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Translanguaging is an emergent concept in bi/multilingualism and language education. It refers to discursive practices where multiple languages are used by plurilingual individuals as an integrated linguistic repertoire (García and Li Wei 2014). This study focuses on the use of translanguaging in a group discussion in a Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classroom at a Japanese university, where three Japanese students and one Arabic student talked in Japanese and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). The study examined why (the function) and how (the process) the participants translanguaged from Japanese to ELF in this particular context. During a forty-minute discussion, the participants spoke in Japanese most of the time, and ELF was used for less than ten minutes in total, especially between a Japanese and an Arabic speaker. Based on Gumperz (1982) and Klimpfinger (2007), four functions of translanguaging were identified: (1) addressee specification, (2) assertion, (3) clarification and (4) appealing for linguistic assistance. The process of translanguaging was also examined in relation to turn-taking structure. The results show that the use of response tokens in ELF and meta-linguistic comments functioned as cues for translanguaging. In so doing, the participants co-constructed a translanguaging space.
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1. Introduction

Translanguaging is an emergent concept in bi/multilingualism and language education. It refers to ‘both the complex language practices of plurilingual individuals and communities, as well as the pedagogical approaches that use those complex practices’ (García and Li Wei 2014, 20). This study focuses on the use of
translanguaging during a group discussion in a Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classroom at a Japanese university. The discussion involved three Japanese and one Arabic student. Both ELF and Japanese were used.

One of the frequently quoted definitions of ELF is ‘any use of English among speakers of different languages for whom English is the communicative medium or choice’ (Seidlhofer 2011, 7). The definition has recently been updated in an attempt to posit ELF within the framework of multilingualism: ‘[m]ultilingual communication in which English is available as a contact language of choice, but is not necessarily chosen’ (Jenkins 2015, 73). ELF is ‘contingent’ in its nature and the norms of discourse (language choice) are not pre-determined (Jenkins 2014, 36).

In the traditional English as a Foreign Language (EFL) framework, code-switching from English to the first language (L1) is marked as ‘error resulting from gap in knowledge’, while, within the paradigm of ELF, code-switching is seen as ‘bilingual resource’ (Jenkins 2014, 26), which chimes with the concept of translanguaging. Translanguaging is distinguishable from code-switching (CS) since it refers ‘not simply to a shift or shuttle between two languages, but to the speakers’ construction and use of original and complex interrelated discursive practices that cannot be easily assigned to one or another traditional definition of a language, but that make up the speakers’ complete language repertoire’ (22). I take the definition given by García and Li Wei (2014) and use the term translanguaging to describe the complex discursive practices interlocutors co-construct in situ with more than one language.

Why (the function) and how (the process) the participants translanguage, from Japanese to ELF in particular, is my central interest. The forms and functions of translanguaging were analysed on the basis of current studies of code-switching. The process of translanguaging was also examined in relation to turn-taking structure (Tsuchiya 2013), the use of response tokens (Gardner 2002; O’Keeffe, McCarthy, and Carter 2007) and meta-language (Storch and Wigglesworth 2003).

The results will be discussed from the perspectives of social-interactional theory, namely participation framework (Goffman 1981) and interactional/transactional talk (Brown and Yule 1983). According to Goffman (1981, 137), an interlocutor is not just a ‘recipient’ or ‘non-recipient’ of an utterance in a conversation. Interlocutors position themselves in relation to utterances – named ‘participation status’ – in the ‘participation framework’ of a conversation. In terms of functions of talk, Brown and Yule (1983, 1) describe ‘transactional’ talk as serving ‘in the expression of content’, and ‘interactional’ talk as being involved in ‘expressing social relations’.
2. Code-switching and translanguaging

The definition of code-switching is controversial and there are several associated terms: ‘loanword’ (Haugen 1950) or ‘borrowing’ (Poplack and Sankoff 1984), as established morphological or phonological convergence, and ‘code-mixing’ (Appel and Muysken 1987) or ‘transversion’ (Clyne 2003), as a complete convergence from one language to another (also cited in Gardner-Chloros 2009). Some scholars claim there are clear differences among them, for example, between code-switching and borrowing (Coulmas 2005) or between code-switching and transversion (Clyne 2003). Others argue that the boundaries between them are obscure (Gardner-Chloros 2009).

In sociolinguistic research, code-switching has been explained in relation to values and social actions, i.e. convergence with and divergence from a certain social community. Myers-Scotton (1993) defines code-switching as a ‘marked’ language choice. One of such examples is a conversation between a farmer and an office worker in Western Kenya, where they used three languages: Lwidakho, Swahili and English.

1 Farmer (Lwidakho): ‘As I live here, I have hunger.’
2 Worker (Swahili): ‘What kind of hunger?’
3 [...] 
4 Farmer (Lwidakho): ‘Hunger for money, I don’t have any.’
5 Worker (English): ‘You have got a land.’
6 (Swahili): ‘You have got a land.’
7 (Lwidakho): ‘You have got a land.’
8 Worker (Lwidakho): ‘I don’t have money’
9 (English): ‘Can’t you see how I am heavily loaded?’

(Adapted from Myers-Scotton 1993, 82–83)

At first, the participants talked in the local language, Lwidakho. However, the office worker answered the farmer’s previous utterance in Swahili and then switched to English, which is the ‘marked’ language choice and departs from the ‘expected’ norm in this context (83). The office worker’s use of code-switching creates social distance.

Research into language contact is also relevant to the current study. Johanson (2002) distinguishes three types of language contact: adoption (the speakers’ secondary code is influenced by their primary code), imposition (the speakers’ primary code is influenced by their second code), code shift (the speakers’ primary code is replaced by their secondary code). Thomason (2001) regards code-switching as
one of the mechanisms which cause contact-induced language change. He distinguishes code-switching from borrowing, in which particular words in a contact language are taken into a dominant language without inducing its grammatical or phonological changes. On the other hand, Heine and Kuteva (2005) exclude code-switching from their research scope on contact-induced grammatisation, positing code-switching in the same category as borrowing. Gardner-Chloros (2010) also describes code-switching in relation to the process of language contact. However, he points out that language change may not always follow distinct phases, moving from code-switching to language mixing and then to ‘fused lects’. Motivations to code-switch are examined in Matras (2009), who includes ‘situational switching’, which is ‘language alternation […] directly related to the roles that each language has […] in specific sets or domains of social activities’ (114), and ‘discourse-related switching’, which ‘contributes to organisation and structuring of the discourse’, i.e. narrating in one language and providing side-comments in another language (124).

Another description of code-switching is in Grosjean (2001), who investigates bilinguals’ behaviours and conceptualised bilinguals’ language modes, depicting a dynamic change in the state of activation or deactivation of languages in bilinguals. The concept of language modes is taken into consideration in the present study.

In language education, learners’ code-switching from the target language to the mother tongue is treated by some scholars as error (Jenkins 2014). García and Li Wei (2014), on the other hand, have elaborated the theory of translanguaging in bi/multilingualism and maintain that ‘the [multiple] language practices of bilingual [and multilingual] people’ are not marked, but taken as ‘the norm’ (22). The authors reject traditional bilingualism, which hypothesises that bilinguals have ‘two autonomous linguistic systems’, and put forward the idea that translanguaging occurs when bilingual speakers select multiple linguistic features appropriate to a given context.

In line with Li Wei, I regard translanguaging as the ‘multilingual speakers’ creative and critical use of the full range of their socio-cultural resources’ (Li Wei 2011, 1222). Translanguaging from Japanese to ELF, rather than ELF to Japanese, is the focus of the present study, since Japanese was dominantly used during the group discussion. Three of the participants were Japanese and there was only one Arabic student (see Section 4). Hence, Japanese was ‘first-order contact’, where ‘speakers of two different languages use one of them in communication’, whereas ELF was ‘a hybrid of similects’ (Mauranen 2012, 30).
3. Forms and functions of translanguaging

Romaine (1995 [1989]) defines three forms of code-switching: inter-sentential, intra-sentential and tag code-switching (also cited in Stockwell 2007). The first two forms are described in Myers-Scotton (1993, 4) as follows:

Intersentential [code-switching] involves switches from one language to the other between sentences. […] Intrasentential switches occur within the same sentence, from single-morpheme to clause level.

I adopt these two forms of code-switching: inter-sentential and intra-sentential ones. Tag code-switching is included in the latter, which ‘involves the insertion of a tag in one language into an utterance which is otherwise entirely in the other language’ (Romaine 1995 [1989], 122). I also take a single lexical item that is recognisably pronounced in Japanese accent as a Japanese word, i.e. America /əˈmɛrɪkə/ is an English word, while /amelika/ is a Japanese word in the analysis.¹

As to the functions, Gumperz (1982) recognised six conversational functions of code-switching: quotation, addressee specification, interjection, reiteration, qualification and personalisation versus objectivization. More recently, Klimpfinger (2007) has analysed academic ELF conversations and identified four functions of code-switching in ELF: specifying an addressee, appealing for assistance, introducing another idea and signalling culture. Based on these studies and the analysis of the data, four functions were identified in my study. These were annotated in the transcript as follows: (1) addressee specification, (2) assertion, (3) clarification and (4) appealing for assistance.

According to Gumperz (1982, 77), addressee specification ‘serves to direct the message to one of several possible addressees’. Klimpfinger (2007, 46) identifies specifying an addressee as a function of code-switching, which ‘is performed to direct one’s speech to one specific addressee in contrast to the whole group’ in a lecture or a workshop. I chose Gumperz’s term ‘addressee specification’, instead of ‘specifying addressee’ in Klimpfinger (2007), since the definition seems to be more appropriate to the occurrences in my data.

The second function is assertion, which is giving opinions in a slightly aggressive manner, seeking or holding a floor of conversation. The other function is clarification, which includes repair, both ‘self-repair’ and ‘other-repair’ (Schegloff 2007, 101), confirmation and initiation of those. Klimpfinger (2007, 49) also describes ‘appealing for assistance’ as a function of code-switching in her ELF data.

¹. The decision about which words were counted as English or Japanese was taken by myself and the transcriber, based on the pronunciation in the recording.
An example is the following interaction between a French speaker from Belgium (S2) and a Dutch speaker (S7):

1 S2 [French (B), f]: er it start with er er e:rm (2) definition of what is er a joint
2 er program. (2) er it could be (. ) one (1) er study program (. )
3 in com- er delivered in COMon in the different er (. )
4 institution or one program (. ) conceived together and located
5 in one’s side. or or two programs interconnected (2) or (. ) er
6 → <to S7><L1fr> consecutifs? {consecutive}</L1fr></to S7>
7 S7 [Dutch, f]:     <un> xx </un> consecutive

(Klimpfinger 2007, 49, an arrow and line numbers were added by myself)

From lines 1 to 4, S2 talks in ELF to a group, but in line 6, S2, a French speaker, appeals for assistance to her Dutch-speaking colleague, switching from ELF to her first language (L1), French. In this example, S2 uses code-switching to the French word ‘consecutifs’ when she appeals for assistance, and S7 provides the English equivalent ‘consecutive’ in the next turn.

In the present study, occurrences of translanguaging in the category of appealing for assistance include both translanguaging used to appeal for language support and translanguaging in response to the appeal, that is an occurrence where a participant appeals for assistance in Japanese, then switches to ELF.

4. Research methods and data

A forty-minute group discussion was audio-recorded and analysed using corpus-assisted discourse analysis, which integrates a quantitative corpus-based analysis and qualitative discourse/conversation analytic approaches (Walsh, Morton, and O’Keeffe 2011; Partington, Duguid, and Taylor 2013). The data were recorded in a CLIL classroom at a university in Japan during the teaching of a module on intercultural communication, which was one of the elective courses at the university and open to all the students in any departments. Fifty-two students were enrolled in the class including six international students from Thailand, China, Korea and Saudi Arabia. Although the medium of language in the class was English, the students used their mother tongues in group discussions.2

2. The CLIL approach was adopted in class, but, since the levels of proficiency in English varied, the lecturer allowed students to use their first language during group discussions. She encouraged them to speak in English when they talked to the whole class and explained key concepts and terms in English. The aims of the course were to understand theories of intercultural communication by reading the textbook and academic articles in English and apply these theories to their own analysis. Although students were required to deliver group presentations in English
In the discussion data, three Japanese students (one male student, Daiki, and two female students, Haru and Mari) and a Saudi Arabian student (Omar), were working on an assignment project using both Japanese and ELF (see Table 1, all names are anonymised). This group volunteered for the study and allowed me to record the discussion. Their levels of English varied. Daiki’s TOEIC score was over 850, Omar’s was over 650 and the scores of Mari and Haru were over 400. Their English levels are indicated in Table 1 in accordance with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), which are based on their TOEIC scores (ETS 2014). I am aware that the assessment criteria of CEFR and all the qualifications mentioned here are ‘ENL (English as a Native Language) based’ (Jenkins 2014, 53–55). However, they might help readers to understand the participants’ English levels. Daiki is a fourth-year Aviation student who spent his childhood in Thailand and Canada and also studied in the United States for one year as part of the university course. The other three students were second-year students in International Studies. Omar had been in the United States for two months and his level of English was B1. Omar was enrolled in the Japanese university, which requires international students to pass a Japanese proficiency test before entering the undergraduate course. The required score is N1 in the Japanese Language Proficiency Test or equivalent, which is B2 in CEFR (Japan Foundation 2012). The two female Japanese students had a lower proficiency level in English (A2) than the male students.

Table 1. Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CEFR</th>
<th>English speaking countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daiki (male)</td>
<td>Japan Aviation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>US (1 year), Canada (1 year) \ Thai land (3 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omar (male)</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia International Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>US (2 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haru (female)</td>
<td>Japan International Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Canada (2 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mari (female)</td>
<td>Japan International Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the assigned project work, students made a short film where misunderstanding in intercultural communication occurred. They created a scenario, acted in English and filmed themselves. I asked the group to audio-record their conversation as part of the course assignment, they had the choice to write the essay either in Japanese or in English and to speak English and their mother tongues in class.
during the preparation of the assignment and left the room to avoid their being too conscious of the recording. The group eventually decided to film four scenes: two in imaginary classrooms in Japan and two in America. In each setting, one scene described misunderstandings occurring between Japanese and American students because of differences in their behaviours. The other scene offered a solution to overcome the misunderstandings.

The audio-recorded group discussion was transcribed and time-stamped using an annotation software tool, Transana (Fassnacht and Woods 2002). Transcription conventions used in the Cambridge and Nottingham Corpus of Discourse in English (CANCODE) (Adolphs 2006) were applied to the transcription. The number of the participants’ utterances and the time lengths of their speaking turns in Japanese and in ELF were measured using the time-aligned corpus (Tsuchiya 2013) to obtain the overview of the data. The video the participants were filming during the group discussion was also used as an additional data source.

5. Results and discussion

5.1 The numbers of turns and words in the discussions

The word count and speaking length in English and Japanese for each participant are summarised in Table 2. The students talked in Japanese for about 25 minutes and in English for about 8 minutes in total, with about 7 minute silent pause. From the length of time they spent speaking in Japanese and ELF, the dominant language in the discussion seems to be Japanese, but they sometimes switched to ELF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wordcount</th>
<th>Speaking length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daiki</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>2314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>2147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haru</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mari</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pause</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>7708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Daiki spoke for 4 minutes 18 seconds (636 words) in ELF and for about 7 minutes (2314 letters) in Japanese, which is similar to Omar. Omar’s English level was B1 and he also had sufficient Japanese proficiency to study subjects in Japanese at
university. Haru and Mari, on the other hand, spoke in Japanese most of the time and used ELF for less than one minute during the discussion. Most of the interactions in ELF occurred between Daiki and Omar.

This indicates the turn-taking patterns where Daiki and Omar sometimes initiated the translanguaging from Japanese to ELF and co-constructed the practice in the discussion, while Mari and Haru stayed in Japanese interaction. The following section looks at the forms of translanguaging the participants employed.

### 5.2 Forms of Translanguaging

Two forms of translanguaging, inter-sentential and intra-sentential, were annotated to the transcription based on Romaine (1995 [1989]) and Myers-Scotton (1993). Tag code-switching were taken as intra-sentential translanguaging and discourse markers and backchannels, such as *okay* and *yeah*, were not counted as occurrences of translanguaging and annotated as discourse markers (DM). Borrowing was also included in translanguaging although a single word with obvious Japanese pronunciation was eliminated.

Extract 1 shows occurrences of the two forms of translanguaging, intra- and inter-sentential translanguaging. Omar and Daiki were talking about which language they were going to use when they acted as Japanese students in the scene.

**Extract 1. (at 00:07:09) Forms of translanguaging**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>&lt;s&gt;日本人でも英語どっち？&lt;/s&gt; &lt;s&gt; (Do Japanese students also speak English, which?)&lt;/s&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>→ Daiki</td>
<td>えだからたぶんアメリカの環境で例えばあのその=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(well, so perhaps, in an American environment, for example, erm=)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>yeah but=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Daiki</td>
<td>アメリカ人のクラスじゃなくて別に=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(It’s not a class for American students, but=)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>ah yeah yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Daiki</td>
<td>あのなんて言うのかな=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(erm what can I say=)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>→ Omar</td>
<td>but we gonna make this the right thing now? or the wrong one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Daiki</td>
<td>the answer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Daiki</td>
<td>right? doesn’t= it’s just practice, it doesn’t really matter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In line 1, Omar raised a question in Japanese about whether Japanese students talked in English or Japanese in the scene they were going to film. In line 2, Daiki answered in Japanese using intra-sentential translanguaging. Omar inserted several response tokens in English, ‘yeah but=’ in line 3 and ‘ah yeah yeah’ in line 5, and then asked another question in ELF, ‘but we gonna make this the right thing now? or the wrong one?’ in line 7, which is an instance of inter-sentential translanguaging.

Table 3 shows the number of occurrences of inter-sentential and intra-sentential translanguaging and discourse markers. The numbers include instances of borrowing except for a single word with Japanese accent.

Table 3. Forms of translanguaging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inter-sentential</th>
<th>Intra-sentential</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daiki</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haru</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mari</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the participants used inter-sentential translanguaging more frequently than intra-sentential translanguaging. The frequent use of inter-sentential translanguaging by Omar (45 in total) and Daiki (31) was observed. Daiki also used discourse markers 41 times, which is about twice that of Omar. The use of all the forms by Haru and Mari was limited in number when compared with the male students. The following section will discuss the functions of translanguaging in relation to the forms.

5.3 Functions of translanguaging

The functions of translanguaging from Japanese to ELF in the discussion are categorised into four types, according to the categorisations provided by Gumperz (1982) and Klimpfinger (2007): (1) addressee specification, (2) assertion, (3) clarification, (4) appealing for assistance.

Translanguaging was used to specify an addressee in the following examples. In Extract 2, Haru and Omar were seated at a desk in front of the whiteboard and Daiki was looking at the camera lens to film and adjust the angle.
In lines 1 to 8, Daiki was adjusting the position of the video-camera, checking the scope together with Omar and Haru in Japanese. Omar then switched to ELF in line 9, asking Daiki, ‘Can you see?’ , to which Daiki answered in ELF in line 10. This is an instance where Omar used translanguaging to speak to Daiki. Omar’s use of translanguaging to ELF was often observed when he addressed Daiki, not the other two students, and the same practices were recognised in Daiki to Omar.

Extract 3 includes the second function: assertion. The four students were talking about the lines they were going to say in the scene where Daiki as a teacher asked what was important in intercultural communication for the students.
だから別に（.）it doesn’t really have to be this word, right? (so it doesn’t have to be=)
Like I mean it can be= if understanding can be like judgement or er I don’t know= belief or whatever like that= can be other words if it’s not the same= これじゃなかったら (if it’s not this one.)

In lines 1 to 7, Daiki, Haru and Omar suggested some possible responses from the students to the question given by the teacher in the imaginary classroom. Then in line 8, Daiki asserted his opinion, switching from Japanese to ELF, slightly raising his voice. He inserted several short Japanese phrases. He uttered an acknowledgement phrase ‘ああそうだね (well yeah)’ after ‘Not=Not=Not’, then switched to ELF, saying ‘Not judging people’, followed by another Japanese phrase ‘だから別に’ (so it doesn’t have to be=). He then switched to ELF for a while, then switched back to Japanese at the end, saying ‘これじゃなかったら (if it’s not this one.)’. Here he took a longer floor to suggest what the students should utter in the scene, leading the discussion.

The participants also translanguaged for clarification. An example of translanguaging for clarification in my data is confirmation initiation, as shown in Extract 4, where they talked about the scene they were going to take next.

Extract 4. (at 00:06:21) Clarification (Confirmation)
1       Omar はい今はアメリカで
(Now in America)
2 →    Haru  in America?
3       Daiki うん [in America]
(Yeah)
4       Omar [now it’s] in America

In line 1, Omar said in Japanese that the next scene they were going to practise was a scene set in America. Haru switched to ELF in line 2 and said: ‘in America?’, which functions as confirmation initiation. The following utterances by Daiki and Omar in lines 3 and 4 were taken as confirmation. Haru used Japanese most of the time. However, she seemed to translanguage in order to initiate confirmation, which can be one of her clarification strategies. In fact, she used clarification in ELF five times (see Table 4).

Extract 5 includes another example of clarification, which is repair. Before this extract, they started acting a scene, but they stopped at this point as they were not sure which scene they should act.
Extract 5. (at 00:26:36) Clarification (Repair)

1 Omar 待って待って<$G?>さぁ
(Wait, wait)

2 → Haru あ これ2個目？Good manner?
(Er is this the second scene?)

3 Omar 例えばね
(For example)

4 → Mari 違う 3個目
(No, this is the third one)

5 → Daiki え これこっちじゃないの？
(Oh is it not this one?)

6 → Omar 3個目だったっけ?
(Is it the third one?)

7 → Haru 3個目
(It’s the third one)

Omar stopped acting in line 1, then Haru asked whether this was the second scene or the third one both in Japanese and ELF in line 2, saying ‘あこれ2個目？(Er is this the second scene?) Good manner?’. The scenes were named in Japanese and ELF, such as ‘良くないヤツ (a bad scene)’ or ‘first shot [sic]’. Haru then chose the term ‘good manner’ for clarification (see Excerpt 4 for another case where Haru used ELF for clarification). Mari first repaired in line 4, saying, ‘No, this is the third one’ in Japanese, which was followed by Daiki and Omar’s response to Haru’s repair initiation and Mari’s repair in lines 5 and 6. Finally, Haru self-repaired and confirmed in line 7, saying ‘It’s the third one’ in Japanese.

There were a few occurrences of translanguaging to ELF for clarification in Mari (5 in total) and Haru (3) (see Table 4). In these occurrences, Haru and Mari spoke to either Daiki or Omar as in Extract 4. Thus, translanguaging for clarification with a relatively lower proficiency level in ELF can be interpreted as their accommodation to the norm in interaction between Daiki and Omar, who tended to communicate in ELF with each other.

Occurrences of translanguaging in appealing for assistance were also observed in my data. One example is Extract 6.

Extract 6. (at 00:03:05) Appealing for assistance

1 → Omar まあいい誰がとら=とれ=なんだっけ?
(okay, who films= can film= how can I say?)

2 → Omar [someone=] someone must take for us

3 Daiki [だからもし=]
(So if=)

4 Daiki [yeah]
Keiko Tsuchiya

In line 1, Omar tried to ask who was going to film in Japanese first, but he could not conjugate the verb ‘撮る (the verb film)’ in Japanese properly and sought assistance, saying ‘なんだっけ? (how can I say?)’, which was followed by an ELF equivalent ‘someone= someone must take for us’ as nobody offered help in Japanese. Daiki started responding to Omar’s statement first in Japanese ‘だからもし=’, then uttered a discourse marker in ELF in line 4 and then eventually answered Omar’s statement, switching to ELF in line 6.

The occurrences of translanguaging are summarised in Table 4. Instances of translanguaging for addressee specification (46 in total) and assertion (54) were observed more often compared with the other two functions, i.e. clarification (13) and appealing for assistance (9). Only Daiki and Omar translanguaged for addressee specification. Daiki translanguaged 15 times to address Omar and Omar translanguaged 18 times to address Daiki. The use of appealing for assistance was observed in Daiki, Omar and Haru. Translanguaging for assertion and clarification appeared in all of the participants, although most of the instances of assertion were seen in Daiki and Omar. The relationship between the forms and functions of translanguaging are summarised in Table 5.

Table 4. Functions of translanguaging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>address</th>
<th>assertion</th>
<th>clarification</th>
<th>assistance</th>
<th>Unclassified</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daiki</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haru</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mari</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Forms and functions of translanguaging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>address</th>
<th>assertion</th>
<th>clarification</th>
<th>assistance</th>
<th>Unclassified</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-sentential</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-sentential</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The participants sometimes used ELF when acting a scene. These instances of translanguaging are not included in the data.
Inter-sentential translanguaging in addressee specification was more frequently used than intra-sentential translanguaging. Both forms were observed in the four functions. The results indicate that Daiki and Omar often used inter-sentential translanguaging in interactions between each other. They seemed to translanguge to restrict their addressee, which can relate to the management of ‘participation framework’ (Goffman 1981) in the discussion (see Extract 2). Interestingly, the qualitative analysis shows that translanguaging for clarification was also related to participation framework, as discussed in Extracts 4 and 5. These are examples of Haru and Mari translanguaging for clarification, simultaneously accommodating their language to ELF, which Daiki and Omar tended to use in their interaction. In doing so, the participants regulated the translanguaging space, utilising both languages available to them by shifting from Japanese to ELF and moving back to Japanese.

5.4 Shifting from interactional talk to transactional talk

A qualitative conversation and discourse analytic approach was also adopted in this study. The use of translanguaging in relation to interactional and transaction talk (Brown and Yule 1983) was analysed by focusing on a longer sequence of interaction in the data.

As shown in Extract 7, some instances of translanguaging seem to indicate a shift from interactional talk to transactional talk. Intending to act as a teacher in the scene, Omar was writing a topic they were going to use in the scene on the white board in front of the desk, where two female students, Haru and Mari were seated. Daiki was setting up a video-camera near the white board.

Extract 7. (at 00:04:01) Translanguaging to shift from interactional to transactional talk

1 Mari 書く？大夫？
   (Do you want me to write? Are you alright?)
2 Omar うん大夫
   (Yeah I’m alright.)
3 Mari ステレオ=
   (stereo=)
4 Omar どっちでいい，intercultural?
   (which is better?)
5 Mari どっちでも[良いです]
   (whichever [you like.])
6 Omar [あとで]聞くんでしょう
   ([later] you will ask about it?)
7 (4.0)
8 → Mari オマールの字じゃ雑
(Omar’s hand writing is untidy.)
9 Haru あれの白のデイジー欲しい
(I want that [Omar’s T-shirt] with Daisy [a Disney character] and white one.)
10 Mari あ デイジーあるの? かわいい
(Oh is there one with Daisy? It’s cute.)
11 Haru [[絶対ほしい]]
([I’ll definitely buy one.])
12 Mari [え かわいい] 絶対かわいい
([Oh it’s cute] really cute.)
13 Omar <$E>$ laugh </$E$
14 Haru 絶対かわいいでしょミニーちゃんたかもあるよ
(It must be really cute. There’s the other one with Minnie.)
15 Mari えー
(Oh)
16 → Omar can you write for me? <$E>$ laugh </$E$
17 Daiki what? write what?
18 Omar intercultural communication
19 → Mari 汚い
(It’s [=Omar’s handwriting] untidy.)
20 Daiki yes I can
21 Omar Mm <$E>$ laugh </$E$

Mari and Omar were talking about which topic they were going to discuss in the scene in Japanese from lines 1 to 6, including one instance of intra-sentential translanguaging by Omar in line 4. After a four-second pause, Mari complained that Omar’s handwriting was untidy in line 8. Then, Haru initiated another topic in line 9, which was totally unrelated to the ongoing task, that is, about Omar’s shirt with some Disney character, saying in Japanese, ‘あれの白のデイジー欲しい’ (I want that [Omar’s T-shirt] with Daisy [a Disney character] and white one). Mari joined Haru in pursuing this topic at the following turn, which continued until line 15. Omar was listening to their talk but just laughed in line 13. This interactional talk between the two female students in Japanese was terminated in line 16 by Omar asking Daiki to write on the board in English, ‘Can you write for me?’ This was also taken as a request to Daiki to act as a teacher. Omar’s request seemed to be his accepting Mari’s complaining about his handwriting in line 8. From a conversation analytic view, Mari’s complaining in line 8 is the first part of an adjacency pair, which is completed with the delayed second part by Omar’s request in line 16 for Daiki to change the roles, which was accepted by Daiki in line 21 (Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks 1977). Meanwhile, Mari repeated her complaint in line 19, which served to strengthen her complaint in line 8, thus proving the legitimacy of the sequence (cf. ‘next-turn proof procedure’ in Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974, 729), also cited in Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008, 15)).
Thus, here Omar translanguaged to ELF to shift from the interactional talk to the transactional talk, which is also related to a transactional goal and decision making on who was going to act as a teacher in the scene. This use of translanguaging for the achievement of transactional goals was also observed in Extract 3, where Daiki asserted his opinion to decide on what they should say in the scene. The next section will briefly look at the process of translanguaging.

5.5 Co-constructing a translanguaging space

From the qualitative analysis of the data, two practices which lead translanguaging in the discussion were identified: (1) the use of English response tokens, and (2) the use of meta-language before floor-taking in ELF. Extract 2 is one of such examples where English response tokens were observed before floor-taking in ELF. Here Daiki was setting up a video camera and Haru and Omar were asking whether he got the right angle. In the first few lines, Haru and Daiki spoke in Japanese. However, Omar uttered an English response token *yeah* in line 7 before he took the floor in ELF in line 9. After Omar’s translanguaging to ELF in line 9, Daiki responded to Omar in ELF in line 10, by which he seemed to co-construct the context where translanguaging was the norm in the discussion. There were four instances of English response tokens in total: in Omar (3) and Daiki (1).

Extract 2. (at 00:00:52) The use of response tokens before translanguaging

1      Omar  こっちからの方がいいじゃん
          (it’s better from this side.)
2      Daiki  あ いいよ
           (okay)
3     Pause   (2.0)
4      Haru  うん映りますか?
           (can you see us?)
5      Daiki  ああ大丈夫
           (yeah okay.)
6      Haru  大丈夫
           (okay)
7 →   Omar  yeah
6      Omar  大丈夫
           (okay)
7 →   Omar  Can you see?
9 →   Daiki  Yeah. Like front row er through=

Another discursive practice before floor-taking in ELF was the use of meta-language. In Extract 6, they were discussing who filmed for them. The data include three instances of the use of meta-language (2 in Omar and 1 in Daiki).
Extract 6. (at 00:03:05) The use of meta-language before translanguaging
1 → Omar まあいい誰がとら=とれ=なんだっけ?
(okay, who films= can film= how can I say [in Japanese]?)
2 → Omar  [someone=] someone must take for us
3       Daiki  [だからもし=]
(So if=)
4       Daiki  [yeah]
5       Omar  [video]
6 → Daiki  so if we are recording the eleventh then she
can do it <$G?>.

Most of the cases of these two strategies were observed during the first ten minutes of the conversation. To investigate the turn-taking structure, seven types of turn-structural episodes were also annotated to the transcription (see Table 6; cf. Tsuchiya 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6. Turn-structural episodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Episode 1  Current speaker’s turn closing → Next speaker’s turn-taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode 2  Current speaker’s turn keeping → Next speaker’s cut-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode 3  Current speaker’s turn closing → (Pause) → Current speaker’s turn retaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode 4  Current speaker’s turn closing → (Pause) → Next speaker’s final turn-taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode 5  Current speaker’s turn giving → Next speaker’s turn-taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode 6  Current speaker’s turn giving → (Pause) → Next speaker’s turn retaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode 7  Current speaker’s turn giving → (Pause) → Next speaker’s final turn-taking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from: Tsuchiya 2013, p. 100; Ohama 2006)

As shown in Table 7, Omar had more turns (97 in total, 16 of which were occurrences of floor taking in ELF) than Daiki (57 in total and 12 in ELF).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. Numbers of instances of seven turn-taking episodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPS1  EPS2  EPS3  EPS4  EPS5  EPS6  EPS7  Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daiki  16(1) 16(3) 3  3  19(8) 0  0  57(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omar  39(9) 24(4) 4  7  23(3) 0  0  97(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mari  22        13 1  5  11  0  1  53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haru  23(1) 10 1  2  8(1) 0  0  44(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 100(11) 63(7) 9  17  61(12) 0  1  251(30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both of them frequently used Episode 1 (floor taking after the previous speaker’s turn closing), Episode 2 (cut-in before the previous speaker’s closing) and Episode

4. The numbers of floor-taking in ELF are shown in brackets.
5 (floor taking after the previous speaker’s turn-giving). Omar used Episode 1 most (9 times) when he took the floor in ELF, while Daiki mostly took the floor in ELF with Episode 5 (8 times), which indicates the turn-taking patterns where Omar initiated the translanguaging from Japanese to ELF and Daiki co-constructed the practice, responding to Omar in ELF. The two female students also frequently used Episodes 1, 2 and 5, but mostly in Japanese, except for only two occurrences in ELF in Haru.

Thus, the bi/multilingual speakers strategically negotiated the discursive norms (language choice), and simultaneously constructed their linguistic repertoire, co-constructing a translanguaging space by using English response tokens and meta-language.

5.6 The multifunctional nature of translanguaging

The findings indicate the multifunctional nature of translanguaging in the academic discussion. I shall summarise three aspects here:

1. comprising ‘subordinate communication’
2. indicating a boundary between discourse frames
3. projecting bi/multilingual self.

First, during the discussion, the four participants talked as a whole group most of the time, but sometimes they broke into two conversational groups of two persons each. The two male students’ use of translanguaging to ELF seems to comprise the ‘subordinate communication’, in other words ‘by play’ (Goffman 1981, 134–135), which enabled them to talk between two participants by specifying an addressee, but without completely excluding the other two participants from the discussion. Thus, translanguaging can be used as a strategy to regulate participation framework in the interaction.

Second, translanguaging to ELF seems to indicate boundaries between different discourse frames. Poncini (2004, 258) identifies frames in multicultural business meetings and found that a shift from a ‘joking’ framework to seriousness was indicated by a change in the participants’ choices of languages at that moment from English to Italian. Extract 7 shows a similar instance, where Omar’s use of translanguaging signalled a shift from interactional talk between Haru and Mari to transactional talk (see Section 5.4).

Since Daiki spent his childhood in other countries and studied in the US for one year, and Omar is an international student from Saudi Arabia (see Section 4), they seemed to be more familiar with multicultural and multilingual environments than the other two participants. As shown in Table 2 in Section 5.1, the
frequent use of translanguaging to ELF in the two male students (see Section 5.1) indicates that mixing languages with translanguaging seems to be the norm for the two male students, although the use of translanguaging to ELF in the other two females was limited and they tended to remain monolingual.

To create a translanguaging space, the two male students did not stay in ELF for long, and went back and forth between ELF and Japanese. Extract 3 includes an example of translanguaging from ELF to Japanese in Daiki.

Extract 3. (at 00:10:57) Translanguaging from ELF to Japanese

1  Daiki  あーじゃあなんかス=ステレオタイプとかね
         (erm you can say stereotype.)
2  Haru   ああ
         (yeah.)
3  Omar   Understanding other culture
4  Daiki  Other culture um
5  Mari   うん
         (Okay.)
6  Haru   じゃあ understanding=
         (Then)
7  Omar   Understanding 一緒に入る
         (I will join at the same time.)
8  Daiki  Not= Not= Not= あそうだね Not judging people=
         (well yeah)
         だから別に(.) it doesn’t really have to be this word, right?
         (so it doesn’t have to be=)
         Like I mean it can be= if understanding can be like judgement
         or er I don’t know= belief or whatever like that= can be other
         words if it’s not the same= これじゃなかったら
         (if it’s not this one.)

Daiki translanguaged from Japanese to ELF at the beginning of line 8, asserting his opinion about what student role actors should say in the scene, and going back to Japanese at the end, saying ‘これじゃなかったら(if it’s not this one)’ in Japanese. Then, they went back to a conversation in Japanese. A similar tendency was observed in Omar’s utterances. In so doing, they seem to represent a bi/multilingual self. In contrast, the two female students, Mari in particular, seems to resist translanguaging to ELF, thus representing a monolingual self in the conversation.

6. Concluding remarks

This study examined the use of translanguaging, mainly from Japanese to ELF, in relation to its forms and functions as well as the turn-taking patterns in a group discussion in a CLIL classroom, where Japanese and ELF were language resources
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for the participants. The quantitative analysis of speaking time in both languages indicates that the use of Japanese seems to be the shared norm in the discussion, but simultaneously, the use of translanguaging from Japanese to ELF was also accepted occasionally. Most occurrences of translanguaging to ELF were observed between Daiki and Omar in the form of inter-sentential translanguaging, while limited use of translanguaging occurred in Haru and Mari. Daiki and Omar translanguaged to specify their addressee and assert their opinions, thus securing the floor of conversation. Haru and Mari, on the other hand, translanguaged for clarification, although the number of occurrences is small. Translanguaging to appeal for assistance was also observed, mostly in Omar. The results from the qualitative analysis are summarised as follows:

(1) The use of translanguaging to ELF in Daiki and Omar seems to relate to their projection of bi/multilingual self in the translanguaging space, and also the management of participation framework (i.e. switching to ELF to specify an addressee),

(2) Haru and Mari’s use of translanguaging for clarification can be their accommodation to the norm in the interaction between the two male students, although the number of the occurrences is limited,

(3) Translanguaging from Japanese to ELF seems to be used as a strategy to mark a shift from interactional talk to transactional talk.

On the basis of the theory of language modes (Grosjean 2001), the difference in the frequency of translanguaging to ELF may derive from the participants’ exposure to language contact situations. Daiki and Omar, who had previously been exposed to bi/multilingual interactions, activated the bilingual mode at ease, while Mari and Haru, who had less experience in language contact settings, remained in the monolingual mode.

The other factor to be considered is of a cultural nature. The difference in their grades, Daiki being senior to the other participants, may have affected the negotiation of the local conversational norms among the participants, since the hierarchy defined by their age or social status is often recognised in a Japanese conversation (Maynard 1993; Watanabe 1993).

The aspects of translanguaging discussed in the article are summarised as follows:
This study explored discursive practices of translanguaging between ELF and Japanese in the context of a CLIL classroom in tertiary education in Japan. The findings unveil the strategic use of translanguaging from Japanese to ELF to regulate participation framework and interactional/transactional talk in the discussion. It also seemed to affect their presentation of themselves as bi/multilingual individuals. This study also sheds light on the potential of the integrated research methodology of a quantitative corpus-driven approach and qualitative discourse/conversation analytic approaches. The results obtained from the present analysis of one forty-minute conversation cannot be generalised, but they are worth exploring in future research.
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## Appendix

### Annotation conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventions</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extralinguistic information</td>
<td>&lt;$E&gt;$…&lt;/$E&gt;$</td>
<td>This includes laughter, coughs and transcribers’ comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintelligible Speech</td>
<td>&lt;$G?$&gt;</td>
<td>Unintelligible speech is marked with these brackets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guess</td>
<td>&lt;$H&gt;$…&lt;/$H&gt;$</td>
<td>Where the accuracy of the transcription is uncertain, the sequence of words in question is placed between these two angle brackets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupted sentence</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>When an utterance is interrupted by another speaker, this is indicated by using a + sign at the end of interrupted utterance and at the point where the speaker resumes his or her utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfinished sentence</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Unfinished sentences of any type are indicated with = sign at the end of unfinished utterances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adolphs 2008, 137–138)
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