LOOW

Language in the Online & Offline World

Language in the Online and Offline World 5: The Amplitude

April 19-20, 2016

English Department
Petra Christian University
Surabaya - Indonesia

Proceedings

PETRA PRESS

Proceedings:

Language in the Online & Offline World 5: The Amplitude

Editors:
Dwi Setiawan
Rosalia Tania Putri
Edlyn Gracia Soewarsono
Janice Giselle Nugraha
Jessica Godwin
Kathleen Liuray
Venny Gunawan

No. Register : 0593/B22.3/UK/XI.2019
PENGESAHAN
Telah diperiksa kebenarannya dan
sesuai dengan aslinya
Malang, Tgl. 25/11/2019
Universitas Kanjuruhan Malang
Rektor,

Dr. Pieter Sahertian, M.Si
REKTOR NIK. 298601102

Published by:

Institute for Research and Community Outreach
Petra Press
Petra Christian University
Surabaya, Indonesia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PEDAGOGICAL DISCOURSE FUNCTIONS ON TRANSLANGUAGING PRACTICE IN THE CLASSROOM INTERACTION

Mujiono, Universitas Kanjuruhan Malang
moejie_nova73@yahoo.com

Abstract: This study was aimed at analyzing pedagogical discourse functions on translanguaging practiced by lecturers and students of English Education Department in classroom interaction at private universities in Malang. Further objective included investigating bilingual students' attitude toward translanguaging practice in classroom interaction. This study applied a combination of qualitative and quantitative research methods. The model used in this descriptive qualitative research was ethnography. Quantitative research method was intended to employ an inferential statistical application. The participants were 4 lecturers and 164 students of Department of English Education in two different private universities in Malang. They were selected by purposive sampling. To know pedagogical discourse functions, questionnaires, interviews, and classroom observation were employed. Classroom observations and interviews were audio-tape for students' cohort. Post hoc item analysis was employed to meet the requirement of validity and reliability since the instruments were not standard. The gathered data were analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively using the statistical software. The findings revealed that pedagogical discourse function on translanguaging in classroom interaction were (1) to reiterate utterances, (2) to motivate students, (3) to express anger, (4) to mock students, (5) to create humor, (6) to tease students, (7) to give question), and (8) to strengthen command. Also, the findings revealed that translanguaging practice was positively perceived by bilingual students and that significant difference in participant attitudes toward translanguaging practice was found, in terms of gender, age, and the first language (L1) for students 'cohort to the 5% degree of significance.

Keywords: pedagogical discourse functions, translanguaging, classroom interaction.

The classroom discourse stands for the language that teachers and students use to communicate with each other in the classroom activity. It gets more attention in language teaching in classroom due to communicative approach. The development of communicative approach (Mewald, 2015; Petkutė, 2010) motivates the experts to give more attention to the nature of verbal interaction (Janssen & Pieper, 2009) and norms of discourse. In general the use of spoken language is more often performed than writing in communication. Similarly happens to the interaction between lecturers and students in the classroom.

The lecturers generally implement the process of teaching in the classroom orally. Interaction in the learning in the classroom is clearly the context i.e. the lecturers deliver the lecture. The speech events happening at interaction between lecturers and students in the classroom is a good language usage which is interactional or transactional in nature. This relates to the use of language by lecturer in delivering lectures to students. Mujiono (2013) reports that in delivering a lecture from a foreign language, especially the language as a foreign language (EFL) in the classroom, lecturers often have difficulties. Since delivering the material to students, lecturer must be able to communicate an idea or ideas and views in order to be easily understood by the students.

To achieve this, then lecturer need strategies, both related to the language use or language choice and strategy of lecture, making it easier for students to understand. Dealing with the language use or language choice which is used in the process of university EFL classes, lecturers must use two languages or even more in delivering lectures. If there are students who do not know or understand of what it conveys in the process of English course, it is not uncommon for lecturers to alternate a language that is easily understood by students. The alternation of that language could be from the English Indonesian, or from the English to a foreign language to another or even other regional languages. Related to the use of or the alternation of two or more languages, Garcia (2014) calls it with translanguaging. The term translanguaging as defined by García (2009) describes the practice of the use of the language in which the boundaries of different languages that constantly crossed communication. Translanguaging have been used by García to indicate the actual language practices multilingual speakers, not from the perspective of language as a system, but as a daily experience where different sources of linguistic and non-linguistic to make meaning and reach an understanding.

Many scholars such (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Garcia,2009,2014, and Canagarajah, 2011) now recognize that the alternation of code generally runs in a multilingual context, not only because of the lack of knowledge in a specific language, but for a different communicative functions. Kramsch & Whiteside (2007) reports that multilingual speakers seem to manipulate their linguistic codes for building multicultural or

identity among themselves. Reyes (2004) calls it as executing a demanding cognitive task, or conveying the meaning of the idea (Zentella, 1997). Lin and Martin (2005) states that acts of translanguaging are not elicited by teachers through conscious pedagogical strategies. While Williams (2002) states that translanguaging refers to multilingual speakers' shuttling between languages in a natural way. Through the strategic planning of the class language that combines two or more languages in a manner that systematically in the same learning activity, translanguaging trying to help multilingual speakers in making meaning, experience and gain more indepth understanding and knowledge of the language used and even the content that is being taught (Cenoz & Gorter, 2011; Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012; Williams, 2002). García (2009) broadened the scope of translanguaging refers to a process involving several discursive practices, where students combine language school in their own linguistic repertoire freely and flexibly. The use of separately two or more languages for instruction and it is used together in complex combination.

The analysis of spoken language in classroom interactions is a discourse study. In the study conducted an analysis of spoken language in classroom interactions to see the function of discourse found in the practice of learning in the classroom. Critical discourse analysis is the application of the analysis of the discourse with interdisciplinary perspectives. As in Aman & Mustaffa (2006) classroom discourse refers to the type of language use or performance that is found in classroom situations.

Translanguaging practice happening in EFL classroom is also referred to as pedagogic discourse. According to Richards, et.al (1992) pedagogic discourse is different in form and function from language used in other situations due to the distinct social roles of students, teachers and the activities. Further they explain that analysis of classroom discourse is useful when examining the effectiveness of teaching methods and the types of student-teacher interaction. Meanwhile Chouliaraki (1998) states that textual features or pedagogic discourse contribute towards an understanding of the relationship between pedagogy and its practice. Classroom discourse seems to offer autonomy and opportunity to teaching and learning interaction between student-teacher and student-student; on a superficial level it appears pedagogically to be a social process that is par excellence (Aman & Mustaffa, 2006). Such translanguaging practice in the classroom makes possible situations in which learning becomes more fun. By implementing the alternation of two or more languages or applying translanguaging, student participation is active and the instruction activity in the classroom will be effective. In addition to such classroom atmosphere also lead teachers to fine-tune their speech according to students' proficiency. Dealing with above statement, Chouliaraki (1998) asserts that fine-tuning is essential in learning since it improves students' understanding. To expound the above idea, this study aims to analyze pedagogical discourse functions on translanguaging practice in EFL classroom.

Methods

Design of the Study

A combination of qualitative and quantitative research methods (mixed method) was applied in this study. The model used in this descriptive qualitative research was ethnography. Quantitative research method was intended to employ a quantitative computation an inferential statistical application.

Data and source of data

The data were linguistic units produced orally by the lecturers in the forms of, clauses and sentences containing translanguagingg from English to Indonesian or vice versa or the other way round. The sources of the data in this study were: (1) the informants: junior and senior lecturers who taught English related courses in semester three and five at the two universities, and (2) the places and events, in which the data were obtained by recording and observing the speech events that occurred in the English classrooms.

Participants

This study involved 4 English lecturers and 164 university students. The English teachers were categorized into junior and senior categories. They were categorized into junior lecturer when they had teaching experience of 15 years and senior one when they had teaching experience more than 10 or above years. The English teachers profile can be shown in table 1.

Table 1

The Profile of English lecturers

No	Category	Sub-category	Number
1	Junior	≤ 10 years	2
2	Senior	≥ 10 years	2

As shown in Table 1, there were 2 junior and 2 senior English lecturers. In terms of teaching experience, 2 English lecturers were categorized as junior and 2 as senior.

The 164 university students were categorized into three categories, namely in terms of gender age, and student's first language (L1). In terms of gender, the observed students were categorized into male and female students. In terms of students' age, they were categorized into young and old. And in terms of student's L1, they categorized into two, i.e. the students using Indonesian or other local languages.

Table 2
The Profile of University Students

No	Category	Sub-category	Number
1	Gender	Male	55
		Female	109
2	Age	Young old	89
		Indonesian	75
2	First Language (L1)	Local Language	65
			99

Table 2 revealed that there were 55 male and 109 female observed university students. In terms of L1, the students used Indonesian were 65 and for local language, 99. In the terms of age, young observed students is 89 and the old one is 75.

Data Collection

To collect the data of this study, questionnaires and classroom observation were applied. The questionnaires which were provided for 164 university students were designed in two parts. Part 1 contained 4 items. This part dealt with the date of birth, gender, L1 language used in the classroom, out of classroom. Part 2 contained 20 items, which dealt with students' language attitudes toward the use of translanguaging in classroom. These items were designed to elicit one of the responses, namely "strongly agree", "agree", "do not agree", "do not know", and "strongly disagree". The questionnaire employed in this study was provided for 164 university students. Post hoc item analysis was employed to meet the requirements of the validity and reliability of this instrument. The statistical software of SPSS, Cronbach's Alpha analysis was utilized for this study. It revealed that 20 items in part 2 which were designed for the students were valid and reliable. Classroom observation was applied to obtain data of translanguaging practice in classroom activity. Classroom sessions were audio recorded to ensure valid and reliable. Audio recording transcriptions were utilized to crosscheck the collected data.

Data Analysis

To analyze the gathered data, descriptive and inferential statistics were utilized. The data gathered through questionnaires were analyzed quantitatively with statistical software of SPSS. The a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was applied to examine whether there was any significant difference in participant attitudes toward translanguaging practice, in terms of gender, age, and the first language (L1).

Findings and Discussion

The pedagogical discourse function on translanguaging in classroom interaction were (1) to reiterate utterances, (2) to motivate students, (3) to express anger, (4) to mock students, (5) to create humor, (6) to tease students, (7) to give question), and (8) to strengthen command.

To Reiterate Utterances

The term of reiteration means emphasizing the point. It aims to reinforce intended message for the students. This can occur in the flow of English to Indonesian or vice versa. The reiteration can be in the form of intersentential or intra-sentential. The examples are presented in bold and italicized as shown in the following data excerpts.

(D:001)   L: predication, complementation, and [modification]
      S: [modification]
      L: right? With different elements (.) ***ya saya catat, mau tanya lagi?*** ('yes, I note,
         want to ask more?')

(D:002)　　L: where is the predicate?

　　　　　　L: **_coba dibaca! mana predikatnya?_** ('please read!, where is the predicate?')

　　　　　　S: the predicate is "see" Sir

　　　　Data excerpts (D:001) line 3 and data (D:002) line 2 show that the English teachers applied translanguaging to reiterate sentence in order to help the university students to understand the presented utterances. The reiteration can be in the form of English to Indonesian as shown in excerpts (D:001) to (D:002). This reason for the reiteration is to assist the university students understand what their lecturers are explaining about.

To Motivate Students

　　　　In an attempt to encourage students to speak English, English teachers motivate to university students not to be afraid of making mistakes while they are involved in English speaking. The English teachers apply translanguaging from English to Indonesian to facilitate university students to be actively involved in teaching and learning process. The following data excerpts describes translanguaging practice to motivate university students to speak English as bold and italicized form below.

(D:003) L: Ok, any other, EM (.) there are two contradicted opinions, I said (.) that animal
　　　　language is not part of linguistics, and the other. It is part of linguistics. Is it
　　　　right? S: yes sir,
　　　　T: Ok, Any jury, EM (.), what is it, the EM (.), A, in the middle position person?
　　　　No, no more ideas, **_mahasiswa sebaiknya (.) saya lebih bangga kepada_**
　　　　mahasiswa yang seharusnya membuat lima kesalahan karena menjawab
　　　　lima kali, dari pada mahasiswa yang membuat nol kesalahan karena sama
　　　　sekali tidak pernah menjawab, ya.('the students should… I am proud for
　　　　students who make five mistake due to answer five times than they make no
　　　　mistakes due to never answer at all.') S: yes sir,

　　　　Regarding to data excerpts (D:003), it is evident that translanguaging was practiced by English lecturers to motivate to university students to learn English. The flow of translanguaging was from English to Indonesian as in excerpts (D:003) line 6-9, it was effective and more easily understood by them.

To Express Anger

To express anger, English lecturer tent to practice translanguaging from English to Indonesian. By expressing anger in Indonesian, he expected that all students of the class know that he is angry. The following data excerpts indicate that translanguaging practice is used to express anger as shown in bold and italicized form below.

(D:004) L: So because this accent has been fossilized and also the (.) and accent of native
　　　　languages are influenced by fossilization too. I am sure, last time before
　　　　you study English, you had a good book and you say 'book good' YA, that
　　　　the grammar but then, that for young learner that their own grammar that
　　　　you just follow it. Oral medium.
　　　L:　what do you sense of oral?
　　　S:　((noisy))
　　　L: hello what is oral? **_yang dak baca saya tunjuk_**!('those who don't read, I point')

　　　　The above data shown that English lecturer practiced translanguaging from English to Indonesia to express his anger as shown in excerpts (D:004) line 9. Translanguaging practice from English to Indonesian was perceived to be powerful way for expressing his anger.

To Mock Students

The terms of mocking refers which is involved laughing at someone in a specific way. The English lecturer applies translanguaging in EFL classroom to mock students. The following data excerpts indicate that translanguaging practice is used to mock students as shown in bold and italicized form below.

(D:005)   L: Anyone who can say the dog song?
        S: ((laugh))
        L: YA, the dog sound.
        S: ((huk- huk))
        L: ((laugh))
        L: how about the cow?
        S: (Hoow-hoow)
        L: ***kasihan seumur hidup belum pernah ke kebun binatang ya?*** ('how pity you are,
          as long as you live never go to the zoo, isn't it'?)

      Dealing with the above data excerpts, it obvious that translanguaging practice was employed by English lecturer to mock students in order to be involved in instruction. The flow of translanguaging practice was from English to Indonesian as displayed in excerpts (D:008) line 8, it was effective way to make students to pay attention of the lesson.

To Create Humor
Translanguaging practice is also intended to create humorous classroom atmosphere in order to reduce students tension when they are dealing with English lesson. The example data were shown in the following bold and italicized form.

(D:006) T: I am going to read the text, and listen carefully. Please read after me. ***jadi baca setelah saya***
        ('so, read after me'), okay?
      S: Okay Sir,
      L: what's the title of this text?
      S: My cat Monthy Sir,
      L: Well, ***ada yang punya*** ('who does belong to') a cat ***di rumah*** ('in the house')?
      S: I am sir,
      L: ***ayo bisa tirukan suara*** ('let imitate the sound of') a cat?
      S and G: [tertawa bersama] ('laugh together')

      As the data excerpts (D:006) showed that translanguaging from English to Indonesian practiced by the English lecturer to create humor. The English lecturer had students imitate the sound of a cat. The observation showed that when the English lecturer ordered to students to imitate sound of cat, most of them were lough. Translanguaging practiced by English lecturer is intended to create a sense of humor in order to make the class more life and conducive.

To Tease Students
Teasing means making fun of students in order to encourage them to be involved in classroom interaction. In EFL classroom interaction, English lecturer tend to practice translanguaging from English to Indonesian to tease to students whether who are willing to participate in English instruction or who are not willing to pay to lecturer's instruction.

(D:007)   L: Now, let us read and study the following sentences. Do you understand class?
        S: understand sir,
        L: well, after reading the sentences, please discuss the form of the sentences with your friends.
          kalian faham ('do you understand')?
        S: ***ya pak*** ('yes sir')
        L: ***ada yang mau di tanyakan*** (is there any questions')?
        S: no sir,
        L: okay do it right now

      Dealing with the above data excerpts, it obvious that translanguaging practice was employed by English lecturer to tease his students in order to be involved in instruction. The flow of translanguaging practice was from English to Indonesian as displayed in excerpts (D:008) line 4 and 6, it was effective way and easily understood by his students.

To Give Question

To give question, English lecturer tent to practice translanguaging from English to Indonesian. By giving question in Indonesian, he expected that all students of the class know and pay attention. The following data excerpts indicate that translanguaging practice is used by the English teacher to give question as shown in bold and italicized form below.

(D:008) G: Okay, study the following text and pay attention ***perhatikan penggunaan*** ('notice the use of')
  simple pas, okay?
  M: Okay sir,
  G: Okay, let me give an example for you
  G: "It blank a bright and sunny Sunday morning". Okay, ***kata apa yang tepat setelah*** it ('what is
  the right word after it')? Anyone knows?
  M: was Sir,
  G: Okay good, and now please fill the following blank!
  G: Okay any questions?
  G: no Sir

The use of translanguaging from the English to Indonesia language as in above data due to the English lecturer wanted to give questions to students. Translanguaging practiced by English lecturer is intended to give question as in (D:008) line 5 and 6.

To Strengthen Command

Translaguanging from Englsih to Indonesian or vice versa is also intended to strengthen command. The example data excerpts of translaguaging practice was displayed in the following data as shown in bold and italicized form.

(D:009) L: Come here! ***ya*** ('yes').
  L: Read this! ***baca*** ('read') !
  S: "My father is the best father in the world"
  L: please read lauder ***baca yang keras*** ('read louder'), Okay go on!
  S: "He is fifty five years old"

The use of the translanguaging from the English to Indonesian as in shown (D: 009) line 4 in due to the English teacher want to strengthen the request or order to his students. The English teacher requested to students by repetition in Indonesian with a rather high intonation.

To further investigation whether there is a significant difference in each category, a two-way ANOVA was applied. The summary of the statistical analysis is presented in table 3.

Table 3 summary of a two-way ANOVA test of university students attitude toeard translanguaging to gender, age, and L1.

variable	The value observed of F	Degree of significance (0.05)
Gender	1.908	.1.69
Age	1.666	.1.99
L1	1.407	.237
Gender, age, and L1	4.558	.034

Referring to the above data, the conclusion is that there is a significant difference in the university students cohort in terms of gender, age, and L1 in relation to their attitudes toward translanguaging practice in the classroom. This finding indicates that the three variable; gender, age, and L1 do simultaneously significant affect the attitudes of university students cohort toward translanguaging practice in the classroom interaction to 5% degree of significance.

Discussion

The English teachers generally apply translanguaging in bilingual or even multilingual EFL classroom interaction. In delivering English materials, the English lecturers frequently have difficulties. One of the alternative ways is to use translanguaging as strategy of teaching. In terms of act of translanguaging, both

English lecturers and university students alternate two languages (English to Indonesian or vice versa) interchangeably. Many scholars such (Mujiono, 2013; Inuwa, 2014; Bista, 2010; Tabaeifar, 2014), they state that the alternation of two or more languages can be as communication strategy in classroom activities. To over their difficulties in delivering subject matter, the English lecturers usually use translanguaging from English to Indonesian.

The translanguaging practiced by the English teacher in EFL classroom at different points in the lesson can parallel develop the L1 and L2. Baker (2006) and Garcia (2009) explains that the use of two languages in parallel or they named translanguaging to develop language skills in both languages and contribute to in-deep comprehension of the subject being learned. In classroom interaction, the students can obtain the same understanding in both languages by which they are able to learn content knowledge in L1 and L2. With regard to Baker (2006) and Garcia (2009), it can be stated that by implementing translanguaging, the students have a good and complete understanding of the subject matter being learned, get development of their ability in language, can perform and produce in both languages, and can develop L2 competence. To develop student's L2 competence, translanguaging is applied.

Conclusion

The pedagogical discourse function on translanguaging in classroom interaction were (1) to reiterate utterances, (2) to motivate students, (3) to express anger, (4) to mock students, (5) to create humor, (6) to tease students, (7) to give question), and (8) to strengthen command. There is a significant difference in the university students cohort in the terms of gender, age, and L1 in relation to their attitudes toward translanguaging practice in the classroom. Three variables; gender, age, and L1 do simultaneously significant affect the attitudes of university students cohort toward translanguaging practice in the classroom interaction to 5% degree of significance.

References

Aman, I & Mustaffa, R. (2006). Classroom Discourse Of Malay Language Lesson: A Critical Analysis. *Jurnal eBangi. 1*, (1) 1-24.

Bista, K. (2010). Factors of Code Switching among Bilingual English Students in the University Classroom: A Survey. *Journal of English for Specific Purpose, 9* (29). 1-18.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *Modern Language Journal, 95*, 401-417.

Cenoz, J. & Gorter, D. (2011). A holistic approach to multilingual education: Introduction. *Modern Language Journal, 95*, 339-343.

Chouliaraki, L. 1998. Regulation in "progressive" pedagogic discourse: individualized teacher-pupil talk. *Discourse & Society*. 9 (1): 5-32.

Creese, A. & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching. *Modern Language Journal, 94*, 103-115.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Basil/Blackwell.

Garcia, O & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Inuwa YN, & Chhristopher AA. (2014).Factors Motivating Code Switching Within the Social Contact of Hausa Bilinguals . *IOSR Journal of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) 19* (3)*, 43-49. Retrieved 14th October, 2015 from http://iosrjournals.org/iosr-jhss/papers/Vol19-issue3/Version-5/I019354349.pdf

Janssen, T., & Pieper, I (2009). Empirical studies on verbal interaction and literary understanding. An annotated list of references. *L1 – Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 9* (1), 117-137.

Kramsch, C. & Whiteside, A. (2007). Three fundamental concepts in SLA and their relevance in multilingual contexts. *Modern Language Journal, 91*, 905-920.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and conceptualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18*, 655-670.

Lin, A. M. Y., & Martin, P. (2005). (Eds.). Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in education policy and practice. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Mewald, C. (2015). Lexical Range and Communicative Competence of Learners in Bilingual Schools in Lower Austria. Global Education Review. *2* (2). 98-113.

Mujiono. (2013). The Use of Code Switching in English Instruction at Universities *International Journal of Linguistics (IJL) 5* (2), 46-65. Retrieved 16th October, 2015 from

http://www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/ijl/article/view/3561/pdf. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/ 10.5296/ijl.v5i2.3561

Petkutė, R. (2010).The Communicative Competence of The Language Teacher?. *Coactivity: Philology, Educology .18* (2), 77-84.

Reyes, I. (2004). Functions of code switching in schoolchildren's conversations. *Bilingual Research Journal, 28* (1), 77-98.

Richards, J.C. et.al. (1992). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics.* Essex: Longman.

Tabaeifard, S.J. (2014). A Closer Look at the Reasons behind Code-switching Used by an Iranian EFL Teacher Action research: A case study. *Global Journal of Science, Engineering and Technology*. Issue (15). 9-12. Retrieved 5th August, 2015 from *http://www.gjset.org/*

Zentella, A.C. (1997). *Growing Up Bilingual*. Maiden, MA: Blackwell.

Williams, C. (2002). Extending bilingualism in the education system. *Education and lifelong learning committee ELL-06-02*. Retrieved from ELL http://www.assemblywales.org/3c91c7af00023d820000595000000000.pdf