The Facilitative Use of Learner-initiated Translanguaging in Japanese EFL Contexts

Seiko Harumi

SOAS University of London

Abstract

This study explores the facilitative use of learner-initiated translanguaging and teacher responsiveness to its use in 68 dyads of conversational interaction between a teacher and individual students in tertiary Japanese EFL contexts. Adopting conversation analysis as an analytical framework, it aims to extend our understanding of the use of learner-initiated translanguaging and teacher responsiveness to translanguaging as an important interactional resource for learners to achieve interactional goals. The study identifies eight facilitative uses of L1. On the one hand, these contribute to the progressivity of talk as 'self-addressed translanguaging'. On the other, they support intersubjectivity as 'co-constructed translanguaging' in L2 interaction. These uses include (1) connectives for topic management; (2) floor-holding devices; (3) explicit word searches; (4) lexical gap fillers; (5) understanding displays; (6) clarification requests (7) confirmation checks and (8) explicit request for assistance. The study also revealed that learners' self-initiated repair using L1 was frequently observed and that its use was intertwined with translanguaging in its functionality in discourse for meaning-making as a discursive practice. This study suggests that the use of translanguaging in the L2 classroom can be an indispensable tool to optimise learners' classroom interactional competence.

Keywords: translanguaging; conversation analysis; interactional repertoire; repair; classroom interactional competence; scaffolding

1. Introduction

This study examines the facilitative use of L1 in translanguaging between an English teacher and individual Japanese university students in Japanese EFL contexts. It specifically focuses on the use of learner-initiated translanguaging, in which individual learners initiate interaction by using L1, as a facilitative interactional resource which helps learners to accomplish their interactional goals within instructed individual conversational practice. Despite growing recognition of the facilitative role of L1 in L2 learning (Al Masaeed, 2016, 2020; Auerbach, 1993; Cheng, 2013; Ferguson, 2003; Kasper, 2004; Lehti-Eklund, 2012; Nyroos et al., 2017; Sert, 2015; Üstünel, 2016; Zue & Vanek, 2015), the use of L1, particularly as a form of code switching (CS) has traditionally been seen as contrary to the ultimate goal of oral proficiency in which monolingual, spontaneous and accurate use of language is emphasised and considered as the key to successful oral interaction, as Sampson (2012) observes.

Although maximum use of the target language has been encouraged as an ultimate goal in interaction through the lens of monolingualism, the dynamics of learners' use of interactional resources to support their interactional achievement needs to be explored holistically. For this reason, diverse notions of speaking competence are inevitably considered within much wider contexts in order for it to fulfil a variety of interactional demands as a social activity (Goh & Burns, 2012). This includes the ability to proceed as well as repair and maintain interaction as dialogic collaborative work (Hall, 2007; Pekarek Doehler, 2018; Waring, 2018; Young, 2008) and as a norm serving to enhance progressivity of interaction (Tudini, 2016) as well as intersubjectivity. This perspective on the social role of interaction resonates with the ideas of Firth and Wagner (2007, p.800), who advocate revisiting 'the notion of faultless discourse' as an incorrect form of interactional resource. Further, Hauser (2010) stresses the importance of drawing attention to what learners are able

to do with the interactional resources they possess as interactionally competent learners. Its scope includes learners' ability to utilise L1 as an important interactional resource and this warrants its close analysis, aimed at exploring how it can help to create L2 learning opportunities within the process of interaction. It must also be emphasized that analysis drawing attention to the types of interactional resources learners already have and utilise (Rezaee, 2020; Seedhouse, 2011; Sert, 2015) is particularly limited. Chavez (2016, p.137) highlights the paucity of studies examining 'the precise connections between teacher and learner talk', while revealing 'how exactly teachers shape the conversational spaces of their students'. As these studies claim, investigation of this aspect of teacher-learner exchange broadens the scope of the role of interactional resources in translanguaging as a discursive practice, while illustrating the mechanisms of sequential interactional patterns in L2 learning.

Subscribing to this view, this study argues that this L1 use, an interactional resource which learners bring to the classroom, functions as a significant alternative pathway able to contribute to the development of oral interaction and shape one's own learning in translanguaging practices. It also explores the possibility that a student's use of translanguaging in dyadic interaction can improve the quality of L2 communication by examining whether and how learners' own languages can serve as useful interactional resources which allow them to express themselves in diverse ways leading to L2 output as a process of potential learning (Pekarek Doehler, 2013; Taguchi, 2015). Thus, in this study, each learning opportunity is considered as emerging from participation in interaction as a discursive practice and 'as an eminently local accomplishment emerging from the detailed moment-by-moment deployment of actions and turns at talk within interactionally organized courses of practical activities' (Pekarek Doehler, 2013, p.139). Specifically, 'local achievement' in this study means display of knowledge in L2 through interaction, in which

learners can harness the use of L1 as part of translanguaging practice. This achievement is evident in levels of progression and intersubjectivity during the process of interaction.

This study examines the specific context of the oral conversation class in Japanese tertiary EFL, where students have limited proficiency in the target language. At the same time, learners are however able to translanguage. This interactional resource involves strategically transferring language codes between English and Japanese. The learners were taught by an experienced English teacher who was also proficient in the students' language, Japanese. Within this context, this study demonstrates that learner-initiated translanguaging closely intertwined with self-repair practices may be used facilitatively. In addition, it shows the teacher's responsiveness to L2 learning opportunities through collaborative interaction as a social activity (Walsh, 2006). This study therefore seeks to explore the under-researched role of learner-initiated translanguaging within instructed conversational interaction in Japanese EFL context.

This study begins by discussing the role of Interactional Competence (IC) (Hall, 2007; Pekarek Doehler, 2013, 2018; Waring, 2018; Young, 2008) and Interactional Repertoire (IR) (Hall, 2018; van Compernolle & Soria, 2020). This study focuses on the analysis of L1 use as translanguaging practice in relation to self-initiated self-repair (SISR) during talk-in-interaction within CA frameworks. It also explores the ways in which the observed students frequently use facilitative translanguaging as part of Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) (Walsh, 2006) to create their own interactional space. Further, it explores the way learner-initiated translanguaging scaffolds students' own L2 learning, mediated by collaborative interaction with a teacher.

The term scaffolding in this study is defined at two levels. First, it refers to teachers' pedagogical support helping individual learners to complete tasks they may not otherwise be able to complete alone (van de Pol et al., 2010). At another level, its sub-concept self-

scaffolding considers the learner as an active participant and also as a main feature of scaffolding (van de Pol et al., 2010; Walqui & van Lier, 2010). It therefore includes the core idea proposed by Walqui and van Lier (2010) that scaffolding is essentially contingent on learners' agency. That is, task achievement and its associated progress depend on initiatives taken by learners in the context of interaction. Thus, this study explores the way learner-initiated translanguaging facilitates co-constructed interaction by illustrating learners' approach to interaction through the medium of L1. This study then specifically explores the types of sequential interactional pattern which emerge from interactional discourse to illustrate how learner-initiated translanguaging contributes to L2 learning opportunities by examining aspects of its turn organisation, such as turn design, turn sequence, topic management and types of self-repair (Schegloff, 1968; Schegloff et al., 1977) used by learners.

Thus, as its central research question this study asks how, as part of CIC, learners make decisions on the use of L1 as an appropriate interactional resource in given contexts. This involves asking how they initiate interaction and create their learning spaces, ultimately engaging in translanguaging practices to enhance their participation in L2. The term translanguaging in this study adopts the concept proposed by Li and Lin (2019, p.211) that 'it is a practice that involves dynamic functionally integrated use of different languages' which contribute to the knowledge construction in L2 learning. In this study, translanguaging is defined as a discursive practice in which learners creatively manipulate their use of L1 (Japanese) and L2 (English) to optimise their L2 learning opportunities, contributing to L2 output and also enhancing progressivity and intersubjectivity in L2 interaction both within and across turns. Within this scope, learner-initiation of self-repair using L1, which often simultaneously occurs with translanguaging, is considered as an integral part of translanguaging practice when it demonstrates learners' ability to monitor and control their

language alternation, i.e. the functionality of its use for meaning-making in interaction. Thus, this study explores how language alternation as translanguaging and self-repair interact as discursive practices.

Drawing from its results, this study outlines key findings illustrating learner-initiated translanguaging practices, as well as implications bearing on our understanding of the pedagogical role of L1 in L2 contexts.

2. Approaching interactional discourse as social action: analytical framework

2.1. L2 classroom interactional competence

This study adopts a sequential CA approach (Sacks et al., 1974) as an analytical framework. CA is a crucial tool in the current study as its analysis involves the 'collaborative achievement of the conversation participants' (Li, 2002, p.177) in dialogic interaction and it also aims at examining the detailed mechanism of participants' mutual understanding in the analysis of turn organization from an interactional perspective (Gardner, 2008; Hall, 2007; Mori, 2007). Linked to this, the concept of CIC, defined as 'teachers' and learners' ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning', (Walsh, 2006, p.132) will also be used as a core analytical lens to explore the extent to which successful learners shape their own interactional space through collaborative interaction in their use of L1 which is mediated by the teacher.

Previous studies (Sert & Walsh, 2012; Sert, 2015; Walsh, 2006, 2011) specifically suggest that the use of L1 is considered meaningful as part of CIC when the interactants recognise the appropriateness and relevance of timely language alternation as CS and utilise it. For example, Sert (2015) illustrated three functions of CS in classroom interaction between a teacher and a student: namely code-mixing, expansion of topic and the provision of an L1

utterance in a response turn. Further, Urmeneta and Walsh's (2017) exploration of learner-initiated CS identified its interactional function within peer activity as a facilitative device for discussion and a pre-indication of disagreement within collaborative interaction. Likewise, the current specific instructional context in L2 learning involving the use of L1 has been selected for its potential facilitative role from learners' perspectives on learning, examining how collaborative interaction promotes L2 learning opportunities within conversational moves through the medium of L1, particularly in repair sequences. The vital role that L1 plays thus echoes previous studies which explored its facilitative role in creating mutually shared interactional space in L2 classroom interaction.

It is also essential to be mindful of the research gap between related but distinct conceptual models of the role L1 plays in L2 learning, particularly in their interpretation of the interconnectivity between language alternation and repair as part of CIC. Following Gafaranga's (2012) identification of the interrelationship between self-repair and language alternation, there have been few empirical studies which refer to the role of self-repair from a translanguaging perspective. Crace-Murray's study (2018) noted the positive use of learners' self-repair for error correction when teachers adopt translanguaging practice in Alaskan EFL contexts. Kim's study (2020) observed that novice and intermediate learners in Korean EFL contexts utilised SISR mainly to correct lexically and grammatically problematic language. In parallel, Yang's study (2020) proposed that novice learners can adopt self-repetition as a strategy for self-repair to complete tasks in L2 Chinese classroom. While these studies suggest certain positive interconnected relationships between language alternation and self-repair, there is a need for deeper investigation to present a more complete picture of the dynamic interaction between these two essential concepts and drawing on observation of practice within learning environments. Hence, this study attempts to fill this gap by focusing

on the role of self-initiated repair by Japanese EFL learners as seen from a translanguaging perspective.

2.2. Translanguaging and self-repair in L2 classroom interaction

In order to explore learners' ability to decide how to proceed when they interact with other interactants, it is necessary to outline the types of interactional abilities required for dialogic interaction, by referring to the concept of interactional competence (IC) (Hall, 2007; Hall et al., 2011; Young, 2008; Pekarek Doehler, 2018; Salaberry & Kunitz, 2019) and Interactional Repertoire (IR) (Hall, 2018, 2019; van Compernolle & Soria, 2020).

First, the concept of IC has been widely used as a key concept in the analysis of classroom discourse from a CA perspective to identify and examine the types of interactional skills learners utilise in specific contexts. Although the features of IC illustrated vary according to the scholar, its role has been specifically characterised as acquisition of knowledge of specific social-contexts, the ability to deploy and recognise context-specific patterns including the use of non-verbal cues and also its potential to repair problems within interactional work (Hall & Pekarek Doehler, 2011).

While IC's scope for the analysis of interaction is regarded as multi-dimensional, recent approaches to L2 classroom discourse (Hall, 2018,19) urge the adoption of more context-sensitive methods used to examine L2 learners' dynamic and total ability to manipulate their interactional skills and to examine utilisation of varied interactional resources in the process of L2 learning. In particular, Hall (2019, p.87) emphasises that it is necessary to 'aptly capture the variable mix of heterogeneous, multilingual and multimodal constitutes that L2 learners draw on and develop' in their diverse social interaction. This study will therefore use the concept of 'interactional repertoire', which involves seeing the use of L1 as an indispensable interactional resource in bilingual interaction.

In relation to the concept of IR in translanguaging practices, another key concept, self-repair using L1, will be discussed as it plays a significant role in learner-initiation in L2 classroom interaction and is an integral component in interaction. Referring to the relationship between language alternation and repair, Gafaranga (2012, p.523) identifies the close and intertwined relationship between language alternation and repair. He notes that language alternation can occur at a repairable level simultaneously. He then says that it is important to examine where and how language alternation is used as an interactional resource (Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011) and indicates that the scope of repair is not limited to error correction. Previous studies also suggest that repair broadly has dual or parallel functions: dealing with linguistic trouble and also with difficulty in progressing towards the attainment of intersubjectivity in interaction. For example, repair has been defined as 'a complex system for doing maintenance work that avoids and averts miscommunication' (Wong & Waring, 2011, p.11). Further, Kramsch (1986) specifically focuses on learners' ability to convey the intended meaning for the establishment of joint understanding.

The concept of repair as a tool which is able to maintain interaction is also supported by Hellermann (2011, p.147), who further advocates the need for progressivity of interaction, saying: 'Although the source of repair is called a trouble source, that source is not necessarily some deviant language structure, error or mistake. It is a trouble source with respect to the ongoing progressivity'. That is to say, previous studies suggest the role of repair does not necessarily involve solving linguistic troubles (as a form of correction, particularly from a teacher's point of view) in isolation but also includes maintaining interaction by restoring mutual understanding through pedagogical engagement.

The complex and dynamic roles which repair plays stand out when the use of self-repair is explored from a learner's point of view. As mentioned earlier, the function of repair goes beyond the scope of error correction. To extend this, studies by Simpson et al. (2012)

and Buckwalter (2001) suggest that the functionality of repair in interaction needs more attention from a learners' perspective. Simpson et al. (2012) examined the use of self-repair in L2 Chinese classrooms from a CA perspective, followed up by stimulated recall interviews. Their study suggests that learners have a monitoring ability to decide when, how and what to repair and regards this monitoring ability as part of self-repair practice. Further, Buckwalter's study (2001) also elaborates on the nature of self-repair, the self-regulation potential in learners' use of L1 as they talk through troubles, or potential troubles, when they prioritise progressivity of interaction rather than repairing linguistic errors. Thus, in cases where self-repair is initiated by the learner aiming to achieve an interactional goal involving progressivity and intersubjectivity in tandem with translanguaging, this study considers self-repair using L1 as integral to translanguaging: the intention and practices of learner-initiated repair overlap with the nature of translanguaging practices for meaning-making.

Within this scope, the use of L1 in translanguaging and associated self-repair practices, often considered negatively as a sign of linguistic or interactional trouble, needs to be further explored as a potential facilitative resource (van Compernolle, 2011) able to facilitate interaction in L2 contexts. The present paper aims to establish whether, and if so how, the use of L1 contributes to progressivity of interaction. Although translanguaging may be motivated by interactional troubles, the act of repair itself, which simultaneously occurs with translanguaging, is intertwined and regarded as coordinated action. Thus, this study attempts to examine exactly how translanguaging in talk-in-interaction involving learners' code-choice as part of CIC can be a bridge connecting L2 learning opportunities and output.

2.3. Interaction mediated through the use of L1 in L2 learning
As for the use of L1 in L2 learning, a study by Gafaranga (2012) emphasises the importance of language choice in L2 contexts and considers its very use a significant aspect of talk

organisation, a tool for mediating L2 learning (van Compernolle, 2015). Following this line, Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) concluded that the use of L1 is orderly and that learners' L1 use in L2 interaction functions as a sign of non-alignment with teachers' pedagogical goals, i.e. a code-switching (CS) practice. Thus, previous studies on the use of L1 which adopted CA (Ziegler et al., 2012) from a CS perspective began to reveal its role as a sequential cue in the process of interaction and attempted to describe the way interaction takes place at the intersections where participants interact, fostering interplay (Chavez, 2016) among participants. Likewise, previous studies suggested that the sequential analysis of L2 discourse focusing on the use of L1 through CA (Üstünel & Seedhouse 2005; Üstünel, 2016; Ziegler et al., 2012) is an indispensable tool for articulating the pedagogical functions of CS and also depicted its various roles in interaction. Although this study adopts the concept of translanguaging, the vital role that L1 plays can be drawn from previous studies which examined its facilitative role in interaction from a CS perspective.

The use of learner-initiated CS in previous studies has also been explored in relation to repair in L2 contexts, first as a means of participation through engagement in language activities which are part of social interaction (van Cormpernolle, 2015), second as a compensatory strategy in the process of interaction, and finally as an instrument providing learning opportunities promoted by collaborative interaction in language activities.

First, examining the notion of 'participation' in the use of CS, which involves the practice of creating an 'opportunity for learning' to serve the needs of individual students who have limited proficiency, van Compernolle (2015) specifically sees the use of CS as a tool for mediating L2 development for those who cannot otherwise participate in the activity itself. Similarly, Park (2015) emphasises the need to pay attention to the limitations of learners' capacity to interact in L2 which can determine the extent of L1 use. Further, Park's (2015) study of low-literate L2 learners claims first language use helps them to pay attention

not only to usage, but also to the process and mechanism of classroom repair and its function as a study resource.

Second, some studies have illustrated the use of CS in repair sequences as a necessary compensatory strategy in the interactional process used to hold the floor. For example, Nyroos et al.'s study (2017) illustrates how learner-initiated repair can function as display of trouble awareness and indicates that self-repair is underway through the use of the Swedish conjunction word *eller* in L2 English oral proficiency test. This also suggests the possibility of bridging 'peripheral to core participation' (Hellermann & Cole 2008, p.210) of learners through language choice (Tudini, 2016). These studies seem to highlight the need to determine learners' current level of understanding (Jarvis & Robinson, 1997) and provide suitable learning support through turn by turn interaction using the medium of CS so learners can stay engaged in interaction (Marti, 2012), also shaping their interactional space as CIC (Walsh, 2006).

Other studies which explored the use of CS to provide L2 learning opportunities through the negotiation of meaning in peer interaction also reported how CS has been used as a repair strategy to support learning. Studies by Leeming (2011) and Moore (2013) both examined the use of CS by EFL learners in pair-work, scrutinising learners' L1 use and suggesting that CS contributes to the negotiation of meaning among participants through social interaction. These studies also emphasise the importance of understanding the function of L1 as a determining factor in the positive use of CS and the extent to which its use can influence L2 learning.

Another study by Stone (2017), which analysed the use of L1 within off-task private talk among Japanese EFL students found that learners used L1 as an immediate code for the negotiation of meaning, then transferred their knowledge into L2-based output even after they understood the content itself in their L1. This kind of learner initiative, promoting own

learning with self-initiated code choice, can also shed light on the positive use of CS in L2 learning. Further, Al Masaeed's study (2016) also explored the judicious use of L1 by intermediate learners of Arabic in conversation-for-learning contexts during study abroad and illustrated a range of facilitative functions of L1 used to promote L2 interaction. Thus, the pedagogical role of L1 in L2 contexts has been recognised as a useful tool for promoting learning through participation, compensation strategies and also learning strategies used as repair to facilitate L2 learning in L2 contexts.

Likewise, this study also adopts an analytical approach to understanding the use of L1 as a contributor to L2 learning possibilities while maintaining progressivity and intersubjectivity, in which the interactants have the option of shifting from one language to the other, also exploring the context-specific pedagogical role of L1 within instructed L2 conversational practice. In the following section, the use of L1 in dyadic teacher-learner talk as translanguaging practice will be further examined to see how the use of L1 initiated by individual learner functions in this specific L2 context.

3. The study

3.1. Participants and research context

68 Japanese EFL students participated in this study, and all were in their first year in tertiary level oral communication classes at a university in Japan. Their proficiency level ranged from B1 to B2 within the common European framework of reference for languages (CEFR). Their English teacher had 20 years' experience teaching in Japanese EFL contexts and was a bilingual speaker of Japanese and English.

In order to explore the role of learner-initiated translanguaging for Japanese EFL learners, the interactional discourse of 68 dyads between an English teacher and individual learners was examined through sequential CA, focusing on CIC under instructional individual

conversational practices in L2 contexts. The data was collected at the one-to-one conversational practice session one month after the new academic year began and each student was allocated approximately five minutes to converse with a teacher. A total of 7.2 hours' data was audio and video-recorded.

The procedures for this conversational practice comprised two oral interactional stages. In the first stage, students were required to speak about their chosen topic for at least one minute, gradually moving towards the second stage which comprised question and answer sequences involving the teacher and individual learners. Thus, at their turn-opening, the individual learners were required to initiate a topic which they were given the opportunity to prepare in advance and take the initiating role from the beginning of the interaction through topic-initiation and turn-taking. That is to say, learners were given opportunities to engage with 'active, initiative-rich participation in the interaction' (Damhuis, 2000, p.245), not rigidly scripted but providing opportunities to shape interactional space for improvisation through the expansion of their own thoughts as a starting point (Sert, 2017).

Owing to this, turn-organisation was initiated by the individual learner at the opening and was followed by opportunities for self-selected turns, contrasting with predominantly IRF sequence where initiation usually starts with the teacher. Therefore, the basic interactional role at the start of the conversation was a reversal of usual practices in teacher-led discourse (Garton, 2012). Also, interactions involved learner initiation in topic management within a meaning-fluency context (Seedhouse, 2004) as well as dealing with an element of the improvisational process of interactions (Hellermann & Cole, 2008) when the teacher asked questions. Learners were therefore given responsibility and opportunities to speak as experts in their chosen topic and initiation as a form of 'self-selected turn' (van Lier, 1988, p.108) was encouraged. Thus, the learners in this study had free topic choice but were required to

follow a preconditioned task procedure involving the two stages of interaction described above.

3.2. Method

The data comes from audio and video recordings of 68 dyads collected over two weeks. These took place during individual conversational sessions which the class teacher organises twice-termly. There were two oral interactional stages, as previously described. Initially, 101 dyadic oral interactions were recorded and transcribed. However, 33 samples were excluded because 17 students discontinued before the end of the first stage as they were unable to maintain the interaction. Another 16 samples conducted solely in L2 were also excluded from the analysis, as the main focus for this study was the use of L1 in interaction.

The data were analysed, focusing on the facilitative use of learner-initiated translanguaging and self-repair as an interactional resource where its use was frequently observed and intertwined, exploring its pedagogical and interactional role by examining the overall turn-taking organisation of the interactions (Heritage, 1997; McHoul 1990) specifically for turn design, turn sequences, topic management and the types of self-repair used as learner initiation towards L2 learning.

4. Data analysis

4.1. Conversational analysis

The initial phase of analysis involved reviewing data for any noticeable and recurrent interactional resources or patterns, with no a priori focus following the CA practice of unmotivating looking. After the initial analysis, the learner-initiated use of L1 emerged as a recurring interactional resource due to its frequency and variety. This led to further analysis of specific types of translanguaging practice and self-repair, examining the length of

utterances used in L1, the complexity of their use and their contribution to the interactional process. Compared to the limited use of L1 observed in Al Masaeed's (2016) investigation of intermediate learners of L2 Arabic, in this study it was notably more widespread, and its facilitative functions have been scrutinised from a translanguaging perspective. Further, the use of L1 as self-repair to maintain the progressivity of interaction was also pronounced. Within the 341 samples of self-initiated repair, 285 samples of self-repair (83.6%) were conducted in L1 and the use of self-repair in L2 English was also limited in its range of types and particularly in the number of learners using it as a formulaic expression, e.g. 'Pardon?', or through repetition of utterances. As discussed earlier, in this study 'self-initiated repair' using L1 is considered a valuable interactional resource which demonstrates L2 learners' ability to monitor ongoing interaction and is regarded as a facilitative resource which can be intertwined with translanguaging practices when both practices occur simultaneously.

Then, samples were divided into two categories according to the type of function of translanguaging in relation to self-repair used as a facilitative interactional resource for the maintenance of progressivity. The first type is self-addressed translanguaging, used by the speaker as a solitary activity to progress interaction within a turn. This translanguaging practice is similar to an interactional resource, 'self-directed talk', conceptualised by Thorne and Steinbach Kohler (2011). In their study, the speaker's ability to uptake speech by the self as an initiator of talk is considered a valuable interactional resource. The other type is 'co-constructed translanguaging', which leaves the opportunity for the other participant to have the uptake of the speech within collaborative interaction both within or across turns. Further, the first type of translanguaging consists of four self-addressed translanguaging practices: 1) connectives for topic management; 2) floor holding devices; 3) explicit word search and 4) lexical gap fillers. The second type of translanguaging practice, which involved the other participant's explicit participation, included: 1) understanding displays; 2) clarification

requests; 3) confirmation checks; 4) explicit requests for support. In relation to the use of translanguaging practice, self-repair in L1 was frequently and simultaneously observed in translanguaging to support learners' progressivity of interaction and the analysis in this study includes the observation of self-repair which plays a key role in interaction.

The analyses documented below are representative uses of translanguaging. In certain cases, translanguaging practices were observed and analysed in tandem with simultaneous learners' self-repair practices, arranged according to the type of aforementioned function of translanguaging, and also to the complexity of interactional exchanges. Translanguaging mechanisms were also revealed through the way they emerged in discourse as social interaction according to its social function at intersections where L1 and L2 are exchanged through productive (speaking) and receptive (listening) skills.

4.1.1. Self-addressed translanguaging within a turn

Connectives for topic management.

In extract 1, a student initiated a topic about a driving school she attended and tried to elaborate on this, but faced difficulty which she had to deal with through non-lexical interactional resources, right from the beginning.

Extract 1: translanguaging used as a continuer for topic management

01 S: i↑have go to driving school(.)↑two years ago.

02   <my driving technique is(.)[a:]:↓>

                    uh::::

       [+ averting eyes, down to the right and away from the teacher]

       [+ teacher waiting for the learner to initiate eye contact]

03   (3.2)

04 T: <↑goo:d (.) or bad↓>

05 S: (.)[ah?]

   uh?

   [+looking up and towards teacher

06 T: <↑goo:d or bad↓>

07 S: (.)[eh?]

   huh?

   [+looks at teacher

08 (3.2)

09 T: no ↑good?

10 S: (0.2) no good↓

11 T: no good↓

12→S: de, a:[:] ↓

   and, uh::::

   [+touches her hair

13 (5.6)

14► i went(.)i↑went every day at night.

15 T: every day.

The first instance of translanguaging (line 12) starts with the first word uttered (de (*and*)) as

a connective, indicating the continuation of talk claiming interactional space for

forthcoming output as well as topic initiation by the learner. It also projects a possible

sequence closing. Also, elongated thinking noise (a::(*uh:::*)) uttered soon after (de (*and*)) was

followed by a long pause of 5.6 seconds with embodied actions of hand movement, which

demonstrates her collection of thoughts (Hauser, 2010) as an indication of topic initiation or

the move being underway during the word-search. Then, in line 14, the learner finally

initiates a new topic through repetition of utterances with a short pause: the frequency of attendance at a driving school. Although the manner of utterance in line 12 displays the learner's self-initiation of talk by non-lexical speech perturbation, she successfully explains what she means in L2 in line 14. This exemplifies successful progressivity of topic expansion in translanguaging. Following this, the teacher can be observed confirming his understanding through lexical repetition of the learners' utterances in the previous turn as CIC, as the falling intonation at line 15 indicates, confirming the achievement of intersubjectivity.

Interaction maintenance – floor maintenance device.

The dialogue in extract 2 took place after the talk in extract 1, where the teacher introduces a topic shift, referring to the name of the instructor at the driving school in a relevant new question.

Extract 2: translanguaging used as floor maintenance device

01   <↑<u>wha</u>t is the <u>name</u> of your driving ↑<u>tea</u>cher? >
02→S: =<e:::[too]:: >

     let me see

      [+looks away from teacher
03   (2.2)
04► yamada ((teacher's name))

After the teacher's initial question, the student takes a moment to recall her thoughts to answer the question by uttering a slow-paced word in L1, with vowel-marking as 'thinking

noise' (Carroll, 2005, p.214) at the turn-construction-unit (TCU) beginning. The 'sound stretch' (Brouwer, 2003, p.539), is traditionally considered a sign of trouble or disfluency, and her embodied action of averting her eyes away from the teacher (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986) displays the fact that the search is underway. However, in this example after a long silence of 2.2 second in line 3, the learner successfully answered the question as the second part of a delayed adjacency pair. This extract shows that the student's pursuit of intended interactional achievements is underway, in parallel with the display of continuing involvement in the interaction through the use of L1. The teacher also collaborates in this process by allowing the learner to say the Japanese word for what she is thinking, thus creating a space for solitary activity.

Explicit word search

In extract 3, the conversation starts with learner topic initiation. The topic is her hometown and the high school she attended.

Extract 3: translanguaging and self-repair used as explicit word search

01 S: my hometown is surrounded by the mountains.

02 T: um hum.

03 S: but i <u>like</u> my hometown.=

04→   =˚are, [<u>nann</u>] da kke˚.

       oh   what CP Q

      oh, what is (next)?

     [+looking away from teacher

05   (2.2)

    + renewing eye contact with teacher

06►   my high school(.) few students <eighty> (.) <eighty>.

07 T: <u>on</u>ly ↑<u>eigh</u>ty?=

08 S: =and all member <is> friendly (.) <<u>are</u>> friendly.

09   we promise that(.) we will meet soon (2.1) when we are

      twenty.

In extract 3, in line 1, topic initiation on the subject of her hometown can be observed, and this is met by the teacher's response through active listenership and facilitation, which supports the learner's forthcoming utterances. This answer, (um hum) as a minimal response token as a continuer, shapes the student's interactional space in line 2 (Girgin & Brandt, 2019) and is offered as a sign of alignment which also acts as the second part of an adjacency pair for immediate turn exchange.

Soon after, in line 3, the student manages to elaborate on her topic by using the conjunction 'but' and successfully develops another sub-topic, saying (I like my hometown). Then, her utterances in L1 (˚are, nann da kke˚ (*oh, what is next*?)), indicating explicit word search (Brouwer, 2003; Hayashi 2003) or 'recollection of thought' (Hayashi, 2002, p.150), are very soft and quiet, suggesting they are self-addressed speech as solitary activity. The self-talk in line 4 shows that the learner is self-scaffolding by uttering words to help her recollect what she wanted to say about her own topic while turning her eyes away from the teacher. It also demonstrates that the use of L1 as self-initiated-self-repair (SISR) helps her to hold the floor and to further expand the topic. At the same time, it functions as translanguaging, as the use of L1 itself is a tool for meaning-making and also as an additional interactional resource.

Then, after a 2.2 second silence in line 5, the student successfully recalls the next topic, the number of students in her high school. Here, in extract 3, it should be noted that one of the characteristics of institutional discourse in a meaning-fluency context (Seedhouse, 2004) is that the teacher exercises less control over linguistic mistakes, although many

grammatical errors may be evident. However, the use of L1 and a 2.2 second silence at line 5 were sequentially relevant and enabled the learner to develop the topic further as a sign of self-initiation, as overall coherence in conversation was further facilitated over successive turns. Thus, coherent discourse is facilitated by various scaffolding techniques acting as CIC, which the teacher provides by showing understanding (line 2), which demonstrates his interest (line 7).

As this example of self-addressed speech (Hayashi, 2002) illustrates, the use of L1 as a word search activity can be seen as a significant interactional resource used to maintain or re-gain self-regulation. Likewise, the use of self-directed translanguaging as explicit word search (Brouwer, 2003) here has demonstrated the facilitative use of L1, which has multiple functions enabling the learner to shape her own interactional space to maintain topic progression up to line 9.

Lexical gap fillers

In extract 4, the use of clearly vocalised L1 and L2 utterances within a turn can be observed after a teacher enquires about the party which a learner talked about in previous turns.

Extract 4: translanguaging used as lexical gap fillers

01 T: <u>when</u> will you go to the ↑<u>party</u>?

02 S: a::::::

    uh::::::

03   (1.2)

04►   this saturday.

05   T: <u>what</u> <u>ti</u>me do you start?

06→S: e:::::tto,

let me see,

07   (2.1)

08→   roku (.) six o'clock.

▶   *six*

This shows how the learner processes his answers in sequences as secondary parts of adjacency pairs. After the learner displays a sound stretched word in line 2, and then a 1.2 second silence in line 3, a L2 utterance finally appears in line 4 (this saturday). This shows how the learner self-scaffolds his interaction through the medium of L1 in translanguaging practices.

In the second example of an adjacency pair, in line 5, the teacher asks when the party began. After translanguaging used as a floor holding device, as was shown in extract 2 in the form of a thinking noise in line 6, followed by 2.1 seconds' silence, the learner uses L1 within a turn at a lexical level (roku [*six*]) and soon after processes the information in the target language (six o'clock). Through the use of L1 before uttering the same word in L2, the learner filled his lexical gap and then displayed his utterance in L2. These instances further demonstrate how learners can self-scaffold to facilitate L2 output in the target language within a turn in translanguaging, using the medium of L1 to complete their utterances to maintain the progressivity of interaction.

4.1.2. Co-constructed translanguaging across turns

Understanding displays

The following short exchange displays the learner's understanding of the teacher's question in L1.

Extract 5. Understanding displays

01 T: <u>what</u> do you ↑<u>think</u> about ichiro?=

((name of a famous baseball player))

02→S: =a:::,(2.1) ichiro wa   (.)e:: (2.3) <↑<u>su</u>barashii>.=

    well   ichiro TP   let me see, wonderful

    well,   ichiro (is)   let me see, wonderful.

03► = i like ichiro.

The learner's facilitative use of translanguaging in extract 5 is demonstrated by the immediate use of L1 in line 2 as the second part of an adjacency pair, answering the question in line 1. This clearly displays that the learner, who provides an answer in L1, understands the meaning of the question asked. The presence of sound stretches at the beginning of the TCU, which is followed by a long silence of 2.1 seconds and the second sound stretch with longer silence which is followed by slow paced utterances display that word search is underway. However, in line 3, the learner further extends his turn by switching to L2 immediately. The use of L1 in line 2 facilitates and displays his understanding of the question asked and also the use of L2 in the next turn as the first step towards providing his answer, enables the learner to state his opinion in L1 first. It should be noted that in this extract the learner also used translanguaging successfully as an effective interactional tool to create coherent discourse across turns. Overall conversational organisation was also coherently scaffolded using L1 to enhance progressivity as in the case of the last utterance in line 3, a delayed response to the question in line 1 which completes an adjacency pair and attains alignment.

Clarification requests and confirmation checks

a) request for clarification of the question asked

The following exchange displays the learner's request for clarification of the question asked about a young man.

Extract 6. Clarification requests

01 T: <u>young</u> man?=

02→S*: =[ah? (1.2) ha↑<u>i</u>?=

    uh?   what?

    [+ looking at teacher

03   T: =<is ↑he a ↑<u>young</u> man?>=

04→S: =iya,(.) old man.

    no

05►T: old man.

In extract 6, the noticeable use of recurring learner-initiated translanguaging is limited to very short utterances such as monosyllabic words, especially at the beginning of sentences shortly after questions were asked by the teacher, for example in line 2. Here the function of L1 use can also be understood as a sign of misalignment by analysing how the learner orientated himself towards trouble sources to make an open-class repair initiator (Drew, 1997) in translanguaging for the dual purposes of clarification request and continuing to hold the turn. The learner's repair initiation was a sequentially appropriate response. As a response to the teacher's question, the student's use of the word (ha↑i*? [what?]*), with low to high pitch movement in line 2, shows uncertainty or lack of understanding and the student makes requests for further clarification for the second time, accompanied by embodied actions. In response, the teacher reformulates the question in a full sentence slowly with accentuate emphasis. Then, in line 4, the learner demonstrates the immediate application of translanguaging in the form of the word *iya*, which means 'no' in this context (Hayashi,

2010), showing that she successfully comprehends the question asked, although her immediate reply is partially in L1, demonstrating that the student can also produce coherent discourse through translanguaging across turns, albeit at a very basic structural level. The use of L1 in line 4 did not have to be repaired, but functioned as a facilitative resource for ongoing interaction. This indicates that the learner's response was finally provided as a sign of the accomplishment of intersubjective interactional goals, as in the questions asked in line 1, and the teacher confirms this through repetition as a sign of alignment in line 5.

b) confirmation check facilitated through interpretation of L2 utterance

The following exchange displays the learner's confirmation check to ensure own understanding.

Extract 7. Confirmation check to ensure own understanding

```
01   T: ok. you choose ↑your topic.=
02→S: =a,(.) wadai desu [ka?]
         oh   topic  CP   Q
         oh, a topic (to talk)?
03   T:            [+nodding
04►S: (1.2) i belong to soccer club.
```

To respond to the instruction, in line 2 the student immediately orients himself to the trouble source at the TCU beginning, first uttering a turn-initial new marker (a,[.]) to display awareness of the need for topic initiation as a state of change particle, followed by (wadai desu [ka?](*a topic to talk*?)). He checks whether his understanding of the instruction is correct as a confirmation check. This use of L1 as learner-initiated initiation clearly displays that he has

understood the teacher's instruction given in L2 and then interpreted it in L1 for a confirmation check, by translanguaging from L2 to L1 so the student can proceed with the task through conversation. Then, in line 3, the teacher nonverbally (by nodding) confirms the alignment achieved by the learner. Sequentially, in line 3 the teacher affirms the learner's more precise formulation in line 2. Following this, after 1.2 seconds' silence in line 4, the learner begins speaking in the target language. This is a good example of the use of translanguaging as a confirmation check through learner interpretation of L2 utterances, which facilitated the progression of talk in this context.

Extract 8 also exemplifies clarification request at sentential level.

Extract 8. Clarification to ensure understanding (2)

01   T: <u>when</u> was the <<u>last time</u>> you saw him?

02   S: when?

03   T: <u>when</u> was the ↑<u>la</u>st time you saw <<u>your</u> <u>frien</u>d>?

04→S: ha↑<u>i</u>?

   pardon?

05   T: <u>when</u> did you see him <<u>last</u>> time?

06→S: <u>saigo</u> ni ↑atta?

   last DP met

   when did I see (him) last time?

07   T: yes.

08→S: <e:::to, [u:::::::nn][to]>

   well, let me see

   [+averting eyes and touching his neck

09   (1.2)

10   T: [<<u>this</u>] year> or <<u>two</u> years ago>?=

11►S: =three months ago.

In this extract, after the teacher asks a question in line 1, the learner requests clarification of the question, through repetition, first in L2 by simply repeating an interrogative word (when?) as an open class repair initiation. This is followed by another reformulated question, asked by the teacher to shape the student's interactional space in line 3. However, the learner's difficulty in comprehending the question invites him to engage with translanguaging, changing his lexical choice (Heritage, 1997) to L1 (ha↑i? [*what*]) through the use of low to high pitch movement in L1, indicating uncertainty or lack of understanding in line 4. This second clarification of meaning through the learner's use of L1 prompted the teacher to further reformulate his question for the third time in line 5.

Following this, in line 6, the learner attempts to clarify the exact meaning of incidental questions the teacher asks by using sentence level translanguaging (saigo ni ↑atta? [(*when) did I see (him) last time?*]), employing newly formatted self-initiated translanguaging as an alternative resource to resolve the uncertainty of understanding in L2. He demonstrates his understanding in L1 and in the next-turn the teacher finally confirms the learner's understanding is correct in L2 as the turn exchanges finally reach intersubjectivity.

Thus, within this initial six turn exchange, the teacher reformulates the initial question twice in response to the learner-initiated turns and as scaffolded help. This suggests that at the initial stage there was non-alignment and a need to clarify the meaning of the question to understand. However, the learners' use of L1 as translanguaging and the self-initiation of repair successfully led to the alignment of the pedagogical task, to understand the meaning of the question. These multiple turn exchanges were necessary to enable the student to check his understanding before answering the question and to reach alignment with the other participant. Only after these turn exchanges was the learner able to start thinking about the

answer, in line 8, first by uttering extremely elongated thinking sounds (e:::to, u::::::nnto (well, let me see)), to maintain progressivity while touching part of his body.

Finally, on being asked an optional question by the teacher in line 10, the student can provide a response. This is another example of a delayed adjacency question and answer pairing, which required ten multiple turns before the response was finally provided. Extract 8 therefore shows that the learner and teacher were in the process of co-constructing intersubjectivity mediated through translanguaging. Although the teacher did not verbalise any utterances in the learner's language in this extract, his understanding of Japanese as interpreted work through receptive skill (listening) and his confirmation in line 7 enabled meaning to be negotiated and mutual understanding was attained.

Initiating request for assistance

Extract 9 below shows various functions of learner-initiated translanguaging. This is the most sophisticated example of the use of L1 in this study, presenting multiple uses of CIC by learners employing translanguaging to create L2 learning opportunities and requesting access to the expert's knowledge of L2 (Brouwer, 2005; Kasper, 2004). What makes this context unique is the mutual troubles experienced both by the learner and the teacher involving a lexical utterance, requiring collaborative problem-solving in order for the learner to accomplish his interactional goal.

Extract 9. Initiating other's help

01   S: this saturday, this sunday, next monday is <kōsōtai>

                              sports competition

02   T: some kind of ↑meeting? (.) meeting?

03 →S: ie, kō…

　　　no, high

　　　+ averting away from the teacher, looking down

04　　(3.2)

05　T: high school ↑gra<u>du</u>ates' ↑<u>mee</u>ting?

06 →S: [e::]tto,

　　　well,

　　　[+gaze returned to the teacher

07　　(2.3)

08→　my mother's school soccer club(.) participate in the taikai

　　　　　　　　　competition

09　T: in the ac↑<u>tivi</u>[ty?

10→S:　　　　[+nodding]

►

11　(0.8)i return (.) to my hometown.

12　T: why do you go back?

13→S: i (3.6) ō[˚en˚]

　　　　　cheer

14 T:　　　[ōen]dan?=

　　　cheering group?

15→S: =no (.)ōensuru.

　　　to cheer

16　T: ↑<u>cheer</u>.=

17►S: =i cheer (.) the soccer club of the high school.

　　　In line 1, the student tries to explain the abbreviated word *kōsōtai* [*kōkō-sōgō-taiiku-taikai* (high school sports competition)]) in L1, which is his main chosen topic. The teacher is

proficient in Japanese, but finds the meaning of this abbreviated word incomprehensible and this non-alignment as a trouble source is evident from the repeated attempts to clarify the questions asked by the teacher at the next-turn, as seen in line 2. This was the starting point for repair activities, and here the teacher's attempts at other-initiated-self-repair (OISR) have the opposite effect to that intended, generating an other-initiated repair problem. Starting at line 3, the learner then immediately switches to L1 and utters the beginning of Japanese words (ie, kō… [*no, high*])) previously uttered in line 1 and uses L1 as an alternative interactional resource in an attempt to explain the word's meaning to make himself understood, but the learner cuts off at the beginning of the turn and the result is a grammatically incomplete sentence. This is followed by a 3.2 second silence in line 4, highlighting that interaction is on hold. Responding to this, in line 5, the teacher tried to anticipate the meaning of words uttered by the learner in the previous turn by asking further questions.

As a temporal response, in line 6 the learner initiated another L1 usage involving a thinking noise, (e::tto[(*well*)) as a floor holding device followed by the 2.3 second silence in line 7. As a result, this use of L1 and the long silence as reflection facilitates the construction of the next learner-initiated repair in line 8 and the student starts to contextualise the topic in L2, first by using L1 with one word (taikai [*competition*]) in Japanese at the end of the sentence, employed to fill the lexical gap. Then, in line 9, the teacher makes another clarification by supplying a broad interpretation of the word to solve the problem, about this specific 'activity'. Following this, in line 10, the student responds non-verbally (nodding) to the question asked by the teacher in the previous turn as an acknowledgement indicating the attainment of intersubjectivity. He then shifts his topic further, attempting to explain why he is going back to his hometown, with disfluency displayed by pauses. Following this, in the next turn, the teacher asks why the student returned to his hometown in line 12. In response,

in line 13 the student attempts to explain his motive, tackling the difficult task of finding the right word in L2 but initiating intra-sentential translanguaging as a medium used to hold the floor, saying (i [3.6] ō[˚en˚] [I cheer]). The learner's quiet voice, with the diminishing volume of the second word, indicates his trouble with this specific word.

Then, the learner's utterance is overlapped by the teacher's in ([ōen]dan?[cheering group]). The teacher's anticipation thus serves as scaffolded help, but is an unresolved trouble source causing misalignment as it does not convey the exact meaning intended by the learner. Thus, the structure of the sentence that the learner is trying to construct demonstrates his awareness of the difference between the verb and noun form of a word meaning 'to cheer'. Then, in line 15, the learner begins with a clear and immediate use of the English word 'No', used as a reply to the teacher's response, before switching to L1 to make it clear that what he would like to know is the verb form rather than the noun, adopting translanguaging to indicate the function of the word meaning 'to cheer'.

This is a clear display of a learner's invitation to the teacher to help as an expert in order for the learner to receive a more appropriate word to complete his sentence in L2 to create mutually-shared space for meaning-making. His intention to use the verb form of 'cheer' is expressed more clearly here than in the previous turn in line 13. Likewise, the sequential analysis of turn exchanges between lines 12 and 17, and their content, show that the learner is fully aware of the intended use of linguistic form and is also able to articulate his needs through the medium of self-initiated translanguaging practices and is therefore finally able to provide the complete sentence in line 17.

This example clearly shows how the learner sought precise linguistic knowledge by creating a learning opportunity to complete his intended L2 output. The intended expressions were finally uttered after several turn exchanges using L1 as a repairable interactional resource. Overall, the turn-taking organisation demonstrated in Extract 9 shows how learner-

initiated translanguaging successfully contextualised unfamiliar words for the other participant, enabling him to create his own interactional space and also finally construct the exact intended response through problem-solving.

5. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

Using CA to analyse learner-initiated translanguaging, key facilitative functions have been identified which can be grouped into two categories: self-addressed translanguaging within a turn and co-constructed translanguaging used across turns. Both types of translanguaging practice have shown learners' initiatives in L2 interaction.

In this study, learner-initiated translanguaging practices illustrated a series of learners' dynamic and skilful attempts to use L1 as an initiation of ongoing L2 interaction and also as an active agency of L2 interaction. One of the common emerging interactional patterns was the way that, with exchanges over several turns, learners managed to contribute to create intersubjectivity, mainly to enable them to comprehend or express themselves verbally by mutually shaping interactional space as CIC. In these cases, the use of L1 itself functioned as a valuable resource to bridge the interactional exchanges and in some cases, words uttered initially in L1 became available later in L2 (Stone, 2017) and precise intersubjectivity was therefore finally harnessed towards L2 output. This shows how learners attempted to expand their self-output through translanguaging practices as both speakers and recipients.

This study also revealed that both types of translanguaging practice, self-addressed and co-constructed, demonstrated learners' strategically effective interactional abilities to monitor themselves and take initiative to maintain ongoing interaction which contributes to the progressivity of L2 interaction. Self-addressed translanguaging practices such as holding the floor, word search and topic expansion aided by the use of L1 were clear examples of learner initiation particularly at the TCU, as open class repair initiation and initiation taking

place within a turn. On the other hand, co-constructed translanguaging practices such as understanding displays, clarification requests, confirmation checks and requests for linguistic support have shown how learner initiation is a facilitative interactional resource and demonstrates the possibilities for mutual uptake of the turn either by the self or the other.

Further, looking at the relationship between translanguaging and self-repair, it is revealed that there are cases where translanguaging as language alternation was used as a resource for an additional and facilitative interactional resource to support overall interaction. On the other hand, there are cases where translanguaging practices were simultaneously intertwined with learner-initiated self-repair, both in self-addressed translanguaging (Extract 3) and in co-constructed translanguaging (Extracts 6, 8, 9). When translanguaging takes place simultaneously as a learner's self-initiated repair in repair sequences using of L1, the role which repair plays in interaction needs to be revisited to explore its functionality and ratify its positive role (Gafaranga, 2012). When the analytical scope for self-repair falls within learners' skilful use of interactional resources at the self-initiation stage, the use of self-repair can be considered an integral part of translanguaging practice used as a facilitative resource.

Furthermore, although this study has mainly analysed learner-initiated translanguaging, used to build a bridge to its use at the next turn, teachers' understanding of learners' use of their own language was also crucial as interpretive work. This study suggests that teachers' receptive skill, listening ability and responsiveness (Lee, 2007; Jarvis and Robinson, 1997) using learners' L1 has a vital role. In many cases, the teacher's guessing skills, 'the role of prediction in listening' (Liddicoat, 2004, p.466), made interaction meaningful. In this sense, the teacher's use of translanguaging through receptive skill, rather than being purely verbal, also serves as a medium for understanding learners' L1 at the intersections where learner-initiated translanguaging is acknowledged as a valuable interactional resource. Likewise, this study's findings also suggest that teachers' L1 use is not

only a productive skill used in their role as speakers but also a receptive one in their role as recipients of talk, able to be used as an 'interpretative practice' (Jakonen & Morton, 2015, p.76) that makes two-directional co-constructed interaction in the learners' own language and L2 possible.

Teachers' comprehension and decision-making ability in next-turn management (Ziegler et al., 2012) serves as an invaluable scaffolding used to shape learning spaces. This study has shown that the use of translanguaging by limited proficiency learners is a foundation for 'heightened mutual orientation to language' (Ohta, 1999, p.510), and also serves as scaffolding providing examples of co-constructed translanguaging practice which involves collaborative interaction with the teacher (e.g. Extracts 8 and 9). Within the context of learner-initiated translanguaging practice, these were cases where the teacher's verbal or non-verbal response or uptake of a turn facilitated intersubjectivity. This study illustrates that learning opportunities can be created at the interactional intersection when a progression of interaction is necessary to achieve interactional goals, but only when both learners and teachers seek to co-construct translanguaging spaces. This study has therefore shown that learner-initiated translanguaging can hold a key role in facilitating collaborative interaction. Effective and creative interactional resources are able to maintain progressivity of interaction and also support the attainment of intersubjectivity leading to L2 learning opportunities.

In this study, it was revealed that learners were evidently willing to communicate and used L1 to facilitate interaction. Also, to mediate learner-initiated translanguaging to L2 output for L2 learning opportunities, the teacher provided various types of scaffolded help as CIC, particularly by using repetition, reformulation and wait-time, by understanding learners' L1 as interpretive work, adjusting the pace of talk and utilising various paralinguistic features, all as part of joint work (Hayashi, 2002) and as discursive practice. Where L1 acted as a first step towards the attainment of potential L2 development leading to L2 output, there

were instances where it supported learners' oral interaction or facilitated it through various uses of students' L1 in micro-practice.

These findings have pedagogical implications which involve the facilitative use of learner-initiated translanguaging. Based on the analysis of learner-initiated translanguaging, it has been found that its employment can be pedagogically useful for learners within three broad categories of interactional resource whose use is closely associated with self-initiated repair.

First, it has been shown that the use of L1 as self-directed translanguaging was valuable when learners were engaged in self-talk, as a means to maintain interactional flow to shape their own interactional space to achieve L2 output. Second, the use of translanguaging as clarification requests and confirmation checks through interpretive work between L2 and L1 was seen to be useful as a mediational skill able to promote two directional interaction, showing the learner's degree of understanding and also providing a means to further promote the next turn when interaction progresses through question and answer sequences. Further, the use of L1 functioning to initiate explicit invitations for assistance was shown to be effective when collaborative interaction was required to solve linguistic troubles or misunderstandings during interactional processes.

This study adds new perspectives to the use of translanguaging practices by limited proficiency learners in Japanese EFL contexts where learner initiation in interaction is considered overwhelmingly lacking (Harumi, 2011, 2020; Hosoda, 2014) and its use from a learner's perspective is also under-explored. First and foremost, this study sheds light on previously concealed components in Japanese EFL students' interactional repertoires in L2 learning. When the use of L1 in L2 learning is observed through the lens of monolingualism, Japanese EFL learners' use of L1 can potentially be misinterpreted as a lack of self-initiation in L2 interaction. However, one sees a completely different picture when learners' use of

dynamic interactional repertoires is factored in. This perspective involves understanding

ways in which the use of L1 acts as a facilitative tool helping learners to contribute to

progressivity of ongoing interaction. To this end, this study has identified the significant

contribution L1 used in translanguaging practices.

Further, this study also introduces new perspectives on Japanese EFL learners' use of

translanguaging and self-repair practices. This study fully supports previous findings on the

facilitative role that L1 plays, for example in their demonstration that these are a means to

increase participation in L2 learning through clarification requests (Park 2015; van

Compernolle, 2015) and also as compensatory strategies used to indicate trouble awareness

through explicit requests for assistance (Al Masaeed, 2016; Nyroo et al., 2017; Tudini 2016).

Nevertheless, new perspectives beyond these findings are revealed in this study.

Among previous studies, Al Masaeed's study (2016) specifically focuses on the

judicious use of L1 in L2 Arabic and also identified the facilitative use of L1, for example

through implicit and explicit request for lexical assistance, ensure that communication flows

continuously. These two aspects of the facilitative use of L1 are duly reflected in the current

study, which was conducted through similar one-to-one speaking practice sessions. However,

there are differences in the overall extent and use of L1 as an interactional resource. First, as

mentioned earlier in section 4.1, Al Masaeed's study observed comparatively restricted use of

L1, drawn from relatively small samples. By comparison, the current study observes

widespread use of L1, with much more frequent and extended use of non-filled pauses

accompanied by shorter L1 utterances. Although further comparative study may reveal a

clearer rational for these differences, the instruction given to participants in Al Masaeed's

study to minimise the use of L1, along with the context of study abroad may have influenced

the participant's use of L1. Second, in Al Masaeed's study, there were no observations of

SISR used in L1 as explicit word searches, topic management, and turn-holding devices

within speaking sessions. Further, in his study, there was no specific data illustrating the relationship between SISR and language alternation or ways in which they interact holistically within learners' language repertoires.

Having examined the findings in previous studies, the current study offers three new translanguaging perspectives on the use of L1 in L2 learning. First, this study explores the role of L1 from a translanguaging perspective in relation to SISR and provides concrete empirical evidence that translanguaging and SISR are indeed intertwined when learners' intentions prioritise the progressivity of talk.

Second, this study classifies a much broader range of L1 use by Japanese EFL learners, involving specific types of translanguaging practice. These translanguaging practices can be either self-addressed or co-constructed. It therefore illustrates these practices through a clearer picture of L1 use facilitated by learner initiation in L2 interaction. Building on this analysis, this study's findings demonstrate that limited proficiency learners can tactically utilise L1 as an effective interactional repertoire, not only for error correction as previously reported, but also to achieve intersubjectivity through interaction.

Third, this study's findings include the highly sophisticated case of learner initiated translanguaging practice (Extract 9), where mutual troubles experienced by the learner and teacher require collaborative problem solving to enable the learner to achieve his interactional goals. This particular example illustrates how the learner can successfully play the role of an active agent and initiate translanguaging in L2 interaction as a problem solver. These new insights gained from this study suggest that Japanese EFL learners' interactional repertoires are much wider than previously considered, that its use are multi-faceted. In addition, it demonstrates that translanguaging practices can have a dynamic relationship with other interactional resources such as SISR and more holistic analyses of interactional processes, in

particular from the perspective of learners. These relationships call for careful exploration and scrutiny.

Finally, as an avenue for further research, observing learners' translanguaging practices in a wider range of social-cultural contexts and focusing on learners of languages which have not been examined in previous studies, has the potential to expand our understanding of more dynamic translanguaging practices, probing deeper than current studies and helping us to ask whether any common or more diverse facilitative practices can be observed and whether those practices may have further pedagogical implications for the use of translanguaging in L2 learning. Additionally, the exploration of learner intentions through the use of translanguaging involving stimulated recall interviews, as conducted by Simpson et al. (2012), may provide a more complete picture of its use and understanding of its reason and intention. Further, studies exploring the use of translanguaging practices and their longer-term changes as longitudinal investigations may reveal the dynamic trajectories of interactional repertoires used by learners across different learning stages of L2. Finally, the role of one-to-one conversational practice or different types of task orientation involving the use of translanguaging could be further investigated to promote learner initiation in oral interaction by varying the orientation of tasks such as pre-allocation of topic or activity types, or through task demands, which may encourage learner initiation in task performance and also, by facilitating the initiation of turns, to promote more learning opportunities.

This study has illustrated some facilitative uses of learner-initiated translanguaging in L2 classroom dyadic interaction. The use of learner-initiated translanguaging in L2 learning can be a useful resource in the process of catalysing collaborative oral interaction: amplifying learners' access to more than one linguistic code as a co-constructed translanguaging space can support learners, helping them to articulate their own thoughts and also enrich L2

learning opportunities. This collaborative interactional process can be used to build a bridge which connects this initial activation stage to the one which will follow.

Acknowledgements

REFERENCES

Al Masaeed, K. (2016). Judicious use of L1 in L2 Arabic speaking practice sessions. *Foreign Language Annals*, *49*(4), 716-728. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12223

Al Masaeed, K. (2020). Translanguaging in L2 Arabic study abroad: Beyond monolingual practices in institutional talk. *The Modern Language Journal*, *104*(1) 250-266. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12623

Auerbach, E. (1993). Reexaming English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, *27*(1), 9-32. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586949

Bonacina, F. & Gafaranga, J, (2011). Medium of instruction vs. medium of classroom interaction: language choice in a French complementary school classroom in Scotland. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 14*(3), 319-334. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2010.502222

Brouwer, C.E. (2003). Word searches in NNS-NS intersection: opportunities for language learning? *The Modern Language Journal, 87*(4), 534-545. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00206

Buckwalter, P. (2001) Repair sequences in Spanish L2 dyadic discourse: A descriptive study. *The Modern Language Journal*, *85*(3): 380-397.

https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00115

Carroll, D. (2005). Vowel-marking as an interactional resource in Japanese

novice ESL conversation. In K. Richards & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying*

conversation analysis. (pp. 214-234). London: Continuum.

Chavez, M. (2016). The first language in the foreign language classroom:

teacher model and student language use – an exploratory study. *Classroom*

Discourse, 7(2), 131-163. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2016.1149499

Cheng, T.P. (2013). Codeswitching and participant orientations in a Chinese as

a foreign Language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 97*(4), 869-886.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12046.x

Crace-Murray, A. (2018). *Teaching English language learners in Alaska: A study of*

translanguaging choices. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Alaska.

Damhuis, R. (2000). A different teacher role in language arts education: interaction

in a small circle with teacher. In K. Hall, K & L.S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and*

foreign language learning through classroom interaction. (pp.243-264)

London: Lawrence Erlbaum

Drew, P. (1997). 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles

in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *28*, 69-101.

https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(97)89759-7

Ferguson, G. (2003). Classroom code-switching in post-colonial contexts:

functions, attitudes and politics. *AILA Reviews, 7*(1), 19-30.

https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.16.05fer

Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (2007). Second/foreign language learning as a social

accomplishment: Elaborations on a reconceptualized SLA. *The Modern*

Language Journal, 91, 800-819. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00670.x

Gafaranga, J. (2012). Language alternation and conversational repair in

    bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 16*(4), 501-527.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/2F1367006911429520

Gardner, R. (2008). Conversation Analysis orientation to learning. *Journal of*

    Applied Linguistics, 5(3), 229-244. https://doi.org/10.1558/japl.v5i3.229

Garton, S. (2012). Speaking out of turn? Taking the initiative in teacher-fronted

    classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse, 3*(1), 29-45.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2012.666022

Girgin, U. and Brandt, A. (2019). Creating space for learning through 'Mm hm' in a

    L2 classroom: Implications for L2 classroom interactional competence. *Classroom*

    Discourse, *11*(1), 61-79. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1603115

Goh, C. and Burns, A. (2012). *Teaching speaking: A holistic approach*.

    Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Goodwin, C. and Goodwin, M. (1986). Gesture and co-participation in the

    activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica*, *62*(1/2), 51-75.

    https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1986.62.1-2.51

Hall, J. K. (2007). Redressing the roles of correction and repair in research on

    second and Language learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(iv), 511-526.

    https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00619.x

Hall, J. K., Hellermann, J. and Pekarek Doehler, S. (Eds.), (2011). *L2*

    interactional competence and Development. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon.

Hall, J.K. (2018). From L2 interactional competence to L2 interactional repertoires:

    Reconceptualising the objects of L2 learning. *Classroom Discourse*, *9*(1), 25-39.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2018.1433050

Hall, J.K. (2019). The contributions of Conversation Analysis and interactional linguistics to

a Usage-Based understanding of language: expanding the transdisciplinary

framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, *109* (Supplement 19), 80-94.

https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12535

Harumi, S. (2011). Classroom Silence: voices from Japanese EFL learners. *ELT Journal*,

65(3), 260-269. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq046

Harumi, S. (2020). Approaches to interacting with classroom silence: the role of teacher talk.

In J. King & S. Harumi. (Eds.), East Asian Perspectives on Silence in English

language education. (pp. 37-59). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Hauser, E. (2010). Sophisticated interaction with limited linguistic resources.

Language learning and social interaction through conversation, Centre for the

Human activity theory, Kansai University, pp.17-26.

Hayashi, M. (2002). *Joint Utterance Construction in Japanese Conversation*.

Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hayashi, M. (2003). Language and the Body as Resources for collaborative

action: A study of word searches in Japanese conversation. *Research on

Language and Social Interaction, 36*(2), 109-141.

https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327973RLSI3602_2

Hayashi, M. (2010). An overview of the question-response system in Japanese.

Journal of Pragmatics, 42, 2685-2702.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.04.006

Hellermann, J. & Cole, E. (2008). Practices for social interaction in the

language learning classroom: disengagements from dyadic task interaction.

Applied Linguistics, 30(2), 186-215. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amn032

Hellermann, J. (2011). Members' methods, members' competencies: Looking for

evidence of language learning in longitudinal investigations of other-initiated-

repair. In J.K. Hall., J. Hellermann & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development*. (pp. 147-172). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Heritage, J. (1997). Conversation analysis and institutional talk: Analysing data. In: D. Silverman. (Ed.), *Qualitative research: theory, method and practice*. (pp. 161-182). London: SAGE.

Hosoda, Y. (2014). Missing response after teacher question in primary school English as a foreign language classes. *Linguistics and Education, 28*, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2014.08.002

Jakonen, T. & Morton, T. (2015). Epistemic search sequences in peer interaction in a content-based language classroom. *Applied Linguistics, 36*(1),73-94. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt031

Jarvis, J. & Robinson, M. (1997). Analysing educational discourse: an exploratory study of teacher response and support to pupils' learning. *Applied Linguistics, 18*(2), 212-228. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/18.2.212

Kasper, G. (2004). Participant orientations in German conversation-for-learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 551-567. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.t01-18-.x

Kim, D.R. (2020). Emergence of proactive self-initiated-self-repair as an indicator of L2 IC development. *Applied Linguistics, 41*(6), 901-921. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amz047

Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal, 70*(4): 366-372. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05291.x

Lee, Y.A. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*, 180-206.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.02.004

Leeming, P. (2011). Japanese high school students' use of L1 during pair-work. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 21*(3), 360-382. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2011.00284.x

Lehti-Eklund, H. (2012). Code-switching to first language repair- a resource for students' problem solving in a foreign language classroom. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 17*(2), 132-152. https://doi.org/10.1177/2F1367006912441416

Li, W. (2002). What do you want me to say? On the conversation analysis approach to bilingual interaction. *Language in Society, 31*,159-180. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404501020140

Li. W. & Lin, A. M.Y. (2019). Translanguaging classroom discourse: pushing limits, Breaking boundaries. *Classroom Discourse*, *10*(3/4), 209-215. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1635032

Liddicoat, A.D. (2004). The projectability of turn constructional units and the role of prediction in listening. *Discourse Studies, 6*(4), 449-469. https://doi.org/10.1177/2F1461445604046589

Marti, L. (2012). Tangential floor in a classroom setting. *System, 40*, 398-406. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2012.07.006

McHoul, A.W. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society, 19*, 349-377. https://doi.org/10.1017/S004740450001455X

Moor, P. (2013). An emergent perspective on the use of first language in the English as-a-Foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language journal, 97*(1), 239-253. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.01429.x

Mori, J. (2007). Border Crossings? Exploring the intersection of second language acquisition, conversation analysis, and foreign language pedagogy. *The Modern

Language Journal 91, 849-862.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00673.x

Nyroos, L., Sandlund, E., & Sundqvist, P. (2017). Code-switched repair initiation:

The case of Swedish *eller* in L2 English test interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics,*

120, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.08.008

Ohta, A.S. (1999). Interactional routines and the socialization of interactional

style in adult learners of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics 31*, 1493-1512.

https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00115-5

Park, S.H. (2015). Teacher repair in a second language class for low-literate

adults. *Linguistics and Education, 29*, 1-14.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2014.10.007

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2013). Social-interactional approaches to SLA: a state of

the art and some future perspectives. Language, *Interaction and Acquisition. 4*(2)

134-160. https://doi.org/10.1075/lia.4.2.02pek

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2018). Elaborations on L2 interactional competence: the

Development of L2 grammar-for-interaction. *Classroom Discourse, 9*(1), 3-24.

https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2018.1437759

Rezaee, P. (2020). Word searches in Persian tutoring session: opportunities for

Language learning. *Applied Pragmatics, 2*(2), 148-173.

https://doi.org/10.1075/ap.19016.rez

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics

for the Organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language, 50*(4), 696-735.

https://doi.org/10.2307/412243

Salaberry, M.R. & Kunitz, S. (Eds.). (2019). *Teaching and Testing L2*

interactional competence: Bridging theory and practice. New York/London;

Routledge.

Sampson, A. (2012). Learner code-switching versus English only. *ELT Journal,*
66(3), 293-303. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccr067

Schegloff, E.A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American*
Anthropologist, 70(6), 1075-1095. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1968.70.6.02a00030

Schegloff, E.A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for
self-correction in the organization of repair. *Language, 53*(2), 361-382.
https://doi.org/10.2307/413107

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: a*
conversation analysis perspective. Oxford: Blackwell.

Seedhouse, P. (2011). Conversation Analytic Research into Language Teaching
and Learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language*
teaching and learning Volume II. (pp. 345-363). New York: Routledge

Sert, O. & Walsh, S. (2012). The interactional management of claims of
insufficient knowledge in English language classrooms. *Language and Education,*
27(6), 542-565. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2012.739174

Sert, O. (2015). Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse. Edinburgh:
Edinburgh University Press.

Sert, O. (2017). Creating opportunities for L2 learning in a prediction activity.
System, 70,14-25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.08.008

Simpson, R., Eisenchlas, S. & Haugh, M. (2012). The functions of self-initiation-
self-repair in the second language Chinese classroom. *International*
Journal of Applied Linguistics, *23*(2) 144-165.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2012.00323.x

Steinbach Kohler, F. & Thorne, S.L. (2011). The social-life of self-directed talk: A

sequential phenomenon. In: J.K. Hall., J. Hellermann., & S. Pekarek Doehler. (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development*. (pp. 66-92). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Stone, P. (2017). *An investigation into multimodal identity construction in the EFL classroom: A social and cultural viewpoint*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Exeter.

Taguchi, N. (2015). *Developing interactional competence in a Japanese study abroad context*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Tudini, V. (2016). Repair and codeswitching for learning in online intercultural talk. *System, 62*, 15-25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.06.011

Urmeneta, E. & Walsh, S. (2017). Classroom interactional competence in content and language integrated learning. In: A. Linares. & T. Morton. (Eds.). *Applied Linguistics Perspectives on CLIL.* (pp.189-206) Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Üstünel, E. & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? Code-Switching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 15*(3), 302-325. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2005.00093.x

Üstünel, E. (2016). *EFL classroom code-switching*. London: Palgrave Macmillan

van Compernolle, R. (2011). Responding to Questions and L2 learner Interactional competence during Language Proficiency Interviews: A Microanalytic study with pedagogical implications. In J.K. Hall., J. Hellermann., & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.). L2 interactional competence and development. (pp. 117-136). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

van Compernolle, R. (2015). Interaction and Second Language Development: A Vygotskian Perspective. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van Compernolle, R. & Soria, N.B. (2020). Developing interactional repertoires in the

classroom through dynamic strategic interaction scenarios. *Vigo International*

Journal of Applied Linguistics, *17*, 141-170.

https://doi.org/10.35869/vial.v0i17.1468

van de Pol, J., Volman, M., & Beishuizen, J. (2010). Scaffolding in

teacher-student interaction: a decade research. *Educational Psychology Review,*

22, 271-296. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-010-9127-6

van Lier, L. (1984). Analysing interaction in second language classrooms. *ELT*

Journal, 38(3), 160-169. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/38.3.160

van Lier, L. (1988). *The language classroom and the language learner: ethnography*

and second language classroom research. London: Longman.

Walsh, S. (2003). Developing interactional awareness in the second language

classroom through teacher self-evaluation. *Language Awareness, 12*(2), 124-142.

https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410308667071

Walsh, S. (2006). Talking the talk of the TESOL classroom. *ELT Journal, 60*(2),

133-141. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci100

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action*.

Abingdon: Routledge.

Walqui, A. & van Lier, L. (2010). *Scaffolding the academic success of adolescent*

English language learners. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.

Waring, H.Z. (2018). Teaching L2 interactional competence: Problems and

possibilities. *Classroom Discourse, 9*(1), 57-67.

https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2018.1434082

Wong, J. & Waring, H. Z. (2011). *Conversation Analysis and Second*

Language Pedagogy. New York: Routledge.

Yang, Ruowei.(2020). Learning strategies and translanguaging space: self-repetition with

    alternation of languages in an L2 Chinese classroom. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*

    and Language Research, *7*(3), 99-120.

Young, R. F. (2008). *Language and interaction: An advanced resource book*.

    London: Routledge.

Zue, X. & Vanek, N. (2015). Facilitative effects of learner-directed

    codeswitching: evidence from Chinese learners of English. *International Journal*

    of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 20 (7), 773-787.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1087962

Ziegler, G., Sert, O., & Durus, N. (2012). Student-initiated use of

    multilingual resources in English-language classroom interaction: next-turn

    management. *Classroom Discourse, 3*(2), 187-204.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2012.716625

Transcript conventions

[   ]   indicates simultaneous talk, overlap with embodied actions

Yea:::h   indicates lengthening of sound

(.)   a very short pauses or micro-pause

(1.5)   indicates the length of the silence in relation to the surrounding talk

↑↓   sharply rising and falling intonations

< >   slower speech

> <   faster speech

[…]   omitted speech

Italics   English translation

˚   ˚   soft voice

+	onset of embodied action
?	slightly rising intonation
.	slightly falling intonation
<u>line</u>	higher volume
=	no time lapse
(( ))	analysts notes
►	second part of adjacency pair/the closing point of the sequence
→	the use of L1 by the learner

Abbreviations used in the interlinear gloss

CP   various forms of copula verb be

DP   dative particle

TP   topic marker

Q   question marker

Address for correspondence

Seiko Harumi

Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures,

School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London

Thornhaugh Street, Russell Square, London WC1H OXG

United Kingdom

sh96@soas.ac.uk

ORCID ID   https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0994-4203