

<u>Workshop ID :</u>	36
<u>Workshop Duration :</u>	Workshop - 1 Day
<u>Workshop Title :</u>	Translanguaging and its kin: Opening the debate
<u>Workshop Leader :</u>	Rakesh Bhatt, University of Illinois

Progress in sociolinguistic theory is evident when significant generalizations that are theoretically recalcitrant become suddenly expressible with a shift in perspective. Recent research in sociolinguistics (of globalization, of mobility) seems to move beyond the post-modern models of language use by engaging with Vertovec's (2007) model of super-diversity (cf. Blommaert&Rampton 2011). The tools, techniques, and terms used in language and super-diversity, especially the theoretical construct of 'TRANSLANGUAGING' (García 2009, Creese&Blackledge 2010, Li 2011; cf. also, polylinguaging (Jørgensen et al. 2011), transidiomatic practices (Jacquemet 2005), translingual practice (Canagarajah 2012), and multilinguaging (Nguyen 2012)), are introduced to address the profound alteration of the landscape of sociolinguistic inquiry, engendering a paradigm shift (Blommaert 2010). Inherent in these new coinages is the idea that old and established terms such as 'CODESWITCHING' lack in descriptive and explanatory adequacy in the face of highly complex 'blends' (cf. Creese&Blackledge 2010, Blommaert 2014).

In this workshop, we will focus on TRANSLANGUAGING - the theoretical construct that replaces CODESWITCHING as a descriptive-analytic term to capture the complexity of bilingual behavior in super-diverse contexts - the term of choice in language and super-diversity that purportedly captures "*new language practices* that make visible the *complexity of language exchanges*" (Garcia & Li Wei 2014:21, emphasis added). As such, the imperative in intellectual inquiry - in order to make meaningful progress in (sociolinguistic) theorization - is to ask such questions as (1) and (2):

- 1 What new generalizable knowledge is offered by theoretical constructs such as Translanguaging?
- 2 What new empirical coverage is offered by theoretical constructs such as Translanguaging?

It is important that we ask these questions so that we don't, even unwittingly, indulge in 'erasure' of established paradigms of understanding (of language, codeswitching, multilingualism) only to re-present (parts or all of) it as new, different, or paradigm-changing. These questions, specifically, allow us to evaluate the claims of the new theory, especially: how, and where, traditional paradigms fall short of explanatory adequacy; whether the creative potential of human-linguistic activity has radically changed to inspire a major recalibration of our theoretical tool-kit; and what (sets of) data would, in principle, falsify the claims of this new theoretical paradigm. It is with this caution, and armed with Occam's razor, we explore the theoretical and empirical bases of the term TRANSLANGUAGING, since much of the theoretical edifice of language and super-diversity rests on this term (and its kin).