

Article

Communicative Acts Used by Emergent Trilingual Pupils in English Classrooms in the Basque Autonomous Community

Amaia Fernández, Pilar Sagasta and Nagore Ipiña * 

Faculty of Humanities and Educational Sciences, Mondragon Unibertsitatea, 20540 Eskoriatza, Spain

* Correspondence: nipina@mondragon.edu

Received: 13 May 2019; Accepted: 26 July 2019; Published: 30 July 2019



Abstract: This research aims at examining the communicative acts (CA) performed by Grade 5 emergent trilingual pupils in the Basque Autonomous Community (BAC) in northern Spain when interacting in the English classroom. Likewise, it examines translanguaging practices when performing CA to analyze whether pupils deploy similar linguistic resources (LR) regardless of the CA they enact. Moreover, it investigates whether pupils from different sociolinguistic contexts behave similarly. Preliminary results suggest that Grade 5 pupils taking part in this study enact CA related to inviting elaboration or reasoning, expressing or inviting ideas, guiding direction of dialogue or activity, positioning and coordination, and showing understanding by using LR coming from different linguistic systems (mostly English and Basque) when interacting in the English classroom across sociolinguistic areas.

Keywords: spontaneous translanguaging; discourse practices; language acquisition

1. Introduction

Translanguaging is a relatively new term that was first used by Cen Williams in 1994 in Wales concerning a pedagogical strategy observed in the Welsh classrooms. Baker (2011) defined translanguaging as a process to make meaning, shape experiences, acquire understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages, and Cenoz and Gorter (2017) drew the difference between pedagogical and spontaneous translanguaging. This paper focuses on spontaneous translanguaging and examines the discursive practices (Cenoz and Gorter 2017) of emergent trilinguals in the English classroom, because as Canagarajah (2011) states, research is needed to investigate how multilingual speakers combine codes in their discursive practices. Moreover, these trilingual pupils have three languages in the curriculum: Basque, Spanish, and English, and their schools are situated in two different sociolinguistic areas. Therefore, this paper considers the social context to better understand these pupils' discursive practices, because as Cenoz and Gorter (2019, p. 133) claim, "the social context is crucial when discussing translanguaging, particularly in communities that involved minority languages".

Cenoz and Gorter (2017) analyzed translanguaging in the context of minority regional languages and examined whether it could be a threat or an opportunity for minority languages. They state that spontaneous translanguaging is common practice in the case of bilingual speakers. Nevertheless, they claim that people involved in the maintenance of these regional languages may fear that their language will lose prominence and they advocate to soften borders between languages in a sustainable way. Linguistic separation, they assert (Cenoz and Gorter 2019), may have benefited minority languages in the past, but today that separation may be counterproductive, because as Gorter et al. (2014, p. 217) affirm, "Basque, Spanish and English reinforce each other". Five principles have been suggested

by [Cenoz and Gorter \(2017\)](#) for promoting sustainable translanguaging in school contexts in which minority languages are used; creating breathing spaces for the minority language; fostering the use of the minority language in translanguaging practices; developing metalinguistic awareness through the use of the emergent multilinguals' entire linguistic repertoire; reinforcing language awareness; and linking spontaneous translanguaging to pedagogical tasks.

Nonetheless, as [Otheguy and García \(2019\)](#), p. 10 claim, educators who foster a translanguaging pedagogy realize that named languages are socio-cultural constructions; but they also recognize that "named languages do not correspond to a psycholinguistic reality of dual systems". That is, bilinguals have access to their whole linguistic repertoire in communicative situations in which the use of linguistic features is not restricted to named languages. On the contrary, bilinguals need to monitor the selection of linguistic features when the interlocutor does not share their linguistic repertoire, as in the case of a monolingual speaker, or in situations in which strict language separation is required. Hence, as [Otheguy et al. \(2015\)](#), p. 297 claim, translanguaging focuses on the individual, it views the speaker from the inside, whereas named languages adopt "the view from the outside".

Concerning research conducted on translanguaging, positive results have been highlighted as regards language learning opportunities and metalinguistic ([Fuller 2015](#); [St. John 2018](#); [Rosiers 2018](#)). [Fuller \(2015\)](#) examined the discursive practices of nine-year-old students enrolled in a German-English bilingual school placed in Berlin. She found that the children's choices to deploy bilingual discourse were personal choices with interactional motivations; when they played the role of good students, they used English, the language of the classroom. Nonetheless, they knew that German was the language of the wider community, and that its status as a symbol of youth culture was more powerful; so they often used it for creating solidarity with their classmates. [St. John \(2018\)](#) studied the multilingual interactions among subject teachers, newly arrived Somali pupils, and mother tongue tutors in oral examinations in Sweden, and found that translanguaging is a situated practice and language choice and its use depends on both the communicative situation and the participants' idiolects. Therefore, it should be analyzed within an interactional framework. [Rosiers \(2018\)](#) investigated the interactional engagement of primary pupils with their linguistic repertoire in two multilingual Belgian schools and claimed that translanguaging practices are influenced by factors such as the topic, the group, as well as cognitive and linguistic factors.

Considering all the above-mentioned studies, it is evident that further research is necessary to find out how emergent multilinguals use their linguistic repertoire in their classrooms, because as [Wei \(2015\)](#), p. 196 asserts, translanguaging can have an important impact on "the development of identity, social relationships and values amongst their users". Moreover, studies that examine spontaneous practices in classrooms where three languages are included in the curriculum, and one of them is a regional minority language are needed, and that is precisely the main goal of this study. This research aims at examining the communicative acts (CA) performed by emergent trilingual pupils in the BAC when interacting in the English classroom. Likewise, it examines translanguaging practices to study whether pupils deploy similar linguistic resources (LR) regardless of the CA they enact. Moreover, it investigates whether pupils from different sociolinguistic contexts behave similarly, because, as mentioned above, the social context may have an impact on translanguaging practices ([Cenoz and Gorter 2019](#)).

Regarding the aforementioned literature, this study raises the following questions:

1. Which CA do emergent trilingual pupils perform when communicating in the English classroom?
2. Do they use similar LR regardless of the CA being performed?
3. Does the sociolinguistic area make a difference?

2. Materials and Methods

The BAC is a bilingual community with Basque and Spanish as co-official languages and this study was conducted in two schools; School A located in Araba (Spanish sociolinguistic area) and School B in Gipuzkoa (Basque sociolinguistic area). Both schools follow a D linguistic model, with Basque as

the main language of instruction and Spanish and English taught as a subject. It must be clarified that this is part of an ongoing study we are carrying out with 153 Grade 5 pupils. Nonetheless, for the purpose of this study, fourteen pupils have been randomly selected, as depicted in Table 1.

Table 1. Participants.

School A (Spanish Area)		School B (Basque Area)	
	S1		S19
	S2		S20
	S3		S21
Grade 5 (n:6)	S4	Grade 5 (n:6)	S22
	S5		S23
	S6		S24
			S25
			S26

Participants.

Fourteen Grade 5 emergent trilingual pupils from two different sociolinguistic areas took part in this study. Six pupils were randomly selected in the Spanish sociolinguistic area and eight pupils in the Basque area.

All participants are Basque and Spanish bilinguals and English is an L3 and they all started learning English at the age of four. It is an ethnographic case study (Gay et al. 2006) in which these fourteen emergent trilingual pupils were observed in the English classroom during the school year 2016/2017, and their spontaneous interactions were audio-recorded. Altogether, 25 h and 48 min of study were analyzed; 13 h and 14 min in School A and 12 h and 33 min in School B.

Data collected were transcribed and analyzed using the SEDA scheme (Hennessy et al. 2016), which was previously adapted to take into account the particular context of study. This scheme is a tool used to examine the CA enacted in classroom dialogue, which are grouped into clusters according to the function of the act. A CA is defined by Hennessy et al. (2016, p. 20) as “the minimum number of utterances or actions needed to reflect its function”.

Based on the research work conducted by these authors, the CA performed by the fourteen participants were identified. Subsequently, the CA were coded and clustered, taking into account the communicative function fulfilled. Afterwards, the translanguaging practices observed in the CA were detected and categorized following this code: LR1 (Basque); LR2 (Spanish); LR3 (English); LR4 (Basque/Spanish); LR5 (Basque/English); LR6 (Spanish/English); LR7 (Other/English); and LR8 (Basque/Spanish/English). Finally, data corresponding to each sociolinguistic area were detected and analyzed separately in order to compare and contrast the results.

3. Results

3.1. Results Concerning Research Question One and Two

Regarding the first research question, Grade 5 pupils articulated 4523 utterances and enacted 4365 CA, which were coded, clustered, and analyzed, as Table 2 shows.

Table 2 depicts that these participants mostly performed CA to focus the dialogue on key aspects of the activity (G5), 12%. They also uttered CA to state (dis)agreement or position (P6), 11.1% or propose solution (P3), 11%. Similarly, they enacted CA to ask for elaboration or clarification (I6), 9.8%.

Table 2. Performed communicative acts (CA).

		CA PERFORMED		FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Cluster	Interactional Function				
I	Invite elaboration or reasoning	I1	Ask for explanation or justification of another’s contribution	7	0.2%
		I2	Invite build on/elaboration/(Dis)agreement/evaluation of another’s contribution or view	30	0.7%
		I3	Invite possibility thinking based on another’s contribution	5	0.1%
		I4	Ask for explanation or justification	58	1.3%
		I5	Invite possibility thinking or prediction	4	0.1%
		I6	Ask for elaboration or clarification	427	9.8%
R	Make reasoning explicit	R1	Explain or justify another’s contribution	13	0.3%
		R2	Explain or justify own contribution	17	0.4%
		R3	Speculate or predict on the basis of another’s contribution	39	0.9%
		R4	Speculate or predict	72	1.6%
B	Build on ideas	B1	Build on/Explain/clarify other’s contribution	72	1.6%
		B2	Clarify/elaborate own contribution	74	1.7%
		B3	Synthesize ideas	7	0.2%
E	Express or invite ideas	E1	Invite opinion/beliefs/ideas	229	5.2%
		E2	Make other (relevant) contribution	279	6.4%
G	Guide direction of dialogue or activity	G1	Encourage dialogue	56	1.3%
		G2	Propose action or activity	237	5.4%
		G3	Introduce authoritative perspective	8	0.2%
		G4	Provide informative feedback	57	1.3%
		G5	Focus the dialogue on key aspects of the activity (guiding)	523	12.0%
		G6	Allow thinking time	4	0.1%
		G7	organization of group activities	201	4.6%
P	Positioning and coordination	P1	Synthesize ideas	4	0.1%
		P2	Compare/evaluate alternative views	21	0.5%
		P3	Propose solution	480	11.0%
		P4	Acknowledge shift in position	1	0.0%
		P5	Challenge viewpoint	5	0.1%
		P6	State (dis)agreement/position	485	11.1%
		P7	Gap of knowledge	4	0.1%
C	Connect	C1	Refer back to prior contributions	1	0.0%
		C2	Make learning trajectory explicit	0	0.0%
		C3	Link learning with other contexts	0	0.0%
		C4	Invite inquiry beyond the lesson	0	0.0%
RD	Reflect on dialogue or activity	RD1	Talk about talk	0	0.0%
		RD2	Reflect on learning process/purpose/value	0	0.0%
		RD3	Invite reflection about process/purpose/value of learning	0	0.0%
EE	Express emotions	EE1	Happiness	19	0.4%
		EE2	Excitement	73	1.7%
		EE3	Gratitude	7	0.2%
		EE4	Expectation/hope	16	0.4%
		EE5	Astonishment	81	1.9%
		EE6	Dubious	43	1.0%
		EE7	Tedium	18	0.4%
		EE8	Irritation	26	0.6%
		EE9	Frustration	78	1.8%
		EE10	Anger	28	0.6%

Table 2. Cont.

CA PERFORMED			FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Cluster	Interactional Function			
	CU	Check understanding	78	1.8%
	SU	Show understanding	227	5.2%
	AH	Ask for help	39	0.9%
	AP	Ask for permission	41	0.9%
	Apr	Ask for participation	22	0.5%
NRC	Non Relevant Contribution		149	3.4%
TOTAL:			4365	100%

Performed CA.

Concerning the second research question, Table 3 below displays the most common CA enacted by all the participants and the resources they used. It is evident that English resources (LR3) are by far the most common means used to perform the CA in the English classroom: I6 (208 utterances), E1 (89 utterances), E2 (138 utterances), G2 (63 utterances), G5 (333 utterances), G7 (52 utterances), P3 (374 utterances), P6 (271 utterances), and SU (158 utterances).

Table 3. Linguistic resources (LR) used in the most frequently performed CA.

CA Performed				LR Used								
Cluster	Interactional Function			LR1	LR2	LR3	LR4	LR5	LR6	LR7	LR8	-
I	Invite elaboration or reasoning	I6	Ask for elaboration or clarification	104	19	208	22	30	28	0	9	7
E	Express or invite ideas	E1	Invite opinion/beliefs/ideas	44	31	89	24	17	20	0	2	2
		E2	Make other (relevant) contribution	47	22	138	21	17	25	0	5	4
G	Guide direction of dialogue or activity	G2	Propose action or activity	77	30	63	35	10	12	0	10	0
		G5	Focus the dialogue on key aspects of the activity (guiding)	49	18	333	28	28	52	0	9	6
		G7	Organization of group activities	68	16	52	34	12	16	0	2	0
P	Positioning and coordination	P3	Propose solution	25	15	374	7	17	33	0	6	3
		P6	State (dis)agreement/position	101	40	271	24	27	19	0	2	0
	SU	Show understanding	12	26	158	3	6	10	0	0	12	

LR used in the most frequently performed CA.

Nonetheless, Basque resources (LR1) were used more often than English resources (LR3) to propose action or activity (G2), 77 utterances. Basque means were also frequently observed when participants asked for elaboration or clarification (I6), 104 utterances or stated (dis)agreement/position (P6), 101 utterance, although they frequently used English means for those CA. When showing understanding (SU), even though they deployed English means (LR3) more often, Spanish resources (LR2) were frequently observed, 26 utterances. Participants also made use of Spanish and English resources (LR6) when focusing the dialogue on key aspects of the activity (G5), 52 utterances, or when proposing a solution (P3), 33 utterances, although the use of English was predominant. Finally, the number of Basque, Spanish, and English means (LR8) were rather low, but they were observed in eight out of nine most frequent CA: I6 (9 utterances), E1 (2 utterances), E2 (5 utterances), G2 (10 utterances), G5 (9 utterances), G7 (2 utterances), P3 (6 utterances), P6 (2 utterances).

Here is a sample interaction (Table 4) to exemplify the aforementioned CA performed and the use of LR:

Table 4. Sample interaction.

26. S3-Then pour, <i>ze pour da botatzea</i> [because pour means spill]	P3	LR5
27. S1- <i>Eta gero</i> [and then]?	I6	LR1
28. S3-Take one:::	P3	LR3
<i>A ver</i> [let's see], ... the monkeys ... coma, daisy's petal, no daisy's petal no ...	P3	LR6
29. S-And ...		
30. S1- <i>Y ponemos</i> [and we write] and, and. <i>Bai zer da koma bat:::</i> [Yes because it is a comma]	E2	LR8
31. S2- <i>A ver</i> [Let's see] ... all the monkeys On a spoon ... <i>venga</i> [come on]! on a spoon	P3	LR6
Spoon, <i>he dicho</i> [I said], spoon ... on a spoon, comma, two centiliters, comma ...	G3	LR6
32. S1-E two <i>centilitis</i> [centilitres] of	I6	LR3
33. S2-Spoon!	P3	LR3
34. S1- <i>Bai</i> [yes], spoon.	P6	LR5
Two <i>centilitis</i> [centilitres] ... <i>dos centilitros</i> [two centilitres].	B2	LR6

Sample interaction.

3.2. Results Concerning Research Question Three

In order to analyze the impact sociolinguistic area could have on the performance of CA, utterances from each area were identified: 2408 in School A and 2115 in School B. A total amount of 2318 CA in School A and 1970 in School B were detected, coded, and clustered. Table 5 below displays a summary of the most frequently enacted CA in each sociolinguistic area:

Table 5. Most frequently performed CA in each sociolinguistic area.

CA Performed in School A					
	Cluster		Interactional Function	Frequency	Percentage
I	Invite elaboration or reasoning	I6	Ask for elaboration or clarification	226	9.7%
G	Guide direction of dialogue or activity	G2	Propose action or activity	141	6.1%
		G5	Focus the dialogue on key aspects of the activity (guiding)	263	11.3%
P	Positioning and coordination	P3	Propose solution	263	11.3%
		P6	State (dis)agreement/position	223	9.6%
CA performed in School B					
I	Invite elaboration or reasoning	I6	Ask for elaboration or clarification	201	10.2%
E	Express or invite ideas	E2	Make other (relevant) contribution	182	9.2%
G	Guide direction of dialogue or activity	G5	Focus the dialogue on key aspects of the activity (guiding)	260	13.2%
P	Positioning and coordination	P3	Propose solution	217	11%
		P6	State (dis)agreement/position	262	13.3%

Most frequently performed CA in each sociolinguistic area.

Results show that participants in both sociolinguistic areas performed similar CA when interacting in the English classroom. However, in the Spanish sociolinguistic area (School A), participants mostly enacted CA to focus the dialogue on key aspects of the activity (G5), 11.3%, or to propose solutions (P3), 11.3%. Nonetheless, pupils from the Basque sociolinguistic area (School B) enacted more CA to make contributions (E2), 9.2%. The frequency was also higher in School B when enacting CA to state (dis)agreement/position (P6), 13.3%, or focusing the dialogue on key aspect of the activity (G5), 13.2%. Therefore, the impact of the sociolinguistic area cannot be confirmed.

Concerning LR identified when performing the five most frequent CA, Table 6 below depicts that participants in the Spanish sociolinguistic area mostly used English resources (LR3), except for proposing actions or activity (G2), CA which were pupils frequently performed in Basque (LR1). Nonetheless, pupils from the Basque sociolinguistic area mostly deployed English resources (LR3) in the enacted five CA. However, it can also be observed that the use of Basque resources (LR1) in both areas is more frequent than the use of Spanish ones (LR2), even in the Spanish sociolinguistic area. Therefore, the impact of the sociolinguistic area cannot be confirmed.

Table 6. LR used in the most frequently performed CA in each sociolinguistic area.

CA Performed School A												
Cluster	Interactional Function	LR Used										
		LR1	LR2	LR3	LR4	LR5	LR6	LR7	LR8	-		
I	Invite elaboration or reasoning	I6	Ask for elaboration or clarification	66	17	100	13	10	14	0	3	3
G	Guide direction of dialogue or activity	G2	Propose action or activity	48	25	23	30	6	5	0	4	0
		G5	Focusing the dialogue on key aspects of the activity (guiding)	15	10	189	9	11	26	0	2	1
P	Positioning and coordination	P3	Propose solution	19	10	181	5	13	27	0	6	2
		P6	State (dis)agreement/position	63	31	82	18	14	12	0	2	1
CA performed School B												
I	Invite elaboration or reasoning	I6	Ask for elaboration or clarification	38	2	108	9	20	14	0	6	4
E	Express or invite ideas	E2	Make other (relevant) contribution	31	12	91	12	10	21	0	2	3
G5	Guide direction of dialogue or activity	G5	Focusing the dialogue on key aspects of the activity (guiding)	34	8	144	19	17	26	0	7	5
P	Positioning and coordination	P3	Propose solution	6	5	193	2	4	6	0	0	1
		P6	State (dis)agreement/position	38	9	189	6	13	7	0	0	0

LR used in the most frequently performed CA in each sociolinguistic area.

Here are two sample interactions (Tables 7 and 8) to exemplify the aforementioned use of CA and the LR deployed:

Table 7. Example from School A.

340. S3-Zuek jaten badituzue txuriak ... niri eman una de cada ... porque si no yo me quedo sin txuri. [If you it the white ones ... give one of each ... because the other way I won't have white]	P3	LR4
341. S1-Si uno no come ... [If one of us don't eat ...]	G5	LR2
342. S2-A ver ... nahastu behar ditugu ... [let's see ... we have to mix them]	G7	LR4
343. S3-Zuek jan behar dituzue hau eta hau ... [you have to eat this and this]	G5	LR1
344. S1-A ver ... bat jaten du ... bi hau, a ver, bi jaten du bi con leche ... eta [Let's see ... you eat one ... second this. Let's see ... she eats two with milk ... and] one, one.	G7	LR8
345. S3-A ver, zuk jango duzu hau eta Mainerrek hau ... Orduan nik ez dudanez jaten txuria. [Let's see, you will eat this and Maider this ... So, as I don't eat White ...]	G7	LR4
346. S2-Nik ez dut jaten [I don't eat] black.	E1	LR5
347. S3-Pues hori ... nik ez dudanez jaten txuria, eman behar didazue bat de [So that ... as I don't eat White, you have to give me a piece of] black ... -	G2	LR8

Example from School A.

Table 8. Example from School B.

201. S26-And the cauldron we?--No ...	I6	LR3
202. S19- ... and put it in the cauldron ...	P3	LR3
203. S22-Pour it ez [no]!	P6	LR5
204. S20-Zer <i>ingo deu</i> [what are we going to do]?	I6	LR1
205. S22-Simmer and mix with ...	P3	LR3
206. S21-Simmer?-The ingredients are into the cauldron.	I6	LR3
207. S22-And simmer it- <i>Punto</i> [dot]. Meanwhile ... -Meanwhile ...	P3	LR5
208. S20- <i>A ver</i> [let's see] ... <i>in daikeu</i> [we can do] ... Mix together in a bowl ... a dragon head ...	G5	LR8
209. S19- ... and a bit of ...	P3	LR3
210. S22- <i>Jarri daikeu</i> [we can put] dry ...	P3	LR5
211. S20-Mix together ... mix together.	P3	LR3
212. S19- <i>TH, T, H, E</i> [in Basque]	E2	LR1
213. S22-R	E2	LR3

Example from School B.

4. Discussion

The aim of the present study was twofold: on the one hand, to examine the communicative acts (CA) performed and the linguistic resources (LR) used by Grade 5 emergent trilingual pupils in the BAC while interacting in the English classroom. Also, on the other hand, to investigate the possible impact the sociolinguist area could have on the use of linguistic resources.

Addressing our first research question, the analysis suggests that participants in this study mostly performed CA concerning inviting elaboration or reasoning, expressing or inviting ideas, guiding direction of dialogue or activity, positioning and coordination, and showing understanding. All these CA are closely related to the type of activities performed in the English classroom and the patterns of interaction involved in such activities. Looking at our classroom data and observations carried out throughout the academic year 2016/2017, it can be said that the pupils had plenty of opportunities for meaningful interaction with their peers due to the great amount of activities done in groups, small groups, and whole class activities in which pupils needed to organize themselves, negotiate meaning, and take a stance in order to perform the task. This pedagogical approach seems to be suitable in order to observe the translanguaging practices of these emergent trilinguals, as can be seen in the following paragraph. As [Otheguy and García \(2019\)](#) state, bilinguals, in this case emergent trilinguals, have access to their whole linguistic repertoire in communicative situations in which the use of linguistic features is not restricted to named languages. These were exactly the communicative situations created in the English classroom. [Rosiers \(2018\)](#) and [St. John \(2018\)](#) also found that translanguaging practices should be analyzed in an interactional framework, because factors such as communicative situations, the topic, the group, as well as cognitive and linguistic features, may impact such practices.

Turning to the second research question, it was observed that pupils used similar linguistic resources (LR) regardless of the communicative acts (CA) being performed. These emergent trilinguals deployed English resources (LR3) more often than Basque (LR1) or Spanish ones (LR2) in the English classroom. Likewise, as reported by other researchers concerning bilingual students ([Baker 2011](#); [Cenoz 2017](#); [García 2017](#); [García-Mateus and Palmer 2017](#); [Lewis et al. 2012](#)), participants in the study frequently used linguistic resources coming from two systems, in this study, Basque and Spanish, in order to make meaning, share ideas, acquire understanding, and knowledge. Hence, this study confirms that spontaneous translanguaging is common practice in bilingual speakers, in our case, emergent trilingual speakers, as [Cenoz and Gorter \(2017\)](#) affirm. Equally, it reinforces the idea put forward by [Wei \(2015, p. 180\)](#), in the sense that translanguaging is not merely a combination of linguistic structures, “but also a creative strategy by the language user”.

Results also showed that participants tended to deploy resources from Basque when they asked for elaboration or clarification, stated (dis)agreement or position, or when they proposed an action or activity. It seems that due to the status of Basque in both schools, as it is the main language of

instruction, participants could have acquired more resources in that language than the ones developed in Spanish or English. Likewise, these emergent trilingual pupils deployed Spanish means (LR2) more often than Basque ones (LR1) when showing understanding, focusing the dialogue on key aspects of the activity, or when they proposed a solution. This tendency may be related to the fact that Basque is the main language of instruction in both schools, and Spanish and English are taught as subjects. Nonetheless, further research is needed to find out the possible impact of individual differences. It may well be that the home language of these emergent trilingual pupils and the use of Basque and Spanish resources in the different language domains have an impact on the use of their whole linguistic repertoire.

Finally, concerning the third and last research question, a comparison between both sociolinguistic areas suggest that pupils from both schools performed similar CA related to inviting elaboration or reasoning, guiding direction of dialogue or activity, and positioning and coordination. However, in the Basque sociolinguistic area, CA related to expressing or inviting ideas are also frequent. Our finding also reveals that the use of linguistic resources (LR) was similar in both sociolinguistic areas. It seems that the possible impact of the sociolinguistic area in the translanguaging practices of these Grade 5 emergent trilingual pupils cannot be confirmed. This could be due to the fact that the main language of instruction in both schools is Basque. In addition, the use of the same material during the English lessons could have an impact in the CA enacted by participants in both areas, as they followed the same methodology and they had similar classroom and task organization. Nevertheless, as aforementioned, individual differences should be analyzed to fine-tune these results.

Given the limited size of our sample, it is evident that further research is needed to study how these emergent trilingual pupils in the BAC communicate spontaneously to make themselves understood in the English classroom over the academic year. The present study is only an exploratory study in which fourteen pupils from two different sociolinguistic areas were randomly selected, observed, and recorded, with the aim of examining the enacted CA and LR used in the English classroom. In that line, the ongoing longitudinal study we are conducting will help us contribute to this field of research. As researchers such as [Lewis et al. \(2012\)](#) claim, a sociolinguistic approach is also needed in this field of research. Equally, [Cenoz and Gorter \(2017\)](#) highlight the possible impact of the social context when studying translanguaging practices.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.F. and P.S.; Investigation, A.F.; Methodology, A.F., P.S., and N.I.; Formal Analysis, A.F. and N.I.; Data curation, A.F.; Writing original draft and presentation, A.F.; Writing, review and editing, A.F., P.S., and N.I.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Baker, Colin. 2011. Language development and language allocation in bilingual education. In *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 3rd ed. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD, pp. 269–94.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. 2011. Translanguaging in the Classroom: Emerging Issues for Research and Pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review* 2: 1–28.
- Cenoz, Jasone. 2017. Translanguaging in school contexts: International perspectives. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* 16: 193–98. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Cenoz, Jasone, and Durk Gorter. 2017. Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: Threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Cenoz, Jasone, and Durk Gorter. 2019. Multilingualism, translanguaging, and minority languages in SLA. *The Modern Language Journal* 103. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Fuller, Janet M. 2015. Language choices and ideology in the bilingual classroom. In *Multilingual Education: Between Language Learning and Translanguaging*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 137–58. ISBN 978-1-107-47751-3.

- García, Ofelia. 2017. Translanguaging in Schools: Subiendo y Bajando, Bajando y Subiendo as Afterword. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* 16: 256–63.
- García-Mateus, Suzanne, and Deborah Palmer. 2017. Translanguaging Pedagogies for Positive Identities in Two-Way Dual Language Bilingual Education. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* 16: 245–55.
- Gay, Lorraine R., Mills Geoffrey, and Airasian Peter. 2006. *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications*. New York: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Gorter, Durk, Victoria Zenotz, and Jasone Cenoz. 2014. Multilingualism and European minority languages: The case of Basque. In *Minority Languages and Multilingual Education*. Dordrecht: Springer Science + Business Media, pp. 201–20. ISBN 978-94-007-7316-5.
- Hennessy, Sara, Sylvia Rojas-Drummond, Rupert Higham, Ana María Márquez, Fiona Maine, Rosa María Ríos, Rocío García-Carrión, Omar Torreblanca, and María José Barrera. 2016. Developing coding scheme for classroom dialogue across educational contexts. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction* 9: 16–44. [CrossRef]
- Lewis, Gwyn, Bryn Jones, and Colin Baker. 2012. Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice* 18: 641–54. [CrossRef]
- Otheguy, Ricardo, and Ofelia García. 2019. Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Commonalities and divergences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. [CrossRef]
- Otheguy, Ricardo, Ofelia García, and Wallis Reid. 2015. Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A new perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review* 6: 281–307. [CrossRef]
- Rosiers, Kirsten. 2018. Translanguaging revisited Challenges for research, policy and pedagogy based on an inquiry in two Belgian classrooms. In *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 361–83. [CrossRef]
- St. John, Oliver. 2018. Between question and answer Mother tongue tutoring and translanguaging as dialogic action. In *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 334–60. [CrossRef]
- Wei, Li. 2015. Complementary classrooms for multilingual minority ethnic children as a translanguaging space. In *Multilingual Education: Between Language Learning and Translanguaging*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 177–98. ISBN 978-1-107-47751-3.



© 2019 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).