Translanguaging in EFL Writing: Examining Student Exam Papers in an EMI Setting

Mehmet Akkuş *   **Ufuk Ataş**

ABSTRACT

Translanguaging has recently emerged as a topic of interest in English Medium Instruction (EMI) contexts, where students are expected to demonstrate proficiency in English, particularly in academic writing. This paper explores the potential benefits of incorporating translanguaging practices in exam papers to support multilingual students' understanding and performance. Drawing on constructionist grammar as its theoretical framework, this study discusses the complexities of translanguaging in exam papers and provides practical examples of how it can be implemented in English literature classrooms, especially in EMI contexts. Embracing a mixed-methods design to comprehensively understand translanguaging practices in exam papers and their effects on student performances and using a sample of English literature students in Türkiye, the study analyses exam papers to explore translanguaging and its potential impact on students' written work. The findings suggest that translanguaging practices in exam papers facilitate students' comprehension and promote their confidence and engagement in learning. Overall, this study contributes to the growing body of research on translanguaging in education and provides insights into how translanguaging practices can be effectively implemented in English medium instruction.

Reference

Akkuş, M., & Ataş, U. (2023). Translanguaging in EFL writing: Examining student exam papers in an EMI setting. *Journal of Language Education and Research, 9*(2), 492-514.

∗ Dr., ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9604-1418, Artvin Çoruh University, Faculty of Education, Dept. of Foreign Language Education, mehmetakkus@artvin.edu.tr

∗∗ Dr., ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8171-8334, Artvin Çoruh University, Faculty of Education, Dept. of Foreign Language Education, atas@artvin.edu.tr

Introduction

Globalisation has had significant linguistic consequences, including the spread of *multilingual* practices, with a lively conceptual discussion of established constructs, e.g., *multilingualism*, codes, and languages as separate entities. While *multilingual* practices have long been defined as how people use and interact with multiple languages in their everyday lives, an emerging paradigm, *translanguaging*, challenges the acceptance of a multiplicity of languages. Translanguaging refers to using all of one's linguistic resources, including different languages and language varieties, to communicate meaning (García & Wei, 2014). Translanguaging, in this respect, views language as a dynamic, complex, and integrated system and recognises that all languages are interconnected. It emphasises the fluidity and flexibility of language use and acknowledges that speakers with linguistic repertoire do not operate within strict linguistic boundaries. From a broader perspective, it highlights cognitive functions, meaning that grammar is not just a set of abstract rules, but is instead grounded in the specific patterns of language use that speakers encounter in their daily interactions (Wei, 2022).

One of the key ideas behind translanguaging is that individuals do not simply use languages as discrete and separate codes but rather as integrated and fluid constellations that are constantly in motion. In this view, speakers do not *switch* between languages but move fluidly and seamlessly, often creating new linguistic forms and expressions. Another critical aspect of translanguaging is its emphasis on the social and cultural dimensions of language use. Translanguaging recognises that language is not just a mode of communication but also a powerful marker of identity, belonging, and social status. By embracing and valuing the full linguistic repertoires of language users, translanguaging seeks to broadly promote more inclusive and equitable language practices in education and society.

In this respect, by examining translanguaging practices in exam papers, researchers and educators can better understand how students use language to demonstrate their understanding of a subject. This can be particularly important in constellations, where learners may have different proficiency levels in the language of instruction. Investigating translanguaging practices in exam papers can also help identify areas where students struggle with language and where additional support may be needed *in situ*. Since translingual practices are *par excellence* emerging and constructed-on-site phenomena, their dynamic patternings and frequencies can best be scrutinised within a constructive model of language use, i.e., construction grammar. Thus, this study attempts to investigate the emerging patterns of translingual practices in writing within the constructionist framework to understand whether *emerging innovative* translingual patterns of constructions are *entrenched* by language users in exam papers.

This study investigates how students with linguistic repertoires use translanguaging strategies in exam papers to better understand the complex and dynamic ways students use their full linguistic repertoires to make meaning in the assessment of written work. Specifically, the study examines how learners draw on the linguistic repertoire to support their comprehension of exam questions, articulate their responses, and provide context for unfamiliar words or concepts. To this end, the present study aims to answer the following research questions:

1.1. How do English Literature students use their linguistic repertoire in exam papers to support their comprehension of exam questions and to articulate their responses?

1.2. What is the frequency of the use of translanguaging in exam papers?

1.3. What are the patterns of use of translanguaging practices?

These research questions aim to explore the interplay between the frequency of language use and emerging translingual practices in exam papers and, thus, covertly investigate the potentiality of a translingual paradigm change in educational contexts.

Literature Review Theoretical Framework I: Translanguaging and Writing

Coined originally by Williams (1994) from the Welsh term *trawsieithu* focusing on the planned and systematic use of two languages in Welsh-English bilingual educational settings, translanguaging has already succeeded in challenging our understanding of how *bi-* and/or *multilinguals* use languages available to them. This challenge of understanding has mainly been relevant in language classroom contexts where the classroom ecology consists of languages in addition to the dominant language(s) used (or imposed) by learners and teachers. This *multilingual* turn (Conteh & Meier, 2014; May, 2014) in language education has lent itself to questioning the labelling of named languages (such as Turkish and English) and focusing more on how students use their linguistic repertoire when they use languages available to them. In this sense, translanguaging is "the deployment of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire, which does not in any way correspond to the socially and politically defined boundaries of languages" (García & Kleyn, 2016, p. 14).

From a pedagogical perspective, translanguaging is transformative in its focus on addressing critical pedagogy for social justice by allowing the students to move freely between languages. It is used as a resource for both teachers and students to deliver and receive content and instruction. It opens up a space for students to extend their repertoires of practice allowing for sociocritical literacy (Gutierrez, 2008). As García and Wei (2014) acknowledge, from a sociocritical approach, translanguaging "has the potential to crack the 'standard language' bubble in education that continues to ostracise many bilingual students" (p. 115), recognising the idea that languages do not fit into clearly bounded entities.

A pedagogical perspective on the translanguaging lens encompasses possibilities for modalities other than oral interactions (García & Wei, 2014). Though translanguaging has often been studied heavily within spoken discourse, written translingual discourse can also be considered a space where translanguaging practices are seen, especially in classroom ecologies where different languages come into contact. The relationship between translanguaging and writing has long been associated with how people with linguistic repertoire negotiate meaning in producing translingual texts, and the evidence from classroom studies shows that translanguaging is a natural phenomenon used by students with linguistic repertoire (Canagarajah, 2011; García & Wei, 2014).

Today, writing ability is seen as "the repository of meaning and hence, knowledge, that leads Western culture to value writing and literacy as the *sine qua non* condition for education and culture" (Menezes de Souza, 2007, p. 155). With the advancement of technology, we tend to mix writing with other modalities via instant messaging, blogging, online discussion forums and others. It is, therefore, inevitable that translanguaging is also observed in written discourses. The combination of translanguaging and writing, first and foremost, challenges and deconstructs the traditional norm in writing instruction and production as it foregrounds the inclusiveness of the languages rather than resorting to a defined named language. Due partly to the English-only

policies in developing the writing skills of foreign language learners (such as in the case of EFL), learners have historically been discouraged from expressing their ideas in translingual forms. In this sense, a translanguaging lens to writing can counteract this trend by allowing learners to move beyond the confines of traditional language categories (Canagarajah, 2013). By embracing translanguaging in writing, teachers may help learners express their ideas more effectively while promoting a more inclusive learning environment (Horner et al., 2011).

Writing skill involves making sense of oneself and moving the message across. As García and Kleifgen (2020) acknowledge, "translanguaging transforms our understanding of language, *bi/multilingualism*, and pedagogical approaches to support *multilingual* learners' use and further expansion of their unique meaning-making repertoire"*[emphasis added]*(p. 554) in their literacy development. Thus, by embracing the diversity of language and utilising translanguaging, learners can better express themselves leading to creativity and connecting with a broader audience. Prior research, albeit limited, has investigated the link between translanguaging and writing in EFL/ESL settings and has demonstrated the effectiveness of this idea from the perspectives of students' note-taking skills (e.g., İnci Kavak & Kırkgöz, 2022; Siegel, 2020), teachers' incorporation of translanguaging into writing instruction (e.g., Ascenzi-Moreno & Espinosa, 2018; Karabulut & Kesli Dollar, 2022), code-meshing in academic writing (Canagarajah, 2011), promoting critical awareness in writing (Yang et al., 2023), and general development of language skills, including writing (Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022). Prilutskaya (2020) examines the use of translanguaging in the draft stage of writing in English by Norwegian students. The study finds that students use translanguaging for various purposes, from socio-pragmatic functions to generating content and experimenting with their linguistic repertoire. The study suggests that translanguaging can be an effective pedagogy to contest the English-only approach to writing instruction. However, considering the growing literature on different aspects of (academic) writing and translanguaging, there seems to be no study investigating exam papers.

Theoretical Framework II: Constructionist Grammar

Construction grammar is a theoretical framework within linguistics that emphasises the importance of grammatical constructions as the basic units of language (Goldberg, 1995). It is based on the idea that grammar is not just a set of abstract rules but is instead grounded in the specific patterns of language use that speakers encounter in their daily interactions. Goldberg (1995) states that, at its core, construction grammar holds that the grammar of a language is made up of a vast number of constructions, which are specific form-meaning pairings used to express particular ideas or convey particular functions in communication. These constructions can range from straightforward patterns, such as subject-verb-object sentences, to more complex and nuanced patterns, such as idioms, collocations, and multi-word expressions (Langacker, 2008).

Construction grammar posits that these constructions are not learned in isolation but acquired through exposure to language use. This means that speakers learn the rules governing the use of these constructions not through explicit instruction but through a process of implicit learning that occurs over time as they encounter the constructions in context. One of the key insights of construction grammar is that constructions are not fixed or rigid patterns but rather dynamic and flexible. Language users can modify and adapt constructions to suit their communicative needs, and new constructions can emerge over time through the creative use of existing linguistic resources.

Another critical aspect of construction grammar is its emphasis on the relationship between

form and meaning. In this framework, grammatical constructions are considered holistic units that encode form and meaning inseparably. This means that the form of a construction is not just a set of arbitrary sounds or symbols but is directly tied to the meaning that the construction conveys. It is also worth noting that there is a strong relationship between constructionist grammar and usage-based linguistics (see Bybee, 2012). Both approaches emphasise the importance of language usage and the construction of language in understanding language structure and meaning.

Constructionist grammar also views constructions as the basic units of language, but it emphasises the role of constructional schemas and their combinatorial properties in shaping language structure and meaning. Constructional schemas are abstract representations of constructions that capture their syntactic and semantic properties and are seen as the building blocks of language. Both approaches reject the idea of a *universal grammar* innate to the human mind and instead view language as a complex system that emerges from usage and experience (see Langacker, 2012). They also share an interest in corpus-based research methods and the use of empirical data to investigate language structure and meaning. According to Barlow and Kemmer (2000), there is an "intimate relation between linguistic structures and instances of the use of language" (p. 2), suggesting that there is a close connection between one's language experience and abstract representations in grammar. In the speaker's language system, linguistic representations are, therefore, closely related to *usage events*. These language structures and usage events constantly affect one another. Usage events are essential to the continuing organisation and functioning of the language system (Barlow & Kemmer, 2000). Usage events, therefore, have a dual function in the system, shaping the language system both as a result of and in response to experience.

Construction grammar and usage-based linguistics emphasise the frequency of use since it is both a consequence and a driving factor of the system (Barlow & Kemmer, 2000; Bybee, 1998; Haiman, 1994, 1998). When a linguistic unit or pattern is used frequently, it indicates that the unit is cognitively ingrained and that its regular usage affects how it is processed. As a result of the primary importance of frequency of use, usage-based linguistics stands out from other methods in that frequency is a key concept that is "unconnected with speakers' linguistic knowledge" (Barlow & Kemmer, 2000, p. 4). Frequency of use has a significant role in the process that leads to strong *entrenchment*. The two go hand in hand; "the higher the frequency of use, the stronger the entrenchment level a unit acquires" (Onar Valk, 2015, p. 54). The process of cognitive *routinisation*, *automatisation*, or *habituation* serves as the foundation for determining the degree of entrenchment. Although type and token frequencies interact somewhat, they play distinct roles in this process because "high token frequency leads to entrenchment by leaving strong memory traces, whereas type variation leads to abstraction" (Behrens, 2009, p. 399). It should be mentioned that regardless of the type of frequency, anytime a language user employs a language unit, its abstract representation is *entrenched*, emphasising the essential importance of frequency of use (Bybee, 2010). If the individual process of entrenchment disperses in the speech community, it becomes *conventionalised*.

Based on the theoretical framework presented above, this study aims at investigating the frequency of use of translanguaging patterns to understand whether *emerging innovative* translingual patterns of constructions are *entrenched* by language users in exam papers.

Methodology

This study mainly employs the qualitative research paradigm and quantitative data for data triangulation, making it a mixed-methods study. According to Hanson et al.'s (2005) classification of types of mixed-methods studies, this study falls into the *concurrent triangulation* design type, given that exam papers are utilised for qualitative data collection. The quantitative data (frequency of use) is nested within it to provide a broad perspective.

Research Design and Ethics

This study employs *concurrent triangulation* design, a type of mixed methods research design, which involves collecting and analysing quantitative and qualitative data concurrently to better understand a research problem (Hanson et al., 2005; Mengshoel, 2012). In this design, researchers collect and analyse quantitative and qualitative data simultaneously and then integrate the results to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the research problem. The purpose of the concurrent triangulation design is to provide a complete understanding of the research problem by combining the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative methods. This design helps researchers validate and confirm findings from one method with findings from another and gain a more in-depth understanding of the research problem by collecting and analysing different data types. The present study was conducted with strict adherence to ethical guidelines to ensure the safety and well-being of the study participants. Prior to the commencement of the research, the study design and procedures were reviewed and approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of Artvin Çoruh University. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and their confidentiality and anonymity were ensured throughout the study.

Context

The present study was conducted at a department of English Language and Literature at a state university in Türkiye which has been accepting students since 2018 and now has a student body of over 200 learners. The department provides a wide range of content courses focusing on literary studies, linguistics, and language teaching to offer students a relatively comprehensive education in the English language and its literature. The researchers gave the following courses in the fall semester of the 2022-2023 academic year: i) Discourse Analysis I, ii) Critical Literary Theory I, iii) Advanced Research Skills I, and iv) Teaching English to Young Learners. The rationale for choosing the mentioned courses was two-fold; these were the courses the researchers gave in the mentioned semester, and all the courses were content-heavy with new concepts and ideas for the students about philosophy, sociology, literary criticism, research in education and literary studies, educational studies, theories of learning and instruction etc. Thus, though they were diverse in content, they were ideal for employing a translanguaging lens to allow the students to negotiate meaning in classroom discussions and any written assessable work. In other words, an English-only policy would have potentially hindered students' understanding and negotiation of concepts. Among these courses, Discourse Analysis I and Advanced Research Skills I were third-grade courses, Critical Literary Theory I and Teaching English to Young Learners were fourth-year courses.

This study examines the use of translanguaging in English-oriented content course exams (midterm and final exams). To improve students' understanding of the content (philosophical content including *arkhe, logos, monad, form, apeiron etc.*), we adopted a

translanguaging stance in our classes. We also urged the students to do the same in class discussions to make the intended meaning clear. Because of this, we also allowed them to use their linguistic repertoire during exams. One of our instructions was as follows:

> "INSTRUCTIONS: ANSWER ALL THE QUESTIONS IN THE SPACES PROVIDED. WRITE LEGIBLY AND CONCISELY. PAY SPECIAL ATTENTION TO GRAMMAR, SPELLING and CORRECT USE OF LINGUISTIC TERMINOLOGY AND PUNCTUATION. FEEL FREE TO TRANSLANGUAGE WHILE DISCUSSING THE CONTENT"

That is to say, to explore this issue, we allowed students to translanguage during their exams to assess the impact of this practice on students' writing skills while conveying their messages and constructing their knowledge in content courses. Allowing translanguaging in written work can increase engagement and participation, as students feel more comfortable and confident expressing themselves in the language(s) they are most proficient (García & Wei, 2014). The number and types of exams are presented in the following table:

Table 1. The Number and Types of Exams

Course	Exam type	Nature of exam	Number of questions	Number of students taking the exam
Critical Literary Theory I	Midterm	Open-ended	3 Qs	29
Critical Literary Theory I	Final	Open-ended	2 Qs	
Advanced Research Skills I	Midterm	Mixed	Five multiple-choice Qs Six fill-in-the-blanks Qs Four open-ended Qs	50
Discourse Analysis-I	Final	Open-ended	3 Qs	52
Teaching English to Young Learners	Final	Open-ended	3 Qs	29

Table 1 displays that there are two exams for the Critical Literay Theory-I. The midterm was an open-ended exam with three questions (see Appendix 1 as a sample exam), and 29 students took it. The final exam was also open-ended and consisted of two questions. The number of students was also 29. Advanced Research Skills I course had a midterm exam that was mixed in nature. It included five multiple-choice questions, six fill-in-the-blank questions, and four open-ended questions. Fifty students took this exam. The final exams of Discourse Analysis-I and Teaching English to Young Learners were open-ended, each comprising three questions. As for the number of students taking the exams, while 52 students took the Discourse Analysis-I final exam, 29 students attended the final exam of Teaching English to Young Learners.

Participants

Since the present study aims to investigate *translanguaging* focusing on students' linguistic repertoires, the participants were selected using convenience sampling, a non-probability sampling technique commonly used in social science research when the researcher selects participants based on availability and accessibility (Neuman, 2013). Regarding the production of written data, exams were administered to 81 students aged 20 and 24. The participants took the exams in the autumn term within the 2022-2023 academic year. All the participants stated that they considered themselves competent in Turkish; however, they did not define themselves as *fully-competent* speakers of English. Such an understanding may lie in the fact that they did have difficulty in mainly the productive skills in English (writing an

essay, conversing with a highly proficient English speaker, etc.). In terms of their socio-economic status, it can be stated that their social and economic profiles were quite akin to one another. They started learning English in primary education and were rarely exposed to English in daily interactions.

Data Collection and Analysis

The present study used exam papers to explore the emerging nature of translanguaging. Using exam papers as a data collection tool is common in educational research, especially in studies focusing on academic performance (i.e., *parole* in Saussurean terms). Exam papers provide a standardised way of assessing student performance across various subjects and can be used to gather data on student knowledge, understanding, and skills. Exam papers in the present study allow for collecting large amounts of reliable and valid data cost-effectively and efficiently. Furthermore, using exam papers as a data collection tool allows for comparing results with other studies, enabling a better understanding of students' academic performance in different settings.

The exam papers providing data for this study included five exams: midterms of Advanced Research Skills I and Critical Literary Theory I and finals of Discourse Analysis I, Critical Literary Theory I and Teaching English to Young Learners. Since the midterm exams of Discourse Analysis I and Teaching English to Young Learners courses and the final exams of Advanced Research Skills I courses were not written assessable work (i.e., the students were assessed based on classroom presentations and other non-written work), they were not included in the data collection process.

Congruent with the *concurrent triangulation* research paradigm, *frequency of use* is used to quantify constructed patterns of translanguaging. Frequency is a critical concept in construction grammar, which is a theoretical framework that focuses on the role of constructions in language production, e.g. writing in exam papers. The more frequently a construction is encountered in language use, the more likely it is to become entrenched in the language user's mental grammar and to be processed more quickly and efficiently during language production (Bybee, 2010). This is because frequent exposure to construction leads to increased activation of its constituent parts, creating strong associations between form and meaning. Moreover, frequency effects can influence the organisation of a language user's mental lexicon and overall linguistic competence. Therefore, frequency is a crucial factor in understanding the acquisition and processing of constructions in language use, and its study can provide important insights into the nature of language learning and use. Thus, the rationale behind using frequency is that it can quantify and triangulate the qualitative data.

In order to quantify the data, the unit of analysis is to be determined prior to analysis. The unit of analysis in linguistics is the smallest unit of language being scrutinised. It is the element of language that is being analysed, observed, or manipulated in linguistic research. The unit of analysis can vary depending on the research question, methodology, and theoretical framework. For example, the unit of analysis in phonetics might be a single sound or phoneme, while in syntax, it might be a sentence or a phrase. Since the present study aims to explore the patterns of conveying meaning through translanguaging, we defined the units of analysis as the *clause* and the *paragraph*. In linguistic terms, a clause is a unit of grammar that typically contains a subject and a predicate and expresses a complete thought or idea. A paragraph is a unit of text usually consisting of sentences focusing on a single idea or topic (cf. Crystal, 2008).

In this study, we took the 'unit of analysis' as our fundamental data analytic unit instead of a 'code' or a 'theme' in a pure qualitative or a nested mixed-methods research design. In this sense, we regarded (i) lexical items, (ii) clauses, and (iii) paragraphs as our units of analysis. After determining the units of analysis, the two researchers first coded the frequencies separately. They later came together to reach an agreement on these, based on Rehbein and Romaniuk's (2014) definition, which regards the unit of analysis 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). In analysing the exam papers, the researchers took a *collaborative autoethnographic stance* to embrace "the unique strengths of self-reflexivity associated with autobiography, cultural interpretation associated with ethnography, and multi-subjectivity associated with collaboration" (Chang et al., 2013, p. 17) following common lived experiences of fluid language use in the content classrooms they have been teaching.

Results

In the present study, the quantitative data were presented through tables, while the qualitative data were extracted through excerpts to present the findings. The frequency analyses suggest that as the size of the unit of analysis increases, so does the probability of translanguaging. This phenomenon may be because larger units of analysis provide more opportunities for students to draw on their entire linguistic repertoire. Additionally, larger units of analysis may allow for more complex thoughts and ideas to be expressed, which can sometimes be better conveyed using multiple languages. This finding, thus, suggests that the size of the unit of analysis should be considered when assessing language proficiency, as students may exhibit different language abilities depending on the size of the text they are working with. Table 2 illustrates translanguaging patterns of exam papers of the students in Advanced Research Skills regarding clause- and paragraph-based units.

Table 2. Frequencies of Translanguaging Patterns in Advanced Research Skills I (Midterm)

	Frequency	*Percentage*
English-only clauses	729	69.1 %
Turkish-only clauses	273	25.9 %
Mixed clauses	52	4.9 %
TOTAL (Clauses)	**1054**	
English-only paragraphs	102	51 %
Turkish-only paragraphs	19	9.5 %
Mixed paragraphs	79	39.5 %
TOTAL (Paragraphs)	**200**	

Table 2 shows that 69.1% (*f*=729) of the clauses in the exam were in English only, 25.9% (*f*=273) were in Turkish only, and 4.9% (*f*=52) were mixed clauses. Similarly, the table shows that 51% (*f*=102) of the paragraphs in the exam were in English only, 9.5% (*f*=19) were in Turkish only, and 39.5% (*f*=79) were mixed paragraphs. The total number of clauses in the exam was 1054, and the total number of paragraphs was 200. Overall, the table suggests that translanguaging was a common practice in the Advanced Research Skills I course midterm exam, with a significant proportion of both mixed clauses and paragraphs. Similarly, Table 3 presents the frequencies of translanguaging patterns in the final exam of Discourse Analysis I.

Table 3. Frequencies of Translanguaging Patterns in Discourse Analysis I (Final)

	Frequency	*Percentage*
English-only clauses	897	83.3%
Turkish-only clauses	88	8.2%
Mixed clauses	91	8.5%
TOTAL (Clauses)	**1076**	
English-only paragraphs	99	52.9%
Turkish-only paragraphs	4	2.1%
Mixed paragraphs	84	45%
TOTAL (Paragraphs)	**187**	

Table 3 provides information on the frequencies and percentages of translanguaging patterns in the final exam of the Discourse Analysis I course. The table shows that out of the 1076 clauses, 83.3% (*f*=897) were in English, 8.2% (*f*=88) were in Turkish, and 8.5% (*f*=91) were mixed. Similarly, out of the total 187 paragraphs, 52.9% (*f*=99) were in English, 2.1% (*f*=4) were in Turkish, and 45% (*f*=84) were translanguaged. It is worth noting that the percentages of mixed clause use were higher in Discourse Analysis I than in Advanced Research Skills I, as shown in Table 1. This may suggest that students in Discourse Analysis I felt more comfortable and confident using translanguaging to communicate their ideas. Table 4 demonstrates the frequencies of translanguaging patterns in the midterm and final exams of Critical Literary Theory I.

Table 4. Frequencies of Translanguaging Patterns in Critical Literary Theory I (Midterm/Final)

	Frequency (Midterm)	*Percentage (Midterm)*	*Frequency (Final)*	*Percentage (Final)*
English-only clauses	572	43 %	1037	64.2 %
Turkish-only clauses	595	44,7 %	516	32 %
Mixed clauses	164	12,3 %	69	4.3 %
TOTAL (Clauses)	**1331**		**1615**	
English-only paragraphs	53	37,6 %	71	49 %
Turkish-only paragraphs	24	17 %	25	17.2 %
Mixed paragraphs	64	45,4 %	49	33.8 %
TOTAL (Paragraphs)	**141**		**145**	

Table 4 presents the frequencies of translanguaging patterns in Critical Literary Theory I at two different time points: midterm and final exams. The data shows that the most frequent translanguaging pattern in both midterm and final exams is English-only clauses, with 43% (*f*=571) and 64.2% (*f*=1037), respectively. In contrast, the frequency of Turkish-only clauses decreased from 44.7% (*f*=595) in the midterm to 32% (*f*=516) in the final exam, while the frequency of mixed clauses decreased significantly from 12.3% (*f*=164) in the midterm to 4.3% (*f*=69) in the final exam. Regarding the paragraph level, the English-only paragraphs increased from 37.6% (*f*=53) in the midterm to 49% (*f*=71) in the final exam, whereas the Turkish-only paragraphs slightly increased from 17% (*f*=24) to 17.2% (*f*=25). The frequency of mixed paragraphs decreased from 45.4% (*f*=64) in the midterm to 33.8% (*f*=49) in the final exam. Lastly, Table 5 provides an overview of the frequencies of translanguaging patterns observed in the final examination of Teaching English to Young Learners.

Table 5. Frequencies of Translanguaging Patterns in Teaching English to Young Learners (Final)

	Frequency	*Percentage*
English-only clauses	729	91.8 %
Turkish-only clauses	53	6.7 %
Mixed clauses	12	1.5 %
TOTAL (Clauses)	**794**	
English-only paragraphs	90	77.6 %
Turkish-only paragraphs	3	2.6 %
Mixed paragraphs	23	19.8 %
TOTAL (Paragraphs)	**116**	

Table 5 displays the frequencies and percentages of translanguaging patterns in the final exam of Teaching English to Young Learners. The table shows that English was predominantly used in the exam papers, as 91.8% (*f*=729) of clauses were in English, while Turkish-only clauses comprised only 6.7% (*f*=53) of the total clauses. Mixed clauses, containing both English and Turkish, had the lowest percentage, with 1.5% (*f*=12). The distribution of language use in paragraphs follows the same pattern. The majority of paragraphs, 77.6% (*f*=90), were written in English, while Turkish-only and mixed paragraphs had percentages of 2.6% (*f*=3) and 19.8% (*f*=23), respectively. This might result from the fact that the researcher's primary use of English as a medium of instruction is reflected in the students' exam papers, especially in providing content-related terminology and explanations.

In addition to tables, excerpts are given in the present study to provide examples and support the data analysis. A sample student exam paper is given in Appendix 2. In presenting the excerpts, the grammar and punctuation mistakes in the students' exam papers have been preserved. Students' original English clauses are presented in **bold**. Turkish clauses are kept in standard fonts. English translations of Turkish sentences are given in *italics [square brackets]*.

Excerpt 1. A shared emerging pattern of *mixed* translanguaging practices

> **According to Multimodal Discourse Analysis, this pictures want to tell us anything because purpose of MDA is tell anythings by using images**, "simgeler" *[symbols]*, **vocabularies and advertisements. There is a family and they are doing everything in collaborate. Father** "asıyor" *[is hanging]* **curtain, is putting book to its places and is cleaning to bookshelve. Mother** "süpürüyor" *[is vacuuming]* **to living room. And children help and support their parents**…(ID309F33)

> **These pictures reflects somethings about social and family life. The most obvious thing that I see is being helpful. Everyone in the photos is helping each other.** Yaptığım bir diğer çıkarım ise, *[Another inference I'm making is that]* **there is a gender identification. For example,** adam perdeleri asıyor *[the man is hanging the curtains]* **because he is strong,** kadın yerleri süpürüyor *[the woman is vacuuming the floor]* **because women are more capable in cleaning. This situation is a** toplum dayatması *[social imposition].* **There is** düzenli olmak ve temiz olmak *[being tidy and clean]* **in every photos; so I think they want to give a message to the students that "be clean". To sum up, there are some both social and individual meanings in the photos.** (ID309F1)

In this excerpt, the students are provided with three images demonstrating different family members cleaning different parts of the houses (see Appendix 3). The students are supposed to discuss these images from an MDA/critical discourse point of view. The excerpt exemplifies a shared emerging pattern of *mixed* translanguaging practices. Both students begin answering the

question in English and seemingly have difficulty retrieving English equivalents of some words or phrases. For instance, when encountering such a situation, the possibility of being able to translanguage enables ID309F1 to use a Turkish phrase yaptığım bir diğer çıkarım ise *[Another inference I'm making is that]*, and ID309F33 to make use of a Turkish word simgeler *[symbols]*, allowing them to utilise their linguistic repertoire.

In these two answers given by two different students, the translingual patterning is triggered by unknown English lexical items (i.e., çıkarım yapmak *[making inference]* and simgeler *[symbols]*). Here, it is worth noting that these two students use the same Turkish verbs (asmak and süpürmek *[to hang and to vacuum]*) with the same progressive aspect (asıyor and süpürüyor *[hanging and vacuuming]*) when describing the images. This implies that such constructions are not only *entrenched* but also *conventionalised* by the students.

The frequency of such mixed constructions, as seen in the tables above, suggests that these translingual patterns are cognitively routinised among students who are expected to synthesise and reflect on the content in an EMI setting, especially in a cognitively stressing condition such as an exam. Excerpt 2 exemplifies a network of translingual practices in and between clauses, particularly emphasising *terminological translanguaging*.

Excerpt 2. A network of translingual practices in and between clauses, particularly emphasising *terminological translanguaging*

Structuralism görünenin arkasındaki gerçekliği ortaya çıkarmaktır. Bir bütün olarak bakmaz. Hayattaki her şeyin tek tek bir anlam ifade ettiğini savunur *[is to reveal the reality behind what appears to be. Doesn't consider it as a whole. Argues that everything in life has a singular meaning]*. **There are three concepts in Structuralism. These are sign, signifier and signified. Sign: the smallest unit of meaning** or verilmek istenen mesaj [or the intended message]. **Signifier: the meaning that signifies**, gördüğümüz şey *[what we see]*. **Signified: the concept that a signify refers to**, gördüğümüz şeyin ne ifade ettiği *[the meaning of what we see]* (ID402F64)

Structuralism, **Ferdinand de Saussure** tarafından ortaya atılmıştır. Dilbilimden gelir ve dili yapısal olarak inceler. Sesler bir araya gelerek **arbitrary** bir ses topluluğu oluşturur. Bu sesleri anlamlandırmak için görünenin ardındaki gerçekliğe bakmamız gerekir. Bunun için Saussure dilin bir sistematik yapı olduğunu, akılsal ve mantıksal şekilde bunu anlamamız gerektiğini ileri sürer. Bunun için de üç kavram geliştirmiştir *[is put forward by Saussure. Comes from linguistics and studies language structurally. Sounds come together to form an arbitrary group of sounds. To make sense of these sounds, we need to look beyond what is visible. For this, Saussure argues that language is a systematic structure, and we need to understand it rationally and logically. To do this, he developed three concepts]*. **These are sign, signifier and signified. Signifier is a subject. It is arbitrary. It is just about the what we can see. But meaning is different. Signified** görünenin ardındaki anlam yani asıl anlatılmak istenendir. Biz bir şeyi anlamlandırmak için bu **signified**'a bakarız *[is the meaning behind what appears to be, in other words, the intended meaning. We consider the signified to make meaning out of a thing]*. **Signifier and signified is meaning of sign. Sign** hem **signifier** yani gösteren hem **signified** yani gösterileni kapsar. Özne, bu yapıları anlamlandırmaya çalışarak ikinci plandadır. Görevi bu **signifier**'ı tanıyıp anlamaktır *[includes both signifier, which signifies, and signified which is signified. The subject is secondary, trying to make meaning in these structures. Its task is to define and understand this signifier]* (ID402F78).

In this excerpt, the students are supposed to refer to a photograph (Appendix 4) demonstrating a Japanese woman and man bowing one another and to analyse the photograph by referring to specific parts using structuralist constructs of *sign, signifier*, and *signified*.

Both students begin explicating the meaning and purpose of structuralism. They use the terminological jargon in English, *structuralism*. However, they immediately translanguaged to explicate its definition. After Turkish explanations, they both introduced three significant structuralism constructs in English: *sign, signifier* and *signified*. After these introductions, they

defined these constructs in Turkish and English by translanguaging, probably to convey their messages thoroughly. They both preferred using specific structuralist terms in English, implying that they could use them in discussions. However, they seemingly relied on their Turkish proficiency to provide their definitions. Thus, in a content course (Critical Literary Theory) exam, their network of translingual practices helps them convey their messages.

As in Excerpt 1, in these two explanations (provided by two different students), the translingual patterning is probably triggered by the urge to provide English terms (*structuralism, sign, signifier, signified*) and to be able to explicate them as correctly as possible. This patterning is also observed in other students' exam papers, implying that such constructions are probably conventionalised.

Translingual practices do not occur only in and between clauses. There are instances in which students tend to translanguage in and between paragraphs while constructing their narration. Excerpt 3 exemplifies a network of translingual practices in and between paragraphs, emphasising the emerging theme of *constructing meaning through translingual paragraphing*. In this excerpt, the students are supposed to discuss the following quotation from a Turkish professor of the history of philosophy: *It is no surprise that if you happen to travel into the depths of Turks' souls, you will discover Plato therein. You cannot find Aristotle in the Turkish way of thinking, though.*

Excerpt 3. Construction of meaning through translingual paragraphing

Platon'a göre bu dünya ideal olan dünyanın yansımasıdır ve felsefesi de ideal olan dünyayı anlamaktır. Platon'un Akademisi'nin girişinde yazan "geometri bilmeyen giremez" yazısı da bununla açıklanabilir. Çünkü Platon'a göre bu geometrik şekiller, bir Tanrı tarafından oluşturulan şekillerdir. Dolayısıyla Platon, bu evrenin, doğanın, intizamın ve insanın anlamını ideal olanda aramaktadır. Aristo ise bu görüşün aksine, anlamı tam manasıyla bizde, yaşadığımız bu dünyada aramaktadır. Bu yüzden Aristo'nun çalışmaları da bu dünyayı anlamaya çalışmakla ilgilidir. Platon, kutsal olanı ideal olan dünyada ararken; Aristo, yaşadığımız bu dünyada aramaktadır. Sonuç olarak Türklerde Platon ve düşüncelerini buluyor olmamız, bu dünyanın, felsefeye göre kutsal olanın Türklere göre kendimizde ve doğada değil başka bir güçte Tanrı'da aramalarından kaynaklanmaktadır. Türkler , bu dünyayla değil, ona kurtuluşun Tanrı'da olduğunu vaat eden din ile ilgilidir. Onlar için önemli olan aklı kullanarak bu dünyayı anlamak değil, Tanrı'nın onu bir gün kurtaracağı inancıdır. *[According to Plato, this world is the reflection of the ideal world, and his philosophy is to understand this ideal world. This can be explained by the inscription "who does not know geometry cannot enter into here (the Academy)" written at the entrance of Plato's Academy. Because according to Plato, these geometric shapes are the shapes created by the Creator. Therefore, Plato seeks the meaning of this universe, nature, order and humanbeing in the ideal. Contrary to this view, Aristotle seeks the meaning literally in us, in this world we live in. That is why Aristotle's work aims at understanding this world. While Plato seeks the sacred in the ideal world; Aristotle seeks it in this world we live in. As a result, that we find Plato and his thoughts in Turks are due to the fact that this world, according to philosophy, is not in ourselves and nature, but in God, in another power, according to Turks. Turks are not concerned with this world, but with religion, which promises them (the Turks) salvation is in God. The important thing for them is not to understand this world using reason, but to believe that God will save them some day.]*

Literature is subjective discipline. So there cannot be one meaning, and it is analysed with various theories. Literary criticism helps to analyse works of literature, and with literature theories we acclaimed various points of views.

Bu eleştirel teorilerin amacı dünyayı ve insanı anlamaktır. Bu bağlamda felsefeyle ilişkilidir. Çünkü felsefenin de ilk amacı kutsal olanı yani bu dünyayı anlamaya ve sorgulamaya çalışmaktır. Örneğin Stoacılar bunu kozmosla yani dünyanın nizamını, akıl yoluyla anlamaya çalışırlar. Edebiyatı incelerken kullandığımız teorilerde de aynı şekilde ilerleriz. Yapısalcılar, kutsal olanı yani metni, onun yapısı ve arkasındaki anlamdan yola çıkarak anlamaya çalışır. Biçimciler ise metni biçim aracılığıyla anlamaya çalışır. Aristo ve Plato, felsefe ve eleştirel teorilerin ilişkisi bununla açıklanabilir. Bütün hepsi

yaşadığımız dünyayı, insanı, kitapları anlamaya çalışır. Felsefe ve eleştirel teori arasında bir benzerlik daha vardır. İkisi de önyargılarımız, inançlarımız, korkularımız ve endişelerimizden arınarak özgür düşünmeyi ve eleştirmeyi amaçlar. *[The purpose of these critical theories is to understand the world and humanity. In this context, they are (somehow) related to philosophy. Because the first purpose of philosophy is to try to understand and question the sacred, that is, this world. For example, the Stoics try to understand this with the cosmos, the order of the world, through reason. We proceed in the same way with the theories we use when examining literature. Structuralists try to understand the sacred, that is, the text, based on its structure and the meaning behind it. Formalists, on the other hand, try to understand the text through form. The relationship between Aristotle and Plato, and philosophy and critical theories can be explained by this. All of them try to understand the world, humanity and books. There is another similarity between philosophy and critical theory; both aim to (help people) think freely and criticise by getting rid of our human-oriented prejudices, beliefs, fears, and worries.]*

According to Claude Lévi-Strauss, we can understand people with binary oppositions. He gives a binary opposition: bricoleur (savage mind) and engineer (scientific mind). People who have savage mind live according to the nature and they do not change it. However, people who have scientific mind, try to change the world in order to develop the humanity.

It related to the dualism of Plato. There is an idealised world and the world we live. Plato focuses on the idealised world, on the other hand Aristotle focuses on the world we live.

Sonuç olarak Türkler, özgür düşüncesini ve aklını kullanmayı engelleyen inançlarının ve korkularının peşine gider. Stoacıların ve Aristo'nun yaptığı gibi yaşamın anlamını bu dünyada ve kendimizde arama sorgusu içerisinde olmak yerine Platon gibi kurtuluşu başka bir yerde aramaktadırlar. *[As a result, Turks follow their beliefs and fears that prevent them from using their free thought and reason. Instead of being in search of the meaning of life in this world and in ourselves, like the Stoics and Aristotle, they seek salvation elsewhere like Plato]* (ID402M73).

The student (ID402M73) began constructing his own narration, explicating Plato's and Aristotle's philosophies in Turkish. They translanguaged in the second paragraph once they tried to link the relationship between literary criticism and philosophy. After referring to the literary theories, they went back to Turkish when they started diving into the depths of literary theories, providing examples: Yapısalcılar, kutsal olanı yani metni, onun yapısı ve arkasındaki anlamdan yola çıkarak anlamaya çalışır. Biçimciler ise metni biçim aracılığıyla anlamaya çalışır *[Structuralists try to understand the sacred, that is, the text, based on its structure and the meaning behind it. Formalists, on the other hand, try to understand the text through form]*).

They evidently relied on their Turkish proficiency to provide broad explanations. However, while using the terminological jargon, they translanguaged, e.g. bricoleur (savage mind) and engineer (scientific mind). They ended up wrapping their ideas up in Turkish. They seemingly constructed *meaning through translingual paragraphing,* providing a linguistic agency to make themselves clear in constructing meaning in a content-heavy course.

In addition to constructing meaning through *translingual paragraphing,* in answer to analysing the series entitled *Monster: The Jeffrey Dahmer Story* within the framework of students' own choosing, an intra-paragraph translingual patterning in which the students navigated through their thoughts with an apparently emerging cognitive procedure was also observed in the dataset. The following excerpt provides an example of such occurrences:

Excerpt 4. Construction of meaning through intra-paragraph translingual patterning

I want to select Postmodernism theory to analyse Jeffry Dahmer Story. Postmodernism is opposed to Modernism. Modernizmde akıl ve bilim düşünceyi belirler. *[In modernism, reasoning and scientific thought determine thought.]* **There is one true for it. However, Postmodernism rejects this idea. Thinking is changeable from culture to culture. There is no one true for it. The most leading thinker is Foucault in postmodernizm. The Archaeology of Knowledge is Foucault's work. Foucault defends "deconstruction". According to Modernism, All is well and everything is true.**

However, Postmodernizm rejects this idea. Everything is not excellent for it. In terms of this aspect, we can analyse Jeffry Dahmer Story. Why does he kill the people? Why is he doing that? Dahmer's story starts in pregnancy because his mother uses psychological drugs. It may lead to some diseases for him. On the other hand, babası ölü hayvanların organlarını ve kemiklerini incelemeyi öğretiyor. Organları dokunup onları hissetmek Dahmer'in hoşuna gidiyor *[his father teaches him to examine the organs and bones of dead animals. Dahmer likes to touch and feel organs]* **and he uses this method in people's organs. As an another example, Dahmer's father admits that I was thinking like you once upon a time and I dream that I kill the people.** Bunu psikanaliz teorisiyle bağdaştırabiliriz. Bilinç altında bastırılmış düşünceler ortaya çıkıyor *[We can reconcile this with the theory of psychoanalysis. Repressed thoughts appear in the subconscious.]*

Babasının hissettikleri başka bir bedende yani oğlunda hayat buluyor *[What his father feels comes to life in another body, that is, his son.]* **When we look at Dahmer in terms of Modernism, Dahmer is a serial killer because he killed seventheen people.** İnsanlara işgenceler yapmış ve öldürdükten sonra da çeşitli işkenceler yapmıştır *[He tortured people (when they were alive) and tortured them after killing them].* **He ate dead people's organs.** Bazı organları saklamıştır *[He kept some organs].* **When we look at this perspective, Dahmer is cruel man. On the other hand, when we look at postmodernism, we**

analyse Dahmer's family. How is his family? Bütün bunları ailesi yüzünden mi yapıyor? *[Did he do all this evil due to his family (issues)].* **There are some scenes in prison. He looks like a** masum *[innocent]* **person… When Dahmer was a child, his father left to the home. Dahmer felt sad and alona because** babasından başka kimse onunla ilgilenmiyor. O da öldürdüğü kişilerin onu bırakmasından korkuyor ve *[no one takes care of him except his father. He is also afraid that the people he killed will leave him, and]* **he doesn't allow them to go somewhere.** Öldürdükten sonra da her birinin bir parçasını saklıyor *[He keeps a piece of each of them after he killed them].* (ID402F64)

In Excerpt 4, translanguaging is evident in how the student uses Turkish and English interchangeably to provide a more nuanced analysis of the text in translingual intra-paragraphing. The student (ID402F64) began their explanations in English, followed by Turkish elaborations. They went back to English as observed in the following extract in the first paragraph: I want to select Postmodernism theory to analyse Jeffry Dahmer Story. Postmodernism is opposed to Modernism. Modernizmde akıl ve bilim düşünceyi belirler *[In modernism, reasoning and scientific thought determine thought].* There is one true for it. However, Postmodernism rejects this idea. Thinking is changeable from culture to culture.

In the second paragraph, however, they began using Turkish, followed by English explications. After a while, they translanguaged to convey their messages. Translanguaging in the exam paper allows the student to bring in cultural and linguistic perspectives that may not be possible with a single-language analysis. Using Turkish and English, the student can provide a more in-depth analysis of the text that considers different cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Excerpt 5. Construction of meaning through translanguaging using discourse markers

(a) Critical discourse analyses discusses the discourses in terms of society. There are four main principles in CDA. These are social relations, ideologies, power relations and social and political. When we analyse the discourse as ideologies, söylemde dini ifadeleri ifadeleri görmeliyiz örneğin bir rahibe ile herhangi bir insanın din açısından konuşmasını ideology açısından inceleyebiliriz *[we need to see the religious statements in discourse, for example we can analyse a religious conversation between a nun and any person in terms of ideology].* **Second principle is power relations. We can analyse the discourse as power relations when we see the middle and upper class differences.** Örneğin bir hizmetçi ile ev sahibi konuştuğunda, hizmetçinin ev sahibine hitap şeklini bir power relation açısından inceleyebiliriz *[For example, when a servant and a householder converse, we can analyse the way the servant addresses the householder in terms of power relations]* (ID309F32)

(b) When I looked at the question, I understand it is example images for multimodality. In these images, there are examples of social relation when analysed in terms of critical discourse. Şöyle ki,

bir babanın, erkek figürün bazı sosyal normlar açısından yardım etmesi ilginç karşılanırken, baba burada çocuklarıyla ve eşiyle "ideal eş, aile babası" olarak nitelendirebileceğimiz bir görüntüyle karşımıza çıkıyor [*That is to say, while it is considered weird in terms of some social norms when a father, a male figure helps, the father here presents himself to us with his children and wife as "an ideal husband, a father-of-the-house figure"*] (ID309F36)

(c) **When we look at Grandma's Garden activity, we can understand and see easily that many skills were used. Actually, that is more useful and needed. In my opinion, while this activity is done, young learners can do painting because young learners can be bored easily. The teacher should focus on these problems. There is not just speaking skill in this exercise, this could be improved with dialogues and a little presentations. If I were a teacher who prepared this exercise, I would do same thing.** Kısacası, temel ve alt beceriler yerinde kullanılmış, konuşma becerisinden de bahsetmiştim zaten. Bir aktivitede illa hepsi olacak diye bir durum yok, sadece kişisel görüşlerimi belirttim. Bir sürü oyun, egzersiz olduğu için becerileri hepsinde sıklıkla kullanabiliriz *[In short, main and sub-skills were properly addressed, I already mentioned the speaking skill. You can't have all in one activity, I just told my personal opinions. We can use the skills for all of these since there are many games, exercises]* (ID451F80).

(d) Şimdilerde öğrenciler ders dinlerken aşırı sıkılıyor ve dersten kopuyorlar ama işin içine teknoloji girince bu öyle olmuyor. Eğer öğretmen gelip düz bir şekilde ders anlatıp giderse öğrenciler dersin yarısında kopuyorlar *[Nowadays students get really bored listening to the lectures and get distracted but it doesn't happen so when there is technology in play. If the teacher comes and goes lecturing in a flat manner, the students get distracted in the first half of the lesson].* **So, the teachers should give something. For example, this activity, not only they learn something but also draw picture and this is more funny for the student** (ID451F63)

(e) A woman and a man have always different roles in society. Bu yüzden bu iki cinsiyete biçilmiş farklı rolleri kritik etmek, incelemek, söylemi ve gizli anlamı çıkarmak **critical discourse analysis** konusunun işidir. Halkına seslenen, konuşma yapan liderleri incelemek, sosyokültürel olarak incelemek any zamanda yine critical discourse işidir *[That's why it's the subject of critical discourse analysis to critique and analyze the various roles attributed to these two genders, extract the hidden meaning and the discourse]* (ID309F29)

Another pattern that we have observed in the analyses of students' exam papers is the construction of meaning through translanguaging using discourse markers. Excerpt 5 presents various quotes from different students regarding the dynamic and fluid use of discourse markers for the functions of exemplification, elaboration, brief restatement, and extending. In (a), in an attempt to discuss the concept critical discourse analysis and its scope as part of the exam question, the student dynamically translanguages when defining and exemplifying the concepts. The mixed nature of the paragraph indicates that the triggering point for translanguaging practices is when the student aims to give examples for the concepts they are defining. The same pattern is also observable in (b) and (c) where the students' negotiation of meaning for the functions of elaboration (with the discourse marker: şöyle ki [that is to say]) and brief restatement (with the discourse marker: kısacası [in short]) is done through a fluid use of translingual practice.

In (d) and (e), the discourse function of extending a previous idea is observed in the students' written work from a translingual perspective, with both students using different linguistic repertoires to indicate how they construct meaning differently. In other words, while one student prefers to use Turkish and extends in English, the other prefers the opposite; using English and extending the idea in Turkish. This suggests that though the students are expected to use English continually in an EMI setting, the construction of meaning does not seem to happen in only one language when the students are given a chance to translanguage.

Discussion

The present study utilised a mixed-methods approach to examine the use of translanguaging in academic writing among university students. The findings overall suggest that translanguaging is a common practice among all students who participated in this study. Another overall finding is that as the size of the unit of analysis increases, so does the probability of translanguaging, which may be because larger units of analysis provide more opportunities for students to draw on their entire linguistic repertoire. In this way, translanguaging allowed students to express their "whole selves" (Ascenzi-Moreno & Espinosa, 2018, p.18) in producing written language.

Furthermore, the findings show that when encountering lexical gaps in English, students tend to draw upon their linguistic repertoire to fill the gap, resulting in mixed translanguaging practices. The use of translanguaging, in this sense, enables students to articulate their thoughts more effectively and contribute to constructing knowledge in a cognitively stressful setting. Prior research also supports this finding. As Karabulut and Kesli Dollar (2022) argued, Turkish learners in an EFL setting scored higher in written tasks regarding task achievement, cohesion and coherence, and lexical and grammatical accuracy. They also report that given a chance to embrace a translanguaging perspective, EFL learners included more details in their written works, negotiated meaning for content better, and thus discussed their ideas more effectively.

It is worth noting that while English was more dominantly used in all the courses, students also utilised Turkish and mixed clauses and paragraphs to express their ideas. The quantified data also revealed that the percentages of mixed clause use were higher in Discourse Analysis I than in Advanced Research Skills I, which may suggest that the nature of the Discourse Analysis I course, due to its content-heavy perspective, probably required the students to use multiple languages to communicate their ideas. On the other hand, while learning the basics of academic research in Advanced Research Skills I, the students were supposed to acquire more *technical* language, which did not allow more flexibility in terms of translanguaging. Similar concerns were observed in Critical Literary Theory I and Teaching English to Young Learners, where the former was a more content-heavy course. As İnci Kavak and Kırkgöz (2022) also highlighted, content seems to be a determining factor for translanguaging, especially in an EMI setting. In their study, students reported that the amount of translanguaging depended on the content and delivery of the course. Our study also emphasises the relation between course content and the amount of translanguaging to be used by the students depending on the nature of these courses in EMI settings.

The use of mixed translanguaging practices is not a new phenomenon, and the findings presented in this study are consistent with previous research (e.g., Canagarajah, 2011; İnci Kavak & Kırkgöz, 2022). However, what is noteworthy is the frequency of these mixed constructions among the students, which suggests that these patterns are routinised and entrenched in the students' cognitive processes. This finding implies that translanguaging is not just a strategy to fill in lexical gaps but an integral part of the students' cognitive processing and meaning-making practices. In this sense, translanguaging in literacy skills, especially in writing, deconstructs the idea of separations of one named language and the other, as well as cognition and practice (García & Kleifgen, 2020). Thus, it is necessary to recognise and value these mixed translanguaging practices in educational settings to promote students' linguistic diversity and support their learning.

In addition, the data suggest that translingual paragraphing enabled the students to navigate through their thoughts and ideas more fluidly and efficiently using a mix of Turkish and English, which suggests that translanguaging is a dynamic and evolving process. Through translingual paragraphing, the students could present their ideas clearly, interactively, and effectively. As Yuzlu and Dikilitas (2022) argue, translanguaging in EFL settings appeals to the learners' affective dimension, such as feeling secure, developing a sense of comfort, sustaining motivation, and experiencing enjoyment. In this sense, a translanguaging perspective enables learners to be better writers in examination settings and provides practical benefits in constructing these written works.

Conclusion and Pedagogical Implications

This study posits that translanguaging is an effective practice that students can utilise in classroom discussions and exam situations where they need to discuss content. In this sense, our study challenges the English-only ideology in written exam papers of EFL students in EMI contexts. Since education in EMI is about language and knowledge construction, translanguaging redefines how we ask the students to construct this knowledge (Wei, 2022). We conclude that translanguaging as a cognitive strategy can facilitate critical thinking and knowledge construction in a classroom with students with diverse linguistic repertoires. By allowing students to draw upon their linguistic repertoire, translanguaging can enhance their ability to engage with complex concepts and ideas when answering questions in exam settings.

The findings of this study have various important implications for language teaching and assessment situations. First of all, language proficiency should be redefined in conformity with a translanguaging paradigm shift, considering the size of the text students are working with, as they may exhibit different language abilities depending on the size of the unit of analysis. Additionally, we believe that translanguaging should not be seen as a problem but rather as a resource for students to express their ideas more effectively, even in academic writing. Therefore, language teachers should be aware of the potential benefits of translanguaging and consider incorporating it into their teaching and assessment practices to support students' language development. Acknowledging and valuing students' linguistic resources and practices can lead to more inclusive and effective pedagogies that enable students to reflect more meaningfully on their learning processes and strategies.

This study is also limited in various aspects. The findings cannot be generalisable to other populations or settings, given the sample size, context, and characteristics of the participants. Thus, further research may be needed to determine the broader implications of translanguaging in different academic settings. Moreover, investigating exam papers in terms of translanguaging may not accurately represent students' language practices outside of the exam context. Students may be more likely to use translanguaging strategies during exams to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the subject matter but may not necessarily use these strategies in everyday communication.

Additionally, the study may not consider the different levels of proficiency in both languages of the students, which could impact their use of translanguaging strategies. Also, this study did not fully consider the broader socio-cultural and institutional factors that influence the use of translanguaging in academic settings, such as the attitudes of teachers and peers, the linguistic and cultural diversity of the classroom, and the policies and regulations governing language use in exams. Lastly, future research may explore the use of translanguaging in other

content-loaded courses and the impact of translanguaging on students' academic performance and linguistic development.

References

Ascenzi-Moreno, L., & Espinosa, C. M. (2018). Opening up spaces for their whole selves: A case study group's exploration of translanguaging practices in writing. *NYS TESOL Journal*, *5*(1), 10-29.

Barlow, M., & Kemmer, S. (Eds.). (2000). *Usage-based models of language*. CSLI Publications. Behrens, H. (2009). Usage-based emergentist approaches to language acquisition. *Linguistics, 47*(2),383-411. https://doi.org/10.1515/LING.2009.014

Bybee, J. (1998). The emergent lexicon. *Chicago Linguistic Society, 34*(2), 421-435. Bybee, J. (2010). *Language, usage and cognition.* Cambridge University Press.

Bybee, J. (2012). Exemplars and constructions. In T. Hoffmann & G. Trousdale (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of construction grammar*, (pp. 49-69). Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 401-417. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.

Chang, H., Ngunjiri, F., & Hernandez, K. (2013). *Collaborative autoethnography*. Left Coast Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315432137

Conteh, J., & Meier, G. (Eds.). (2014). *The multilingual turn in languages education: Opportunities and challenges*. Multilingual Matters.

Crystal, D. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (6th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell

García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2020). Translanguaging and literacies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *55*(4), 553-571. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.286

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.

Goldberg, A. (1995). *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure.* University of Chicago Press.

Gutierrez, K. D. (2008). Developing critical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly, 43*(2), 148-164. https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.43.2.3

Haiman, J. (1994). Ritualisation and the development of language. In W. Pagliuca (Ed.), *Perspectiveson grammaticalisation* (pp. 3–28). John Benjamins.

Haiman, J. (1998). *Talk is cheap: Sarcasm, alienation, and the evolution of language*. Oxford University Press.

Hanson, W. E., Creswell, J. W., Clark, V. L. P., Petska, K. S., & Creswell, J. D. (2005). Mixed methods research designs in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *52*(2)*,* 224-235. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.224

Horner, B., Lu, M. Z., Royster, J. J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Language difference in writing: Toward a translingual approach. *College English, 73*(3), 303-321. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25790477

İnci Kavak, V., & Kırkgöz, Y. (2022). Exploring university students' note-taking in literature courses:A translanguaging perspective. *Çukurova University Faculty of Education Journal,*

51(2), 1468-1486. http://doi.org/10.14812/cuefd.1027947

Karabulut, A., & Kesli Dollar, Y. (2022). The use of translanguaging pedagogy in writing classes of Turkish EFL learners. *Participatory Educational Research, 9*(6), 41-65. http://doi.org/10.17275/per.22.128.9.6

Langacker, R. W. (2008). *Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction.* Oxford University Press. Langacker, R. W. (2012). *Essentials of cognitive grammar.* Oxford University Press.

May, S. (2014). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education.* Routledge.

Menezes de Souza, L. M. T. (2007). Entering a culture quietly: Writing and cultural survival in indigenous education in Brazil. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*, (pp. 135-169). Multilingual Matters.

Mengshoel, A. M. (2012). Mixed methods research–so far easier said than done? *Manual Therapy*, *17*(4), 373-375. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.math.2012.02.006

Neuman, W. L. (2013). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches.* Pearson. Education.

Onar Valk, P. (2015). *Transformation in Dutch Turkish subordination? Converging evidence of change regarding finiteness and word order in complex clauses.* LOT.

Prilutskaya, M. (2020). Writing in L2: Norwegian students' use of translanguaging at the draft stage. *Nordic Journal of Modern Language Methodology, 8*(2), 1-26. https://doi.org/10.46364/njmlm.v8i2.677

Rehbein, J., & Romaniuk, O. (2004). 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/0.1515/applirev-2014- 0007

Siegel, J. (2020). Appreciating translanguaging in student notes. *ELT Journal, 74*(1), 86-88. hptts://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccz05

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

Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o Ddulliau Dysgu ac Addysgu yng Nghyd-destun Addysg Uwchradd Ddwyieithog*, [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education]. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, Bangor.

Yang, Q., Yang, S., & Shi, W. (2023). Translanguaging pedagogies in EFL writing education.

International Journal of TESOL Studies, 5(1), 50-68. https://doi.org/10.58304/ijts.20230105

Yuzlu, M. Y., & Dikilitas, K. (2022). Translanguaging in the development of EFL learners' foreign language skills in Turkish context. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 16*(2), 176-190, hptts://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2021.1892698

Appendices

Appendix 1. A Sample Exam (Critical Literary Theory-I)

IDE 401 ÇAĞDAŞ ELEŞTİREL KURAM-I
2022-2023 GÜZ DÖNEMİ ARA SINAVI

Ad: _____

Soyad: _____

Öğrenci No: _____   **NOT:** _____ /100

INSTRUCTIONS: ANSWER ALL THE QUESTIONS IN THE SPACES PROVIDED. WRITE LEGIBLY AND CONCISELY. PAY SPECIAL ATTENTION TO GRAMMAR, SPELLING and CORRECT USE OF LINGUISTIC TERMINOLOGY AND PUNCTUATION. FEEL FREE TO TRANSLANGUAGE WHILE DISCUSSING THE CONTENT

---

1. QUESTION (THEORETICAL INQUIRY) [50 points]   **[VIDEO]**

"It is no surprise that if you happen to travel into the depths of Turks' souls, you will discover Plato therein. You cannot find Aristotle in the Turkish way of thinking, though".

Based on the judgement provided above, you are expected to discuss the essential differences between Plato and Aristotle. You are supposed to reflect on their contributions to the literary criticism as a subfield of research in literary studies.

In your <u>answer</u> (taking its historical development into account) try to provide a historical background of philosophical theories and literary theories we covered in the class (from the Ancient era onwards), to name few major schools of literature, and to show **how these theories are/similar and different** in how they **approach** the issue, **how they involve other related concerns (such as, for example, "philosophy", "social movements" etc.) in their models/theories**. **If** you have reservations or **critiques** for them, please also comment.

<u>Make sure you give a concise/short account of the meanings of the constructs "literature", "literary", "theory", and "critical" in your argumentation.</u>

---

2. QUESTION (APPLICATION) [50 points]   **[VISUAL]**

Referring to the photograph provided in Appendix A in the following page, you are expected to discuss the very constructs of "sign", "signifier", and "signified". Please use the terminological jargon that we made use of in our discussion in the lectures.

Make sure that you refer to the Japanese culture, history, as well as your subjective "Japan" illusion, such as *Samurai, Hara-kiri, Mount Fuji. sushi, Shintoism, Tokyo, Japanese anime*, etc.

In your <u>answer</u> (taking the structural understanding into account) try to analyse the photograph by referring to specific parts and give an elaborated account of the appropriate element. Justify your answers with strong argumentations and reasoning.

<u>Make sure you give a detailed account of "sign", "signifier", and "signified".</u>

Appendix 2. Originals of student exam papers presented in Extract 1

According to Multimodal Discourse Analysis, this pictures want to tell us anything because purpose of MDA is tell anythings by using images, "simgeler", vocabularies or advertisements. There is a family and they are doing everything in colloborate. Father "asıyor" curtain, is putting book to its places and is cleaning to bookshelve. Mother "süpürüyor" to living room. And children help and support their parents. According to MDA, it is worked to tell in these images that family's colloboration, if father and mother do anything together, children take an example to them and this is a positive action for children's development.

These pictures reflects some things about social and family life. The most obvious thing that I see is being helpful. Everyone in the photos is helping each other. Yaptığım bir diğer çıkarım ise there is a gender identification. For example, adam perdeleri asıyor because he is strong, kadın yerleri süpürüyor because women are more capable in cleaning. This situation is a toplum dayatması. There is düzenli olmak ve temiz olmak in every photos, so I think they want to give a message to the students that "be clean." To sum up, there are some both social and individual meanings in the photos.

Appendix 3. Image as prompt for Discourse Analysis I

Appendix 4. Image as prompt for Critical Literary Theory I