



Colloquium 6: Meaning making, learning, and identity formation through dynamic, dialogic, and multimodal translanguaging processes in spatiotemporal ecosocial systems

Peichang (Emily) He, *Centre for Advancement of Chinese Language Education and Research (CACLER), Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China*

Angel M. Y. Lin, *Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, Canada*
(Moderator)

Paper 1: Yanming (Amy) Wu, *Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China* & Angel M. Y. Lin, *Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, Canada*

Paper 2: Haiwen (Karen) Lai, *Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong*

Paper 3: Qinghua Chen, *Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, Canada*

Contact email: yeonmia@gmail.com

Contact email: gzhemily@gmail.com

While translanguaging has become well-established as a practical theory of language (Li, 2017) in bilingual and multilingual education (García, 2009; García & Li, 2014; García, Lin & May, 2017), questions and misinterpretations about translanguaging are equally noticeable. Among these disputes are the mixing up between translanguaging and the existing pedagogical approaches such as co-switching/code-mixing as well as the disagreement on the positions of language as reflected in the strong version vs the weak version of translanguaging (García & Lin, 2017).

To address these issues, this colloquium explores on-site and on-line translanguaging practices in multi-level (i.e. secondary and tertiary school levels) educational contexts by individuals from multilingual and multicultural (e.g. English, Cantonese, Putonghua, etc.) backgrounds learning various subjects (e.g. Biology, Science and English as a Second Language) under diverse curricula with language playing different roles (e.g., Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), English Medium Instruction (EMI), and English as a Second Language Instruction (ESL Instruction)). Drawing on recent theoretical explication of translanguaging in sociolinguistics and socio-semiotics such as Bakhtin's (1981) dialogic theory, Thibault's (2011) distributed language view, Lemke's (2016) translanguaging as flows, Canagarajah's (2018) new materialism perspective as well as Lin's (2018) theorization of translanguaging and trans-semiotizing for content-based education, this colloquium aims to approach translanguaging events through a lens that emancipates educators and researchers from the shackles of the traditional



structuralist code view of language, the boundaries between named languages, the mono-languaging dogma as well as the monolingual language policies that are still dominating bi/multilingual education classrooms in many countries and regions around the world.

This colloquium is worthy of attention in the following aspects: first, it attempts to explicate the nature and patterns of translanguaging phenomena as dialogic, heteroglossic and fluid processes with complex dynamic entangling of multiple meaning-making artifacts within ecosocial systems across long and short timescales (e.g. Paper 1); second, it advocates a paradigm shift for validating and valuing translanguaging practices in classrooms and challenges traditional solidified boundaries and hierarchies such as L2 vs. L1, languages vs. multimodalities as well as academic registers vs. everyday registers (e.g. Papers 1, 2, and 3); third, it illustrates pedagogical designs based on translanguaging and trans-semiotizing perspectives as well as the model of Multimodalities /Entextualisation Cycles (MEC) (Lin, 2015; 2018) (e.g. Papers 1, 2, and 3); last but not least, all three research studies to be discussed in this colloquium have been conducted following well-planned research design and qualitative data collection as well as fine-grained data analysis. Hence, this proposed colloquium not only provides data-driven evidence for elucidating the theories and hypotheses about translanguaging, but also offers theoretical, methodological, and pedagogical references for future translanguaging studies.

To deepen the discussion on translanguaging, the colloquium puts forward the following questions which remain yet to be answered: 1) If translanguaging is a complex dynamic process of knowledge construction that entangles multiple meaning-making resources in the ecosocial systems across timescales, what implications can teachers have in the CBI/CLIL/EMI/ESL classrooms? 2) Should translanguaging be prohibited to avoid giving learners the chance to use their more familiar languages as the “buoys” that may hinder their progress in using the target language? 3) How should researchers collect and analyse data of translanguaging events to achieve methodological validity and reliability? 4) How can researchers define “translanguaging events”, “timescales” and “ecosocial systems” when doing data analysis? The brainstorming and reflection on these questions will provide potentially crucial implications for future research and pedagogical practices.

References:

- Canagarajah, S. (2018). Translingual Practice as Spatial Repertoires: Expanding the Paradigm beyond Structuralist Orientations. *Applied Linguistics* 39 (1),31–54, <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx041>
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Basil/Blackwell.
- García, O. & Li, W. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- García, O., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2016). Extending understandings of bilingual and multilingual education. In O. García, A. M. Y. Lin, & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education* (Encyclopedia of Language and Education). (pp. 1-20)
- García, O., Lin, A. M. Y., & May, S. (Eds.) (2017). *Bilingual and Multilingual Education* (Encyclopedia of Language and Education). Switzerland: Springer. (ISBN: 978-3-319-02257-4) DOI:10.1007/978-3-319-02258-1
- Lemke, J. (2016). Translanguaging and flows (Unpublished manuscript). Department of



- Communication, University of California, San Diego, California.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (2015). Egalitarian bi/multilingualism and trans-semiotizing in a global world. In W. E. Wright, S. Boun, & O. García (Eds.), *Handbook of bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 19-37). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lin, A.M.Y. (2018). Theories of trans/languageing and trans-semiotizing: implications for content-based education classrooms, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2018.1515175
- Thibault, P. J. (2011). First-order languageing dynamics and second-order language: The distributed language view. *Ecological Psychology*, 23, 210–245. doi:10.1080/10407413.2011.591274

Paper 1: Exploring the Nature of Translanguageing Practices in a CLIL Classroom in Hong Kong: Implications of a Multimodal Classroom Discourse Analysis

Yanming (Amy) Wu, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China
Contact email: amywuym@yahoo.com
Angel M. Y. Lin, Simon Fraser University, Canada
Contact email: yeonmia@gmail.com

While translanguageing perspectives have been gaining currency in educational research and practices (e.g. Williams, 1994; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Garcia & Li, 2014), one contested issue involves how it is different from code-switching/code-mixing and existing pedagogical approaches which already seem to value using L1 to scaffold learning of additional languages and/or content subjects.

To address this issue, this study aims to elucidate how an experienced science teacher co-constructed complex biological concepts with students in a Grade 10 CLIL (Content-and-Language-Integrated-Learning) biology class in Hong Kong through frequent translanguageing and trans-semiotizing (Halliday, 2013; Author 1, 2015) by drawing on new theoretical insights into translanguageing, which encompass Bakhtin’s dialogic theory (Bakhtin, 1981; Bailey, 2007), Thibault’s conceptions of first order languageing and second-order language (Thibault, 2011; Li, 2017; Author 1 & Co-authors, forthcoming), and the new materialism perspective (Canagarajah, 2017/2018a, 2018b). Data will include classroom videos analyzed through fine-grained multimodal analysis (Heap, 1985; Kress et al., 2001), researcher field notes and interviews with the teacher and students.

The study reveals important nuances of the translanguageing phenomena, calling into question the traditional structuralist code view of language and learning: First, every utterance in the lessons examined is always dialogic and multi-voiced (Bakhtin, 1981), emerging in and through ‘trans-’ processes, i.e., complex dynamic entangling of multiple meaning-making resources (i.e., the so-called languages, L1, L2..., different linguistic features, registers, visuals, gestures, actions, material and spatial resources) across shorter and longer timescales. Second, in translanguageing performances, the traditional boundaries and hierarchies of privileging L2 (English) vs. L1 local languages, languages vs. multimodalities, academic registers vs. everyday registers are transcended, as the nature of all these resources are reexamined and found distributed, mutually shaping each other and equally indispensable, together forming a continuous holistic meaning-making process.



Implications of the study for furthering the theorization and practices of translanguaging will be elucidated.

References:

- Author 1 (2015)
- Author 1 (forthcoming)
- Bailey, B. (2007). Heteroglossia and boundaries. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism: A social approach* (pp.257–276). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M.Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Canagarajah, S. (2018a). Translingual Practice as Spatial Repertoires: Expanding the Paradigm beyond Structuralist Orientations. *Applied Linguistics*, 39 (1), 31–54.
- Canagarajah, S. (2018b). Materializing ‘Competence’: Perspectives from International STEM Scholars. *The Modern Language Journal*, 102, (2), DOI: 10.1111/modl.12464
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94 (1), 103-115.
- García, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2013, October 23). Languages, and language, in today’s changing world. Seminar presented at the University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.
- Heap, J. L. (1985). Discourse in the Production of Classroom Knowledge: Reading Lessons. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 15, 245–279.
- Kress, G., Jewitt, C., Ogborn, J., & Tsatsarelis, C. (2001). *Multimodal teaching and learning: The rhetorics of the science classroom*. London: Continuum.
- Li, W. (2017). Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language. *Applied Linguistics*, DOI: 10.1093/applin/amx044.
- Thibault, P. J. (2011). First-order languaging dynamics and second-order language: The distributed language view. *Ecological Psychology*, 23, 210–245.
- Williams, C. (1994). Arfarniad o Ddulliau Dysgu ac Addysgu yng Nghyd-destun Addysg Uwchradd Ddwyieithog [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education]. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, Bangor.

Paper 2: Trans-registering in CLIL Materials Design –A study to develop Secondary Students’ English Academic Literacies

Haiwen (Karen) Lai, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China
Contact email: laihaiwen@gmail.com

Objectives: The English as the medium of instruction (EMI) education in Hong Kong poses tremendous challenges to Chinese speaking students, especially those with basic English proficiency suffered in their achievements in content subjects (e.g. science) that are taught in English (Lo & Lo, 2014). These content subjects use various academic genres which are different from students’ everyday genres, such as narratives (Rose & Martin, 2012). Nonetheless, there are many genres lying in-between these two genres in practice (Lin, 2016) and they are called “hybrids” by Lemke (1990). These hybrids genres are examples and semiotic configurations (Lin,



2018) of trans-registering, hybridizing every day registers with academic registers, which presents one's fluid meaning making processes and constructing discursive practices. Therefore, making effective use of these hybrids can largely help move students from every day registers to academic registers as well as highly potentially interact with students' original, dynamic and spatial language repertoire. But the question falls into how – how to make effective use of these trans-registering in various forms of hybrid? And while trans-registering bridging students from everyday repertoire to academic repertoire, how content knowledge can be incorporated into the process? This design-based research study will answer these questions by designing content and language integrated (CLIL) materials for teachers to implement in their EMI classrooms, and by observing these classrooms' practices.

Theoretical Framework: The Multimodalities-Entextualisation Cycle (MEC) (Lin, 2016) and the Sydney School's genre theory are drawn on as the theoretical framework informing the design of the CLIL materials. The major principle in these materials is 'trans-registering' presented in the form of tightly integrating the elemental "narrative" genres (Martin & Rose, 2012) and key school academic genres.

Significance: By exploring how to make effective use of trans-registering presented in the form of hybrids in the material design level, the study will extend the current framework of Sydney School's genre theory and draw pedagogical implications for CLIL materials design.

References:

- Lemke J. (1990). *Talking Science: Language, Learning, and Values*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.
- Lin, A, M. Y. (2016). *Language Across the Curriculum in English as an Additional Language (EAL) Contexts: Theory and Practice*. Singapore: Springer
- Lin, A.M.Y. (2018). Theories of trans/languageing and trans-semiotizing: Implications for content-based education classrooms. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-12. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2018.1515175
- Lo, Y. Y., & Lo, E. S. C. (2014). A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of English-medium education in Hong Kong. *Review of Educational Research*, 84(1), 47–73.
<http://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313499615>
- Rose, D., & Martin, J. R. (2012). *Learning to Write, Reading to Learn*. UK: Equinox.

Paper 3: Translanguaging and Trans-semiotizing in On-line English Tutoring Classes

Qinghua Chen, Simon Fraser University, Canada
Contact email: qinghua_chen@sfu.ca

On-line tutoring as a way of coaching high-stakes language assessment tests has become an emerging trend in China. Despite its mobility and flexibility for participants, we still have insufficient understanding of the semiotic processes



involving on-going coordination of different semiotic resources including the white board, bodily intonation, spoken and written verbal texts, and emoticons.

Previous studies found the role of webcam in on-line language tutoring could be more disruptive than resourceful, as participants demonstrated very limited effective use (Anthony, 2010; Develotte, Guichon, & Vincent, 2010; Guichon & Wigham, 2016). Some studies suggested ways to improve the use of webcams such as better strategies of framing and positioning of the instructor so as to achieve the best possible simulation of the face-to-face settings (Guichon & Wigham, 2016). However, few studies have considered the alternative option of dropping the webcams and focusing on audio conferencing with visual aids (i.e., slides, and/or whiteboard). Could this configuration be more resourceful for meaning-making than requesting instructors to act out on webcams?

The researcher of this study has been working as an on-line tutor for more than two years, preparing students for high-stakes English proficiency tests. This study aims at exploring the possibilities of making strategic use of various semiotic resources to make meaning in an audio-conference context.

This study examines the 6 video recordings of on-line tutoring in coaching students for the TOEFL iBT speaking test, which covered the six tasks in TOEFL iBT speaking test respectively. Instead of assuming one kind of semiotic resources taking the leading role in communication, the analysis adopted a linguistic ethnographic approach (Wortham, 2008) by working from the bottom up to make fine-grained analysis of the dynamic, fluid, meaning-making processes involving translanguaging (Garcia & Li, 2014) and trans-semiotizing (Lin, 2018).

References:

- Anthony, N. (2010). Refocusing focus on form in the context of online language teaching via audio conferences. *The Slavic and East European Journal*, 76-95.
- Develotte, C., Guichon, N., & Vincent, C. (2010). The use of the webcam for teaching a foreign language in a desktop videoconferencing environment. *ReCALL*, 22(3), 293-312.
- García, O., & Li Wei. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Guichon, N., & Wigham, C. R. (2016). A semiotic perspective on webconferencing-supported language teaching. *ReCALL*, 28(1), 62-82. doi:10.1017/S0958344015000178
- Lin, A.M.Y. (2018). Theories of trans/languaging and trans-semiotizing: Implications for content-based education classrooms. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-12. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2018.1515175
- Wortham, S. (2008). *Linguistic Anthropology*. Retrieved from http://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/162