

**Research Article**

# Comparison of Translanguaging Pedagogies Used by Native and Non-native Teachers in EFL Writing Classes

Emel Kucukali<sup>1,\*</sup>  and H. Kübra Er<sup>2</sup> <sup>1</sup> School of Foreign Languages, Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir, Turkey<sup>2</sup> School of Foreign Languages, Erzurum Technical University, Erzurum, Turkey\* **Corresponding author:** Emel Kucukali, School of Foreign Languages, Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir, Turkey. Email: emel.kucukali@deu.edu.tr**ARTICLE INFO****Article History:**

Received: 10/11/2023

Revised: 05/12/2023

Accepted: 12/12/2023

Published: 25/12/2023

**Keywords:**

Academic writing

EFL classes

EFL native teachers

EFL Non-native Teachers

Translanguaging pedagogies,

**ABSTRACT**

**Introduction:** The present study aimed to compare the translanguaging pedagogies used by native and non-native EFL teachers in their academic writing classes in a Turkish university context. Translanguaging pedagogies included strategies such as switching between and speaking multiple languages, comparing languages and cultures, and making use of translation.

**Methodology:** A native EFL teacher, a non-native EFL teacher, and their students (N = 32) were purposefully selected from the English pre-session program of a Turkish university. The native teacher is British, and the non-native teacher and the students are of Turkish nationality. Data was collected from two audio recordings of teachers' academic writing classes. Data were analyzed through descriptive statistics such as the frequency of translanguaging pedagogies and English and Turkish words of the participants using CLAN (Computerized Language Analysis) Program.

**Results:** The findings revealed differences between the teachers' classes. In the non-native teacher's class, language integration (students' L1 and target language) was more intensive, compared to the session with the native teacher. The frequency of Turkish words was high and close to the frequency of English words in the non-native teacher's classroom, while English was dominating Turkish in the native teacher's session at a significant level. Similarly, the switches between languages were much more in the classroom of the non-native teacher. Another finding indicated that the non-native teacher made much more use of translanguaging pedagogies than her native counterpart. Apart from code-switching, the non-native teacher compared English and Turkish grammar and translated vocabulary, sentences, and her questions to the students very often. On the other hand, the native EFL teacher only compared American and British cultures.

**Conclusion:** Native and non-native EFL teachers may approach translanguaging differently in the classroom, and this also affects the translanguaging behavior of their students accordingly. Further research is suggested with qualitative and longitudinal studies on native vs. non-native EFL teachers' translanguaging. Implications were recommended at the end of the study.

## 1. Introduction

Translanguaging in language education has emerged recently as an innovative and intriguing area of research (Cenoz & Gorter, 2022). The concept of translanguaging is approached from a dynamic multilingual standpoint, with its pedagogical consequences encompassing the integration of many languages within the classroom setting to facilitate the

process of teaching and learning (García & Wei, 2014). The primary objective of this study is to conduct a comparative analysis of the Translanguaging pedagogies (TP) exhibited by native and non-native English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instructors in the context of academic writing courses.

The literature on translanguaging in the context of EFL

► Cite this paper as: Kucukali E, Kübra Er H. Comparison of Translanguaging Pedagogies Used by Native and Non-native Teachers in EFL Writing Classes. Journal of Contemporary Language Research. 2023; 2(4): 192-198. DOI: 10.58803/jclr.v2i4.90



The Author(s). Published by Rovedar. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

and academic writing is extensive, with studies employing questionnaires and interviews to gauge the perspectives of EFL teachers and students regarding translanguaging (Adamson & Coulson, 2015; Emilia & Hamied, 2022; Turnbull, 2019; Yang et al., 2023; Zhang, 2023). Also, the research on translanguaging discourse in EFL writing classes primarily centers around the examination of observations (Cai & Fang, 2022; Emilia & Hamied, 2022; Yang et al., 2023), as well as in-class recordings (Afriadi & Hamzah, 2021; Jiang et al., 2022). Notably, these studies predominantly concentrate on classes taught by non-native instructors. The research on native EFL teachers' classes and analysis of their translanguaging speech is given less attention (Jiang et al., 2022), and seems to be a need for comparison of native vs. non-native EFL teachers' in-class talk while teaching academic writing. In an effort to address this research gap, the primary objective of this study is to conduct a comparative analysis of the TP employed by a native English teacher and a non-native English teacher, as well as their Turkish students, within the setting of EFL writing classes in a Turkish university. The objective of analyzing the in-class recording is to extract and compare the frequency, nature, and functions of TP utilized in classes taught by native vs non-native teachers. Therefore, the following research questions were investigated

RQ1: What is the frequency of the words spoken in English and Turkish during the writing lesson of the native vs. non-native teacher?

RQ2: What are the frequency and functions of TP used during the writing lesson of the native vs. non-native teacher?

### **1.2. Theoretical background**

The teaching strategy known as translanguaging was first proposed by Williams (1996) as a means for students to switch between English and Welsh within a bilingual educational environment (García & Wei, 2014). Following this, the term has undergone a transformation and is now referred to as translanguaging pedagogies (TP), which has a wider range of educational implications (García & Kano, 2014). The term TP is utilized in this study to refer to instructional methods in which both students and teachers utilize and transition between multiple languages to enhance the teaching and learning process (Canagarajah, 2020; Cenoz & Gorter, 2020; Council of Europe, 2020).

Translanguaging pedagogies recognize the incorporation of languages of bi-/multilingual individuals in a unified and integrated linguistic framework, drawing upon the concepts of multilingual ideology and the notion of dynamic bilingualism. According to Cenoz and Gorter (2020) and García and Wei (2014), it can be observed that within the educational setting, TP challenges the monolingual perspective that segregates languages, by giving precedence to the target language and disregarding other languages in the classroom. In contrast, Cenoz and Gorter (2020) have argued that TP advocates for the incorporation of all languages spoken by learners during the process of teaching the target language in the classroom.

According to the research, the utilization of translanguaging pedagogies is recommended because they entail the incorporation of several languages within educational settings (Council of Europe, 2020; García & Wei, 2014). The focus of the current study revolved around four cross-linguistic strategies, namely translation, comparison of languages, switching between languages, and comparison of cultures (Council of Europe, 2020; García & Wei, 2014).

The revised hierarchical model (Kroll & Stewart, 1994; Kroll & Tokowicz, 2005) is a psycholinguistic model that provides support for TP in relation to language integration. This model is particularly relevant to the context of the study, which focuses on emergent bilinguals in EFL settings. The revised hierarchical model (RHM), as proposed by Kroll and Stewart, posits that the lexical and conceptual representations of an individual's first language (L1) and second language (L2) are distinct yet interrelated. Based on this psycholinguistic model, emergent bilingual individuals rely on indirect connections through translation equivalents in their L1 to access the meaning of L2 words (L2 → L1 → Conceptual system). In contrast, proficient bilingual individuals have established direct links to the conceptual system, enabling them to comprehend the meanings of L2 words without relying on their L1 (Ellis, 2008, p. 375).

### **1.3. Empirical background**

Recent research has given attention to the phenomenon of translanguaging within EFL settings (Emilia & Hamied, 2022; Liu & Fang, 2020; Yang et al., 2023; Zhang, 2023). According to literature, translanguaging has been utilized as a pedagogical approach within EFL settings to facilitate the teaching of grammar and vocabulary, enhance comparisons between English and students' L1, provide instructions and feedback, foster informal conversations, facilitate question and answer exchanges, and aid in seeking clarifications (Turnbull, 2018; Yuvayapan, 2019). According to Yuzlu and Dikilitas (2021), the findings also indicated that TP was employed in EFL classrooms for constructive, cognitive, interactive, and emotional objectives.

The existing research conducted in EFL and academic writing contexts has demonstrated the various benefits of using translanguaging pedagogies on students' writing skills. These advantages include improved performance levels, increased involvement rates, and enhanced interest in the process of essay writing. According to Turnbull (2019) and Zhang (2023), the implementation of translanguaging pedagogies has been found to enhance the ability of EFL students to comprehend content, effectively communicate, and develop critical awareness in the context of academic writing sessions (Yang et al., 2023).

According to Emilia and Hamied (2022), the results related to EFL classrooms taught by non-native teachers revealed that TP was utilized for interpretative, administrative, and interactive purposes. The observational analyses conducted by Cai and Fang (2022) utilized various TP. These practices aimed to improve students'

comprehension, clarify essential concepts, and encourage active participation in the classroom. According to Anderson (2022), observations revealed that learners consistently embraced the translanguaging approaches employed by their instructors. The results derived from the analysis of recorded interactions in an EFL classroom reveal that the primary utilization of the target language was for instructional objectives, such as providing explanations, seeking clarification, and managing classroom activities (Afriadi & Hamzah, 2021). Other findings revealed a positive attitude toward the use of TP in class (Khairunnisa & Lukmana, 2020; Sobkowiak, 2022). Interviews with EFL teachers reported that TP was used to explain grammar and manage the classroom by showing shared cultural values (Putri & Rifai, 2021).

Another research also successfully investigated the level of involvement of native English teachers in the implementation of TP in English language classrooms in Hong Kong. This was achieved by analyzing video recordings capturing the dynamic interactions in the classroom setting. The results revealed that translanguaging activities were present, characterized by ambivalence rather than intensity. These behaviors included weak forms of translanguaging and multimodal translanguaging, which did not involve the use of students' own language (Jiang et al., 2022).

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1. Participants

The participants in this study were chosen using convenience sampling. The sample included an EFL instructor who was a native English speaker, an EFL teacher who was a non-native English speaker, and a total of 32 students enrolled in the English pre-session program at a university in Türkiye. The teachers were teaching academic English, including academic writing, in the pre-session program, and they had 15-20 years of teaching experience. The students' age varied from 18 to 22 years. All students' proficiency level of English was pre-intermediate, and they were assigned into pre-intermediate groups according to a placement exam at the beginning of the English course. After completing the English course successfully, the students can study their majors, including engineering, medicine, business and administration, and dentistry. The informed consent form was taken from the participants and the institution. The native teacher was British but had enough knowledge of Turkish to communicate. The non-native teacher and all students were of Turkish nationality. In the present study, codes were used instead of participants' names, as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1.**

*Participants' codes*

CODE	Participant
NT	Native teacher
NNT	Non-native teacher
NTS	Native teacher's students
NNTS	Non-native teacher's students

### 2.2. Data collection

The data was obtained from audio recordings of two academic writing sessions of the teachers. The teachers were teaching the structure of an essay in both classes. The first recording had a duration of 50 minutes, while the second recording lasted for 45 minutes. The data collection took place during the summer school of the pre-session program, in July 2018. Subsequently, the collected data was transcribed using the CHAT Transcription Format of CLAN program (MacWhinney, 2000). Please refer to Appendix A for a transcribed sample of the CHAT conversation.

### 2.3. Data analysis

The data underwent analysis utilizing descriptive statistics for language analysis, employing the CLAN (Computerized Language Analysis) Program (MacWhinney, 2000; Wei & Moyer, 2008). Initially, the transcribed recordings underwent a process wherein each individual word was assigned a label indicating the specific language in which it was spoken. Subsequently, the utilized TP was categorized and assigned codes based on the corresponding utterances by two coders operating independently. The utilization of codes and transcription norms were according to the CHAT Transcription Format. Therefore, the language analysis involved the execution of the `FREQ` command to generate two sets of data: 1) the frequency of word usage in each language and 2) the frequency of TP codes utilized during the lecture, along with their respective purposes. The commands utilized for the analysis were chosen from the CLAN Program manual.

### 2.4. Reliability and validity

To assess the reliability of the codes employed in the analysis of the recordings, an inter-coder reliability analysis was conducted using Kappa statistics. This statistical measure was utilized to evaluate the level of agreement between two coders who worked independently on the data, as outlined by Landis and Koch (1977). The inter-coder reliability for eight codes used in recording data was assessed, yielding a Kappa value of 0.72 ( $p < 0.001$ ) and a Kappa value of 0.59 ( $p < 0.001$ ). These results were statistically significant and indicated a strong level of agreement between the two coders (Viera & Garrett, 2005).

The recordings were analyzed utilizing the CLAN Program (MacWhinney, 2000) to enhance the study's reliability through uniform coding and transcription standards (Wei & Moyer, 2008). The codes, transcription techniques, and analytic instructions utilized in this study were selected from the CHILDES (Child Language Data Exchange System) database (MacWhinney, 2000).

## 3. Results

### 3.1. Findings related to the first research question

The first research question addressed the frequency of the words spoken in English

**Table 2.***Frequency of English and Turkish words/tokens*

Participants Classroom	Teacher nat	Students nat	Total nat	Teacher non-nat	Students non-nat	Total non-nat
Frequency (f) English words/tokens	666	214	880	696	69	765
Frequency (f) Turkish words/tokens	8	58	66	594	89	683

and Turkish during the writing lesson of the native vs. non-native teacher.

As can be seen in Table 2, there were differences between the teachers' classes. In the NNT class. There was a more intensive integration of languages (students' L1 and target language), compared to the NT session. The frequency of Turkish words (f = 683) was high and close to the frequency of English words (f = 765) in the NNT's classroom, while English (f = 880) dominated Turkish (f = 66) in the NT's session at a significant level. The inclusion of Turkish was much higher by the NNT (f = 594) than by the NT (f = 8). On the other hand, the students of the NT spoke in English (f = 214) much more than L1 Turkish (f = 58), while the frequency of Turkish words (f = 89) was higher than that of English words (f = 69) for the students in the NNT's classroom.

### 3.2. Findings related to the second research question

The second research question aimed to examine the frequency and functions of TP used during the writing lesson of the native vs. non-native teacher.

Tables 3 and 4 indicate that the switches, specifically intra-sentential switches, between languages were much more common in the NNT classroom.

For instance, native teachers preferred English for formal functions like giving instructions, explanations, feedback, and answers during guided activities:

NT: So, we are talking about the thesis statement. It is about the main idea, we use it in the introduction of an essay.

However, the NNT used dense switches between English and Turkish in the same formal situations:

NNT: What part of speech summery, noun, *özet demek*, *peki* verb formu *ne*, summarizing we make it noun, *nerde yaptık bunu* concluding *son paragrafta nasıl başlarız nasıl biter*.

(*Turkish is in italics*. English is not in italics)

For informal situations such as jokes, the NT used switches:

NT: *Aaa o zaman* no ok.

(*Turkish is in italics*. English is not in italics)

On the other hand, for fun NNT preferred Turkish, the common native language with her students:

NNT: *Siz bu dille ne zaman kavga etmeye bırakacaksınız olduğu gibi*

*kabullenin artık*.

(*Turkish is in italics*. English is not in italics)

Another finding from Tables 3 and 4 indicated that the NNT made use of TP much more than her native

**Table 3.***Frequency of Codes Representing the Functions of Translanguaging Pedagogies Used During the Writing Session of the Native Teacher*

Codes	Native Teacher		Students	
	Frequency	Language	Frequency	Language
Giving feedback / answers	12	EN	10	EN
Asking questions	1	TUR	6	EN-TUR
Jokes / Fun	2	EN-TUR	2	EN
Instructions/ explanations	1		1	TUR
Informal talk	6	EN		
Group work	1	EN-TUR		
Comparison of Cultures	1		1	TUR
	1	EN		

counterpart. Apart from code-switching, the NNT compared English and Turkish grammar and translated vocabulary, sentences, and questions to the students very often:

NNT: ordering, *sıraya sokmak*, yes, first, second...What is the function? *Ne işe yarıyorlar? Ashında bu da bir zamir ama aynı zamanda bir bağlaç, niye? Sequence başlığı altında çünkü sıralama önemli*.

(*Turkish is in italics*. English is not in italics)

On the other hand, the native NT teacher compared American and British cultures only:

NT: Utility is actually an American word that means like electricity, gas, water, all of the things.

Similarly, Tables 3 and 4 revealed that students in both classrooms made use of both English and Turkish. Specifically, asking questions was mainly in Turkish in the NNT's session:

NNTS: *Sonra, sonradan olan değil mi, önceki, hocam?*

**Table 4.***Frequency of Codes Representing the Functions of Translanguaging Pedagogies Used During the Writing Session of the Non-Native Teacher*

Codes	Non-Native Teacher		Students	
	Frequency	Language	Frequency	Language
Giving feedback / answers	5	TUR	9	EN
Asking questions	2	EN-TUR	14	TUR
Jokes / Fun	9	EN	1	EN-TUR
Instructions/ explanations	9	TUR	4	TUR
Informal talk	2	EN-TUR		
Comparison grammar	1	TUR	1	TUR
Translation Questions	9	EN-TUR		
Translation Sentence	2	TUR		
Translation Vocabulary	2	EN-TUR		
	5	EN-TUR		
	3	EN-TUR		
	10	EN-TUR		

(*Türkisch is in italics.* English is not in italics)

However, English or English-Türkisch switches were preferred for asking questions by students in the native teachers' class:

NTS: Do we use this so very generally? How can I *şu kadar gibi mi?*

(*Türkisch is in italics.* English is not in italics)

For giving answers to their teacher, the students of NT preferred mainly English:

NTS: They are different and similar in many ways.

The students' of NNT preferred English for just words or short phrases, but Türkisch for full sentences when answering their teacher's questions:

NNTS: *İki cümlecik iki kelime arasında.*

NNTS: End, also, in addition, firstly...

(*Türkisch is in italics.* English is not in italics)

In addition, intra-sentential switches by students were observed in both classrooms.

To summarize, English was the prevailing language in the NT's classroom, while English and Türkisch were balanced in NNT's session. The NNT demonstrated dense, intra-sentential switches and intensive use of TP while teaching. Her students also integrated the languages but preferred their native language for interaction. On the other hand, the NT used a weak form of TP and preferred English for teaching. Her students used English or English-Türkisch switches to interact with their teacher.

#### 4. Discussion

The current study was an attempt to compare TP used by native and non-native EFL teachers in their academic writing classes in a Türkisch university context. In response to the first question regarding the frequency of the words spoken in English and Türkisch during the writing lesson of the native versus non-native teacher, the integration of students' L1 in the instruction of the target language, particularly in classes taught by non-native teachers, aligns with the Revised Hierarchical Model (Kroll & Stewart, 1994; Kroll & Tokowicz, 2005). This phenomenon occurs since the students participating in the present study were classified as emergent bilinguals, and they utilized indirect connections to understand the concepts in their L2. They achieve this by referencing their equivalents in their L1 (Ellis, 2008).

In response to the second research question regarding the frequency and functions of TP used during the writing lesson of the native vs. non-native teacher, the results pertaining to the class of the non-native teacher in the current study align with prior scholarly investigations. Similar to the methodology employed in the current investigation, TP, specifically the utilization of language choice and switches, was employed as a means of facilitating efficient communication (Yang et al., 2023). Also, these cross-linguistic strategies were found to serve interpretative, managerial, and interactive purposes (Cai & Fang, 2022; Emilia & Hamied, 2022). Another common observation is that learners tend to adopt translingual practices from their instructors (Anderson, 2022).

Specifically, they tend to switch to the language mode utilized by their instructors. Another common finding is the utilization of the target language for instructional objectives, such as providing explanations, clarifying, and managing classroom activities (Afriadi & Hamzah, 2021). The observation that non-native instructors employed TP more extensively for the purpose of elaborating grammar and other educational content was consistent with other studies conducted by Khairunnisa and Lukmana (2020), Putri and Rifai (2021), and Sobkowiak (2022).

The translanguaging pedagogies exhibited by the native English instructor in this study are consistent with those observed in earlier studies among her native colleagues. Similar to the participants in the study, the instructor in the current investigation adhered to a non-intensive weak version of TP, with a focus on the target language and limited attention to L1 (Jiang et al., 2022).

#### 5. Conclusion

From the findings above, it might be concluded that native and non-native teachers of a foreign language may approach translanguaging differently in the classroom, and this also affects the translanguaging behavior of their students, accordingly.

The implications of the findings may indicate incorporating translanguaging as a discipline into teacher education and training programs, as well as providing in-service training opportunities for both native and non-native foreign language teachers. Furthermore, in order to enhance the awareness and knowledge of EFL teachers, it is recommended that translanguaging be implemented and tested in various educational settings. Additionally, it is recommended to arrange workshops that facilitate collaborative efforts between native and non-native teachers.

The current study is limited by the absence of qualitative methodologies and the lack of triangulation with additional quantitative data. Further research is suggested with longitudinal research in several settings with different instructors and learners' profiles.

#### Declarations

##### *Competing interest*

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest concerning the research, authorship, and publication of this article.

##### *Funding*

This study was not financially supported by any institution/agencies.

##### *Authors' contribution*

All authors have contributed equally while conducting the research and preparing the manuscript. All authors have

read and approved the final manuscript.

### Availability of data and materials

The manuscript contains all datasets generated and/or analyzed in the current study.

### Ethical considerations

Ethical issues (including plagiarism, consent to publish, misconduct, data fabrication and/or falsification, double publication and/or submission, and redundancy) have been checked by the authors.

### References

- Adamson, J., & Coulson, D. (2015). Translanguaging in English academic writing preparation. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 10(1), 24-37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/22040552.2015.1084674>
- Afriadi, R., & Hamzah, H. (2021). Exploring translanguaging practice in EFL classroom talk. English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC) Proceedings.
- Anderson, J. (2022). The translanguaging practices of expert Indian teachers of English and their learners. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, pp. 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2045300>
- Cai, Y., & Fang, F. (2022). TESOL in transition: Examining Stakeholders' use of and attitudes toward translanguaging and multimodal practices in EFL contexts. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL*, 19(1), 7-33. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1331965.pdf>
- Canagarajah, S. (2020). Transnational work, translingual practices, and interactional sociolinguistics. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 24(5), 555-573. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12440>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes*, 39(2), 300-311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12462>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2022). Enhancing bilingual resources in third language acquisition: Towards pedagogical translanguaging. *Educational Linguistics*, 1(2), 338-357. <https://doi.org/10.1515/eduling-2022-0009>
- Council of Europe (2020). Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume. <https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4>
- Ellis, N. C. (2008). Words and their usage: Commentary on the special issue on the bilingual mental lexicon. *The Mental Lexicon*, 3(3), 375-385. <https://sites.lsa.umich.edu/nickellis/wp-content/uploads/sites/933/2021/07/Ellis-2008-ML-commentary.pdf>
- Emilia, E., & Hamied, F. A. (2022). Translanguaging practices in a tertiary EFL context in Indonesia. *Teflin Journal*, 33(1), 47-74. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v33i1/47-74>
- García, O., & Kano, N. (2014). Translanguaging as process and pedagogy: Developing the English writing of Japanese students in the US. In J. Conteh & G. Meier (Eds.), *The multilingual turn in languages education: Opportunities and challenges* (pp. 258-277). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783092246-018>
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Pivot. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765>
- Jiang, L., Gu, M. M., & Fang, F. (2022). Multimodal or multilingual? Native English teachers' engagement with translanguaging in Hong Kong TESOL classrooms. *Applied Linguistics Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2022-0062>
- Khairunnisa, K., & Lukmana, I. (2020). Teachers' attitudes towards translanguaging in Indonesian EFL classrooms. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 20(2), 254-256. <https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/JER/article/view/27046/12813>
- Kroll, J. F., & Stewart, E. (1994). Category interference in translation and picture naming: Evidence for asymmetric connections between bilingual memory representations. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 33(2), 149-174. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.1994.1008>
- Kroll, J. F., & Tokowicz, N. (2005). *Models of bilingual representation and processing: Looking back and to the future*. Oxford University Press.
- Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33(1), 159-174. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2529310>
- Liu, Y., & Fang, F. (2020). Translanguaging theory and practice: How Stakeholders perceive translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *RELC Journal*, 53(2), 391-399. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220939222>
- MacWhinney, B. (2000). *The childe project: Tools for analyzing talk: Transcription format and programs*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2000-03630-000>
- Putri, F. I., & Rifai, I. (2021). Translanguaging practices In EFL classrooms: Teachers' perspective. *English Journal Literacy Utama*, 6(1), 460-470. <https://doi.org/10.33197/ejutama.v6i1.155>
- Sobkowiak, P. (2022). Translanguaging practices in the EFL classroom: The Polish context. *Linguistics and Education*, 69, 101020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2022.101020>
- Turnbull, B. (2018). Is there a potential for a translanguaging approach to English education in Japan? Perspectives of tertiary learners and teachers. *JALT Journal*, 40(2), 101. <https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTJJ40.2-3>
- Turnbull, B. (2019). Translanguaging in the planning of academic and creative writing: A case of adult Japanese EFL learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 42(2), 232-251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2019.1589603>
- Viera, A. J., & Garrett, J. M. (2005). Understanding interobserver agreement: The kappa statistic. *Family Medicine*, 37(5), 360-363. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15883903/>
- Wei, L., & Moyer, M. G. (Eds.) (2008). *The blackwell guide to research methods in bilingualism and multilingualism*. Blackwell.
- Williams, C. (1996). Secondary education: Teaching in the bilingual situation. In C. Williams, G. Lewis, & C. Baker (Eds.), *The language policy: Taking stock* (pp. 193-211).
- Yang, Q., Yang, S., & Shi, W. (2023). Translanguaging pedagogies in EFL writing education. *International Journal of TESOL Studies*, 5, 50-68. <https://doi.org/10.58304/ijts.20230105>
- Yuvayapan, F. (2019). Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Dil ve Dilbilimi Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 15(2), 678-694. <https://doi.org/10.17263/jills.586811>
- Yuzlu, M. Y., & Dikilitas, K. (2021). Translanguaging in the development of EFL learners' foreign language skills in Turkish context. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 16(2), 176-190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2021.1892698>
- Zhang, L. (2023). Empowering Chinese college students in English as a foreign language writing classes: Translanguaging with translation methods. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1118261. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1118261>

**Appendix A.**

*Chat transcription format and coding sample*

---

\*STS: yes.  
%spa: \$ANS:ENG  
\*JUL: we can work together if you want, five minutes making sentences for the same and different places.  
%spa: \$INS:ENG  
@Bg: Clarification  
\*STS: how can I şukadar@s gibi@s mi@s?  
%spa: \$QST:TUR:ENG  
\*JUL: yes like this.  
\*STS: bu@s şekilde@s mi@s getirecez@s araya@s?  
%spa: \$QST:TUR:ENG  
\*JUL: ne@s?  
%spa: \$QST:TUR  
\*STS: mesela@s bu@s şekilde@s mi@s for this much money?  
%spa: \$QST:TUR:ENG  
\*JUL: we could say it like this xxxx.  
\*STS: ok.  
\*JUL: you are listening to nice music.  
@Eg: Clarification  
\*JUL: ok are you ready to talk about some answers, obviously I will not ask all the students because we have no time so does anyone want to give us comparing sentences any answers.  
%spa: \$INS:ENG  
\*STS: it is too xxxx xxxx xxxx xxxx but xxxx all in english.  
%spa: \$ANS:ENG  
\*JUL: ok excellent wonderful thank you anyone else.  
%spa: \$FEE:ENG  
\*STS: it is too xxxx xxxx xxxx xxxx but the other apartment xxx all in english.  
\*JUL: may be we can share xxxx xxxx.  
%spa: \$ANS:ENG  
\*STS: it is too xxxx xxxx xxxx xxxx but the other apartment is more expensive xxxx all in english.

09aug02[E|CHAT] 9

