



Mobilising multilingual and multimodal resources for facilitating knowledge construction: implications for researching translanguaging and multimodality in CLIL classroom context

Kevin W. H. Tai & Li Wei

To cite this article: Kevin W. H. Tai & Li Wei (16 Dec 2024): Mobilising multilingual and multimodal resources for facilitating knowledge construction: implications for researching translanguaging and multimodality in CLIL classroom context, Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, DOI: [10.1080/01434632.2024.2442525](https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2024.2442525)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2024.2442525>



© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 16 Dec 2024.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 901



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)

Mobilising multilingual and multimodal resources for facilitating knowledge construction: implications for researching translanguaging and multimodality in CLIL classroom context

Kevin W. H. Tai ^{a,b} and Li Wei ^b

^aAcademic Unit of Language and Literacy Education, Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong; ^bIOE, UCL's Faculty of Education and Society, University College London, London, UK

ABSTRACT

The articles in this special issue of the *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* highlight three significant areas of research that have evolved in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) education: (1) the implementation of translanguaging pedagogy and the use of multimodal resources in scaffolding content and language in CLIL classrooms, (2) CLIL teachers' awareness of the pedagogical philosophies of multilingualism and translanguaging, and (3) the role of multimodality in CLIL assessments. This commentary will begin with a discussion of the articles in this special issue and draw out key theoretical and methodological themes. This commentary will advance the field of CLIL education by critically reflecting on the implications of adopting translanguaging as a methodological framework in CLIL research, which enables teachers and researchers to achieve a greater understanding of the meaning-making processes in CLIL classrooms.

ARTICLE HISTORY


Received 5 December 2024
Accepted 10 December 2024

KEYWORDS

Translanguaging; CLIL; methodological innovation; paradigm shift; multilingual and multimodal resources

Introduction

In the last decade, the concept of 'translanguaging' has gained significant attention among scholars studying multilingual educational environments, such as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classrooms. The term 'translanguaging' initially introduced by Williams (1994) in the context of Welsh bilingual classrooms, denotes the deliberate switching between languages for receptive or productive purposes. Initially, the goal of translanguaging was to utilise a stronger language to enhance the weaker one, promoting balanced language development. Over time, the concept evolved to encompass the use of a wide range of languages and semiotic resources in multilingual repertoires for meaning-making (García and Li 2014; Li 2018; Tai 2023). As Li (2018) argues, translanguaging refers to a process of knowledge construction which entails going beyond different linguistic structures and systems (i.e. not only different named languages and dialects, but also different ways of speaking, accents and registers), and different modalities (i.e. switching between communicative modes, gestures, facial expressions and visual images). Such an understanding of translanguaging encourages us to think about how knowledge is constructed through using diverse linguistic and non-linguistic including different modal cues.

CONTACT Kevin W. H. Tai  kevin.tai@hku.hk

This article has been corrected with minor changes. These changes do not impact the academic content of the article.

© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

However, the term is sometimes uncritically understood as recognising or employing multilingual students' first languages, enabling them to navigate between languages of instruction (Li and García 2022). A prevalent question in applied linguistics concerns the distinction between translanguaging and code-switching analyses. While some researchers regard translanguaging as a descriptor for language-mixing practices, others argue that it lacks clear distinctions or definitions for different translanguaging practices, such as pedagogical or social forms (Li 2024). It is vital to note that the notion of code-switching treats named languages as 'codes' and emphasises the structural and functional differentiation between specific languages and their pedagogical roles in the classroom (Fang, Jiang, and Yang 2023; Li 2020; Tai and Li 2021). Translanguaging is perceived as a facilitative and empowering approach in bilingual and multilingual education, encouraging learners and teachers to employ and share their knowledge of various languages and other semiotic resources in their communicative repertoire in collaborative learning. Therefore, translanguaging should not be misconstrued as a simple rebranding of code-switching (Nikula and Moore 2016) since translanguaging views language itself as a multilingual, multimodal, and multisensory resource for understanding and creating meaning.

Scholars working on translanguaging further conceptualise it as transcending boundaries between linguistic and semiotic resources (e.g. Ho and Li 2019; Li and Ho 2018; Tai 2023). By adopting a social semiotic perspective of multi – and indeed, trans-modality, they challenge ideological biases favouring conventional linguistic codes in meaning-making. As Li (2020) posits, linguists often concentrate on linguistic aspects of communication, such as syntax, phonology, and morphology, neglecting other semiotic resources that contribute to meaning in social interactions. However, social interaction is inherently multimodal, and meaning extends beyond verbal utterances and written communication in daily human interactions. Recent studies (e.g. Ou and Gu 2022; Prada 2019; Tai 2024; Tai and Li 2021, 2024) on translanguaging in classroom practices have shown how multilingual learners surpass linguistic and cultural barriers to create novel language configurations and pedagogical practices. These practices aim to challenge language hierarchies, establish translanguaging spaces for learning, and facilitate students' full engagement in knowledge construction within CLIL classroom settings. The growth of translanguaging research in CLIL contexts signals a paradigm shift towards embracing translanguaging as multilingual, multisemiotic, multisensory, and multimodal practices for thinking and expressing thoughts. This highlights the need for researchers to move beyond traditional conceptualizations of distinct languages as separate codes of speech and writing, particularly focusing on the embodied and multimodal aspects of communication.

In this commentary, we will first discuss the three significant areas of research that have emerged in this special issue: (1) the implementation of translanguaging pedagogy and use of multimodal resources in scaffolding content and language in CLIL classrooms, (2) CLIL teachers' awareness of the pedagogical philosophies of multilingualism and translanguaging, and (3) the role of multimodality in CLIL assessments. As a feature of the special issue, it embraces contributors from three educational levels: two studies from primary education (e.g. Liu and Lin; Amondarain-Garrido and Ruiz de Zarobe), two studies from secondary education (Liu and Lo; van Batenburg and Dale) and two studies from higher education (Boggio and Costa; Querol-Julián). This commentary will then critically examine the implications of adopting translanguaging as a methodological framework in CLIL research. As an analytical framework, translanguaging shifts away from perceiving language as abstract codes to focusing on the language user's ability to engage in purposeful and meaningful communicative practices and activities in specific sociocultural contexts (Li 2022; Tai 2023).

Contributions in the special issue

The implementation of translanguaging pedagogy and the use of multimodal resources in CLIL classrooms

The primary goal of CLIL is to integrate the teaching of both the L2 and content knowledge, enabling learners to develop proficiency in the L2 while acquiring subject-specific knowledge.

CLIL education offers flexibility in selecting the language of instruction, although English is commonly used (Macaro 2018). It is believed that CLIL learners benefit from exposure to meaningful L2 input, allowing them to learn the language incidentally without compromising content learning (Coyle, Hood, and Marsh 2010). However, there are unanswered questions regarding how CLIL impacts content learning and how teachers can make subject content and registers accessible to all students. Language-related challenges in CLIL classrooms can create linguistic barriers, particularly for less proficient L2 learners, hindering their acquisition of content knowledge (e.g. Morton and Llinares 2017). Researchers working from a systemic functional linguistics perspective have identified some features of the so-called 'academic language', including the prevalence of abstract specific terms, passive voice, nominalisation and use of special genres (Schleppegrell 2004). Viewed this way, academic language is a genre or register that is prevalent in academic subjects, and it differs from everyday language and poses difficulties for L2 learners who need to learn content through the L2. If CLIL teachers solely rely on L2 instruction without explicit language teaching, bridging this gap can be extremely challenging.

CLIL education also raises concerns about social justice, particularly related to the preservation of minority languages and students' linguistic rights. The dominance of English-only policy (e.g. in English Medium Instruction) has led parents to undervalue local languages, considering them less important in education (Sah 2022). Consequently, enforcing a monolingual medium of instruction in CLIL classrooms can negatively impact students' attitudes towards local languages, as well as their sense of linguistic and cultural identities (e.g. Ou, Gu, and Hult 2021). Moreover, the gap that has been mentioned above between the so-called academic language in the classroom and the everyday social language that the learners use puts minoritised and racialised learners at an immediate disadvantage.

To challenge the monolingual language policy and promote inclusive and socially just translanguaging, García, Johnson, and Seltzer (2017) propose three recommended features for teachers in multilingual classrooms. Firstly, teachers should adopt a translanguaging stance, recognising the value of translanguaging and students' language and cultural practices as resources for learning. Secondly, teachers need to plan for translanguaging design, creating an inclusive space where students can utilise their full communicative repertoires. Finally, teachers should be prepared for translanguaging shifts, being flexible in their lesson plans to address students' learning needs during classroom interactions.

Despite the demonstrated potential of translanguaging in enhancing academic learning and socio-emotional well-being (e.g. Cenoz and Santos 2020; Zhang 2024), many teachers lack training and knowledge in translanguaging (Tai and Wong 2023; Tian 2020; Wong and Tai 2023). Implementing translanguaging pedagogy in multilingual classrooms presents challenges such as limited knowledge of students' first languages (Barros et al. 2021), institutional restrictions (Holdway and Hitchcock 2018), and teachers' longstanding belief in monolingual instruction (Vanish 2019). Therefore, it is crucial for teachers to have adequate knowledge of translanguaging pedagogy and its application in their practices. However, research on developing teachers' knowledge of translanguaging remains limited. Some studies have explored integrating translanguaging theories into L2 teacher preparation programmes, revealing the transformative impact on teachers' understanding and pedagogical repertoire (e.g. Deroo, Ponzio, and De Costa 2020; Tian and Zhang-Wu 2022). Nevertheless, there is a scarcity of research on how CLIL teachers comprehend and implement translanguaging in their classrooms, particularly in creating a translanguaging space for multilingual students. Hence, further research is needed to examine the practical implementation of translanguaging by CLIL teachers, bridging the gap between theory and classroom practice.

Several articles in this special issue aim to fill the research gap by examining how translanguaging pedagogy can be implemented by CLIL teachers. Liu and Lin conducted a study to examine how co-teachers use translanguaging practices in CLIL lessons to teach Hong Kong primary students with special learning needs about writing information reports on animals. The English and General

Studies teachers collaborated with researchers to adapt the Multimodalities/Extexualisation Cycle framework for their primary 1 students. The results show that when co-teachers coordinate different types of communication resources across time and space, it helps in (1) encouraging students to collaboratively construct the thematic patterns specific to the academic genre, (2) creating structured learning environments within the classroom and (3) facilitating the exchange of knowledge and emphasising students' accomplishments in discipline-specific activities. The findings particularly highlight the potential of translanguaging in supporting dyslexic students in learning the target genre.

In another study that explores the implementation of translanguaging pedagogy in CLIL classrooms, Boggio and Costa conducted a study utilising the Multimodal Discourse Analysis framework to investigate how translanguaging and semiotic resources contribute to the process of meaning-making in Language-Related Episodes (LREs). Translanguaging in this study is defined as the flexible use of different languages in communication. The study focused on engineering lectures at a Spanish multilingual university to examine how LREs are constructed through translanguaging and multimodal resources. The results reveal that the occurrence of LREs varied greatly across the analysed lectures, even with the same lecturer, suggesting that contextual factors strongly influence LREs. Additionally, the lecturers heavily relied on multiple semiotic modes to convey content knowledge while constructing LREs. This study supports the perspective put forth by scholars like Li (2018), Wu and Lin (2019), and Morell (2018) that CLIL contexts are characterised as multimodal, translingual, and trans-semiotised. The authors propose the integration of LREs as a pedagogical strategy in CLIL to support students in comprehending content and developing disciplinary literacy.

Amondarain-Garrido and Ruiz de Zarobe utilise the concept of multimodal translanguaging (García and Li 2014) to investigate the multimodal discourse of three primary school CLIL teachers in science education. The authors analyse the discourse functions observed in interactions within the CLIL science classroom. In this study, multimodal translanguaging refers to a dynamic approach that enables a pedagogy where participants can select from a range of semiotic resources found in their own communicative repertoires and the multimodal literacy developed within classroom episodes. The authors employ multimodal interaction analysis to examine classroom interactions, and the findings reveal that teachers utilise gestures and movements within the classroom space, as well as tools and resources to complement language and create a multimodal system of meanings. These actions serve to express teachers' discourse strategies and functions in teaching science content.

CLIL teachers' awareness of the pedagogical philosophies of multilingualism and translanguaging

In order to resist traditional monolingual approaches that view multilingual students as deficient language users lacking English proficiency, scholars such as Canagarajah (2014) and Cenoz and Gorter (2021) emphasise the importance of recognising multilinguals as resourceful individuals with complex multilingual repertoires and abilities. Furthermore, teacher educators are encouraged to guide teacher candidates in shifting their perspective on translanguaging from a mere scaffold to actively challenging language hierarchies and advocating for social justice in U.S. schools (Tian and Zhang-Wu 2022). Several studies (e.g. Deroo, Ponzio, and De Costa 2020; Gorter and Arocena 2020; Tai and Wong 2023; Tian and Zhang-Wu 2022; Wong and Tai 2023) have explored the learning of translanguaging among teacher candidates and have demonstrated that a teacher education course focused on translanguaging not only develops candidates' translanguaging stance but also expands their pedagogical repertoire. For instance, Gorter and Arocena (2020) investigated the beliefs of 124 teachers regarding multilingualism and translanguaging after an eight-week professional development course. They concluded that such a course can indeed change teachers' beliefs, but it should be implemented gradually and tailored to local school contexts. To foster

the development of a translanguaging stance among teacher candidates, Deroo, Ponzio, and De Costa (2020) suggest that teacher educators should provide a platform for candidates to discuss their understanding of translanguaging, enabling them to reflect on the opportunities and challenges they may encounter in their teaching practices. Similarly, Wong and Tai (2023) conducted a study focusing on an English as an Additional Language teacher candidate who was a multilingual speaker but did not share her students' home languages. The findings revealed the candidate's strong stance and her ability to employ a variety of strategies to create a translanguaging space, which resulted from her training. This study underscores the importance of teachers expanding their pedagogical repertoire by recognising the potential benefits of diverse multilingual, multimodal, and multi-sensory resources in facilitating effective teaching and learning processes.

Several articles in this special issue aim to investigate how professional development seminars can influence the beliefs of CLIL teachers regarding the use of translanguaging practices to support students' content and language learning. One of these articles, by van Batenburg and Dale, focuses on the perceptions of plurilingualism among pre-service English teachers through small-scale research conducted in a CLIL setting. The qualitative findings reveal that all pre-service teachers hold a positive attitude towards plurilingualism as a valuable resource in CLIL. The exercise of conducting small-scale research encourages them to critically assess school policies, consider students' perspectives, and reflect on their own views regarding plurilingualism. The authors suggest that future CLIL teacher education programmes should include a module that requires pre-service teachers to investigate their students' multilingual repertoires and language learning experiences within the school context.

In a complementary study, Querol-Julián investigates the impact of a brief online discrete learning intervention and its role in enhancing CLIL teachers' understanding of translanguaging concepts and semiotic awareness. The objective is to help teachers design more effective learning experiences for students in the classroom. Querol-Julián conducted a content analysis of an initial survey and reflective essays written by teachers. The findings demonstrate that the pedagogical intervention significantly enhances teachers' knowledge of translanguaging and trans-semiotising and motivates them to incorporate translanguaging and trans-semiotising into their classroom instruction, thereby making content knowledge more accessible to students. Querol-Julian recommends that future research should incorporate diverse data sources, such as video-recordings of classroom interactions and interviews with students, to evaluate the effectiveness of pedagogical interventions in developing CLIL teachers' awareness of translanguaging and trans-semiotising practices.

The role of multimodality in CLIL assessments

We believe that this is a crucial issue that remains unresolved and requires immediate attention. The potential of pedagogical translanguaging and multimodality in classroom instruction has received significant research attention. However, the incorporation of these approaches in assessment practices is notably lacking (Schissel, De Korne, and López-Gopar 2021). Translanguaging and multimodality present challenges to traditional content and language assessments while also offering new perspectives on assessment. Currently, most assessment practices follow a 'one test, one language' principle, which we argue is inherently unfair to individuals who use multiple languages. For example, there is currently no English language test that evaluates a learner's ability to translanguage between their first language and other languages, despite ample research evidence demonstrating that code-switching is a defining feature of bilingualism and multilingualism. It is a significant indicator of linguistic competence and a contributing factor to cognitive advantages.

Considering that language assessments for LX speakers typically do not holistically examine learners' linguistic abilities, researchers have proposed allowing multilingual students to utilise their full linguistic resources, such as through translanguaging practices, during assessments. This approach enables students to demonstrate their actual content knowledge (e.g. Gorter and Cenoz 2017;

Shohamy 2011). Gorter and Cenoz (2017) explore various possibilities for using multilingual approaches in language assessment. These include providing translations to ensure student understanding of the test and employing multilingual scoring, which aggregates scores obtained in different languages to determine a level of multilingualism instead of proficiency in a specific language. Another possibility is the use of a translanguaging approach that allows for the utilisation of different resources from student's multilingual repertoire (Schissel et al. 2018; Schissel et al. 2019; Schissel, De Korne, and López-Gopar 2021).

Schissel, De Korne, and López-Gopar (2021) conducted an action research case study involving 40 language teachers in the linguistically and culturally diverse state of Oaxaca, Mexico. The study aimed to engage L2 teachers in discussions, reflections, and the development of assessment tools suitable for multilingual contexts. The findings indicate that L2 teachers gradually shifted their perspectives from expecting monolingual-like language production to embracing multilingualism and validating students' linguistic repertoire and multilingual identities. The study also proposes several ways of designing translanguaging assessments, such as providing instructions in students' home language(s) and incorporating points for translanguaging in the rubric for open-response writing, allowing students to create texts that reflect their linguistic repertoire. In a similar vein, Rafi (2023) proposes an assessment design that embraces creativity, criticality, and translanguaging as key principles. This study focuses on the assessment design in eight language and content learning classrooms within Bangladeshi higher education. The research aims to explore how assessment designs can effectively incorporate a wide range of linguistic practices, semiotic resources, and social experiences to accommodate creativity and critical thinking. Rafi implements translanguaging pedagogical approaches, such as multilingual vocabulary induction, translation, and guided reading using authentic Bangla text, to teach students how to structure a standard paragraph in language learning interventions. The argument put forth is that a translanguaging-oriented assessment allows students to utilise their entire linguistic, cultural, ideological, and identity backgrounds in their task attempts. Additionally, this assessment approach fosters creativity among students, creating an environment where all their linguistic competencies and experiences are appreciated and valued.

However, when designing CLIL assessments, there are several issues that testers need to consider. Elder and Davies (2006) emphasise the importance of adhering to specific requirements, such as construct validity, fairness, and responsibility to candidates and stakeholders, in test design. These principles serve as constraints in the test development process. Testers must carefully define the linguistic and content knowledge or skills that the assessment aims to measure through evidence-based validation. However, the nature of translanguaging challenges the idea of static norms. Test validity requires adequate descriptions of the domain, representative test tasks or items, context-sensitive criteria, informed decision-making regarding performance thresholds, and supporting evidence and arguments for score inferences (Elder and Harding 2008). Consequently, candidates and examiners may find it confusing to determine what forms of language use are considered appropriate in a CLIL assessment, which sources/examples candidates can use for assessment preparation, and what criteria examiners should use to evaluate candidates' performance. Therefore, further research is needed to address this significant gap by investigating whether and how written CLIL assessments allow multilingual students to effectively utilise their complete communicative repertoire to demonstrate their actual content knowledge. There is also an urgent need for test developers and scholars to develop a multilingually conceptualised CLIL assessment framework that recognises students' diverse multilingual and multimodal resources that students bring to their learning experiences in order to effectively evaluate their content knowledge and L2 proficiency.

Liu and Lo's study in this special issue explores the role of CLIL assessment in leveraging multimodal resources for students to demonstrate their content learning in secondary education. Through thematic analysis of individual interviews with 10 CLIL teachers in Chinese contexts and examination of their assessment materials, the study examines teachers' perceptions and

practices regarding the use of multimodal resources in CLIL assessment. The findings indicate that while teachers recognise the potential of multimodal resources in making assessment questions more accessible and facilitating students' expression of content knowledge, they generally require further systematic knowledge and skills to design effective multimodal assessment tasks, establish multimodal assessment criteria, and provide feedback on students' multimodal production. The study aligns with the growing call to reconceptualize the 'language' dimension in CLIL as a multimodal dimension (e.g. Tai and Li 2021; Tai and Li 2023). The authors propose that the integration of a systematic consideration of the multimodal scope can enhance the development of teachers' knowledge and practices in CLIL assessment. Although this conceptualisation is in its early stages, the study serves as a starting point for exploring teacher assessment literacy from a multimodal perspective.

Future research: adopting translanguaging as a methodological perspective

To further the study of CLIL education, we suggest incorporating translanguaging as an analytical perspective in CLIL research. This approach emphasises the importance of closely examining teacher interactions with their environment and their use of multilingual resources, as well as their physical orientation and adaptation in relation to students and classroom artifacts. This is crucial for understanding CLIL teaching as a dynamic process that enhances students' content and language learning. The main goal of adopting translanguaging as an analytical perspective is to shift the focus from viewing language as abstract codes to examining a broader range of multilingual and multi-semiotic resources for meaning-making. This perspective does not prioritise any specific communication mode or method over others (Li 2018). Specifically, the act of surpassing boundaries between different forms of expression is a crucial element of translanguaging, setting it apart from the idea of code-switching. This is because the notion of code-switching focuses on the functional aspects of language use, disregarding the multifaceted nature of creating meaning through various modes of communication (Anderson 2024; Tai 2024).

Tai (2023) proposed a methodological approach that combines Multimodal Conversation Analysis (MCA) and Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) to explore the complexities of translanguaging practices in multilingual classroom interactions. This combination is inspired by Li's (2011, 2018) concept of moment analysis and the use of translanguaging as an analytical perspective. The combination of MCA and IPA aims to examine how language users blend named languages and non-linguistic semiotic systems during specific moments in social interactions. It is essential to understand what triggers a particular social action and its consequences. To conduct this analysis, researchers must gather various data sources, including observational and audio/video recordings of natural interactions and metalanguage data (i.e. speakers' commentary on their language use and use of semiotic and modal resources). Collecting metalanguage data helps researchers better comprehend how language users attempt to make sense of their experiences (Li 2011). MCA focuses on how social order is co-constructed by members of a social group through a fine-grained analysis of social interactions. This approach avoids pre-theorizing the relevance of language-in-use and examines sequences rather than isolated turns or utterances. On the other hand, IPA helps understand how teachers perceive their translanguaging practices during specific moments in interactions. The dual interpretation process of IPA, called 'double hermeneutic', enables researchers to interpret participants' attempts to make sense of their world. Thus, in linguistically diverse and culturally-rich CLIL learning environments, the methodological approach of combining MCA and IPA can offer a new analytical strategy for understanding both the process and causes of classroom translanguaging. Future research studies can investigate CLIL teachers' translanguaging practices and their pedagogical goals. This methodological approach can enhance our understanding of how translanguaging can positively or negatively impact students' content acquisition and second language development (Tai 2023; 2024).

Another area of exploration involves the development of CLIL teachers' skills in transpositioning, which is key to fostering fluent and dynamic language practices in CLIL classroom interactions. The notion of transpositioning is an emerging term in the field of Applied Linguistics which is informed by the concepts of positioning theory (Davies and Harré 1990) and liquid modernity (Bauman 2012 [2000]). Liquid modernity suggests an inherent inclination towards constant change, which reinforces the notion that language use is a dynamic phenomenon. Speakers utilise diverse linguistic resources and modes, combining and integrating them within a semiotic repertoire that individuals draw upon to create inventive and/or critical interventions. The notion of transpositioning involves individuals breaking away from their predetermined roles and adopting different perspectives through translanguaging. By challenging conventional norms and embracing a wider range of possibilities, transpositioning enables individuals to break free from habitual thinking and develop empathy for others involved in the process (Li and Lee 2024). Viewing identity as an ongoing and repetitive process of shifting one's position and that of others, the concept of transpositioning emphasises the dynamic nature of social interactions, where speakers modify their identity positions in response to the unfolding development of the mutually constructed interaction. In essence, the process of transpositioning seeks to demonstrate how speakers free themselves from predetermined roles or positions in social interactions and manoeuvre their stance while engaging with other interlocutors.

It is recommended that adopting the notions of translanguaging and transpositioning as analytical perspectives can potentially allow researchers to examine how CLIL teachers alter their roles, stances and/or positions through translanguaging in order to achieve their specific communicative goals. One way of achieving transpositioning is through co-learning. Co-learning emphasises that all knowledge, acquired through all languages and in all sociocultural contexts, should be valued. It exhorts the teacher and students to learn from each other and engage in the joint construction of knowledge (Brantmeier 2013). In other words, the teacher is no longer the sole possessor of knowledge in the class and the concept of co-learning emphasises the process in which teachers and students attempt to adapt to one another's behaviour and learn from each other in order to produce desirable learning outcomes. Most studies of classroom interaction studies focus on students and teachers sharing the same physical space in a class and although cultural variations exist, scholars (e.g. Seedhouse 2004; Walsh 2011) tend to conceptualise the role of the teacher in the classroom as experts who provide knowledge and the role of the students are learners or receivers of knowledge. However, such a role differentiation may create a knowledge-power relationship since the knowledge of the 'expert' is privileged and valued and the teacher is the expert who is qualified to validate students' knowledge (Lawrence 1996). This can possibly marginalise students' ideas since their knowledge may not be valued in the classroom which consequently discourages students from stretching the extent of their participation and getting access to different various learning opportunities.

In a recent study by Tai and Li (2021), the authors examined how a CLIL teacher and students engage in co-learning in a CLIL secondary mathematics classroom. The results show that the mathematics teacher identifies himself as an L2 English learner and regards the students as the possessors of accurate L2 English pronunciation. Similar to many CLIL teachers who lack confidence in their L2 English usage in classrooms (Macaro et al. 2018), the mathematics teacher negotiates the correct English pronunciation with his students through translanguaging. As evidenced in the findings, the CLIL teacher's openness to being a co-learner with his students acknowledges their complete linguistic knowledge and fosters a more equitable learning environment for students. Therefore, the notion of co-learning highlights fairness in knowledge construction and necessitates CLIL teachers to let go of their authoritative teacher roles and adopt a more 'vulnerable' position, which involves taking the risk of not knowing, and acting as a recipient of knowledge rather than a provider. By applying the concepts of translanguaging and transpositioning to re-analyse the findings in Tai and Li's (2021) study, it can be argued that this co-learning process can be conceptualised as a transpositioning process, wherein both teachers and students surpass modalities, enact different

social roles and fully utilise each other's knowledge to facilitate meaning-making. Pedagogically, this encourages CLIL teachers to position themselves and their students on the same level as knowledge holders, which challenges the traditional hierarchical relationship between them and enables a more equitable treatment of all students.

Together, this special issue serves as a valuable addition to the growing body of research on translanguaging in CLIL education. The empirical studies presented offer crucial insights into how translanguaging pedagogy can foster inclusive spaces that challenge institutionalised monolingualism in linguistically and culturally diverse CLIL classrooms. By prioritising students and incorporating their unique perspectives and voices into CLIL activities, both content and language learning can be enhanced. This, in turn, will advance the field by introducing new and different ways of exploring questions related to multilingualism and multilingual education worldwide. As we continue to delve into translanguaging within CLIL classroom settings, it is essential that future research integrates the concepts of translanguaging and transpositioning as analytical lenses. This will allow us to better understand and appreciate the role of teachers and students in creating innovative learning opportunities in CLIL classrooms.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

ORCID

Kevin W. H. Tai  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2098-8082>

Li Wei  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2015-7262>

References

- Anderson, J. 2024. "Translanguaging: A Paradigm Shift for ELT Theory and Practice." *ELT Journal* 78 (1): 72–81. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccad057>.
- Barros, S., L. M. Domke, C. Symons, and C. Ponzio. 2021. "Challenging Monolingual Ways of Looking at Multilingualism: Insights for Curriculum Development in Teacher Preparation." *Journal of Language, Identity and Education* 20 (4): 239–254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2020.1753196>.
- Bauman, Z. 2012 [2000]. *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Brantmeier, E. J. 2013. "Pedagogy of Vulnerability: Definitions, Assumptions, and Applications." In *Re-Envisioning Higher Education: Embodied Pathways to Wisdom and Transformation*, edited by J. Lin, R. Oxford, and E. J. Brantmeier, 95–106. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Canagarajah, A. S. 2014. "In Search of a new Paradigm for Teaching English as an International Language." *TESOL Journal* 5 (4): 767–785. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.166>.
- Cenoz, J., and D. Gorter. 2021. *Pedagogical Translanguaging*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cenoz, J., and A. Santos. 2020. "Implementing Pedagogical Translanguaging in Trilingual School." *System* 92:1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102273>.
- Coyle, D., P. Hood, and D. Marsh. 2010. *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, B., and R. Harré. 1990. "Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves." *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20 (1): 43–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.1990.tb00174.x>.
- Deroo, M. R., C. M. Ponzio, and P. I. De Costa. 2020. "Reenvisioning Second Language Teacher Education Through Translanguaging Praxis." In *Envisioning TESOL Through a Translanguaging Lens: Global Perspectives*, edited by Z. Tian, L. Aghai, P. Sayer, and J. L. Schissel, 111–134. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Elder, C., and A. Davies. 2006. "Assessing English as a Lingua Franca." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 26:282–301. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000146>.
- Elder, C., and L. Harding. 2008. "Language Testing and English as an International Language." *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 31 (3): 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.2104/ara10834>.
- Fang, F., L. Jiang, and J. Yang. 2023. "To Impart Knowledge or to Adhere to Policy: Unpacking Language Ideologies and Practices in Chinese EMI Courses Through a Translanguaging Lens." *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688231183771>.

- García, O., S. I. Johnson, and K. Seltzer. 2017. *The Translanguaging Classroom: Leveraging Student Bilingualism for Learning*. USA: Carlson.
- García, O., and W. Li. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism, and Education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Gorter, D., and E. Arocena. 2020. "Teachers' Beliefs About Multilingualism in a Course on Translanguaging." *System* 92:1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102272>.
- Gorter, D., and J. Cenoz. 2017. "Language Education Policy and Multilingual Assessment." *Language and Education* 31 (3): 231–248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2016.1261892>.
- Ho, W. Y. J., and W. Li. 2019. "Mobilising Learning: A Translanguaging View." *Chinese Semiotic Studies* 15 (4): 533–559. <https://doi.org/10.1515/css-2019-0029>.
- Holdway, J., and C. H. Hitchcock. 2018. "Exploring Ideological Becoming in Professional Development for Teachers of Multilingual Learners: Perspectives on Translanguaging in the Classroom." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 75:60–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.05.015>.
- Lawrence, R. 1996. *Co-learning Communities: A Hermeneutic Account of Adult Learning in Higher Education Through the Lived World of Cohorts*. PhD Dissertation. USA: Northern Illinois University.
- Li, W. 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>.
- Li, W. 2018. "Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language." *Applied Linguistics* 39 (1): 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>.
- Li, W. 2020. "Multilingual English Users' Linguistic Innovation." *World Englishes* 39 (2): 236–248. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12457>.
- Li, W. 2022. "Translanguaging as Method." *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics* 1 (3): 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmal.2022.100026>.
- Li, W. 2024. "Transformative Pedagogy for Inclusion and Social Justice Through Translanguaging, co-Learning, and Transpositioning." *Language Teaching* 57 (2): 203–214.
- Li, W., and O. García. 2022. "Not a First Language but One Repertoire: Translanguaging as a Decolonizing Project." *RELC Journal* 53 (2): 313–324. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882221092841>.
- Li, W., and J. W. Y. Ho. 2018. "Language Learning Sans Frontiers: A Translanguaging View." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 38:33–59. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190518000053>.
- Li, W., and T. K. Lee. 2024. "Transpositioning: Translanguaging and the Liquidity of Identity." *Applied Linguistics* 45 (5): 873–888. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amad065>.
- Macaro, E. 2018. *English Medium Instruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Macaro, E., S. Curle, J. Pun, J. An, and J. Dearden. 2018. "A Systematic Review of English Medium Instruction in Higher Education." *Language Teaching* 51 (1): 36–76. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000350>.
- Morell, T. 2018. "Multimodal Competence and Effective Interactive Lecturing." *System* 77:70–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.12.006>.
- Morton, T., and A. Llinares. 2017. "Content and Language Integrated Learning: Type of Programme or Pedagogical Model?" In *Applied Linguistics Perspectives on CLIL*, edited by A. Llinares, and T. Morton, 1–16. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nikula, T., and P. Moore. 2016. "Exploring Translanguaging in CLIL." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 19 (3): 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1254151>.
- Ou, W. A., and M. M. Gu. 2022. "Competence Beyond Language: Translanguaging and Spatial Repertoire in Teacher-Student Interaction in a Music Classroom in an International Chinese University." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 25 (8): 2741–2758. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.1949261>.
- Ou, W. A., M. M. Gu, and F. M. Hult. 2021. "Discursive Ripple Effects in Language Policy and Practice: Multilingualism and English as an Academic Lingua Franca in Transnational Higher Education." *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 44 (2): 154–179. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aryl.20096.ou>.
- Prada, J. 2019. "Exploring the Role of Translanguaging in Linguistic Ideological and Attitudinal Reconfigurations in the Spanish Classroom for Heritage Speakers." *Classroom Discourse* 10 (3-4): 306–322. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1628793>.
- Rafi, A. 2023. "Creativity, Criticality and Translanguaging in Assessment Design: Perspectives from Bangladeshi Higher Education." *Applied Linguistics Review*, Epub ahead of Print. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2023-0086>.
- Sah, P. 2022. "English Medium Instruction in South Asian's Multilingual Schools: Unpacking the Dynamics of Ideological Orientations, Policy/Practices, and Democratic Questions." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 25 (2): 742–755. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1718591>.
- Schissel, J. L., H. De Korne, and M. E. López-Gopar. 2021. "Grappling with Translanguaging for Teaching and Assessment in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Language Learning Contexts: Teacher Perspectives from Oaxaca, Mexico." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 24 (3): 340–356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1463965>.
- Schissel, J. L., C. Leung, M. López-Gopar, and J. R. Davis. 2018. "Multilingual Learners in Language Assessment: Assessment Design for Linguistically Diverse Communities." *Language and Education* 32 (2): 167–182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2018.1429463>.

- Schissel, J. L., M. López-Gopar, C. Leung, J. Morales, and J. R. Davis. 2019. "Classroom-based Assessments in Linguistically Diverse Communities: A Case for Collaborative Research Methodologies." *Language Assessment Quarterly* 16 (4-5): 393–407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2019.1678041>.
- Schleppegrell, M. 2004. *The Language of Schooling: A Functional Linguistics Perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Seedhouse, P. 2004. *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. London: Blackwell.
- Shohamy, E. 2011. "Assessing Multilingual Competencies: Adopting Construct Valid Assessment Policies." *The Modern Language Journal* 95 (3): 418–429. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01210.x>.
- Tai, K. W. H. 2023. *Multimodal Conversation Analysis and Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: A Methodological Framework for Researching Translanguaging in Multilingual Classrooms*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003351047>.
- Tai, K. W. H. 2024. "Cross-curricular Connection in an English Medium Instruction Western History Classroom: A Translanguaging View." *Language and Education* 38 (3): 435–464. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2023.2174379>.
- Tai, K. W. H., and W. Li. 2021. "Co-learning in Hong Kong English Medium Instruction Mathematics Secondary Classrooms: A Translanguaging Perspective." *Language and Education* 35 (3): 241–267. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2020.1837860>.
- Tai, K. W. H., and W. Li. 2023. "Embodied Enactment of a Hypothetical Scenario in an English Medium Instruction Secondary Mathematics Classroom: A Translanguaging Approach." *Language Teaching Research*. Epub ahead of Print. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688231152858>.
- Tai, K. W. H., and C. Y. Wong. 2023. "Empowering Students Through the Construction of a Translanguaging Space in an English as a First Language Classroom." *Applied Linguistics* 44 (6): 1100–1151. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amac069>.
- Tian, Z. 2020. "Faculty First: Promoting Translanguaging in TESOL Teacher Education." In *Plurilingual Pedagogies: Critical and Creative Endeavours for Equitable Language in Education*, edited by S. M. C. Lau, and S. Van Viegen, 215–236. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Tian, Z., and Q. Zhang-Wu. 2022. "Preparing Pre-Service Content Area Teachers Through Translanguaging." *Journal of Language, Identity and Education* 21 (3): 144–159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2022.2058512>.
- Vanish, V. 2019. "Translanguaging Pedagogy for Simultaneous Biliterates Struggling to Read in English." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 16 (3): 286–301. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1447943>.
- Walsh, S. 2011. *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Williams, C. 1994. "An Evaluation of Teaching and Learning Methods in the Context of Bilingual Secondary Education." PhD thesis, University of Wales.
- Wong, C. Y., and K. W. H. Tai. 2023. "I Made Many Discoveries for Myself": The Development of a Teacher Candidate's Pedagogical Knowledge of Translanguaging." *System* 116:1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103058>.
- Wu, Y., and A. M. Y. Lin. 2019. "Translanguaging and Trans-Semiotising in a CLIL Biology Class in Hong Kong: Whole-Body Sense-Making in the Flow of Knowledge co-Making." *Classroom Discourse* 10 (3-4): 252–273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1629322>.
- Zhang, H. 2024. "Translanguaging Space and Classroom Climate Created by Teachers' Emotional Scaffolding and Students' Emotional Curves About EFL Learning." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 21 (1): 298–324. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2021.2011893>.