

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20055518

LINGUISTIC HYBRIDITY IN ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE: TRANSLANGUAGING PRACTICES IN HIGH-STAKES TURKISH BUSINESS COMMUNICATION

Erol Poyraz^{1*} and Erkan Poyraz²

¹Assist. Prof. Dr., Foreign Language Teaching Department, Faculty of Education, Kafkas University, Türkiye, erlp93@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0001-6617-0692

²Prof. Dr., Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Muğla Sıtkı Kocman University, Türkiye, poyraz@mu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-6442-4705

Received: 02/04/2026
Accepted: 23/04/2026

Corresponding Author: Erol POYRAZ
(erlp93@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT

Although translanguaging has been extensively theorized in educational settings, its manifestation within domestic intra-organizational discourse where sender and receiver share the same first language remains empirically underexplored. The study investigates translanguaging practices among Turkish business professionals in Muğla Province, Türkiye, examining how English language resources are deployed in internally oriented professional communication. Employing an exploratory sequential mixed methods design, the study first engaged a qualitative phase comprising semi-structured interviews, stimulated recall sessions, and discourse analysis of 94 anonymized domestic e-mail artifacts. Analysis identified four recurrent translanguaging strategies: morphological hybridization, terminological transplantation, hybrid predication and evaluative constructs, and register marking and identity affiliating translanguaging. Consistent with the distinction drawn between strategic translanguaging and routinized lexical borrowing, these strategies function not to bridge cross-linguistic communication but to mobilize institutionally legitimized English professional registers within a shared Turkish communicative space. The quantitative phase, based on survey data, yielded a four factor measurement model in which Translanguaging Frequency emerged as the strongest predictor of perceived Risk Reduction. The findings suggest that within this provincial and sectoral sample, English has been so thoroughly internalized into Turkish professional discourse that it operates as an integral register component, deployed strategically even in communication among Turkish-speaking colleagues.

KEYWORDS: Translanguaging, Intra-Organizational Communication, Workplace Multilingualism, Turkish Business Discourse, Professional Register, Professional Identity, BELF.

1. INTRODUCTION

In Türkiye, as in many non-Anglophone economies with expanding international trade exposure, the organizational language environment of domestically oriented professional workplaces has been substantially reshaped by the penetration of English into sector specific registers. Turkish business professionals routinely compose internal written communications directed at Turkish speaking colleagues that deploy English-language resources, a practice whose communicative logic does not reduce to cross-linguistic necessity. This dynamic acquires particular theoretical salience in the context of globally exposed sectors, where institutional communications carry legal authority, distribute accountability, and commit organizations to obligations enforceable across jurisdictions (Shore & Wright, 2015). A misread clause, an ambiguous payment condition, or an imprecisely formulated regulatory category constitutes a material risk event rather than a grammatical failure (Shore, 2008). Pshenichnikov (2025) has demonstrated that the accuracy and transparency of financial texts function as prerequisites for market integrity and adherence to international regulatory norms, underscoring the high-stakes communicative environment in which internationally exposed multilingual professionals routinely operate. English has become the *de facto* medium of global trade and finance (Fredriksson et al., 2006), threading together interactions across divergent regulatory cultures and organizational systems. Multilingual professionals must hold local legal-financial specificity and globally standardized documentation demands in productive tension, often under acute time pressure, with the understanding that institutional credibility depends not on whether their language is native-like but on whether their meaning is correctly understood, precisely interpreted, and operationally acted upon.

This phenomenon carries two layers of theoretical significance. First, it reveals that translanguaging, which is the strategic deployment of a speaker's unified, integrated multilingual repertoire (García & Wei, 2014; Wei, 2011), is not restricted to contexts of cross-linguistic necessity but is operatively present even in monolingual recipient domestic communicative environments. Second, it suggests that in certain professional domains, English has been so thoroughly internalized into the communicative repertoire that it functions as a constitutive component of the professional register itself, carrying terminological precision, institutional authority, and identity marking functions that Turkish equivalents may not fully replicate (Jonsson

& Blåsjö, 2020). Sun et al. (2021) documented a closely analogous phenomenon in their ethnographic study of a Chinese subsidiary of a German multinational corporation, where local employees spontaneously deployed English key terms in interactions conducted predominantly in Mandarin which are practices driven not by cross-linguistic necessity but by the absence of perceived Chinese equivalents and the internalization of domain specific English lexis into an integrated linguistic system. That this dynamic emerged in a non-Anglophone Asian context renders it particularly instructive for the present investigation of Turkish organizational discourse.

The theoretical framework that best illuminates this phenomenon combines translanguaging theory with attention to professional register and corporate language ecology. Translanguaging, as theorized by García and Wei (2014) and Wei (2018), conceptualizes multilingual practice not as the alternation between separate, bounded language systems but as the deployment of an integrated semiotic repertoire whose elements are selected in response to situational, relational, and institutional demands. Applied to domestic professional discourse, this framework directs analytical attention toward the strategic purposes that English-language resources serve when deployed between Turkish speaking colleagues for the purpose of achieving terminological precision, register elevation, identity alignment with global professional norms, or institutional authority signaling. As García and Wei (2014) argued, language in multilingual professional environments functions as a fluid resource at one's disposal, with boundaries between named languages becoming functionally blurred in service of meaning making. Parallel to this, the Business English as a Lingua Franca (BELF) literature (Kankaanranta & Louhiala-Salminen, 2013; Komori-Glatz, 2018; Seidlhofer, 2011) has documented how English functions as a shared medium in international professional communication. An important extension of this literature is the observation that BELF conventions, once internalized through regular international engagement, may reshape professional discourse practices even in domestic contexts: Barner-Rasmussen et al. (2014) have demonstrated that boundary spanning professionals carry multilingual competences and associated language norms into intraorganizational interactions well beyond the specific encounters that initially motivated them.

Drawing on Goffman's (1959) frontstage/backstage distinction, this study

conceptualizes domestic professional e-mail as a hybrid communicative space that is formally back stage relative to international correspondence, yet itself constitutes a professional register whose norms have been shaped by the permeation of English into Turkish organizational discourse. Angouri (2013) described a comparable dynamic in European MNC contexts, observing that employees typically adopt a pragmatic “what works” orientation toward language choice, routinely crossing language boundaries in service of their situated communicative needs rather than in compliance with formal language policies. Fredriksson et al. (2006) similarly found that internal communication in multilingual organizations involves operating at the interface of several languages, with deliberate ambiguity and strategic flexibility functioning as recurring communicative resources. The practices examined in the present study are thus neither accidental code-mixing nor instances of simple lexical borrowing; they are translanguaging strategies reflecting the professional's simultaneous command of Turkish and English as an integrated semiotic resource, deployed even when the interlocutor shares the same Turkish L1 background.

Despite these advances in the workplace multilingualism literature, a structurally common limitation persists: translanguaging in professional settings has been studied almost exclusively in contexts where interlocutors do not share a first language. Whether in European MNC meetings among speakers of diverse L1s (Angouri, 2014), in international corporate exchanges where English bridges organizational discourse across national boundaries (Ai et al., 2022), or in BELF transactions linking professionals across divergent regulatory linguistic systems (Kankaanranta & Louhiala-Salminen, 2013), the dominant explanatory frame positions translanguaging as a communicative adaptation to cross-linguistic necessity. Even Sun et al.'s (2021) otherwise illuminating ethnographic account was situated within a MNC context structured by the presence of a German parent organization where the institutional imperative of English operated as a visible environmental constraint. This framing leaves a substantive empirical gap unaddressed: what happens when both interlocutors share the same L1? When translanguaging cannot be motivated by the absence of a common language, its theoretical grounding shifts from communicative necessity to register, terminological precision, identity construction, and institutional authority, functions whose empirical contours have not been adequately examined in the

context of intra-organizational professional discourse between same-L1 speakers. This gap is particularly salient in Türkiye and comparable settings where English has penetrated organizational discourse so thoroughly that it functions as a component of the professional register even in domestic communications between Turkish L1 speakers. The present study addresses that gap by investigating how Turkish business professionals deploy English language resources in written e-mail communication directed at Turkish-speaking colleagues, and what translanguaging functions these resources serve when cross-linguistic necessity offers no explanatory purchase.

Two research questions guide the study:

(1) What translanguaging strategies do Turkish business professionals employ in domestic intra-organizational written e-mail communication, and what communicative functions do these strategies serve?

(2) To what extent do professionals perceive translanguaging as effective for reducing ambiguity, improving clarity, and mitigating risk in high-stakes professional workplace contexts?

2. METHODS

2.1. Research Design

This study employs an exploratory sequential mixed methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018), in which a qualitative phase conducted first informs the development and interpretive framing of a subsequent quantitative phase. The ordering is not arbitrary. Translanguaging practices in same-L1 professional writing resist measurement before they are adequately characterized, and characterization requires qualitative, artefact grounded inquiry.

The first phase addressed the first research question concerning the morphosyntactic and functional properties of translanguaging strategies in Turkish intra-organizational e-mail communication through three complementary data sources: semi-structured interviews, stimulated recall sessions, and discourse analysis of authentic workplace e-mail artifacts. Analysis was guided by Wei's (2018) conceptualization of translanguaging as the deployment of integrated semiotic resources in situated activity. This framing matters because it treats translanguaging not as switching between bounded language codes but as the activation of a unitary, speaker specific repertoire in response to communicative demands which is a distinction with direct consequences for how the data were coded and interpreted. The analysis attended accordingly to morphosyntactic integration, contextual function,

and the conditions under which English-language resources appear within otherwise Turkish-medium correspondence.

The second phase addressed the second research question which was the Turkish business professionals' perceptions of translanguaging as a workplace practice through a survey instrument adapted from Fang and Liu (2020), administered to a broader participant sample. Responses were analyzed using confirmatory factor analysis to evaluate the factorial validity of the adapted instrument and hierarchical multiple regression to examine the contribution of professional and demographic variables to perception scores. It bears stating clearly that the quantitative phase speaks to perception, not practice. It corroborates qualitative findings at the level of reported attitudes. The two phases are analytically distinct in what they can claim to evidence and that distinction is maintained throughout the analysis.

The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee of social and human

sciences research of Muğla Sıtkı Kocman University (protocol code 250188 approved on 22.12.2025).

2.2. Research Context and Participants

A purposive, criterion based sampling procedure was employed with the Muğla Chamber of Commerce and Industry serving as the primary recruitment gateway for both phases. Eligibility criteria were consistent across both phases. These criteria were active employment in a firm operating in sectors characterized by regular Turkish-English bilingual professional discourse, occupancy of a role requiring written internal communication with documented Turkish-English mixing, and regular engagement in domestic intra-organizational communication tasks. Professional roles meeting these criteria included export managers, financial controllers, compliance officers, logistics coordinators, human resources specialists and international sales professionals. Participant characteristics are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Participant Characteristics (N = 214 Survey; n = 12 Interview).

Characteristic	Total (N = 214)	Interview Sub-sample (n = 12)	M (SD)	Range
Gender: Male / Female	127 (59.3%) / 87 (40.7%)	7 / 5	—	—
Age (years)	—	—	38.4 (7.2)	26–58
Years of Experience	—	—	9.6 (4.8)	1–26
Daily Turkish-English Use	123 (57.5%)	8 (66.7%)	—	—
Sector: Manufacturing / Logistics / Finance / Other	68 / 54 / 52 / 40	4 / 3 / 3 / 2	—	—

Note. M (SD) reported where continuous. Years of Experience and Age refer to the full survey sample. Sector distribution reflects the registered firm population in Muğla Province.

Table 1 presents demographic and professional profiles across two nested samples: the full quantitative survey sample (N = 214) and the qualitative interview sub-sample (n = 12). The full sample was predominantly male (59.3%) with the interview sub-sample reflecting a comparable gender distribution (7 male, 5 female), indicating proportional representation across both strands. Participants ranged in age from 26 to 58 years (M = 38.4, SD = 7.2) suggesting a mid-career adult population whose professional socialization into English medium workplace norms may vary across cohorts. Professional experience ranged from 1 to 26 years (M = 9.6, SD = 4.8), with the relatively high standard deviation indicating considerable seniority heterogeneity within the sample which was a factor of potential analytical relevance given that translanguaging repertoire development may be shaped by tenure and institutional exposure. A slight

majority of the full sample (57.5%) reported daily Turkish-English language use in professional contexts, a figure that rises to 66.7% within the interview sub-sample, possibly reflecting purposive selection toward more active translanguagers in the qualitative phase. Sector representation was distributed across manufacturing (n = 68, 31.8%), logistics (n = 54, 25.2%), finance (n = 52, 24.3%), and other industries (n = 40, 18.7%) with the interview sub-sample following the same proportional ordering offering implicit support for cross strand representativeness, though this alignment should be addressed explicitly in the sampling rationale rather than left for the reader to infer.

2.3. Data Collection Instruments

Three instruments were used following the triangulation principle that convergent evidence across independent sources strengthens inferential

credibility in qualitative research (Patton, 2002). Each source does a different job. The e-mail artifact corpus documents what participants actually wrote. The semi-structured interviews establish how they understood and situated those choices within their occupational contexts. The stimulated recall sessions furnish post-hoc accounts of the reasoning behind specific decisions at the artifact level. A clarification is worth making here: following Gass and Mackey (2000), recall data are treated as verbal reports of participant reasoning, not as direct access to online cognitive processing. They illuminate the intentionality behind documented practices; they do not stand as primary evidence of those practices.

The interview protocol comprised five questions. The first invited participants to identify situations in their workday where they drew on both Turkish and English with concrete examples. The second asked how they decide which language to use across different task types such as internal correspondence, meetings, client communication. The third addressed the tasks for which working bilingually felt especially necessary or useful. The fourth asked how bilingual work affects participants under deadline pressure or in time sensitive situations. The fifth elicited a specific instance in which language mixing helped prevent a misunderstanding, reduce error, or manage a compliance risk. Interviews ranged from 44 to 62 minutes ($M = 52.6$ min) and were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Stimulated recall sessions were conducted with the nine participants who submitted e-mail artifacts, using each participant's own e-mail as the visual stimulus. The remaining three participants had declined to submit artifacts because organizational confidentiality protocols at their firms restricted disclosure of internal written communications. Their contributions were limited to the interview component; their accounts entered the thematic analysis but not the recall dataset. Sessions ranged from 18 to 34 minutes ($M = 24.7$ min). The gap between e-mail composition and recall session ranged from four to eleven days, within the range considered acceptable for written text based stimulated recall (Gass & Mackey, 2000).

The e-mail corpus comprised 94 anonymized domestic professional artifacts drawn from voluntary submissions across seven communication domains: legal compliance ($n = 13$), performance management and human resources ($n = 20$), information technology ($n = 13$), corporate strategy, ESG, and organizational vision ($n = 13$), marketing and digital branding ($n = 13$), workplace safety and compliance ($n = 13$), and supply chain and operations

($n = 9$). The lower artifact count in the supply chain and operations domain reflects a recruitment constraint: two firms in this sector declined to submit internal written communications citing commercially sensitive logistics documentation, resulting in fewer voluntary submissions from this domain relative to the others. This imbalance is noted as a boundary condition on domain specific claims. All artifacts were exchanged between Turkish-speaking colleagues within the same organizational environment. Before analysis, all identifying information was removed under the anonymization protocols agreed at the point of data collection.

The survey was adapted from Fang and Liu (2020) and comprised 25 Likert scale items rated on a five-point scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). It was administered in English with a Turkish-language preamble defining translanguaging as the fluid deployment of two or more linguistic resources in professional communication, to ensure consistent interpretation across respondents.

2.4. Data Analysis

Interview transcripts, stimulated recall protocols, and e-mail artifact texts were analyzed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) in MAXQDA, applying an inductive open-coding and axial-coding procedure across all three data types. A functional discourse coding framework directed analytical attention toward six dimensions: morphosyntactic hybridization patterns, terminological transplantation, predicate-level code integration, multimodal and semiotic resources, register marking constructions, and identity-affiliating discourse features.

Before the confirmatory analysis, the dataset was screened for normality, outliers, and sampling adequacy. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure ($KMO = .87$) and a significant Bartlett's test confirmed factorability. Common method variance (CMV) was addressed procedurally through three reverse coded items. Harman's single factor test attributed 31.4% of total variance to a single factor, below the conventional threshold though it bears noting that Harman's test alone cannot rule out common method bias (Williams et al., 2010), and a CFA-based latent factor approach is recommended in future replications.

CFA was conducted in R using lavaan (Rosseel, 2012) with maximum likelihood estimation. Fit was evaluated against Hu and Bentler's (1999) benchmarks, and a competing two-factor solution was tested and compared to the hypothesized four-

factor oblique model via chi-square difference test. Convergent and discriminant validity were assessed through average variance extracted and composite reliability. All constructs met accepted thresholds (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Bivariate associations between Translanguaging Frequency and the four outcome constructs were examined through Pearson correlations, followed by two-step hierarchical regression with perceived Risk Reduction as the criterion variable. Step 1 entered professional background variables (years of experience and English use frequency) as covariates. Step 2 added Translanguaging Frequency as the focal predictor. Variance inflation factors were all below 2.0. Standardized β coefficients and ΔR^2 increments are reported for each step. All analyses were run in SPSS 27. Internal consistency was assessed separately ($\alpha = .84$), and a five-factor sensitivity analysis confirmed equivalent fit.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Qualitative findings of the first research question

Thematic and discourse analysis of the 94 domestic email artifacts, triangulated with interview and stimulated recall data, yielded four recurrent translanguaging strategies. Before describing them, one observation warrants emphasis. Unlike translanguaging in international correspondence, where English deployment is driven by communication with non-Turkish interlocutors, the practices documented here occur between Turkish-speaking colleagues who share both a first language and an organizational environment. Communicative necessity, in the classical sense, does not explain them. The English language resources these emails deploy reflect a strategically motivated practice: the domestication of English into Turkish professional register.

Two caveats apply throughout. The sectors represented, specifically IT, legal compliance, HR, marketing, and workplace safety, are precisely those where English terminology is already highly salient in Turkish professional discourse, so the findings may partly reflect sectoral concentration rather than a cross-organizational norm. All claims are also scoped to this sample and provincial context and are best read as interpretive propositions that warrant broader empirical testing.

The harder analytical problem was distinguishing translanguaging from borrowing. Items such as KPI, ESG, audit, LinkedIn, forward etmek, and data entry are widely present in Turkish professional environments and could be characterized as lexical

conventionalization or domain specific Anglicization rather than translanguaging in the stronger theoretical sense. Borrowing implies unidirectional lexical importation; translanguaging implies situational, strategic deployment of an integrated repertoire. Three diagnostic criteria distinguished the two throughout coding: morphosyntactic integration depth (whether the English element was inflectionally embedded within Turkish grammar rather than inserted as an uninflected item); functional purposiveness as evidenced in stimulated recall (whether the participant attributed the choice to a strategic goal such as precision or register marking rather than habitual use); and contextual distribution (whether the element appeared preferentially in high-stakes passages rather than randomly across message types). Instances satisfying the first criterion, or both the second and third, were coded as translanguaging. Uninflected proper nouns and isolated acronyms were treated conservatively as potential borrowings unless stimulated recall indicated strategic intentionality.

The corpus also differs from international business correspondence in structural terms. Where English in BELF contexts tends toward syntactic simplification calibrated for non-native recipients (Kankaanranta & Louhiala-Salminen, 2013), the present data show translanguaging operating at a deeper grammatical level – through morphological affixation, predicate construction, terminological selection, and register-marking. The four strategies below are reported in descending order of frequency. They are cooccurring patterns rather than mutually exclusive categories; a single artifact frequently exhibits two or more simultaneously, and frequency counts reflect the number of artifacts in which each pattern was independently identifiable, not exclusive classification. Wei (2018) characterizes multilingual practice precisely in these terms: the fluid, simultaneous deployment of integrated semiotic resources rather than sequential alternation between bounded language systems, and the present data are consistent with that framing.

3.1.1. Morphological Hybridization

The most widespread translanguaging strategy across the corpus was the grammatical absorption of English lexical items into Turkish morphological structure. Concretely, this means that writers affixed Turkish inflectional morphemes, specifically plural markers, case suffixes, and postpositional endings, directly onto English stems, treating those stems as fully Turkish grammatical words subject to Turkish morphosyntactic rules. The pattern appeared in 81 of

the 94 email artifacts, which makes it the single most structurally embedded form of translanguaging in the data.

An example from the performance management domain makes the mechanism visible:

"Departman KPI'ları ekte. Üretim ekibi over performed ama satış biraz stagnant kalmış. Bonuses buna göre yatacak."

[Translation: The department KPIs are attached. The production team over-performed but sales has been a bit stagnant. Bonuses will be paid accordingly.]

The token KPI'ları is where the hybridization is most transparent. The English acronym KPI receives, first, the Turkish plural suffix -lar, and then the Turkish accusative/possessive suffix -ı, producing a nominal form that participates fully in Turkish grammatical structure while remaining orthographically and phonologically English. This was not an isolated construction; analogous forms, including CV'ler (= CVs) and LinkedIn'de (= on LinkedIn), recurred across multiple professional domains throughout the corpus.

Participant 7 explained the choice during stimulated recall:

"KPI diyince herkes anlar ne kastettiğini. Türkçede tam karşılığı yok, anahtar performans göstergesi de çok uzun ve formel."

[Translation: When you say KPI, everyone understands what you mean. There is no exact Turkish equivalent, and 'key performance indicator' in Turkish is too long and overly formal.]

The participant's reasoning is worth pausing on. The Turkish rendering anahtar performans göstergesi is grammatically well-formed and institutionally recognized, yet Participant 7 treats it as effectively unavailable for routine correspondence, on the grounds that it is too formal and too slow for the operational register of internal email. This is not a claim about lexical gaps; it is a claim about register fit.

A second and grammatically distinct form of morphological hybridization appeared in a legal compliance artifact:

"Eski çalışanın paylaşımı resmen NDA breach. Confidential bilgileri sızdırmış. Screenshot'ı hukuk birimine forward ettim."

[Translation: The former employee's post is officially an NDA breach. They leaked confidential information. I forwarded the screenshot to the legal unit.]

This artifact contains three analytically distinct instances of hybridization that should be read separately. First, forward ettim consists of the

English verb stem forward, the Turkish light verb et- (meaning to do or to make), and the Turkish past tense first-person singular suffix -tim, producing a fully conjugated Turkish verbal form. The English element carries the lexical meaning; the Turkish morphology carries all tense, aspect, and agreement information. The writer is not inserting an English word into Turkish prose but is instead conjugating an English verb through the Turkish verbal paradigm. Second, Confidential bilgileri places the English attributive adjective Confidential directly before the Turkish noun bilgiler (meaning information), which itself bears the Turkish accusative case suffix -ı. The English adjective functions syntactically as a Turkish attributive modifier. Third, NDA breach operates as the entire predicate nominal of the Turkish sentence Eski çalışanın paylaşımı resmen NDA breach, in which the subject paylaşımı (= the post/sharing) and the adverb resmen (= officially) are Turkish, while the predicate itself is entirely English.

Participant 3 explained the preference for forward etmek over the available Turkish verb iletmek during stimulated recall:

"Forward etmek yerine 'iletmek' de diyebilirim ama 'forward' işlemin dijital, resmi olduğunu daha iyi anlatıyor."

[Translation: I could say 'iletmek' instead of 'forward etmek,' but 'forward' better conveys that the action is digital and formally documented.]

The participant's distinction between iletmek and forward etmek is not simply a preference for English. It is a claim that the two verbs are semantically non-equivalent in the context of institutional digital communication, and that forward indexes a specific bureaucratic action, namely the traceable transfer of a digital record within an official chain, that iletmek does not carry with the same precision. This account is consistent with the position that translanguaging reflects the strategic mobilization of an integrated linguistic repertoire rather than incidental borrowing (Wei, 2018).

3.1.2. Domain Specific Terminological Transplantation

The second strategy involved the systematic adoption of English professional terminology in domains where available Turkish equivalents were judged insufficient in precision, register appropriateness, or international currency. It appeared in 74 of the 94 artifacts and was distributed across multiple professional subdomains, which indicates a pattern that is not idiosyncratic to individual writers but reflects a systematic relationship between domain specificity and English-

language resource deployment.

This strategy also requires the most careful interpretive discipline. Domain specific English terminology is precisely where conventionalized borrowing and active translanguaging are most difficult to distinguish. For the purposes of this analysis, an instance was treated as translanguaging in the repertoire-based sense only when two conditions were met: stimulated recall confirmed that the writer perceived the choice as purposeful, and the English term appeared in functional contrast with a Turkish equivalent that the writer had consciously set aside.

The information technology domain produced the most concentrated instance:

"Hafta sonu sistem ERP migration nedeniyle offline olacak. Hiçbir data entry yapmayın, her şey lost olabilir."

[Translation: The system will be offline this weekend due to ERP migration. Do not perform any data entry; everything could be lost.]

This short artifact contains five discrete English elements: ERP, migration, offline, data entry, and lost. Each occupies a domain specific conceptual position for which no Turkish equivalent appears in the message. The final construction, *lost olabilir*, deserves particular attention. It consists of the English past participle *lost* combined with the Turkish modal copula *olabilir* (meaning *may be* or *can be*), producing a predicate in which the English element supplies the semantic content and the Turkish element supplies modality and sentence-final predication. The structure is grammatically identical to the auxiliary integration pattern described in Section 3.1.1, but here applied to an adjectival rather than a verbal stem.

The ESG compliance domain produced a structurally more complex instance:

"Avrupa'daki müşteriler artık ESG report istiyor. Fabrikaya solar panels kurmak artık bir choice değil, necessity."

[Translation: Our European clients are now requesting an ESG report. Installing solar panels at the factory is no longer a choice; it is a necessity.]

The second sentence requires close reading. Its full Turkish grammatical frame consists of *artık bir* (= *now a*), *değil* (= *not/negation*), and the sentence final predicate position, all of which are Turkish. Within that frame, both the argument (*choice*) and its rhetorical counterposition (*necessity*) are expressed in English, even though their Turkish equivalents (*seçim* and *zorunluluk*) are common and accessible words. The writer has not used English because Turkish lacks the words. The writer has used English

because choice and necessity, as they appear in the message, carry the institutional weight of international ESG discourse in a way that *seçim* and *zorunluluk* do not. Participant 4 confirmed this directly in stimulated recall:

"ESG bir uluslararası kavram ve İngilizce karşılıklarını kullanmak mesajın ciddiyetini artırıyor."

[Translation: ESG is an international concept, and using its English terms increases the seriousness of the message.]

The safety management domain illustrated how terminological transplantation can extend across entire multi-word phrases rather than individual lexical items:

"Internal safety audit sonuçları kötü. Fabrikada protection gear kullanmayanlar var. Zero tolerance politikasına geçelim."

[Translation: The internal safety audit results are poor. There are workers at the factory not using protection gear. Let us move to a zero tolerance policy.]

Three English phrases operate as grammatical constituents within Turkish syntactic frames here. First, *Internal safety audit* functions as a multiword English noun phrase in the genitive modifier position of the Turkish noun *sonuçları* (= *results*), producing the construction *Internal safety audit sonuçları* (= *the results of the internal safety audit*). Second, *protection gear* functions as the direct object of the Turkish participial construction *kullanmayanlar* (= *those who do not use*), yielding *protection gear kullanmayanlar* (= *those who do not use protection gear*). Third, *Zero tolerance* combines with the Turkish compound noun *politika* plus Turkish possessive and dative suffixes to yield *Zero tolerance politikasına* (= *to a zero tolerance policy*). Taken together, these three constructions indicate that the conceptual vocabulary of workplace safety management, covering its procedural categories, equipment terms, and enforcement language, is indexed through English even when the communicative act itself is addressed to Turkish speaking colleagues in a domestic context.

3.1.3. Hybrid Predication and Evaluative Constructs

The third strategy involved English adjectives, verbs, or complete predicative phrases occupying the predicate or complement position in Turkish sentences. This is grammatically distinct from the lexical patterns described in the two preceding sections. In those sections, English elements functioned as referential modifiers, terminological

labels, or morphologically absorbed stems. In this strategy, the English element carries the main meaningbearing weight of the utterance. It is, in syntactic terms, the predicate: the part of the sentence that tells the reader something about the Turkish subject. The strategy appeared in 60 of the 94 artifacts and is the one least plausibly accounted for by routinized borrowing, because predicate-position English elements in Turkish subject sentences require active grammatical accommodation from the writer. They are not ready-made phrases that arrive with the professional domain.

The corporate performance domain produced a clear opening example, drawn from the same artifact analyzed in Section 3.1.1:

"Departman KPI'ları ekte. Üretim ekibi over performed ama satış biraz stagnant kalmış. Bonuses buna göre yatacak."

[Translation: The department KPIs are attached. The production team overperformed but sales has been a bit stagnant. Bonuses will be paid accordingly.]

In the clause *Üretim ekibi overperformed*, the subject *Üretim ekibi* (= Production team) is Turkish, but the predicate is entirely English. There is no Turkish copular verb and no Turkish tense suffix; *overperformed* carries the full predication load of the clause on its own. In the immediately following clause, *stagnant kalmış* shows a different configuration: here, the English adjective *stagnant* combines with the Turkish copular verb *kalmış* (= has remained, in evidential perfect aspect) to produce an integrated evaluative predicate. The two clauses thus demonstrate two distinct subtypes of hybrid predication within a single sentence: bare English predication without a Turkish copula, and English-Turkish predicate coordination with a Turkish finite verb.

The digital marketing domain produced the most structurally extreme instance of hybrid predication in the entire corpus:

"LinkedIn'de paylaştığımız video viral oldu. Engagement oranları skyrocketing. Bu çizgide devam edelim."

[Translation: The video we shared on LinkedIn went viral. Engagement rates are skyrocketing. Let us keep going in this direction.]

The sentence *Engagement oranları skyrocketing* requires careful parsing. The subject *Engagement oranları* (= Engagement rates) is a hybrid nominal: the English noun *Engagement* functions as an attributive modifier of the Turkish noun *oranları* (= rates), which bears a Turkish possessive suffix. The predicate, however, is *skyrocketing* alone, with no

Turkish finite verb attached. The sentence is grammatically complete only if *skyrocketing*, an English progressive participle, is accepted as the sole predicate of a Turkish-subject clause. No Turkish verb is present. No Turkish tense morpheme is present. The English participial form carries the entire predication meaning of the utterance. This construction is the most grammatically radical instance of translanguaging identified in the corpus, because it produces a Turkish-subject sentence whose predicate is expressed exclusively through an English lexical and morphological form.

Participant 12 addressed this choice directly in stimulated recall:

"'Skyrocketing' tam istediğimi anlatıyor, 'fırladı' desem aynı hissi vermez, çünkü bu bir İngilizce sosyal medya terimi, herkes biliyor ne anlama geliyor."

[Translation: 'Skyrocketing' expresses exactly what I mean. If I said 'fırladı' (shot up), it would not give the same feeling, because this is an English social media term and everyone understands what it means in context.]

Participant 12's account draws a distinction between referential meaning and affective or register-level meaning. The Turkish verb *fırladı* and the English participle *skyrocketing* are not semantically empty alternatives for this writer; they occupy different positions in the professional register, and only the English form carries the social media domain connotation that the writer wants the message to convey.

The strategic planning domain produced a further instance in which hybrid predication served an explicit identity affiliating function:

"Önümüzdeki yıl için hedefimiz global player olmak. Chart'taki gibi %25 growth bekliyoruz. Ready for the challenge!"

[Translation: Our goal for next year is to become a global player. We expect 25% growth as shown in the chart. Ready for the challenge!]

The construction *global player olmak* consists of the English phrase *global player* functioning as the nominal complement of the Turkish infinitive *olmak* (= to be/to become). The Turkish infinitive supplies the grammatical frame; the English phrase supplies the identity content. *Ready for the challenge!* is the only fully English sentence in the entire corpus. It appears at the message boundary, after Turkish-medium content, and functions as an affective and collective close to the communication. Its placement assigns to English the role of motivational culmination and organizational identity statement, not the role of technical terminology or

morphological integration.

Participant 11 explained the choice of global player in the interview:

"Global player" ifadesi sadece büyük oyuncu olmak demek değil, uluslararası bir kimlik taşıyor."

[Translation: The expression 'global player' does not just mean being a big player; it carries an international identity.]

The participant's observation distinguishes between the referential content of the phrase (organizational scale) and its identity indexing function (international affiliation). This distinction underpins the fourth strategy analyzed below.

3.1.4. Register-Marking and Identity-Affiliating Translanguaging

The fourth strategy was the most contextually specific of the four. Rather than serving terminological precision or morphological integration, it deployed English-language resources to mark a shift in professional register, signal institutional authority, or construct an organizational identity position that participants reported as more effectively achieved in English than in Turkish. The strategy appeared in 47 of the 94 artifacts and was concentrated in messages dealing with management directives, motivational communications, compliance enforcement, and organizational self-positioning.

The human resources domain provided a clear illustration of register elevation through English:

"Gelen CV'ler çok weak. Bize fluent English ve sektörde well connected birisi lazım. İlanı repost edelim."

[Translation: The incoming CVs are very weak. We need someone with fluent English who is well-connected in the sector. Let us repost the listing.]

Three English elements require individual analysis. First, çok weak places the Turkish degree intensifier çok (= very) before the English adjective weak, producing an evaluative predicate that attributes inadequacy to the candidates. The available Turkish adjective zayıf (= weak) is orthographically and semantically close, but Participant 6 confirmed in stimulated recall that zayıf felt like a softer, more general evaluation, whereas weak carried the specific connotation of professional underperformance familiar from English-medium performance management discourse. Second, well-connected is used as a compound attributive adjective modifying the implied candidate. As Participant 6 noted, the Turkish approximate, sektörde tanınan biri (= someone known in the sector), describes social recognition but does not

carry the network capital connotation that well-connected imports from professional English, a connotation with a theoretical basis in Bourdieu's (1986) concept of social capital as an active, mobilizable resource. Third, repost edelim combines the prefixed English verb repost with the Turkish hortative first person plural auxiliary edelim (= let us), forming a directive speech act in which the English element identifies the specific platform action and the Turkish element supplies the social and grammatical frame of the directive.

The crisis management domain produced an example in which urgency itself was being marked through English:

"Hammadde tedariginde major disruption var. Alternative suppliers listesini activate edelim, üretim durmasın."

[Translation: There is a major disruption in raw material supply. Let us activate the alternative suppliers list so production does not stop.]

The phrase major disruption draws on the standardized lexicon of supply chain risk management, where the term functions as a technical classification rather than a general description of difficulty. Using major disruption rather than a Turkish paraphrase such as büyük bir aksaklık (= a big problem) signals that the situation is being categorized within the institutional framework of supply chain management, with the procedural implications that classification carries. Activate edelim again uses the Turkish hortative auxiliary to frame an English action verb as a directive. The institutional authority of the directive is expressed partly through the English lexical choice, which positions the action within recognized operational procedure.

The workplace motivation domain demonstrated a different dimension of register marking, one oriented toward collegial affect rather than institutional authority:

"Zor bir sezonu successfully closed. Haftaya tüm ekiple bir dinner & celebration yapalım. Well deserved!"

[Translation: We successfully closed a difficult season. Let us have a dinner and celebration with the whole team next week. Well deserved!]

The construction successfully closed places an English adverb-verb combination in the predicate position to frame collective achievement within the language of professional performance. Well deserved! functions as a complete English interjection serving as a collegial affective close to the message. Participant 9 noted in the interview that the Turkish alternatives, specifically iyi hak ettiğiniz or

bunu hak ettiniz, felt either too formal or too flat by comparison. The participant's report suggests that English affective interjections carry a register of collegial warmth in Turkish organizational contexts that their Turkish equivalents do not fully replicate. This finding is consistent with research on the role of language choice in managing relational alignment in multilingual professional settings (Angouri, 2014) and indicates that register-marking translanguaging serves not only informational but also relational and interactional purposes in this corpus.

Analysis of 94 intra-organizational email artifacts, triangulated with stimulated recall and interview data, identifies four translanguaging strategies among Turkish-speaking professionals communicating with same-L1 colleagues. A key framing observation is that communicative necessity cannot explain these practices; English deployment is strategically motivated rather than interlocutor-driven.

Methodological note: Translanguaging was distinguished from borrowing through three criteria: morphosyntactic integration depth, functional purposiveness (confirmed via stimulated recall), and preferential distribution in high-stakes passages.

Strategy 1 – Morphological Hybridization (81/94 artifacts): English stems receive Turkish inflectional morphemes (plural, case, tense), integrating them fully into Turkish grammatical structure (e.g., KPI'ları, forward ettim). Participants report this as serving register fit rather than lexical gap-filling.

Strategy 2 – Terminological Transplantation (74/94): Domain-specific English terminology replaces available Turkish equivalents when precision, register weight, or international currency is perceived as insufficient in Turkish (e.g., ESG, zero tolerance, data entry).

Strategy 3 – Hybrid Predication and Evaluative Constructs (60/94): English elements occupy the predicate position within Turkish-subject clauses, carrying primary semantic load (e.g., skyrocketing, overperformed, stagnant). This is the least attributable to routinized borrowing.

Strategy 4 – Register-Marking and Identity-Affiliating Translanguaging (47/94): English resources signal institutional authority, professional register elevation, or organizational identity (e.g., major disruption, well-connected, Well deserved!), serving relational and interactional alongside informational functions.

3.2. Quantitative Findings

CFA model comparison revealed that the hypothesized four-factor oblique solution fit the data

significantly better than the two-factor rival model, $\Delta\chi^2(5) = 90.09$, $p < .001$, yielding strong fit: CFI = .97, TLI = .96, RMSEA = .052, SRMR = .041, satisfying all criteria recommended by Hu and Bentler (1999). All factor loadings were statistically significant ($\lambda = .74-.84$, all $p < .001$). AVE values ranged from .56 to .67, all exceeding the .50 convergent validity threshold (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). CR values ranged from .72 to .88. Discriminant validity was confirmed for all four construct pairs.

A structural distinction in the measurement model requires clarification. Although the survey comprised five subscales, the CFA was specified as a four-factor solution encompassing only the four perceived functional outcome constructs (CLR, EC, CC, and RR). Translanguaging Frequency (TF) was conceptualized as an independent focal predictor and excluded from the measurement model. TF (4 items; e.g., "I use translanguaging to manage high pressure or urgent work situations") demonstrated acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = .84$; $M = 4.18$; $SD = 0.63$), with item level means consistent across the four items (range: $M = 3.97$ to $M = 4.38$).

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics and Reliability for Survey Constructs (N = 214).

Construct	M	SD	Min	Max	Skew	α
Cognitive Load Reduction (CLR)	4.12	0.61	2	5	-0.44	.83
Emotional Comfort (EC)	3.89	0.74	1	5	-0.31	.79
Communicative Clarity (CC)	4.25	0.56	2	5	-0.52	.86
Risk Reduction (RR)	4.31	0.59	2	5	-0.58	.88

Note. M = mean; SD = standard deviation; α = Cronbach's alpha. Items rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). Translanguaging Frequency (TF) is excluded as it was treated as an independent focal predictor rather than a perceived outcome construct.

Table 2 presents construct-level descriptive statistics and reliability coefficients for the four outcome constructs. Mean scores for all four exceeded the scale midpoint of 3.0. Risk Reduction yielded the highest mean ($M = 4.31$, $SD = 0.59$) and Emotional Comfort the lowest ($M = 3.89$, $SD = 0.74$). Standard deviations were consistently modest across constructs (range: 0.56–0.74), reflecting a high degree of inter-individual consensus in perceived translanguaging benefits. The highest individual item mean was recorded for RR1 ("I use translanguaging to ensure compliance with local regulations"; $M = 4.38$, $SD = 0.61$), directly consistent with the risk-management orientation documented in Phase 1.

Table 3: Pearson Correlations Between Translanguaging Frequency and Perceived Outcome Constructs (N = 214).

Variable	CLR	EC	CC	RR
Translanguaging Frequency	.58**	.42**	.63**	.67**

Note. CLR = Cognitive Load Reduction; EC = Emotional Comfort; CC = Communicative Clarity; RR = Risk Reduction. ** $p < .01$.

Table 3 shows the Pearson correlation coefficients between Translanguaging Frequency and the four outcome constructs. All associations were positive, statistically significant at $p < .01$, and ranged from moderate to strong in magnitude ($r = .42$ to $.67$). The strongest association was between TF and Risk Reduction ($r = .67$, $p < .001$), followed by Communicative Clarity ($r = .63$), Cognitive Load Reduction ($r = .58$), and Emotional Comfort ($r = .42$). This rank ordering places compliance-oriented outcomes above psychologically oriented outcomes, a pattern suggesting that professionals' primary perceived motivation for translanguaging deployment is regulatory and transactional rather than affective.

Table 4: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Perceived Risk Reduction (N = 214).

Predictor	B	SE B	β	t	p	ΔR^2
Step 1 (Controls)						.08***
Years of Experience	0.04	0.02	.10	2.04	.042	
English Use Frequency	0.06	0.03	.12	2.20	.029	
Step 2 (Focal Predictor)						.38***
Translanguaging Frequency	0.48	0.05	.54	9.60	<.001	

Note. Total $R^2 = .46$, $F(3, 210) = 59.74$, $p < .001$. β = standardized regression coefficient. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4 presents the results of the hierarchical regression predicting perceived Risk Reduction. The Step 1 control variables collectively accounted for 8% of variance in Risk Reduction, $R^2 = .08$, $F(2, 211) = 9.17$, $p < .001$. Both years of experience ($\beta = .10$, $p = .042$) and English use frequency ($\beta = .12$, $p = .029$) reached statistical significance. The addition of Translanguaging Frequency in Step 2 produced a statistically and practically significant increment of $\Delta R^2 = .38$, $p < .001$, bringing total explained variance to 46%. As Table 4 illustrates, Translanguaging Frequency showed the strongest perceptual association ($\beta = .54$, $t = 9.60$, $p < .001$), with a standardized coefficient more than four times the magnitude of either control variable. The overall model was statistically significant, $F(3, 210) = 59.74$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .46$.

It must be stated clearly that this model does not identify causal directionality. Given the cross-sectional self-report design and the absence of theoretically relevant covariates including professional role, sector, educational background, and self-assessed L2 proficiency the coefficient should be interpreted strictly as evidence of perceptual covariation. Future research employing behavioral observation or longitudinal panel designs would be better positioned to establish the causal mechanisms underlying the observed translanguaging-risk reduction relationship.

4. DISCUSSION

The most consequential finding here is not which strategies were identified but where they appear: internal email between Turkish-speaking colleagues who share a first language and an organizational environment. Dominant accounts of professional translanguaging have anchored the practice to cross-linguistic necessity (Canagarajah, 2011; García & Wei, 2014; Pennycook, 2010). This corpus offers no such necessity. Register construction, terminological precision, and professional identity work are sufficient motivation for deploying English-language resources even when everyone in the exchange speaks Turkish. Wei's (2018) account of translanguaging as the strategic mobilization of an integrated semiotic repertoire, irreducible to code-switching or borrowing, best captures what the data document. Each of the four strategies serves a distinct, purposive function; none can be plausibly reduced to incidental mixing or accommodation for a non-Turkish speaking recipient.

This finding engages Jaspers' (2018) critique that translanguaging scholarship romanticizes multilingual agency while underestimating institutional constraint. The present data support neither position. Stimulated recall accounts, read with appropriate caution as post-hoc verbal reports rather than direct windows onto cognitive processing (Gass & Mackey, 2000), consistently describe pragmatic assessments shaped by sector norms and global professional registers. When Participant 12 reported that *fırladı* cannot carry the register weight of "skyrocketing," or when Participant 4 attributed the choice of "ESG" to its perceived institutional authority, these articulations reflect professional judgment formed within conditions that make certain linguistic resources more effective than others (Bourdieu, 1991). Jonsson and Bläsjö (2020) identify this kind of organizationally conditioned practice as characteristic of workplace translanguaging embedded in institutional discourse ecology.

The findings both extend and qualify existing research. Angouri (2013, 2014) documented language alternation serving solidarity in mixed-L1 teams where cross-linguistic accommodation was structurally required. Strategy 4 of the present corpus performs comparable affiliative work without any such requirement: "Well deserved!" and "global player" appear between Turkish colleagues. Solidarity marking translanguaging, the data suggest, does not depend on a linguistically mixed team. Ai et al.'s (2022) research documented English serving epistemic precision in settings where it was the institutionally designated medium; the present findings reveal analogous epistemic functions in domestic writing where no such designation applies, suggesting that English professional registers now carry sufficient perceived authority for professionals to deploy them even with a shared L1 available (Seidlhofer, 2011; Smit, 2010).

This dynamic sits uneasily with Goffman's (1959) frontstage/backstage distinction. Domestic email might be expected to function as a backstage space where register pressures relax. The data suggest otherwise. Even in this nominally backstage setting, participants sustain frontstage register performance through English-language resource deployment, consistent with research on professional identity construction in organizational settings (Angouri & Marra, 2011; Holmes & Meyerhoff, 1999). The backstage has its own audience, and translanguaging is among the resources through which membership in the professional community is claimed and maintained (Wenger, 1998).

The structural depth of these practices also diverges from BELF contexts as Kankaanranta and Louhiala-Salminen (2013) describe them. BELF strategies, including strategic explicitness and sequential structuring calibrated for non-native recipients, are fundamentally comprehension-oriented. The present corpus operates at a different level: Turkish inflectional morphology suffixed onto English stems; English verbs fully committed to Turkish tense and agreement paradigms. These are not comprehension repairs. They presuppose shared English literacy and serve register constitution and institutional authority (Heller, 2010). This contrast between surface accommodation in BELF contexts and grammatically committed translanguaging in domestic same-L1 communication is where the present study departs most substantively from prior work.

Two explanatory frameworks bear on this evidence. Domain loss (Hultgren, 2013; Phillipson, 2009) can account for terminological transplantation

in Strategy 2: Participant 7's report that KPI lacks an adequate Turkish equivalent and Participant 12's account regarding "skyrocketing" are consistent with lexical unavailability. The morphosyntactic evidence in Strategies 1 and 3, however, exceeds what domain loss predicts. Domain loss explains vocabulary gaps; it does not explain grammatical commitment (Hultgren, 2013). A Turkish subject clause with "over-performed" as its sole predicate is not compensation for a missing word, Turkish predicative structures are grammatically available. The construction reflects an active choice of English grammar over Turkish grammar (Wei, 2018). Both frameworks are needed, each addressing a different stratum of the evidence.

Finally, BELF spillover must be treated as an interpretive hypothesis rather than a finding. Strictly, BELF as theorized by Kankaanranta and Louhiala-Salminen (2013) describes English as a shared medium in international communication and does not apply to domestic same-L1 exchanges. What the present findings raise is whether BELF conventions, once internalized through sustained international engagement, carry over into domestic organizational discourse (Canagarajah, 2013). Barner-Rasmussen et al. (2014) note that boundary spanning professionals often reshape their organizations' language practices beyond the encounters that originally motivated them, and Lønsmann (2014) finds that corporate language norms diffuse inward from external facing roles, both observations compatible with this reading. The study does not independently verify that international BELF engagement causally produces domestic English deployment; sector wide Anglicization of Turkish professional registers (Doğançay-Aktuna, 1995; Kırkgöz, 2009) remains a live alternative. The hypothesis warrants longitudinal investigation.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This study examined how Turkish business professionals deploy translanguaging in domestic intra-organizational email between Turkish L1 colleagues, and whether those practices are perceived as functionally effective. Evidence from both phases is internally convergent, though its scope is limited to the sample and design.

The qualitative phase identified four recurrent strategies across 94 email artifacts: morphological hybridization, terminological transplantation, hybrid predication, and register marking and identity affiliating translanguaging. A three criterion diagnostic framework addressing morphosyntactic integration depth, functional purposiveness, and

contextual distribution distinguished these from routinized borrowing. Their occurrence in domestic same-L1 writing challenges comprehension-based accounts of translanguaging; rather than functioning as a cross-linguistic accommodation strategy, the practice appears to operate as a means of register constitution. The quantitative phase found that self-reported Translanguaging Frequency is positively associated with perceived Risk Reduction ($\beta = .54$, $\Delta R^2 = .38$), Communicative Clarity, Cognitive Load Reduction, and Emotional Comfort across 214 provincial professionals. These are perceptual associations, not behavioral evidence of functional outcomes, and the TF-RR association carries substantial common method variance risk that constrains its inferential weight.

The study makes three contributions, each appropriately bounded. It extends translanguaging research into domestic same-L1 professional writing and provides a diagnostic framework for a distinction the existing literature has largely left

implicit: strategic translanguaging versus borrowing (García & Wei, 2014; Wei, 2018). It introduces BELF spillover as a provisional hypothesis for how English professional registers internalized through international engagement may carry over into domestic discourse (Barner-Rasmussen et al., 2014; Kankaanranta & Louhiala-Salminen, 2013), one that warrants longitudinal investigation and is not demonstrated here. It also contributes a prototype four factor measurement instrument that requires subscale expansion, cross-sample validation, and fuller operationalization of the Translanguaging Frequency construct before it can carry confirmatory weight.

Turkish business professionals who use English-language resources in internal communications are not engaged in undisciplined code-mixing. Among this sample, those practices reflect genuine professional competence: the deliberate use of a bilingual repertoire calibrated to precision, register, and institutional credibility (Wei, 2018).

REFERENCES

- Ai, B., Hao, M., & Qiao, X. (2022). Unpacking translanguaging practices in multilingual business communication in China: A qualitative phenomenological approach. *Applied Linguistics*, 43(6), 1184-1206. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amac029>
- Angouri, J. (2013). The multilingual reality of the multinational workplace: Language policy and language use. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 34(7), 564-581. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2013.807273>
- Angouri, J. (2014). Multilingualism in the workplace: Language practices, identity, and power. *Multilingua*, 33(1-2), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2014-0001>
- Angouri, J., & Marra, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Constructing identities at work*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Barner-Rasmussen, W., Ehrnrooth, M., Kovesnikov, A., & Mäkelä, K. (2014). Cultural and language skills as resources for boundary spanning within the MNC. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 45(7), 886-905. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2014.7>
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Harvard University Press.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2, 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110239331.1>
- Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Doğançay-Aktuna, S. (1995). An evaluation of the Turkish language reform after 60 years. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 19(3), 221-249.
- Fang, F., & Liu, Y. (2020). 'Using all English is not always meaningful': Stakeholders' perspectives on the use of and attitudes towards translanguaging at a Chinese university. *Lingua*, 247, 102959. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2020.102959>
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3151312>
- Fredriksson, R., Barner-Rasmussen, W., & Piekari, R. (2006). The multinational corporation as a multilingual organization: The notion of a common corporate language. *Corporate Communications*, 11(4), 406-423.

- <https://doi.org/10.1108/13563280610713879>
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Anchor Books.
- Heller, M. (2010). The commodification of language. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 39, 101-114. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.012809.104950>
- Holmes, J., & Meyerhoff, M. (1999). The community of practice: Theories and methodologies in language and gender research. *Language in Society*, 28(2), 173-183. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404599002018>
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1-55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- Hultgren, A. K. (2013). Lexical borrowing from English into Danish in the sciences: An empirical investigation of "domain loss." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23(2), 166-182. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2012.00324.x>
- Jaspers, J. (2018). The transformative limits of translanguaging. *Language & Communication*, 58, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2017.12.001>
- Jonsson, C., & Blåsjö, M. (2020). Translanguaging and multimodality in workplace texts and writing. *International journal of multilingualism*, 17(3), 361-381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2020.1766051>
- Kankaanranta, M., & Salminen, L. L. (2013). "What language does global business speak?"-The concept and development of BELF. *Ibérica: Revista de la Asociación Europea de Lenguas Para Fines Específicos (AELFE)*, (26), 17-34. <https://revistaiberica.org/index.php/iberica/article/view/115>
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2009). Globalization and English language policy in Turkey. *Educational Policy*, 23(5), 663-684. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904808316319>
- Komori-Glatz, M. (2018). Conceptualising English as a business lingua franca. *European Journal of International Management*, 12(1-2), 46-61. <https://doi.org/10.1504/EJIM.2018.089250>
- Lønsmann, D. (2014). Linguistic diversity in the international workplace: Language ideologies and processes of exclusion. *Multilingua*, 33(1-2), 89-116. <https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2014-0005>
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. Routledge.
- Phillipson, R. (2009). *Linguistic imperialism continued*. Routledge.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
- Pshenichnikov, D. (2025). Bridging Languages in International Finance: The Translator's Function in Global Organizations. *Scientific Journal of Bielsko-Biala School of Finance and Law*, 29(3). <https://doi.org/10.19192/wsfp.sj3.2025.5>
- Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(2), 1-36. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i02>
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford University Press.
- Shore, C. (2008). Audit culture and illiberal governance: Universities and the politics of accountability. *Anthropological Theory*, 8(3), 278-298. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1463499608093815>
- Shore, C., & Wright, S. (2015). Governing by numbers: Audit culture, rankings and the new knowledge economy. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 8(1), 22-40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17530350.2014.943251>
- Smit, U. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in higher education: A longitudinal study of classroom discourse*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Sun, W., Qiu, Y., & Zheng, Y. (2021). Translanguaging practices in local employees' negotiation to create linguistic space in a multilingual workplace. *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación*, 86, 31-42. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5209/clac.75493>
- Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1222-1235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035>
- Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9-30.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803932>

Williams, L. J., Hartman, N., & Cavazotte, F. (2010). Method variance and marker variables: A review and comprehensive CFA marker technique. *Organizational Research Methods*, 13(3), 477–514.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428110366036>