Critical Multilingualism Studies
an interdisciplinary journal

Mei-Hsing Tsai
National Taiwan University of Science and Technology

Ya-ting Chiang
National Taiwan University of Science and Technology

Chi-Chuan Yang
National Taiwan University of Science and Technology

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS' TRANSLANGUAGING PRACTICES IN A MULTILINGUAL TAIWANESE UNIVERSITY: A SEQUENTIAL ANALYSIS

Abstract:
This study investigates the international students' use of translanguaging during a task-based language activity conducted in Taiwan. The focal participants in this study were international students who learned Mandarin Chinese as an additional language at a multilingual Taiwanese university. Adopting the methodology of sequential analysis (e.g., Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff et al., 2002) to analyze a small corpus of multilinguals' interactions, we show that international students employed translanguaging practices as a pragmatic strategy to accomplish specific interactional goals. Specifically, the international students in this study integrated Mandarin Chinese into English-language conversations in order to explicitly make themselves understood, to express social solidarity, and to preserve face. This study's findings speak to the need for pedagogical language-learning materials that directly address the needs of multilinguals who learn a local language as an additional language and who may engage in similar multilingual interactions within their own communities of practice.

Keywords: Multilingual interactions ◆ translanguaging ◆ international students ◆ conversation analysis ◆ additional language learning

Tsai, M-H., Chiang, Y-t., Yang, C-C. (2023). International students' translanguaging practices in a multilingual Taiwanese university: A sequential analysis. *Critical Multilingualism Studies, 10*(1), 36–65. ISSN 2325–2871.

Introduction

Universities worldwide have sought to internationalize because internationalization is one of the crucial criteria for competing globally and fulfilling local demands. Therefore, the number of international students had been continuously increasing all over the world before 2019. Specifically, there were 5.6 million students who studied abroad in higher education globally in 2018, a two-fold increase from 2005 (International Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2021). Taiwanese universities are not exceptions, which recruit many international students to promote international reputations and forge multi-faceted partnerships with academic institutes in other countries to boost competitiveness on the world stage. In 2018, Taiwan hosted 129,207 international students in higher education, double the number from 2009 (https://stats.moe.gov.tw/statedu/chart.aspx?pvalue=36).

The growing number of international students in Taiwan could also be due to the New Southbound Policy, the Taiwanese government's foreign policy, to promote regional integration with the member countries of the Association of Southeast Asia Nations (ASEAN), South Asia, New Zealand, and Australia. Educational ties are a main emphasis in the category of "conducting talent exchange" (Office of Trade Negotiations, Executive Yuan, 2016). Because of this New Southbound Policy, universities in Taiwan have recruited many international students from South Asian countries such as Indonesia or Vietnam. In 2018, the number of degree-seeking international students attracted by the New Southbound Policy reached 29,946, accounting for 23% of the total international students in Taiwan (https://stats.moe.gov.tw/statedu/chart.aspx?pvalue=36). Due to the rising number of international students, universities in Taiwan have become multilingually and culturally diverse educational institutes (Lin, 2022).

In a time of increasing scholar and student mobility, English maintains its dominance in multilingual contexts, enabling multilingual users to complete their academic programs, assignments, and other important tasks. Even though English is the primary medium of instruction, a growing number of international students in Taiwan learn Mandarin Chinese, the local language, as an additional language in order to expand their communicative capacity and increase their future career opportunities (Fukui & Yashima, 2021).

Many studies on multilingualism and multilingual interactions have focused on the European context, while far fewer studies address other regions in the world, especially East Asia, where the governments are implementing international policies to recruit more international students at a tertiary level and the importance of multilingualism and multilingual interactions is increasing. Second, international students who learn Mandarin Chinese, the local language, as

an additional language and use it in English conversations have not been systematically investigated from an emic perspective. To fill this research gap, the present study aims to explore how international students who learn the local language as an additional language deploy translanguaging practices to accomplish specific goals during intercultural communication tasks in a multilingual Taiwanese university. This study, therefore, poses a research question: How do international students strategically deploy translanguaging practices to accomplish specific goals during interactions in a task-based language activity?

Taking international students in a multilingual Taiwanese university for example, this study also contributes to the body of research on translanguaging, which explores how various local languages such as Mandarin Chinese, Arabic, German, and many others function as shared languages for international students. When considering an additional language learning in a multilingual classroom, it is important to examine actual examples of multilingual speakers' interactions. The excerpts in this study might serve as pedagogical materials of successful multilingual communication for study-abroad students who learn a local language as an additional language and may encounter similar intercultural communication in our rapidly internationalized society. Given that two fields of studies are particularly relevant for the current study (translanguaging and facework), we review them in the following section.

Literature Review

Translanguaging

The term *translanguaging* originated from Williams's (1994) and Baker's (2011) analyses of pedagogical practices in English/Welsh bilingual classrooms where teachers used both English and Welsh as instructional languages while students spoke or wrote in Welsh (the second language). In this way, students could use their more familiar language (English) to learn the second language (Welsh). Canagarajah (2011) defined translanguaging as "the ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system" (p. 401). Translanguaging consists of diverse and fluid language practices resulting from multilingual speakers' *one* full linguistic system rather than a linguistic switch between two separated language systems (García & Li Wei, 2014; Lewis et al., 2012; Otheguy et al., 2015). In other words, the first language (L1), the second language (L2), or the third language (L3) can be treated as available semiotic resources rather than as structural rules or self-enclosed language systems (Kramsch, 2012). According to García and Li Wei (2014), translanguaging and code-switching are different. Code-switching denotes individuals switching between two separate, monolingual language systems, while

translanguaging focuses on multilinguals' whole linguistic repertoire (Cenoz, 2017, 2019). One of the major reasons is that multilingual speakers can naturally use existing prior knowledge as a resource when they learn and use languages. For example, when multilingual students learn an additional language, the acquisition process is impacted by the first and second language vocabulary, phonetics, syntax, pragmatics, etc. (e.g., Safont, 2005; De Angelis, 2007). At the same time, *reverse transfer* can be observed when multilinguals employ linguistic resources from their additional language to L2 or L2 to L1 (Cenoz, 2019; Tsang, 2016). Overall, these findings imply that multilingual speakers' use of linguistic resources draws from their full linguistic repertoire. This phenomenon of using the resources of multilingual students' full linguistic repertoire can be seen in Cenoz and Gorter's (2011) study. Cenoz and Gorter (2011) stated that multilingual learners used the same common strategies when they wrote three different topics in three languages. Specifically, multilingual students organized their compositions in similar ways and employed general writing strategies by using resources in their full linguistic repertoire. Furthermore, Li Wei (2018) stated that the act of translanguaging creates a social space for multilingual speakers to integrate different dimensions of their personal history, experience, belief, as well as cognitive and physical capacity "into one coordinated and meaningful performance," which is creative and transformative (p. 23).

Pedagogical translanguaging and spontaneous translanguaging

The original meaning of translanguaging refers to a teaching strategy based on the systematic use of different languages for educational purposes (Lewis et al., 2012). As García (2009) pointed out, translanguaging is defined as "multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds" (p. 45). This explanation indicates the reality of bilingual/multilingual usage naturally occurring inside and outside the classroom. Furthermore, Cenoz and Gorter (2017) identified translanguaging as a specific pedagogical strategy in its original meaning and regard translanguaging as discursive practices in a broad sense when they distinguish between *pedagogical translanguaging* and *spontaneous translanguaging*. Pedagogical translanguaging is considered as part of that teaching process, which uses different languages in pedagogical activities organized by the teacher, or refers to other planned teaching strategies based on the learners' whole linguistics repertoire. Spontaneous translanguaging signifies fluid and multilingual discursive practices taking place inside and outside of classrooms. Furthermore, Cenoz and Gorter (2020) explained that these two types of translanguaging can be shown as a continuum that represents that pedagogical translanguaging planned by the teacher can co-occur with the spontaneous usage of multilingual recourses that are unplanned. On the other hand, spontaneous translanguaging used by the teacher and students would be to some extent associated with the curriculum or pedagogical

activity. Therefore, Cenoz and Gorter (2020) concluded that pedagogical translanguaging and spontaneous translanguaging are not a dichotomy but a continuum with the former at one end and the latter at the other.

Research related to pedagogical translanguaging highlights the use of the L1 as a resource in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classes. For example, Rácz's (2022) study demonstrated that the teacher's use of translanguaging as a pedagogical strategy facilitated students' performance in an L2 (Romanian) testing situation. Specifically, the teacher employed secondary students' L1 language, Hungarian, to analyze the text associated with a graduation exam in Romanian language and literature. In this way, students were able to quickly adapt new Romanian words and use them in sentences that combined Hungarian and Romanian. Moreover, pedagogical translanguaging can be employed in educational settings by using three different languages. For example, Leonet et al. (2020) conducted an experimental study on the development of morphological awareness in English as a third language for students who were fluent in Basque and Spanish. The findings show that the experimental group who received translanguaging pedagogies (e.g., analyzing a text in one language and writing a similar text in other two languages) outperformed the control group.

Recent work on spontaneous translanguaging occurring in communicative activities among students indicates that multilinguals flexibly use their whole linguistic repertoires to facilitate ongoing communication, produce integrated knowledge and deep understandings, or claim a multilingual identity. For example, Melo-Pfeifer and Araújo e Sá (2018) showed multilingual students' active participation in language learning through translanguaging in multilingual chat rooms. In chat rooms, students engaged in translanguaging episodes focusing on language forms and leveraged their entire linguistic repertoires when inquiring and receiving feedback from other participants. More recently, Duarte (2019) investigated the role of secondary multilingual pupils' translanguaging in content-matter mainstream classrooms. A sociocultural discourse analysis demonstrated that students' translanguaging practices were used to advance understanding and to mediate the collaborative process of knowledge development. Similarly, Fallas Escobar (2019) examined the purposes of 19 college students' spontaneous translanguaging during pedagogical activity in an EFL program at a Costa Rican university. Adopting discourse analysis, the author identified eight purposes of students' spontaneous translanguaging and their frequency: refereeing key content, giving an opinion, offering an explanation, referring to Spanish graffiti, offering a critique, narrating, asking a question, and expressing an emotion. The author argued that translanguaging is a feature of bilingual/multilingual students' linguistic knowledge that needs to be acknowledged in an EFL program.

Facework

In the present study, we adopt the framework of Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory to examine the instances in which international students used translanguaging to establish rapport and in-group solidarity or to cope with potentially face-threatening situations. Following O'Driscoll's (2001) insight, it is argued that the use of different languages in plurilingual contexts often results from facework. According to Goffman (1967), facework is defined as the actions by which an individual makes whatever he or she is doing consistent with face (Goffman, 1967). Goffman (1967) further defined *face* as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact (p. 7)." Brown and Levinson's politeness theory can be seen as an interpretation of Goffman's notion of face, combined with the Gricean concept of utterances. According to Svennevig (2000, p. 40), Brown and Levinson borrowed the concept of face as "a social actor's public self-image" from Goffman and they borrowed fundamental assumptions about rational behaviour (e.g., means-end rationality)[1] from Grice.

Building upon Goffman's notion of face, Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) presented two aspects of face: positive face (i.e., the desire to have a positive self-image) and negative face (i.e., the need to avoid being imposed upon by others). Brown and Levinson (1987) further stated that any type of human communication to some extent includes face-threatening acts (FTAs), and they considered redressive actions that counteract an FTA as facework. Corresponding to the two aspects of face, Brown and Levinson (1987) proposed two kinds of politeness strategies: positive politeness strategies and negative politeness strategies. The former approaches (e.g., compliments or joking) cultivate friendship and closeness between individuals by redressing the conversation participant's positive face, while the latter approaches (e.g., apologies or hedges) preserve distance and respect by minimizing the threats to the conversation participant's negative face.

On the other hand, humorous expressions seem closer to positive politeness strategies than negative politeness strategies, which are used to minimize the threat to a person's positive face (Zajdman, 1995). For example, Brown and Levinson (1987) viewed joking as a positive strategy

1 According to Grice (1975), conversations contain purposive acts, including the process of mean-end rationality. Conversation participants engage in goal-oriented actions and decide on the means that best reach the ends. This presupposes the conversation participants' ability to compare different means and choose the one that maximizes profit and minimizes cost (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 65, as cited in Svennevig, 2000, p. 13).

that can promote friendliness and closeness by implying interlocutors' shared values and background knowledge. Another type of humorous expressions, teasing, has been touched upon by many researchers from different perspectives. A substantial body of research examines teasing as a positive way to bond, particularly in interactions with family members or friends, while teasing is also predominately considered to be a negative communication message that can be destructive to relationships. This is because teasing may be constructed as a face-threatening act because teasing is an intentional provocation that comment on something related to the target (Keltner et al., 2001). This intentional provocation has some effect on the target and are frequently accompanied by mitigating devices such as laughter or exaggeration, which makes the teasing humorous and ambiguous (Mir & Cots, 2019). Furthermore, teasing often occurs in response to interpersonal conflict, allowing interactionists to solve a conflict in playful ways (Keltner et al., 2001).[2] For example, acquaintances were more likely to tease each other when discussing different views (Straehle, 1993).

With a growing number of international students studying in Taiwan, it is important to examine actual examples of multilingual interactions between Taiwanese students and study-abroad students in newly internationalized Taiwanese universities. Adopting the methodology of sequential analysis, this qualitative study aims to shed light on how international students who learn Mandarin Chinese as an additional language successfully engage in spontaneous translanguaging with Taiwanese students to carry out intercultural communication language tasks. In particular, our dyadic data, collected from Taiwanese students (who are L1 Mandarin Chinese speakers) and international students (who learn Mandarin Chinese as an additional language), show that the international students deployed their interlocutors' L1 during multilingual interactions. Following Wagner's (2018) argument, translanguaging in this study can be also viewed as *recipient design*. Recipient design is observable in interaction: speakers design their talk by considering with whom they are talking, and more importantly, "what that recipient knows and what they know in common" (Drew, 2013, p. 148). In other words, participants understand which languages are appropriate to use in a specific situation, and they design their utterances accordingly to meet their communicative needs.

[2] According to Habib (2008), disagreement and teasing can promote rapport and binding among friends who already have initial bonds. In excerpt 8, however, Lia's teasing occurs when Yun and Lia disagree about the saltiness of Taiwanese food. As this teasing includes elements of criticism toward Yun, it is to some extent a face-threatening act. Moreover, the task-based language activity was the first encounter for Yun and Lia. Lia produced translanguaging teasing since translanguaging enhances social solidarity by generating feelings of similarity and indicating shared linguistic and cultural knowledge.

The data we gathered from multilingual users were investigated thoroughly to show how the international students successfully deployed translanguaging practices to accommodate, collaborate, and protect face based on Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness. In doing so, this study contributes to the enhancement of pedagogical materials that casts translanguaging as an essential device for successful communication for multilingual individuals who learn a local language as an additional language and may encounter similar interactions within their own communities of practice.

Methodology

In 2018, the data collection took place at a major university in northern Taiwan.[3] The materials used for this study were taken from a task-based language activity that was part of the coursework in an elective English course. This English course focused on cultural issues aimed at enhancing Taiwanese students' intercultural awareness and understanding of different cultures. Students were expected to be capable of understanding cultural differences and to communicate confidently and effectively in English with individuals from different cultural backgrounds. The activity was a mandatory intercultural communication task that required Taiwanese students to interview international students using four to five prepared questions related to the students' cultures and to introduce the local culture to the international students.

International students were recruited from Chinese language courses since international students are more likely to be reached in the Chinese language program than in other programs offered by the university.[4] Although each of the international students received 200 NT dollars (approximately 6.7 USA dollars) for their participation in this project, participation was wholly voluntary. Since Mandarin Chinese is widely used in local contexts (even in campus life), learning Chinese can help international students integrate into the local community and prepare themselves for careers in a Chinese-speaking environment.

The corpus of data consisted of 40 Taiwanese students, including 11 female undergraduates, 27 male undergraduates, and two male graduate students. There were also 21 international students from multicultural backgrounds: 12 female and three male graduate students from Indonesia,

3 In 2018, the university had 10,304 students, including 1,720 international students, most of whom studied in engineering and applied sciences graduate programs.

4 The international students who participated in the current project were primarily recruited from Chinese courses, including 'Oral Training in Basic Chinese,' 'Mandarin Chinese Practical (Level 1),' and 'Mandarin Chinese Practical (Level 2).'

three female and one male graduate students from Vietnam, one female exchange student from France, one female and two male exchange students from Germany, and one male graduate student from Panama. All of the participants were randomly paired by the instructor (who is also the first author), forming 40 dyads. Most of the international students had two individual, one-on-one interviews; each of these interviews was conducted with a different Taiwanese student. Two international students had only one individual, one-on-one interview since their assigned Taiwanese partners dropped the course before their one-on-one interviews could be conducted. All of the students met for face-to-face interviews and recorded their conversations on their smartphones at a time and location outside of the classroom that they had arranged. Each interview lasted for at least 20 minutes. The corpus of the data ultimately consisted of approximately 18 hours of audio-recorded conversations between the Taiwanese students and the international students.

The audio files of the interviews were initially analyzed holistically. A series of translanguaging sequences, however, caught our attention. To investigate the use of translanguaging as a conversational resource by multilingual speakers during the task-based language activity, we adopted conversation analysis (e.g., Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff et al., 2002) entailing a *sequential* investigation of multilingual speakers' translanguaging, combined with ethnographic-informed data to understand participants' turn-by-turn interactions.[5] Our sequential analysis involved a close examination of the sequential processes by which the multilingual speakers in this study strategically translanguaged in their interactions. Because three researchers are members of the community under investigation, they had important access to the participants' spoken practices and knowledge of the communicative practices of the community, which helped them to analyze the data. Furthermore, each Taiwanese student was required to offer their reflection on this intercultural communication task in their written reports that were part of the course requirements.[6]

5 According to Maynard (2006), ethnography facilitates the conversation analytic studies of talk-in-interaction. Specifically, using relevant ethnographic data (e.g., interviews, documents, or observation) yields a better understanding of participants' ongoing talk (Antaki, 2011; Maynard, 2006).

6 There were three potential reflection questions: (1) What did you learn from this project? (2) Which part of the project did you enjoy the most?, and (3) What was the biggest challenge for you? Students decided which issues they would like to address in their report. The length of their written reflections was approximately 100–150 words. This ethnographic data facilitated our sequential analysis of students' turn-by-turn communication.

Data analysis

The ATLAS.ti 18 program was used to examine the data during the data analysis process. ATLAS.ti 18 allows researchers to review audio files in a systematic manner, attaching labels (i.e., codes) when they notice interesting aspects or patterns. Moreover, the researchers can collect similar data segments by applying the same labels. Therefore, ATLAS.ti 18 can facilitate an analytical process that moves from noticing to coding to discovering insights and identifying patterns. After examining all of the data, we found that international students engaged in translanguaging for particular communicative purposes: repairing understanding, establishing rapport and in-group solidarity, as well as mitigating embarrassment and disagreement. The excerpts presented in this study are representatives of each communicative purpose. We examine eight instances of translanguaging practices among multilingual speakers in this section. The profiles of the focal participations are illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1. Focal participants' profiles.[7]

Name	**Student Status**	**Nationality**	**L1**	**L2**	**L3**
Dewi	Graduate student	Indonesia	Indonesian	English	Chinese
Gemi	Graduate student	Indonesia	Indonesian	English	Chinese
Lia	Graduate student	Indonesia	Indonesian	English	Chinese
Katharina	Exchange student	Germany	German	English	Chinese
Ngon	Graduate student	Vietnam	Vietnamese	English	Chinese
Tuyen	Graduate student	Vietnam	Vietnamese	English	Chinese

Results

In this section, we discuss international students' translanguaging practices for three types of communicative purposes. First, we demonstrate how the international students in this study translanguaged in their repair sequences to solve the problem of understanding and improve clarity. Second, we investigate how the international students established in-group solidarity with their interlocutors through translanguaging. Finally, we show the international students' skillful use of translanguaging humor as a device to mitigate disagreement or to preserve face.

Repairing understanding

7 All names are pseudonyms that reflect the linguacultural backgrounds of the participants.

In Excerpt 1, Ngon is a female Vietnamese graduate student, and Hong is a male Taiwanese graduate student. Ngon and Hong are talking about the food and traffic in Taiwan.

Excerpt 1.

1	N:		actually when I:: (.) for the first time, I taste
2			the way (.) you cook, u::m (.) the taste is so
3		→	↑different because it has a lot of /ɔɪr/, sesame /ɔɪr/.
4	H:	→	/ɔɪr/?
5	N:	→	/ɔɪr/, jiùshì hǎoduō yóu ya!= ((speaking Chinese,
6		→	*it means there is a lot of oil*))
7	H:	→	=yóu, ((speaking Chinese, *oil*)) oh yóu ((speaking
8		→	Chinese, *oil*))
9	N:		u:n
10	H:		nǐ shuō zhèbiān bǐjiào yóu. ((speaking Chinese,
11			*you said the food here is more oily*))
12	N:		mhm. ránhòu ((speaking Chinese, *and then*)) (.)
13		→	and then about the /træfɪdʒ/ [/træfɪdʒ/
14	H:	→	[/træfɪdʒ/
15	N:	→	/træfɪdʒ/, it's so ↑different!=
16	H:	→	=/træfɪdʒ/, what is /træfɪdʒ/?
17	N:	→	/træfɪdʒ/, jiùshì jiāntōng yā! ((speaking Chinese,
18			*it means traffic*))
19	H:		oh, jiāntōng ((speaking Chinese, *traffic*)) ( )
20	N:		[duì ((speaking Chinese, *yes*))
21	H:		[°okay°

In lines 1–3, Ngon mentions that the food in Taiwan contains a lot of oil. The trouble source is "/ɔɪr/" as Ngon replaces the /l/ phoneme with the /r/ phoneme. In line 4, Hong repeats "/ɔɪr/" with a rising intonation, which functions as a repair initiator, revealing that "/ɔɪr/" affects intelligibility at this point. Ngon's repair starts with the repetition of the trouble source in the same manner. Without Ngon's changing the /r/ phoneme into the /l/ phoneme, the utterance may remain unintelligible. However, the following action of translanguaging restores intelligibility, to which Hong shows his understanding by repeating "yóu" and stating "oh yóu." Furthermore, because both parties use Mandarin Chinese to conduct the phonological negotiation, Hong uses Mandarin Chinese to confirm whether Ngon thinks the food in Taiwan is oily. In line 12, Ngon's discourse marker "mhm" indicates that the repair sequence has been brought to a successful conclusion.

In line 13, Ngon talks more about traffic in Taiwan; however, the pronunciation of the word "traffic" is problematic due to its ambiguity. Hong tries to make sense of the sound /træfɪdʒ/ through self-repetition, which overlaps with Ngon's utterance in line 14. After Ngon repeats the word in the same manner again, Hong directly asks for clarification, saying, "what is /træfɪdʒ/?" Ngon utters the word again and provides the Chinese equivalent. In turn, Hong offers the discourse marker "oh." This marker shows a change in Hong's state of knowing. Intelligibility has been restored, and the repair sequence has been successfully completed.

It should be noted that different pronunciations accompanied by Chinese equivalents help achieve mutual understanding. Specifically, without pronunciation adjustment, Hong may have remained confused regarding the phonological trouble sources or the repair sequences may have lasted longer. Employing Chinese allowed Ngon to enhance the clarity of the utterances and increase the intelligibility of her speech for her interlocutor. Thus, translanguaging is shown to be an efficient means of negotiating diverse pronunciations. By translanguaging, interactants can maintain the flow of conversation and move on to the next topic without conducting any additional repairs.

Excerpt 2.

1	Y:		is there anything impress you after you come to Taiwan?
2	L:		haha, £impress£
3	Y:		°haha°
4	L:	→	(1.0) the /seɪftɪ/
5	Y:	→	hm?
6	L:	→	the /seɪftɪ/
7	Y:	→	/seɪf/ /seɪ/[/f/
8	L:	→	[/seɪftɪ/
9	Y:	→	o:[:h
10	L:	→	[ānquán ((speaking Chinese, *safety*))
11		→	/seɪftɪ/=
12	Y:		=is it (.) i:s it dangerous in
13			[i:n I:ndonesia?
14	L:		[yea::h! in my country
15			it's dangerous, especially at night.
16	Y:		un.

Lia is a female Indonesian graduate student, and Yi-han is a female Taiwanese undergraduate student. Yi-han is asking Lia what has most impressed her since arriving in Taiwan. Lia answers Yi-han's question by indicating that the safety of Taiwan has impressed her the most. Despite its potentially high comprehensibility by others, Lia's utterance "the safety" is a trouble source

for Yi-han. Yi-han deploys the open class repair initiator "hm?" in line 5. In response, Lia repairs the trouble source by repeating the phrase "the safety." In line 7, Yi-han repeats the word "safe" twice in order to make sense of Lia's utterance through self-repetition. This repetition may indicate that Yi-han does not fully understand Lia's pronunciation because she is not able to repeat the complete word "safety." In Yi-han's written reflection, she states that "I think the biggest challenge [of this intercultural communication activity] is the accent." If a multilingual speaker does not share or have familiarity with another multilingual speaker's pronunciation, it may be difficult for the first multilingual speaker to understand the English sounds produced by the second multilingual speaker. This excerpt represents Yi-han and Lia's first time talking with each other. It is understandable that Yi-han is still becoming accustomed to Lia's speech style during the interview.

After Yi-han's indication of non-understanding, Lia takes her turn performing a repetition again for accommodation. In Yi-han's response, "oh" shows a transition from a state of non-understanding to a state of understanding. This suggests that intelligibility has been restored. At the same time, in line 10, Lia translanguages by using Mandarin Chinese in order to make the meaning of the phrase "the safety" clearer for Yi-han. This translanguaging instance is an example of Lia taking a proactive step to increase the explicitness of the utterance.[8]

Excerpt 3.

1	K:		I feel quit okay, I don't know how many (ex) I broke
2	Z:		hahaha, ↑okay::
3	K:		so maybe I shocked some Taiwanese.
4			(2.0)
5	Z:		It is ↑okay:: (.) for you.
6	K:		but fro from my side, I think I'm um I'm fine.
7	Z:		o:h un
8	K:	→	also I'm um only half /dʒɜmən/
9	Z:	→	/dʒɜr/ /dʒɜrbən/
10	K:	→	/dʒɜrmən/
11	Z:	→	/dʒɜr/ o::h
12	K:	→	déguórén ((speaking Chinese, *German*))

8 In the present study, explicitness means that multilingual speakers use Mandarin Chinese to make their English utterances clearer. It is used differently from the word, 'clarity.' This word, clarity, indicates that a multilingual speaker uses Mandarin Chinese to clarify the meanings of the English words due to the diverse pronunciations (i.e., /ɔɪr/ for 'oil' and /træfɪdʒ/ for 'traffic').

```
13  Z:  →    °o:h°
14  K:       but only half
```

In Excerpt 3, Katharina is a female German exchange student, and Zhen is a female Taiwanese undergraduate student. Katharina and Zhen talk about Katharina's culture shock in Taiwan and her ethnicity. Because of Zhen's mishearing (line 9), Katharina repeats the word "German." Zhen's response "/dʒɜr/ o::h" indicates that the intelligibility of the word has been restored from "/dʒɜrbən/" to "/dʒɜrmən/." Similarly, Katharina uses translanguaging "déguórén" as an explicit strategy in order to promote comprehensibility of the utterance. In response, Zhen deploys the discourse marker "oh" as a receipt token to signal that she understands the information delivered by Katharina in the previous turn. Therefore, Katharina proceeds to describe her ethnicity.

The international students in these three excerpts strategically translanguage in their discourse. Translanguaging supports clarity and explicitness in interactions. It tends to co-occur by repetition. Specifically, the international students address the source of the problem by first repeating pronunciations for clarification and subsequently employing Chinese. Repetition is considered to be an accommodation strategy to enhance communicative efficiency in a problematic exchange. Additionally, it seems that the international students engage proactively in repair sequences. Because trouble sources threaten intersubjectivity, the speakers are concerned with not only "trying to get things right" (Sacks, 1987, p.66) but also trying to make utterances more explicit and clearer. In this way, mutual intelligibility can be achieved. Translanguaging by using Chinese is an important means of the international students making themselves clear. Ngon's translanguaging practices after repetition eliminate the ambiguity of different pronunciations. Lia and Katharina also deploy translanguaging practices to make utterances more explicit and to improve communicative efficiency. Finally, the use of translanguaging not only ensures intelligibility among interlocutors, but also helps international students establish solidarity. The following three excerpts show how the international students in this study established rapport and in-group solidarity through translanguaging practices.

Establishing rapport and in-group solidarity

Individuals generally seek to establish each other's positive face and minimize the threats to each other's negative face in cooperative conversations. Negative politeness strategies (e.g., apologies or hedges) are employed to address the conversation participant's negative face. Positive politeness strategies (e.g., compliments or joking) are used to minimize the threats to the conversation participant's positive face, or contribute to in-group solidarity. According to Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 102), "claiming common ground" is viewed as a positive

strategy, which can be accomplished via the use of in-group language (Poncini, 2002). Specifically, international students establish rapport and in-group solidarity with their interlocutors through translanguaging in the following three excerpts.

Excerpt 4.

1	C:		the thousand years eggs, do you ever:?
2	G:		thou[sand years eggs,
3	C:		[hear?
4	G:		nope, >what is it?<
5	C:		e::h, let's google (1.0) just like the dark egg, but
6			it's black.
7	G:		(2.0) ↑o::h=
8	C:		=do you ever °(think)?°
9	G:	→	it's like u::m (2.0) it's quote in pí ((speaking
10		→	Chinese, *the first Chinese character of pídàn*))
11	C:	→	pí ((speaking Chinese, *the first Chinese character*
12		→	*of pídàn*))
13	G:	→	pí= ((speaking Chinese, *the first Chinese character of pídàn*))
14	C:	→	=pí, pí ((speaking Chinese, *the first Chinese character*
15		→	*of pídàn , the first Chinese character of pídàn*))
16	G:	→	chá, chá ((speaking Chinese, *tea*, *tea*))
17	C:	→	chá, chá ((speaking Chinese, *tea*, *tea*))
18	G:	→	°chá° ((speaking Chinese, *tea*))
19	C:		you said the tea egg?
20	G:		yeah, is it? is: ↓it
21	C:		no, it's di[fferent
22	G:		[oh, it's different
23	C:		yeah
24	G:		o:[:h
25	C:		[it uses uh some Chinese medicine to
26	G:		°mm:°
27	C:		°yes°
28	G:	→	oh, is it sold in 7-11 too?
29	C:	→	um, no, 7-11 doesn't have. (.) [maybe
30	G:	→	[°what (about)°
31	C:	→	some=
32	G:	→	=guāngnán? ((speaking Chinese, *a store name*))
33	C:	→	guāngnán ((speaking Chinese, *a store name*))
34		→	yes, [maybe, maybe
35	G:		[yeah

36 oh, but I've never tried it.

In this excerpt, Gemi is a female Indonesian graduate student, and Chia-hao is a male Taiwanese undergraduate student. Chia-hao introduces a local food, "pídàn," to Gemi. Chia-hao asks if Gemi has ever heard of it. Gemi indicates that she has not. In response, Chia-hao suggests that Gemi Google it; he then proceeds to describe the food in lines 5–6. It seems that Gemi realizes what the food is when she offers the change-of-state token "oh" (line 7). Gemi tells Chia-hao the Chinese name of the food starting with the first character "pí" and then uttering "chá" (lines 9–18). Although Gemi is not able to give the complete name of the food in Chinese, these translanguaging utterances indicate Gemi's intent to show that she knows Chinese and to claim common ground. In lines 28–34, Gemi and Chia-hao discuss stores that sell the food. Gemi inquires whether a 7-11 store or guāngnán sells pídàn. Indicating the Chinese name of the local store projects Gemi's positive self-image as the one who is familiar with the stores in the community.

Excerpt 5.

13	J:		and the máng, ((speaking Chinese, *the first Chinese*
14			*character of mango*)) mángguǒ, ((speaking Chinese,
15			*mango*)) [máng ((speaking Chinese, *the first*
16			*Chinese character of mango*))
17	D:		[°mángguǒ° ((speaking Chinese, *mango*))
18	J:		mango=
19	D:		=mango
20	J:		mango ice=
21	D:		=mango ice
22	J:	→	and beef, beef noodles.
23	D:	→	oh, u::m (.) niúròumiàn, ((speaking Chinese,
24		→	*beef noodles*)) niúròumiàn. ((speaking Chinese,
25		→	*beef noodles*))
26	J:	→	yes yes yes!
27	D:		hahaha
28	J:		and you can't miss yǒngkāng ((speaking Chinese,
29			*a street name*)) street in Taipei.
30	D:		hahaha

In Excerpt 5, Dewi is a female Indonesian graduate student, and Jia is a female Taiwanese undergraduate student. Like Gemi in the previous excerpt, Dewi speaks the name of a signature dish in Mandarin Chinese in order to claim common ground and to express her positive image.

In lines 13–21, Jia names mango ice cream in English and Chinese, and then Dewi repeats exactly what Jia has said. It is worth noting that Dewi does not repeat "beef noodles" in English but produces translanguaging utterances. Jia responds with "yes yes yes" in a cheerful voice to show that Dewi has successfully spoken the dish's name in Chinese.

Excerpt 6.

```
1   S:      uh you um: (4.0) maybe you need to search that, where
2           will=
3   T:      =okay, searching on the ↑internet, right?
4   S:      yes
5   T:      I'm searching [(I'm)
6   S:                    [I see
7       →   that in hébīn gōngyuán. ((speaking Chinese,
8       →   a riverside park))
9   T:  →   hébīn gōngyuán, ((speaking Chinese, a
10      →   riverside park)) °hébīn [gōngyuán° ((speaking Chinese,
11          a riverside park))
12  S:                              [we
13  T:  →   hébīn gōngyuán zài nǎlǐ? ((speaking Chinese,
14      →   where is the riverside park?))
15  S:  →   (3.0) um:: (4.0)
16  T:  →   ↓unh wǒ hái méiyǒu kàn. ((speaking Chinese,
17      →   I've not seen it yet))
18  S:      (  ) oh, sorry
```

In Excerpt 6, Tuyen is a female Vietnamese graduate student, and Shun is a male Taiwanese undergraduate student. Tuyen and Shun discuss the location of the dragon boat racing during the Dragon Boat Festival in Taipei. Shun indicates that the boat racing takes place at a riverside park by using Mandarin Chinese ("hébīn gōngyuán"). In response, Tuyen repeats the translanguaging utterance as an acknowledgment token in line 9. It seems that Tuyen then tries to practice this utterance by repeating it at a lower volume a second time. Multilingual speakers continually update their linguistic repertoires and adapt to their interactional contexts. Tuyen takes the previous utterance a step further—"hébīn gōngyuán zài nǎlǐ"—by raising a question in which the wording is slightly modified (line 13). Shun's two long pauses in response show that he has difficulty pinpointing the place. Tuyen senses Shun's hesitation and self-selects to produce another translanguaging utterance that successfully directs the conversation to another issue (Tuyen has never seen dragon boat racing). Shun's "oh, sorry" brings the sequence to a closure. By developing a chain of translanguaging utterances to discuss local events, Tuyen

indicates her competence as a capable multilingual speaker, as well as her desire for group solidarity.

In these three excerpts, the use of translanguaging can be considered to be a vital aspect of building rapport and stressing in-group solidarity. The use of in-group terminology— languages and a local-related lexis—indicates that the international students understand and share the associations of languages with their interlocutors. Specifically, the local-related lexis includes names of foods, stores, streets, and locations. It also indicates shared linguistic knowledge concerning local features, which in this study is related to conversation participants' food culture and customs. This contributes to establishing in-group solidarity and rapport.

Mitigating embarrassment and disagreement

The following two excerpts show that international students skillfully use humorous expressions through translanguaging to mitigate disagreement or to save their own face. Humorous expressions have a mitigating and affiliative function when addressing disagreement and embarrassment (e.g., Matsumoto, 2014). Specifically, translanguaging joking is employed to address potential embarrassment in excerpt 7 and translanguaging teasing is used to negotiate a conflict in excerpt 8.

Excerpt 7.

37 N: a::nd oh so that's um when I ride a bike here,
38 actually I'm (1.0) qui::t surprised.
39 H: so in your country, is ride on th:e (2.0)
40 N: is: on the main road.
41 H: on the main road.
42 N: jiùshì: ((speaking Chinese, *it means*)) (.)
43 >it means that< we can ride the bike um the same,
44 <the same road with motorbikes.>=
45 H: =↑o:h ↓okay okay
46 N: <and the same road with cars.>
47 H: °okay°
48 N: → (so those) jiùshì ((speaking Chinese, *it means*))
49 → (.) jiǎng jiùshì ((speaking Chinese, *what we*
50 → *can say is*)) £luàn (.) luàn (.) luàn ((speaking Chinese,
51 → *in a zigzag manner, in a zigzag manner, in a zigzag manner*))
52 → [luànqí£ ((speaking Chinese,
53 → *riding in a zigzag manner*))
54 H: → [( ) luàn ((speaking Chinse,

```
55        →    in a zigzag manner))
56  N:    →    £luàn (.)qí jiǎotàchē ba£ ((speaking Chinse,
57        →    riding bikes in a zigzag manner)) haha[haha
58  H:    →                                       [haha
```

Ngon is a female Vietnamese graduate student, and Hong is a male Taiwanese graduate student. In this excerpt, Ngon demonstrates her skillful use of translanguaging joking to minimize her potential embarrassment and maintain solidarity between her and her interlocutor. Ngon and Hong talk about the differences between Vietnam and Taiwan in terms of riding a bike. Ngon tells Hong that people in Vietnam do not ride bikes very often, and that the way people ride bikes in Taiwan is different than in Vietnam. She indicates that she is surprised at the way Taiwanese people ride bikes in line 38. In response to Ngon's utterance, Hong asks a question in order to find out where Vietnamese people ride bikes. Ngon first indicates that they do so on the main roads. She then elaborates on her answer—they ride bikes on the same roads as motorbikes and cars—in lines 42–46.

All types of vehicles ridden or driven on the main roads may increase traffic. In order to cope with the exchange that is potentially embarrassing to Ngon, Ngon makes a comment, luànqí jiǎotàchē ba. In this comment, she makes fun of the cyclists who ride their bikes in a zigzag manner, indicating that she is in control of the situation (Schnurr & Chan, 2011; Zajdman, 1995). This translanguaging joking can enhance a person's positive self-image. At the same time, translanguaging joking can downplay the seriousness of a situation; in this case, the situation in which cyclists ride their bikes on the same roads as motorbikes and cars. Ngon's accompanying laughter in line 57 can be considered an invitation to view her translanguaging utterance as humorous. By joining in the laughter, Hong shows his acceptance of Ngon's remark as joking. This translanguaging joking may be used to soften an FTA (toward Ngon) and turn it into joking.

Additionally, Ngon uses this translanguaging joking as a way of affiliating with Hong. This translanguaging joking seems to be based on the common ground that both of them have experience riding a bike in Taiwan and may perceive the traffic situation in the same way. More importantly, this translanguaging joking is based on shared linguistic knowledge and therefore can promote feelings of friendship and familiarity by alluding to the interlocutors' shared linguistic knowledge and values.

Excerpt 8.

1	L:		ah food, the food.=
2	Y:		=food, really?
3	L:		yeah the food, I think compared the food in my country
4	Y:		yeah
5	L:		the food in Taiwan (.) is plain
6	Y:		plain
7	L:		p l a n e, °plain°
8	Y:		°p l a n e°
9	L:	→	yeah plain it means (2.0) um (2.0) hahaha
10	Y:	→	what? that's okay.
11	L:	→	it means £no taste£=
12	Y:	→	=no taste? really?
13	L:		compared to my country because my country the food is
14			like spicy
15	Y:		o::h
16	L:	→	là ((speaking Chinese, *spicy*)) (el) so (.) um:: more
17		→	spicy they have (3.0)
18	Y:	→	they have so many seasoning
19	L:	→	(so it will) for the Taiwanese if they eat my
20		→	country's food they will feel un! (.) £it's so strong£,
21		→	or un! (.) £it's so salty£ [un! £it's spicy£
22	Y:	→	[hahahaha
23			£yeah£
24	L:	→	but if people in my country first time come and eat
25		→	the food here (4.0)
26	Y:	→	£no taste£ hahaha
27	L:		°hahaha° basically [but
28	Y:	→	[I think
29	L:	→	huh?
30	Y:	→	be:cause I thought that our food is: is (.) really
31	L:		salty?
32	Y:		[yeah
33	L:		[what?
34		→	you feel salty? (2.0) your food?
35	Y:	→	yeah (.) I think it's (1.0) um enough
36	L:	→	yeah because (2.0) yes because (1.0) you xíguàn le
37		→	((speaking Chinese, *became used to it*))
38	Y:	→	hahahaha
39	L:	→	but for me (.) after one year it's okay
40	Y:		o::h

In Excerpt 8, Lia is a female Indonesian graduate student, and Yun is a female Taiwanese undergraduate student. A speech event in which a conversation participant makes "a potentially insulting or aggressive comment but simultaneously provides/relies upon cues that the utterance is to be understood as playful/nonserious" (Alberts, 1992, p.155) can be considered a form of teasing (Hay, 2000). The process by which translanguaging teasing is constructed between Lia and Yun is investigated sequentially.

Lia and Yun discuss the saltiness of Taiwanese food. In lines 9–11, Lia explains why she considers Taiwanese food to be plain. Two 2-second pauses in line 9 signal that her explanation is an unfavorable response. Then Yun encourages Lia to expand upon her original explanation. After Lia states that "plain" means "no taste," Yun immediately produces two clarification requests, "no taste?" and "really?," which serve to indicate disagreement with Lia's critical assessment of the food.

Lia is clearly aware that Yun disagrees and explains that Indonesian food is spicy. It is worth noting that Yun collaborates with Lia to co-construct utterances during the conversation. Yun completes Lia's turn right after a three-second pause (line 17). It is possible that the pause is interpreted by Yun as a sign of a word-search moment, and Yun therefore takes the turn and completes Lia's utterance. This collaborative utterance appears to show Yun's engagement and understanding of the conversation. Furthermore, Lia uses a smile voice to explain how Taiwanese people may feel when they eat Indonesian food. This indicates that the utterance is framed as amusing. In other words, Lia senses the conflict between them, and she uses playful talk to diffuse tension and create solidarity and intimacy (Coates, 2007). Yun acknowledges Lia's humorous intentions by laughing and producing the agreement token "yeah" in line 23.

Lia continues to elaborate on why she views Taiwanese food as "plain." Since her elaboration is a dispreferred one, there is a long pause in line 25. Similar to that which occurs in line 17, here Yun displays that she is finely attuned to Lia and performs a completion of Lia's utterance by stating "no taste." Yun's smiling voice and laughter in line 26 creates a contextual cue that her utterance is playful rather than serious. Lia signals her involvement in the playful talk with laughter and the agreement token "basically."

In line 28, Yun indicates her own opinion that is contrary to her initial statement in line 26. It is noted that Yun's self-selected utterance "I think" overlaps with Lia's final chuck of her turn "but." This overlapping evokes Lia's recognition of Yun's intention to talk, and Lia invites Yun to continue speaking in line 29. Yun is certain of Lia's assessment of Taiwanese food. In order to avoid explicit disagreement, Yun seems to delay expressing her own opinion so as to not to damage Lia's positive face in line 30. This delay lasts until Lia initiates the clarification request

"salty?" Yun indicates "yeah," a response which overlaps with Lia's discourse token "what." Lia deploys two additional clarification requests to confirm Yun's answer in line 34. Yun avoids a confrontation when disagreeing with Lia by hedging her opinion from "salty" to "enough" in line 35.

Since there is a conflict between Yun and Lia (they have different opinions about the saltiness of Taiwanese food), Yun's disagreement poses a potential threat to Lia's positive face. Therefore, Lia launches into translanguaging teasing, "you xíguàn le," in line 36. Teasing includes elements of criticism directed towards the interlocutor (Attardo, 1994). Even though Yun states that Taiwanese food is salty enough for her, Yun's evaluation of Taiwanese food is not because Taiwanese food is salty; it is likely because Yun has become used to the taste of the local food. The teasing is used as a form of conveying aggression in a non-serious way. Moreover, this translanguaging teasing, "you xíguàn le," can be interpreted as Lia's attempt to preserve her own face by indicating that her initial assessment is legitimate. Because of the face-threatening nature of teasing, Lia may want to mitigate the impact of her act by employing redressing strategies. Translanguaging can enhance social solidarity by generating feelings of familiarity and indicating shared linguistic and cultural knowledge. With her laughter in line 38, Yun seems to accept Lia's translanguaging utterance as teasing and minimize Lia's potentially FTA.[9]

In order to further redress the potential threat of translanguaging teasing, Lia declares that after one year, she has become comfortable with Taiwanese food. By pointing to the same behavior of becoming used to Taiwanese food, she negates the face-threatening aspect of teasing and softens her FTA (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 124).

Discussion and Conclusion

Our study investigated translanguaging practices between Taiwanese students and international students who learn Mandarin Chinese as an additional language in a multilingual university in Taiwan. Specifically, we demonstrated that international students could successfully deploy their interlocutors' L1s in order to achieve their own communicative purposes, with an emphasis on the ways in which international students integrated their interlocutor's L1 (Mandarin Chinese) into English-language communication in order to explicitly make themselves understood, to establish in-group solidarity, and to preserve face. This type of

9 Yun's laughter can be viewed as a signal that she has understood that Lia's teasing is not meant seriously.

translanguaging practices can be viewed as *recipient design* (Drew, 2013; Wagner, 2018). Mandarin Chinese and English are co-available in the community investigated in this study. It is obvious from the detailed analysis of audio-recorded conversational data in the present study that English is the primary language for ongoing conversations. Yet Mandarin Chinese is an important linguistic resource that international students have in common with their co-participants. The international students seem to be equipped with an intrinsic ability to adjust their language choices to their respective addressees. In spite of their different levels of proficiency in Chinese, the international students in the current study were observed to translanguage successfully for various pragmatic functions.

In the data analysis section, we investigated how six international students of diverse cultural backgrounds employed translanguaging practices as a multilingual resource for particular communicative purposes. Our findings warrant three observations. First, translanguaging is employed to enhance understanding and to improve communicative efficiency (Excerpts 1–3). In other words, translanguaging is used to enhance the effectiveness of communication. This is particularly important for international students in a given community, as it can help to demonstrate familiarity between interlocutors and to promote clarity and explicitness in interactions among interlocutors who have different pronunciations. In Excerpt 1, Ngon repairs her pronunciation by repeating it and then changing to Mandarin Chinese. In the absence of pronunciation adjustment, translanguaging can eliminate the ambiguity of deviant pronunciations and facilitate mutual understanding. In Excerpts 2 and 3, Lia and Katharina take proactive steps to increase the explicitness of their utterances through translanguaging during the negotiation sequences.

Second, this study draws on politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987) to discuss the exploitation of translanguaging and positive politeness. Translanguaging, and especially using an interlocutor's first language, is a basic politeness function (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p.118). By using an addressee's L1 to indicate the local features, the international students stress the common ground they share with their conversation participants and build rapport. Gemi, Dewi, and Tuyen are international students in Taiwan where Mandarin Chinese is the primary language used in the community. When their interlocutors discuss local foods in English, Gemi and Dewi use Mandarin Chinese related to the in-group lexis in an attempt to establish in-group solidarity. If one participant spontaneously engages in translanguaging practices during a conversation, the other participant is likely to follow suit. In following Shun's lead in translanguaging, Tuyen produces a series of translanguaging utterances that indicate her competence as a capable multilingual speaker, as well as her involvement in the conversation and rapport.

Third, by employing translanguaging joking or teasing, the international students show their awareness of FTAs in interactions, skillfully minimize those that have emerged, and nurture solidarity. In Excerpt 7, the conversation may embarrass Ngon; however, she is able to use translanguaging joking to mitigate the FTA and enhance her positive image. Moreover, translanguaging joking can enhance solidarity by generating feelings of familiarity and announcing the interlocutors' shared linguistic and cultural knowledge. For instance, while Lia and Yun disagree about the saltiness of Taiwanese food, Lia uses translanguaging teasing to preserve her positive face, as well as diffuse tension and create solidarity with Yun.

In line with previous studies (e.g., Melo-Pfeifer & Araújo e Sá, 2018), spontaneous translanguaging is a communicative tool that the international students use to enhance the smooth progression of conversation, reflect their multilingual repertoires, and demonstrate alignment and solidarity. As an interactional resource, translanguaging can be also deployed to build rapport and in-group solidarity. The international students' skillful use of translanguaging facilitates effective intercultural communication. The international students' abilities to exploit translanguaging and to flexibly integrate it into their communications are important in pluralistic communication. Additionally, studying abroad is prevalent in this international world. Although English is a medium of instruction or communication in many educational contexts, international students may learn the local language (e.g., Mandarin Chinese or German) in order to expand their communicative capacity and increase their career opportunities in the given community.

Traditionally, language education for second or additional language learning has been concerned with the use of the target language (e.g., Mandarin Chinese) in monolingual interactions. Since different languages coexist with each other, especially in global higher education where English is the main medium of instruction or communication, this study's findings raise scholars' awareness of multilingual pedagogy for international students who learn the local language and use it in their multilingual interactions. Specifically, translanguaging in the current study refers to international students' integration of language practices. For an international student, learning an additional language may go beyond acquiring and using new language features in monolingual communication; indeed, it may involve the integration of translanguaging practices into one linguistic repertoire that becomes a meaning-making resource to know and use in multilingual settings. Moreover, translanguaging enables international students to use the linguistic repertoires already acquired or they learn new linguistic items in multilingual interactions and immediately employ newly learned linguistic recourse in ongoing conversations. Therefore, incorporating translanguaging practices drawing on the local language into language learning materials might help international students develop

translanguaging competence and flexibly when using the local language in multilingual communication. The translanguaging data shown in this study can be used to enhance pedagogical materials. Specifically, these interactional data can be integrated into multilingual learning materials for international students who learn a local language as an additional language and may have similar interactions within their own communities of practice. For example, English is often adopted as a medium of instruction, especially for lower-level additional language classrooms. This is due to the assumption that international students' proficiency level in English is higher than in the target language and that the use of English can enhance chances of getting intended messages across (Kirkebæk, 2013).

This leads to the intriguing question of whether Chinese language classrooms are educational settings where international students develop their translanguaging competence. When international students use English for classroom interaction, they can gradually integrate the Chinese language they learn into their conversation. Our translanguaging analysis can be incorporated into students' language learning materials and can be viewed as good examples of translanguaging practices.

Dyadic and triadic interactions could be different (e.g., Stivers, 2021). It would be valuable to have a better understanding of how spontaneous translanguaging occur in triadic interactions. Moreover, it remains to be examined whether or not a multilingual speaker's use of translanguaging changes over time during the period of studying abroad. We suggest that more data with various intercultural communication activities in educational contexts could have strengthened the observation, ensured more patterned findings, and produced answers to the questions posed above.

References

Alberts, J. K. (1992). An inferential/strategic explanation for the social explanation of teases. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *11*(3), 153–177. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X92113003

Antaki, C. (Ed.). (2011). *Applied conversation analysis: Intervention and change in institutional talk*. Springer.

Attardo, S. (1994). *Linguistic theories of humor.* Mouton de Gruyter.

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism (5th ed.)*. Multilingual Matters.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978). Universals of language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56–311). Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *Modern Language Journal*, *95*, 401–417. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x

Cenoz, J. (2017). Translanguaging in school contexts: International perspectives. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *16*(4), 193–198. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1327816

Cenoz, J. (2019). Translanguaging pedagogies and English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, *52*(1), 71–85. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000246

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). Focus on multilingualism: A study of trilingual writing. *Modern Language Journal*, *95*, 356–369. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01206.x

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *38*(10), 901–912. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2017.1284855

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Pedagogical translanguaging: An introduction. *System*, *92*, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102269

Coates, J. (2007). Talk in a play frame: More on laughter and intimacy. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*(1), 29–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.05.003

De Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or additional language learning*. Multilingual Matters.

Drew, P. (2013). Turn design. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 131–149). Wiley-Blackwell.

Duarte, J. (2019). Translanguaging in mainstream education: A sociocultural approach. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *22*(2), 150–164. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1231774

Fallas Escobar, C. (2019). Translanguaging by design in EFL classrooms. *Classroom Discourse*, *10*(3-4), 290–305. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1628789

Fukui, H., & Yashima, T. (2021). Exploring evolving motivation to learn two languages simultaneously in a study-abroad context. *Modern Language Journal*, *105*(1), 267–293. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12695

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective.* Wiley-Blackwell.

García, O., & Li Wei. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Anchor.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole, & J. L. Morgan. (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech arts*, (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.

Habib, R. (2008). Humor and disagreement: Identity construction and cross-cultural enrichment. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *40*(6), 1117–1145. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.02.005

Hay, J. (2000). Functions of humor in the conversations of men and women. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *32*(6), 709–742. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00069-7

International Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2021). *Education at a glance 2020: OECD indicators*. Retrived August 5, 2022, from https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/deliver/69096873-en.pdf?itemId=%2Fcontent%2Fpublication%2F69096873-en&mimeType=pdf

Keltner, D., Capps, L., Kring, A. M., Young, R. C., & Heerey, E. A. (2001). Just teasing: A conceptual analysis and empirical review. *Psychological Review*, *127*(2), 229–248. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.2.229

Kirkebæk, M. J. (2013). "Teacher! Why do you speak English?" A discussion of teacher use of English in a Danish language class. In H. Haberland, D. Lønsmann, & B. Preisler (Eds.), *Language alternation, language choice and language encounter in international tertiary education* (pp. 143–159). Springer.

Kramsch, C. (2012). Authenticity and legitimacy in multilingual SLA. *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, *1*(1), 107–128.

Leonet, O., Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Developing morphological awareness across languages: Translanguaging pedagogies in third language acquisition. *Language Awareness*, *29*(1), 41–59. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1688338

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International*

Journal on Theory and Practice, *18*(7), 641–654. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718488

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

Lin, S. (2022). Negotiating language choice in multilingual lab meetings: Voices from domestic and international students in Taiwan. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *25*(1), 117–130. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1636762

Matsumoto, Y. (2014). Collaborative co-construction of humorous interaction among ELF speakers. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, *3*(1), 81–107. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2014-0004

Maynard, D. (2006). Ethnography and conversation analysis: What is the context of an utterance? In S. N. Hesse-Biber, & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Emergent methods in social research* (pp. 55–94). SAGE Publications.

Melo-Pfeifer, S., & Araújo e Sá, M. H. (2018). Multilingual interaction in chat rooms: Translanguaging to learn and learning to translanguage. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *21*(7), 867–880. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1452895

Mir, M., & Cots, J. M. (2019). The use of humor in Spanish and English compliment responses: A cross-cultural analysis. *Humor*, *32*(3), 393–416. https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2017-0125

O'Driscoll, J. (2001). A face model of language choice. *Multilingua*, *20*(3), 245–268. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1452895

Office of Trade Negoations, Executive Yuan. (2016). *"New southbound policy" guidelines and action plan*. Retrieved August 6, 2022, from https://www.ey.gov.tw/otnen/64C34DCA8893B06/a0e8fd0b-a6ac-4e80-bdd4-16b4cf999b49

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

Poncini, G. (2002). Investigating discourse at business meetings with multicultural participation. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *40*(4), 345–373. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.2002.017

Rácz, K. (2022). "Creating the illusion of speaking Romanian well": Hungarian speakers' teaching and learning the majority language in Romania. *Multilingua*, *41*(1), 29–56. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2020-0129

Sacks, H. (1987). On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 54–69). Multilingual Matters.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematic for the organization of turn taking for conversation. *Language*, *50*, 696–735. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-623550-0.50008-2

Safont, M. P. (2005). *Third language learners: Pragmatic production and awareness*. Multilingual Matters.

Schegloff, E. A., Koshik, I., Jacoby, A., & Olsher, D. (2002). Conversation analysis and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *22*, 3–31. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016

Schnurr, S., & Chan, A. (2011). When laughter is not enough. Responding to teasing and self-denigrating humour at work. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(1), 20–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.09.001

Stivers, T. (2021). Is conversation built for two? The partitioning of social interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *54*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2020.1864158

Straehle, C. A. (1993). "Samuel?" "yes, dear?" teasing and conversational rapport. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Gender and conversational interaction: Oxford studies in sociolinguistics* (pp. 210–230). Oxford University Press.

Svennevig, J. (2000). *Getting acquainted in conversation: A study of initial interactions* (Vol. 64). John Benjamins Publishing.

Tsang, W. L. (2016). *Crosslinguistic influence in multilinguals: An examination of Chinese-English-French speakers*. Multilingual Matters.

Wagner, J. (2018). Multilingual and multimodal interactions. *Applied Linguistics*, *39*(1), 99–107. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx058

Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Bangor University.

Zajdman, A. (1995). Humorous face-threatening acts: Humor as strategy. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *23*(3), 325–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(94)00038-G

Appendix

Transcription Symbols

Symbols	*Represents*
° °	soft volume
=	latched talk
[	overlapping utterance
//	speech in the phonetic transcription of the IPA
(.)	micropause
(3.0)	duration of silence (e.g., three-second pause)
:	stretched sound
,	continuing intonation
.	falling intonation
?	rising intonation
!	animated intonation
↑	step-up in pitch
↓	step-down in pitch
underline	emphasis
£	smiling voice
( )	inability to make out what was said
(word)	uncertain hearing
(())	editorial comments
< >	an utterance spoken more quickly or rushed
><	an utterance spoken more slowly than the surrounding talk
→	particular feature the researchers wish to discuss