

Translanguaging in English-medium instruction (EMI): Examining English literature content classrooms

Ufuk Ataş 

Artvin Çoruh University, Faculty of Education, Artvin, Türkiye, atas@artvin.edu.tr



ABSTRACT Recently, translanguaging has begun challenging and replacing English-only policies in English-medium instruction (EMI) contexts, advocating that bi/multilingual learners may better internalise information in two or more languages. Within this perspective and using linguistic ethnography as the framework, this case study examines the translanguaging practices used by the instructor and the students in English literature classrooms and how/whether these practices mediate learning when multilingual resources are used for pedagogical purposes. The data for this study comes from the researcher, as the instructor, observing and recording their two content classrooms in an English Literature department, namely Contemporary British Novel and Discourse Analysis courses. These observations and recordings were analysed from a pedagogical translanguaging lens to identify the instructor's input and the students' output in terms of their display of linguistic repertoires in English (the language of instruction) and Turkish (the shared language in the classroom). The results provide implications for research and practice, offerings suggestions for how/whether a pedagogical translanguaging lens might be adopted in content classrooms.

Keywords: Content classrooms, English-medium instruction, English literature, Pedagogical translanguaging, Translanguaging

Eğitim dili olarak İngilizce bağlamında dillerarası geçişlilik: İngiliz edebiyatı içerik sınıflarının incelenmesi

ÖZ İki/çok dilli öğrenenlerin iki veya daha fazla dilde bilgiyi daha iyi içselleştirebileceğini savunan dillerarası geçişlilik (translanguaging) kavramı son zamanlarda, eğitim dili olarak İngilizce (EDI) bağlamlarında 'sadece İngilizce' politikalarına meydan okumaya ve bunların yerini almaya başlamıştır. Bu bakış açısından yola çıkarak ve dilbilimsel etnografik analiz kuramı çerçevesinde, bu durum çalışması İngiliz edebiyatı sınıflarında öğretmen ve öğrenciler tarafından kullanılan dillerarası geçişlilik uygulamalarını ve bu uygulamaların öğrenenlerin çok dilli dağarcıklarını pedagojik amaçlarla kullanıldığında öğrenmeye aracılık edip etmediğini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Çalışmada veri aynı zamanda dersin öğretim elemanı olan araştırmacı tarafından İngiliz Edebiyatı bölümündeki Çağdaş İngiliz Romanı ve Söylem Analizi derslerini gözlemlemesi ve kaydetmesi yoluyla elde edilmiştir. Elde edilen bu gözlemler ve kayıtlar, öğrencilerin ve dersin öğretim elemanının İngilizce (eğitim dili) ve Türkçe (sınıfın ortak dili) dil dağarcıklarını pedagojik dillerarası geçişlilik (pedagogical translanguaging) bakış açısıyla nasıl kullandıklarını belirlemek amacıyla analiz edilmiştir. Sonuçlar, İngilizce eğitim yapılan içerik odaklı İngiliz Edebiyatı sınıflarında pedagojik dillerarası geçişlilik bakış açısının ne derece uygun olduğuna ya da nasıl uygulanacağına dair öneriler sunmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Dillerarası geçişlilik, İçerik sınıfları, İngiliz edebiyatı, İngilizce eğitim, Pedagojik dillerarası geçişlilik

Citation: Ataş, U. (2023). Translanguaging in English-medium instruction (EMI): Examining English literature content classrooms. *Turkish Journal of Education*, 12(3), 142-157.
<https://doi.org/10.19128/turje.1210174>

INTRODUCTION

Learning and teaching content through a medium of a language that is other than the local one has long been researched increasingly due to factors such as globalisation and mobility. In Turkish education, as in many non-English speaking countries, increased attention has been given to English-medium instruction (EMI) since the establishment of universities that provide English-medium instruction entirely. Initially, various concerns were raised among stakeholders about the employment of EMI in different contexts caused by the difficulties students faced (Kırkgöz, 2014). Recently, however, the ‘E’ in EMI has been challenged by researchers in local and global contexts with a growth of an understanding that monolingual policies of language instruction do not sufficiently grasp the nature of instruction in bilingual/multilingual contexts due to issues such as ignoring the rich linguistic repertoires of teachers and students in the EMI contexts (Sahan & Rose, 2021), lack of provision for equity for language marginalised students (Yılmaz, 2021), challenges experienced by subject lecturers (Deignan & Morton, 2022); lack of addressing diverse cultural, social, and ethnic backgrounds (Preece, 2022), and shifting ideologies of the focus on language as an abstract system (Wei, 2022).

Canagarajah (2011) mentions that multilinguals do not distinguish among languages in their repertoire and that these languages are considered a part of their integrated system. That is why multilinguals utilise their linguistic repertoire for communication purposes (Canagarajah, 2011) through various communicative tools in different settings or registers. Such ideas regarding multilinguals’ use of languages, as opposed to the English-only policies in contexts where other languages are also available, solidified interest in new types of concepts and neologisms, what Pennycook (2018) calls “language ideological baggage of sociolinguistic ideas” (p. 3) including code-switching, translanguaging, polylinguaging, linguistics repertoire, heteroglossia, and register (Pennycook, 2018).

Within the perspectives outlined above, this study aims to explore translanguaging as an alternative pedagogical approach in English Literature classrooms which, by nature, employs ‘English’ medium instruction. In the next section, translanguaging as a pedagogical framework is discussed. Later, the paper focuses on how/whether these translanguaging practices mediate learning when multilingual resources are used for pedagogical purposes. The article posits a “language-as-a-resource-lens” (Carroll & Sambolin Morales, 2016, p. 249) and frames L1 use in an EMI setting into a ‘pedagogical translanguaging’ lens (Cenoz, 2017; Cenoz & Gorter, 2021; García & Wei, 2014). This study answers the following research questions: (1) What are the functions of pedagogical translanguaging practices used in English literature classrooms? (2) Are there any patterns in these translanguaging practices?

Understanding Translanguaging

Translanguaging has recently attracted attention from a growing body of research studies and has been applied in various pedagogical, linguistic, sociolinguistic, communicative, and multi-modal discourses (Wei, 2018). In its broadest sense, translanguaging refers to “a practice that involves dynamic and functionally integrated use of different languages and language varieties, but more importantly, a process of knowledge construction that goes beyond language(s)” (Wei, 2018, p. 15). Translanguaging as a concept starts with the idea of *linguaging* (a verb, not a noun), referring to “the simultaneous process of continuous becoming of ourselves and of our language practices, as we interact and make meaning in the world” (García & Wei, 2014, p. 8). The origins of translanguaging have its roots in Welsh bilingual education contexts in 1980, coined by Cen Williams from the Welsh term *trawsieithu* (Lewis et al., 2012). As Conteh (2018) mentions, translanguaging reverberates with the *common underlying proficiency* by Cummins (2001) though the term has lately been used to describe interaction and communication in multilingual environments, including bi/multilingual classrooms. A translanguaging perspective, focusing on individuals’ multilingual repertoires to make meaning in their socially situated contexts (Yuan & Yang, 2020), views language as a continuous process rather than a fixed code, as in the idea of *linguaging* as a verb.

The perspective that translanguaging focuses on the fluidity of language boundaries (Cenoz, 2017) and rejects the separate, monoglossic view of shifting two fixed language codes (Goodman & Tastanbek, 2021; Liu & Fang, 2022) distinguishes it from code-switching. As Goodman and Tastanbek (2021) argue, translanguaging as a theoretical and pedagogical lens explicates the use of languages to negotiate meaning in language classrooms better than a code-switching perspective. Though the two concepts share commonalities, especially in their treatment of planned vs unplanned speech for communicative and pedagogical goals, translanguaging and code-switching differ theoretically and conceptually in their focus on how bi/multilingual speakers make use of their linguistic repertoires and how translanguaging practices create a third space (García & Wei, 2014) going beyond merely shifting languages, and how code-switching views languages as named and separate codes.

Translanguaging has also been accommodated to various classroom language ecologies as it leverages students' linguistic repertoires. Van Lier (2008) stresses that classroom language ecologies are spaces where languages in the classrooms are interrelated, teachers and students constantly engage in and explore ecological interactional practices. As Blackledge and Creese (2010) acknowledge, "an ecological approach considers the already established with the new" (p. 201). That is, new languages are developed in classroom interactional spaces alongside the already existing ones. This idea translates into language classrooms with the ideology that new identities are formed inside the classroom as teachers and learners engage in meaning-making through translanguaging practices. As classrooms are diverse sites for social interactions, multilinguals, in this sense, enact their identities, making their identity positions salient (Ayres-Bennett & Fisher, 2022). In other words, the extent to which multilinguals' participation is legitimised contributes to their identity construction (Wenger, 1998). Classrooms in which translanguaging practices occur are more likely to legitimise and sustain multilinguals' participation and identities. A translanguaging perspective, then, affirms students' bi/multilingual identities by giving voices to language minoritised students (Yılmaz, 2021) and allowing them to utilise their linguistic repertoires, thus, eliminating any inequalities caused by language proficiency in language and content-integrated EMI classrooms. In an EMI ideology, the basic notion is that teachers try to maximise the input in the target language (i.e., English) to compensate for the limited time learners have in practising or discussing the content through the medium of language inside the classroom. However, such an EMI ideology contradicts the nature of bi-/multilinguals' identities in classrooms where students' repertoires from different interactional spaces come into contact and are leveraged through translanguaging.

EMI and Translanguaging

Highlighting the evasiveness of the term, Macaro (2018) defines English-medium instruction as "the use of the English language to teach academic subjects (other than English itself) in countries or jurisdictions where the first language (L1) of the majority of the population is not English" (Macaro, 2018, p. 19). Even though the definition seems to exclude *English* in departments such as English Language and Literature, where the academic subject is overarchingly English literature, the use of English in these contexts also poses challenges and problems both from academic and sociolinguistic perspectives. One of these problems (particularly in English Language and Literature classrooms) stems from excluding students' linguistic repertoires in their home languages, thus, promoting a monolingual language instruction policy. Yılmaz (2021) mentions that alternative pedagogical approaches, i.e., those that view bi/multilingual use of languages as adaptable in contexts where students have access to other languages, work as a scaffolding to maximise content learning. Similarly, such alternative pedagogical approaches in the EMI context, in the case of translanguaging, for instance, focus on language users' capacity to engage in purposeful and meaningful communicative practices in particular contexts (Wei, 2022). A translanguaging lens in EMI contexts is incredibly empowering because the EMI classroom is essentially a context that is bi/multilingual (Sahan & Rose, 2021). From this perspective, teachers and students move beyond the inherent English-only policy in EMI settings.

Pedagogical Translanguaging

Inherent within translanguaging as a pedagogy is the rejection of monolingual and monoglossic ideologies that treat languages as distinct entities and promote one-language-only policing and policies, as in the case of EMI in many learning and teaching environments. It refers to “the use of bilingual students' language practices flexibly in order to develop new understandings and new language practices, including academic language practices” (García, 2014, p.112). Pedagogical translanguaging is “a theoretical and instructional approach that aims at improving language and content competences in school contexts by using resources from the learner’s whole linguistic repertoire” (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021, p. iii). It concentrates on multilingual speakers rather than the traditionally idealised monolingual native speaker; it contests English-only policies by highlighting the multilingual repertoires of students in the classroom, and it favours the social contexts involving these multilingual speakers and multilingual repertoires rather than decontextualised classrooms that ignore creativity and language playfulness (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020). Generally speaking, in EMI classrooms, there is particular language policing stemming from the one-language ideology. In other words, “the language used in teaching and assessment only permits certain lexical and structural linguistic features, leaving out many other features that are used by people, and especially by those positioned as powerless minorities” (García & Kleyn, 2016, p. 15). A translanguaging perspective eliminates this inequality and works towards leveraging students’ meaning-making through “moment-to-moment interactions, as meanings are negotiated and employing mutually recognisable linguistics forms drawn from language users’ linguistic repertoires” (Tian et al., 2020, p.9).

Cenoz and Gorter (2021) differentiate pedagogical translanguaging and spontaneous translanguaging. On the one hand, pedagogical translanguaging practices are those planned by the teacher to teach languages or content. On the other hand, spontaneous translanguaging practices refer to unplanned instances of language shifts representing the fluidity of language boundaries and the naturality of the translanguaging practices by bi/multilinguals. These two are distinguished but represent a continuum (Cenoz et al., 2022) rather than complete opposites. Lastly, pedagogical translanguaging is based primarily on the concepts of prior knowledge (i.e., the knowledge that learners bring to the classroom), scaffolding (i.e., flexible language processes supporting learner speech), and connected growers (i.e., learners using and connecting similar strategies for languages available to them) (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021). In summary, as a theoretical and practical approach, translanguaging as a pedagogy empowers teachers and learners in the EMI classroom, leveraging their negotiation of meaning by allowing them to use their linguistic repertoires.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Methodological Framework

This qualitative case study employed linguistic ethnography as the methodological framework to examine the discourses of translanguaging practices used in EMI content classrooms. Linguistic ethnography “is an interpretive approach which studies the local and immediate actions of actors from their point of view and considers how these interactions are embedded in wider social contexts and structures” (Copland & Creese, 2015, p. 13). Influenced by the ethnography of communication (Hymes, 1968, 1974) and interactional sociolinguistics (e.g., Gumperz, 1982), it enables researchers to connect the micro settings (i.e., English-medium English literature content classrooms) to the macro (i.e., students’ employment of their multilingual repertoires) as it “views language as communicative action functioning in social contexts” (Copland & Creese, 2015, p. 27). It also enables researchers to examine how language is used in social contexts through detailed descriptions and recordings to define the discourses (Tai, 2021).

Participants and Setting

The participants of the study include 30 English Literature students in these classrooms and the researcher teaching courses. As part of the English Literature curriculum, the students took two courses; Discourse Analysis II and Contemporary English Novel. In these courses, the students were assigned to read four novels; *A Room with A View* (1908, E. M. Forster), *Heart of Darkness* (1899, Joseph Conrad), *The French Lieutenant's Woman* (1981, John Fowles) and *The Passion* (1987, Jeanette Winterson). The students were assigned to read the novels in English, but some students preferred reading in Turkish. That is, they could read the novels in two named languages. The students had taken prerequisite courses (Discourse Analysis I, English Novel I and II). The researcher has PhD in English Language Teaching (ELT), studied first language use in EFL classrooms, and taught content and language courses at mainly tertiary levels. The researcher, however, did not have any teaching background in teaching literature courses despite having taught the same students in different classes. Therefore, the students knew that the researcher did not discourage using other languages in the classroom.

This study was carried out at an English Literature department of a state university in northeast Türkiye. The university is relatively developing, with over ten thousand students and 800 academic staff. The students at the Department of English Literature took the central university exam, had relatively lower scores than many other universities, had studied a compulsory preparatory English class prior to their literature courses, and had taken many courses focusing on literary studies, language skills, and linguistics. The Department of English Literature employs English-medium instruction (EMI) naturally even though the students have a rich linguistic repertoire, including bilingual and multilingual students speaking Turkish, Kurdish, Arabic, German and Turkmen. However, these students generally do not actively participate in classroom discussions as their languages are minoritised (therefore, not being able to use their full linguistic repertoires). Out of these named languages of students, the researcher is fluent in Turkish and English, with some understanding of German and Turkmen. Since the mentioned courses did not aim to teach language but content, the students knew, as they were acquainted with the instructor, that they could use any language in the classroom to express ideas.

Data Collection and Analysis

The researcher video-recorded the classrooms to obtain the translanguaging practices in the mentioned courses as they generally provide dense data reflecting authentic language use (Copland & Creese, 2015; DuFon, 2002). There were 118 minutes of recording in the Discourse Analysis course and 165 minutes in the Contemporary English Novel course. In total, 283 minutes of classroom language were recorded. All the recordings were then transcribed verbatim.

Inductive content analysis was used to analyse the data based on identifying translanguaging practices, involving three phases: preparation, organisation, and reporting of the data and results (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008). Teacher and student utterances in the recordings were taken as the categorisation matrix (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008) while thematically analysing the data regarding translanguaging functions and patterns. In the preparation phase, the researcher read the data numerous times to make sense of it and identify the translanguaged utterances. The organisation phase included thematic analysis to identify the functions and number of translanguaging practices. In identifying and counting the utterances, Rehbein and Romaniuk's (2014) definition was adopted, which regards them as "the basic unit of counting is due to the segmental structure of discourse which is organised according to utterance acts on the communicative surface" (Rehbein & Romaniuk, 2014, p.140). Through multiple readings of the data by the researcher and another colleague experienced in classroom research and translanguaging, Turkish and English utterances were identified, counted and reported. In identifying utterances, the data were then read again to find out teacher and student utterances (in Turkish, English, and total), as well as teacher-initiated and student-initiated utterances, to guide the first research question on the functions of translanguaging. In addition, the transcripts were also member-checked (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), employing member-check interviews to aid and enhance the credibility in the descriptions and interpretations of the functions of translanguaging practices, with the idea that knowledge is co-

constructed when doing so (Birt et al., 2016). Upon completing the thematic content analysis, the researcher consulted the students to ask for the functions of the translanguaging practices they used to validate the analysis of these utterances. The participants were presented with the utterances without the labels so as not to guide their responses. After combining participant comments with the researchers' analyses, the final functions and labels were decided.

Ethics

The research obtained the necessary ethical approvals from the Ethical Committee at the institution where the study was conducted (Artvin Çoruh University, numbered E-18457941-050.99-50754 and dated 31.05.2022). In addition, participant consent was sought to obtain recordings in the classrooms. The students were informed that their participation was entirely voluntary. In reporting the excerpts from the language use recorded in the classrooms, all information that would expose participant identity was masked. They were referred to with the letter S (for student) followed by numbers (e.g., S1, S2, S3...).

FINDINGS

The main finding that emerged from this study shows that both instances of pedagogical and spontaneous translanguaging practices were observed in EMI English Literature classrooms. Pedagogical translanguaging practices were used to ask questions, check for understanding, and elicit information. Spontaneous translanguaging practices were used for discussing content, taking turns and self-correction. Overall, translanguaging practices were helpful as the students in the classrooms did not have to stop expressing ideas because they were not sure how to say them in English. In this sense, the member-check interviews also suggested that translanguaging encouraged active student participation allowing fluidity through multilingual language use. Additionally, the patterns for these translanguaging practices were diverse but systematic. The four patterns included; responses in English to Turkish-initiated utterances, responses in Turkish to English-initiated utterances, responses in Turkish to Turkish-initiated utterances, and responses in English to English-initiated utterances. These two aspects, functions and patterns of translanguaging practices, are discussed in detail through specific experts from the data. In the excerpts, T stands for teachers, S stands for students, and utterances in italics are non-English utterances with their English translations in square brackets. Pauses are shown with either dots representing the length or parentheses indicating the seconds. The interaction mode for the classrooms was usually teacher-student and student-teacher, with a focus on whole-group interactions. Individual students in the conversations are assigned different numbers (S3, S4, etc.).

Table 1.
Number of Utterances in the Discourse Analysis Course

	<i>Number of utterances</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Total utterances	1296	
Teacher utterances in Total	1101	85%
Student utterances in Total	195	15%
Teacher utterances in Turkish	177	16%
Student utterances in Turkish	64	33%
Teacher-initiated turns	106	
Teacher-initiated turns in Turkish	27	25%
Student-initiated turns	100	
Student-initiated turns in Turkish	9	9%

Tables 1 and 2 present the number of utterances and initiated turns by students and teachers in the Discourse Analysis and Contemporary English Novel courses. Teacher-initiated turns are when the teacher starts leading the discussions, and student-initiated turns are those when the students interrupt the teacher to ask a question or initiate a conversation without the teacher giving them the turn. As seen

in the tables, though the teacher's talk generally dominated the language used in the classrooms, the students seemed to have used more translanguaging practices than the instructor in both courses. These translanguaging practices were scarcer, however, in student-initiated turns.

Table 2.

Number of Utterances in Contemporary English Novel Course

	Number of utterances	Percentage
Total utterances	1570	
Teacher utterances in Total	1299	83%
Student utterances in Total	271	17%
Teacher utterances in Turkish	175	14%
Student utterances in Turkish	137	51%
Teacher-initiated turns	127	
Teacher-initiated turns in Turkish	39	31%
Student-initiated turns	174	
Student-initiated turns in Turkish	12	7%

Extract 1.

Pedagogical Translanguaging as Negotiation of Meaning

- T: Up to the point that you have read •• what is happening in the story?
 S2: Charles and Sarah kissed each other. Someone looked. Then that's all.
 T: And then Sarah goes to a different city, to Exeter. Charles also goes after her trying to find her. And then—
 S4: He sees a child. I guess he sees a child near Sarah.
 S3: Multiple endings, maybe?
 T: *Anlamadım* [I didn't understand].
 S4: *Sarah'nin yanında bir çocuk var* [There is a child near Sarah].
 S3: Sarah is pregnant.
 T: *O en sonda ama. Çok atladınız. O kadar atlamayalım.* [But that's at the very end. You've skipped a lot. Let's not skip that far]. Ok, so, in chapter 43, we have Sam and Charles on the train, going to...

Extract 1 is an example of translanguaging as a negotiation of meaning integrating Turkish and English in the conversation (with the pattern English-Turkish-Turkish-English) when the teachers and students discuss the events in the story. The extract begins with a teacher-directed question in English; *what is happening in the story?* The students start recounting the events. In line 7, in response to line 5, the teacher begins the utterance in Turkish, signalling misunderstanding and eliciting student clarification. S4 replies in line 8 with the Turkish translation of the utterance in line 4, to which the teacher replies in Turkish in line 10.

In this instance, the negotiation of meaning is carried out by the shared linguistic repertoire of the participants as the teacher corrects a mistake that the students are making about the chronological order of the events in the novel. It is seen that the managerial aspect of the content (i.e., the students skipped more events than they should have) is handled in Turkish, and the correction that follows is in English. Also, S4 uses first English to answer the question in line 1 and then moves to English in line 4, having seen that the teacher did not receive the meaning of the utterance in line 7.

Extract 2.

Spontaneous/Pedagogical Translanguaging for Content Redirection

- T: So, these were some important parts in chapter 13. But in general, narrative voice ••• Can you give me some examples of unique narrative voices throughout the novel?
 S7: *Hocam Lucy'nin ağzından da anlatıyordu bir yerde sanki. Bir yerde Lucy—* [Teacher, (the narrator was) narrating from Lucy's point, I guess. At one point, Lucy—]
 T: *Lucy? Öbür derste kaldı o* [That was in the other class].
 S7: *Ha o diğeri miydi? Pardon hocam* [Oh was it the other one? Sorry teacher].

T: *Yanlış yerdesin. Lucy öbür derste* [You're in the wrong place. Lucy is in the other class]

In Extract 2, the conversation starts again with a teacher-directed question in English (i.e., asking the students to give examples of narrative voices in the novel), followed by the student's response in Turkish in line 3. However, before the student finishes his utterance, the teacher realises, in line 6, that the student is mentioning a character from another book in another course, redirecting the content by doing so. Thus, the teacher corrects the student, and the student realises the mistake and apologises. In this example, the pattern for translanguaging practice is English-Turkish-Turkish. When S7 initiates the translanguaged utterance in line 3, the teacher also continues addressing the same linguistic repertoire, and the conversation continues in Turkish.

The student's choice of language in S7 represents a spontaneous translanguaging practice (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021) in which the student uses Turkish, eliminating the language boundary and referring to the fluidity of his bilingual repertoire. Following that, the teacher's utterances following line 6 represent pedagogical translanguaging practices to correct the student, occurring next to the spontaneous use of language resources.

Extract 3.

Spontaneous Translanguaging Shift as Reflecting

- T: I know that there are some people here who like history ((2s.)). Is there anyone who says, 'I don't really care about the past, but I focus on the present?'
- S5: I can't say I don't care, but I don't like very much.
- T: Why don't you like it?
- S7: It's boring.
- T: What is not boring? Present?
- S5: *Böyle sorunca hocam • • bilmiyorum. Okumak sıkıcı geliyor, dinlemek hikâye tarzı dinlemek hoşuma gidiyor ama böyle tarihler vs. sıkıcı geliyor.* [When you ask like that teacher • • I don't know, I enjoy listening, like a story but these dates and thing are boring]

Extract 3 is an example of a translanguaging shift (García et al., 2017) employed by S5 as a spontaneous decision to respond to the communicative need of the moment. The teacher directs a question in English in the extract, and S5 replies. Nevertheless, the repeated follow-up questions by the teacher in lines 4 and 6 urge the student to shift their linguistic repertoire and use Turkish (with a pattern English-English-Turkish) in line 7.

In line 6, with the question, *what is not boring? Present?* the student feels challenged enough, and their answer is not satisfying the teacher. With the utterance *böyle sorunca hocam...* (when you ask like that teacher...), S5 seems to have spontaneously shifted to Turkish to reflect on their thoughts about the answer. The utterance *bilmiyorum* (I don't know) in line 7 indicates that this translanguaging shift is not caused by a lack of proficiency in expression in English but an unplanned use of another language resource by the student. The following utterances in lines 7 and 8, which are somewhat repetitions of the same ideas in lines 3 and 5, show that S5 deconstructs the boundaries between the two named languages in their linguistic repertoire.

Extract 4.

Translanguaging as Fluid Language Boundaries

- T: So, we can see that George— can we conclude that George is not as innocent as he seems?
- S3: He is a little bit selfish.
- T: A little bit selfish. *Di mi? Biraz şey gibi— Çizginin öbür ucu. Bir ucunda çok katı bir bakış açısı var. İşte bir öpücüğü bile insult olarak— • • • Ne yaptın sen vs. Charlotte ona çok şey yapıyor. Ama öbür tarafta da Lucy gibi bir karakter var. Sen onu insult olarak kabul eden bir karaktere bir kere yaptın, ikinciye bir daha zorlamak gibi bir şey oluyor aslında. Orda bir freedom vermiyor. Bir choice vermiyor. Feminist açıdan bakınca aslında bu Lucy için—* [Right? It's a bit like— the other end of the line. At one end, there is too conservative of a view. You know,

regarding even a kiss as insult— What you did etc. Charlotte does a lot of things. But on the other hand, there is a character such a Lucy. You did this once to Lucy; the second time is like forcing. He doesn't give her freedom. Doesn't give a choice. If you think about it from a feminist perspective, this is actually, for Lucy—]

S3: Insulting—

T: Insulting *bir durum. Aynen. Insulting bir durum. Bununla ilgili daha sonra Lucy George'a bir confrontation yapıyor birkaç sayfa sonra...* [an insulting situation. Exactly. An insulting situation. A few pages later, Lucy makes a confrontation to George about this...]

In Extract 4, with the English-Turkish-English-Turkish pattern, the teacher and the students are commenting on a character's personality in *the French Lieutenant's Woman* in the Contemporary English Novel course. The teacher's question in line 1 gets a response from S3 in line 3; he is a *little bit selfish*, and afterwards, the teacher repeats the student's response in English. The teacher then uses the Turkish question tag *di mi* (Isn't that right?) to clarify understanding. From this point on, the teacher goes on conversating, explicating the idea mentioned. In the rest of the conversation, from line 5 onwards, the teacher uses his linguistic repertoire to shift back and forth between Turkish and English to express certain words and concepts (e.g., insult, freedom, insulting, confrontation).

While the beginning of the translanguaging practice in the conversation (i.e., line 4, *di mi*?) serves as a pedagogical translanguaging, the choice of English words in Turkish utterances in the rest of the conversation seems to represent spontaneous translanguaging through the use of the multilingual repertoire. Similarly, the utterance by S3 in line 15, as a response to the teacher's utterance in line 9, represents spontaneous translanguaging. In other words, the situation is also repeated in line 15 in the incomplete utterance of S3 (i.e., *insulting*), where the student shifts the language of the ongoing conversation up to that point.

Extract 5.

Spontaneous Translanguaging Leveraging Linguistic Repertoire

T: Uncivilised according to this European perspective. *Kime göre savage?* [Savage, according to who?] And then his naming him— by giving him a name, maybe he is giving him some human properties.

S3: The name comes from the day Robinson saved the savage.

T: What about Gulliver's Travels?

S4: In one part of Gulliver's Travels, Gulliver goes to the Houyhnhnms' country. And Houyhnhnms' country is where civilisation— it's a big colony. Horses. But— *İşte. Ne deniyordu? ••• Üstün, daha üstün.* [You know. How to say it? ••• Superior, more superior]. • Superior creatures. And then Gulliver starts to behave like that. And then he— belittle the humans. They see them as savages.

T: The same thing, right? In both of these books, we have the same discourse. The same thing is actually happening in Heart of Darkness as well.

In Extract 5, the teacher and the students discuss the general theme of colonisation through Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*. In the presented episode, the theme is compared with other novels the students had read in other courses (i.e., Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* and Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*). The teacher's question, "What about the Gulliver's Travels?" in line 5, is answered by S4 in lines 6 to 10. During their speech, S4 starts speaking in English up to the point where they cannot retrieve a particular adjective from their linguistic repertoire. Trying to mention that Houyhnhnms are superior, S4 struggles to find the word, translanguages to Turkish with the discourse marker *işte* (you know), signalling a search for the word, followed by the actual utterance showing the intent; *Ne deniyordu?* (how to say it?). The fact that the Turkish utterance in line 8 (*üstün, daha üstün*) is immediately followed by the English one in line 9 (superior creatures) with just a little pause in speech suggests that S4 is actively using their linguistic repertoire and at last retrieving the word and uttering it. In the member-checking interview with S4, they mentioned that it was only after uttering the Turkish word that they could retrieve the English word. In other words, Extract 5 presents an example of spontaneous

translanguaging practice by S4 leveraging their linguistic repertoire through self-correction.

Extract 6.

Pedagogical/Spontaneous Translanguaging as Fluid Language Boundaries

- T: What does the title imply to you? Heart of Darkness?
 S3: Maybe the company's workers— their intentions for Africa—
 T: Yes, their intentions. Heart of Darkness *ile ne alakası var?* [What does it have to do with Heart of Darkness?]
 S3: *Onların intentionınının aslında kötü olması, yani olanları bilerek görmezden gelmeleri.* [That their intentions are indeed bad, I mean they ignore them on purpose]
 T: Okay. Let's look at the title from a linguistic perspective. What is signifying what? Heart of Darkness, *Karanlığın Yüreği. Orada karanlık olan ne?* [Heart of Darkness. What is it that's dark there?]
 S4: Black people *olabilir mi?* [Could it be...?]
 T: *Olabilir.* [Could be]. Could be.
 S5: Or place
 T: Place. So, Africa is darkness, and the heart is the centre of Africa?
 S5: Yes
 T: So, you take it literally? Any other ideas?
 S7: The way the European societies are trying to domesticate the African people is the darkness, I think.
 S8: And the society of Africa is the heart.
 T: Could be. I don't have a specific answer to that. We are just reflecting.
 S9: *Hocam bir yerde şey diyordu, karanlığın yüreğinde ilerliyoruz. Mesela çok uzun süre denizde gitmeleri, çok ıssız bir şekilde ilerlemeleri de olabilir mi?* [Teacher, there was this at one point, we are advancing in the heart of darkness. For example, could it also be that they've been sailing for long at sea, desolately?]
 T: *İşte o karanlığın yüreğinde ilerliyoruz mesela kendi karanlığımız mı? Kendi içimizde ilerliyoruz mu yoksa her yer çok karanlık ve biz de içine doğru ilerliyoruz mu?* [So, is that advancing in the heart of darkness our own darkness? Are we advancing inside or is everywhere dark and we are advancing towards it?] Right? We can understand it from two perspectives...

Extract 6 is an example of a dynamic use of linguistic resources in the Discourse Analysis course, where the teacher and the students are translanguaging fluidly as bilingual speakers of Turkish and English. In this episode, the classroom discusses the meaning of the title *Heart of Darkness* of Conrad's novella. After directing the question in line 1, the teacher uses Turkish in line 3 to elicit more student responses. S3, then, in line 5, responds using the same named language, mixing the English word *intention* in the ongoing Turkish conversation. In line 7, the teacher shifts to English again with another question but finishes in Turkish, to which S4 replies with a bilingual label quest (Blackledge & Creese, 2010) with the content words *black people* and the question *olabilir mi?* (could it be?) in Turkish. Up to this point in the conversation, the languaging used by the teacher represents pedagogical translanguaging practices with the function of eliciting response. In line 20, when S9 suddenly and spontaneously uses Turkish, the student starts reflecting on the previously-read content and checks for their understanding. The question is responded to by the teacher using the same languaging practice (i.e., Turkish). The complex translanguaging pattern in Extract 6 (Turkish-Turkish-English-Turkish) exemplifies how the teacher and the students dynamically use their linguistic repertoires to discuss the content. In lines 5 and 10, English is used as scaffolding to the Turkish utterances, and in line 11, as a follow-up utterance. In this episode, the boundaries between the two languages seem to be blurred by the participants' fluid translanguaging practices. In this sense, increased participation due to the ability to use translanguaging practices was also observed and validated in member-check interviews.

DISCUSSION

The findings of the study highlight the recognition that languages do not fit into transparent bounded entities for meanings to be conveyed and negotiated (Creese & Blackledge, 2010). In other words, the students and the teacher in the EMI English literature classrooms tended to use their linguistic repertoires to connect socially meaningful utterances (Blackledge & Creese, 2010). Translanguaging practices, such as those presented in the extracts in the previous section, were reported to be typically observed in EMI content classrooms (i.e., mechanical engineering departments) in Türkiye (Sahan & Rose, 2021), especially where the academic subject is other than English. In Sahan and Rose's (2021) study, translanguaging practices were characterised by the fluid language use of scientific and subject-specific concepts where the teacher mainly employed translanguaging as scaffolding strategies. Contrary to content classrooms that use English as a medium, not a subject, this study provides examples of translanguaging practices in English literature courses where the academic subject is indeed English. In other words, language use in EMI contexts seems fluid and flexible no matter how the E in EMI is framed in different settings.

This study's first research question aimed to examine the functions of translanguaging practices. The findings suggest that the participants used both pedagogical and spontaneous translanguaging (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021). Furthermore, these fluid language use practices serve as negotiation of meaning, discussion of content, reflection, and leveraging linguistic repertoires. Other studies also reported such observations that examined translanguaging in EMI contexts (e.g., Dalziel & Guarda, 2021; Sobkowiak, 2022). Translanguaging practices functioned as scaffolding, as seen in Extract 5, as the students engaged in meaning-making processes where Turkish helped the student retrieve lexical items in English. Such scaffolding and negotiation of meaning purposes enabled the students to have a voice in the classroom, fostering participation and building rapport (Sobkowiak, 2022). Fluid use of language, as seen in Extracts 4 and 6, for instance, acted as an engagement strategy on the part of the teacher through pedagogical translanguaging, linking the shared language outside the classroom with the classroom, rather than separating the two languages (Creese & Blackledge, 2010). Similar functions related to the "social side of translanguaging" (Chang, 2019, p. 33) are also reported by Dalziel and Guarda (2021) in their study that views translanguaging practices as opportunities "to enhance the affective atmosphere among speakers and thus create a safe place for everyone to express their ideas" (Dalziel & Guarda, 2021, p. 138) by building personal relations with the students via the shared language outside the classroom.

The second research question aimed to find patterns in the translanguaging practices used by the teachers and the students in the EMI classrooms. Overall, the translanguaging practices reflect a mixed pattern in language choice (i.e., two-dimensional shifts in Turkish and English), indicating that the two languages are not regarded as separate codes. This might be linked to the nature of the courses where students were allowed to read the novels both in Turkish and English. Just as translanguaging removes the language and literacy barriers in bi/multilingual education (Celic & Seltzer, 2012), it allows the students to open up a third space (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021; Kramsch, 2009) for content discussion. In short, by combining the two languages, Turkish and English, the students could maximise their content discussions. In this sense, translanguaging maximised interactions that would expand the student's language and meaning-making repertoire when they are given a chance to draw from their existing repertoires (Yılmaz, 2021).

In summary, the pedagogical and spontaneous translanguaging practices in the previous section suggest that language use in EMI classrooms is fluid, with content presented and discussed in both the shared language of the classroom and the target language of instruction. These translanguaging practices also point to the possibility and tolerance of other languages being used in an EMI context rather than a strict English-only policy.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that a pedagogical translanguaging lens is possible in English literature EMI classrooms, although the data presented here draws upon a limited number of classrooms observed and recorded. (Pedagogical) translanguaging “offers educators a non-competitive perspective between ‘languages’ of instruction” (García & Wei, 2014, p. 73). A monolingual English-only medium of instruction does not seem plausible and consistent with the language and content classroom ecologies as both students and teachers, especially in EFL contexts, rely on their linguistic repertoires to teach and learn content and languages. As Wei (2018) mentions, translanguaging; transcends language boundaries in favour of diverse meaning-making processes and is transformative and transdisciplinary. It offers pedagogical implications for educators involved in EMI to take on a stance that allows and encourages, not hinders, multilingual language use in content and language-integrated classrooms.

Further research, in this sense, might look into how and whether translanguaging practices are salient in other contexts where the E in EMI is conceptualised from the subject point of view rather than the medium. Also, in this study, teacher utterances were long. Further studies might investigate the importance of the length of utterances in relation to its effect on translanguaging practices. Lastly, further research would also consider the implications of how to allow for the creation and craft of more dialogical translanguaging spaces, especially for the students to engage more in meaning negotiation and reflection.

Acknowledgement

A draft version of this paper was presented at 14th METU International ELT Convention that took place on 17-19 June 2022 at Middle East Technical University, Ankara with the title “*Is (pedagogical) translanguaging a possibility in English literature classrooms?*”.

REFERENCES

- Ayres-Bennet, W., & Fisher, L. (2022). Towards interdisciplinarity in multilingual identity research: Differing perspectives and common ground. In W. Ayres-Bennett & L. Fisher (Eds.), *Multilingualism and identity: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 1-18). Cambridge University Press.
- Birt, L., Scott, S., Cavers, D., Campbell, C., & Walter, F. (2016). Member checking: A tool to enhance trustworthiness or merely a nod to validation? *Qualitative Health Research*, 26(13), 1802-1811. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732316654870>
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. Continuum.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2(1), 1-28 <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110239331.1>
- Carroll, K. S., & Sambolin Morales, A. N. (2016). Using university students' L1 as a resource: Translanguaging in a Puerto Rican ESL classroom. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 39(3-4), 248-262. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2016.1240114>
- Celic, C., & Seltzer, K. (2012). *Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB guide for educators*. The City University of New York.
- Cenoz, J. (2017). Translanguaging in school context. International perspectives: An introduction. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 16(4), 193–1-98. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1327816>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes*, 39(2), 300-311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12462>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2021). *Pedagogical translanguaging*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009029384>
- Cenoz, J., Santos, A., & Gorter, D. (2022). Pedagogical translanguaging and teachers' perceptions of anxiety. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.2021387>

- Chang, S. Y. (2019). Beyond the English box: Constructing and communicating knowledge through translingual practices in the higher education classroom. *English Teaching & Learning* 43, 23-40. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-018-0014-4>
- Conteh, J. (2018). Translanguaging. *ELT Journal*, 72(4), 445-447. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy034>
- Copland, F., & Creese, A. (2015). *Linguistic ethnography: Collecting, analysing and presenting data*. Sage. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781473910607>
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching?. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103-115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x>
- Cummins, J. (2001). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Dalziel, F., & Guarda, M. (2021). Student translanguaging practices in the EMI classroom: A study of Italian higher education. In D. Paulsrud, Z. Tian, & J. Toth (Eds.), *English-medium instruction and translanguaging* (pp. 124-140). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788927338-013>
- Deignan, T., & Morton, T. (2022). The challenges of English medium instruction for subject lectures: a shared viewpoint. *ELT Journal*, 76(2), 208-217. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab084>
- DuFon, M. A. (2002). Video recording in ethnographic SLA research: Some issues of validity in data collection. *Language Learning & Technology*, 6(1), 40-59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.125/25142>
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107-115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x>
- García, O. (2014). Countering the dual: Transglossia, dynamic bilingualism and translanguaging in education. In R. Rubdy & L. Alsagoff (Eds.), *The global-local interface, language choice and hybridity* (pp. 100-118). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783090860-007>
- García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). Translanguaging theory in education. In O. García & T. Kleyn (Eds.), *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments* (pp. 9-33). Routledge.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765>
- García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K., (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Caslon.
- Goodman, B., & Tastanbek, S. (2021). Making the shift from a codeswitching to a translanguaging lens in English language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 55(1), 29-53. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.571>
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1968). The ethnography of speaking. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the sociology of language* (pp. 99-138), Mouton.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2014). Students' perceptions of English language versus Turkish language used as the medium of instruction in higher education in Turkey. *Turkish Studies*, 9(12), 443-459. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.7596>
- Kramsch, C. (2009). Third culture and language education. In V. Cook & L. Wei (Eds.), *Contemporary applied linguistics: Language teaching and learning Vol. 1* (pp. 233-254). Continuum.
- Lewis G., Jones B., & Baker C. (2012). Translanguaging: origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 641-654. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718488>
- Lincoln, S. Y., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage
- Liu, Y., & Fang, F. (2022). Translanguaging theory and practice: How stakeholders perceive translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *RELC Journal*, 53(2), 391-399. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220939222>
- Macaro, E. (2018). *English medium instruction*. Oxford University Press.
- Pennycook, A. (2018). Repertoires, registers and linguistic diversity. In A. Creese & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language and superdiversity* (pp. 3-15). Routledge.
- Preece, S. (2022). Deceloping the multilingual agenda in EMI higher educational institutions. *ELT Journal*, 76(2), 183-193. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab087>
- Rehbein, J., & Romaniuk, O. (2014). How to check understanding across languages. An introduction into the Pragmatic Index of Language Distance (PILaD) usable to measure mutual understanding in receptive multilingualism, illustrated by conversations in Russian, Ukrainian and Polish. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 5(1), 131-171. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2014-0007>
- Sahan, K., & Rose, H. (2021). Problematizing the E in EMI: translanguaging as a pedagogic alternative to English-only hegemony in university contexts. In D. Paulsrud, Z. Tian, & J. Toth (Eds.), *English-medium instruction and translanguaging* (pp. 1-14). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788927338-005>
- Sobkowiak, P. (2022). Translanguaging practices in the EFL classroom - the Polish context. *Linguistics and Education*, 69, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2022.101020>

- Tai, K. W. H. (2021). Researching translanguaging in EMI classrooms. In J. K. H. Pun & S. M. Curle (Eds.), *Research methods in English medium instruction* (pp. 119-132). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003025115>
- Tian, Z., Aghai, L., Sayer, P., & Schissel, J. L. (2020). Envisioning TESOL through a translanguaging lens in the era of post-multilingualism. In Z. Tian, L. Aghai, P. Sayer, & J. L. Schissel (Eds.), *Envisioning TESOL through a translanguaging lens: Global perspectives* (pp. 1-20). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-47031-9>
- van Lier, L. (2008). The ecology of language learning and sociocultural theory. In A. Creese, P. Martin and N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Ecology of language* (pp. 53-65). Springer.
- Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9-30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>
- Wei, L. (2022). Translanguaging as a political stance: implications for English language education, *ELT Journal*, 76(2), 172-182, <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab083>
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yılmaz, T. (2021). Translanguaging as a pedagogy for equity of language minoritised students. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 18(3), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1640705>
- Yuan, R., & Yang, M. (2020). Towards an understanding of translanguaging in EMI teacher education classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 1-23, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820964123>

TÜRKÇE GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Dillerarası geçişlilik (translanguaging) kavramı son zamanlarda önemli ölçüde araştırılmaya başlanmış ve çeşitli pedagojik, dilbilimsel, toplum dilbilimsel, iletişimsel ve çok modlu söylemlere uygulanmıştır (Wei, 2018). Wei (2018) diller arası geçişliliği en geniş anlamıyla "farklı dillerin ve dil çeşitlerinin dinamik ve işlevsel olarak bütünleşik kullanımını içeren bir uygulama, daha da önemlisi dil(ler)in ötesine geçen bir bilgi yapılandırma süreci" olarak tanımlamaktadır (Wei, 2018, s.15). Bir pedagoji olarak diller arası geçişlilik, birçok öğrenme ve öğretme ortamında eğitim dili olarak İngilizce (EDİ) örneğinde olduğu gibi, dilleri ayrı varlıklar olarak ele alan ve yalnızca tek bir dilin kullanımına yönelik dil polisliğinin (language policing) yapıldığı tek dilli politikaları teşvik eden ideolojileri reddetmektedir. Bu anlamda pedagojik diller arası geçişlilik, "öğrencinin var olan tüm dil dağarcığı kaynaklarını kullanarak okul bağlamlarında dil ve içerik yeterliliklerini geliştirmeyi amaçlayan teorik ve eğitici bir yaklaşımdır" (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021, s. iii). Cenoz ve Gorter (2021), pedagojik ve kendiliğinden olan diller arası geçişliliği birbirinden ayırmaktadır. Pedagojik diller arası geçişlilik uygulamaları dil veya içeriği öğretmek için öğretmen tarafından planlanan uygulamalardır. Öte yandan, kendiliğinden olan diller arası geçişlilik uygulamaları, dil sınırlarının akışkanlığını ve iki/çok dilliler tarafından kullanılan dilin doğallığını temsil eden planlanmamış dil kaymaları örnekleri olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Özet olarak, teorik ve pratik bir yaklaşım olarak diller arası geçişlilik, EDİ ortamlarındaki öğretmen ve öğrencilerin dilsel repertuarlarını kullanmalarına izin veren ve anlam müzakeresi yapmalarını sağlayan bir bakış açısıdır.

Yukarıda özetlenen bu bakış açısı dahilinde, bu çalışmanın temel amacı, doğası gereği eğitim dili olarak İngilizce (EDİ) kullanılan İngiliz Edebiyatı sınıflarında diller arası geçişlilik kavramının alternatif bir pedagojik yaklaşım olarak kullanımını araştırmaktır. Çalışma genel olarak EDİ bağlamında ana dil kullanımını "dil zenginliği bakış açısı"ndan (Carroll & Sambolin Morales, 2016, s. 249) ve pedagojik diller arası geçişlilik (Cenoz, 2017; Cenoz & Gorter, 2021; García & Wei, 2014) çerçevesinden incelemektedir. Bu amaçla, çalışmada şu araştırma sorularına yanıt aranmaktadır: (1) İngiliz edebiyatı sınıflarında kullanılan pedagojik diller arası geçişlilik uygulamalarının işlevleri nelerdir? (2) Bu diller arası geçişlilik uygulamalarında herhangi bir örüntü var mıdır?

Bu nitel durum çalışmasında, EDİ içerik sınıflarında kullanılan diller arası geçişlilik uygulamaları söylemlerini incelemek amacıyla metodolojik çerçeve olarak dilbilimsel etnografi kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın katılımcılarını İngiliz Edebiyatı müfredatı kapsamında verilen Söylem Çözümlemesi ve Çağdaş İngiliz Romanı derslerindeki 30 öğrenci ve bu derslerin öğretim elemanı oluşturmaktadır. Bu derslerde öğrencilerden dört roman okumaları istenmiştir; Manzaralı Bir Oda (1908, E. M. Forster), Karanlığın Yüreği (1899, Joseph Conrad), Fransız Teğmenin Kadını (1981, John Fowles) ve Tutku (1987, Jeanette Winterson). Öğrenciler daha önce bahsi geçen derslerin önkoşulu olan Söylem Analizi I, İngiliz Romanı I ve II derslerini almışlardır. Çalışmada veri derslerin öğretim elemanı olan araştırmacı tarafından, genellikle doğal dil kullanımını yansıtan yoğun veriler sağladığından (Copland & Creese, 2015; DuFon, 2002), söz konusu derslerde diller arası geçişlilik uygulamalarının incelenmesi için sınıfları video ile kayıt altına almıştır. Söylem Analizi dersinde 118 dakika, Çağdaş İngiliz Romanı dersinde 165 dakika kayıt yapılmıştır. Toplamda 283 dakikalık kayıt elde edilmiştir. Tüm kayıtlar daha sonra kelimesi kelimesine yazıya dökülmüştür. Toplanan verilerin incelenmesi için üç aşamadan oluşan (verilerin hazırlanması, düzenlenmesi ve sonuçların rapor edilmesi) tümdengelimci içerik analizi yöntemi (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008) kullanılmıştır. Sözcelerin tespit edilmesi ve sayılması Rehbein ve Romaniuk'un (2014) sözcük tanımına göre yapılmıştır. Rehbein ve Romaniuk sözcüğü "iletişimsel yüzeyde sözcük edimlerine göre düzenlenen söylemin parçalı yapılar" (Rehbein & Romaniuk, 2014, s.140) olarak tanımlamaktadırlar. Buna ek olarak, diller arası geçişlilik uygulamalarının işlevlerinin açıklanmasında ve yorumlanmasında güvenilirliği artırmak için katılımcı teyidi (member checking) yapılmıştır (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Araştırma için, araştırmanın yapıldığı kurumdaki Etik Kurul'dan gerekli etik onayları almıştır. Ayrıca derslerin kayıt altına alınması için öğrenciler bilgilendirilmiş, katılımın tamamen gönüllü olduğu söylenmiş ve katılımcı onayı alınmıştır.

Çalışmada elde edilen bulgular, dillerin anlam ifade ederken ve anlamın müzakere edildiği durumlar için kesin ve sınırlandırılmış varlıklar olmadığını göstermektedir (Creese & Blackledge, 2010). Başka bir deyişle, EDİ İngiliz edebiyatı sınıflarındaki katılımcıların, sosyal açıdan anlamlı ifadeleri birbirine bağlamak için dil dağarcıklarını kullanma eğiliminde oldukları gözlemlenmiştir (Blackledge & Creese, 2010). Çalışma ortaya çıkan diller arası geçişlilik uygulamaları, özellikle İngilizce'nin akademik içerik olarak kullanılmadığı EDİ ortamlarında (Macaro, 2018) Türkiye bağlamında sıklıkla gözlemlenmektedir (Sahan & Rose, 2021). Bu çalışma, İngilizce'nin akademik içerik olarak kullanılmadığı EDİ ortamlarında da benzer diller arası geçişlilik uygulamalarının kullanılabilirliğini göstermektedir. Başka bir ifadeyle, EDİ bağlamlarında dil kullanımının akışkan (fluid) ve esnek olarak kullanıldığı görülmektedir.

Özetle, çalışmada elde edilen diller arası geçişlilik uygulamaları, EDİ sınıflarında dil kullanımının akışkan olduğunu, içeriğin hem sınıfın ortak dilinde hem de hedef eğitim dilinde sunulabileceğini göstermektedir. Ayrıca, EDİ bağlamında diller arası geçişlilik uygulamaları sıkı bir “yalnızca İngilizce” politikası yerine, bu bağlamlardaki diğer dillerin var olduğunu ve bu dillere karşı toleranslı olunması gerektiğine işaret etmektedir. Son olarak, bu çalışmada EDİ İngiliz edebiyatı sınıflarında pedagojik diller arası geçişlilik bakış açısının mümkün olduğu sonucunu varılmıştır. Çalışma ayrıca içerik ve dille bütünleştirilmiş sınıflarda, özellikle EDİ bağlamında, çok dilli öğrencilerin bu dil zenginliklerini engellemek yerine kullanımına izin veren ve teşvik eden bir bakış açısına sahip olunması gerektiği önerisini getirmektedir.