Translanguaging Gestures and Onomatopoeia as Resources for Repairing the Problem

修復の資源としての「言語境界線超越的」ジェスチャーとオノマトペの一考察

Satomi Kuroshima, 黒嶋 智美

Tamagawa University, Center for English as a Lingua Franca, Japan
skuroshi@lab.tamagawa.ac.jp

Blagoja Dimoski, ディモスキ・ブラゴヤ

Tamagawa University, Center for English as a Lingua Franca, Japan
bdimoski@lit.tamagawa.ac.jp

Tricia Okada, 岡田 トリシャ

Tamagawa University, Center for English as a Lingua Franca, Japan
tokada@lit.tamagawa.ac.jp

Yuri Jody Yujobo, 祐乗坊 由利 ジョディー

Tamagawa University, Center for English as a Lingua Franca, Japan
yujobo@lit.tamagawa.ac.jp

Rasami Chaikul, チャイクル・ラサミ

Tamagawa University, Center for English as a Lingua Franca, Japan
rasami.chaikul@lab.tamagawa.ac.jp

ABSTRACT

This paper elucidates the use of translanguaging gestures and onomatopoeic expressions as a practice of concerted actions by participants in English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) interactions. As traditional discussions of communication strategies for ELF users have overly emphasized the aspect of language, recent studies of ELF interactions from a multilingual setting have started to explore the use of various semiotic resources, such as gestures and/or tools, in addition to linguistic codes. However, virtually no previous studies have shown atypical translanguaging phenomena

involving gestures and onomatopoeia. Therefore, in this paper, by drawing on conversation analysis as a research framework to analyze data of first-time encounters between Japanese participants and their foreign interlocutors in online settings, we will investigate how non-typical translanguaging phenomenon are indeed made observable and accountable for the purpose of their lived and coordinated courses of actions. Special focus is placed on the participants' use of gestures and onomatopoeic expressions of their first language in the face of difficulties arising in spoken ELF interactions. The results will demonstrate that such bodily and linguistic practices are resources for the speaker's action of repairing a problem as well as a means for the recipient to help resolve interactional problems. In addition, the paper will contribute to the body of knowledge by demonstrating how participants display their orientation to shared agreement in translanguaging practices in ELF interactions such as repair.

KEYWORDS: Translanguaging, Gestures, Onomatopoeia, Conversation analysis, Self-repair

1. INTRODUCTION

While the recent discussion of translanguaging conceptualizes it as a dynamic, fluid, multimodal, and transcultural practice (Garcia & Li, 2014; Li, 2016), there is still much room to investigate how translanguaging phenomena are indeed made observable and accountable for the purpose of their lived and coordinated course of actions with their orientation to the recipient (Garfinkel, 1967), i.e., as a practical theory of interaction (Wagner, 2018).

Although recent studies of interactions from a multilingual setting have started to explore the use of various semiotic resources, such as gestures and/or other tools, in addition to linguistic codes, a large body of translanguaging practice in the literature refers mainly to its linguistic aspects, as it is often claimed to be "a practical theory of language" (Wagner, 2018, p. 102), as shown, for instance, in Garcia & Li (2014), Li (2016), and Mazzaferro (2018). Furthermore, most of the literature on this practice is from multilingual and bilingual settings, where participants are accountably known to be competent in multiple languages (Garcia & Li, 2014; Jakonen et al., 2018; Mazzaferro, 2018).

As several cases of translanguaging[1] gestures and onomatopoeic expressions are used by our participants with a monolingual background in their interaction with conversational partners, most of whom have a multilingual background, we would like to offer a detailed description of how translanguaging practices of those participants emerge (cf. Dimoski et al., 2019), demonstrating that they are practical methods that transcend whichever language they are using. Following this, we would like to propose that accountability in any given course of action is a foundational dimension of translanguaging practices.

1 Although the term is generally referred to the phenomenon involving languaging, the authors use this term in a more technical sense throughout the paper than what is conceived in other studies particularly due to its reference to a bodily phenomenon.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Translanguaging

Broadly speaking, translanguaging is speaker-centered and refers to language practices in which interlocutors select certain language features and use them to match their communicative needs by employing all of their linguistic and semiotic resources (Garcia, 2011). It should not, however, be confused with code-switching, which “often carries language-centered connotations of language interference, language transfer or borrowing of codes, [with] a monolingual orientation where languages are treated as separate codes” (Makalela, 2017, pp. 15-16).

Li (2018, p. 15) stated that translanguaging is a practice that involves dynamic and functionally integrated use of different languages and language varieties, but more importantly a process of knowledge construction that goes beyond language(s). The reason why it is crucial to observe and study translanguaging is because languages are a constantly emerging phenomenon and the use of more than one named language has become a global phenomenon especially between interlocutors with various cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

In light of this perspective, by definition, an ELF context provides a rich multilingual resource for the participants (Jenkins, 2015). Thus, as studies by Cogo (2012, 2016) and Pietikäinen (2014) have shown, the phenomenon of translanguaging is often observed in European settings, where multilingualism is a norm (also see Jenkins, 2015), confirming that translanguaging occurs at phonological, lexical, and discourse levels (see Guzula et al., 2016 for translanguaging in an African pedagogical multilingual setting). However, we lack evidence of translanguaging in monolingual contexts such as Japan regarding whether it can be still observed, and if so, how it is incorporated into their interaction.

Li (2018) also claimed that translanguaging empowers both the learner and the teacher, transforms power relations, and focuses the process of teaching and learning on making meaning, enhancing experience, and developing identity. Although the way people use ‘language’ by utilizing their unified repertoire of language features linguistically has been observed, nonverbal translanguaging and onomatopoeic translanguaging, if any, also need to be observed.

2.2 Onomatopoeia

Another important background to this study is onomatopoeia. Bredin (1996), categorizes onomatopoeia into two types. The first is direct onomatopoeia, in which two criteria must be met: One is that the word denotes a class of sounds, and the other is that it resembles a member of that class. Or put more simply, “the sound of the word resembles the sound that it names” (Bredin, 1996, p. 558), e.g., hiss, moan, cluck, whirr, and buzz. The second type he calls associative onomatopoeia, which occurs when “the sound of a word resembles a sound *associated with* whatever it is that the word denotes” (Bredin, 1996, p. 560), e.g., cuckoo, bubble, smash, whip, and so on. Turning to a Japanese context, onomatopoeic expressions are used widely in all levels of the language, which can make Japanese very challenging for learners and for translators (Inose, 2007).

Examples of onomatopoeic expressions used to imitate real sounds made by human or animal voices or otherwise in Japanese include, for example, “zaazaa” (the sound of rain) or “wanwan” (the sound of a dog barking). Such expressions, according to Inose (2007), function as adverbs for the most part in Japanese.

As Bredin (1996) points out, it is often the case that the acoustic resemblance between onomatopoeic expressions and the actual sounds made by the objects they refer to is weak. This suggests that onomatopoeia in social interactions is not used merely to convey the sounds but to accomplish a specific action, whose usage can be only describable by analysis of the actual interaction.

2.3 Interaction Studies of Multimodality in ELF Communications

Finally, due to critiques made in the 90s which portrayed users of English as a second/foreign language as deficient communicators (Firth & Wagner, 1997), in more recent studies on interaction among ELF users, researchers have concluded them to be *competent* or have *unproblematic* interactions by demonstrating how capable they are of managing their interactions with multimodal semiotic resources (Björkman, 2014; Cogo, 2009; Firth, 1996, 2009; Kaur, 2011, 2016, 2020; Konakahara, 2017, 2020; Matsumoto, 2011, 2014, 2018; Mauranen, 2006, 2012). Especially relevant to the current studies is the burgeoning research area of gesture use in ELF communication (Kimura, 2020; Kimura & Canagarajah, 2020; Konakahara, 2017, 2020; Matsumoto & Canagarajah, 2020). These studies have demonstrated that participants’ uses of other modalities besides language are an important resource to conduct meaningful communications. However, no existing studies have elucidated the gestures used as translanguaging.

Based on more than a decade of ELF research, it has become clear that ELF users (a) are “able to draw from the whole of their linguistic repertoires in order to achieve intersubjectivity” (Pietikäinen, 2018, p. 323), (b) “are competent in inviting the recipient to participate in searching together by incorporating multimodal resources” (Matsumoto & Canagarajah, 2020, p. 263), and (c) interact through meaning “co-constructed by the participants and expanded in context with the use of multilingual resources” (Cogo, 2018, p. 360). These insights are all evidence for the accountability of participants’ engagement by utilizing any named language or means of multilingual communicative practice as a capable and competent member (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1972). In order to address these issues, we need to elucidate how our participants use gestures and onomatopoeic expressions of their first language (and culture) as a translanguaging practice in spoken ELF interactions and describe in detail the position and composition of a turn (Schegloff, 2007) in which they occur. By adopting the methodology of conversation analysis (Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 2007), we will describe how the ELF users are utilizing the translanguaging gestures and onomatopoeic expressions for their construction of course of action.

3. DATA

Eighteen Japanese university students between the ages of 18-20 years from various departments participated in the present study as part of a larger project on

communication strategies (Dimoski, et al., 2019). The gender breakdown consisted of ten male students and eight females. We also had 19 overseas participants living in eight different countries. Their ages ranged from 20-50 years old, and they were from various professions. In order to keep the number of pairs even, two Japanese participants and one foreign participant participated twice. The participants were randomly paired, not based on their linguistic knowledge but depended on their availability and time zones. As such, our original intention was not to investigate translanguaging gestures and onomatopoeia; however, those phenomena were so observed and visible that the current study was launched.

During the pre-pandemic period, we collected all of our data from participants by pairing a Japanese student with a foreign participant and video-audio recorded naturally occurring conversations using Zoom totaling 6.5 hours. All of the interactions were first encounters, and names of the participants were changed with pseudonyms. Although participants could talk freely on any topic, we also created speaking prompts for the conversation to maximize the use of session time. We analyzed all the transcribed data and videos for use of gestures and onomatopoeia with translanguaging implications. Specifically, conversation analysis was conducted to analyze the position and composition of a turn for translanguaging of gestures and onomatopoeia.

Our working definition of translanguaging gestures and onomatopoeia is the use of culturally conventionalized and typical gestures and onomatopoeic expressions of a named language (e.g., Japanese, English, Spanish, Thai, etc.) and integrated with other language systems, such as English. As translanguaging implies the integration of different named language systems, we also treat gestures as a form of translanguaging when used to construct actions beyond the named language and culture.

We found 14 cases of translanguaging gestures, and one case of translanguaging onomatopoeia in our data corpus. This result indicates that both phenomena are not frequently observed; nonetheless, they are treated as accountable by the participants. In the following, we will demonstrate how these gestures and/or onomatopoeia of a named language are used as resources for practices in ELF interactions transcending linguistic boundaries.

4. ANALYSIS

4.1. Translanguaging Gestures and Onomatopoeia as a Repair Solution

On several occasions, our participants used non-verbal resources such as gestures to achieve various social actions. Of particular interest among the practices is their use of observably culturally specific gestures. Akin to translanguaging practices typically performed via verbal elements of a conversational turn, participants used their gestures as a means to go beyond linguistic and cultural boundaries.

In Excerpt 1, a Brazilian speaker Miguel is conversing with a Japanese student Nami about her plan to move to Hawaii in the future. In line 1, Miguel asks when she wants to move, to which Nami has a bit of trouble formulating her response at the beginning in line 4. Due to the ambiguous formulation of her answer to the wh-question with just the number “forty or fifty” (line 5), Miguel initiates a repair (Drew, 1997) in

line 8. Although Nami attempts to repair her original response in lines 9 to 13 by treating Miguel's trouble as a hearing problem, Miguel initiates a repair again by reformulating his original question to more explicitly convey what he really means in lines 15 to 22 (the phenomenon called "third position repair," see Schegloff, 1992). Nami still displays trouble in answering right away as she delays her response until line 26. She then formulates her answer by modifying her original version to "forty years after" with a hand gesture.

Excerpt 1 [Pair 9 forty][7:34] ((*A Brazilian speaker Miguel is conversing with a Japanese student Nami about her plan to move to Hawaii in the future*.))

```
01   MIG:   when do you want to mo::ve? When do you pla:n
02          to::mo::ve- to::, Hawai'i?
03          (.)
04   NAM:   uh::::m, (1.0) n:::: (1.5) <I thi::nk,> n:::
05          forty::, forty:: or, fifty.
06          (1.0)
07   NAM:   [<I li::ve,>
08   MIG:   [Sorry?
09   NAM:   forty:: or, fifty::.
10          (1.0)
11   NAM:   [forty years o:ld
12   MIG:   [forty or:-
13   NAM:   (mae)
            back
14          (2.5)
15   MIG:   uh:m, (0.2) I:- I mean like, (0.5) now you are:
16          at university:,
17   NAM:   ya.
18   MIG:   so, livi::ng in: Tokyo.
19          (0.2)
20   NAM:   ya.
21   MIG:   and uh::, when will you::, <mo:ve> to
22          live in Hawai'i?
23          (0.5)
24   NAM:   e/a::: n:::
25          (3.5)
26   NAM:   uh- (1.0) uh:: I want to for- (.) forty: (.)
27          forty? forty years *after.
     nam                       *waves her left hand once
28          (2.0)
29   MIG:   +Four?
     mig    +indicates four with four fingers-->>
30   NAM:→ *%four:: *ti::+ ((hand gesture))
     fig     %fig. 1a
```

```
    nam →*indicates "4" with four fingers
    nam →          *makes "0" shape with both hands
    mig                +puts down his four fingers
31        *%(2.0)*
    nam →*displays "4" fingers in her R hand and "0" in L
          hand*
    fig    %fig. 1b
32        *(1.0)
    nam   *leans over to the camera
33  NAM:  [hhh
34  MIG:  [Oh, (0.5) s(h)o:: li:k(h)e,
35        may[be after you::- you retire?
35  NAM:     [huh
36  NAM:  ¥yeah¥
37        (0.2)
38  MIG:  [¥Oh:::: ri::ght.¥ hh hh hh
39  NAM:  [huhhuh
40  NAM:  huh huh huh [.hh
41  MIG:              [hhh
```

Figure 1a

Gestures performed by Miguel (left) and Nami (right) (line 29)

Figure 1b
Hand gestures for “4” and “0” by Nami (line 31)

Miguel then checks his understanding with a candidate hearing in line 29 accompanied with a sign of four with his four fingers (Figure 1a). Nami repairs it by showing the two numbers of 4 and 0 with her hand gesture along with the word “forty” in line 30 and repeats the hand gesture subsequently in line 31 without a word. There, she uses a translanguaging gesture by displaying four fingers with one hand and making a circle shape with her other left thumb and index finger to indicate zero (Figure 1b). This iconic gesture is arguably culturally specific to Japanese culture, which may not be in the recipient’s domain of knowledge. However, Miguel seeks confirmation about his renewed understanding of Nami’s response from line 34 with a reformulation of forty with “after you retire”, which is happily acknowledged by Nami in line 37.

This example shows that, when a trouble with understanding has been indicated several times previously and as such repairing the problem becomes relevant, the translanguaging gesture of a named culture (Japanese in this case) serves as a means to repair the trouble source of the original utterance by presenting the information visually to the recipient along with verbal language.

More remarkable instances are found in Excerpt 2. Here, the participants utilize both onomatopoeic expressions and gestures as a practice of translanguaging to repair an interactional problem. Prior to this segment, Mexican speaker, Monica, said she used to study abroad in Japan so she mentioned that she missed Japanese food. When a Japanese student, Kanako, asks what her favorite Japanese food is, Monica answers “*ramen*” and “*takoyaki*”, a fried octopus in pancake batter shaped like a ball. Then, Kanako gives a negative evaluation of not being able to eat “*tako*” (octopus), whose problematic nature is displayed through her laughter in line 2 (the troubles-resistant orientation displayed through laughter as in Jefferson, 1984).

Excerpt 2 [Pair 13 takoyaki][7:40]

```
01          (1.0)
02   KAN:   I can’t eat tak(h)o. hhh
03          *(0.8)
     kan    *smiles
04   MON:   %↑really? *↑wh::y?
```

```
    mon   %raises her eye blows to show surprise
    kan               *nods
05  KAN:  .hhh
06        *(1.0)
    kan   *looks upward
07        *+(4.0)
    fig    +fig. 2
    kan → *use an iconic hand gesture for chewing for 5
          times
08  KAN:→ hhh *chewing, *nn?
    kan       *chewing gesture *tilts her head
09        *(2.0)
    kan   *puts her left hand on her cheek
10  MON:  too hot?
11        (1.0)
12  KAN:  <hottu?>
13  MON:  like,
14        %(1.0)
    mon → %+puts her left hand into mouth and does the
          'hot' gesture
    fig   +fig. 2b
15  MON:→ hot.
16        (0.8)
17  KAN:  a:: *no, no, no. mm::::.
    kan       *shakes her head and looks upwards
18        (3.0) *(2.0)
    kan         *looks at Monica
19  KAN:  *u::::n
    kan   *gradually looks upwards
20        (2.0)
21  KAN:→ *I <don't> <like>, ↓nandaro
    kan → *looks at Monica-->>
22  KAN:  *che- chewing, kucha kucha hhh
    kan   *repeats the same chewing gesture as line 7
23  MON:→ *really? like %chewing takoyaki?
    mon →              %chewing gesture
    kan → *chewing gesture twice
24        (0.8)
25  KAN:  huh- hehheh nn::::
26        (2.0)
27  MON:  wh::y.
```

Figure 2a
Iconic hand gesture (line 7)

Figure 2b
Gesture for "hot" (line 14)

Kanako's negative evaluation is received as unexpected by Monica as displayed in her facial expression. Consequently, Kanako is held accountable by Monica seeking an explanation (in line 4). However, Kanako starts engaging in remembering activity (Goodwin, 1987) by looking upwards in line 6. During the five-second pause, while keeping her gaze direction, Kanako uses an iconic hand gesture for chewing typically used in Japanese contexts. Subsequently, she utters a term that is hearable as an answer to Monica's question ("chewing") again with the typical Japanese chewing hand gesture (Figure 2a), along with her tilted head in line 8; thereby, displaying it as a candidate word choice. When Kanako puts her left hand on her cheek and brings back her gaze towards her interlocutor, indicating that she gives up the word search for now in line 9, Monica proffers her candidate understanding of Kanako's answer in line 10. However, Kanako displays trouble with her partial repetition with a modified pronunciation of Monica's turn in line 12. Such display of a possible trouble invites Monica to repair her prior turn by first projecting to exemplify it ("like") and then demonstrating what she was conveying with a culturally specific gesture of "hot" by putting her left hand into mouth in line 13 and 14 (Figure 2b), which can be presumed not in Kanako's domain.

When Monica completes her embodied exemplification in line 15, Kanako first claims her renewed understanding of the repaired information with a Japanese change-of-state token a:: (Endo, 2018) and denies Monica's candidate understanding in line 17. Then, the same formulation trouble again arises. Kanako indicates the trouble by looking upwards and engages in a word search. She finally constructs her response in a full sentence from line 21 by initiating her turn with "I don't like" to indicate she is on her way to formulate her response. Then, she switches to Japanese and uses a self-addressed question of *nandaro* 'What do you call it?' to display that she still needs to search for a word, and then reuses the Japanese onomatopoeic expression for chewing (*kucha kucha*) with a gesture to formulate the action of chewing with her left hand, conveying that this is her 'best' formulation. Monica finally accepts it as a reasonable formulation and requests to confirm her understanding in line 23 by copying Kanako's gesture of chewing to demonstrate her candidate understanding.

In this excerpt, gestures and onomatopoeia from their native cultures and languages are used to formulate relevant actions when a speaker encounters formulation difficulties or repairs the recipient's problem in understanding. As the contextual

configuration of language, gestures, and sequential environment elaborates the construction of an action that is made relevant in the local context (Goodwin, 2000), translanguaging gestures and onomatopoeic expressions used as a practice for repairing have their own accountability in the lived course of action.

4.2 Preference for Treating the Onomatopoeia as a Practice for a Word Search

While we have a good number of cases of translanguaging gestures, we only found one example of translanguaging onomatopoeia in our corpus (cf. Excerpt 2). The scarcity of its occurrence in our data might be explained by the nature of onomatopoeia, which is more unique to a named language compared to gestures. However, even though it is understood to be language specific, generic procedural knowledge of onomatopoeic expressions has accountability to constitute a recognizable action in the ELF communication, and such seemingly shared knowledge by members transcends the linguistic domain.

Excerpt 3 illustrates this point. In this segment, Taiwanese speaker, John, is recommending Japanese student, Ken, to visit scuba diving spots in the northern part of Taiwan, leading them to engage in a discussion about scuba. Then, from lines 1 to 7, John agrees with Ken's opinion about scuba diving by accounting for the nature of the activity, namely being able to see coral under the water.

Excerpt 3 [Pair 2 scuba][28:17]

```
01 JOH:   but- but, like you say, go- go scuba diving:,
02        uh: easy one is- is quite
03        it's kind of: (0.5) very good (drill),
04 KEN:   n::.
05 JOH:   because you could see::::: (.) sea:?
06        and, (0.5) like uh:: (1.0)>how to say,<
07        it- it- it's like a pla:nt under the sea?
08        (0.5)
09 KEN:   ah:: yeah?
10 JOH:   you know what I'm talking about, [(of course,
11 KEN:                                    [uh-hum, uh-hm.
12 JOH:   you don't know) the w(h)or::d'
13 JOH:   [hhh
14 KEN:   [huh huh huh .hhh
15 JOH:   *like ah:: barry reef, I guess.*(0.5)barry reef,
   joh    *rolling up eyes                *looks at Ken-->>
16 JOH:   barry *reef,
   joh          *looks upwards-->>
17        *(0.8)
   joh    *brings up his R hand and waves-->>
18 JOH: → like, be::: blah, blah, blah* eh::
   joh                                *puts down his R hand
19        (0.2)
```

```
20 KEN:→  be:: blah, blah, blah, wha-
21     →  what's be:: blah blah blah.
22 JOH:   *Just like a plant under the sea a::n'
   joh    *holding gesture with his R hand and moves back
          and forth
23 JOH:   beautifu::l? fra:gi::[l?*
   joh                         -->>*
24 KEN:                       [ya, ya, ya.
25 JOH:   (I think) uh:: the reef or:: I:: forgot.uh:.°ya:°
26        (1.8)
27 KEN:   n:::
28 JOH:   So,just-(0.6)north of Taiwa:n and east of Taiwan.
29 JOH:   yep.
27 KEN:   OK.
```

On the way to explaining the coral, John engages in a word search from line 6 ("how to say"). Without the interlocutor to assist him (John indeed recognizes the nature of the problem in lines 10 and 12), he is not very successful, and so tries to give an example of Australian famous coral reef as a way of circumlocution in line 15. However, his memory is only partially correct as he is saying "*barry* reef" instead of "great *barrier* reef" as an attempt to repair. He then gives another word search trial in line 18 with a typical English onomatopoeic expression of "blah, blah, blah" to indicate the part of the word he is having memory trouble with by providing the initial sound of "B". However, John's appeal for help becomes in vain as Ken initiates a repair in line 20. As Ken's repair initiation format (i.e., "What is X?" with a partial repeat of John's turn) targets John's prior turn to self-repair the trouble source (i.e., word search), that is "be:: blah blah blah," this onomatopoeic expression does not become transcended as in the previous excerpt, and instead the practice itself becomes a trouble source. However, in line 22 and 23 John treats Ken's understanding trouble as a referential problem rather than a problem with understanding the practice itself as a preferred solution to the problem, and thus explains what he means by "be:: blah, blah, blah" in lines 22 and 23.

This phenomenon suggests the participant's orientation to the accountability of a word search practice using onomatopoeia for translanguaging. When the possible problem with understanding the practice itself is indicated by the interlocutor, the speaker has an option to repair the problem by explaining the practice. However, the participant does not select the option but rather regards the nature of the trouble in another dimension of interaction, that is, a referential aspect of the expression. The language system here indicates that there seems to be a strong preference for treating the initiation of repair as a problem with the reference rather than a practice of using it as a placeholder with, in this case, "blah, blah, blah." Such preference indicates that while misunderstanding does occur, it is allowed for by our language system of onomatopoeic expression; that is, the practice has a language specific form (e.g., blah blah blah in English, *nani nani* in Japanese), which is accountably not part of the recipient's linguistic domain. This, in other words, confirms that the practice itself is not treated

as problematic. Therefore, this instance suggests that the onomatopoeic expression of a named language used in ELF communication is a practice for translanguaging. While further investigation is of course necessary to confirm this aspect of translanguaging onomatopoeia, we believe this example points to an interesting direction for further pursuing our investigation.

5. DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION

Although the number of cases in the present study is fairly limited, they nevertheless serve to describe the practices of translanguaging with gestures and onomatopoeic expressions. Even though such forms accountably belong to the domain of the producer and not necessarily presumed to be shared by the members of other languages and cultures, the translanguaging gestures and onomatopoeic expressions are produced and understood as resources for recognizable actions, such as repairing or word searches, and practices to repair the broken interactional surfaces (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1972; Schegloff et al., 1977). While assembling a collection of cases, we also found instances of translanguaging gestures used for practices other than repair. The analyses of these cases will be reported in a separate article in the future.

In short, in addition to the mutual elaboration of language and gesture, what makes them observable, reportable, and accountable in a particular situation is the shared agreement on the methodical ways of accomplishing recognizable actions in speaking according to a rule (Garfinkel, 1967). Such a property of natural language practice consists of a position and a composition of each turn, permitting the members to go beyond the named culture and language and dynamically transcend a specific linguistic domain.

With this new approach and description of translanguaging phenomena, as practitioners of ELF, we strongly believe that awareness of and sensitivity to particular details of participants' interactional competence are needed and only it becomes a describable object through the lens of participants' orientation. Regarding onomatopoeic expressions, exposing students to their usage across cultures, including their own, would serve to heighten students' awareness of (a) variations in the way sounds are interpreted and represented by people around the world, and (b) potential communicative usability that may arise when using them in certain contexts. A similar approach could also be beneficial regarding translanguaging gestures. By exploring them in the classroom, students can become more creative and flexible when they encounter or use them in future ELF interactions, which is a necessary skill for a global citizen. We believe it is beneficial for students to learn that they are by-products of interactants' engagement because these occurrences are a part of practices we all commonly share beyond one particular language.

6. LIMITATIONS

Finally, the limitations of this study were influenced by the period it was conducted and the main objective of this long-term study, which was to focus on communication strategies among ELF users whose background is monolingual. Our positionality as the researchers comes from Southeast Asian, American, Australian, and Japanese cultural backgrounds, thus, we were able to confirm that certain gestures are an accountable repertoire from the culture of particular participants. However, it is not possible to say with certainty whether the gestures identified in the current study denote translanguaging, since, in principle, they differ from language and thereby, are dependent on our conceptual understanding. Thus, whenever possible, the researchers' positionality and cultural backgrounds were invoked to verify whether certain gestures were conceptually available in participants' domain of knowledge.

REFERENCES

Björkman, B. (2014). An analysis of polyadic English as a lingua franca (ELF) speech: A communicative strategies framework. *Journal of Pragmatics, 66*, 122–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.03.001

Bredin, H. (1996). Onomatopoeia as a figure and a linguistic principle. *New Literary History, 27*(3), 555-569.

Cogo, A. (2009). Accommodating difference in ELF conversations: A study of pragmatic strategies. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca: Studies and findings* (pp. 254-273). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Cogo, A. (2012). ELF and super-diversity: A case study of ELF multilingual practices from a business context. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 1*(2), 287–313. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2012-0020

Cogo, A. (2016). Conceptualizing ELF as a translanguaging phenomenon: Covert and overt resources in a transnational workplace. In K. Murata (Ed.), *Waseda Working Papers in ELF Volume 5* (pp. 61–77). ELF Research Group Waseda University.

Dimoski, B., Kuroshima, S., Okada, T., Chaikul, R., & Yujobo, Y. J. (2019). The initial stages of developing resources for teaching communication strategies in ELF-informed pedagogy. In K. Murata, T. Ishikawa & M. Konakahara (Eds.), *Waseda Working Papers in ELF Volume 8* (pp. 105-128). ELF Research Group Waseda University.

Drew, P. (1997). "Open" class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 28*(1), 69–101. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(97)89759-7

Endo, T. (2018). The Japanese change-of-state tokens a and aa in responsive units. *Journal of Pragmatics, 123*, 151–166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.06.010

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On lingua franca English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26*, 237–259. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(96)00014-8

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*(3), 285-300. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1997.tb05480.x

García, O. (2011). From language garden to sustainable languaging: Bilingual education in a global world. *Perspectives, 34*(1), 5-9.

García, O. (2020). Singularity, complexities and contradictions: A commentary about translanguaging, social justice, and education. In Panagiotopoulou, A., Rosen, Lisa., & Strzykala, J. (Eds.), *Inclusion, Education and Translanguaging How to Promote Social Justice in (Teacher) Education?* (pp. 11-20). Wiesbaden Springer VS.

García, O., & Li, W. (2013). Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education. In *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Polity Press.

Garfinkel, H., & Sacks, H. (1972). On formal structures of practical actions. In H. Garfinkel (Ed.), *Ethnomethodological Studies of Work* (pp. 160–193). Routledge & Kegan JOH.

Goodwin, C. (1987). Forgetfulness as an interactive resource. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 50*(2), 115–130. https://doi.org/10.2307/2786746

Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics, 32*(10), 1489–1522. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00096-X

Guzula, X., McKinney, C., & Tyler, R. (2016). Languaging-for-learning: Legitimising translanguaging and enabling multimodal practices in third spaces. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, 34*(3), 211–226. https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2016.1250360

Inose, H. (2007). Translating Japanese onomatopoeia and mimetic words. *Translation*

Research Projects, 1, 97-116.

Jakonen, T., Szabó, T. P., & Laihonen, P. (2018). Translanguaging as playful subversion of a monolingual norm in the classroom. In G. Mazzaferro (Ed.), *Translanguaging as Everyday Practice* (pp. 31-48). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-94851-5_3

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). John Benjamins.

Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *Englishes in Practice, 2*(3), 49-85.

Kaur, J. (2011). Raising explicitness through self-repair in English as a lingua franca. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(11), 2704–2715. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.04.012

Kaur, J. (2016). Conversation analysis and ELF. In M.-L. Pitzl & R. Osirnk-Teasdale (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca: Perspectives and prospects: contributions in honour of Barbara Seidlhofer* (pp. 161–168). Mouton De Gruyter.

Kaur, J. (2020). Other-correction in next position: The case of lexical replacement in ELF interactions in an academic setting. *Journal of Pragmatics, 169*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.06.013

Kimura, D. (2020). Enacting and expanding multilingual repertoires in a peer language tutorial: Routinized sequences as a vehicle for learning. *Journal of Pragmatics, 169*, 13–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.07.008

Kimura, D., & Canagarajah, S. (2020). Embodied semiotic resources in research group meetings: How language competence is framed. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 24*(5), 634-655. https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12435

Konakahara, M. (2017). Interactional management of face-threatening acts in casual ELF conversation: An analysis of third-party complaint sequences. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 6*(2), 313–343. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2017-0015

Konakahara, M. (2020). Single case analyses of two overlap sequences in casual ELF conversations from a multimodal perspective: Toward the consideration of mutual benefits of ELF and CA. *Journal of Pragmatics, 170*, 301–316. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.09.024

Li, W. (2016). New chinglish and the post-multilingualism challenge: Translanguaging ELF in China. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 5*(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2016-0001

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

Makalela, L. (2017). Translanguaging practices in a South African institution of higher learning: A case of ubuntu multilingual return. In C. Mazak & K. Carroll (Eds.), *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies* (pp. 11-28). Multilingual Matters.

Matsumoto, Y. (2011). Successful ELF communications and implications for ELT: Sequential analysis of ELF pronunciation negotiation strategies. *Modern Language Journal, 95*(1), 97–114. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01172.x

Matsumoto, Y. (2014). Collaborative co-constructionation 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

Matsumoto, Y. (2018). "Because we are peers , we actually understand": Third party participant assistance in English as a lingua franca classroom interactions. *TESOL Quarterly, 52*(4), 845–876. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.430

Matsumoto, Y., & Canagarajah, S. (2020). The use of gesture, gesture hold, and gaze in trouble-in-talk among multilingual interlocutors in an English as a lingua franca context. *Journal of Pragmatics, 169*, 245–267. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.08.015

Mauranen, A. (2006). Signaling and preventing misunderstanding in English as lingua franca communication. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 177*, 123–150. https://doi.org/10.1515/IJSL.2006.008

Mauranen, A. (2012). *Exploring ELF: Academic English shaped by non-native speakers*. Cambridge University Press.

Mazzaferro, G. (2018). Translanguaging as everyday practice. An introduction. In G. Mazzaferro (Ed.), *Translanguaging as Everyday Practice* (pp. 1-12). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-94851-5_1

Mondada, L. (2019). Conventions for multimodal transcription. Retrieved from https://www.lorenzamondada.net/multimodal-transcription

Pietikäinen, K. S. (2014). ELF couples and automatic code-switching. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 3*(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2014-0001

Peitikäinen, K. S. (2018). Misunderstandings and ensuring understanding in private ELF talk. *Applied Linguistics, 39*(2), 188–212. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw005

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversations* (Vol. 1 & Vol. 2). Blackwell.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology, 97*(5), 1295–1345. https://doi.org/10.1086/229903

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511791208

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53*(2), 361–382. https://doi.org/10.2307/413107

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

APPENDIX

Transcript conventions developed by Gail Jefferson (2004)

.	pitch fall
?	pitch rise
,	continuing intonation
↑ ↓	marked pitch movement
_	underscoring indicates some form of stress
-	truncation
[ ]	overlap
=	latching of turns
(0.5)	pause (length in tenths of a second)
(.)	micropause
:	lengthening of a sound
°word°	portions quieter than the surrounding talk
hhh	audible out-breath
.hhh	audible in-breath
(h)	within-speech aspiration, usually indicating laughter
#	creaky voice quality
<word>	slow speech rate
>word<	fast speech rate

Multimodal transcript conventions developed by Lorenza Mondada (2019)

* *	Descriptions of embodied movements are delimited between
+ +	two identical symbols (one symbol per participant's line of action) and are synchronized with corresponding stretches of talk/lapses of time.
*-->	The action described continues across subsequent lines
-->*	until the same symbol is reached.
>>	The action described begins before the extract's beginning.
-->>	The action described continues after the extract's end.
. . . .	Preparation.
------	Full extension of the movement is reached and maintained.
,,,,,	Retraction.
ava	Participant doing the embodied action is identified when (s)he is not the speaker.
fig	The exact moment at which a screenshot has been taken is indicated