

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The results show that translanguageing resemblance, complementary translanguageing, and congruent-lexicalization translanguageing are the three translanguageing strategies used by ELT students in their argumentative writing. These findings that students use Indonesian and English as interconnected linguistic resources rather than as separate language systems throughout the writing process. among. The most common strategy among those found is translanguageing resemblance, which is followed by congruent-lexicalisation translanguageing and complementary translanguageing. This result is in line with García & Wei's (2014) argument that multilingual learners generally use their full language range to create meaning and complete academic assignments. The dominance of translanguageing resemblance is also consistent with Zhang et al. (2022), who explain that multilingual writers often transfer conceptual and argumentative pattern from their first language into second language. Additionally, congruent lexicalization supports Saputra (2015) by reflecting students' willingness to translate common knowledge of Indonesian and grammatical patterns into English.

Complementary translanguageing further demonstrates that students strategically combine Indonesian and English to elaborate and clarify their ideas, supporting Krause & Prinsloo's (2016) explanation that multilingual learners use multiple linguistic resources to facilitate meaning-making. Overall, the findings suggest that translanguageing serves as both a linguistic and cognitive resources.

Among, the three translanguaging strategies identified in this study, translanguaging resemblance emerges as the most frequently strategy found in the participants' writing. The incorporation of well-known Indonesian argumentation framework into English writing is one prominent trend found in the participants' writings. This implies that while structuring arguments in English, students rely on argumentative structure that they have previously internalised through their native tongue. They use their prior understanding of argumentative writing in Indonesian to formulate assertions, offer justifications, and arrange supporting information rather than immediately developing ideas in English. This tendency lends support to Asetya's (2026) claim that writing in one's native language facilitates comprehension and argument construction prior to English expression. According to Maulana et al. (2025), writers may more easily establish arguments in Indonesian since they are not limited by English syntax and vocabulary, allowing them to concentrate on developing ideas. According to this viewpoint, the transfer of Indonesian argumentative frameworks may be seen as a cognitive technique that makes it easier to generate ideas and organise arguments when writing.

Students use a variety of linguistic tools to provide more thorough descriptions in their writings in addition to transferring argumentation patterns. This suggests Garcia & Kleifgen (2019) that instead of depending just on English for expanding thoughts, translanguaging allows to use their whole language range. Students are able to convey concepts and details that are challenging to directly define in English by using their understanding of the Indonesian language. This view aligns with the findings of Robillos & Art-in (2023), who discover that by

integrating new knowledge with current language resources, translanguaging enables learners to better organise thoughts and articulate ideas. Similarly, students often sketch their ideas in their native tongue before translating them into English, according to Ifadoh et al. (2025). Thus, translanguaging seems to serve as a useful tool for improving content creation in academic writing in addition to being a linguistic activity.

Although, translanguaging facilitates the creation of ideas and content, it also has an impact on how English sentences were put together. Numerous phrases exhibit Indonesian grammatical patterns, indicating that student use well-known linguistic frameworks to try to convey their views in English. this tendency can arise from learners' underlying reliance in prior language expertise while using a second language. This perspective is consistent with the findings of Febrianti & Salwa (2026), who contend that sentence formation in the second language is greatly influenced by the original language, resulting in both facilitating and limiting effects. In the same way, Maxwell (2025) highlights how underlying linguistic and cognitive processes involved in sentence production are impacted by multilingual language use. As a result, it is possible to interpret the effect of Indonesian sentence patterns as a logical consequence of students' attempts to connect the demands of English writing with their prior linguistic expertise.

The widespread usage of directly translations from Indonesian into English is another example of this effect. Students frequently translate words and idioms directly from their native tongue rather than rephrasing them in accordance with English standards. This method assists them in conveying meaning, but it

sometimes leads to statements that sound strange or odd in English. This study supports to Sudirman's (2016) assertion that translation procedures may result in obstacles related to cultural and linguistic variation across languages as well as difficulty correctly communicating intended meanings. Similarly, Sandra (2018) points out that while literal translations are frequently comprehensible, they may seem strange as contextual meanings are not always successfully convey. As a result, literal translation can be seen as a useful strategy that helps students communicate concepts while also highlighting the drawbacks of largely depending on first language structures.

Additionally, there are examples of code-mixing in the essays, suggesting that students occasionally switch between languages while writing. When students have trouble finding relevant English vocabulary or when some topics are easier to understand in their own tongue, they seem to include Indonesian phrases or idioms. This technique might be seen as an adaptive method that enables students to keep the flow ideas and continue the writing process rather than only as proof of a language deficit. Leonet et al. (2020), who contend that translanguaging promotes learners to use their whole language repertoire to aid learning and meaning-making, concur with this view. Code-mixing therefore shows how students deliberately used the language tools at their disposal to facilitate idea creation and communication.

Taken together, these findings indicate a more widespread phenomena of cross-linguistic impact at work in students' writing processes. Sentence forms, meaning creation, and word selections all demonstrate the connection between Indonesian and English. This implies that students used both languages

concurrently when writing English texts rather than treating them as distinct systems. Nagy (2018), who highlights that multilingual people frequently view their languages as interrelated and fluid rather than firmly divided, supports this viewpoint. Similarly, Fajrina et al. (2022) emphasise the impact of culturally influenced linguistic structures in academic writing, while Cahyono, (2000) observes that Indonesian writers often adapt English writing to Indonesian modes of expression. The dynamic interplay of linguistic resources that students use while creating meaning in a second language is thus reflected in the cross-linguistic effect found in this study.

The interview data also show that students often think in Indonesian before writing in English, which was consistent with the linguistic patterns seen in the students' essays. They prefer to develop thoughts, arrange arguments, and gather meanings in their native tongue before translating or modifying them into English, as opposed to coming up with ideas immediately in the target language. This implies that the cognitive processes that underlie writing are significantly influenced by Indonesian, especially in the early phase of production. Wang et al. (2025) discover that the first language has several purposes, such as making it easier to comprehend complicated ideas and lessening the cognitive load that comes with using a second language. Similarly, Rahoma (2026) finds that students who first generate ideas in their native tongue are frequently able to successfully articulate those ideas in English, especially when assisted by technology tools like artificial intelligence (AI). As a result, translanguaging allows students to concentrate on coming up with ideas before dealing with linguistic issues in English.

However, the results indicate that there may be some difficulties in using the first language as a cognitive resource. Before students start writing in English, Indonesian serves as a tool for concept organization, argument evaluation, and uncertainty resolution during brainstorm sessions. The finding lends support to Zhu & Li's (2025) idea that the first language serves as a metacognitive checkpoint that aids writers in recognising issues and tracking the evolution of their writing. The current results, however, also point to a more nuanced connection between first language usage and writing in a second language. While Bakir et al. (2026) find that language transitions may contribute to grammatical and lexical errors caused by linguistic and psychological factors, Abbas et al. (2026) discover that students who heavily rely on their first language frequently have more difficulty switching to English. The advantages of brainstorming in Indonesian are accompanied by indications of first language impact on the final English writings, which reflect these issues in the current study. As a result, the results imply that the first language serves as both a useful cognitive resource and a possible cause of linguistic interference. Excessive reliance on it may impede the creation of linguistically accurate English writing, even as it facilitates idea formation and problem-solving.

The study's overall conclusion suggests that translanguaging serves as a linguistic and cognitive tool that influences students' English argumentative writing before students communicate their thoughts in English argumentative writing. Before students communicate their thoughts in English, using Indonesian during the writing process helps with idea formation, argument structuring, language selection, and meaning construction of persuasive writings that are more logical and

organised. However, a heavy dependence on Indonesian also results in cross-linguistic impact, as seen by the transfer of grammatical patterns, expressive patterns, literal translation, and code-mixing into English literature. Thus, the results imply that translanguaging plays two roles in English argumentative writing: it increases the likelihood of first language influence on the final English text's linguistic development while also favourably supporting the cognitive processes involved in idea and argument construction. This connection suggests that students' reliance on translanguaging influences both the degree of cross linguistic impact in their writing and the efficacy of concept generation.

This study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting the findings. First, although five students' essays are analysed, only three participants are willing to participate in the semi-structured interviews. One selected participant declines to be interviewed because of concerns that the essay may be identified as involving the use of artificial intelligence (AI), while another participant does not respond to the interview invitation. Consequently, the interview findings represent the perspective of only three participants. Second the study analyses five students' essay because of the limited time available for collecting additional data. Although concern regarding the authenticity of one participant's essay emerge during the research process, the essay remains part of the dataset because it has already been included in the documentation. Therefore, the findings of this study should be interpreted within the context of these limitations. Future researchers are encouraged to involve a larger number of participants, obtain interview data from all selected participants and implement stricter procedures for

verifying the authenticity of students' writing to strengthen the credibility and transferability of the findings.