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Abstract: There has been a recent proliferation of studies pertaining to translanguaging. This impetus is largely driven by the increasing acknowledgement of daily communications as translingual practice. In fact, the closely related construct of plurilingualism has been incorporated into the development of the companion volume of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Council of Europe. 2020. Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing. Available at: www.coe.int/lang-cefr). Despite the rising awareness towards translanguaging and plurilingualism in European and Northern American contexts (cf. Vallejo, Claudia & Melinda Dooly. 2020. Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Emergent approaches and shared concerns. Introduction to the special issue. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 23(1). 1–16), scepticism remains, especially in classroom settings. Through detailed analyses of extracts taken from 27 h of recordings of UK university ESL classroom interactions among Taiwanese L1 Mandarin students transcribed based on Jefferson (Jefferson, Gail. 2004. Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In Gene Lerner (ed.), Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation, 14–31. Philadelphia: John Benjamins) and supplemented by Matsumoto (Matsumoto, Yumi. 2019. Material moments: Teacher and student use of materials in multilingual writing classroom interactions. The Modern Language Journal 103(1). 179–204) and Zhu et al. (Zhu, Hua, Wei Li & Agnieszka Lyons. 2017b. Polish shop(ping) as translanguaging space. Social Semiotics 27(4). 411–433), we aim to demonstrate the complementarity effect of various multimodal resources in progressing classroom instructions. Our analyses reveal that the different linguistic and non-linguistic resources deployed contribute to scaffolding and the development of a layered understanding of the concept in discussion (e.g. phrasal verbs). We argue that the translanguaging space enables students to engage in deeper learning. Students are empowered to break down
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the rigid power structure and actively participate in knowledge co-construction. We end our paper by calling for research that bridges current understanding of translanguaging and policy and assessment strategies development.
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### 1 Introduction

Recent years have seen an increased recognition of the complexity of daily communications as translingual practice. Strict linguistic boundaries are blurred and various linguistics and non-linguistic resources are deployed to make meaning (Blackledge and Creese 2010; Li 2018, 2020; Wicaksono and Hall 2019). This is reflected through the ever-rising number of specialist articles (e.g. Danjo 2018; Tai and Li 2020, 2021a, 2021b; see also Prilutskaya 2021), journal special issues (e.g. Jones 2020; Payant and Galante 2022; Vallejo and Dooly 2020) and edited volumes on topics related to translanguage and plurilingualism (e.g. Moore et al. 2020; Piccardo et al. 2021; Tian et al. 2020). There is also evidence of wider interest as translanguage studies begin to feature in publication outlets which target non-specialist audiences as well (e.g. Brooks 2022 – ELTJ review issue; Lovell 2019 – in the Conversation). Despite the apparent enthusiasm, especially in the European and Northern American contexts where translanguage and plurilingualism have most resonance (Vallejo and Dooly 2020), hesitancy of embracing such practices, particularly inside the classroom persists (e.g. Martin 2005; Probyn 2009). Even though a rich body of empirical work has long documented the prevalence of L1 use (e.g. García and Otheguy 2020; Hall 2020; Pennycook 1989, 2008; Smith 2003) and indeed their potentially facilitative functions (e.g. Hall and Cook 2012; Lin and Martin 2005), the utilisation of a person’s full repertoire of resources in the classroom (Zhu et al. 2020) including their L1 remains the elephant in the room, something to be frowned upon (Hall 2020) and translanguage practice is considered “inappropriate” (Li and Lin 2019). The reluctance to use or even resistance to using non-target language inside the classroom is arguably attributable to the perpetuating “(mono)lingual bias” in the field of language learning and teaching (see Block 2014; Liu et al. 2020; Zhu et al. 2020) as well as the misapplication of second language acquisition research findings (see Spada 2015). There is thus a need to communicate and raise awareness of the strong evidence base that supports the normalcy and the potential benefits of translanguage practices to language learners and teachers (Coffey and Leung 2020; Hall 2020; Tian and Shepard-Carey 2020).
Our study aims to speak to the theory and practice divide by providing analyses of Taiwanese (L1 Mandarin) English as a second language (ESL) university classroom discourse in a translinguaging space, which demonstrate the beneficial effect such a space can have on progressing classroom instructions (including scaffolding). We argue that when a liberating translinguaging space is allowed, learners can benefit from the complementary effects that different deployed resources bring which in turn facilitate negotiations and understanding. We also illustrate how the translinguaging space and the translanguaging stance it espouses together allow students to take on non-traditional roles inside the classroom to challenge authority and engage in deeper learning. The discussion of our data below contributes further supporting evidence, as called for by Lin (2022), to convince educators of the possibilities that can be opened by embracing the translinguaging space where language users’ full repertoire of resources is utilised.

The remainder of this article first provides a brief account of translanguaging and translinguaging space. It then reviews research on translanguaging in classrooms, and scaffolding before providing contextual information about Taiwanese ESL classrooms. The methodology is then discussed, followed by data analyses. It ends with some concluding remarks advocating translanguaging practices inside classrooms, highlighting the deeper student engagement it stimulates and their possibility of disrupting the traditionally rigid power structure.

1.1 Translanguaging and translinguaging space

Williams’s (1994) and Baker’s (2001) pioneering work in Welsh classrooms, which reported observations of apparently seamless communications in and across English and Welsh, spearheaded investigations into translinguaging (see Lewis et al. 2012a, 2012b for the development of the term; see also Mufwene 2001). In addition to exploring translingual exchanges, later translanguaging work has extended their scope to include multi-/trans-modality, and the relationship between language and semiotic repertoires in and outside classrooms (e.g. García and Li 2014; Tai and Li 2020, 2021a, 2021b; Zhu et al. 2017a, 2017b). For example, Pennycook and Otsuji (2014: 161) highlighted how linguistic resources and urban space are interlinked when they coined “spatial repertoires”. Li’s (2011, 2018) “translinguaging space” aims to capture the creativity, fluidity, multimodality, multi-historicity, and multifaceted nature of (multilingual) communications and language. He describes a translinguaging space as:

a space that is created by and for Translanguaging practices, and a space where language users break down the ideologically laden dichotomies between the macro and the micro, the societal and the individual, and the social and the psychological through interaction. A Translanguaging Space allows language users to integrate social spaces (and thus ‘linguistic codes’) that have been formerly separated through different practices in different places (Li 2018: 23).
It is a space where speakers “bring together different dimensions of their personal history, experience and environment, their attitude, belief and ideology, their cognitive and physical capacity into coordinated and meaningful performance” (Li 2011: 1223). Translanguaging is, therefore, not only about going between various linguistic, cognitive, semiotic systems and modalities, but going beyond them (e.g. W. Li 2020). We argue below that translanguaging and translanguaging space provide a useful lens to understand ESL/EFL classroom interactions where various multimodal resources (e.g. linguistic and paralinguistic codes, gestures, realia, etc.) are deployed and “orchestrated” (Zhu et al. 2020) to make meaning and perform pedagogical functions.

1.2 Translanguaging and the classroom

Underscoring the facilitative functions of translanguaging and a translanguaging space, Lin and He (2017) demonstrate that translanguaging is practised by a science teacher in a content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classroom in Hong Kong (HK) to motivate and engage South Asian ethnic minority students despite the monological school and governmental policies. They argue that translanguaging helps “to bridge communication disconnects, to activate creative thinking […] to motivate learning, and to affirm learners’ ethnic/cultural identities” (243) and should therefore be embraced. Similarly, Tai and Li (2020, 2021a, 2021b) suggest that a safe space for co-learning is created by translanguaging practice in a secondary English as a medium of instructions (EMI) mathematics classroom in HK. Students are able to use multilingual, multimodal, multisensory resources and real-world knowledge to learn new maths concepts collaboratively and negotiate meaning. Moreover, in the translanguaging space, learners are able to utilise playful language to challenge or even “transgress” the imbalanced classroom power relationship. It is also worth noting, however, that translanguaging and plurilingual practices are not always welcomed because of entrenched “either-or”, “binary” thinking (i.e. either L1 or L2) in curriculum design, assessment, and more generally the conceptualisation of language (Lin 2020).

In Taiwan, EMI has been promoted by the government and school stakeholders (National Development Council Ministry of Education 2021). But there is evidence that multilingual and multimodal resources are being deployed in different classrooms. Kao’s (2022) recent study of 422 in-service teachers shows that although translanguaging is a new concept to many in Taiwan, various language and semiotic/para-linguistic resources are used daily among teachers of different subjects to a varying degree. While elementary and middle school English teachers employ English and other semiotic resources, middle school content teachers prefer using L1 to
reinforce subject learning. Kao suggests that the “translanguaging approach has expanded the linguistics practices and empowered the use of other meaning-making signs that are typically less valued in school” (1). Lin (2022) discusses the variability and complexity of language use and choice in Taiwanese university engineering and science lab meetings among culturally and linguistically diverse students and professors. Through 53 interviews, Lin discovers that “language choice was subject to constant negotiations among all lab members, leading to dynamic flows and configurations of translanguaging” but “not all language choices are equally inclusive and conducive to learning for all members” (117) because of the local-global tension between Taiwanese students’ preference of (Mandarin) Chinese and international students’ preference of using lingua franca English, each choice including/excluding certain groups. Lin ends by calling for more research with discourse data to identify “optimal” translanguaging practices. Hence our study attempts to provide classroom data and explore pedagogical functions/scaffolding in a translanguaging space.

1.3 Scaffolding

Scaffolding was initially described as an “interactional instructional relationship” between adults and learners that “enables a child or novice to solve a problem […] beyond his unassisted efforts” (Bruner 1983; Wood et al. 1976: 90). In a classroom setting, it can be understood as “a type of teacher assistance that helps students learn new skills, concepts, or levels of understanding that leads to the student successfully completing a task, a specific learning activity with finite goals” (Maybin et al. 1992: 88). Scaffolding can take many forms, from clarification check to error correction, so long as they are aimed at assisting learners.

Translanguaging practice can also be used as a means of scaffolding, such as progression of lesson and clarification of misunderstanding/confusion (Li 2011, 2018). Feller’s (2022) longitudinal investigation of a third-grade bilingual classroom in Portugal provides a recent example of how translanguaging is used to teach content and establish communication in natural and social sciences and English language lessons. Feller shows that scaffolding is not limited to teacher-initiated sequences, but learners also actively scaffold each other’s contributions to advance their understanding of a target concept/structure, concurring with our analyses below.

Our study is guided by the overarching question: how does a translanguaging space facilitate scaffolding in an ESL classroom in higher education in the UK? This is addressed through examining: (1) how scaffolding is carried out in the translanguaging space, and (2) how the teacher and students co-construct learning and (3) how students share their perspective to challenge the classroom power structure.
2 Methodology

This study is based on two UK university ESL classrooms informed by ideas from Cognitive Linguistics taught by the first author. Data came from three-week video-recorded observations, totalling 27 h. Semiotic resources, including cognitive maps, semantic tables, and in-class tasks were utilised while designing the teaching materials (see Appendix). The classroom is a translanguaging space by design, as the materials tapped into similarities and differences between concept constructions across L1 Mandarin and L2 English (e.g. conceptualisation of metaphors, categorisation, etc.). Materials focused on the conceptual understanding of the adverbial particles or prepositions used in phrasal verbs (multi-word constructions).1

Translanguaging practice is evident in the entire corpus of recordings. For this paper, we focus on episodes of scaffolding and classroom interactions where verbal and non-verbal resources are employed (i.e. gaze, facial expression, gesture, hand movement, and object manipulation). We have selected two extracts that belong to two different modes in Walsh’s Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) framework that are characterised by different interactional features to demonstrate 1) the prevalence of fluid and dynamic use of speakers’ diverse communication repertoire in the translanguaging classroom space and 2) how they act as scaffolding to progress instructions (see Section 3).

2.1 Participants, materials and procedures

Thirteen L1 Mandarin Chinese UK university students aged 18–28 (Mean = 22.9, SD = 3.20) participated. Eight were undergraduates and five postgraduates. The average length of living in English-speaking countries was 3.3 years (SD = 3.98) (see Table 1).

Participants reported having at least seven years of English learning experience. Their level was between intermediate and upper-intermediate according to IELTS scores. However, one participant did not report their English proficiency level.

Three sets of worksheets (see Appendix) were used in class. They followed an identical organisation, containing four main sections: (1) a list of ten target phrasal

---

1 The data set came from a larger study that aims to investigate the effect of ESL materials designed based on key notions in cognitive linguistics such as conceptualisation of metaphors and categorisation on the learning of phrasal verbs. In this paper, we specifically focus on the interactions in the translanguaging classroom space that’s created. Readers interested in the details of the cognitive linguistics design can refer to Lin (in press).
verbs involving two target particles, (2) two radial category diagrams and a semantic table (3) a table of example sentences, and (4) two in-class tasks: word map drawing and story creation.

The project received ethical approval from the authors’ university. Participants consented to partake and be video recorded. A small camera was used to minimise disruptions.

To identify relevant interaction episodes, each author first viewed the recordings and transcribed the data individually. Interaction data were transcribed in accordance with Jefferson's system (2004). We modelled our transcription after Jefferson’s convention in order to capture interactional details relevant to our analyses textually as adequately as possible. This is supplemented by Matsumoto’s (2019) and Zhu et al.’s system (Zhu et al. 2017b) which captures both verbal and non-verbal behaviours. Screenshots were used to demonstrate multimodal interactions.² We then selected the two episodes on which to focus (see below) and coded the data with reference to Walsh’s (2011) SETT framework of classroom discourse. Next, we compared and resolved transcription discrepancies by repeatedly watching recordings together. We then collectively and iteratively interrogated the data to analyse the moment-by-moment interactions and pedagogical functions achieved in the translanguaging space to reach the interpretations offered below.

² We also note the recent work by Tai (2023) which may provide an even more detailed framework for analysing our data, which we aim to incorporate for our future work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant¹</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education (UG = undergraduate; PG = postgraduate)</th>
<th>Years of learning English</th>
<th>Years spent in an English-speaking country</th>
<th>IELTS scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FS01</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS02</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS03</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS04</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS05</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS06</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS07</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG01</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG02</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG03</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG04</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG05</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG06</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹FS = frame semantics class, CG = categorisation class.
3 Data analysis and discussion

Here, we present our analysis and commentary on two selected extracts. The extracts representing different modes in the SETT framework (Walsh 2011: 113) are marked by distinctive pedagogical goals and interactional features. Extract 1, containing 4 episodes/sections, is largely representative of the skills and systems mode where there is attention to forms. Extended teacher turns and instructions scaffolding are some of the interactional features involved in this mode. Extract 2, comprising two overlapping episodes/sections, is a mixture of the materials-oriented mode and classroom context mode where language is practised and learners express themselves. Its interactional features include both learners’ and teachers’ turns and clarification requests. We demonstrate that naturally flowing translanguaging practice contributed to the scaffolding of instructions, such as progression of lesson, clarification of misunderstanding/confusion, stimulating (non) verbal responses and co-construction of knowledge.

3.1 Extract 1: Scaffolding of instructions

Extract 1 is a transcript of the explanation of the difference between off and away. It came from a session that aimed at establishing a conceptual understanding of English particles on and off in phrasal verbs. Teacher-student interactions took place multilingually and multimodally aided by verbal (L1 and L2) and non-verbal resources (e.g. nods, gestures, and realia). Teacher (T) initiated the sequence by discussing a question raised by FS01 in the previous turn: how to distinguish the uses between off and away. T’s explanation utilised a real-life object, a flask, as well as multilingual resources including Mandarin Chinese. Detailed analyses below demonstrate that scaffolding is achieved by translanguaging.

**Extract 1**: Constructing concept of off and away through a flask (i.e. realia) in a translanguaging space.

Videorecord_UK-FS-2-20170207_00.14.38-00.15.46

Speakers: T (teacher); FS01 (student 1); FS02 (student 2); FS03 (student 3); FS04 (student 4); FS05 (student 5); FS06 (student 6); FS07 (student 7); All (all 7 students)

Extract 1.1 (turn 1–19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Verbal/non-verbal action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Ok. I would like to mention it here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>The &lt;differences&gt; between &lt;off&gt; and &lt;away&gt;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Most of their meanings are similar. (raising her hands to make a circle in the air)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Verbal/non-verbal action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Just {her right hand touching the surface of the desk} not touch (clapping both of her hands to make a sound-emphasising not touch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Lost of contact {using her left hand touching the surface of the desk twice}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>But:: the differences between off and away is like (.) {moving her hands forward and backward}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>For example:: {picking up a lid and a flask in front of students} (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>I put this {pointed at the lid}, I put the lid on the cup (1.0) {placing the lid on top of the flask}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>This is on, right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>(all students gazing at the teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>So, (0.5) I take it off {removing the lid from top of the flask} (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>(all students gazing at the teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>But:: off would be here {indicating the surface of the desk} (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>But:: if I say, I took this away {holding the lid to be further away from the flask}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>(all students gazing at the teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Probably somewhere else (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>But:: not ready to access:: (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>&gt;Got it&lt;? {the right hand's index finger indicating up} (FS01, FS03, FS06 nodded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>&gt;This is&lt; the difference between off and away (moving the lid forward and backward towards the direction of the flask) (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>聽懂吗? (tīng dòng ma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Understood? (FS06 nodded – continued to the next turn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>FS02</td>
<td>Mm, Hm (FS02, FS01 nodding)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 22   | T        | Off 的話就是 ( ) 我就是分開 ( ) 但是 ( ) 我可能馬上又可以拿得到.
Off de huà jù shì, wǒ jiù shì fēn kāi dàn shì wǒ kě néng mǎ shàng yǒu kě yǐ ná dé dào
Off means separate but it can be retrieved immediately {moving the lid forward and backward towards the direction of the flask} (1.0) |
3.1.1 Episode 1: Similar concept of “off” and “away”

In turn 1–2, T responded to FS01’s question by uttering “OK. I would like to mention it here. The differences between off and away” and by raising her hands to make a circle in the air (turn 3). In turn 3–5, T first discussed the shared concepts between off and away by saying “Most of their meanings are similar. Just not touch. Loss of contact.” Simultaneously, T clapped her hands (turn 4) and used her left hand to tap the desk twice to attract students’ attention. After the similarity was introduced, T continued by offering an account of the conceptual difference between off and away (turn 6–17). To clarify students’ understanding, T had an extended turn while holding a flask with its lid on hand to demonstrate...
the different spatial configuration of *off* and *away*. Initially, T placed the lid on top of the flask to remind students of the spatial concept of *on* and said “I put this, I put the lid on the cup” (turn 8). T recapitulated the concept of *on* (i.e. confirmation check) by saying “This is on, right?” (turn 9). All students responded to T’s question by gazing at the teacher (turn 10) to confirm their understanding. T moved on to *off* in turn 11 by uttering “So I take it off” to contrast its opposite spatial relationship with *on* while simultaneously removing the lid from top of the flask. Joint-attention and common understanding are achieved, signalled by students’ gaze at the teacher’s direction (turn 12).

### 3.1.2 Episode 2: Different concept of “off” and “away”

In turn 13, T directed students’ attention back to *off* by using her finger to point to the surface of the desk. These verbal and gestural resources provided the setup for explaining the spatial concept of *away* in turn 14 which is accompanied by visual and semiotic references, i.e. holding the lid further away from the flask. Again, all students gazed at the teacher as joint-attention is achieved (turn 15). T then provided further explanations of the spatial concept of *away* in turn 16–17 by uttering “probably somewhere else” and “but not ready to access”. After an extended teacher turn, T attempted to check students’ understanding by the confirmation check, “Got it?” (turn 18) and holding up her right index finger. In response to T’s initiation, FS01, FS03 and FS06 nodded (turn 18). In turn 19, T complemented the spatial meaning difference between *off* and *away* previously established by verbalising, “This is the difference between off and away” and reinforcing through referencing semiotic resources, i.e. moving the lid backward and forward towards the flask (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1: The teacher is using a flask to demonstrate the concept of off and away and indicate the movement of directions.](image)
3.1.3 Episode 3: 聽懂嗎 (tīng dǒng ma)/understood?

In turn 20, T attempted to concept check by asking “聽懂嗎 (tīng dǒng ma)? (understood?)” in Mandarin to invite students’ responses. FS06 nodded in response. Others responded in the subsequent turn to confirm their understanding (FS02’s “Mm Hm”, FS01’s and FS02’s nod, and FS06’s nod continued from the previous turn). *tīng dǒng ma* (understood?) functions to open up the floor for learners’ contributions and clarification requests, and it also serves as a discourse marker that focuses/grabs students’ attention on the content/explanation to follow.

3.1.4 Episode 4: Translanguaging practice: multimodality

After the concept check question, T reiterated the spatial concept of *off* in Mandarin by uttering “Off 的話就是, 我就是分開但是我可能馬上又可以拿到得 (Off means separate but then the thing can be retrieved immediately)” in turn 22 and concurrently moving the lid back and forth towards the direction of the flask. In turn 23, T restated that *away* is different from *off* by saying “但是 *away* 是分開但是它有距離 (but *away*, it means separated with distance)” in Mandarin and holding the lid further away from the flask. Upon hearing T’s explanation, FS01 gazed at FS04 to seek confirmation. FS04 nodded in response to confirm her understanding (turn 24). T elaborated on *away* by uttering “而且可能不是我馬上, 我要拿我就可以 (and I cannot access it immediately)” in Mandarin while continuing to hold the lid away from the flask to highlight the distance (turn 25). T added “懂我意思?” (Got what I mean?) in turn 26 as a gap-filler and a concept check question to allow students to ask questions if they do not follow. It also acts as a bridge for a further illustrative verbal example in turn 27, “I throw things away”. It is noteworthy that T continued to deploy spatial resource to supplement/complement her verbal explanations by maintaining the position of the far-away held lid. FS01 nodded and continued doing so till the next turn to acknowledge her understanding. T repeated her verbal explanation in turn 28, but reconfigured her semiotic resources by virtually grabbing with her left hand and then performing a throw-away motion to reinforce the “away” position of the right hand. FS03 confirmed her understanding by nodding. Finally, T uttered “有距離了 (It has distance)” in turn 29 and “distance” in turn 30 while waving the lid in the air with her right hand to complete her response/explanation to FS01’s question regarding the use of *off* and *away*.

Through the four episodes above we saw how scaffolding is carried out in the translanguaging space (sub-RQ1). It can be seen that instructions progressed
naturally and understanding is achieved through the meaningful “orchestration” (Li 2018; Zhu et al. 2020) of linguistic and semiotic repertoires (i.e. linguistic cues, gestures, hand movements, pointing, eye contact, and realia) in the translanguaging space (see also Tai 2022 for teacher’s translanguaging in dealing with contingencies or lack of student response). Importantly, the deployment and coordination of multimodal and multisensory resources are not simply an act of “translation” (translating L2 into L1), but a progressive scaffolding act that adds different layers of meaning to the overall explanation, thereby creating the opportunity for potentially engaging learners in deeper processing and learning through the activation of various cognitive functions (i.e. visual, spatial, (para-)linguistic). This resonates with the perceived benefits of multimodal practices including retaining and deepening knowledge reported by M. Li (2020).

3.2 Extract 2: Co-construction of learning through discussion

Unlike the previous extract involving extended teacher turns, Extract 2 involves multi-directional exchanges, therefore it provides opportunities for us to illustrate how the teacher and students co-construct learning (sub-RQ2) and how students share their perspective to challenge the classroom power structure (sub-RQ3). The extract was taken from the exercise phase of the class when students tackled the worksheet assigned which targets the adverbial particles/prepositions taught. The analyses below illustrate how students are empowered to contribute and cross-validate their understanding with their teacher and/or their peers to co-construct understanding. It is also useful to note that the horseshoe seating arrangement which conveys a more egalitarian stance contributed to opening up the possibility for students to “challenge” authority, thereby reinforcing the idea that a translanguaging space affords the utilisation of linguistic (i.e., linguistic repertoires) and non-linguistic resources (e.g. spatial repertoires, semiotic resources) in the meaning making process.

Extract 2 compromises two overlapping episodes. The first episode involves CG01’s contributions to cross-check her understanding of the ego perspective and container metaphor with the teacher. Concurrently, CG05 was disputing 退 (tuì) as down with his peers, foregrounding the horizontal dimension of 退去 (tuì qù), i.e. out. As opposed to classroom discourse work that largely focuses on interactions where turn-taking is relatively smooth, the extend overlaps or rather multiplicity of interactions this extract features and captures reflect the “messiness” of classroom, something with which research have not always honestly engaged (Jones 2020: 536).
**Extract 2:** Co-construction of learning through discussion of *coming in* and *out*.

Videorocors_UK-CG-1-20170203_00.34.57-00.36.21

Speakers: T (teacher); CG01 (student 8); CG02 (student 9); CG03 (student 10); CG04 (student 11); CG05 (student 12); CG06 (student 13); All (all 6 students)

**Extract 2.1** (turn 1–13); **Extract 2.2** (turn 14–27); **Extract 2.3** (turn 28–43); **Extract 2.4** (turn 44–55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Verbal/non-verbal action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | T       | 你看我們中文是退, >對不對<?  
             *nǐ kàn wǒ men zhòng wén shì tuì, dui bù dui?*  
             *You see in Mandarin Chinese it means decline, right?* |
| 2    | CG01    | Mm, hm!  
             ((nodding her head)) |
| 3    | T       | 退反而是 down.  
             *tuì fǎn ér shì down*  
             *In other words, decline is down.* |
| 4    | T       | 但是英文不是哦!  
             *dàn shì yīng wén bù shì ò!*  
             *But it does not mean the same in English!* |
| 5    | CG01/CG05/CG06 | ((looking at the direction of the teacher))  
             *yīng wén shì*  
             *In English is*  
             *(1.0)* |
| 6    | T       | 我剛剛跟你講 <come in>  
             *wǒ gāng gāng gēn nǐ jiāng come in*  
             *I just told you about come in* |
| 7    | T       | 所以當然是 <go>=  
             *suǒ yí dāng rán shì go*  
             *Of course! It means go* |
| 8    | CG01    | 可是你不是說那個  
             *kě shì nǐ bù shì shuō nà gè*  
             *But you just said*  
             *((raising and waving her right hand and pointing at the teacher)) |
| 9    | CG01    | 那個叫什麼東西! Come out  
             *nà gè jiào shì me dōng xī come out*  
             *What is it! Come out* |
| 10   | CG05    | [沒有啊!]*  
             *méi yǒu ò!*  
             *No* |
| 11   | CG01    | [Come in]  
             *tui shì wǎng hòu zǒu* |

*Lin and Leung*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Verbal/non-verbal action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Retreat is moving back</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{moving his both hands towards himself and looking at the direction of the teacher at the same time}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG03/CG06</td>
<td></td>
<td>(((looking at CG01)))]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Come in那个 waves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Come in nà gè waves</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Particularly waves come in</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CG01</td>
<td>[&gt;對對對&lt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dui dui dui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG03/CG05/CG06</td>
<td></td>
<td>(((looking at each other))]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG06</td>
<td></td>
<td>[退回去嗎?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tuì huí qù ma?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Moving back?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>CG01</td>
<td>[可是 (.) 它是進入那個地方]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kě shì tā shì jìn rù nà gè dì fang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>But it enters that place</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG05</td>
<td></td>
<td>[對啊! 退不就是回去嗎?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dui ò tui bù jiù huí qù ma?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes! Isn’t retreat moving back?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>CG01</td>
<td>可是 (.) 對它來說, 它是出去啊!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kě shì dui tā lái shuō tā shì chū qu à</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>But for it, it means going out!</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>對它?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dui tā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>For whom?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG05</td>
<td></td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{moving his hands towards himself}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>CG01</td>
<td>[對於 wave 本身來說]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dui yú wave běn shēn lái shuō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>From the wave’s perspective</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG06</td>
<td></td>
<td>[回漲 (looking at CG05])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>huí zhǎng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Move back and go up</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>CG05</td>
<td>[就是退啊!]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>jiù shì tuì ò</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>That is retreat!</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[{(gradually raising his right hand up and left hand below)}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>喔! 對.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wǒ! dui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Oh! Yes.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20  T  可是你要看你對應的.
    kě shì nǐ yào kàn nǐ duì yìng de
    It depends on what you compare and contrast

21  T  Because we say (.) big waves come in where?

22  T  這有個 container.
    zhè yǒu gè container
    There is a container

23  CG01  就是要看它後面那個-
        jiù shì yào kàn tā hòu miàn nà gè
        Look at what is behind that
        {using her right hand drawing a circle in the air}

24  T  對，就是它的 container
    duì jiù shì tā de container
    Yes, then it would be the container

25  T  你要看誰是 container?
    nǐ yào kàn shuí shì container?
    You have to check what the container is?

26  T  所以(.) container是 <海岸線>
    suǒ yǐ container shì hǎi àn xiàn
    So the container is the shoreline

27  CG01  所以對它來說 (.) 它是 in.
        suǒ yǐ duì tā lái shuō tā shì in
        So it means that waves are moving into the container

28  T  對.
    duì
    Yes

29  T  它是進來有沒有?
    tā shì jìn lái yǒu méi yǒu?
    They are coming in, right?

30  T  就是我懂 =
    jiù shì wǒ dǒng
    I got it

31  T  = 你是覺得 big wave 是一個 container.
    nǐ shì jiào dé big wave shì yī gè container
    So you think big wave is considered as a container

32  T  但是 (.) no
    dàn shì no
    But no

33  T  In here (.) in this sentence

34  T  We say (.) it’s coming in.
    (1.0)
suǒ yǐ 它如果退潮呢?
What if the tide is moving away from the shore?

It's not up and down. 直线的

It's moving back and forth in the horizontal sense. 平衡的.
Turn | Speaker | Verbal/non-verbal action
--- | --- | ---
52 | T | 移動．
yí dòng
Movement
53 | T | 直線的移動．
zhí xiàn de yí dòng
Linear movement
54 | T | Yeh.
(3.0)
55 | All | ((looking back to the teaching materials))

Transcription conventions
The video-recorded interactions were transcribed according to the list below. It mainly follows the Jefferson's (2004) transcription system, and the notation for multimodal transcription were adapted from Matsumoto (2019).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0.6)</td>
<td>Timed pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>Brief pause, less than 0.2 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Overlapping speech/non-vocal actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>The break and subsequent continuation of an interrupted utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Interruption in utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>Falling intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>Continuing intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!</td>
<td>Exclamatory pitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>::</td>
<td>Prolongation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;text&gt;</td>
<td>Speech delivered more slowly than usual for the speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;text&gt;</td>
<td>Speech delivered more rapidly than usual for the speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underline</td>
<td>Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>italics</em></td>
<td>Transliteration of Mandarin Chinese in pinyin &amp; broad translation in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((moving hands))</td>
<td>Non-verbal action that is not synchronised with speech; transcriber's descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{moving hands}</td>
<td>Non-verbal action that is synchronised with speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>()</td>
<td>The ungotten talk; unintelligible speech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1 Episode 1: Cross-checking ego perspective and container metaphor
Prior to this stream of interactions, T introduced an English particle, *in*, as a container metaphor that can be used to describe waves coming onshore with the
shoreline being the boundary of the container. In turn 1, T attempted to contrast the representation of the wave movement in English and Mandarin by a display question “你看我們中文是退, 對不對? (i.e. You see in Mandarin Chinese it means decline, right it?)” and sought agreement/confirmation in the following turns. However, in turn 8, 9, and 11, CG01 raised and clarified her question in English and Mandarin as “那個叫什麼東西! (What is it!) Come out, come in.” T rephrased CG01’s question in turn 12: “Come in那個 (particularly) waves.” CG01 confirmed that her question was understood in turn 13 by saying 對 (yes) thrice. CG01 continued her utterance in turn 14: “可是它是進入那個地方 (But it enters that place)” and turn 15 (see Figure 2): “可是對它來說它是出去啊! (But for it, it means going out). It was unclear for T what the pronoun (i.e. 它 it) referred to, so she asked: “對它? (i.e. For whom?)” in turn 16. CG01 clarified her question: “對於wave本身來說 (i.e., from the wave’s perspective)” in turn 17. T responded to CG01’s question by uttering: “可是你要看你對應的 (It depends on what you compare and contrast)” in Mandarin (turn 20). T repeated her explanation in English: “Because we say big waves come in where?” (turn 21) and added in a combination of Mandarin and English: “這有個 container (There is a container)” (turn 22). Also in turn 26, T briefly emphasised that the shoreline is considered as the boundary of the container in Mandarin and English: “所以container是海岸線 (So the container is the shoreline), which illustrated that T aimed to ensure the student’s uptake of the container concept. CG01 checked her understanding by uttering in English and Mandarin: “所以對它來說它是 in (So it means that waves are moving into the container)” in turn 27. As soon as T realised CG01’s previous ego perspective on the container concept, she said: “就是我懂 (I got it) in turn 30 and then went back to the student’s previous opinion about the container concept by uttering in English and Mandarin: “你是覺得 big wave 是一個 container (So you think the big wave is a container)” in turn 31. In this episode, both the teacher and CG01 were translanguaging in formulating the clarification request and subsequent scaffolding acts in lockstep. At the same time, real-world knowledge about the movement of waves was drawn upon to aid understanding and establish common ground, in manner similar to how out-of-school knowledge was called upon to understand mathematical concepts in an EMI maths class in Hong Kong (Tai and Li 2020).

3.2.2 Episode 2: Disputing the concepts between “down” and “out”

While CG01 was interacting with T on the left side of the room, CG05 was disputing the contrast previously set up by T (i.e. the equivalent of 退 (tuì) is down) with his peers on the right. In turn 11, while CG01 was asking a question to T, CG05 initiated his query/dispute by verbalising a declarative sentence in Mandarin: “退是往後走 (Retreat is moving back).” Acknowledging the potential validity of CG05’s contribution, CG03 and CG06 exchanged eye-gaze with each other and CG05 without attending
to the exchange between CG01 and T that was happening concurrently. CG06 responded to CG05 in Mandarin: “退回去嗎? (Moving back?)” (turn 13). CG05 replied in Mandarin: “對啊! 退不就是回去嗎? (Yes! Isn’t retreat moving back?)” (turn 14). CG05 had an unintelligible utterance and moved his hands toward himself in turn 16. Later in turn 17 while gazing at CG05, CG06 elaborated her interpretation by saying: “回漲 (huí zhǎng) (Move back and go up)” in Mandarin (see Figure 3). CG05 insisted on his opinion by saying: “就是退啊! (That is retreat!)” in Mandarin and gradually raising his right hand and lowering his left (turn 18) (see Figure 4). At that point, CG05 and CG06 tried to establish eye-contact with T and CG01 to bid for attention, potentially attempting to bring in T to resolve the dispute/debate (see Figure 5), but T and CG01 were still engrossed in their discussion until turn 34, so that bid for attention was not successful.

Upon the completion of the interaction between T and CG01 in turn 34, T then bid for the attention of the entire class by asking another display question “所以它如果退潮呢? (What if the tide is moving away from the shore?)” (turn 35) in an attempt to direct their attention back to the similarities and differences of using in and out as well as up and down in English and Mandarin. T regained the whole class’s attention between turn 37 and 39. Following T’s question, some students looked at her to show their awareness and CG05 responded: “coming out” (turn 37) and T added: “Or going out” (turn 38). Most students acknowledged their understanding by gazing at T or nodding. T further clarified the use of up and down in English, distinguishing them from the ones used in Mandarin, so she uttered in
Figure 3: The student is disputing the use of 退 (tui) with his peer.

Figure 4: The student is using hand movements to express his opinion.
Mandarin and English: “因為中文的漲和退是 up and down (Waves coming in and out is described as up and down in Mandarin)” (turn 42) and added: “它講的是中間 (The meaning is based on the middle of the wave motion)” (turn 43). She then contrasted that with English where the attention of the motion is given to the beginning of the process in her Mandarin utterance, “可是英文反而講的是最前面的這個動作 (But in English the meaning relies on the beginning of the wave motion.)” in turn 44. CG05 latched onto the opportunity in turn 46 to raise his query “退不是指前後的退嗎? (Doesn’t retreat mean moving back and forth [in the horizontal sense]?)” in Mandarin and moving his hands back and forth (turn 46–47). T agreed by responding in English: “Ya! So in and out can be horizontal” (turn 48) and continued to utter in Mandarin (turn 49): “有沒有? (Right?)”; simultaneously, CG05 responded in Mandarin: “對 (Yes)”. T realised that the student might have been confused over the polysemous Mandarin Chinese character “退 (tuì)” as it can refer to declining (the concept of down) or retreating (the concept of out). Thus, T highlighted the spatial sense of in and out in terms of linear movement in Mandarin (turn 53): “直線的移動 (zhí xiàn de yí dòng)” when she finally attempted to resolve CG05’s dispute between 退 (tuì) as down and 退 (tuì) as out.

In this episode, we saw that students are actively engaging in multi-lingual and multi-modal translanguaging to clarify understanding and dispute concepts presented in class, and in turn co-construct knowledge with both their peers and the
teacher. We noted above that the seating arrangement might have facilitated the disruption of the traditional power structure (i.e. high-power, teacher dominated classroom). GG05’s vocal and gestural contributions could have been viewed as face-threatening, but arguably the “translanguaging stance” (Zhu et al. 2020) adopted by the teacher verbally as well as spatially has transpired. This signalled to students that this classroom is a safe space for them to question or even challenge in order to reach common understanding. Thus, in a translanguaging space, students are able to take advantage and truly engage with/initiate knowledge co-construction instead of being a passive learner merely “receiving” knowledge. The learners’ deeper engagement is reflected through the multi-directional flow of interactions and the heavy overlap of turn-taking (i.e. the messiness of the classroom). Similar practice has been observed in other classrooms where learners are empowered to actively engage in the co-construction of knowledge afforded in the translanguaging space (e.g. Tai and Li 2021a) as well as in linguistic field work where the power imbalance between “researcher” and “the researched” can be redressed through translanguaging practices (e.g. Nemouchi and Holmes 2022).

4 Conclusion and implications

Our study set out to address the question: how does a translanguaging space facilitate scaffolding in an ESL classroom in higher education in the UK? It is among the first to answer the plead by Lin (2022) who calls for much needed empirical evidence based on analyses of actual classroom interactions. Our paper has demonstrated how “flexible multilingual practice” (Li and Zhu 2013) is naturally employed in L2 classrooms. In addition to documenting the translanguaging episodes, we have identified and analysed the pedagogical functions translanguaging helped perform. Our analyses show that the teacher and learners utilise both linguistic and non-linguistic resources at their disposal to make sense of the learning content and co-construct knowledge in situ. On that basis, we argue that opening up the translanguaging space aids the scaffolding of instructions and understanding, which in turn helps achieve the pedagogical goal, i.e. enhancing understanding of the phrasal verbs/multi-word constructions. By providing excerpts and analyses that illustrate the facilitative functions of a translanguaging space and translingual practices, we are calling for the acknowledgement and acceptance of the power of translanguaging pedagogies. Educators who subscribe to such a view can help unlock the potentials afforded by such practices (García and Kleifgen 2010; Jones and Lewis 2014).

As seen through our analyses, translanguaging encourages and empowers all participants (students and teachers) to share their knowledge and experience, co-construct knowledge, and even challenge authority in a classroom (e.g. Extract 2),
which in turn allows participants to embrace the beauty of linguistic diversity (García and Li 2014). The spontaneous and smooth-flowing translanguaging practices analysed above supported various pedagogical goals, such as scaffolding instructions, seeking clarifications/validation (e.g. Extract 1). The translanguaging stance empowers students to break the cultural stereotype of the “reticent Asian/Chinese student” and take ownership of their learning. Learners and the teacher in our study did not follow a script (cf. Tai 2022), but are nonetheless able to reach common ground in the translanguaging space. Therefore, once we are able to see past the straitjacket of monolingual pedagogy/(mono)lingual bias, it becomes obvious that these seemingly “innovative” deployment of and seamless shuffle between linguistic (various named languages) and non-linguistics resources are simply the normal day-to-day reality of multilingual communications and situated sense-making inside the classroom (see literature review) and beyond (Canagarajah 2022; W. Li 2020; see also Danjo 2018 on Japanese-English multilingual family interactions; Li 2018 for examples of multilingual exchanges among Singaporeans).

That said, one should also recognise that although research on translanguaging has made great strides in recent years, in some contexts a translanguaging space is not always available if not outright prohibited due to constraints imposed by the national/local policy, for instance, in target-language-only EMI schools. That is not to say that translanguaging does not take place in those contexts, but whether or not teachers and students have the agency to decide how they can benefit from translanguaging might be more restricted than in a setting such as the present study where participation was voluntary and the stake was low (i.e. non-credit bearing). Arguably, this discrepancy and disconnect between policy and practice is what led to the imbalanced status of and values attached to different communicative resources (cf. Canagarajah 2022) which in turn lead to some of the dilemmas that teachers face (see introduction). This divide is something that teacher educators and applied linguists must attempt to confront and tackle.

The data we presented help illustrate that there is much to be gained from adopting a translanguaging classroom vis-à-vis enhancing participation and depth of learning. These, in our view, provide a strong pedagogical rationale to support the opening up of a translanguaging space in the teaching and learning context. Through contributing more empirical evidence that supports the normalcy and facilitative functions of a translanguaging space, we hope to help turn the tide and reframe the utilisation of all resources (including the L1) in a more positive light. In fact, Tai and Dai (2023) have recently argued that translanguaging or the ability to be able to translanguage and utilise one’s full communication repertoire constitute an integral element to a person’s interactional competence. By advocating the translanguaging stance, we hope to help relieve teachers from the sense of guilt for “deviating” from the strict monolingual education policy (Hall 2020; Macaro 2006). Acknowledging
opportunities that translanguaging offers in the classroom and the realities of translanguaging embedded in many TESOL classrooms can not only help narrow the gap between theory and practice in TESOL but also challenge the perpetuation of the monolingual ideology. This “unlearning” of entrenched ideologies can in turn contribute to a more equitable and socially just teaching and learning environment (Li 2023), one of the goals we should all aim for as the field of language learning & teaching and applied linguistics is attempting to “decentre” and “decolonialise” (Kumaravadivelu 2016; Ortaçtepe Hart 2023; Phipps 2021). It is encouraging to see recent development of teacher training materials with a translanguaging/pluri-lingual orientation (e.g. Galante et al. 2022). Emerging research which targets policy changes/rethink in both pedagogy and assessments (e.g. Cenoz and Gorter 2020, 2022; Wang 2022), we believe, is the next logical endeavour towards fruitfully embracing translanguaging practices.
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