

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Codeswitching as Translanguaging Practice by Filipino Immigrants in a Spanish as a Foreign Language Class

Jevic Anjin F. Cruel

*Department of European Languages, College of Arts and Letters
University of the Philippines Diliman, Philippines
jfcruel@up.edu.ph*

ABSTRACT

This paper examined the codeswitching (CS) practices of Filipino students in a basic level Spanish class for immigrants in Barcelona using a translanguaging lens. Translanguaging encourages bilinguals and multilinguals to make use of their entire linguistic repertoire in meaning-making and communication. Student CS data from two class sessions were collected through non-participant observation as well as through audio recording and transcription of classroom discourse. These exchanges were then analyzed using conversation analytic and translanguaging frameworks in order to identify the different functions of student CS. The results of this study revealed that the students switched from Spanish to other languages for various purposes: translation, metalanguage, private speech, acting as a language broker, expressing personal knowledge on a topic, telling jokes and creating wordplay, and giving encouragement to other students. These functions helped the students to make sense of the target language and the language class itself, as well as to mitigate communication breakdowns in conversations with the teacher and other students.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: July 15, 2021
Reviewed: August 3, 2022
Revised: October 6, 2024
Accepted: October 8, 2024
Published: November 8, 2024

KEYWORDS

codeswitching; immigrant language learning; Spanish as a Foreign Language; translanguaging

SUGGESTED CITATION

Cruel, J. A. F. (2024). Codeswitching as translanguaging practice by Filipino immigrants in a Spanish as a Foreign Language class. *Philippine Journal for Language Teaching*, 54(1), 1–26.

Introduction

Teachers' implicit imposition of native-like competency on their students (Cook, 1999; Kramsch, 1998) and the preference for the use of the target language as common practice in the language classroom has subsequently resulted in the stigmatization of the first language (L1) in language learning. This rejection of the L1 in the language classroom is motivated by various reasons; on one hand, the need to maximize the use of the target language (L2) in class, especially in foreign language (i.e., non-immersion) contexts, and on the other, the negative attitude towards the L1 as opposed to the L2. In other words, the use of the L1 in the language classroom is

considered a failure of the objective of an L2 class: the achievement of native-like proficiency by the learner (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017), and as noted by Turnbull and Dailey-O’Cain (2009), promotes the image of the learner as a “poor imitator of the native speaker” (p. 1). Furthermore, Macaro (2005, p. 69), argued that there is a preexisting disregard towards the L1 in the literature, as observed in the terms used by various authors, such as “resorting to the L1.” Cook (2001) also noted that teachers tend to associate the use of the L1 with feelings of guilt because of their failure to use the L2 at all times in the classroom.

The “multilingual turn” (Conteh & Meier, 2014; May, 2014) in language education has ushered in a shift in how learners, languages, and language learning are conceptualized and has foregrounded multilingualism versus monolingualism as the norm. Translanguaging is one of the paradigms that emerged from this recognition of multilingual learners and their practices in the classroom.

Drawing from in-class observations and oral classroom data, this paper identifies the functions of student codeswitching (CS) practices by Filipino immigrants learning Spanish in Barcelona through a translanguaging lens. *Codeswitching* “is a speech style in which bilinguals alternate languages between or within sentences” (MacSwan, 2017, p. 168) while *classroom codeswitching* is defined as “the alternating use of more than one linguistic code in the classroom by any of the classroom participants (e.g., teacher, students, teacher aide)” (Lin, 2017, p. 488). *Translanguaging*, on the other hand, refers to “the flexible use of linguistic resources by bilinguals in order to make sense of their worlds” (García & Leiva, 2014, p. 4). In this study, translanguaging is viewed as a broader term for the language practices by bilinguals, which includes the phenomenon of codeswitching (García, 2009; Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012; MacSwan, 2017; Mazak, 2017; Sayer, 2013).

Despite the fact that the Filipino community in Spain is one of the oldest immigrant groups in the country (García Mateos, 2004), to date, there is only one other study on Filipino immigrants’ learning of Spanish (Salazar Lorenzo, 2008), as other studies on Filipino learners of Spanish have focused on students studying Spanish as a Foreign Language in Philippine universities (Monsod, 2017; Morta Enderes, 2005; Sánchez Jiménez, 2010; Sibayan, 2011) or in Instituto Cervantes (Denst-García, 2009; Hsiao & Vieco, 2012, 2015). The growth of these Filipino communities, particularly in Madrid and Barcelona, can be attributed to the Spanish Civil Code allowing Filipinos to obtain Spanish citizenship after a shorter residency period in the country (two years) than the usual 10 years imposed on other nationalities. Also, as of 2015, applicants for Spanish citizenship from non-Spanish speaking countries are also required to pass the DELE (*Diploma de Español como Lengua Extranjera*) A2 examination apart from a test on Spanish culture and laws (CCSE, *conocimientos constitucionales y socioculturales de España*).

First and foremost, this paper wishes to address CS scholars’ observation that there is a lack of studies on student CS (Lin, 2017) as well as on CS outside higher education contexts (Galindo Merino, 2012; Gardner-Chloros, 2009). In addition, the present study wishes to address the gap in the literature on Spanish language learning, specifically in the body of work on immigrant language learning by Filipinos in the Spanish context.

Literature Review

Translanguaging, Translanguaging to Learn, and Codeswitching

The term translanguaging is derived from *trawsieithu*, a method of bilingual teaching developed in Wales in the 1980s. Educator Cen Williams (1994) coined the term to describe the way students would read or talk about a topic in one language, and write about it in another language. This teaching method helped students gain knowledge and at the same time make sense of their world with the use of two languages, English and Welsh. Williams's colleague Colin Baker later translated the term into English, with *translanguaging* now covering the use of multiple languages in many contexts. Baker (2011) defines translanguaging as such: "the process of making meaning, shaping experiences and gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages" (p. 288). Baker (2011), García (2009) and other scholars (Canagarajah, 2011; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García & Leiva, 2014) have extended Williams' (1994) original concept of translanguaging and placed stress on process, meaning-making, experiences, understanding and knowledge—in other words, what people *do* with and through their languages. Li (2018, para. 4) also calls translanguaging a "process of meaning and sense-making," where one "draws upon different linguistic, cognitive, and semiotic resources to make meaning and make sense." These definitions, therefore, see translanguaging as a process where one flexibly uses all their linguistic resources in order to create meaning and construct knowledge.

In relation to language learning, García and Li (2014) noted the following:

Translanguaging goes beyond having to acquire and learn new language structures, rather it develops the integration of new language practices into one linguistic repertoire that is available for the speaker to be, know and do, and that is in turn produced in the complex interactions of bilingual speakers. Rather than learning a new separate 'second language', learners are engaged in appropriating new languaging that makes up their own unique repertoire of meaning-making resources. (p. 80)

García and Li (2014) also enumerated various ways on how *pupil-directed translanguaging* (Lewis et al., 2012) occurs in the classroom, along with its advantages. Translanguaging is manifested in students' metatalk, metacognition, and whispered private speech in the L1 (Kibler, 2010), which, in turn, help students expand their zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978). The authors also cited studies (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Swain & Lapkin, 2000) which described the use of the students' 'home language' (i.e., their respective L1s) to assist in task management and clarification, learning vocabulary and grammar, as well as in developing interpersonal interaction within members of the class. In a 2011 study, García described how both Latino and non-Latino kindergarteners in a two-way bilingual program translanguaged orally despite the strict separation of Spanish and English in the school. García (2011) cited six metafunctions of translanguaging in this case study: (a) To mediate understandings among each other, usually through providing translations and interpretations for both teachers and children; (b) To co-construct meaning of what the other is saying through interactions in both languages, usually in conversations between a more experienced bilingual and another student with limited knowledge in one of the

languages; (c) To construct meaning within themselves, usually manifested in the children's private speech in Spanish; (d) To include others; and (e) To exclude others; which in both cases show that the children are aware of and can use one language or the other for social interaction; and finally, (f) To demonstrate knowledge, as seen in examples where students show and experiment with what they have learned in class through the use of both languages. Of note here is how children of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds as well as varying degrees of exposure and proficiency in the two languages in the classroom were able to maximize their entire linguistic repertoire to facilitate learning and interaction within the classroom.

One aspect of translanguaging is codeswitching, which is “the systematic use of linguistic material from two or more languages in the same sentence or conversation” (Levine, 2011, p. 50). In codeswitching, one shifts from one language to another (or more) in a specific communication episode. We see an example of this in the language classroom in Excerpt 1, where both teacher (PRO, for *profesor*) and students (SWL, KRU; codes were used in this study to protect participants' anonymity and privacy) shift from Spanish to English and vice versa in a conversation about safekeeping one's passport when on vacation:

Excerpt 1

- 1779 *PRO: <okay you go to the swimming pool of the hotel> [<] **vas a la piscina**
1780 **del hotel (.) qué haces** [= what do you do]?
1781 *SWL: vale (.) **put it in the armario** [= closet].
1782 *KRU: para seguridad [= for security] **I will take it** .
(S1)

From an analytical standpoint, CS takes an external view in describing the phenomenon of language alternation. Traditionally, it maintains the boundaries between codes and focuses its analysis on the languages found in the data, such as distinguishing CS from lexical borrowing, identifying where and how switches happen and the interactional functions of the languages involved (Auer, 1998; Muysken, 2000). In the classroom, CS has been studied by looking at the relative amounts of L1 versus L2 use as well as the functional distribution of L1 and L2 in the classroom, and in later studies, the relationship of classroom L1/L2 use with societal language ideologies, and the effects of CS in specific cognitive classroom tasks such as vocabulary learning (see Lin, 2017 for a review).

In a 2009 work, García asserted that CS in itself does not equate to translanguaging, but rather is a manifestation of translanguaging, which includes the use and contact of various languages. Lewis et al. (2012) also noted that CS emphasizes the separation of the languages involved in a communicative episode while translanguaging promotes and celebrates the flexibility and integration of these languages.

It is interesting to note that García and other authors (García & Kleyn, 2016; García & Li, 2014; Otheguy et al., 2015) later considered translanguaging and codeswitching as “epistemologically at odds” (Vogel & García, 2017, p. 5) because of the inherent notion that CS considers the various languages to be separate, while translanguaging rejects this separation of languages in favor of a view that considers

languages and their boundaries to be a social, cultural and political construct and that sees the bilingual as having a “unitary linguistic repertoire” (Vogel & García, 2017, p. 3).

MacSwan (2017), on the other hand, refuted this model and its rejection of CS and proposed that translanguaging be seen from an integrated multilingual model, arguing that bilinguals have “a single system with many shared grammatical resources but with some internal language-specific differentiation as well” (p. 179). This means that bilinguals draw strategically from a single linguistic repertoire, but maintain some degree of differentiation in their mental grammars and therefore, reflect languages as discrete codes in the brains of speakers. MacSwan’s (2017) proposed model agrees with García’s earlier views (García 2009, 2011), wherein CS and other bilingual linguistic phenomena are considered as instances of translanguaging.

The present study takes after MacSwan (2017) and other authors’ view that CS is a manifestation of translanguaging (García 2009; Lewis et al., 2012; Mazak, 2017; Sayer, 2013) and that recognizes translanguaging as an important analytical lens without the need to dispense of discrete language categories and the focus on linguistic systematicities in the analysis of bilingual oral data.

Methodology

Research Design

This study followed a qualitative research approach with a cross-sectional case study research design. Gerring (2017, p. 28) defines a case study as “an intensive study of a single case or a small number of cases which draws on observational data and promises to shed light on a larger population of cases.” The present study is cross-sectional in design because it collected and analyzed data about the case (a group of Filipino immigrants studying Spanish in Barcelona, Spain) at a specific point in time (October to November 2016). No quantitative data (e.g., frequency of switches in the corpus) related to student codeswitching were collected and analyzed.

Research Site and Teacher and Student Participants

The study was conducted in a Spanish class for immigrants offered by Easy English Academy, a language school founded by two Filipina immigrants in Barcelona. The establishment of the school was their final project for a leadership and social entrepreneurship course organized by the School of Government of the Ateneo de Manila University based in the Philippines. Aside from Spanish language classes, the school also offers basic and intermediate Catalan language classes, as well as English and Mathematics classes for children.

The target class was a “basic level” Spanish class, as was indicated in the school’s promotional materials. There was no information regarding the class’s equivalent level in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), the standard language proficiency levels stipulated by the Council of Europe (2018).

Most Filipino workers in Barcelona have to earn the minimum language requirement while working, and so they would usually choose to take language classes that only meet once a week or during weekends in order to accommodate their work schedules. Because the class was specifically for immigrants, the class met on Saturdays and Sundays only, with a duration of two hours per session. At the start of data gathering for this research, the students already completed a total of 10 sessions with their teacher. The class did not use any textbooks, and the students would usually work on activities compiled by the teacher for each session.

The teacher was a native speaker of Spanish from Barcelona with master’s degrees in secondary education and teaching of Spanish to immigrants. He had experience in Spanish language teaching, having served as volunteer teacher at Centro Filipino–Tuluyan San Benito. He could speak Spanish, Catalan, English, French, and Dutch and had some knowledge of Tagalog and Cebuano acquired from his travels to the Philippines. All utterances by the teacher were encoded as PRO in the transcript.

Table 1

Participants’ Profile

Participant	L1	L2	L3	Years of Stay in Barcelona	Other Countries of Residence	Years of Stay	
1	GRB	Cebuano	Tagalog	English, French	1 year	Netherlands Belgium	3 years 1 year
2	LRD	Ilocano	Tagalog	English	1 year	-	-
3	SWL	Davaweny o ¹	Tagalog	English, Arabic, Danish	1 year	Singapore Denmark Norway	2.5 years 2 years 2 years
4	KRU	Hiligayno n, Cebuano	Tagalog, Kinaray-a	English, Norwegia n	1 year	Denmark Norway Netherlands	2 years 2 years 1 year
5	ISV	Ilocano	Tagalog	English	3 months	-	-

Note. ¹Davawenyo is the language spoken in the province of Davao and some parts of Mindanao, Southern Philippines. It is considered to be a synthesis of Cebuano, Tagalog, and some dialects of Cebuano (Eberhard et al., 2019).

The participants of this study were five Filipino immigrant students who came from different provinces of the Philippines. To protect their anonymity, all participants were assigned codes. LRD and ISV were from the provinces of Pangasinan and Abra, respectively, from the North; GRB was from Bohol, a province in Central Philippines; SWL and KRU were from the provinces of Davao Oriental and Bukidnon, from Mindanao, Southern Philippines. As seen in Table 1, all students could speak Tagalog and English; however, not all shared the same L1. Three participants, namely, GRB, SWL and KRU spoke Cebuano as L1 (see note on Davawenyo¹), while the other two spoke Ilocano, one of the major languages spoken in the northern part of the country. All participants in the study received bilingual education in Tagalog (Filipino) and

English, in accordance with the Bilingual Education Policy of the Philippines' Department of Education (1987).

Of all the participants, only LRD was unemployed. The rest of the participants were working as domestic helpers (GRB, SWL and KRU) or as maintenance staff (ISV). The three female participants, GRB, SWL and KRU, had also worked as domestic helpers or au pairs in other countries before arriving in Spain. It should be noted that all participants of the study had bachelor's degrees or at the very least, started university studies in the Philippines. This profile coincides with the usual educational background of Filipino immigrants in reports and articles (Pe-Pua, 2005; United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs [UN DESA] & Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2013), which state that many Filipino migrant workers are university graduates.

Research Instruments and Data Analysis

This study used audio recordings and transcripts of two class sessions as well as non-participant observation by the researcher of the said classes. Data gathering was done from October to November 2016, and each class session had a duration of two hours. While the oral corpus consisted of a total of six audio recorded class sessions, only the first two were analyzed in this paper because these were the only sessions where all participants in the study were in complete attendance. In addition, these two sessions had the most number of student CS occurrences from the six class sessions recorded. Before the start of the recording, the student and teacher participants signed an informed consent form, allowing the researcher to observe and collect audio data.

The transcription of the audio data was done using the CHAT (Codes for the Human Analysis of Transcripts) format of the CHILDES (Child Language Data Exchange System) Project (MacWhinney, 2000). Using the CHAT format instead of Conversation Analysis (CA) transcript conventions to transcribe the data was a deliberate choice of the researcher, as CHAT employs the use of specific transcription symbols (see Appendix A) that capture and encode certain features of oral discourse that are important for the identification and analysis of utterances with CS such as pauses, hesitations, false starts, incomplete words, repetitions, reformulations and prosodic features. In addition, CHAT also allows the tagging of turns where CS occurs in the transcript.

On the other hand, non-participant observation was done through an observation sheet (see Appendix B) created by the researcher. It was used to collect the following information as the classes transpired:

1. Date and Time
2. Session Number
3. Participants
4. Utterance Where CS Occurred
5. Language(s)
6. Class Activity
7. Description and Analysis

In lieu of a video recording of the class sessions, the observation sheet served to support the oral data in various ways. Firstly, this instrument allowed the researcher to easily identify the following: the speakers, the utterances and class activities where CS occurred, as well as the languages that were frequently used in the class sessions. In addition, the observation sheet also enabled the researcher to document other contextual information such as gestures or actions that accompanied utterances, the addressees of utterances in student-student conversations, and so on. The researcher's field notes were also recorded using this observation sheet.

The transcripts were then analyzed, drawing on concepts from translanguaging and CA, particularly sequential analysis (Schlegloff, 1991, 2007). Taking a CA approach assumes that both language use and social interaction are orderly and coherent in that conversations contain recurring patterns of interaction. This feature allows the researcher/analyst to describe the structures that underlie the conversation through a micro-analysis of the excerpts in question, guided by CA's fundamental question of "Why this, in this way, right now?" (Seedhouse, 2005). Sequential analysis (Schlegloff, 1991, 2007), with its focus on turns, actions within turns and adjacency pairs within the transcripts enabled the researcher to not only identify recurring patterns in student CS (when and how it occurs), but also to provide explanations for their language choice (why it occurs). Following the principles of CA, the data were analyzed from an emic perspective, and as such, no pre-established categories were used to identify the functions found in the data.

With its use of CA in conjunction with translanguaging, this study ultimately considered student CS not only as isolated cases of alternating from Spanish to other languages. In addition, it is a bilingual language practice that is shaped by context and interaction within the classroom and which takes advantage of the students' various languages as linguistic, cognitive, and meaning-making resources.

Contextualizing the Analyzed Sessions

Firstly, there was the predominance of teacher talk which is seen in the number of turns of the teacher versus that of the students. Student talk in Spanish is limited to the use of chunks (Wray, 2002) as in the cases where they would answer *sí* (yes), *no* (no), *ya está* (I'm done) or *sí, puedes* (Yes, you may, as a response to "May I erase this?"). The students also used Spanish in social talk through the expressions *bien* (good), *muy bien* (very good) and *así así* (so-so), in reciting answers to homework and written activities and in responding to the teacher in controlled practice contexts. It is important to note that the teacher encouraged the students to produce more spontaneous responses through follow-up questions and through putting the students in pairs or threes to practice orally. However, these teaching strategies did not encourage spontaneous oral interaction because the students simply asked questions and gave responses based on what was indicated in the different activity sheets, without actually engaging in a conversation.

Secondly, there was discrepancy in terms of the structure of the class, specifically in the sequence of activities and exercises included in each of the two analyzed sessions. In the first session, the first half of the class was dedicated to the correction of homework that was assigned in the previous meeting, and the second half was devoted to a lesson on expressions and questions for talking about vacations. On

the other hand, the second session talked about phrases to express disbelief, which came up as a correction to a conversation between two students before the start of class. After this, the students practiced these expressions through a question from the teacher using the present perfect verb form, as well as through construction of sentences using this particular verb form and its contrast with the gerund in Spanish.

In any case, it was observed that it was the teacher who directed the changes in activity or topic, and in many cases, there was a temporary change in topic through digressions and personal anecdotes about the teacher's travels to the Philippines. The students, especially the females, asked questions to the teacher. However, in the second session, there was a considerable number of questions from ISV both to the teacher and the other students, which was supposedly due to the fact that it was his last day in class and wanted to take the opportunity to ask questions.

Results and Discussion

The purpose of this study was to identify the different functions of student CS in a basic Spanish class for Filipino immigrants. This section presents the different situations wherein the students codeswitched in the analyzed class sessions. Following that, a discussion of the results is offered.

Results

The functions of student CS presented below illustrate how participants in this study used their L1 and other languages in navigating classroom events. These events ranged from those related to the specific lessons for the day to those which are more social in nature.

Translation

Excerpt 2

- 200 *PRO: when someone is peein(g) on the street (.) he is a +//?
 201 *PRO: +, cochino (.) marrano [= dirty pig] .
 202 *KRU: &n (.) &no &ah +...
 203 *PRO: when someone is peein(g) on the street you say (.)
 cochino@i [= pig] !
 204 *SWL: <it's bad> [>] .
 205 *KRU: <in English it's bad> [<] .
 206 *PRO: when the baby is eatin(g) and throwin(g) all the food you
 say (.) o:
 207 you're a (.) cochino [= pig] .
 208 *KRU: nasty .
 209 *LRD: kotse [= car] ?
 210 *PRO: yeah .
 211 *KRU: <kind of nasty> [>] ?
 212 *PRO: <yeah you're a bit dirty> [<] +...
 213 *PRO: coming from like (.) little pork .
 214 *PRO: it's like a [///] you're a little pig .
 215 *SWL: a:h .

- 216 *PRO: vale [= okay] ?
217 *PRO: qué ha pasado (.) G [>] [= what happened G] ?
218 *SWL: **cerdito** [<] [= little pig] .
(S2)

In Excerpt 2, we see the students using translation in order to unpack an unknown expression in Spanish. In lines 200-201, the teacher tried to explain the meaning of the colloquial expression *cochino marrano* ('dirty pig') through a question addressed to the students, referring to an incident that happened before the start of the class (i.e., seeing someone urinating on the street). In line 203, the teacher reformulated his message with the phrase 'you say', indicating that the term *cochino* should be interpreted as an assessment of the situation, and in the succeeding two turns, students SWL and KRU showed their understanding of expression by offering the word *bad* as a translation of the said expression. In line 206, we see the teacher giving a particular situation where the expression can be used, to which the student KRU responded with another word, *nasty*, which is nearer in meaning to the expression in question. Later, in lines 213 and 214, the teacher explained the origin of the word *cochino*, and in line 218, SWL translated the teacher's explanation in English to Spanish using the word *cerdito* ('little pig').

While the previous example shows translation of unknown words or expressions from Spanish to English, there were also instances where students translated words from Spanish to Tagalog and their respective L1s, Ilocano and Cebuano, as seen in Excerpts 3 and 4:

Excerpt 3

- 1965 *GRB: <what is salir> [<] [= to leave] ?
1966 *ISV: <ano (i)tong> [/] [<] ano (i)tong (.) paano itong (.) paano na
1967 (i)tong escribir [= what is what is how do you say escribir] ?
1968 *SWL: exit !
1969 *LRD: [- ilo] agsurat [= to write] [>] .
(S1)

Excerpt 4

- 4454 *KRU: **qué 0es playa** [= what is playa] ?
4455 *KRU: [- ceb] (..) **aplaya** [= beach] ?
(S1)

Metalinguage

In many instances such as in Excerpt 5, it was observed that the students would use English to refer to grammatical terms. The tendency towards the use of English as metalinguage seems to be conditioned by the explanations given by the teacher in English when talking about grammar topics in class.

Excerpt 5

- 1080 *PRO: divorciarse es un verbo qué (.) G [= divorciarse is what kind of verb G] ?
1081 *GRB: &ah divorsiarse [: divorciarse] [*] [= to get divorced] ?
1082 *SWL: **reflexive** .
1083 *PRO: reflexivo [>] [= reflexive] .

(S2)

While it was also observed in the data that the teacher would also use Spanish grammatical terms in his explanations, some students, like SWL in Excerpt 5, tended to use English. However, it was also noted in the data that some students maintained the use of Spanish to talk about features of the target language, often inserting Spanish grammatical terms in clarifications in the L1 directed to a classmate or in questions in English addressed to the teacher, as shown in the Excerpts 6 and 7:

Excerpt 6

362 *KRU: [- ceb] <determinado nga ini> [<] [= is this determinado]

?

363 %add: GRB

(S1)

Excerpt 7

948 *SWL: &tha [///] there's one question .

949 *SWL: importantes is [///] there's (.) plural [% in Spanish] (.)

no@i [= important]?

950 *PRO: sí: (.) plural como aquí (.) por esto rojo (.) rojo(s) .

(S1)

Private Speech

Private speech is talk that is directed to oneself. In other words, it is usually seen when one thinks aloud during tasks. Vygotsky (1986) recognized the importance of this phenomenon in cognition. He described private speech as the middle ground between external social speech and the internal speech of a person. According to him, private speech is the partial interiorization of social speech and is a tool for cognitive self-guidance (Vygotsky, 1986). This phenomenon can be observed in the data in students' utterances that were said in a low voice, whispered, and muttered to oneself such as in Excerpts 8 and 9 from students LRD, ISV and SWL:

Excerpt 8

591 *SWL: número siete [= number seven] .

592 *ISV: las amigas [= the friends].

593 *SWL: o:h@i muy bien [= oh, very good] .

594 %add: ISV

595 *PRO: las amigas +...

596 *GRB: amigas ba yan [= is that friends] ?

597 *LRD: ayun (.) babae pala [=! low voice] [= oh, they are girls] .

(S1)

Excerpt 9

367 *PRO: dónde has estado (.) toda la tarde [= where have you been all afternoon] ?

368 *ISV: has estado [=! low voice] [= have you been] .

369 *SWL: hoy [= today] ?

370 *PRO: ayer [= yesterday] .

371 *SWL: ayer [= yesterday] ?

372 *PRO: sí [= yes] ?

- 373 *SWL: &est &um (..) he: estado &*PRO:sí (...) <nasaan ako
noong kahapon>
374 [=! whispers] [= where was I yesterday] ?
(S2)

Another interesting observation from the data is that many utterances involving private speech in Tagalog would also contain the Tagalog particle *pala*, which can be roughly translated as ‘it turns out that’ and which expresses a contrast between what the speaker expects and what happens in reality. This particle is usually found at the end of utterances where students would react to a correction, explanation, or clarification by the teacher.

Other instances of private speech in the transcript were observed to be about class-related concerns such as side comments or questions about the current activity or about the class in general, repetitions or translations of Spanish words into other languages, and comments related to students not being able to do their homework for the class session. Moreover, students’ private speech included more personal matters, for example, reminders to oneself or comments on physical sensations or feelings (e.g., sudden itchiness, being bored). Examples of these can be seen in Excerpts 10 and 11 from KRU:

Excerpt 10

- 994 *KRU: wa:h@i wala akong assignment [= I don’t have my
homework] !
995 *KRU: halalalala@i!
(S1)

Excerpt 11

- 1056 *KRU: o:h@i my@i God@i !
1057 *KRU: I don't have this .
(S1)

Acting as a Language Broker

The term *language broker* was used by McQuillan and Tse (1995) to describe immigrant children who act as linguistic mediators for family members and other adults who do not speak the language of the host country. In this study, language brokering was seen in cases where a student employs CS to mediate between the teacher and other students in the class.

Excerpt 12

- 1850 *PRO: vale (.) y tú (.) G [= okay and you, G] ?
1851 *GRB: &ah en mi bolsa [= ah, in my bag] .
1852 *PRO: en mi bolsa (.) sí [>] [= in my bag, yes] ?
1853 *GRB: sí [<] [= yes] .
1854 *PRO: la bolsa o el bolso [= the bag or the handbag] ?
1855 *GRB: ah@i la bolsa [= ah the bag] .
1856 *PRO: esto es una bolsa [= this is a bag] .
1857 *PRO: bolsa de plástico <de la:> [/] <de la:> [/] de la carne [= plastic
bag of the of the of the meat] .
1858 *GRB: a:h@i en la bolsa [= ah, in the bag] .

- 1859 *PRO: la bolsa es una bolsa (.) de plástico [= the bag is a plastic bag] .
- 1860 *PRO: una bolsa: de:l supermercado [= a grocery bag] .
- 1861 *SWL: shoulder bag .**
- 1862 *GRB: shoulder bag .**
- 1863 *PRO: el bolso [= the handbag] .
- (S1)

Excerpt 12 is from an activity where the teacher asked the students one by one about where they would keep their money when they travel. In line 1851, GRB used the word *bolsa* ('bag' or 'sack') incorrectly to refer to *bolso* ('handbag or 'purse'). This lexical error ensued the teacher to clarify in line 1854, as well as to explain the meaning of the word *bolsa* in lines 1856 and 1857; however, in the succeeding line, the student continued to use the word *bolsa* incorrectly. Finally, in line 1861, a different student, SWL, intervened through a translation of the word *bolso* to English, *shoulder bag*. GRB repeated this phrase in the next line as confirmation of what SWL said, and the teacher then reiterated the correct term (*el bolso*) at the end.

Here we can see how students who are more proficient in the language can act as a language broker to those who are not as adept in the target language. The confusion by GRB between two similar sounding words with related meanings in Spanish (*el bolso* vs. *la bolsa*) was persistent despite various attempts of the teacher to explain the nuances between the two terms; this confusion was detected by the other student SWL, who used CS to resolve the communication breakdown between GRB and the teacher through a switch to English, 'shoulder bag', which is the term that Filipinos use to refer to one's purse or handbag.

Expressing Personal Knowledge on a Topic

Excerpt 13

- 567 *SWL: antes también aquí (.) no@i [= before here also no] ?
- 568 *SWL: en Barcelona [= in Barcelona] ?
- 569 *PRO: en Barcelona (.) no lo sé [= in Barcelona, I don't know] .
- 570 *SWL: <twenty years ago> [>] ?**
- 571 *PRO: <en Barcelona había> [<] el bullfighting (.) eso sí [= in Barcelona there was bullfighting, yes] .
- 572 *SWL: it's like +/-**
- 573 *PRO: está en la Plaza de xxx [= it's in the Plaza de xxx] .
- 574 *SWL: +, I've seen that on T_V [% letters in English] .**
- 575 *PRO: sí [= yes] ?
- 576 *PRO: corrían en Barcelona [= bull runs in Barcelona] ?
- 577 *PRO: pues no lo había visto [= well I haven't seen that] .
- 578 *GRB: mmm yeah (.) bullfighting [>] .
- 579 *SWL: <yeah in> [<] .**
- 580 *SWL: no .
- 581 *GRB: <bullfighting in the arena> [>] ?
- 582 *SWL: <Meteor Garden> [<] ?**
- 583 %com: Meteor Garden is a Taiwanese series that was popular in the 2000s.
- 584 *SWL: **Shan Cai (.) she [/] (.) she .**
- 585 %com: Shan Cai is the female protagonist of the series.

586 *KRU: it's a película [= movie] .
(S2)

In Excerpt 13, SWL tried to confirm with the teacher whether bullfighting was practiced in Barcelona in the past. However, the teacher responded in the negative, to which the student responded with a follow-up question in English, ‘twenty years ago.’ In line 572, SWL began her explanation but interrupted herself as the teacher responded back, while in line 574, the student tried to explain to the teacher where she got the information. The teacher did not confirm this, and in turn, in lines 579 and 582, the student mentioned her personal experience related to the topic at hand, referring to a scene from a Taiwanese series shot in Barcelona. In the last line, KRU, who until this moment was not involved in the conversation, said in a mix of Spanish and English that the other student was referring to a *película* (‘movie’). Other examples of this CS function were seen in cases where students codeswitched from Spanish to English in order to react to the teacher’s utterances in Spanish about his own experiences during his travels to the Philippines.

Telling Jokes and Creating Wordplay

Jokes and wordplay are usually seen in the data through students making connections from one language to another using phonetic similarities between the languages involved. These findings can be observed in Excerpt 14 below:

Excerpt 14

1888 *KRU: me (.) l@l v@l [% letters in English] (.) lumang@wp [= old] vag@wp [= bag] .

1889 *ISV: ah@i Louis botón@wp .

1890 *PRO: yo tengo una Louis Vuitton y dos Chanel [= I have a Louis Vuitton and two Chanel] .

1891 *PRO: xxx .

1892 *GRB: me (.) Louis &b botón@wp [= botón sounds like Vuitton] &=laughs .

(S1)

Excerpt 14 is part of a conversation where the students and the teacher talked about designer bags in class. In line 1888, KRU claimed that she had an *LV*, which usually stands for Louis Vuitton, a famous brand of luxury bags. However, in the example, the student said that *LV* actually stands for *lumang vag* (a wordplay on the Tagalog phrase *lumang bag* or ‘old bag’). Here KRU created humor through an oxymoron in her juxtaposition of the association of the Louis Vuitton brand with luxury, and the “true” meaning of the acronym *LV* (‘old bag’). Another student, ISV, made another joke by saying *Louis boton*, through evoking the similarities between the sound of the Tagalog word *buton* (*botón* in Spanish, ‘button’) and *Vuitton* in French. In the last line, another student, GRB recognized the humor in the wordplay and repeated it.

The dual function of this strategy as a way to compensate for communication problems was also observed, similar to Bachman’s (1990) strategic competence. Specifically, it was evident in the utterances of ISV, the student with the least experience with Spanish and with the shortest time of stay in Barcelona. ISV would

usually respond to the teacher or participate in conversations in class through mentioning proper names:

Excerpt 15

- 1826 *PRO: dónde lo pones [= where do you put it] ?
1827 *ISV: la Caixa .
 1828 *PRO: a que tienes un millón de pesos [= ah so you have one million pesos] ?
 1829 *GRB: wo:w@i si I [= wow I] !
 1830 *PRO: hola guapo [= hello handsome] !
 1831 *PRO: hola [= hello] !
 (S1)

Excerpt 16

- 1876 *GRB: bolso .
 1877 *GRB: ah@i now I know .
 1878 *GRB: bolso .
1879 *ISV: Hermès [<] .
 1880 *KRU: <ah sí> [>] [= ah yes] ?
 1881 *PRO: el qué [= what] ?
 1882 *GRB: bolso i:s shoulder bag .
 1883 *KRU: Hermès bag afford ko I
 [= I can afford a Hermès bag I] !
 1884 *GRB: +^ yeah (.) Hermès bag .
 1885 *PRO: Hermès (.) sí (.) yo tengo Chanel [= Hermés, yes, I have Chanel] .
 (S1)

In Excerpt 15, ISV responded to the teacher's question with *La Caixa* (*Fundació Bancària Caixa d'Estalvis i Pensions de Barcelona*, in Catalan), the colloquial term for one of the major banks in Spain that was founded in Barcelona. Similarly, in Excerpt 16, ISV confirmed his comprehension of the term *bolso* ('handbag') by mentioning the designer brand *Hermès*, which can be considered as a successful response, as seen in the reactions from other students and the teacher in subsequent turns. Despite his limited knowledge in the target language, the student's use of translanguaging through the use of one's entire linguistic repertoire was seen here in the demonstration of personal knowledge of brand names in other languages such as Catalan and French.

Giving Encouragement to Other Students

In Excerpts 17 and 18, it can be seen how one student, GRB, switched to other languages in order to encourage her other classmates. In line 1518 from Excerpt 17, GRB gave positive reinforcement to LRD for giving the correct answer to the teacher. In the lines preceding this, GRB and another student SWL gave instructions to LRD on how to form the past participle form in Spanish, which then helped the latter answer correctly.

Excerpt 17

- 1512 *PRO: L (.) cocinar [= L to cook] ?
 1513 *LRD: cocina:r [= to cook] ?

- 1514 *LRD: <cocinar [/] cocinar> [=! whispers] [= to cook to cook] .
1515 *GRB: tanggalin mo (i)yong a@l r@l [= remove the -ar] .
1516 *SWL: ganoon o (.) ado [= like that example, -ado] .
1517 *LRD: cocinado [= cooked] ?
1518 *GRB: <a:h@i (.) you got it > [>] !
(S2)

Excerpt 18

- 1678 *PRO: y querer [= and querer] ?
1679 *SWL: &quer +...
1680 *LRD: &que: querido [: querido] [*] [>] ?
1681 *GRB: querido [<] [= wanted] ?
1682 *GRB: (..) no@i ?
1683 *GRB: madali lang (.) no@i [= it's easy, right] ?
1684 *ISV: sí [=yes] .
1685 *GRB: kung makuha mo na (i)yong ano: [= once you get it] +...
(S2)

Meanwhile, in Excerpt 18, specifically in lines 1683 and 1685, GRB reacted to the correct answer given by LRD in line 1680, saying that it was easy to identify the past participle form of the verb once a student understands the rules behind its formation. LRD did not respond; however, GRB's observation was supported by another student, ISV, in Spanish. This function is similar with García's (2011) finding that translanguaging was used to include others through the speakers' conscious choice to use a specific language with certain interlocutors.

Discussion

This study aimed to identify the functions of student CS by immigrant language learners of Spanish through a translanguaging lens. The use of translanguaging concepts and the micro-analysis espoused by conversation analytic methods allowed the researcher to view CS through a more holistic lens. Moreover, the combination of these approaches encouraged the analyst to reject notions of student CS as a deficit and viewing it simply as "resorting to the L1" and the learner's other languages.

It was found that students alternated between the target language, their L1s, and other languages for a variety of reasons. These functions also appeared to be related to two main dimensions, namely: (1) making sense of the target language and the language class itself, and (2) the social and interactional aspects of a language class.

In the metafunctions of *translation*, *metalinguage*, and *private speech*, student CS was used to process input in the target language, to talk about its grammar, to understand the task at hand and to regulate one's learning. Sayer (2013) observed the same use of translation and negotiating content using the vernacular language to explain and demonstrate the student's understanding, while Lewis et al. (2012) also found the frequent use of "spontaneous translanguaging" by students in bilingual classrooms in Wales as a strategy to maximize understanding and performance. Previous studies (Arthur, 1996; Bunyi, 2005; Fennema-Bloom, 2009; Lin, 1996) indicated that codeswitching can function as a scaffold in order to facilitate comprehension of the additional language. Bialystok (2004) and García (2009) pointed out that because

bilinguals have to cognitively organize two (or more) language systems, they tend to take a more analytic approach to language, thus developing higher metalinguistic awareness. In particular, we see this phenomenon in the student CS examples under *translation* and *metalinguage*, where the students would typically draw on their L1 and other languages for translations of unknown lexical items and also performed a contrastive analysis between the target language and both Tagalog and English, particularly in their explanations of Spanish grammar as well as in using grammatical terms in these languages. The use of Tagalog and English for grammar topics was fairly consistent in both sessions and can be attributed to the fact that the students were educated in these two languages as opposed to their own L1s. In line with this, Cummins (1979, 2000) underlined the important role of the “home language”—in this case, the students’ L1 alongside Tagalog and English—in solving problems in the target language and in developing the language of study. Aside from students’ comparison of Spanish and their languages, the usefulness of the students’ languages was also seen in the students’ private speech in their respective L1s, Tagalog and English, which frequently helped them process the teacher’s instructions or explanations in Spanish, what is going on in the class, or their own feelings or realizations in various class activities. The examples of student CS mentioned here underscore the link between the use of one’s L1 and other languages and its advantages to student cognition and metacognition (Antón & DiCamilla, 1998; Brooks & Donato, 1994; Brooks et al., 1997; Kibler, 2010).

On the other hand, the rest of the CS functions found in the data were related to the social and interactional features of a language class and the discursive functions of student CS. In these metafunctions, student CS has a similar purpose to CS employed by bilinguals in conversation. Auer (1984) argued that CS can be *discourse-related*, or linked to how interlocutors organize conversation, or *participant-related*, where CS is usually triggered by participant attributes such as language preference. In the cases of *acting as a language broker*, *expressing personal knowledge* and *telling jokes and creating wordplay*, the students’ switch from Spanish to other languages were strategies that enabled them to contribute to a conversation despite their limited knowledge of Spanish. In these metafunctions, we see how the students used CS as a way to mitigate communication breakdowns with the teacher or as a way to respond to the teacher instead of simply abandoning their turn. We also highlight here the creativity of the multilingual (Treffers-Daller, 2018) such that student CS gave way to humor by drawing on students’ awareness of features of their various languages. Previous works (Caubet, 2002; Fishman, 1967; Siegel, 1995) also documented the use of CS for humorous purposes in bilingual conversation. Meanwhile, the last function, *giving encouragement to other students*, can be considered as participant-related CS, in that the students consistently used CS to English or Tagalog in addressing other classmates. The students’ choice of using English or Tagalog instead of the target language showed their consciousness of the language preference of their addressees. Lastly, following a translanguaging lens, in all of the metafunctions identified in the data we see the student in the roles of mediator (teacher-student and student-student) as well as co-creator of meaning and knowledge in the language classroom. Students’ strategic use of CS allowed them to take an active role in the classroom, not only in conversations but also in the learning process, and highlighted the importance of promoting the students’ “agency to select features from their entire language repertoire in social interactions” (García & Li, 2018, p. 3).

Parallels between the results of this study and García's (2011) study can be observed in that some CS functions that arose from the data are similar to her account of the translanguaging practices of kindergarten bilingual students. These similarities share the feature of relying on the students' home language in order to make sense of what is happening in the classroom. In this study, this aspect was seen in the translation of key grammatical terms and vocabulary items from Spanish to English or Tagalog and in the private speech of students. Another common feature is the constant crossing of language boundaries, as seen in the frequent alternation of Spanish, English, Tagalog and their respective L1s in the utterances of the students. This intersection of languages enabled them to mediate not only between the teacher and other students, but also to mediate understandings in the target language.

Results from this study also support the growing body of work that discourages exclusive use of the target language and supports the use of L1 and other languages in the language classroom (e.g., Cook, 2001; Dailey-O'Cain & Liebscher, 2009; Macaro, 2005), as well as respects and recognizes the idiosyncrasies of multilingual learners of a language (Cenoz, 2009; De Angelis, 2007; Dewaele, 2010; Lasagabaster, 2015).

The study's findings also have implications in language teaching practice. If both the teacher and students are encouraged to maximize the use of various languages present in the classroom by instituting a language policy that encourages translanguaging, difficulties posed by the exclusive use of the target language as the medium of instruction can be mitigated, especially for beginner-level classes. Creese and Blackledge (2010), in their observation of bilingual classrooms, noted the importance of both languages in conveying messages and of translanguaging as a pedagogic strategy of moving tasks forward. While outside of the scope of this article, it is worth noting that the teacher in this study would often rely on the strategy of asking other students to explain in Tagalog (one of the shared languages of all student participants) in cases of communication breakdown with students of lower proficiency in the language, including an instance where the teacher asked the researcher to translate a particular term from Spanish to English in order to respond to a student's question. Ultimately, the results of this study support Canagarajah's (2011) observation that translanguaging—which includes student CS—is a naturally-occurring phenomenon for multilingual students.

Conclusion

From the various examples seen in the data, it can be observed that student CS can be considered as translanguaging practice such that the students alternated between their L1s, the target language, and other languages for a variety of purposes. These examples illustrate how the students, as multilingual individuals, make use and maximize their linguistic repertoire in meaning-making—in that their L1s and other languages serve as tools not only for navigating language-related tasks in the classroom, but also in facilitating comprehension, cognition, and socialization among members of the class. This study's findings also illustrate that when analyzed from a translanguaging lens, CS departs from its purely analytic stance of languages and instead gives importance to the process behind bilingual practices such as language alternation. Translanguaging, thus, centers on what speakers do and perform with their various languages.

While the study offers a new lens to analyze student CS in classroom discourse, it was limited by its cross-sectional design and data gathering procedures. Since translanguaging aims to identify the ways in which a bilingual uses his or her entire linguistic repertoire, future studies can investigate translanguaging practices of Filipino immigrants outside the classroom set-up and from ethnographic and multimodal perspectives (Kress, 2010). Datasets of these studies can go beyond oral data and analyze, for example, translanguaging in social media or in computer-mediated communication.

Other researchers can also explore the translanguaging practices of immigrants with a higher proficiency in Spanish and/or those who have stayed longer in the host country. As such, researchers can make use of longitudinal research designs that can show the possible evolution of the immigrants' translanguaging practices as they become more immersed in the host country's language and culture.

In this study, we have seen how student codeswitching in a language class is not merely for translation or for filling in lexical gaps. Rather, it can be considered as part of translanguaging practice—a way for students to use their knowledge in, about and beyond the languages that they know, enabling them to maximize their full linguistic repertoire to make sense of their multilingual worlds.

Funding

No funding was received for this work.

Declaration of Ownership

I confirm that this is my original work and that all outside material has been properly cited and acknowledged.

Conflict of Interest

The author has no conflict of interest to declare.

ORCID

Jevic Anjin Cruel, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4579-329X>

References

- Antón, M., & DiCamilla, F. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54(3), 314–442.
- Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation*. John Benjamins.
- Auer, P. (1998). Introduction: Bilingual conversation revisited. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity* (pp. 1–24). Routledge.

- Arthur, J. (1996). Code switching and collusion: Classroom interaction in Botswana primary schools. *Linguistics and Education*, 8(1), 17–33. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898\(96\)90004-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898(96)90004-2)
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford University Press.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Bialystok, E. (2004). Language and literacy development. In T.K. Bhatia & W.C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism* (pp. 577–601). Blackwell.
- Brooks, F. B., & Donato, R. (1994). Vygotskian approaches to understanding foreign language learner discourse during communicative tasks. *Hispania*, 77(2), 262–274. <https://doi.org/10.2307/344508>
- Brooks, F. B., Donato, R., & McGlone, J. V. (1997). When are they going to say “it” right?: Understanding learner talk during pair-work activity. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30(4), 523–541. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1997.tb00860.x>
- Bunyi, G. W. (2005). Language classroom practices in Kenya. In A. M. Y. Lin & P. W. Martin (Eds.), *Decolonisation, globalization: Language-in-education policy and practice* (pp. 131–152). Multilingual Matters.
- 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>
- Caubet, D. (2002). Jeux de langues: Humour and codeswitching in the Maghreb. In A. Rouchdy (Ed.), *Language contact and language conflict in Arabic: Variations on a sociolinguistic theme* (pp. 233–259). Routledge.
- Cenoz, J. (2009). *Towards multilingual education: Basque educational research from an international perspective*. Multilingual Matters.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Translanguaging as a pedagogical tool in multilingual education. In J. Cenoz, D. Gorter, & S. May (Eds.), *Language awareness and multilingualism* (pp. 309–321). Springer.
- Conteh, J., & Meier, G. (2014). *The multilingual turn in language education: Opportunities and Challenges*. Multilingual Matters.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185–209. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587717>
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 57(3), 402–423. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402>
- Council of Europe. (2018). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Council of Europe. <https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companion-volume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989>
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching?. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x>
- Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question, and some other matters. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 19, 121–129.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Multilingual Matters.

- Denst-García, E. (2009). Problemática del alumno filipino en su primer encuentro con el español. In J. F. Robisco García (Ed.), *El currículo de E/LE en Asia-Pacífico: Selección de artículos del I Congreso de Español como Lengua Extranjera en Asia-Pacífico (CE/LEAP)* (pp. 268–281). Instituto Cervantes de Manila and Embassy of Spain in the Philippines.
- Dailey-O’Cain, J., & Liebscher, G. (2009). Teacher and student use of the first language in foreign language classroom interaction: Functions and applications. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O’Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 131–144). Multilingual Matters.
- De Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or additional language acquisition*. Multilingual Matters.
- Department of Education. (1987, May 21). *The 1987 Policy on Bilingual Education*. Department of Education, Culture and Sports.
<https://www.deped.gov.ph/1987/05/21/do-52-s-1987-the-1987-policy-on-bilingual-education/>
- Dewaele, J. M. (2010). *Emotions in multiple languages*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Eberhard, D. M., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (Eds.). (2019). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. (22nd ed.). SIL International.
- Fennema-Bloom, J. (2009). Code-scaffolding: A pedagogic code-switching technique for bilingual content instruction. *The Journal of Education*, 190(3), 27–35.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/42744132>
- Fishman, J. 1967. Bilingualism with and without Diglossia; Diglossia with and without Bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 23(2), 29-38.
- Galindo Merino, M. M. (2012). *La lengua materna en el aula de ELE*. ASELE.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O. (2011). Translanguaging of Latino kindergarteners. In K. Potowski & J. Rothman (Eds.), *Bilingual youth: Spanish in English speaking societies* (pp. 33–55). John Benjamins.
- García, O., & Kleyn, T. (Eds.). (2016). *Translanguaging with multilingual students*. Routledge.
- García, O., & Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 199–216). Springer.
- García, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- García, O., & Li, W. (2018). Translanguaging. In C.A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1488>
- García Mateos, C. (2004). *Experiencias y propuestas didácticas y metodológicas para la enseñanza de la L2 a personas inmigradas*. Edinumen.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009). *Code-switching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gerring, J. (2017). *Case study research: Principles and practices* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Hsiao, D. L., & Vieco, M. (2012). El podcast bien entendido en curso intensivo es más divertido. *MarcoELE*, 15, 1–12. https://marcoele.com/descargas/15/hsiao-vieco_podcast.pdf
- Hsiao, D. L., & Vieco, M. (2015). “Mi vida loca”: ejemplo de explotación didáctica y reflexiones en torno a su integración en ELE. *RedELE*, 27, 100–117.

- <https://www.educacionfpydeportes.gob.es/dam/jcr:0075ddfb-6cd4-49be-9209-bdca72ca6b40/2015-redele-27-5-du-lu-hsiao-mila-vieco-pdf.pdf>
- Kibler, A. (2010). Writing through two languages: First language expertise in a language minority classroom. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(3), 121–142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2010.04.001>
- Kramsch, C. (1998). The privilege of the intercultural speaker. In M. Byram & M. Fleming (Eds.), *Language learning in intercultural perspective: Approaches through drama and ethnography* (pp. 16–31). Cambridge University Press.
- Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. Routledge.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2015). Different educational approaches to bi- or multilingualism and their effect on language attitudes. In M. Juan-Garau & J. Salazar-Noguera (Eds.), *Content-based learning in multilingual educational environments* (pp. 13–30). Springer.
- Levine, G. S. (2011). *Code choice in the language classroom*. Multilingual Matters.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 655–670. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718490>
- Li, W. (2018, May 9). *Translanguaging and code-switching: What's the difference?*. OUPBlog. <https://blog.oup.com/2018/05/translanguaging-code-switching-difference/>
- Lin, A. M. Y. (1996). Bilingualism or linguistic segregation? Symbolic domination, resistance and codeswitching. *Linguistics and Education*, 8(1), 49–84. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898\(96\)90006-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898(96)90006-6)
- Lin, A. M. Y. (2017). Code-switching in the classroom: Research paradigms and approaches. In K. A. King, Y. J. Lai, & S. May (Eds.), *Research methods in language and education*. (3rd ed.) (pp. 487–501). Springer.
- Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 63–84). Springer.
- MacSwan, J. (2017). A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(1), 167–201. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216683935>
- MacWhinney, B. (2000). *The CHILDES project: Tools for analyzing talk*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- May, S. (Ed.). (2014). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education*. Routledge.
- Mazak, C. M. (2017). Introduction: Theorizing translanguaging practices in higher education. In *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies*. (pp. 1–10). Multilingual Matters.
- McQuillan, J., & Tse, L. (1995). Child language brokering in linguistic minority communities: Effects on cultural interaction, cognition and literacy. *Language and Education*, 9(3), 195–215. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500789509541413>
- Monsod, J. A. D. (2017). Notas sobre el uso de textos de literatura filipina en español en las clases de E/LE en Filipinas. *Didáctica. Lengua y Literatura*, 29, 189–206. <https://doi.org/10.5209/DIDA.57137>

- Morta Enderes, A. (2005). *Interlengua y análisis de errores de los estudiantes filipinos en el aprendizaje de español como lengua extranjera*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Salamanca.
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281–307. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-0014>
- Pe-Pua, R. (2005). Vínculos entre Filipinas y España: migraciones y relaciones bilaterales. *Revista CIDOB d'Afers Internacionals*, 68, 53–65. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40586123>
- Salazar Lorenzo, D. (2008). Propuesta curricular para la enseñanza de español L2 con fines laborales a inmigrantes Filipinos. *Dosieres Segundas Lenguas e Inmigración*, 4.
- Sánchez Jiménez, D. (2010). La adquisición de la lengua extranjera española por estudiantes Filipinos: Análisis descriptivo y explicativo de la interlengua. *RedELE*, 18. <https://www.educacionfpydeportes.gob.es/dam/jcr:8fb5dd47-56d9-4753-a338-4464f99f7871/2010-redele-18-04sanchezjimenez-pdf.pdf>
- Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, TexMex, and bilingual pedagogy: Emergent bilinguals learning through the vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(1), 63–88. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.53>
- Schlegloff, E. A. (1991). Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition. In L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. 150–171). American Psychological Association.
- Schlegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.
- Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching*, 38(4), 165–187. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444805003010>
- Sibayan, A. M. (2011). Reparaciones en la producción oral: Un estudio sobre aprendices de español en Filipinas. *MarcoELE*, 13, 2–80.
- Siegel, J. (1995). How to get a laugh in Fijian: Code-switching and humor. *Language in Society*, 24(1), 95–110. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S004740450001842X>
- Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting?. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 760–770. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588224>
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research*, 4(3), 251–274. <https://doi.org/10.1177/136216880000400304>
- Treffers-Daller, J. (2018, January 23). *Code-switching and translanguaging: exploring the creativity of multilinguals* [PowerPoint slides]. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322677346_Code-switching_and_translanguaging_exploring_the_creativity_of_multilinguals
- Turnbull, M., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2009). Introduction. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 1–14). Multilingual Matters.
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, & Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2013). *La migración mundial en cifras*. <https://www.oecd.org/els/mig/SPANISH.pdf>
- Vogel, S., & García, O. (2017, December 19). *Translanguaging*. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.181>

Cruel, J. A. F.

- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind and society*. Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. The MIT Press.
- 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 dissertation]. University of Wales.
- Wray, A. (2002). *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge University Press.

Appendices

Appendix A

CHAT Transcription Format (MacWhinney, 2000)

Transcription Symbols Present in the Main Line	
xxx	Unintelligible speech
&	Incomplete words, filled pauses
@i	Interjection
@l	Spelling out
@o	Onomatopoeia
@wp	Wordplay
[?]	Best guess
()	Shortening
[*]	Error
(.)	Short pause
(..)	Long pause
(...)	Very long pause
:	Syllable lengthening
[/]	Repetition
[//]	Correction
[///]	Reformulation
[>]	Overlapping follows
[<]	Overlap precedes
[: going to]	Replacement, assimilation
[=!]	Paralinguistic material
[=]	Explanation
0	Omitted word
&*	Interposed word
&=	Simple events
[- ceb]	Utterances in Cebuano, Tagalog and Ilocano
[- tgl]	
[- ilo]	
%com	Comment on the main line
%add	Addressee tier
Final Punctuation Markers	
.	Declarative utterances
?	Interrogative utterances
!	Exclamations or commands
+...	Trailing off (incompletion marker)
+..?	Trailing off of a question
+/.	Interruption
+//.	Self-interruption
+/?	Interruption of a question
+!?	Question with exclamation
Utterance Linkers	
+^	Quick uptake (no short pause between utterances)
+,	Self-completion

Appendix B

Observation Sheet

Date and Time		Session No.		
Participant	Utterance Where CS Occurred	Language(s) (SPA/ENG/TGL/CEB/ILO)	Class Activity	Description and Analysis

Notes

About the Author

Jevic Anjin F. Cruel is an Assistant Professor at the Department of European Languages, University of the Philippines Diliman. She has more than 10 years of experience in teaching foreign languages to young adolescents and adults and has taught Spanish and language studies classes at both undergraduate and graduate levels. She obtained her master’s degree in Training of Teachers of Spanish as a Foreign Language at the University of Barcelona and Pompeu Fabra University under a scholarship from the Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation and the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation. Her research interests include language learning and pedagogy, multilingual education, immigrant language learning, and technology-enhanced language learning.