

LANGUAGE BEHAVIORS SIGNIFYING LECTURERS' SOCIAL IDENTITY IN THE BUSINESS ENGLISH TEACHING CONTEXT

Khatuna Buskivadze

¹ *American Research Institute of the South Caucasus, Georgia*

² *Sociolinguistics, Faculty of Humanities, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia*

buskivadzekhatuna@gmail.com  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2187-1297>

Abstract:

The present study aims to investigate the socio- and applied linguistic functions and frequency of lecturers' language behaviors (code-switching (CS), code-mixing (CM), and translanguaging) in terms of showing lecturers' social identity in the Georgian educational discourse, namely, in teaching Business English (English for Specific Purposes - ESP) at the university level. An examination of Georgian discursive peculiarities is a novel addition to this field of research, as there are very few studies focusing on Georgian lecturers' language behaviors in English for Specific Purposes (ESP). Both quantitative (online questionnaires (70 students) and qualitative (8 lecturers' recorded lectures) research methods are used to illustrate the functions of using code-switching, code-mixing, and translanguaging in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) (lecturers' recorded lessons (80 hours). Surprisingly, in contrast to previous studies' findings, we found that the Georgian and English languages are equally used for informal and formal purposes. Both languages are used to express solidarity in classroom conversations. The given study is a unique example in which both English and Georgian are used as marked/unmarked ("We-code", "They-code") choices, as previous studies only considered L1 (first language) as "we-code" and a foreign language (English) was regarded solely as "they code." Within 80 hours of recordings (ESP), 549 cases of code-switching, 103 cases of code-mixing, and 177 cases of translanguaging, planned use of L1 (Georgian) were detected in teaching vocabulary. Consequently, using translanguaging can be beneficial to business English lecturers seeking to improve and fossilize students' business terminology in Georgian. The business English lecturers consider the English language to be an inseparable part of their identity, however, they still incorporate the mother tongue in their lectures for encouraging the enhancement of the Business terminology in the Georgian language.

Keywords: ESP, Code-switching, Code-mixing, Translanguaging, Social identity

Citation: [to be filled out by the editorial office]

Introduction

This research studies Business English lecturers and their students across two state universities in Georgia (the country). Business English (B2-C1 level) is taught as a compulsory course at Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University and as an optional course (B1-B2 levels) at Ilia State University. The study combines both



quantitative and qualitative research methods. The article will suggest a combination of psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, and structural perspectives to provide a deeper explanation of language behaviors captured in the recorded lectures.

Moreover, this paper illustrates the co-existence of the competitive terms: translanguaging, code-switching, and code-mixing. The original use of translanguaging as a language behavior has two core aims: 1. For students to gain a deeper comprehension of the content; 2. For students to acquire both languages simultaneously since these languages represent inseparable parts of bilingual speakers' repertoire. There is no such notion as language, but 'lect', and idiolect is a subject of interest in translanguaging studies.

As for code-switching (code-mixing) behavior, it refers to the switching of languages depending on the purpose and environment of the communication within one conversation. Some unconscious switches, those which are not associated with comprehension and acquiring knowledge, can be found in the educational discourse.

The research questions are the following:

1. What are the sociolinguistic functions of using code-switching, code-mixing, and translanguaging in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) context (based on the data collected in two state universities)?
2. What is the structural representation of code-switching, code-mixing, and translanguaging in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) context (based on the data collected in two state universities)?
3. What are the attitudes Georgian lecturers and students have toward lecturers using L1 (Georgian) in business English classrooms?

The structure of the paper follows the three WH-questions: what (the terminological clarification of the words: translanguaging, code-switching, code-mixing, diglossia, borrowings, how (theoretical framework: a description of quantitative and qualitative methods used in the study), and where (discourse, in our case, teaching ESP – Business English).

Code-switching and its related vocabulary

The term 'code' has been widely observed. In sociolinguistics, 'code' is employed in both a general (i.e., system of signs) and specific (i.e., dialect and register, etc.) sense. Code refers to the language and a variety of languages that are transmitted by different groups in social situations (Swann, 2004). Swann suggests a broad understanding of code (the language and a variety of a language). A language variety, also called a 'lect', is a specific form of a language or language cluster, which may include languages, dialects, registers, styles, or other forms of language, as well as a standard variety.

Based on the definition of the term code (general/specific), the definition of code-switching is determined. According to Myers-Scotton, code-switching is the use of two or more languages in the same conversation usually within the same conversational turn or even within the same sentence of that turn (Myers-Scotton 1997:47). Mayers-Scotton suggests the general understanding of the word code, which refers to language (i.e., Georgian, English, etc.).

There are other terms used in the scientific literature concerning code-switching; these are code-mixing, translanguaging, diglossia, and bilingualism. This article will discuss the terminological distinction between the above-given terminologies.

Table 1. Terminological clarification of code-switching related words

Code-mixing	Wardhaugh (1986:103) suggests that code-mixing occurs when conversants use both languages together to the extent that they change from one language to the other during a single utterance. It means that the conversant just changes some of the elements in their utterance. Code mixing takes place without a change of topic and can involve various levels of language, e.g., morphology and lexical items.
Translanguaging	Translanguaging is the use of the full linguistic repertoire “without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named languages”. - Oftentimes, it is assumed that bilinguals have one dominant language, and thus there is a hierarchical relationship between their known languages (García et al 2017).
Borrowing	It has been claimed that from synchronic examination [i.e., without comparative or etymological evidence] no loans are discoverable or describable (see Fries and Pike, 1949, see also Haugen, 1950a, Weinreich 1953) presumably because they are perfectly assimilated to the recipient language patterns (Poplack and Sankoff, 1984).
Diglossia	A state of “being bilingual”. A situation, in which a community uses two different languages or varieties of a language for different situations (high variety and low variety).

The distinctions between code-switching and borrowing are vivid since borrowed words do not have an equivalent in the recipient language and become perfectly assimilated into it. On the contrary, code-switching and code-mixing may represent better versions of the existing units or fill the lexical gap in the recipient language. Importantly, they never become fully assimilated to the receiver (language).

Code-switching and code-mixing are also easily distinguished since one represents the switch on the intersentential (between sentences) level and the other intrasentential (within the sentence) which may involve morphology and lexical items.

Diglossia is a situation in which two languages or two varieties of one language have their status (high, low). On the one hand, there is a standard language, which is used in education and literature, for official documents, etc. On the other hand, there is a low variety of language, which is only used in oral discourse and used as a standard language. The perfect example of diglossia is Arabic languages, standard Arabic and Arabic dialects, which are never used interchangeably. Communities living in such diglossic situations are bilingual.

There is considerable confusion surrounding translanguaging, as it can be an all-encompassing term for diverse multimodal and multilingual practices, which have traditionally been described as code-switching, code-mixing, code-meshing, and crossing.

There are two views of teaching languages in the classroom. The conventional view represents the process when two languages are generally taught as two isolated systems. The focus has tended to be historically on the structure of those languages, i.e., vocabulary, grammatical structure, and so on. But most people, who live in bilingual and multilingual parts of the world, engage in practices where they borrow words from one language that pop them into the language that they are using.

Table 2. Conventional versus contemporary views.

Code-switching and translanguaging	
Conventional view:	Contemporary view:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two languages are taught as separate entities (Lambert, 1991). • Focus on form (structure – lexis, syntax, 4 skills) • Code-switching and code-mixing are regarded as illegitimate practices. • Code-switching is the alternating use of chunks (clauses, sentences, paragraphs) of two or more languages. • Code mixing, usually inserting/including one or two words here & there from a second language into the predominant use of one language. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • two languages, part of the student’s repertoire (bilinguality/multilinguality) (Agnihotri, 2007), • Focus on (social) process – ‘linguaging’ (Swain, 2006), ‘translanguaging’ (Garcia, 2009). • Increasing awareness of what bilingual learners do to make meaning. • Reappraisal of the role of translation and Interpreting.

Translanguaging is using language as a unitary meaning-making system of the speakers. It is characterized by bilingual speakers. Languages are not perceived separately in translanguaging, rather they are seen from speakers' perspective as a language repertoire, from which they select features that are appropriate to communicate. In Pedagogy, translanguaging is used as an approach to make the context better understandable with the help of using bilingual speakers’ (students’) repertoire.

The concepts of translanguaging and code-switching using bilingual classrooms are often confused. However, they can be distinguished in terms of language interference and individuals involved in language practice.

There are several distinctive features between these two terms: Garcia and Wei (as cited in Molina & Samuelson, 2016) think that code-switching is seen as the process of changing two languages, whereas translanguaging is about “the speakers’ construction that creates the complete language repertoire” (Molina & Samuelson, 2016: 3).

Table 3. Terminological distinctions between code-switching and translanguaging.

Translanguaging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An existing controllable cognition (bilinguals know what they are saying while producing words in both languages) • analyses “how bi/multilingual individuals are involved in their linguistic practice” (Hornberger and Link, 2012: 267) • focuses on learning both languages at the same time without separating
-----------------	--

	(Lewis, Jones, and Baker, 2012)
Code-switching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Changing languages within a single conversation“(Baker & Jones, 58) (bilingual individuals shift between two or more languages, which depend on the purpose and environment of the communication) • Has been considered a linguistically incompetent ability • searches for “language interference and transfer” (Hornberger and Link, 2012: 267) • According to Lewis, Jones, and Baker (2012), code-switching practices the notion of separate languages.

Thus, code-switching is seen as the process of changing two languages (1. using at least a clause in a sentence in one language and switching over to a new one, then developing a second clause, a subordinate clause in the second language; 2. one sentence in one language and then, alternating with one sentence in the second language; 3. speaking for five minutes in one language or writing a paragraph in one language and switching over and writing or speaking in the other language) for deliberate purposes, whereas translanguaging is about perceiving languages as unitary meaning-making systems, bilingual repertoire.

Translanguaging has been studied in bilingual and multilingual societies (Garcia, 2009; Wei, 2011). It must be said that the term translanguaging was originally intended to be a descriptive label for a specific language practice. It was Baker's (2001) English translation of Williams's (Williams, 1994) Welsh term ‘trawsieithu’, to describe pedagogical practices that Williams observed in Welsh revitalization programs, where the teacher would try and teach in Welsh and the pupils would respond largely in English. William suggested that they help to minimize the learners’ and the teacher’s linguistic resources in the process of problem-solving and knowledge construction.

Wei (2017) elaborated on two related concepts translanguaging space and translanguaging instinct to bridge the artificial and ideological divides between the so-called socio-cultural and the cognitive approaches to translanguaging practices. Current studies use the notion of translanguaging since both sociocultural and cognitive (acquiring language through bilingual communication) aspects of using L1 versus target language in the Business English classes. In terms of code-switching and code-mixing behaviors, we are interested in the sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic aspects of using L1 in the same context.

Method

Both qualitative and quantitative studies were used to better illustrate the core aim of the given paper. On the one hand, we analyzed Business English lectures recorded via the Zoom platform. On the other hand, two questionnaire forms were filled out by eight lecturers (teaching Business English) and their students (taking Business English courses) from two state universities (Ivane Javakishvili Tbilisi State University and Ilia State University). The participants are randomly chosen for both, quantitative and qualitative studies, the questionnaires were sent to as many students and lecturers as possible via platforms (argus.iliauni.edu.ge; LMS.tsu.ge) which are used in the above-mentioned universities. We asked 11 lecturers to record their Business

English lectures, however only 8 complied with our request.

The quantitative data was collected with the help of Google forms from 70 students (taking Business English course) and from eight teachers who recorded the Business English lectures (80 hours overall, 10 hours, 5 lessons each). As for the qualitative data, 80 Zoom lectures were transcribed with the help of online software (otter.ai). The lecturers' moments of switching from the target language (English) to L1 (Georgian) were analyzed by using conversational analytics (CA) (Auer, 1988), interactional sociolinguistic (IS) (Bailey, 2015), and contextualization cues (Gumperz, 2002) methods. According to the CA approach, language choice and turn-taking define the teachers' attitudes toward each language. A change in register and implicature (IS) signifies the language identity. Lecturers' language choice is also determined by their identity ("we-code and "they-code"); Employing the structural analysis in our research qualitative data is also illustrated quantitatively.

Results and Discussion

Translanguaging cannot fully have the same usage in multilingual classrooms (knowing more languages than a native one) as it has among bilingual speakers (people naturally have an inborn ability to speak two languages). This research focuses on cases in which the monolingual approach is a dominant teaching method for Business English. Thus, some elements of translanguaging are included together with code-switching and code-mixing behaviors.

Business English is the most popular field of interest in teaching English for specific purposes (ESP) due to several reasons. First, business administration has become one of the most demanded professions in Georgia. Across Georgia's higher education institutions, from 6000 to 7000 (21-22%) of BA students study at the faculty of Business Administration based on the statistical data of 2018-2022. Second, English, in addition to being a lingua franca, obtained a function of code used in business communications worldwide; therefore, a specific English terminology bank is formed, and equivalent terms may not be found in other languages. Thus, the paper is focused on Business English (ESP), rather than English as a foreign language (EFL).

Qualitative research

Eight participant Business English lecturers were categorized in the following way: their demographical data, their attitude towards the English language, and functions of using L1 in their Business English classes. The demographic values are illustrated in the table below.

Table 4. demographical data of the research participants.

Business English lecturers	Age	Gender	Place of birth	The highest level of Education they have	Their mother tongue	The language they use with their family members
Teacher 1	41-45	F	Georgia	MA	Georgian	English
Teacher 2	41-45	F	Georgia, Tbilisi	Ph.D.	Georgian	Georgian

Teacher 3	36-40	F	Georgia, Tbilisi	MA	Georgian	Georgian
Teacher 4	31-35	F	Georgia, Tbilisi	MA	Georgian	Georgian
Teacher 5	31-35	F	Georgia, Chiatura	MA	Georgian	Georgian
Teacher 6	56-60	F	Georgia, Sokhumi	Ph.D.	Georgian	Georgian
Teacher 7	36-40	M	Georgia, Tbilisi	MA	Georgian	Russian
Teacher 8	21-30	F	Georgia, Tbilisi	MA	Georgian	Georgian

The table shows that most of the lecturers (4 out of 8) surveyed are from 31 to 40 years old and were born in Tbilisi, Georgia. Only one lecturer is male. Most of them (6 out of 8) have MA degrees. Most individuals speak Georgian with their family members but two use either English or Russian.

Based on our survey two lecturers work at Ilia State University, while six work at Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University. Six out of eight lecturers believed having a good command of English is very important and seven out of eight lecturers considered the English language as an important part of their identities. All eight participants claimed that they use and prefer to use either only English or a combination of English and Georgian languages. None of them prefer nor use only Georgian in their Business English classes.

Based on the recorded Business English lectures (80 hours), we managed to identify the functions of using lecturers' code-switching and code-mixing language behaviors and to single out the translanguaging moments. The paper aimed to structurally analyze and categorize the parts of speeches found in lecturers' code-switching and code-mixing examples.

Within the 80 hours of recordings (ESP), 549 cases of code-switching, 103 cases of code-mixing, and 177 cases of translanguaging were used by the Business English lecturers. These three language behaviors are analyzed separately. All five translanguaging behaviors found in the recordings had comprehensive functions, lecturers used them namely for Business English vocabulary clarification purposes code-switching and code-mixing language behaviors had almost similar functions:

- to give instructions
- to explain difficult concepts
- to explain grammar explicitly
- to check for comprehension
- to introduce unfamiliar materials/topics in Business
- to explain the differences between the students' L1 (Georgian) and English
- to draw students' attention to the correct pronunciation of sounds in English
- to maintain classroom discipline and the structure of the lesson
- to provide praise/feedback/personal remarks about students' performance
- to encourage student's participation in classroom activities
- to build/strengthen interpersonal relationships between the teacher and students

- to reduce students' anxiety in learning Business English
- to increase students' motivation and confidence in learning Business English

Table 5. The structural stratification of the given language behaviors:

Structural forms:	English for Specific Purposes (Business English)
Paragraph	Code-switching (16); Translanguaging (21)
Phrase	Code-switching (14) Translanguaging (2)
Collocation	Code-switching (3); Translanguaging (4)
Idioms	Code-switching (0); Translanguaging (0)
Participle	Code-mixing (1)
Noun	Code-mixing (12); Translanguaging (2)
Adjective	Code-mixing (4); Translanguaging (1)
Numeral	Code-mixing (2)
Adverb	Code-mixing (17)
Verb	Code-mixing (31)
Particle	Code-mixing (25)
Interjection	Code-mixing (4)
Conjunction	Code-mixing (2)

Structurally, there were dominant parts of speech found in the recordings. Code-mixing and translanguaging behaviours are categorized to show the quantity of each part of speech in the lecturers' language repertoire.

In terms of code-switching and translanguaging, L1 is used mostly in the form of a paragraph, while code-switching is mostly presented as a verb.

Sentences were classified according to their content.

Table 6. Classification of sentences found in the Business English teaching context

Types of sentences:	English for Specific Purposes
Declarative Sentence	Overall: 243 Code-switching (154); Translanguaging (90)
Interrogative Sentence	Overall: 127 Code-switching (113); Translanguaging (14)
Exclamation Sentence	Overall: 111 Code-switching (92); Translanguaging (19)
Interrogative-exclamatory Sentence	Overall: 103 Code-switching (85); Translanguaging (18)
Imperative Sentence	Code-switching (31)
Negative Sentence	Overall: 44 Code-switching (38); Translanguaging (6)

Declarative sentences are the most, while the negative sentence type is the least used.

Some examples are discussed in this section of the paper: code-witching, code-mixing, and translanguaging.

Notes:

// - Pause 0.5 seconds and more

= - a direct link between sentences

[] – speeches coincide

, - hesitation

? - rising tone

. - falling tone

— - Georgian sentences are underlined

() - English Translation

Example 1/01:28 (code-switching)

Topic: Reading (Problem Solving); Grammar (Past modals)

Function: (1) (2) to solve the problem created in the process of lecturing: interrogative

S: მიჭედავდა და ხმა კარგად არ მესმის./mitchedavda da khma kargad ar mesmis. (It was stuck and I barely hear the voice.)

T: (1) არ ისმის ახლა ჩემი ხმა?/ar ismis akhla chemi khma? (?) (Can you hear my voice, now?)

S: ახლა კი, არ ვიცი რატომ ჭედავს./akhla ki, ar vitsi ratom tchedavs. (now yes, I don't know why it is unstable)

T: (2) ჲო, რატომ?/ui, ratom? (?) (oh, why?)

This example shows the pitfalls of online learning. e.g., interruptions caused by weak internet connection. As can be seen from the example, both sides use the Georgian language, consciously or unconsciously, in order to quickly eliminate the mentioned problem. The choice of the Georgian language by the lecturer is determined by the students' language choice.

Example 2/1:38:37 (code-mixing)

Topic: Writing (Minutes)

Function: Greetings/Farewells

T: Okay, I guess you have no questions, would you like to, I don't know, say something before we say goodbye?

Ss: (silence)

T: okay, then guys, have a nice day. Have a nice weekend and see you next week.

Ss: Thank you, Okay, goodbye.

T: Okay, bye,

S: goodbye,

T: ნახვამდის/nakhvamdis (goodbye).

The example shows a change in register, namely the English language is used either formally (would you like to, goodbye) or informally (guys, bye, okay). The Georgian is used formally (ნახვამდის/nakhvamdis (goodbye)). The function of the example is seeing off in the form of interjection.

Example 3/1:22:33 (Translanguaging) (Code-switching) (Code-mixing)

Topic: Vocabulary (Law)

Function: Code-switching - (1) (2) (6) (7) to check for comprehension, to ask, to inquire so that the students answer by themselves.

Code-mixing (3) to ask, to inquire so that the students answer by themselves.

Translanguaging - (4) (5) (8) to explain difficult concepts

T: Okay (.) (1) ახლა, რამე სიტყვები რაც თქვენ გახსოვთ აქედან?/akhla, rame sityvebi rac Tqven gakhsovT aqedan? (now any vocabulary items you remembered from the task?)

S1: Excruciating

T: (2) რა არის ეგ?/ra aris eg? (what does that mean?)

S1: მტანჯველი/mtanjveli (gives a Georgian definition of the word)

T: yeah! = (3) კიდევ?/kidev? (what else?)

S2: trepidation?

T: (4) რაცღა ისეთი/raghats iseti (something like) = trepidation. So, you, you feel trepidation (.) (5) რაცღა/raghats (something) excitement-სავითარი ხო?/excitement-saviTari kho? კიდევ?/kidev? (like excitement, isn't it? what else?)

S2: incredulously,

T: Yeah, (6) კარგი სიტყვა არის. კიდევ რა, ვის რა აქვს?/kargi sityva aris. Kidev ra, vis ra aqvs? (it is a nice word, what else, what else do you have?)

S3: vigor

T: vigor! = (7) რა არის გ (student's name) vigor? /ra aris G = vigor? (G (student's name) what is vigor?)

S3: ძალა!/Dzala! (power!)

T: (8) ენერჯია ხო? სხვათაშორის vigor არ არის მარტო ენერჯია, ეს არის ფიზიკური ძალაც და აი, ჯანმრთელი რომ ხარ./energia kho? Skhvatashoris vigor ar aris marto energia, es aris fizikuri dzalats da ai, janmrteli rom khar. (Energy, right? Vigor is not only energy, but also physical power and, like being healthy.) = You are vigorous and full of energy.

This example incorporates all language behaviors. Translanguaging is used to clarify the meanings of the unknown terms; With the help of using translanguaging, lecturer tries to teach his or her students the business terms, both in Georgian and English. Code switching is used to check for comprehension (რა არის ეგ? /ra aris eg? (What does that mean?)). Code mixing is used by the lecturer to make his or her students talk. The example can be analyzed with the help of CA (lecturer encourages his or her students to use Georgian).

Quantitative research

Participants: 70 BA Students, taking a Business English course, from Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University and Ilia State University.

Quantitative research aims to answer the following research questions: 1. What is the correlation between Business English students' sex and their identity; 2. How Business English students' English language competence is correlated with their identity; 3. How functions of using L1 (Georgian) by lecturers are

determined by students' identity, sex, and English language competence.

- 86% of Business English students believe that the English language is part of their identity. Only 14% of students surveyed believe that the English language is not part of their identity and consider it only as means of communication.

- (No difference in Gender - Fisher's Exact Test = .543, Pearson Chi-Square = .733).

- In terms of Identity, there is no difference in results between students born in Tbilisi and the regional parts of Georgia. (Fisher's Exact Test = .484, Pearson Chi-Square = .695).

Business English Students want their lecturer not to use the Georgian Language, but to reinforce using the English language for expressing the following functions:

- to explain the differences between the students' L1 (Georgian) and English
- to encourage student's participation in classroom activities
- to build/strengthen interpersonal relationships between the lecturer and students
- to reduce students' anxiety in learning Business English
- to increase students' motivation and confidence in learning Business English

Conclusion

Based on both, quantitative and qualitative research methods, we came to the following conclusions:

In the Georgian educational discourse, within 80 hours of recordings (English for Specific Purposes (ESP), 549 examples of code-switching, 103 examples of code-mixing, and 177 examples of translanguaging were found.

The language behavior examples are classified according to the structural forms and sentence types. Overall, the most spread ones are a paragraph and declarative sentence type.

The lecturers' frequently-expressed functions of code-switching and code-mixing behaviors are (1) to explain the differences between the students' L1 (Georgian) and English; (2) to encourage student's participation in classroom activities, and (3) translanguaging – to explain the specific Business term.

All participants (8 lecturers) claimed that they use and prefer to use either only English or a combination of English and Georgian languages. None of them prefer or/and use only Georgian in their Business English classes.

Even though the Georgian lecturers have a conventional view of teaching a foreign language, English wasn't the only language used in their Business English classes. The use of the first language (L1- Georgian in our case) was also detected in their recorded lectures.

Although there is a considerable amount of L1 (Georgian) used by the lecturers in the Business English classes, still English was the dominant language of instruction used by the lecturers to show their positive attitude towards using it.

The majority of Business English students (86%) believe that the English language is part of their identity. Only

a few (14%) of them consider it only as means of communication. Regarding attitude, there is no difference in Gender (Fisher's Exact Test = .543, Pearson Chi-Square = .733).

Considering students' identity there is no difference in results between students born in Tbilisi and the regional parts of Georgia. (Fisher's Exact Test = .484, Pearson Chi-Square = .695).

Students' attitudes toward lecturers using L1 (Georgian) are far more negative than the lecturers themselves in the Business English classes. Although there is a considerable amount of L1 (Georgian) used by the lecturers in the Business English classes, English was still the dominant language of instruction used by the lecturers to show their positive attitude towards using it.

In brief, using translanguaging in the Business English teaching context can have a positive outcome and result in reinforcing not only the business terminology in English but also its equivalents in Georgian. The English language being part of the lecturers' social identity can help them contribute to the betterment of the business field in the Georgian language.

Recommendations

The future perspective of this study is observing students' language behaviors found in the recordings. As for the applied linguistics, the productivity of using L1 by the lecturers and their students would also play a role in the development of the business English teaching methodology.

Acknowledgements or Notes

This paper is partly supported by a grant from ARISC.

References

- Auer, P. (1984). *Interpretive sociolinguistics: migrants, children, migrant children*.
- Agnihotri, R. (2007). *Towards a Pedagogical Paradigm Rooted in Multilinguality*. *International Multilingual Research Journal*. 1. 79-88. 10.1080/19313150701489689.
- Bailey, B. (2015). *Interactional Sociolinguistics*. In *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction* (eds K. Tracy, T. Sandel, and C. Ilie). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118611463.wbielsi060>
- García, O., Flores, N. & Spotti, M. (eds.) (2017). *Handbook of Language and Society*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gumperz J. J. (2002). *Language and social identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hornberger N. & Link H. (2012) *Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: a biliteracy lens*, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15:3, 261-278, DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2012.658016
- Lambert, R. D. (1991). *Distance education and foreign languages*. Washington, D.C.: Johns Hopkins University,

- National Foreign Language Center. ERIC Document #: ED 334 833.
- Lewis G., Jones B. & Baker C. (2012) Translanguaging: developing its conceptualization and contextualisation, *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18:7, 655-670, DOI: 10.1080/13803611.2012.718490
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1997). *Dueling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford University Press.
- Poplack, S., & Sankoff, D. (1984). Borrowing: The synchrony of integration. *Linguistics*, 22, 99-135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/ling.1984.22.1.99>
- Serafín M. Coronel-Molina & Beth L. Samuelson (2017) Language contact and translingual literacies, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38:5, 379-389, DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2016.1186681
- Swain M. (2006). *Languaging, Agency, and Collaboration in Advanced Second Language Proficiency*. In Byrnes H. (Ed.), *Advanced Language Learning: The Contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky*, 95-108. London-New York: Continuum.
- Swann, J. (2004). Language choice and code-switching In: R. Mesthrie, J. Swann, A. Deumert and W. L. Leap (eds.). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 146-182.
- Wardhaugh, R. (1986). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*, Blackwell textbooks in linguistics.