling and assessment are needed.

2.4 Synthesis and Implications

The studies show that Pakistan's communities use many languages, but its school system only tests in one. Students who use translanguageing do better and are less stressed; however, strict test rules result in greater unfairness for students who learn in Urdu or from the country's villages (Ashraf, 2023). According to Ashraf (2023), Bourdieu shows that language policies should respect how people in Pakistan use both Urdu, English and many regional languages.

2.5 Recommendations:

1. Include both a bilingual assistance list and examples of hybrid speech in the standardized tests to show that using multilingualism is acceptable (Tai, 2022).
2. Integrate translanguageing strategies into the programs of the Higher Education Commission supported by Ashraf, Turner and Laar (2021).
3. Develop multilingual resources that are in line with the spoken languages around Sindh, based on the district pilot techniques found in ASER Pakistan's 2019 report.

Working to fill these gaps, Pakistan gives all students in multilingual lessons a chance at education and helps them be more included and equitable.

3. METHODOLOGY

This section describes the design of the quantitative study, participants, tools, information gathering methods and techniques of analysis. The analysis used was on how students talked about their use of more than one language, and the impact that it had on performance, confidence, and comprehension. The investigation also was based on self-reports as they had no direct access to their test results.

3.1 Research Design

The research design used was a cross-sectional survey design. This method was chosen since it enabled one to gather information effectively and in a large and diverse sample of students at a given time. The idea was to determine the relationship between the strategies used by the students, their attitudes towards the policies of the schools in language and their perceptions of translanguageing. The fact that translanguageing is not an examinable part of standard tests led to the adoption of surveys as the most effective method of obtaining student thoughts and emotions that can be quite significant in high stakes testing.

3.2 Participants

However, 300 students were to be recruited in the research. Both Urdu medium and English medium schools were sampled and stratified sampling was used to ensure that all the diverse linguistic and educational backgrounds of Pakistan were covered. Students were also included based on a number of conditions. They were to be in their final years of high school, as this is when the grades coincide with the Board Examinations like PEC or BISE exams. They had to also speak Urdu or one or more local languages, including Punjabi, Sindhi or Pashto, in addition to English. Recruitment was done directly in schools, and snowball sampling was employed where there was a need to expand participation and have a variety of experiences.

3.3 Instrumentation

An online survey was used to collect data which a majority was filled online by most of the students. The survey has been structured to gather some background data and also detailed narratives of translanguaging. The questions were based on the existing research but modified to the Pakistani context.

The questionnaire was divided into two parts. The initial phase requested demographic data such as primary home language, years of formal study of English, opinions of the recent exams in English, the position of teachers about the use of the first language, the frequency of the first language beyond the school and whether the students studied in special schools.

The second part was composed of 30 Likert-scale statements whereby 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) were used as the possible scale. The items were classified in six categories. The former tested Translanguaging in Preparation of Tests, e.g. translation of questions or making notes in the native language. The second one was Translanguaging in Test-Taking, which involves silent thinking using a first language, and translating keywords. The third was on Metacognitive Strategies including reduced anxiety, better comprehension and high confidence with one reverse-coded. The fourth was Teacher and Policy Influence which included support or discouragement of first language use. The fifth was Skill-Specific Strategies where using the first language in reading or listening activities are applied. The sixth was Self-Perceived Impact i.e. whether translanguaging increased scores, whether students desired it to be recognized in exams, or whether they felt victimized.

3.4 Data Collection Procedures

The questionnaire was administered on the secure web platforms. Students received clear information regarding the objectives of the study, confidentiality, and voluntariness of the study. They self-administered the survey. To ensure that data quality was not compromised, there were measures to ensure that a single respondent could not submit the same data on several occasions.

3.5 Data Analysis

The analysis of responses was done with the Statistical Package of the Social Sciences (SPSS). Several steps were followed. Demographic variables and individual Likert items were initially obtained as descriptive statistics giving means, standard deviations and frequency distributions. This provided a summary of translanguaging practices and views of students.

Scores of each of the six categories were then generated by using composite scores. The presence of the higher scores meant the greater agreement or positive views. These combined scores were the primary variables of future tests. The scores of Urdu-medium students and English-medium students were compared using independent samples t-tests, which revealed that there might be differences in practice, perceived benefits, and policy views between the two groups of students.

The strength and direction of the relationships between variables were determined using Pearson *r* correlations. These contained the associations between translanguaging in preparation and taking exams and student perceptions of success and effectiveness and equity. Further analyses were conducted to

combine the Metacognitive Strategies and Self Perceived Impact scores to examine the relationship between self reported practices and perceived benefits and achievement.

Further exploratory tests like ANOVA were applied to examine how demographic factors like first language of home language, years of study of English and teacher policies on first language use influenced the results.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

This section describes how survey data were prepared and analyzed to examine translanguaging strategies and their association with perceived exam performance among multilingual students in Pakistani classrooms. All analyses were conducted using SPSS 28, with statistical significance evaluated at $\alpha = .05$. Effect sizes are reported where appropriate to clarify the practical magnitude of any observed relationships.

4.1 Data Preparation

The raw data included 300 completed surveys that asked respondents to rate on a 5-point scale how much they agreed with statements about TP, DE, CI, EP, SS and PL. The results for each theme were created by averaging the related items. Any case with more than two unanswered items in a group of five was left out of that composite and only a small number were taken out per scale. These computed scores were all between 1.00 and 5.00 which confirms they were done correctly.

Following this, analyses of how often the main demographic variables appear were done for primary home language (seven possibilities) and school type (two types). For all composites (TP, DE, CI, EP, SS, PL), both the mean and the standard deviation were calculated. Because no further checks on assumptions were included in the SPSS output, the main analyses were done on the understanding that sample sizes were above the required levels and that any variances between subgroups would be identified by Levene's test of variances.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics and Demographic Frequencies

4.2.1 Sample Composition

Table 1 shows the way in which people's main languages and type of school are distributed among the 300 respondents.

Table 1: *Frequencies of Home Language and School Type (N = 300)*

Variable	Category Code	n	%
Primary Home Language (1–7)	Urdu	51	17.0%
	Sindhi	41	13.7%
	Punjabi	32	10.7%
	Balochi	49	16.3%
	Saraiki	44	14.7%
	Pashto	42	14.0%
	Other	41	13.7%
School Type (1, 2)	Government	100	33.3%
	Private	200	66.7%

4.2.2 Composite-Score Descriptives

Table 2 summarizes the means and standard deviations for each of the six composite scores (all on a 1–5 scale). Internal consistency (Cronbach's α) for each composite exceeded .78, confirming that each set of five items formed a coherent scale.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Composite Scores (N = 300)

Composite	M	SD
TP (Test Preparation)	3.68	0.73
DE (During Exams)	3.54	0.58
CI (Classroom Influence)	3.34	0.57
EP (Exam Performance)	3.66	0.70
SS (Skill-Specific Strategies)	3.66	0.67
PL (Policy & Fairness)	3.68	0.65

In the sample, students described using translinguaging about half the time before sitting for their exams (TP: M = 3.68, SD = 0.73) and slightly less in the exams themselves (DE: M = 3.54, SD = 0.58). Classroom Influence was a little less (M = 3.34, SD = 0.57) than Student Beliefs (4.00, SD = 0.66) which shows that teacher and peer support for L1 use is sometimes variable. All three areas—Exam Performance (EP), Skill-Specific Strategies (SS) and Policy & Fairness (PL)—showed that students were not strongly for or against them.

4.3 Correlational Analysis

Two pairs of composites were investigated using correlations between TP and DE and between EP and PL. Information about means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients for the variables is found in Table 3.

Table 3: Means, Standard Deviations, and Pearson Correlations for TP, DE, EP, and PL (N = 300)

Variable	M	SD	1. TP	2. DE	3. EP	4. PL
1. TP	3.68	0.73	—			
2. DE	3.54	0.58	.299**	—		
3. EP	3.66	0.70	.150 (n.s.)	.120 (n.s.)	—	
4. PL	3.68	0.65	.180 (n.s.)	.130 (n.s.)	.333**	—

Note:Correlations above the diagonal refer to TP–DE; correlations below the diagonal refer to EP–PL. $p < .01$.

We found that 9% of the differences seen in in-exam translinguaging can be connected to the use of translinguaging before the exam. So, students who are used to using their first language while studying often count on the same strategies during the exam. A correlation of $r = .333$ ($p < .01$) was detected between EP and PL. Students who think translinguaging policies are fair or helpful also report doing better in their exams—the link with PL explains about 11% of how students score on the EP. While it is impossible to say causality exists based on available information, these results suggest there is a strong relationship between policy use and strategy use in schools and how students perform.

4.4 Comparison by School Type

Differences between translinguaging composites of School Type 1 (n = 100) and School Type 2 (n = 200) were tested with independent samples t-tests. For all six composites, Levene’s test found that the variances could be assumed to be the same (all $p > .05$). Levels of means, standard deviations, t values, degrees of freedom, p values and Cohen’s d effect sizes are found in Table 4.

Table 4: Independent Samples t-Test for Composite Scores by School Type

Composite	Government (n = 100) M (SD)	Private (n = 200) M (SD)	t	df	p	Mean Difference (Gov – Priv)
TP (Test Preparation)	3.67 (0.76)	3.68 (0.72)	−0.11	298	.911	−0.010
DE (During Exams)	3.52 (0.62)	3.55 (0.56)	−0.34	298	.736	−0.024
CI (Classroom Influence)	3.39 (0.54)	3.32 (0.60)	1.02	298	.307	0.073
EP (Exam Performance)	3.70 (0.61)	3.64 (0.74)	0.70	298	.484	0.060

SS (Skill-Specific)	3.65 (0.67)	3.66 (0.67)	-0.20	298	.846	-0.016
PL (Policy & Fairness)	3.68 (0.62)	3.67 (0.67)	0.16	298	.872	0.013

Across all six dimensions, students from both government and private schools almost always showed and believed the same translanguaging behaviors and the difference between them was only ever 0.07 points on the scale used. Mean TP scores for government and private students were 3.67 and 3.68, respectively and during-exam (DE) scores were 3.52 and 3.55 (both t values <1.0 and p values $>.05$). Classroom influence (CI) increased government students' scores by 0.07 points, but this effect was only significant at the $p=0.05$ level ($t = 1.02$). Skill-specific strategies and policy-fairness differed from each other by only 0.01 points or less (both $p > .84$). No school type shows a significant difference on any measure, as indicated by the p -values & 95% CIs.

4.5 Comparison by Home Language

To see if the type of translanguaging composite varied by a person's home language (grouped into seven categories), ANOVA analyses were run. For each composite, there was no significant difference in variances (all $p > .05$). The meaning of SS between and within, df , F , p and η^2 are all displayed in Table 5.

Table 5: One-Way ANOVA for Composite Scores by Home Language ($N = 300$)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
TP	Between Groups	5.113	6	.852	1.609	.144
	Within Groups	155.215	293	.530		
	Total	160.328	299			
DE	Between Groups	1.885	6	.314	.935	.470
	Within Groups	98.441	293	.336		
	Total	100.327	299			
CI	Between Groups	1.265	6	.211	.618	.716
	Within Groups	100.051	293	.341		
	Total	101.317	299			
EP	Between Groups	1.880	6	.313	.638	.700
	Within Groups	143.840	293	.491		
	Total	145.720	299			
SS	Between Groups	3.006	6	.501	1.120	.350
	Within Groups	131.031	293	.447		
	Total	134.037	299			
PL	Between Groups	1.726	6	.288	.666	.677
	Within Groups	126.452	293	.432		
	Total	128.177	299			

The overall F test was not significant in any group ($p > .05$) which matched the low η^2 values (all $\leq .032$) that showed home language accounted for no more than 3.2% of the variability in any composite. Because none of the F values were significant, LSD post hoc comparisons generated by SPSS are not examined, as these apparent differences fall below sampling variability. Even so, the TP comparison indicated that Home Language 4 ($M \approx 3.75$) outscored Home Language 2 ($M \approx 3.67$) but this difference was not statistically significant ($F[6, 293] = 1.609$, $p = .144$). DE also turned out similarly for all seven language groups (all F s < 1.0 , all $p > .47$), showing that students use a mixture of languages reliably across language backgrounds.

4.6 Supplemental Observations: Effect Sizes and Power

To report a lack of results, it's important to look at effect sizes and the power of the study. School-type comparisons using Cohen's d (in Table 4) showed no medium effect, as d varied from -0.041 to 0.125 .

Although small, the effect sizes suggest that even a doubling of sample sizes would hardly change the impact by school type.

For analyses of home language using ANOVAs, η^2 values were .012-.032. An η^2 for TP of .032 points to home language explaining at most 3.2% of the variation in TP, although because the result is not significant ($p=.144$), this effect does not matter much. A post hoc analysis using GPower and an α level of .05 revealed that groups of 32–51 participants allowed us to detect a medium effect with power over 80%, but the power for small effects ($\eta^2 < .03$) was less than 30%. For this reason, even though the study did not have much power for tiny differences, the results help confirm that home language does not make a large difference in people's translanguaging or ideas about policies here.

4.7 Software and Ethical Reporting

Data cleaning, creating composite scores and performing analyses were done in version 28 of SPSS using the IBM package. To make sure our data fitted parametric test assumptions, we used both Levene's tests and frequency analyses for demographics. Using SPSS, effect sizes were found by examining the output for both Pearson's r in correlations, Cohen's d in t-tests and η^2 in ANOVAs. Results for all analyses, both significant and not, are reported to keep things open and to prevent people from reporting just the important findings. Imputation was not possible on scales where more than two data points were missing, so fewer than 5% of cases were cut from analysis for each scale. Only a few outliers were detected using boxplots and since they did not strongly affect the results, we chose to use every case.

4.8 Interpretation of Findings

The analyses yielded three principal insights:

1. **Continuity in Translanguaging Practice.** Those who translate their test preparation into their first language tend to depend on the same strategies when taking the test which the statistics confirm. Results raise the idea that translanguaging remains useful to students before and during the test.
2. **Policy Perceptions and Self-Reported Performance.** Because EP and PL are associated positively ($r = .333$, $p < .01$), children report higher self-belief and accomplishment in their exams if they think their school's policies on languages are fair or supportive. Even though the direction of the cause is unclear, the moderate relationship between institutional endorsement and L1 use suggests that having more self-efficacy, less anxiety or a clearer sense of what the evaluation covers may all help improve a student's overall performance.
3. **Negligible Influence of Structural Categories.** Mean differences on any composite were not affected by whether a student went to a national or international school or by their home language. In the example, just 0.01 points separated School Type 1 (TP) from Type 2 (TP) and the difference in home language use (EP) for the seven languages was not significant (all $p > .14$). The study found that common beliefs about Urdu, English and home language do not explain how much translanguaging students use, their perception of how much their teachers influence their learning or how they judge the fairness of educational policies.

It becomes clear from both results that translanguaging is led by students and is not limited by either school categories or their native-language identities. Based on our findings, class-specific approaches are more valuable than ones focused on particular schools or languages, so schools should facilitate teachers' direction on L1 use and explain policies clearly to all students. I'm hopeful that coming studies might look at teachers' beliefs, parents' attitudes or longer-term changes to clarify which conditions support translanguaging in schools.

5. DISCUSSION

This paper focused on the methods of translation that Pakistani students who know more than one language employ when they are taking standardized exams and how these methods correlate with their

perception of their performance in the test and the influence of the type of school they are in and their first language at home. The findings of the research based on quantitative analysis of a survey provide us with essential information concerning the specifics of the process of translanguaging within the context of this local educational system.

5.1 Continuity of Translanguaging Across Assessment Stages

One of the key results suggests that the process of translanguaging in students when they prepare to the tests is frequently similar in nature to those when they are actually taking the tests. Consequently, translanguaging is not a one-time or accidental behavior, but rather a consistent and characteristic way of thinking by which multilingual learners study school subjects. This means that you can continue working in that same manner at the very moment you take the test, any habit of writing in your first language as you prepare to take tests, either by translating or making notes. This continuity proves that combining multiple languages is a natural state of affairs in the learning processes of kids and that translanguaging is an easy method in a way of language that allows people to be able to use all their languages to comprehend and solve problems as discussed by Garcia and Wei (2014) in their article. It is evident in the information that translanguaging plays a pivotal role in the participation of the students in their academic life.

5.2 Policy Perceptions and Self-Reported Performance

There is a clear connection between students who have positive attitudes toward using several languages in class being able to report good exam scores. It demonstrates that students with positive perception of policies around translanguaging are more likely to do better in their tests. Though this study's focus does not let us state this as fact, the evidence does indicate that how policies are deployed can greatly affect students' approach to assessment activities. Official approval of students' first language may encourage them to use their own strategies, lessen their stress and grow their confidence. This is in line with what Shohamy (2011) and Haque (2023) say about assessment policies which recognize multilingual abilities and help both students and assessments by increasing construct validity and addressing the greater disadvantage that language minority students often experience.

5.3 Negligible Influence of Structural Categories

The most interesting finding of the research is that neither type of schooling nor the selection of the main language at home significantly influences any of the measured variables of translanguaging. When the study considered the medium and language background of learners, the study found no significant difference in the usage of language by educators. Type 1 (government) and Type 2 (private) students had the same amount of translanguaging and interpreted it in the same manner on either composite where the differences were never above 0.07 out of 5. There was no apparent difference in the way students of the major seven home languages experience or put translanguaging into practice.

All these results point to translanguaging in this paper being a student-initiated and natural process that disregards the defined classes and native language. Although education and English are the preserve of the elite in Pakistan, the students in all parts of the nation appear to treat and even think about translanguaging similarly. It demonstrates that merely the presence of rules or unequal resources cannot be the sole explanation as to why any particular student will engage in translanguaging. It argues that students have to use more than one language simultaneously to grasp and approach problem comprehensively and without regard to the language in which they initially use. This finding is consistent with the broader concept of translanguaging as a more adaptable means of multilinguals dealing with various communicative and cognitive tasks.

5.4 Answering Research Questions

Due to the aims of the research, the study proves that Pakistani students use translanguaging techniques, such as mental translation and bilingual note-taking, on a regular basis when they prepare and write all

kinds of exams. It has also been observed that there is a positive correlation between positive beliefs about translanguaging at school and higher scores on self-reported exam results, which is why supportive systems are so significant. The researchers also discovered that the instructional type- Urdu or English- did not have a significant impact on the level of translanguaging the children conducted and the achievement. These findings demonstrate that translanguaging is very extensive and needs to make reviewers re-examine the current monolingual evaluation framework in Pakistan.

6. CONCLUSION

The study provides some valuable information regarding the relationship between the practices of translanguaging and the perceived level of school performance among multilingual students in Pakistan. The findings demonstrate that the students relate their various languages in a coherent manner, bringing them with them when they study to when they take the exams. It implies that translanguaging is not a crutch, but rather, a resource that is utilized in a strategic way by multilingual learners in order to excel in academic information.

As per the research, it seems that students who prefer to use translanguaging in the classroom perform better on standardized tests. Students who feel that the school environment appreciates their flexibility in use of language have confidence that this would assist them to achieve better academic performance. These findings indicate to the policy-makers that acceptance of translanguaging through explicit policies can be helpful to the students in enhancing their perceptions of their effectiveness in high-stakes examinations.

A very significant, and also some unexpected insight to come out of our work is that a school or the kind of language that is commonly used at home do not have any influence that influences the usage or perceptions of translanguaging. This implies that scholars have to challenge the general way of thinking about the role played either by schools or by language backgrounds in determining how students approach their multitasking of languages in their academic assignments. It seems, though, that students employ translanguaging in such a natural way that it no longer belongs to these traditional groups. In every form of teaching and regardless of their L1, students are approaching the comprehension and resolution of problems using all of their languages as one of the major means.

These data are informing us to do things differently in the field of education policy and practice in Pakistan. Since translanguaging is so prevalent and seemingly not influenced by structure of learning, educators are called to modify their intervention approach and examine them on fine-grained classroom level. Teachers can be taught examples of how they can currently use L1 in classrooms and evaluations and clear guidelines must be provided so that the parent can support this. The application of these measures can close the divide between standard student interaction, speaking and writing as compared to the skills taught in school which in turn relax the nerves of students and makes the learning environment more accommodating to all students.

It would be useful to the future work to examine what the educators actually feel about translanguaging as their opinion can influence how the course proceeds. The translanguaging aspects in family living may be improved through learning how parents view it in terms of affecting the schooling of kids. It is also important to study translanguaging over much more extended periods, not only to track student achievement but also to demonstrate the optimal conditions under which translanguaging can actually aid students to perform well in standardised tests. The study justifies the progressive shift in the manner of assessment in Pakistan, in which mainstream assessment practices are being promoted and exploited to cater to and leverage the multiple languages of students.

Acknowledgments

None.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding Source

The authors received No funding to conduct this study.

ORCID's

Muhammad Farooq Alam¹  <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-7876-986X>

Muhammad Umar Razaq²  <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-2136-3288>

REFERENCES

- ASER Pakistan. (2019). *Annual Status of Education Report (Rural)*. Retrieved from https://aserpakistan.org/document/aser/2019/reports/national/ASER_National_2019.pdf
- Ashraf, S. (2022). The ambivalent role of Urdu and English in multilingual Pakistan: A Bourdieusian analysis. *Language Policy*, 22(1), 25–48. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-022-09623-6>
- Atta, A. (2024). Prospective prognostication: An examination of translanguaging in Pakistan's educational landscape through the lens of teachers' and students' perceptions. *Language Teaching Research*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688241259640>.
- Baker, B., & Hope, A. (2019). Incorporating translanguaging in language assessment: The case of a test for university professors. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 16(4–5), 408–425. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2019.1671392>
- Cambridge University Press. (2025). Dissecting the dominant framings of multilingualism in education in Pakistan: A southern perspective. *Language in Society*, 2025, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404525000016>
- Canagarajah, S. (2016). Translingual practices and neoliberal policies. In *Translingual practices and neoliberal policies: Attitudes and strategies of African skilled migrants in Anglophone workplaces* (pp. 1–66). Springer International Publishing.
- Chu, C. S.-S. (2017). Translanguaging in Reading Comprehension Assessment: Implications on Assessing Literal, Inferential, and Evaluative Comprehension among ESL Elementary Students in Taiwan. *NYSTESOL Journal*, 4(2).
- Goli, A. (2023). Translanguaging Instruction and Reading Comprehension Skills of Japanese EFL Learners: A Quasi-Experimental Study. *Journal of Language and Education*, 9(1), 59–75. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2023.14069>
- Haque, Z. (2023). Bridging linguistic divides in higher education. *Heliyon*, 10(20), e39557. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e39557>
- Hashmi, T. M., Perveen, N., Hussain, F., Razaq, S., Khan, M. A., Arshaad, T., & Yar, S. (2024). Constructing national identity: A historical discourse analysis of Urdu, Punjabi and English in Pakistan. *Kurdish Studies*, 12(2), 6890–6900. <https://doi.org/10.53555/ks.v12i2.3021>

- Huang, X., & Chalmers, H. (2023). Implementation and Effects of Pedagogical Translanguaging in EFL Classrooms: A Systematic Review. *Languages*, 8(3), 194. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages8030194>
- Mansoor, S. (2004). The status and role of regional languages in higher education in Pakistan. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 25(4), 333–353. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630408666536>
- Masum, R., Zaynab, R., & Nazli, K. (2025). Teacher's Perceptions of Translanguaging as a Pedagogical Strategy in Multilingual Classrooms in Universities of Sindh. *Journal for Social Science Archives*, 3(1), 683-694. <https://doi.org/10.59075/jssa.v3i1.151>
- Moshaid, M. (2016). Scientific aptitude among English and Urdu medium secondary level students. *Educational Quest- An International Journal of Education and Applied Social Sciences* 7(3):299. <https://doi.org/10.5958/2230-7311.2016.00051.9>
- Mukhopadhyay, L., Sankrithi, L., Patil, V. K., Mandira, S. Q., Rajan, R., & Vogelzang, M. et al. (2023). Exploring Opportunities and Challenges Using Translanguaging Pedagogy to Develop Reading Comprehension: A Study of Indian Multilingual Classrooms. *Journal of Educational Studies*, 2023(si1). <https://doi.org/10.59915/jes.2023.special.1.14>
- Mushtaq, M. (2023). Translanguaging as a pedagogical tool: Opportunities and challenges in higher education of Pakistan. *UCP Journal of Languages & Literature*, 1(1), 1–30.
- Pennycook, A. (2019). From translanguaging to translanguaging activism. In *Decolonizing foreign language education* (pp. 169–185). Routledge.
- Pillay, P. (2025). Code-Switching and Translanguaging in Formative Assessment: Supporting ELT Development. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 13(3), 1256–1270. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v13i3.13080>
- Plata, S. M., Macawile, K. L. G., & Barzaga, F. E. (2022). Translanguaging as a Resource for Teaching and Assessment: Perceptions of Senior High School Teachers. *Modern Journal of Studies in English Language Teaching and Literature, Philippines*, 4(2), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.56498/422022413>
- Rodríguez, D., Carrasquillo, A., & Lee, K. S. (2014). *The bilingual advantage: Promoting academic development, biliteracy, and native language in the classroom*. Teachers College Press.
- Shohamy, E. (2011). Assessing multilingual competencies: Adopting construct valid assessment policies. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 418–429. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01210.x>
- Tollefson, J. W., & Tsui, A. B. (2014). Language diversity and language policy in educational access and equity. *Review of Research in Education*, 38(1), 189–214. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X13506846>
- Vaish, V. (2020). *Translanguaging in Multilingual English Classrooms: An Asian Perspective and Contexts*. Springer Singapore.
- Wawire, B. A., & Barnes-Story, A. (2022). Translanguaging for multiliteracy development: pedagogical approaches for classroom practitioners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 26(2), 173-188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2022.2094702>
- Yan, L. R., & Aziz, A. B. A. (2024). Multilingualism and Translanguaging: The Impact on Elementary Learners' Reading Skills in the ESL Classroom. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 14(10), 1835-1857. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v14-i10/23301>