



## Translanguaging as Interactional Resources Employed by Students in EFL Student-Led Group Task Interaction

Hao Yang<sup>1\*</sup> , Joseph Foley<sup>2</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> Graduate School of Human Science, Assumption University, Bangkok, Thailand

<sup>2</sup> Graduate School of Human Science, Assumption University, Bangkok, Thailand

### APA Citation

Yang, H., & Foley, J. A. (2024). Translanguaging as interactional resources employed by students in EFL student-led group task interaction. *Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 5(1), 2024, 33-54. <https://doi.org/10.62819/jel.2024.145>

Received: February 5, 2024

Revised: March 13, 2024

Accepted: March 20, 2024

### Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the strategies used by students during group task interaction in an EFL classroom. It also focused on translanguaging practices as one of the interactional resources to facilitate communication and interaction among students. The data were collected by recording the classroom discussions of a focused group in an EFL class at a Chinese university over three class hours. The analysis was carried out using conversation analytic methodology. The study revealed various interactional features in turn construction. Students often used single learner turns to show their agreement and extended learner turns with clarification or explanation to support their ideas for turn-taking. Concerning turn passing, students prefer to use open-ended questions to ask for opinions; they also use open-ended questions to ask for opinions, confirmation checks for meaningful understanding, and extended wait times for other speakers to take turns. Moreover, gaze was also noticed when they passed the turn to the others. Regarding self-repairs and peer repairs, they often made content-focused repairs rather than form-focused ones, and students with higher English proficiency usually provided support. Translanguaging was an effective strategy to facilitate peer interaction and avoid errors in meaning-making. This study has important implications for language teaching

---

\* Corresponding author.  
E-mail address: yanghaoyan@163.com

and learning policy, highlighting the need to encourage prospective teachers to practice translanguaging to facilitate classroom interaction and second language acquisition.

**Keywords:** conversation analysis, EFL classroom, interactional features, student-student classroom interaction, translanguaging

## Introduction

This study examined how students in an English oral class for translation and interpretation majors in a Chinese university use translanguaging in their interaction. Despite studying English since elementary school, many Chinese students need help with speaking fluently in English. This is often called “dumb English” and is caused by various factors such as limited exposure to English outside of class, traditional grammar-focused teaching methods in China, and ineffective learning strategies. Many scholars have investigated solutions to this problem (Amoah & Yeboah, 2021; Lu, 2017; Maimaitiyiming, 2017; Yin, 2007; Zhang, 2010). Take the university in this study, for example. In the oral English class, students are usually required to use English only in classroom communication to build up a monolingual English environment to promote the practice of oral English. However, in actual classroom practice, the students were found to use Mandarin or other Chinese dialects to communicate in the group discussion, which made the classroom bilingual or multilingual. Recent studies on foreign language teaching have shown that bilingualism can be highly beneficial for both teachers and students. By using two languages, lecturers and students can more easily interact and communicate on a wide range of topics (Cesaria et al., 2023). Additionally, there is potential for non-target languages to be included in second language teaching and learning, which could have even more benefits (Brown, 2023). Thus, monolingualism in EFL classrooms impacts the learners’ engagement in classroom interaction for non-native speakers. Students with low English proficiency will have less engagement in classroom interaction, which is very important, not only because it provides non-native speakers a chance to receive input, but also an opportunity to create effective communication to make the meaning understood by other speakers. Furthermore, monolingualism in EFL classrooms holds back translanguaging practices by which students and teachers engage in complex discursive practices that include all the language sources of all students in a class to communicate with each other and to help the students gain appropriate knowledge (García & Kano, 2014). Anderson (2017) claims that the EFL classroom could become a translingual environment, where translanguaging can be regarded as a reliable language teaching and learning practice for the teachers and students. So the “old-school” monolingualism and native-speaker policy in EFL classrooms need to be revisited.

This study investigated student strategies for communication and interaction in the EFL classroom, including translanguaging. For further consideration, this study can enable translanguaging implementation in EFL classes at higher education levels, emphasizing the positive influence of translanguaging in EFL classroom interaction and foreign language learning.

## Literature Review

### *1. Conversation Analysis and Classroom Interaction*

Conversation Analysis (CA) is a sociological observational discipline started by Sacks and Schegloff, and it deals rigorously, empirically, and formally with the details of social action (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Seedhouse (2005) identified three approaches to CA in language learning: the ethnomethodological, sociocultural, and linguistic approaches to CA. In this study, the researcher adopts the linguistic CA approach as a tool to analyze the classroom discourse in EFL classes.

Sacks et al (1974) provided a seminal account of the organization of turn-taking in ordinary conversation. The basis of the system is turn-constructual units (TCUS) and transition relevance place (TRP). The organization of turn-taking in institutional settings is restricted and related to the institutional goal, as in language classroom interaction (Seedhouse, 2004). Several studies describe how these interactional organizations are adapted to institutional goals in different institutional settings (Barnes, 2019; Betti & Mahdi, 2020; Heritage, 2004; Meredith, 2019; Mondada, 2013; Peräkylä, 2019). Many scholars conducted studies concerning classroom interaction in these institutional settings. Regarding interactions from a CA standpoint, subtle interactional behaviors that alter our views of L2 learners and teachers are explored, and it is shown how teachers voluntarily use incomplete statements as a teaching practice to initiate self-correction by learners.

In addition, there has been interest in how CA can be employed to investigate notions relevant to language teaching and learning, such as interactional competence. Rather than assuming that competence is a fixed quality that individuals possess at a given time, Conversation Analysis (CA) views competence as variable and co-created by participants in their interaction. CA also offers a way to investigate how participants jointly construct this competence in specific settings. Walsh (2012) identified some features in classroom spoken interaction that can show evidence of classroom interactional competence (CIC): turn-taking, repair, overlaps, interruptions, and topic management. In the present study, these features can be selected from the student-led group task interactions to investigate the strategies that students used to interact.

## 2. Classroom Interactional Competence

The notion of interactional competence was first coined by Kramsch (1986). In her definition, the basis of successful interaction was called *interactional competence* (Kramsch, 1986, p.367). Then, in the 1990s, the first systematic conceptualizations of L2 interactional competence emerged in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research through the work of Hall (1993, 1995) and Young (He & Young, 1998; Young, 2000, 2003). L2 interactional competence refers to the skills necessary for active participation in L2 discursive practices (Young & Miller, 2004). They argued that learners are introduced to specific interactional patterns within a given community of practice and activity while acquiring a second language. The existing research indicates that L2 speakers transfer their L1 intercultural competence (IC) and recalibrate and readapt it in L2. The way L2 speakers interact changes over time as part of their evolving L2 IC (Doehler, 2019). As part of L2 development, individuals refine their basic turn-taking and disagreeing techniques to enhance efficiency.

Many studies focus on the development of systematic procedures used by speakers to achieve a particular goal. To improve their communication skills, individuals can develop their practices for turn-taking (Cekaite, 2007). They can also learn how to disengage from classroom tasks, open up new topics for discussion (Hellermann, 2008), and handle disagreements effectively (Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2011). Storytelling is another important aspect of communication that can be improved (Hellermann, 2008; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018). Finally, individuals can learn how to repair conversational trouble to maintain effective communication (Hellermann, 2009, 2011). Studies have less commonly focused on documenting how a precise linguistic form is used in new contexts or for new purposes.

Classroom interactional competence (CIC) is defined as teachers' and learners' ability to use interaction as a tool for meaning-making, teaching, and learning language (Walsh, 2011); the critical point is to admit that interaction plays a vital role in teaching and learning. In an EFL context, most English learning takes place in English classrooms. As central to the notion of interactional competence, language development resides in interaction. Collaborative work is crucial in developing learners' CIC as it provides a space to interact with their peers and expand their toolkit of interactional resources. In most classrooms, learners only have the opportunity to take control of certain interactional aspects, such as interrupting, acknowledging, or moving the conversation forward, during peer interaction, which the teacher typically dominates. This study aims to explore the interactional features of learners' discourse that can be included in the construct of CIC. Specifically, it focuses on learner-learner interactions that arise from language learning tasks designed to encourage meaningful communication in a translinguaging context.

---

### 3. *Translanguaging in EFL Classroom Interaction*

Translanguaging derives from the Welsh *trawsieithu* and was coined by Williams (1994). It was initially used to describe a teaching technique where students would use both Welsh and English for speaking and writing. However, scholars have expanded it to encompass the intricate language practices of multilingual individuals and communities and the instructional methods that utilize them. Williams (2002) defines translanguaging in education as using one language to reinforce the other, increasing understanding and activity in both languages. Williams defines translanguaging as an educational approach that fosters deep cognitive bilingual engagement by having students learn two languages. García (2009) expanded the concept of translanguaging to apply it to bilingual education and bilingualism in the United States. She argued that teachers and students could have more communication and interaction in a classroom that practices translanguaging in EFL or ESL courses compared to monolingual classrooms or language practices that consider every language as an independent source method. Translanguaging is seen as one system of the entire linguistic repertoire used by speakers (García & Li, 2014); it blurs the clear boundaries between the two languages and integrates them into one linguistic system where we can establish translanguaging space. Translanguaging space provides the space for learning in which the learners take control or self-regulate their understanding, and new learning occurs within a zone of proximal development (ZPD) (Vygotsky, 1978).

Previous studies of translanguaging in EFL classrooms focused on teachers' attitudes towards translanguaging (Khairunnisa & Lukmana, 2020; Yuvayapan, 2019). Most of EFL teachers held a positive attitude towards the practice of translanguaging in their classrooms. They were flexibly use translanguaging in some particular situations. However, there were some constraints to employ this pedagogy due to the expectations of their institutions, colleagues and parents of their students. Furthermore, most studies investigated the practice of translanguaging in EFL classrooms by analyzing classroom interactions. The findings showed that teachers and students employed English, national, and local languages in classroom interactions for various purposes and in clearly distinctive ways (Afriadi & Hamzah, 2021; Fallas Escobar, 2019; Sahib, 2019). Moreover, the effects of implementing translanguaging in EFL classrooms have been discussed. Rabbidge (2019) examined the effects of translanguaging practices on student participation, and the findings indicate that teachers who use translanguaging practices may facilitate students' engagement in class by enhancing their comprehension of the teacher's talk. Nevertheless, when teachers employ translanguaging during IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) sequences, student participation seems confined to responses within those sequences, indicating that students may find it difficult to control the learning environment in such scenarios. Huang & Chalmers (2023) conducted a systematic review on the

implementation and effects of pedagogical translanguaging in EFL classrooms by analyzing ten eligible studies; according to the results, pedagogical translanguaging was mainly used for teaching reading and writing, compared to other domains, and they claimed that pedagogical translanguaging may be helpful in teaching in some circumstances, but that the low methodological quality of the literature on average makes it challenging to draw firm causal inferences. As translanguaging in the EFL context is an emerging research area, researchers may continue to pay attention to the evidence of the effects of pedagogical translanguaging, especially in the other aspects of EFL learning that few studies have been well-designed and conducted, except reading and writing.

Walsh and Li (2016) have explained the interconnection between translanguaging and IC, that using all the language resources can help to facilitate interaction, and it plays a vital role in the EFL classroom. Kampittayakul (2017, 2019) investigated the use of translanguaging to foster learners' CIC and IC, and the findings showed that the Thai students interacted through translanguaging in two different manners: a dependent manner for those with lower English proficiency and an independent manner for well-developed English proficiency; furthermore, the findings proved that translanguaging practices in an EFL context could enhance the development of learners' IC and CIC. In this perspective, utilizing all available language resources by teachers and students can be considered translanguaging, which enhances the interactional competence of learners and facilitates classroom interaction, finally influencing English language teaching and learning. Otheguy et al. (2015) suggest that to assess learners' translanguaging is to explore how the learners interact with other speakers.

In the current study, translanguaging plays a role in learning practice. Students are encouraged to use all available language resources, including verbal (Mandarin and English) and non-verbal (gestures, gaze) languages, for meaning-making in group discussions where the translanguaging space can be built. In this place, students' interactional features in turn-taking, turn management, repair, overlaps, and interruptions can be observed to explore how the students interact with other speakers and then assess students' translanguaging.

## **Research Objectives**

This study aimed to investigate the interactional strategies and features in student-led group task interaction in EFL classrooms and to evaluate translanguaging practice in student-student interactions. By regarding translanguaging as a crucial interactional resource in EFL classroom interaction, bilingualism or multilingualism in language teaching could be promoted and enhance language teaching and learning. With the aim stated above the study is guided by two research questions.

1. What are the interactional features in student-led group task interactions?
2. How does translanguaging play a role in student-led group task interactions?

## **Methodology**

### *1. Research Design*

Four sophomores majoring in translation and interpretation in a Chinese university were selected as the focus group in the current study. Mandarin was their first language, and English was a foreign language in their community. The students did not know translanguaging theory before, and they got different scores on their oral English test in the last semester; one got a high score, two got in the middle, and the other got a lower score. The score reflects their English-speaking proficiency at different levels. In their previous oral English courses, the teacher was a native English speaker, and the classrooms were required to be English-only, where the monolingual environment was built and believed to foster foreign language learning compared with the classroom where learners' L1 intervened. The researchers were also the participants in this study for the role of teacher who was familiar with translanguaging theory and encouraged students to use their whole linguistic resources in classroom interactions. In other words, students could speak English, Mandarin, or different Chinese dialects to interact with others to set up a translanguaging space. The participants have been anonymized in the transcript: T refers to the teacher, and S1, S2, S3, and S4 refer to individual students.

Classroom observation was employed as the research instrument in the study, which allowed the researchers to collect naturally occurring data directly from the research context, including verbal and non-verbal data. Video recording was an essential tool to help the researcher observe the classroom interactions among students during the student-led group task. The whole process of group discussion was video recorded. Through the playback and the transcripts of the video, the researcher could observe the spoken and non-verbal interactions occurring during the group discussion. It could help the researcher identify the interactional features in these interactions.

### *2. Data Collection and Analysis*

Four students mentioned above worked as one group, and three different group tasks were conducted in three separate but successive sessions within two weeks in the second semester of the 2021/2022 academic year at Yunan Agricultural University in Kunming, China.



**Table 1**

*Three Group Tasks for the Study*

Task	Name	Descriptions
Task 1.	Story Telling	Students watch a Chinese news report about a Role Model in China, then use the information in the video and on the Internet to introduce the Role Model and tell the story of the heroine in English.
Task 2.	Jigsaw Puzzle	Each student holds one or two pictures of a comic, and they describe the pictures to others one by one, then try to find the correct order of the pictures to form the complete story of comics, finally retelling the story of comics.
Task 3.	Role Play	The teacher set a situation; student A, with her mother, and a friend (student B) came together to see the tutor to discuss the professional career of student A after graduating. Students randomly selected the role to play and only had two minutes to prepare, then gave an impromptu role play.

The student-led group discussions were recorded via Bluetooth by a cellphone connected to a microphone. Each group discussion took around thirty minutes, and the video length was one and a half hours. At the beginning of the course, the researchers introduced the translanguaging theory to the students and encouraged them to use all their linguistic resources to communicate with their group members in group discussions and also interact with the teachers and classmates in the classroom.

Then, the video recordings will be transcribed according to the Jeffersonian conventions (see Appendix A). Analysis was performed using MAXQDA, line-by-line narratives were used to describe verbal and nonverbal actions deemed relevant. The transcripts were analyzed using multimodal Conversation Analysis (CA) tools to identify the interactional features from four perspectives: turn-taking, turn management, repair, overlaps, and interruptions. And to develop an understanding of how learners establish joint understandings and characterize learners' CIC in the EFL context where translanguaging was an interactional resource. When using multimodal conversation analysis to analyze our data, researchers view language as more than a collection of abstract possibilities. Instead, researchers observe language as situated action, organized by its temporal and sequential unfolding uses, and mobilized with other multimodal resources like glances, gestures, bodily postures, and body movements (Mondada, 2013). The findings were illustrated and discussed in the following part.



## Results

### Interactional features in Turn Constructions

#### 1. Turn Taking

There were 333 turns in total in the pilot study. The percentage of each learner's turn-taking varies with their English-speaking proficiency. S1, who got a high score on the oral English test, takes turns frequently; following were S2 and S3, who got a middle score on the test, and the last one was Student 4, who got a lower score in the test compared with the other three, but the student still could take turns a few times in the interaction of discussion. S1 took nearly 35% of turns during their conversation and was dominant. S1 was a group leader who directed the discussions. This can be observed in the following extracts:

*Extract 1. S1's Talk to Manage the Group Discussion in Three Tasks.*

- 1 S1: let(.) let's describe the story in our order↑
- 2 S1: ok(.) let's retell the story.
- 3 S1: at first(.) I think we could introduce who is. Zhang Guimei(.) so(.) e:h(.)we
- 4 can: see more information in this picture↓
- 5 S1: so:: um shall we exercise↑
- 6 S1:这些都要<these all> and should we eh(.) talk about his achievement all?
- 7 ((looking at S2))
- 8 S1: so: (.)I think now we can prepare for what we will do in the presentation↓

In extract 1, the utterances in lines 3 and 4 were produced at the very beginning of the group discussion of task one, where students were asked to retell the story of a Role Model of Times in China after having watched the focused person's Chinese introduction video. S1 takes turns to manage the discussion and inform other group members how to build a personal story. In lines 1 and 2, S1 uses *let's* to call on the other group members to engage in the next step. Using modal verb construction like *we could/should/shall/can* (see in lines 3-6) is another way for S1 to direct the discussions.

Regarding turn-holding, students can hold turns in single or extended learner turns. Students produced single turns frequently to show agreement, for instance, *yeah, yes, ok*. The transitional markers: *so* signaled the movement to the next stage of the discussion and helped S1 manage the group discussion. Moreover, the extended learner turn was produced while explaining, clarifying, and disagreeing. With this in mind, consider the following case. Here, students were playing jigsaw games. Each student held one or two pictures of a comic; they needed to describe the content of the pictures and then find the correct order of the comic, and finally, they retell the story in the comic. Moreover, it was the extract of their discussion:

*Extract 2: Students' Discussion in Task Two (lines 218-232)*

- 218 S1: eh(.) I think at the I think to begin with they are just going to have a dinner(.)  
 219 S2: yeah↓  
 220 S1: but her son was absent↓  
 221 S2: yeah↓  
 222 S1: and the mother ask the father to find his son to have a dinner↓  
 223 S3: yes↓  
 224 S1: and when he when he found his son(.) he- he just find that his son was uh(.)  
 225 his son is. reading book↓  
 226 S3: yes↓  
 227 S1: and he want to check the book(.) check the book her- his son read just now(.)  
 228 uh and and what↑  
 229 S4: and then his father was also read the book↓  
 230 S1: yeah↓  
 231 S1: eh(.) I think at the I think to begin with they are just going to have a dinner(.)  
 232 S2: yeah↓

In this extract, S1, as a group leader, summarizes the order of the pictures. S2 and S3 show their agreements with a single turn: 'yeah, yes.' In line 228 S1 forgot the content of the successive pictures and asked others, then in line 229, S4 answered her; in the following line, S1 responded with a single turn 'yeah' to show her agreement. Also, we can see that in this conversation, S1 produced extended learner turns continuously using the conjunction 'but, and' to complete her explanation of the comic.

Concerning turn passing, students prefer to use open-ended questions, for instance, 'what do you think? what's your opinion? Moreover, you?' and confirmation checks by raising the intonation, repeating or rephrasing the precedent utterance to pass the turn initiatively.

*Extract 3: Students' Discussion in Task Two (lines 48-65).*

- 48 S4: what the order↑ ((laughter))  
 49 S2: I(.) I(.) I think maybe when the when they have dinner 就是他们快要吃  
 50 饭的时候(1.2)<when they are going to have dinner> here is only the  
 51 mother and the father(.) but the son is absent(.) so:: the woman asked his  
 52 husband to find their son an-and then I think is yours  
 53 ((S2 looking at S3))  
 54 S3: yeah(.) yeah↓  
 55 S2: and(.) and his father(.)It just is walking to the room to find his son to told.

- 56 him to eat the dinner(.) but(.) er(.) when he enter the room(.)he find his son  
 57 is reading the book(.)and when the little boy to come to the table with his  
 58 mother to eat the dinner(.) his mother find his father=  
 59 S4: =[yeah]  
 60 S2: =[is absent]  
 61 S1: yeah↓  
 62 S2: so his=  
 63 S1: =reading a book↓  
 64 S2: yeah(.) 就可能是那个<maybe like that>  
 65 S1: yeah↓  
 66 S2: 你们是怎么认为的↑<what do you think>((looking at others))  
 67 S4: 好像<sounds like>  
 68 S1: I agree with you↓

In this extract, S2 talked about the order of the comic, and all four students engaged in the discussion. In lines 54, 59, and 61, S4 and S1 responded positively to S2 using 'yeah' several times. Moreover, in line 63, S1 interrupted S2's talk by completing S2's contribution and behaved positively to take turns in the discussion; S2 noticed that, so she passed the turn to others and allowed other group members to express their ideas. In line 66, S2 used an open-ended question in Chinese to ask the others' opinions and to pass turn initiatively.

## 2. Overlaps and Interruption

Overlaps and interruptions rarely occurred in the group discussions. Overlaps can be observed when the student shows agreement and supplements while the speaker talks. These overlaps did not influence the flow of conversations.

### *Extract 4, Group Discussions in Task One (lines126-140)*

- 126 S4: and(.)she um she made the Zhang Guimei's foundation to: uh: provide  
 127 some money for these girls um:(.) to help them have a better future↓  
 128 (3.0)  
 129 S3: and she devoted maybe many years [to achieve] this  
 130 S4: [yeah]  
 131 (2.8)  
 132 S4: I think we could divide [into]  
 133 S3: [two parts]  
 134 S4: yes(.) two parts. um(1.2)the backgrounds and her achievement. an::d

- 135 (3.8)  
136 S1: so have you finished↑  
137 ((S4 and S3 discussed in low voice in Chinese))  
138 S3: maybe we could also um- explain why she decided to- to go to [Li Jiang]  
139 S4: [yeah]  
140 S3: to establish a high school↓

In extract 4, S4 and S3 discussed how to retell the story of a Role Model in China for their parts. In lines 126 and 127, S4 talks about the heroine's experience. In line 129, S3 made a supplement for the S4's utterance. In line 130, S4 produces an overlap of 'yeah' to show her agreement. Meanwhile, S3's turn in line 129 was not interrupted; she could still complete her turn. Same in lines 138, 139, and 140, S3 suggests the content they need to be concerned with when retelling the story, and S4 produces an overlap of 'yeah' to show her agreement, which did not interrupt the conversation. In lines 132 and 133, another overlap can be observed; in line 133, S3 produces an overlap to help complete the S4's contribution in line 132. Then, S4 has a learner's echo, repeating S3's utterance, and continues to produce her turn.

Concerning interruptions, the learner interrupted the conversation mostly to complete the speaker's contribution and show their positive engagement in the discussion. As shown in Extract 3, in lines 59 and 60, S2's turn was interrupted by S1 trying to complete S2's contribution in line 60. In the following Extract 5, students discussed the order of the comics. In lines 135 and 136, S1's turn was interrupted by S4, who completed S1's contribution actively. The completion helped remind S1 that S4 held the last picture. It allowed students to complete the task of finding the correct order of the disrupted comic.

*Extract 5, Short Conversations between S1 and S4 in Task Two (lines 135-137)*

- 135 S1: oh(.) I think the last one may be the::uh-(.)the father=  
136 S4: =is reading book=  
137 S1: =yeah(.)whose↑ it' s yours↑ ((looking at S4)) your(.) yeah↓

### 3. Repair

Students often make content-focused repairs instead of form-focused ones for self-repair and peer repair. Form-focused repairs are mostly on personal pronouns. Students with high scores in English-speaking fluency act more helpfully in peer repair. In the current study, S1 was the leader and reliable person to help repair the learners' turn.

*Extract 6. Group Discussions in Task One Storytelling (lines 5-20)*

- 5 S3: em::(2.5)em:: Zhang Guimei: eh-(.) is a female who born in China  
6 and her::民族<minority>=  
7 S1: =man people=  
8 S3: =man people(.) and she was born - in Heilongjiang (.) province(.)  
9 Mudanjiang city(.)and she: (.) her birthday was eh:: Ju[ly](.) eh↑  
10 S1: [June]  
11 S3: June(.)and er: she was a headmaster of the Li Jiang Hua Ping(.) high er-  
12 女子 high school↓  
13 S1: female=  
14 S3: =female high school (1.5)an::d(.)说什么呢<what to say>↑  
15 ((passing the microphone to S4))  
16 S2: she has a lot of e::r achievements(.) eh- eh: (1.5) some main achievements  
17 of sh- of her is- like what↑  
18 S3: 共产党员< member of the Communist Party>  
19 S2: community ((looking at S1))  
20 S1: a member o::f the:: Communist Party of China↓

In extract 6, students discussed the story of a Role Model in China. It illustrated the features of self-repair and peer repair in group discussion of the study. In line 10, S3 noticed and corrected her wrong employment of personal pronouns from *she* to *her*. In line 6, S3 did not know the expression of the minority in English, so she pronounced *min zu*, which means the minority in Chinese. S1 noticed that and told her the name of the minority in English to make the peer repair in line 7. Then, in line 8, S3 repeated the correct expression and continued to produce the extended turn. In lines 10 and 11, S3 had the wrong month of the heroine's birthday in July, S1 immediately corrected the month in June, and in line 12, S3 made an echo and continued to share her ideas. The same situation could be observed in lines 13-15; S1 helped S3 to make the content-focused repair. The interactions from lines 18-20 showed that in the group discussion, S1 was regarded as a reliable and helpful person in the student-led group task interaction. In line 18, S3 mentioned 共产党员 (*gong chan dang yuan*), which means the member of the Communist Party in Chinese. S2, in line 19, helped her find the corresponding expressions in English, but she was unsure if she was correct, so after having said the word, she looked at S1 to confirm. They passed the turn directly to S1, who they thought might know the correct answers.

#### 4. Topic Management

The breakdown in learners' talk reflected directly the English-speaking proficiency of the speakers. In S4's turn, more breakdown with 'uh, em, eh' or silent in a few seconds could be noticed compared with the other three. Although S4 could produce the extended turn and gave some examples or evidence to support her points of view, she produced utterances disfluently. On the contrary, S1, with a high level of English-speaking proficiency, could make utterances fluently, and few breakdowns were noticed in her talk. All four students engaged actively in the group discussions and shared their ideas to complete the group tasks. During their interactions, English, Mandarin, and body language, the whole linguistic resources of the learners could be observed, and translanguaging emerges in their interactions. The following part demonstrated the finding of translanguaging in student-led group task interaction.

#### 5. Translanguaging in Student-led Group Task Interactions

Translanguaging practices in group task interactions referred to utilizing all available language resources by students to interact. Two kinds of language resources could be recognized frequently while students interact. First, the spoken language was Mandarin and English; students spoke both Mandarin and English while discussing. As in an EFL classroom, students spontaneously choosed English as the primary spoken language to communicate; Mandarin played an assistant role in meaning-making while facing difficulties in English expressions. In the following extracts, students talked about the experience of a role model in China who has built a female high school for girls in a poor area and devoted herself to education.

##### *Extract 7. Translanguaging Practice in Task One (lines 169-186)*

- 169 S4: 然后再怎么着↑<and then> under her um: teacher teaching these(.) these  
170 girls. um(.) all got great grades and got into a great=  
171 S3: =college  
172 S4: yeah college. so..that's all↑  
173 (1.8)  
174 S3: and her and the graduates come back to help her to teach these students  
175 um:: (.)it's a kind of uh (1.6) 良心<conscientiousness>(.).how. to say it↑  
176 S1: what↑  
177 S3: 就是她教的学生回来帮她教现在的孩子  
178 <the students that she have teached come back to help her teach children>  
179 S1: 使命↑<mission>  
180 S2: mission↓  
181 S4: 不是↓<no>

- 182 S3: 是她教毕业生回来(.)然后=<the graduates come back then>  
183 S2: =感恩的心↓<grateful heart>  
184 S3: 嗯嗯(.)感恩(.)感恩怎么说<yes be grateful how to say it>↑  
185 S2: want to pay back to the school and the teacher↓  
186 S3: ok↓ ((writing down sentences))

In line 175, S3 did not know the English expression of conscientiousness and spoke Mandarin *liang xin*, which has a similar meaning of conscientiousness in Chinese to meaning-making, and then she asked the other group members for repair. However, S1 did not clearly understand S3's question, so in line 176, S1 asked S3 for clarification. In line 177, S3 clarified the problem in Mandarin for negotiating meaning, and then S1 produced a term in Mandarin with a rising intonation for confirmation check. Still, it was not the proper term that S3 wanted to express. In line 182, S3 continued to explain the situation in Mandarin; this time, S2 understood and gave a response in Mandarin. In line 184, S3 showed agreement with S2's response and asked S2 for the corresponding expressions in English. In line 185, S2 explained the term in English for negotiating meaning instead of directly saying the word, which made all the group members got the meaning and helped repair the breakdown of S3's utterance in line 175. Second, the non-verbal translanguaging practices were recognized when students used body language to describe something. In the following extract, students discussed the pictures of disordered comics and tried to find the correct order. During their discussion, body language was adopted to describe the content of the pictures and make meaning.

*Extract 8. Translanguaging Practices of Body Language in Task Two (lines18-28).*

- 18 S1: ((noding ))I-I think your second one is uh(.)similar to my- second picture↓  
19 S2: yeah↓  
20 S1: but(.) but in my second picture(.)the mother didn't ask her son do anything↓  
21 S2: er(.)but my second one is her mother just at eh: like this ((pointing at left))  
22 to-to the room(.) maybe(1.5) an::d asked his son to-to find his father to  
23 come here to eat the dinner (.) and e::h I think my first picture is similar to  
24 S4((student name))'s picture↓  
25 S4: a::h in my picture(.) the father read book like this ((stoop)) this is the book  
26 ((point at floor)) (2.0)and the father just like this((stoopping)) to read the  
27 book(.)and the little boy was was went into the door↓  
28 (5.1)  
29 um(.) maybe in the:: (.) in their house went in↓



In line 18, S1 nodded to show agreement, and thought one of the pictures was similar to S2's according to the previous descriptions. So, in line 21, S2 described her pictures in detail by using body language to mimic the action of the comic character to help identify the difference between the two pictures. Also, in lines 25 and 26, S4 imitated the actions of the comic character using body language to help distinguish her pictures from the S3s'.

## Discussion

To further understand the translanguaging practices in EFL student-led group task interaction, the researchers have focused on interactional features in students' talk to investigate how the learners interact with each other from the conversation analytical perspective. The results demonstrated that the turn-taking, overlaps and interruptions, repair, and topic management can be observed in the group discussions. All the group members engaged in the interactions and produced single learner turns to show their agreement and extended learner turns with clarification or explanation to support their ideas. Concerning turn-taking, students prefer to use open-ended questions to ask for opinions, confirmation checks for meaningful understanding, and some extended wait time for other speakers to take turns; besides, gazing or directly passing the microphone to others is another way that students adopted for turn passing. Auer (2021) argued that gaze is the most ubiquitous next-speaker-selection technique. Kendrick et al. (2023) suggested that coordinating transitions between speakers should involve not only linguistic resources but also visual and gestural ones. Therefore, the standard model should be reconceptualized as multimodal. In this study, visual and gestural resources could be noticed when the speaker passed the turn in interaction, which proved that the transition-relevance places in turns are multimodal in the classroom context.

Overlaps occur when learners show their agreement with a short single turn, which does not cut off the interaction flow; speakers can complete the turn. When speakers have shared knowledge or a similar perspective, they interrupt for two purposes: to complete turns and to cut them (Lestary et al., 2018). In the current study, only a few interruptions can be noticed where students shaped the speaker's contribution by rephrasing the previous utterances and taking turns to express their opinions in a similar perspective, and the purpose is mainly to complete turns. Concerning repairs, three kinds of repair sources of trouble: grammar, pronunciation, and processing were the most frequent in viva discussion in English (Betti & Mahdi, 2020). However, in the current study, students often make content-focused repairs (vocabulary) instead of form-focused ones (grammar) for self-repair and peer repair, which students with a higher English proficiency often support. It reflected that in the group discussion, the students paid more attention to meaning-making than the form of the discourse. Regarding topic management, the student with better English proficiency played the leader and

reliable partner in group task interaction. She managed the topics in the interaction and directed the discussions. The mini-microphone was a turn-allocation device to engage members. There has been increasing interest in using classroom objects as a resource for managing talk in CA classroom research (Markee, 2015). And the use of classroom objects appropriately for managing the talk may also be evidence of the speakers' interactional competence.

These interactional features in the current study are the pieces of evidence of students' CIC. Students engage actively in the group discussion and can complete the group task effectively. Still, the students' CIC must be enhanced to promote their learning. For instance, the speaker continued to produce extended and complex turns without concerning the listener's reactions. However, the utterances were clearly and fluently delivered, and the lack of strategies in turn-passing, repair, and topic management impeded the participant's engagement in interaction. The majority of CIC's features mentioned by Walsh have been highlighted from teachers' classroom interactional practices both in online classrooms and face-to-face classrooms (Moorhouse et al., 2023; Urmeneta & Walsh, 2017; Walsh, 2002, 2014, 2014). From this study, the teacher can further understand students' CIC and raise awareness to teach learners CIC through peer interaction in group task discussions in EFL classrooms to facilitate the development of learners' CIC and promote learning. The enhancement of the learners' CIC needs to be further considered in language teaching and learning. Walsh and Li (2016) argued that translanguageing can help to facilitate interaction, and it plays a vital role in the EFL classroom. The results of the current study proved that students employed all language resources, including verbal and non-verbal, for meaning-making and negotiating to promote peer interaction in group discussions, where participants positively engaged in interaction less concerning the low proficiency of the L2 and felt free to share their ideas. Translanguageing is one of the interactional resources that can assist peer interaction and is one of the strategies to avoid producing errors in meaning-making in interaction. In the EFL classroom, the English-only policy restricts translanguageing practices in interaction, which harms language learning.

## Conclusion

These findings enhance our understanding of student-led group task interaction in EFL classrooms, and the results of the current study support the idea that translanguageing practices promote classroom interaction and language learning. A critical implication of these findings is that the English-only policy in EFL classrooms needs to be reconsidered, and the monolingual native speakers teaching oral English may not be beneficial for the learners' development of CIC that the teacher-student classroom interaction may be restricted, especially for the students with low proficiency of English. Several significant limitations need to be considered. First, regarding classroom interactions, including teacher-student and student-

student types, the current study has only examined interactions among students and found some pieces of evidence that reflected learners' CIC. Second, the study just collected data within three weeks; it is not a longitudinal study that can show the development of learners' CIC. Thirdly, with a small sample size, the findings might not be transferable to all the EFL programs.

## Recommendation

Considering the current study's limitations, future research should concentrate on teacher-student and student-student classroom interaction to investigate learners' CIC from all angles. Besides, the longitude research on learners' talk in classroom interaction from a conversation analytical perspective needs to be explored to investigate in depth the development of learners' CIC in EFL classrooms.

## References

- Afriadi, R., & Hamzah, H. (2021). Exploring translanguaging practice in EFL classroom talk. *English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC) Proceedings*, 4, 99–107.
- Amoah, S., & Yeboah, J. (2021). The speaking difficulties of Chinese EFL learners and their motivation towards speaking the English language. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(1), 56–69.
- Anderson, J. (2017). Reimagining English language learners from a translangual perspective. *ELT Journal*, 72(1), 26–37. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx029>
- Auer, P. (2021). Turn-allocation and gaze: A multimodal revision of the “current-speaker-selects-next” rule of the turn-taking system of conversation analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 23(2), 117–140.
- Barnes, R. K. (2019). Conversation analysis of communication in medical care: Description and beyond. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 52(3), 300–315.
- Betti, M. J., & Mahdi, M. A. (2020). A conversation analysis of repair trouble sources, inadequacy and positions in the Iraqi university viva discussions in English. *International Linguistics Research*, 3(4), 69–69.
- Brown, A. (2023). Monolingual versus multilingual foreign language teaching: French and Arabic at beginning levels. *Language Teaching Research*, 27(6), 1634–1659. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168821990347>
- Cekaite, A. (2007). A child's development of interactional competence in a Swedish L2 classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(1), 45–62.

- 
- Cesaria, A., Kemal, E., & Adnan, M. (2023). How does the bilingualism improve the student English ability: A discourse case study on higher education. *Journal of Pragmatics and Discourse Research*, 3(2), 122–136.
- Doehler, S. P., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2011). Developing ‘methods’ for interaction: A cross-sectional study of disagreement sequences in French L2. *L2 Interactional Competence and Development*, 56, 206.
- Fallas Escobar, C. (2019). Translanguaging by design in EFL classrooms. *Classroom Discourse*, 10(3–4), 290–305.
- García, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. *Social Justice through Multilingual Education*, 140–158.
- García, O., & Kano, N. (2014). Translanguaging as process and pedagogy: Developing the English writing of Japanese students in the US. *The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges*, 258–277.
- García, O., & Li, W. (2014). Translanguaging and education. In *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education* (pp. 63–77). Springer.
- Hall, J. K. (1993). The role of oral practices in the accomplishment of our everyday lives: The sociocultural dimension of interaction with implications for the learning of another language<sup>1</sup>. *Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 145–166.
- Hall, J. K. (1995). (Re) creating our worlds with words: A sociohistorical perspective of face-to-face interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 16(2), 206–232.
- He, A. W., & Young, R. (1998). Language proficiency interviews: A discourse approach. *Talking and Testing: Discourse Approaches to the Assessment of Oral Proficiency*, 14, 1–24.
- Hellermann, J. (2008). *Social actions for classroom language learning* (Vol. 6). Multilingual Matters.
- Hellermann, J. (2009). Looking for evidence of language learning in practices for repair: A case study of self-initiated self-repair by an adult learner of English. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 53(2), 113–132.
- Hellermann, J. (2011). Members’ methods, members’ competencies: Looking for evidence of language learning in longitudinal investigations of other-initiated repair. *L2 Interactional Competence and Development*, 147–172.
- Heritage, J. (2004). 5 conversation analysis and institutional talk. In *Handbook of Language and social interaction* (pp. 103–147). Psychology Press.
- Huang, X., & Chalmers, H. (2023). Implementation and effects of pedagogical translanguaging in EFL classrooms: A systematic review. *Languages*, 8(3), 194.  
<https://doi.org/10.3390/languages8030194>

- Kampittayakul, T. (2017). Developing Thai learners' CIC through translanguaging in one on-one English tutorial sessions. *The New English Teacher*, 11(1), 69.
- Kampittayakul, T. (2019). The role of translanguaging in improving Thai learners' interactional competence in dyadic "English as a foreign language" tutorial sessions. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand*, 56, 80–111.
- Kendrick, K. H., Holler, J., & Levinson, S. C. (2023). Turn-taking in human face-to-face interaction is multimodal: Gaze direction and manual gestures aid the coordination of turn transitions. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 378(1875), 20210473.
- Khairunnisa, K., & Lukmana, I. (2020). Teachers' attitudes towards translanguaging in Indonesian EFL classrooms. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 20(2), 254–266.
- Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(4), 366–372.
- Lestary, A., Krismanti, N., & Hermaniar, Y. (2018). Interruptions and silences in conversations: A Turn-Taking analysis. *PAROLE: Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 7(2), 53–64.
- Lu, M. (2017). Causes and Solutions to the Phenomenon of "Dumb English" for College Students. *New Campus(Reading)*, 04, 54–55.
- Maimaitiyiming, X. (2017). Investigation of methods to develop English speaking competence of college students. *Overseas English*, 08, 88–89.
- Markee, N. (2015). Giving and following pedagogical instructions in task-based instruction: An ethnomethodological perspective. *International Perspectives on ELT Classroom Interaction*, 110–128.
- Meredith, J. (2019). Conversation analysis and online interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 52(3), 241–256.
- Mondada, L. (2013). Conversation analysis and institutional interaction. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, 1005–1011.
- Moorhouse, B. L., Li, Y., & Walsh, S. (2023). E-classroom interactional competencies: Mediating and assisting language learning during synchronous online Lessons. *RELC Journal*, 54(1), 114–128. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220985274>
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281–307.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Berger, E. (2018). L2 interactional competence as increased ability for context-sensitive conduct: A longitudinal study of story-openings. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(4), 555–578.

- Peräkylä, A. (2019). Conversation analysis and psychotherapy: Identifying transformative sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 52(3), 257–280.
- Rabbidge, M. (2019). The effects of translanguaging on participation in EFL classrooms. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 16, 1069–1453.  
<https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2019.16.4.15.1305>
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simple systematic for the organization of turn taking in conversation. *Language*, 50, 696–735. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412243>
- Sahib, R. (2019). Translanguaging as a pedagogical strategy in EFL classroom. *ELT-Lectura*, 6(2), 139–146.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4), 289–327.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective. *Language Learning*, 54(Suppl1). <https://doi.org/1467-9922.2004.00266.x>
- Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching*, 38(4), 165–187.
- Urmeneta, C. E., & Walsh, S. (2017). Classroom interactional competence in content and language integrated learning. *Language Learning & Language Teaching Applied Linguistics Perspectives on CLIL*, 183–200.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. *Readings on the Development of Children*, 23(3), 34–41.
- Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: Teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 6(1), 3–23.  
<https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168802lr095oa>
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2012). Conceptualising classroom interactional competence. *Novitas-Royal*, 6(1).
- Walsh, S. (2014). Developing classroom interactional competence. *Language Issues: The ESOL Journal*, 25(1), 4–8.
- Walsh, S., & Li, L. (2016). Classroom talk, interaction and collaboration. In *The Routledge handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 504–516). Routledge.
- Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog* [PhD Thesis]. Prifysgol Bangor University.
- Williams, C. (2002). Extending bilingualism in the education system. *Education and Lifelong Learning Committee ELL-06*, 2.
- Yin, B. (2007). Causes and measures to solve the “dumb English” for Chinese college students. *Journal of Chizhou Teachers College*, 01, 109–112.
- Young, R. F. (2000). *Interactional Competence: Challenges for Validity*.

- Young, R. F. (2003). Learning to talk the talk and walk the walk. *North Eastern Illinois University Working Papers in Linguistics*, 2, 26–44.
- Yuvayapan, F. (2019). Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(2), 678–694.
- Zhang, C. (2010). Causes and solutions to Chinese college students' "dump English" under the trend of economic globalization. *Journal of Hebei University of Engineering(Social Science Edition)*, 27(01), 62–63.