English Language Teaching Educational Journal
Vol. 9, No. 2, August 2026, pp. 416-430
ISSN 2621-6485

'(.) Which picture↑ gambar yang mana?': Micro context analysis of Indonesian EFL teachers' spontaneous translanguaging

Hellien Jequelin Loppies [a,b,1]*, Yazid Basthomi [a,2], Nunung Suryati [a,3], Siti Muniroh [a,4], Yudha Aprizani [a,c,5]

[a] Universitas Negeri Malang, Jl. Semarang No. 5, Sumbersari, Kec. Lowokwaru, Kota Malang, Jawa Timur 65145, Indonesia
[b] Universitas Pattimura, Jl. Ir. M. Putuhena, Kampus Poka, Ambon 97233, Maluku, Indonesia
[c] Universitas Islam Kalimantan Muhammad Arsyad AlBanjari, Jl Adiyaksa, Banjarmasin, Kalimantan Selatan, Indonesia
[1] hellien.loppies@lecturer.unpatti.ac.id*, [2] ybasthomi@um.ac.id, [3] nunung.suryati.fs@um.ac.id, [4] siti.muniroh.fs@um.ac.id; [5] yudha.aprizani.2302219@students.um.ac.id

*Corresponding author

ARTICLE INFO

Article history
Received 31 May 2026
Revised 15 October 2026
Accepted 31 October 2026
Available Online 06 November 2026

Keywords
EFL classroom interactions
Micro contexts
Spontaneous translanguaging

ABSTRACT

Synthesizing pedagogical functions of teachers' translanguaging practices within micro contexts in second language (L2) classroom interactions is prominently critical, particularly in multilingual EFL teaching contexts where the dearth of such analysis is obvious. This study employed conversation analysis (CA) and the self-evaluation of teacher-talk (SETT) schema to elucidate translanguaging forms and functions from four teaching sessions of three secondary Indonesian EFL teachers. The data reveals that combinations of translanguaging and trans-semiotizing practices were identified in materials as well as skills and systems modes which English linguistic constructions and meaning making procedures were also observable. The dominant use of cross-linguistic translanguaging functions to instructional checking and task procedure explanation mainly appeared within managerial mode. The discussions include insights that EFL teachers' spontaneous translanguaging pedagogically adjusts to learners' communicative readiness and instructional demands which also considers supportive to L2 knowledge constructions. Suggestion for future research includes a prominent indication for supportive professional development and the influence of teachers' classroom interactional competence (CIC) and their translanguaging practices variation across learners' English proficiency level.

© The Authors 2026. Published by Universitas Ahmad Dahlan.
This is an open access article under the CC–BY-SA license.

How to Cite: Loppies, H. J., Basthomi, Y., Suryati, N., Muniroh, S., & Aprizani, Y. (2026). '(.) Which picture↑ gambar yang mana?': Micro context analysis of Indonesian EFL teachers' spontaneous translanguaging. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal, 9*(2), 416-430. https://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v9i2.16562

1. Introduction

While global multilingual research trends have embraced translanguaging as a recognized pedagogical approach, it is rarely adopted as a planned instructional design in the multilingual English as foreign language (EFL) teaching contexts. Instead, in such contexts, translingual practices are commonly observed as spontaneous, natural occurrences driven by fluid nature of human communication system (Anderson, 2024b; Canagarajah, 2011). In such circumstances, spontaneous translanguaging (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021) plays significant roles to facilitate real time interactional exchanges to accomplish the intended pedagogical goals (Rabbidge, 2025). Nevertheless, analyzing how these fluid practices are enacted in classroom social contexts remains under-explored, particularly in the teaching of EFL where monolingual norms pedagogically dominate (Huang & Chalmers, 2023; Zhang et al., 2025). Addressing this empirical gap requires closer synthesis to the dynamic features of classroom discourse, which

according to Li (2017) and Walsh (2013), relies heavily on context-specific interactional demands. Within EFL settings in Indonesia for example, the interactional exchanges are particularly complex in secondary school contexts where both teachers and students commonly practice cross linguistic communication, moving fluidly between local dialects and Bahasa Indonesia as national lingua franca (Liando et al., 2023; Permana & Rohmah, 2024; Rasman, 2018). Despite these multilingual realities, both English language teacher education and national curriculum standards keep advocating to monolingual target language pedagogy (Zein, 2020). The mismatch between educational policy and contextual multilingual realities creates tension between pedagogical expectations and classroom practices, resulting in marginalization of Indonesian multilinguals' linguistic capacity to support pedagogical approach to scaffold EFL learning. If this circumstance is not significantly synthesized, it is presumably predicted that facilitating L2 learning by activating learners' multimodal and multilingual repertoire could not be pedagogically addressed within the EFL teaching contexts like in Indonesia, a multilingual nation-state with over than 700 local languages throughout the country (Anderson, 2024a; Cummins, 2021; Li, 2018; Rasman & Santoso, 2025).

Existing translanguaging studies in the Indonesian EFL contexts have disseminated various domains on essential issues, yet the analyses persist heavily in a macro-level approach. Prior translanguaging analysis have extensively documented types of linguistic categorization (Afriadi, 2021; Liando et al., 2023), ideological resistance to translanguaging practices (Rasman, 2018; Rasman & Margana, 2022; Santoso & Hamied, 2022), general participants' attitudes towards translanguaging practices from different educational levels (Riswanto, 2022; Sahib, 2019; Sahib et al., 2020; Sapitri et al., 2018; Sari & Nurhikmawati, 2025) and discussions over its pedagogical functions in online learning settings (Emilia & Hamied, 2022; Umam et al., 2023). Respectively, these studies have established the pedagogical orientation towards translanguaging practices. Nonetheless, the analysis depends largely on general interviews, teachers' post-hoc reflections and inventories of collective corpus on linguistic code-switching types. As a result, a substantial empirical gap remains, leaving the paucity of momentary spontaneous translingual interactions insufficiently explored. Furthermore, the current body of research remains limited on its geographical coverage, providing little understanding on peripheral regions such as Maluku which is completely understudied despite its exceptional linguistic complexity (Collins, 2018; Zein et al., 2020).

Maluku represents a diverse linguistic landscape which Ambonese Malay serves as the regional dialect alongside minority indigenous languages and Bahasa Indonesia as formal lingua franca. This multilingual ecology creates particular challenges for secondary English teachers in rural areas where monolingual target language pedagogy may create tension with translingual realities and limited opportunities for authentic English use (Loppies & Patty, 2024). Without careful empirical investigations, such tension risks context-insensitive pedagogical approaches and unfavorable perceptions of translingual in English learning. Therefore, we argue that leaving fluid dynamics of in situ momentary EFL classroom translingual practices understudied may lead to speculative classroom data-driven evidence that may result to inappropriate decision making to address pedagogical translanguaging in second language (L2) learning (Jing & Kitis, 2023). For this reason, analyzing classroom discourse in multilingual EFL teaching context such as in Indonesia has yet to substantively uncover in what ways teachers' spontaneous translingual practices are functionally organized and how the mechanisms inform pedagogical translanguaging within multilingual EFL teaching contexts. With this view in mind, our study intendedly addresses the following questions:

1. What forms of translanguaging practices do EFL Indonesian teachers perform within micro contexts during classroom interactions?
2. How do Indonesian EFL teachers' translanguaging practices pedagogically function within micro contexts during classroom interactions?

2. Method

2.1. Study context and data collection

This study employed a case study and the data was collected from four teaching sessions (each was around 90 minutes) in three secondary schools in West Seram, Maluku, Indonesia. Three EFL teachers participated in our study. They were purposively recruited and voluntarily agreed to take part in this study after reviewing the ethical consent approval by the authors' institutions. They were selected because they

met the recruitment criteria such as at least five years of teaching experiences, multilingual speakers, teaching groups of multilingual learners and reside in West Seram, Maluku. The learners are groups of secondary school learners who start learning English as a foreign language in grade 7 which accords to the educational policy applied in the Indonesian school curriculum. The learners come from various societal background including minority ethnics in West Seram and Javanese transmigrants reside in that region. The learners agreed to be video recorded during the data collection sessions, with the informed ethical consent verified by each school leader. Therefore, every identified individual in the selected data extract is anonymous for confidentiality. Table 1 summarizes the teacher demographic data and the nature of the observed lessons.

Table 1. Participants' demographic and transcribed data recordings

Teacher	Linguistic background	School level taught	Video recordings	Teacher
T1 (Female)	L1-Ambonese Malay L2-Bahasa Indonesia L3-English	7th grade	90 mins (Video)	Writing
T2 (Female)	L1-Ambonese Malay L2-Bahasa Indonesia L3-English	11th grade	120 mins (Video)	Writing/speaking
T3 (Female)	L1-Ambonese Malay L2-Bahasa Indonesia L3-English	10th grade	90 mins (Video)	Speaking

2.2. Analytical framework: The self-evaluation of teacher talk (SETT) and conversation analysis (CA)

In this study, the data was analyzed using the self-evaluation of teacher talk (SETT) framework and the conversation analysis (CA). The SETT framework (Walsh, 2006, 2013) provides tools for teachers to (self)-reflect their classroom interactions. SETT framework (Walsh, 2006), enables the coded data to be categorized into four 'micro-contexts (or micro discourse) within the overall classroom discourse' (Jing & Kitis, 2023, p.4520). The SETT framework consists of two praxes: (1) the four modes (managerial, materials, skills and system, and classroom contexts modes) which are defined as "L2 classroom micro-contexts which has a clearly defined pedagogical goal and distinctive interactional features determined largely by a teacher's use of language" (Walsh, 2006, p.62), and (2) the interactional features or so-called interactants are the specific conversational behaviors, language functions, and strategies used by teachers to shape learners' contributions, manage turn-taking, and organize classroom discourse. These features are the practical tools teachers use to mediate learning, and they are inextricably linked to the teacher's pedagogical goals at any given moment.

Meanwhile, the CA coding scheme is categorized into four elements namely; adjacency pair, repair, turn taking and intonation. Adjacency pairs consist of at least two moves, the FPP and SPP which are the minimal basic units of an interaction. Schegloff (2007) mentions that inserted sequences may also appear within (insert expansions) or after (post expansions) the adjacency pairs. Insert expansions denotes two types: the 'post first inserts' which refers to clarification move as there may be problems with hearing or understanding the FPP. In contrast, 'pre-second inserts' describes expansions to establish sequences by utilizing resources to accomplish delay SPP. Post expansions denote subsequent moves following delays or absence of SPP as a result of trouble resources that may cause breakdown. Repair refers to the practices employed by participants in talk-in-interaction to deal with trouble or problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding the talk (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). In CA, repair is much more applicable to relate any trouble instead of correction which usually refers to treat a speaker's factual error or mistake (Schegloff, 2007). Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) categorize the varieties of repair to the initiation of repair and the actual repair. The first is self-initiated self-repair which means that both the initiation and repair are executed by the trouble source. The second is the other-initiated self-repair indicates that the repair is accomplished by the trouble source but is initiated by other. Timing elements such as pause and waiting time also gestures or verbal expressions to 'promote the same turn' (Jing & Kitis, 2023, p.4522) are classified as non-verbal features. Meanwhile, intonation denotes to paralinguistic elements (Tai, 2023) such as falling or rising pitch in the data analysis.

2.3. Data analysis procedure

Following Zuo and Walsh (2023), the procedure for analyzing the data includes three steps. The first step adopts Stivers' (2015) CA-grounded formal coding approach to detect the SETT modes and to allow translanguaging instances to be grouped into data subsets, emerging from participants' interactions. In this way, the dataset was not intended to be imposed towards the predetermined SETT categories, therefore keeping the process remains true to emic perspective of CA principles. The second step applies the 'unmotivated looking' (Schegloff, 2007) of CA approach. In this process, the translanguaging instances were analyzed from CA perspective and was not dictated by mode classification in step 1. Finally, in step 3, CA analysis on the selected translanguaging episodes was undertaken across modes. During this process, comparing relevant instances of translanguaging occurrences between modes enables identification to determine translanguaging forms and functions within participants' interactions. The data was transcribed using Jefferson's (2004) CA convention (see appendix A) with a total transcription of 5 hours and is aligned to Seedhouse's (2004) minimum requirements of at least 4-6 hours to conduct CA analysis. The transcribing process was done manually since the materials consist of multiple linguistic resources including Ambonese Malay, Bahasa Indonesia, English and non-linguistic clues (e.g gesture, gaze, eye contact). To check that the transcribed coded data was confirmable, the transcripts were reviewed multiple times by different coders to ensure accuracy and to check against the original recordings with the participants in order to preserve their actual language uses. In addition, the analytical memo writing and an audit of CA convention was regularly discussed between coders both during transcription processes and data interpretation.

3. Findings and Discussion

Our analysis of all the video recordings confirms typical teacher-initiated interaction dynamics with Bahasa Indonesia as the dominant linguistic code use when teachers conduct cross linguistic translanguaging (Cummins, 2021). For this reason, L1 in the data analysis refers to teachers' use of Bahasa Indonesia. Data analysis reveals that the pedagogical functions of translanguaging in EFL Indonesian classrooms can be linked through several embedded key interactional features during micro context of classroom interactions framing within the SETT modes and CA analytical tools. Also, all translanguaging instances presented below were derived from three SETT modes- managerial, materials, skills and systems contexts while in classroom context mode, interaction was absent.

3.1. In Managerial Mode

a) Dominant use of L1 to check for instructions and to explain task procedures

Managerial mode refers to management and organization of a lesson and is characterized by teachers' monologue to orient learners to classroom activities and to manage task completion (Walsh, 2006). The patterns of interactional sequences in this mode reveal that teachers tend to use L1 predominantly to check for understanding of instructions and to reexplain task procedures when learners failed to respond with preferred actions after the instruction was delivered in English. For example, data in extract 1 was situated in T2's writing lesson which shows that the pedagogical orientation in this extract is to set up learners to do a jumbled paragraph activity. The adjacency pairs began when the teacher drew the learners' attention to complete first task (lines 1-5). The repair mechanisms, shown by waiting time (lines 6-7) subsequently following T2's use of L1 to check for comprehension of the given instruction, indicates troubles which is demonstrated by the absence or delay of learners' responses.

The occurrences of translanguaging practice by T2's to employ Bahasa Indonesia (lines 6-7) may be an indicative of self-repair strategy as learners' absence of preferred SPP signifies repair initiation (Schegloff, 2007). Interestingly, even though T2's translanguaging practice could be said successful to enable learners to realign with the interactional agenda, as can be seen by learners' response to read aloud the instruction for the first task (line 8), T2's code mixing practice combined with eye contact (line 9) functions as pre second insert to clarify understanding of the task instruction, implying that the preferred SPP has not been accomplished (Schegloff, 2007). Consequently, T2 initiated translanguaging use of L1 to explain the task procedure (lines 11-16) as learners' silence indicate teachers to self-repair the trouble of misunderstanding. Respectively, analyzing the sequential organization of teachers' translanguaging practices in this extract has demonstrated that dominant use of L1 combine with paralinguistic cues like eye contact and actions like waiting time (i.e. pause) demonstrates teachers' attempts to ensure that learners comprehend the task procedures.

Extract 1

Line	Participant	Classroom discourse	Translation in English (Commentary)
1	T2	(.) okay attention please::	
2		(0.3) the first instruction	
3		(.) you have to arrange (.) the following	
4		jumbled paragraph (.) into a good analytical	
5		exposition text	
6		**(0.8) Aktifitas pertama:: ↑**	(0.8) The first activity:: ↑
7		**(0.5) kamu bikin apa:**	(0.5) What are you going to do?
8	Ss	[Arrange= the jumbled paragraph]. *((learners read the instructions from their worksheets)).*	
9	T2	**Apa itu arra::nge↑**	What is arrange?
10		(0.5) huh:: *((conduct eye contact to check for comprehension))*	
11		(1.5) **Jumbled paragraph adalah paragraph (.)**	(1.5) Jumbled paragraphs are
12		**yang tidak bera:: ↑turan↓**	paragraphs which are not correctly
13		**(0.3) tugas kalian adalah::**	order.
14		**kalian akan mengurutkan paragraf-paragraf**	(0.3) Your task is to reorder the
15		**ini**	paragraphs
16		**(.)menjadi teks yang bera:: ↑turan↓**	into a good text

b) L1 reformulation signifies the shifts from lexical knowledge checking to task-related elaboration

Apart from the facts that teachers dominantly use L1 for managing instructions, it is evident that teachers repeatedly reformulate L1 to elaborate task procedures. Extract 2 shows an instance of how T1 shifts from code mixing to L1 reformulation in order to orient learners to task completion. As can be seen, there is an occurrence of code mixing in T1's communicative practice (line 1) which functions to check for lexical knowledge *"introduce"*. The use of L1 expression *"sudah tahu (tr. you know already, right?)"* with rising intonation and conducting eye contact could be a sign of confirmation check feature which primarily appears in managerial mode (Walsh, 2006). Notably, having provided brief waiting time (lines 2-3), T1 took back the turn as the delay response on the part of the learners result in the teacher's practice of code mixing (line 3) and L1 use (line 4) to reformulate the confirmation check question. This reformulation strategy may be an indicative of self-repair approach, highlighting that the preferred SPP had not been achieved.

Extract 2

Line	Participant	Classroom discourse	Translation in English (Commentary)
1	T1	**sudah tahu** introduce in English↑ *((conducting eye contacts to check for learners' understanding))*	You know already the word introduce in English, right?
2		(0.3) ehm	
3		(0.8) **In Bahasa Indonesia**	(0.8) What's introduce in Bahasa Indonesia
4		**itu apa:: ↑**	
5	Ss	(0.5) **Perkenalkan:: ↑**	(0.5) Introduce
6	T1	(.) **Nah, diperkenalkan dulu**	(.) So, you introduce first
7		**Objek apa**	Which object
8		**yang mau describe itu**	that you want to describe

A further observation shows that learners confirm their positive knowledge on that particular lexis by providing equivalent translation into L1 (line 5). This preffered SPP immediately follows T1's L1 reformulation to elaborate the task orientation signified by the L1 transitional marker *"nah (tr. so)"* (line 6). This extract shows that code mixing practice combining with paralinguistic cues (i.e eye contact, rising intonation) and transitional marker in L1 enables the teachers to not only check for lexical knowledge but also to mark the shift for further elaboration of task completion.

3.2. In materials mode

a) Linking learners' prior experiences to visual materials through translanguaging and multimodal practices

It is worth noting that within materials mode, translanguaging practices appear to link learners' prior knowledge to visual materials. Extract 3 is an example of how T2's multiple linguistic practices and

multimodal communicative resources support meaning making negotiation to connect learners past experiences to the materials. In line 4, T2 initiated adjacency pairs by combining linguistic and multimodal practice (i.e gesture) that invites learners to associate their personal experiences with the materials. Despite the ungrammatical target language production on the part of the teacher, learners' collective response '*pernah* (*tr. have ever)*' (line 5) may demonstrate prior encounter meaning with the question. Subsequently, T2 echoed '*pernah* (*tr. have you ever*)' (line 6) with rising intonation functions to keep the ongoing interactions relevant as the teacher signposted the confirmation check (Walsh, 2006). Building on this exchange, the interactional progresses to translanguaging practices when the teacher particularly translated the prompt *'which picture'* (line 9) into L1 equivalent (line 10) following her attempts to establish learners' experiential knowledge in order to clarify specific visual referent (line 11).

Extract 3

Line	Participant	Classroom discourse	Translation in English (Commentary)
1	T2	look at the picture	
2		(.) Can you see?	
3	Ss	[Yes, ma'am::]	
4	T2	Have you ever go there: ↑	
		((Pointing to the picture on the slides))	
5	Ss	**[pernah ma'am::]**	[Yes we have]
6	T2	**pernah:: ↑**	Have you:: ↑
7	Ss	Yes ma'am::	
8	T2	(0.5) ehhm, (°wh=a) err (0.3)	
9		(0.2) Which picture↑	
10		**Gambar yang mana (.)**	Which picture (.)
11		**yang pernah kamu kunjungi:↑**	That you've ever visited:↑
12	Ss	(0.8) The first one. [first. Third]	

It is therefore plausible to argue that within materials mode, visual referent may function as one of multimodal tools (Wang & Yu, 2026), combining with teachers' linguistic and non-linguistic translanguaging practices to establish eliciting strategy to link learners' prior knowledge to the materials (Tai, 2024).

b) Extending learners' L1 contribution to elicit target language response

It is notable from several interactional instances that by building on learners L1 contribution, teachers conducted scaffolding techniques to progress any relevant sequential organization across modes. In contrast to the practice of reformulating learners' L1 use in managerial mode (see extract 2), the instance in extract 4 shows that T1 extended learners' L1 responses to elicit target language use related to the materials.

Extract 4

Line	Participant	Classroom discourse	Translation in English (Commentary)
1	T1	Take a look:: at this picture. *((pointing to the picture on the powerpoint slide))*	
2		(0.5) Do you: know her↑	
3	Ss	**[Tau ma'am]**	(.) [we do know]
4		(.) Taylor Swi::ft↑	
5	T1	Who is she:: ↑	
6	Ss	**[Penyanyi::]**	[singer]
7	T1	**Penyanyi in English::↑**	Singer in English:: ↑
8	Ss	Singer::	
9	T1	Singer (.) Okey	
10		(.) **Dia seora::ng penyanyi** ↓	(.) She is a sing::er↓
11		(0.8) Taylor Swift is a singer	
12		**(.) Apa lagi yang kalian**	(.) What else that you know about her:: ↑
13		**tahu tentang dia::↑**	
14		**(1.2) Tadi bilang she is a singer (.)** Okey	(1.2) You said before that she is a singer
15		(.) What el::se↑ **Apa lagi::↑**	↑ what else::↑
16	S1	(0.10) She is single↓	

Prior to line 10 where the teacher provided feedbacks to learners' L1 contribution (line 6), the initiation response feedback (IRF) sequences (lines 1-8) demonstrate the teacher's effort to elicit learners' prior knowledge while also check for vocabulary understanding (line 7). Rather than treating learners' L1 responses as endpoints, T1 extended these contributions (lines 10–11), creating an interactional opportunity to model and elicit the target-language form (Walsh, 2006). This sequence illustrates how translanguaging can serve as a resource for pedagogical scaffolding, when the teacher linked learners' existing linguistic resources to the target-language demands of the task. Furthermore, T1's extended turn (lines 9–15) reveals the sequential relationship between the teacher's preceding interactional moves and the subsequent pedagogical work, highlighting how the teacher's use of multiple linguistic resources contributes to the progression of classroom interaction (Schegloff, 2007). Particularly, T1's response pursuit (lines 12-13) functions to renew the turn design to sustain the elicitation procedures which finally results in S1's subsequent target language production (line 16). It is therefore, reasonable to contend that T1's translanguaging practice in this extract provides evidence on how multiple linguistic practices are embedded in elicitation procedures.

3.3. In skills and systems mode

a) Dominant use of L1 to initiate repair sequences and to provide explicit instructions on English linguistic points

The translanguaging occurrences in skills and systems mode shows various utilization of multi linguistic and multimodal resources which also denotes to target language linguistic constructions, particularly in developing phonological awareness.

Extract 5

Line	Participant	Classroom discourse	Translation in English (Commentary)
1	T3	how old are you?	
2	S1	(0.8) <I am fift=ty =ears old>	
3	T3	Are you fifty? ↑	
4	S1	**<Iyaa::>**	<Yes::>
		((The learner seemed hesitate to confirm))	
5	T3	Are you fifty::? ↑	
6	S1	(0.3) =ehmm, no. no	
		((while shaking her hands))	
7	Ss	[no::]	
8	T3	(1.3) So, [ma'am fifty] ya::	
9		(.) and you::, how old are you?	
10	S1	I am fif=ty =ers old	
		((The learner seemed unsure))	
11	T3	(0.8) I am fifty. Fif:ty.	
12		**(.) Fifty tuh berapa?**	(.) How many is it fif:ty?
13	Ss	**[lima belas;;]**	[fiftee::n)
14	T3	Ehmm no::. It's me.	
15		**Ma'am lima belas tahun?** ↑	Am I fifteen? ↑
16	S1	Ehhm no:: no::	
		((Negating hand gesture showing that she was making mistake))	
17	T3	**oh, masa saya lima belas tahun?**	Oh, am I fifteen?
18		(0.8) Oh, thank you ya↑	
19		**sangat muda sekali saya::**	I am so young, really::
20		(1.3) okey..**nah..**I am fifty four years old.	(1.3) so..
21		and you, (.) how old are you?	
22	S1	<fiftee::n)> [fifte;;n]	
		((some learners were echoing what S1 was saying))	
23	T3	**(0.5) Ingat. Kalau yang ti; ti: itu puluhan,**	(0.5) Remember. If the final sound is
24		**(.) yang tin, tin itu balasan**	ti::ti::, that refers to tens. If it is tii:n,
25		**Iya:: ↑ ya**	tii:n, that refers to teens
26		**(0.3) jadi, kalau kamu dengar kata**	Right:: ↑ yes
27		(.) teen:: teen;;ager teen::: ager::	(0.3) so, if you listen to the word
28		**Itu berarti kamu berada di usia remaja,**	that means you are in the
29		(.) teen:ager.	age of teens

The translanguaging discourse primarily functions as scaffolding techniques to initiate repair sequences and to provide explicit explanation on a particular L2 forms and meanings. Extract 5 explicitly shows that translanguaging mediates phonological scaffolding when T3 conducted real-time form reconstruction to help the learners differentiate final sound /tI/ in fifty and /ti:n/ in fifteen. The dispreferred SPP produced by S1 (line 2) signifies the beginning of interactional occurrences to meaning making process and L2 linguistic construction which was not only facilitated through multiple linguistic practices but also multimodal resources. The dominant CA features are repair to trouble segments, featured intonation and waiting time. Line 5 is an example of T3's other-initiated self-repair signaling error awareness following S1's response in line 4. The rising tone in line 5 displays a multi-sensory resource towards repair to trouble fragment towards S1's response which functions as clarification request on the inquiry in line 3 (Walsh, 2006). It is clear that S1 realized that there was an error (line 6) but her insufficient phonological knowledge to differentiate and produce correct final sound /ti:n/ in fifteen invites the teacher to negotiate the meaning in L2 through an extended turn (lines 8-9) after a brief pause, indicating an attempt to create opportunities for learners to process the information (Tai, 2026). Nonetheless, this quite significant pause had not successfully facilitated the correct phonological production. This activates T3's translanguaging instinct to utilize L1 (line 12) to check for the learners' phonological knowledge on final sound /tI/ in fifty. The learner's incorrect response in line 13 was followed by T3's feedback (lines 14-15), particularly in line 15 where she translanguaged in L1 confirms that utilizing multiple linguistic resources may be pedagogically supportive to provide space for a situated communicative practice which pedagogical significance depends on the interactional context in which it occurs (Tai, 2026). Interestingly, T3 also created a safe space for repair (lines 17-19) by humorously recasting the error within the translanguaging space which may also function to reduce anxiety and promote metalinguistic reflection (Ebrahimi & Chowdhury, 2025; Rabbidge, 2025). The preferred SPP was finally accomplished in line 22 followed by T3's metalinguistic explanation through L1 (see lines 23-28) which may function to provide reflection over phonological features, form and meaning to develop phonological awareness. This confirms Alqefari's (2024) assertion on the essential role of translanguaging practice to support linguistic awareness. To conclude, the translanguaging discourse in skills and systems mode primarily functions as repair practices and to provide explicit explanation on a particular L2 forms and meanings. While it is clear that teachers' translingual practices adjust accordingly to the interactional demands in each mode, the momentary exchanges show the interplay between various multimodal communicative resources including cross linguistic translanguaging and trans-semiotizing realities. Table 2 is the summary of pedagogical functions and forms of teachers' translanguaging practices in each mode.

Table 2. Indonesian EFL teachers' translanguaging functions and forms within mode

Mode	Translanguaging functions	Translanguaging forms
Managerial	To check for instruction	Extensive L1 use
	To explain task procedures	Code mixing
	To ensure that the task instructions are accessible	Code switching
	To check for English lexical knowledge	Paralinguistic cues
Materials	To link learners' background knowledge to materials	L1 confirmation check
	To check for English lexical knowledge	translation
	To promote learners' engagement and participation	Code mixing
		Gestures
		Paralinguistic cues
Skills and systems	To address repair sequences	L1 explanation
	To check for English linguistic knowledge	Code mixing
	To provide explicit instructions on target language linguistic points	Paralinguistic cues

Despite the lack of reliable studies on translanguaging analysis in EFL teaching contexts (Huang & Chalmers, 2023), our study, even though reporting only observation from three teacher participants, has provided insights of translanguaging procedures by non-native multilingual EFL teachers. Several key points can be derived from the analysis of micro interactional features framing within the SETT and CA frameworks.

First, teachers' translanguaging practices confirm that spontaneous occurrences create spaces (Li, 2018) to accommodate pedagogical goals which not only create opportunities for learners to process information but also provides spaces for non-native multilingual EFL teachers to discover their strengths as multilingual users of English (Rabbidge, 2025) to facilitate English learning to be accessible to their learners. Second, with secondary Indonesian EFL learners, teachers' translanguaging was manifested in three distinct micro contexts of SETT modes- managerial, materials also skills and systems- in which extensive L1 use dominate teachers' translanguaging practices in managerial mode, while the combination of multiple linguistic resources and para linguistic clues like gesture and rising intonation are mostly comprised within materials as well as skills and system modes. Third, the functions of EFL teachers' translanguaging were realized through different CA interactional linguistic mechanisms including gestures, inserting sequences, waiting time and repair practices. This dynamic accentuates Canagarajah (2011) and Li's (2018) arguments about individuals' multi competence (Anderson, 2024a) which should be taken into consideration when analyzing multilinguals' capacity to communicate their thought in their daily social interactions.

Our data confirms that EFL teachers' translanguaging practices facilitate pedagogical orientation as this practice emerges in the process of meaning making during classroom interaction. Like Zuo and Walsh (2023), findings from our study context confirm that scrutinizing translanguaging as a means of communication practice of non-native English teachers provides transformative nuances in approaching L2 classroom interactions. As evidenced from the data (see extract 3, 4 and 5), the translanguaging mechanisms underscore the usage-based theory which may promisingly encourage linguistic construction that is considered essential in promoting opportunities for L2 learning (Rabbidge, 2025). As multilinguals, our teacher-participants dynamically utilize their multiple linguistic resources (i.e Bahasa Indonesia, English) also non-linguistic elements (i.e intonation, gestures) during classroom interactions which pedagogically aim to respond to the dynamics classroom discourses and to mediate English language learning process. In extract 5 for example, T3 creatively utilized linguistic and para linguistic clues (i.e rising intonation and L1 use) to negotiate the meaning and forms of English lexis. This situation describes real-life interactions (Ramasamy & Zainal, 2023) among multilingual teachers and learners in which the dynamic and fluid use of their multilinguistic and multimodal repertoires becomes meaningfully utilized to co-construct linguistic knowledge of the target language. In addition, the interactional dynamics were dominated by repeated exposure to input (for example, see lines 3-8 in extract 5) in the target language and confirmation check for target language point through L1. Another noteworthy analytical data also reveals that the non-standard target language used by T2 in extract 3 (see line 4) describes real-life interactions in EFL classrooms. This is also a proof that translanguaging may conceivably provide opportunities for emergent multilingual teachers to develop skills and expertise to deal with their context-specific circumstances (Anderson, 2024b; Rabbidge, 2025) regardless of their English proficiency level. Rabbidge (2025) contends that as emergent multilingual (EML) speakers, EFL teachers develop their multi competence to negotiate meaning and co-construct target language knowledge learning despite of their limited English competence, particularly in global-south contexts where English teachers are mostly non-native speakers and proficiency level is an issue.

Relating to the conflicting debates between adopting pedagogical translanguaging and the needs to provide ample target language exposure to develop English learners' target language proficiency in the EFL teaching contexts (e.g. Renandya & Chang, 2022), findings from our study suggests that teachers' spontaneous translanguaging practices could be seen as interactional scaffolding techniques to adjust with learners' communicative readiness and instructional demands. This means that the occurrences of translanguaging spontaneity within EFL teachers classroom discourse should not be merely seen to diminish the potential role of exposure to target language proficiency. For example, the interplay between multi linguistic and multi modal repertoires to negotiate meaning in materials as well as skills and systems mode implies efforts to activate learners' engagement with target language inputs and outputs. This reality of course may not indicate a significant special of analysis towards learners' target language proficiency development as what is expected by Renandya and Chang (2022). However, they may serve as examples of English communicative realities between non-native speakers of English in real-life contexts (Anderson, 2024b). In this sense, we believe that the natural occurring of translanguaging mechanism among non-native English teachers and their learners should not be perceived as a deficit to the target language proficiency development. Conversely, it is plausible to suggest that teachers' translanguaging occurrences could also create opportunities for English language learning within multilingual EFL teaching contexts, particularly when interacting with learners who have limited experiences and knowledge to utilize in English in their daily communicative practices (Jing & Kitis, 2023). By building

on the dynamic interactional exchanges, EFL teachers fluidly adjusts their communicative practices which may also provide spaces for learning opportunities within micro contexts of classroom interactions (Sert, 2015). As can be seen from the data (extract 1 and 2), teachers adapt their linguistic resources to adjust with in-situ interactional contingencies (Tai, 2024), including the existence of dominant use of L1 in managerial modes. The exchange interactions in this mode signify procedural communicative events which require teachers to adapt with immediate pedagogical decision to enable learning (Walsh, 2006). This finding underscores Jing and Kitis' (2023) assertion that translanguaging occurrences within managerial mode is more likely 'methodological rather than material' indicating that extensive occurrences in managerial mode could be the high-support zone to adopt translanguaging pedagogy, particularly with EFL learners who have limited proficiency of the target language (p.4527). This contention is reasonable since the groups of learners in our study are secondary school learners who never experience English learning before. Therefore, it is defensible to contend that learners limited prior experiences and knowledge of the target language can be a sensible reason for teachers to adjust their translanguaging practices. Our assertion may seem contradictory to Renandya and Chang's (2022) argument that EFL teachers need to consult with long standing research-based SLA principles if the intention is to develop learners' proficiency of the target language. As for our concern, translanguaging pedagogy is not limited to a pedagogical approach. Instead, corroborating to Anderson (2024b), inculcating translanguaging into EFL pedagogy means considering L1 as not only linguistic code but more importantly a source of multilingual communicative practice which could be made supportive to English learning (Luitel et al., 2023).

Meanwhile, adopting the SETT and CA frameworks has predominantly addressed micro analysis in researching EFL teachers' translanguaging practices. Referring to Rasman and Santoso's (2025) review on methodological gap in translanguaging studies in the Indonesian contexts, the adopted analytical frameworks in our study provide informed classroom data-driven evidence which not only focuses on linguistic repertoires but also analysis on semiotic resources (e.g gesture). In this way, CA plays crucial roles in identifying non-linguistic data as essential properties to interpretatively synthesize teachers' choices of communicative resources to mediate L2 learning within micro contexts (the SETT modes). In extract 3, 4 and 5 for example, teachers used pictures, gestures and paralinguistic cues which show trans-semiotizing and multimodal practices to elicit input to scaffold target language production (Turner & Lin, 2020). Extract 5, in particular, shows productive employment of interactional scaffolding to support phonological knowledge construction by T3. The practices enable multi modal resources including waiting time and insert sequences to be analyzed as pedagogical scaffolding strategies that has the potential to create opportunities for L2 learning. This indicates that employing CA and SETT in analyzing translanguaging may broaden our methodological approach to micro element analysis, which remains underexplored in the previous studies (Rasman & Santoso, 2025). In addition, analyzing translanguaging from CA perspective may also project teachers' cognition studies on the topic of multilingual teachers' communicative practices which can be perceived through their talk-in-interactions (Li, 2017, 2023).

This study has uncovered that teachers' spontaneous translanguaging forms and functions are adjusted accordingly to classroom interactional demands. Nevertheless, our analysis indicates key areas to support EFL teachers' professional development, specifically to strengthen teachers' classroom interactional competence (CIC) in multilingual contexts (Walsh, 2006). Firstly, it is important to develop teachers' awareness of how their multiple linguistic resources could be made effectively utilized to adjust with real-time classroom interactional dynamics. In line with Walsh's (2006) principle of 'appropriacy', professional development should primarily focus on helping teachers to evaluate their choices of available communicative resources to be aligned with the interactional moves, the pedagogical orientation and its relation to learners' display understanding (Sert, 2015). Secondly, enhancing teachers' context-sensitive translanguaging practice is crucial to enable efficient support within micro stages of learning process. Drawing on the interactional patterns identified in this present study; it is recommended that teachers should critically compare alternative SETT and CA interactional features across modes in order to enable opportunities for learners to elaborate and replicate more target language responses. As argued by Rabbidge (2019) EFL teachers' translanguaging practices do not always establish condition for learners' participation, particularly within teacher-fronted interactions. This implies that equipping teachers with evaluating tools can be beneficial to examine their translanguaging discourse practices. In this sense, the final pedagogical recommendation would be establishing SETT and CA combining with video-based as a useful tool to assist teachers with ready-to-use resources for an easily access evaluative device. In this way, the SETT and CA may beneficially function to inform professional learning as

teachers may be able to evaluate strengths or missed opportunities for leaners to participate and therefore may decide purposeful ways to mobilize translanguaging resources effectively in classroom interactions.

4. Conclusion

This study has addressed the limited analysis of real time classroom data-driven evidence on the interplay between EFL teachers' spontaneous translanguaging forms and its pedagogical functions within micro contexts of classroom interactions. Even though the exploration is limited to a particular multilingual EFL circumstance and therefore could not be generalized to broader contexts, the analysis has constructively contributed to our understanding towards how non-native multilingual EFL teachers naturally respond to classroom interactional dynamics within micro episodes which may be also informative towards L2 learning research and translanguaging studies. Respectively, this study has explained how CA and SETT schema could be utilized as analytical frameworks of the interplays between classroom interactional translanguaging data and its relation to L2 knowledge constructions within EFL classroom contexts. In this sense, it is plausible to suggest that within multilingual contexts, EFL learning experiences could also be informed through classroom translanguaging and trans-semiotizing (Turner & Lin, 2020) practices. Future studies could be directed to focus on how teachers' translanguaging practices vary across learners' proficiency level and how continuous professional learning on translanguaging pedagogy influences teachers' CIC development and practices. Such investigations would broaden our understanding of how EFL classroom interactions influence English learning and how teachers, in real-time, make decision on their classroom discourse choices within linguistically diverse contexts.

Acknowledgment

The authors express their profound gratitude to all individuals who played a role in the research undertaking, including those involved in the collection and examination of data, as well as those who provided constructive feedback.

Declarations

Author contribution : The first author conceptualized the study, designed the research, collected the data, conducted the analysis, and drafted the manuscript. The second, third, fourth and fifth authors contributed to the refinement of the research design, provided theoretical and methodological guidance, and checked for coding and analysis confirmability. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of the article

Funding statement : The first author would like to thank the Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education Agency (LPDP) of the Republic of Indonesia for providing financial support for the first author's doctoral study and this research.

Conflict of interest : The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interests in this work

Ethical declaration : During the preparation of this work, the authors used Claude AI to assist with paragraph organization, to enhance language clarity and refinements in academic arguments. The tool was not used to generate research data, conduct data analysis or formulate research findings. All AI-assisted outputs were critically reviewed by the authors, who assume full responsibility for the accuracy, originality and integrity of the manuscript.

We support ELTEJ in maintaining high standards of personal conduct, practicing honesty in all our professional practices and endeavors.

Additional information : No additional information is available for this paper.

References

Afriadi, R. (2021). Exploring language repertoire in EFL classroom interaction. *Modality Journal: International Journal of Linguistics and Literature, 1(1)*, 10–19. https://doi.org/10.30983/mj.v1i1.4727

Alqefari, A. N. (2024). The presence of translanguaging and its effect on EFL learners' languaging opportunities in video-based peer editing. *System*, *125*, 103452. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103452

Anderson, J. (2024a). Reimagining educational linguistics: A post-competence perspective. *Educational Linguistics, 3(2)*, 258–285. https://doi.org/10.1515/eduling-2023-0009

Anderson, J. (2024b). Translanguaging: A paradigm shift for ELT theory and practice. *ELT Journal, 78(1)*, 72–81. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccad057

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

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2021). *Pedagogical translanguaging.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009029384

Collins, J. T. (2018). *Penelitian bahasa di Maluku* (Asrif, Ed.). Kantor Bahasa Maluku, Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. https://repositori.kemendikdasmen.go.id/25064/1/PENELITIAN%20BAHASA%20DI%20MALUKU.pdf

Cummins, J. (2021). Translanguaging: A critical analysis of theoretical claims. In P. Juvonen & M. Källkvist (Eds.), *Pedagogical translanguaging: Theoretical, methodological and empirical perspectives* (pp. 7–36). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788927383-004

Ebrahimi, Z., & Chowdhury, R. (2025). Translanguaging with machine translation: A pedagogical tool for enhancing language proficiency and autonomy of Iranian EFL learners. *TEFLIN Journal*, *36*(2), 187–206. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v36i2/187-206

Emilia, E., & Hamied, F. A. (2022). Translanguaging practices in a tertiary EFL context in Indonesia. *TEFLIN Journal, 33(1)*, 47–74. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v33i1/47-74

Huang, X., & Chalmers, H. (2023). Implementation and effects of pedagogical translanguaging in EFL classrooms: A systematic review. *Languages, 8(3)*, Article 194. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages8030194

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.02jef

Jing, Y., & Kitis, E. D. (2023). Pedagogical translanguaging in the primary-school English-L2 class: A case study in the Chinese context. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 45(10)*, 4517–4532. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2173213

Li, L. (2017). *Social interaction and teacher cognition.* Edinburgh University Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1g0526w

Li, L. (2023). Cognition-in-interaction: A discursive psychological perspective of novice language teacher cognition. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language—TESL-EJ, 27(2)*. https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.27106s2

Li, W. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics, 39(1)*, 9–30. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039

Liando, N. V. F., Dallyono, R., Tatipang, D. P., & Lengkoan, F. (2023). Among English, Indonesian and local language: Translanguaging practices in an Indonesian EFL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 13(1)*, 204–216. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v13i1.58270

Loppies, H. J., & Patty, J. (2024). EFL in-service teachers' efficacy beliefs: Findings from an underdeveloped Indonesian context. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics, 13(3)*, 1084–1105. https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v13i3.10939

Luitel, B., Poudel, K. K., Sharma, U. N., & Karki, T. M. (2023). Uses of the first language in the English as a foreign/second language classroom: Teachers' views and arguments. *TEFLIN Journal*, *34*(2), 245–263. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v34i2/245-263

Permana, P. G. A. M., & Rohmah, Z. (2024). Contemporary translingual English language policy and practice in Indonesia. *Cogent Education, 11(1)*, Article 2404059. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2404059

Rabbidge, M. (2019). The effects of translanguaging on participation in EFL classrooms. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 16(4)*, 1305–1322. https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2019.16.4.15.1305

Rabbidge, M. (2025). Translanguaging in ELT. In N. A. Nazari (Ed.), *Empowering the English language teacher in a multipolar environment* (pp. 175–192). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-4839-9_11

Ramasamy, S. A., & Zainal, A. Z. (2023). Facilitating the construction of knowledge collectively through dialogic discourse: Teachers' perspectives and practices in English language teaching. *TEFLIN Journal*, *34*(1), 79–96. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v34i1/79-96

Rasman, R. (2018). To translanguage or not to translanguage? The multilingual practice in an Indonesian EFL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7(3)*, 687–694. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i3.9819

Rasman, R., & Margana, M. (2022). Constructing translanguaging space in EFL classrooms in Indonesia: Opportunities and challenges. In A. Krulatz, G. Neokleous, & A. Dahl (Eds.), *Theoretical and applied perspectives on teaching foreign languages in multilingual settings: Pedagogical implications* (pp. 118–133). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788926423-012

Rasman, R., & Santoso, W. (2025). Translanguaging and English language education. In S. Zein & F. A. Hamied (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of English language education in Indonesia* (pp. 550–564). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003399308-41

Renandya, W. A., & Chang, A. C. S. (2022). Translanguaging: Does it work in EFL contexts? *Teaching English as a Second Language Electronic Journal (TESL-EJ), 26(3)*. https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.26103a25

Riswanto, R. (2022). Exploring translanguaging as a pedagogical strategy used by the English teacher in EFL classroom setting. *JPGI (Jurnal Penelitian Guru Indonesia), 7(1)*, 96–103. https://doi.org/10.29210/021948jpgi0005

Sahib, R. (2019). Translanguaging as a pedagogical strategy in EFL classroom: A case study at senior high school in Bulukumba Regency. *ELT-Lectura, 6(2)*, 139–146. https://doi.org/10.31849/elt-lectura.v6i2.3032

Sahib, R., Nawing, N., Sari, H., & Ukka, S. (2020). West Papuan teachers' perceptions on translanguaging practices in EFL classroom interaction. *ELT-Lectura, 7(2)*, 73–84. https://doi.org/10.31849/elt-lectura.v7i2.4205

Santoso, W., & Hamied, F. A. (2022). Towards multilingual education: Pre-service English teachers' perceptions of translanguaging pedagogy. *Prosiding Konferensi Linguistik Tahunan Atma Jaya (KOLITA), 20*, 364–374. https://doi.org/10.25170/kolita.20.3817

Sapitri, N. M., Batan, I. G., & Myartawan, I. P. N. W. (2018). Functions of teachers' translanguaging in the EFL classroom at two junior high schools in Singaraja. *Lingua Scientia, 25(1)*, 29–36. https://doi.org/10.23887/ls.v25i1.18821

Sari, C. C., & Nurhikmawati, A. R. (2025). Translanguaging practices in written peer feedback: A case study in a second language writing class in Indonesia. *TEFLIN Journal*, *36*(1), 137–152. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v36i1/137-152

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis (Vol. 1).* Cambridge University Press.

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

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

Stivers, T. (2015). Coding social interaction: A heretical approach in conversation analysis? *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 48(1)*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2015.993837

Tai, K. W. H. (2023). *Multimodal conversation analysis and interpretative phenomenological analysis: A methodological framework for researching translanguaging in multilingual classrooms.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003351047

Tai, K. W. H. (2024). Classroom interactional competence in an English medium instruction mathematics classroom: A creation of a technology-mediated translanguaging space. *Learning and Instruction, 90*, Article 101849. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2023.101849

Tai, K. W. H. (2026). *Translanguaging in classroom discourse.* Elements in Applied Linguistics. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009660624

Turner, M., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2020). Translanguaging and named languages: Productive tension and desire. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 23(4)*, 423–433. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1360243

Umam, A. H., Sugiharto, S., & Manara, C. (2023). Translingual practice in remote EFL tertiary education: How multilingual speakers create translanguaging spaces. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 13(2)*, 258–269. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v13i2.63065

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203015711

Walsh, S. (2013). *Classroom discourse and teacher development.* Edinburgh University Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1g0b484

Wang, W., & Yu, B. (2026). Reconceptualizing multimodal translanguaging framework for EFL teaching: Translanguaging practices in Chinese ethnic minority. *System*, *143*, 104180. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2026.104180

Zein, S. (2020). *Language policy in superdiverse Indonesia.* Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/Language-Policy-in-Superdiverse-Indonesia/Zein/p/book/9781032174396

Zein, S., Sukyadi, D., Hamied, F. A., & Lengkanawati, N. S. (2020). English language education in Indonesia: A review of research (2011–2019). *Language Teaching, 53(4)*, 491–523. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208

Zhang, Z., Ma, Q., Liu, C., & Li, L. (2025). Research strength analysis, pedagogical components, and effectiveness of translanguaging: A systematic literature review. *Pedagogies: An International Journal, 20(3)*, 404–423. https://doi.org/10.1080/1554480X.2024.2336502

Zuo, M., & Walsh, S. (2023). Translation in EFL teacher talk in Chinese universities: A translanguaging perspective. *Classroom Discourse, 14(2)*, 128–146. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2021.1960873

Appendix A.

Transcription conventions

Adapted from Jefferson, G. (2004)

[]	Onset and end point of overlapping utterances
=	Indicating no hearable break or gap to show the contiguous talk between the speakers when the turn-taking occurs, or within the same speaker's turn is separated in the script.
(0.0)	Numbers in parentheses indicate elapsed time (by tenths of seconds) between utterances
(.)	A micro-pause (a tenth of a second or less) within or between utterances
_____	Some form of stress, via pitch and/or amplitude
:	Prolongation of the immediately prior sound (more colons = longer prolongation)
.	Fall in tone (not necessarily the end of a sentence)
,	Continuing intonation (not necessarily between clauses)
_	An abrupt stop in articulation
↑↓	Rising or falling intonation
?	Rising inflection (not necessarily a question)
° °	Talk that is quieter than surrounding talk
()	Approximations of what is heard
(())	Transcriber's descriptions
tr.	translation of Bahasa Indonesia