Taiwan Journal of TESOL
Vol. 19.1, 87-120, 2022 DOI: 10.30397/TJTESOL.202204_19(1).0004

TRANSFORMING IDENTITIES AND IDEOLOGIES: CREATING TRANSLANGUAGING SPACE WITH OVERSEAS CHINESE STUDENTS IN TAIWAN

Shumin Lin
Jouyi Wu

Abstract

This study examines the relationships among language, identity, and interaction in multilingual multicultural classrooms through a case study of classroom interactions involving *qiaosheng* (overseas Chinese students). Qiaosheng education was created in the historical context of nation building in Taiwan. Qiaosheng Chinese ethnicity has been linked to Chinese language and culture. However, like foreign students, most qiaosheng are multilinguals, speaking various L1s and studying Chinese and English as L2s. While classroom interactions with foreign students have received increasing attention among applied linguistics scholars in Taiwan, classroom interactions involving qiaosheng have not. This study adopts an ethnographic and discourse-analytic approach to examine classroom interactions between an English teacher and qiaosheng in a high school for qiaosheng. Analyzing classroom discourse as well as interviews with the teacher from the theoretical lens of language socialization and language ideology, we show that through interacting with qiaosheng over time, the teacher was socialized into recognizing and subsequently addressing qiaosheng linguistic and cultural diversity by adopting a translanguaging pedagogy. We argue that when teachers recognize the taken-for-granted language ideology about qiaosheng and harness their multilingual multicultural repertoire to teach, qiaosheng can attain their maximum potential to learn when they are appreciated for their multilingual multicultural existence.

Key Words: overseas Chinese students, translanguaging, multilingualism, language ideology, language socialization

INTRODUCTION

How to best teach linguistically and culturally diverse students in the age of globalization and transnational migration is a complex and contentious issue. It is challenging for teachers – especially when the diversity of students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds is recognized and engaged in the process of teaching and learning. The challenge becomes even more complex if the teacher does not share students' languages or cultures. This complex issue surrounding language and interaction in diverse classrooms challenges teachers across educational levels and various multilingual contexts around the world.

The issue of language use in linguistically diverse classrooms has been contentious. In the applied linguistics and TESOL fields, traditionally, monolingual norms were taken for granted as "code-mixing has not been welcomed in traditional L2 classrooms" (Park, 2013, p.50). Students' L1s are regarded as interference. The existing bi/multilingual repertoires of learners are either ignored or perceived as deficits under the "monolingual bias" in SLA (Kachru, 1994). Such purist and monolingual language ideology (e.g., one should only speak the target language in the language class) has been assumed in the traditional SLA research and in the practices of second language education (Ke & Lin, 2017).

One other language ideology that plays a key role in language and education in multilingual classrooms is the Herderian or nationalist ideology of language, which equates a language (the monoglot standard) with the nation-state (Bauman & Briggs, 2003; May, 2014). Top-down national-language-only policies conflict with multilingual students' linguistic practices and identities (Farr & Song, 2011). For example, after its retreat to Taiwan in 1949, the KMT government imposed a Mandarin-only policy that banned the use of local languages (Hoklo, Hakka, etc.) in the classroom (Hsiau, 1997; Lin, 2009). Students were punished when speaking their home languages. The English-only movement in education in the U.S. is another example (Farr & Song, 2011).

The recent multilingual turn in applied linguistics recognizes the contemporary communicative reality of multilingual speakers and promotes flexible and strategic use of multiple languages in the classroom (May, 2014). Scholars have advocated "translanguaging" as pedagogy to engage and harness the entire linguistic repertoire of multilingual individuals for educational purposes (Garcia & Li, 2014). The concept of translanguaging originated from a specific historical and social context in the West to address the learning

difficulties of immigrant or minority children. Through using these children's first language (L1) in school instruction, the translanguaging approach aims to facilitate their English language learning and content mastery, show respect for their languages and cultures, and foster positive multilingual multicultural identities (Creese & Blackledge, 2011, 2015).

Over the years, translanguaging has been shown to be an effective pedagogical practice in bilingual or multilingual environments where students and teachers strategically use their entire communicative repertoire to teach and learn in language as well as content courses (Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012) in various settings, including the newly internationalized universities in non-Anglophone countries (He, et al., 2017; Lin, 2018, 2022; Mazak & Carroll, 2017). Despite the monolingual policy for the EMI (English-medium instruction) courses in these newly internationalized universities, teachers, local students, and international/foreign students translanguaged to teach and learn. Lin (2022) further pointed out that language practices in internationalized university classrooms in Taiwan are interconnected with how the interlocutors position others and themselves as English speakers, Chinese speakers or multilingual speakers. In essence, language use is related to identity.

Garcia & Li (2014) argue that translanguaging is key to mediate students' identities as well as cognitive learning activities. For students to be willing to participate (invest), they need to have "a secure sense of self that allows them to appropriate new language practices" (p. 79). At the same time, they "must be able to cognitively engage with learning and to act on learning" (p. 79). In addition, language practices are not just cognitive techniques but also "the product of positioning of students within social/political economies" (p. 79).

This study examines the relationships among language, identity, and interaction in multilingual multicultural classrooms through a case study of classroom interactions involving *qiaosheng* (overseas Chinese students, who were born and raised overseas and have come to Taiwan for education).[1] Qiaosheng education has been interconnected with the national imagination in Taiwan's modern history (Goh, 2010). It began in 1951 as part of the KMT's efforts to

[1] In the text of this article, we choose to use the name qiaosheng instead of overseas Chinese students because the former is the name used in Taiwan and because many qiaosheng do not identify with the term overseas Chinese students.

establish a national identity tied to China after they retreated to Taiwan following a civil war with the Chinese Communists. Qiaosheng education is thus connected with a Chineseness ideology, an ideology that connects ethnic Chinese around the world to a nation-state (Republic of China in Taiwan, or People's Republic of China on the mainland) (Goh, 2010). This Chineseness ideology contributes to Taiwanese people's (mis)conceptions of qiaosheng language and cultural backgrounds. Although qiaosheng are ethnically Chinese, their Chineseness does not (necessarily) index Chinese language abilities. Further, not only are the overwhelming majority of qiaosheng foreign nationals, but in recent years, they can choose to study in Taiwan as qiaosheng or as *waijisheng* (foreign students). Like many foreign students, qiaosheng are multi-linguals, speaking various first languages (L1s) and studying Chinese and English as their second or foreign languages. While classroom interactions with foreign students have received a lot of attention among applied linguistics scholars in Taiwan (e.g. Lau & Lin, 2017; Lin 2018, 2022), classroom interactions involving qiaosheng have not. Given their similar language backgrounds to those of foreign students, qiaosheng's educational experiences can provide fertile ground in which to explore the interplay among multilingualism, identity, and education.

In applied linguistics literature, transnational migrant students such as qiaosheng are called returnees. Kubota (2013) defined returnees as "individuals who return to their homeland after sojourning in another country …… The length of time away from the homeland varies from a few years to more than one generation" (p. 1). Traversing the social, linguistic, and cultural terrains of two countries, returnees have to "negotiate their identity with the images of them construed by mainstream society, accommodating, resisting, or appropriating mainstream images" (p. 2).

Empirical applied linguistics research on returnees is scarce (Kubota, 2013). Currently available studies focus on returnees in Japan, for example, *kikokushijo* (children of Japanese expatriate corporate and government personnel) (Kanno, 2000, 2003) and school-aged children of *Nikkei* (Japanese-descent) ethnic returnees, who moved from Brazil to Japan for unskilled work (Kubota, 2013; Ortloff & Frey, 2007). This emerging research has shown that returnee students face identity struggles and encounter difficulties in Japanese schools due to their limited Japanese proficiency. However, this line of research has not yet presented classroom interactional data to illustrate the interplay among identity, language, and interaction.

The present study adopts an ethnographic and discourse-analytic approach to examine classroom interactions between an EFL teacher and qiaosheng in a high school which was historically established to serve qiaosheng. Analyzing classroom discourse as well as interviews with the teacher from the theoretical lens of language socialization and language ideology, we show that through language-mediated interactions with qiaosheng over time, the teacher was socialized into recognizing and subsequently addressing qiaosheng's linguistic and cultural diversity in her teaching by adopting a translanguaging pedagogy. We argue that when teachers recognize the taken-for-granted language ideology about qiaosheng and harness their multilingual multicultural repertoire to teach, qiaosheng can attain their maximum potential to learn when they are appreciated for their multilingual multicultural existence.

BACKGROUND ON QIAOSHENG EDUCATION

Qiaosheng (overseas Chinese students) refers to those of Chinese descent who were born and raised overseas and come to Taiwan for education, or those who have lived overseas for at least six consecutive years and obtained permanent or long-term residency status overseas and return to Taiwan for education (Overseas Chinese Affairs Council, 2021).[2]

Qiaosheng education has been interconnected with Taiwan's political history and the recent trend of globalization and internationalization (Chan, 2021). It was historically tied to the nation-building project of the KMT government after it retreated to Taiwan in 1949 (Pham, 2011). Providing education to children of overseas Chinese was an integral part of maintaining ethnic solidarity with overseas Chinese and directing their loyalty to and support for Taiwan, instead of China.[3] With the financial assistance from the US between 1954 and 1965,[4] and the continued financial

[2] Those of the latter category are citizens of the Republic of China. Constituting a very small minority of the qiaosheng population, they have been nicknamed "fake qiaosheng" (假僑生) and come under attack for strategically managing their transnational mobility for benefiting from preferential treatment allocated for qiaosheng (Goh, 2010).

[3] Most overseas Chinese were migrants or descendants of early migrants to Southeast Asia from China.

[4] After U.S. vice president Richard Nixon's visit to Taiwan in 1953, he was

aid provided by the Taiwanese government, the recruitment of qiaosheng was considered very successful, resulting in significant increases of the number of qiaosheng throughout the decades from the 1950s to the 1980s (Goh, 2010).

In the wake of the democratization movement in Taiwan in the 1980s, the Taiwanese population demanded changes to reduce the preferential treatment of qiaosheng (e.g. financial aid and preferential treatment for admissions to universities) (Ma, 2014). In addition, the economic development in Southeast Asia allowed overseas Chinese to pursue education elsewhere. Thus, although the government made continuous efforts to recruit qiaosheng, the 1990s witnessed a sharp decline in the number of qiaosheng (Ma, 2014).

In the past two decades, as part of the trend in non-Anglophone countries to internationalize higher education, Taiwanese universities have actively recruited foreign students with government policies and funding. In the same period, the number of qiaosheng has also increased. In 2018, the number of foreign students reached 33,000, an increase of almost 20,000 since 2011 (Department of Statistics Ministry of Education, 2019a); the number of qiaosheng increased to 29,000, twice the number in 2011 (Department of Statistics Ministry of Education, 2019b). In recent years, the government changed policies, allowing Chinese descendants with foreign nationalities the opportunity to choose to study in Taiwan as qiaosheng or as foreign students (Goh, 2010).

From the perspectives of qiaosheng, qiaosheng is a category that the Taiwanese society imposes on them. Some consider themselves as foreign students and they do not fit into the national imagination attached to the category of qiaosheng (Lin, 2010; Tong, 2016). There is also a recent call from the qiaosheng community to simply call qiaosheng foreign students (Goh, 2010; Liu, 2019). Whatever name qiaosheng are called, they are as much "transnational migrant students" (Shin, 2012) as *waijisheng* (foreign students), and their diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds are distinct from those of local Taiwanese students. Therefore, they provide a fertile ground in which to investigate the interplay of multilingualism, identity, and interaction in education.

---

impressed by the overseas Chinese education and realized its important role in preventing the expansion of Chinese Communist power in the region. After his return to the U.S. he recommended the U.S. government should support Taiwan's qiaosheng education. From 1954 to 1965, more than US$900 million of financial aid was provided to support overseas Chinese education (Ma, 2014).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study draws on the theoretical concepts of language socialization and language ideology to examine multilingual multicultural classroom interactions involving qiaosheng. Both theoretical concepts emerged from linguistic anthropology in the 1980s and have been influential in many fields, including applied linguistics.

Language socialization is a process of "socialization through the use of language and socialization to use language" (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986, p. 163). Research in this paradigm examines how children and other novices are socialized into communicative competence and community membership through language mediated interactions with expert members of the community (Ochs, 1986). Language socialization has been shown as a lifelong (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986), as well as a "life-wide" (Duff 2011) process across communities. When the life course involves moving through new speech communities (e.g. a teacher begins teaching linguistically diverse students after years of teaching monolingual, mono-cultural students) or across national boundaries (e.g. when students move to another country for education), one may be socialized into adopting new language practices and identities (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012).

Scholars have also noted bi-directionality in language socialization (Duff, 2002; Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002; Miller & Hoogstra, 1992). That is, not only are "novices" socialized but they also socialize "experts". Bi-directional socialization is evident when, for example, immigrant children in the U.S. act as "language brokers" for their parents who have limited English proficiency (Orellana, 2009), or as will be shown in this case study, when linguistically and culturally diverse qiaosheng socialize their teacher into adopting a translanguaging pedagogy.

The language socialization processes – and results – become more complex in linguistically and culturally diverse settings as linguistic and cultural contact is rarely a neutral state of affairs, but "tends to be a focal point of … social conflict with linkages to other, equally contested issues" (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002, p. 350). These other issues are often related to language and power (Bourdieu, 1991).

The interplay between language and power has been fruitfully investigated through the theoretical lens of language ideology (Kroskrity, 2000). Silverstein (1979) defined language ideology as "sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a

rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" (p. 193). Language ideologies are important mechanisms through which speakers attach social meanings to languages, language users, and language use (Park & Wee, 2012). They are thus not just about language, but are interconnected with meaning systems in other arenas of life. One language ideology that Silverstein (1996) termed "Monoglot ideology" has been shown to play a key role in structuring policies and institutional and classroom practices associated with minority and immigrant education. It is also often connected with the Herderian or nationalist ideology of language, which equates a language (the monoglot standard) with the nation state (Bauman & Briggs, 2003).

Importantly, language ideologies are not only explicit but also implicit. Implicit language ideologies are tacit assumptions about language, its use, and its users that are naturalized in historical processes. Irvine & Gal (2000) contended that tacit language ideologies can be uncovered through investigating the semiotic processes involved in the construction of ideological representations of languages. One of the processes is erasure, which is "the process in which ideology, in simplifying the sociolinguistic field, renders some persons or activities (or sociolinguistic phenomena) invisible. Facts that are inconsistent with the ideological scheme either go unnoticed or get explained away" (p. 38). Another semiotic process is iconization, which involves "a transformation of the sign relationship between linguistic features (or varieties) and the social images with which they are linked" (p. 37). Thus, for example, qiaosheng education was created in the historical context of nation building in Taiwan. Qiaosheng Chinese ethnicity is iconically linked to the Chinese language and qiaosheng L1s and other language abilities go unnoticed, effectively "erased" from public consciousness.

An impressive body of literature has examined multilingual language socialization in language-contact settings characterized by globalization and transnational migration (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002). In these settings language ideologies tend to come to the fore, consequentially framing interactions and classroom instruction (e.g. Davila, 2020; Johnson, Johnson, Hetrick, 2020; Li & Zhu, 2013; Lin, 2015). For example, when a teacher misrecognizes qiaosheng Chinese ethnicity as indexing their Chinese language ability, the teacher will use Chinese as the primary language of instruction. Our analytic focus in the present study will demonstrate the teacher's transformation in the language ideology of qiaosheng in the language socialization process, gradually

changing her monolingual pedagogy to a translanguaging pedagogy.

THE STUDY

This study took place in Global High School (GHS, all names are pseudonyms). GHS was established in 1955 in Taiwan to serve qiaosheng. In addition to teaching the high school curriculum – which is the same as that in other high schools in Taiwan, cultivating qiaosheng's familiarity and identification with the Chinese language and culture is also the mission of the school.

Although GHS was established for qiaosheng, it started enrolling local Taiwanese students in 1963. At the time of the study in 2014, qiaosheng comprised around 22 percent (N= 406) of the student population. Most qiaosheng in GHS came from Asia, with a small number from other parts of the world (e.g. the U.S., Mexico, Germany). At GHS, qiaosheng and Taiwanese students were assigned to different classes. Although local classes and qiaosheng classes have the same curriculum, the teachers tend to be more lenient with qiaosheng in terms of class requirements or the amount of materials covered. This is because qiaosheng have more alternatives after graduating from high school than Taiwanese students, who are under tremendous pressure to perform well in college entrance exams in Taiwan. A small minority of qiaosheng choose to attend universities in Taiwan; others choose to return to their countries or go to other countries for undergraduate education.

All the teachers at GHS are Taiwanese, and the Chinese language is used as the main language of instruction in both Taiwanese and qiaosheng classes, including in English classes.

We conducted ethnographic observations in a 10th-grade English class. The English teacher, Carol, was in her late thirties. She taught English in private English language institutes for several years before joining GHS. At the time of the study, she had taught ten years in GHS. During those ten years, she had experience teaching three qiaosheng classes prior to teaching the focal class of the study. She has a bachelor's degree in English and a master's degree in English literature. After becoming an English teacher, she continued developing professionally by attending TESOL workshops. She loves traveling abroad; her foreign travelling experiences enable her to relate to qiaosheng from different countries.

We selected the focal class because it had a reputation for being active and engaged in class. Nineteen of the 24 students in the class gave their consent to participate in this study. Most of them came to

Taiwan alone, either living with their Taiwanese relatives (N = 4) or in the school dormitory (N = 10). Five of them came to Taiwan with their parents. They represent a wide range of linguistic and cultural backgrounds (See Table 1). All students came from Asian countries, with the majority coming from Indonesia (N = 8). The participants learned English and Chinese as a second language (L2) at various ages, with most starting to learn English before Chinese. In Taiwan, they used multiple languages (L1, Chinese, English) to communicate. L1 was used primarily among co-nationals. A mix of Chinese and English was used with students from other countries and with teachers.

Table 1

The Key Information from the Survey on Students

Participants	L1	Nationality	Countries lived over 6 months	Learned English since (age)	Learned Chinese since (age)
Andy	Filipino	Filipino	The Philippines	5	12
Evonne	Vietnamese Cantonese Chinese	Vietnamese	Vietnam	10	1
Matt	Spanish	Mexican	Mexico, Argentina, Paraguay	3	5
Henry	Japanese	Japanese	Japan	14	15
Jenny	Japanese	Japanese	Japan	13	16
James	Myanmarese	Myanmarese	Myanmar	7	9
Benson	Myanmarese	Myanmarese	Myanmar	5	5
Thomas	Thai	Thai	Thailand	6	13
Cindy	Thai	Thai	Thailand	10	17
Rachel	Thai	Thai	Thailand	7	7
Chris	Thai, Chinese	Thai	Thailand	10	1
Tim	Indonesian	Indonesian	Indonesia	7	16
Justin	Indonesian	Indonesian	Indonesia	7	5
Melody	Indonesian	Indonesian	Indonesia	5	10
Joy	Indonesian	Indonesian	Indonesia	6	9
Alice	Indonesian	Indonesian	Indonesia	6	12
Sherry	Indonesian	Indonesian	Indonesia	6	14
Kevin	Indonesian	Indonesian	Indonesia	4	8
Alex	Indonesian, English	Indonesian	Indonesia, Australia	1	3

This study adopted an ethnographic and discourse-analytic approach to examine the interactions between Carol and qiaosheng in GHS. Data collection procedures include classroom observation

as well as interviews and informal conversations.

The second author, who was an English teacher at GHS at the time of the study, collected data for this study. She observed the focal class one or two times each week over a semester in spring 2014. Detailed field notes were taken during each observation and typed soon after the observation, with special attention paid to the multilingual multicultural interactions between Carol and the students and among the students. During or after each observation, whenever appropriate, she initiated informal conversations with Carol or the students to clarify things or ask for more information. Informal conversations were also noted in the field notes. Her discussions with other English teachers about qiaosheng in GHS were also drawn to shed light on data collected for the study.

Two interviews with Carol were conducted, each lasting more than one hour. The first interview focused on Carol's beliefs and strategies of teaching qiaosheng. The second focused on her teaching career and her changes in her attitude towards, and interactions with, qiaosheng. Detailed notes were kept for the first interview, which was not recorded. The second interview was audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Data analysis was informed by the theoretical frameworks of language socialization and language ideology. The interview data were read and reread to identify Carol's pathway of socialization into recognizing qiaosheng multilingual multicultural repertoire. We categorized Carol's narrative accounts in the interviews into two periods that reflect her changing language ideologies of qiaosheng over time in her ten-year teaching in GHS.

Analysis of field notes, which include instances of multilingual multicultural interactions along with the context of the interactions and analytic memos, was conducted in the following procedures. In the beginning, the field notes were set in chronological order. After multiple readings of the field notes, they were reorganized under three codes informed by the translanguaging literature that highlights the importance of validating and respecting students' multilingual multicultural identities while harnessing students' full linguistic and cultural repertoire to teach and learn (Garcia & Li, 2014). The three codes were: leveraging students' multilingualism, engaging students' multicultural identities, and developing students' pluriliteracy. The informal conversations and interviews where Carol described her changed interactions with qiaosheng were used to triangulate with the observed classroom interactions.

FINDINGS

Within her ten-year tenure at GHS, Carol had six years of experience teaching qiaosheng classes. Over the years, her language ideology of qiaosheng transformed from ignoring their different language backgrounds from those of Taiwanese students to recognizing qiaosheng linguistic diversity. Her pedagogy changed accordingly from a primarily monolingual to a translanguaging pedagogy. Below we first delineate her pathway of socialization into recognizing qiaosheng multilingual multicultural repertoire based on her narrative accounts and then we present classroom interactional data that illustrates the translanguaging practices in the focal classroom.

Socialization into Recognizing Qiaosheng Multilingual, Multicultural Repertoire

When Carol taught qiaosheng classes for the first time in GHS, she had little knowledge of how best to teach and communicate with them. She recalled, "我覺得第一個沒有能力，第二個也沒有那個想法。就是說僑生應該要給個什麼不一樣的東西，當時就沒有。" (*Back then I wasn't capable of teaching qiaosheng in ways that are more suitable for them. I wasn't even aware that I need to do any adaptation in my teaching.*) Instead, she focused on classroom management to control student behavior based on advice given by her colleagues,

> 有人跟我說不能對他們太 nice，那時候有人跟我特別講這件事，叫我要特別注意僑生規矩的部分，我就有特別注意，第一節上課果然僑生就是比較活潑可愛，調皮搗蛋，我就想來了來了…我那個時候很兇，我都跟他們說, "Do not mess up with me. If you try to mess up with me，你們就會被處罰。"
>
> *I was told that I cannot be too <u>nice</u> to qiaosheng. They made a point of telling me to pay extra attention to qiaosheng classroom behavior. So I did. In the first class meeting, the students were indeed very lively and 'naughty', so I thought to myself, here we go…. I was very strict and demanding. I often told them, "<u>Do not mess up with me. If you try to mess up with me</u>, you will be*

punished.[5] *”*

Thus Carol’s relationship with her earlier qiaosheng classes was distant. Students were “in fear of” her, according to Carol. One time she praised them for their PowerPoint presentations, and students simply could not believe what they heard. Carol recounted,

> 有一個學生問我: “老師妳教我們這麼久, 都沒有讚美過我們. 妳今天讚美我們，你是講真的嗎？Are you serious about it?” 我到現在都還沒有辦法忘掉那個臉。
>
> *A student came ask me, “Teacher, you have taught us for a while and you have never praised us. Are you serious about it?” I can never forget the look on her face.*

While emphasizing classroom behavior, Carol overlooked qiaosheng different linguistic backgrounds from those of Taiwanese students. There was no institutional language policy for qiaosheng classes at GHS. Carol taught and communicated with qiaosheng mainly in Chinese in exactly the way she did with Taiwanese students.[6]

As mentioned above, qiaosheng Chinese ethnicity has been iconically linked to the Chinese language, and qiaosheng L1s in their home countries go unnoticed, effectively “erased” from public consciousness. As Irvine and Gal (2000) contended, uncovering the semiotic process of “erasure” helps to reveal implicit language ideologies. The implicit language ideology of qiaosheng informed Carol’s interactions with them in this early period of her teaching in GHS. She unwittingly used Chinese as the language of instruction in qiaosheng classes.

Over time through interacting with qiaosheng she began to notice that qiaosheng had difficulties learning from the Chinese language of instruction. She observed that when she explained grammar rules in Chinese, many students looked confused. When she chatted with them in Chinese, some of them had to respond with a mix of English or turn to their co-nationals for translation in their L1. Students also used various languages (L1, Chinese, English) to

---

[5] Underlined words indicate utterances spoken in English in the original interview.

[6] As Chinese is Taiwanese students’ L1, most English teachers in Taiwan teach English through Chinese (Ke & Lin, 2017).

communicate with each other.

In addition, Carol recalled several incidences that made her realize that qiaosheng do not have sufficient Chinese literacy for academic work. Once when she was supervising a qiaosheng class taking a chemistry exam, a student asked her what the word 透明 meant on the exam paper. She was surprised that this student did not know such a simple Chinese word. She also remembered seeing a Japanese student translating key terms in the Chinese math textbook into Japanese. The student said that this helped her understand the math teacher's lecture better. Carol started to realize that Chinese is qiaosheng L2 and many struggled to learn in a "Chinese only" environment in Taiwan.

Carol then decided to change her language of instruction, trying to use English to teach. However, she soon realized that English-only pedagogy does not work either. She described the complex situation:

> 有些僑生的英文很不錯，你還可以和他們用英文聊天，他也會用英文回你，所以自然而然，就變用英文…但是有些僑生的英文程度，其實比台灣的國中程度還要低…看到學生無法完全學習的狀況，覺得 They totally wasted their life…所以我可以做的，就是語言跳來跳去，讓學生有不同語言的 input 知道我在說什麼。
>
> *Some qiaosheng English is very good. You can chat with them and they answer in English. So naturally I use English. ... But some has the English level that is lower than Taiwanese junior high students' level. ... Seeing some students could not learn at all, I felt that they totally wasted their life [in Taiwan]. What I can do is to switch between languages so that they receive different linguistic input and hopefully they can understand what I say.*

Realizing that both English and Chinese are qiaosheng L2 and that there exist considerable variations in their proficiencies in either language, Carol deployed all she could use in her linguistic repertoire – English and Chinese – to teach: "所以我可以做的，就是語言跳來跳去，讓學生有不同語言的 input 知道我在說什麼。" (*What I can do is to switch between languages so that they receive different linguistic input and hopefully they can understand what I say.*) However, for those who have poor command of both Chinese and English, they become extremely disadvantaged in their education in Taiwan. Carol then noticed that during her

Chinese-English bilingual instruction, students used their L1 to help each other make sense of Carol's lecture:

> 我對全班講英文，我講完一遍我會自己再講一遍中文，對聽得懂的小孩這個就是浪費時間，可是我覺得他們很可愛，他們會跑去跟他們的同學用印尼文講，我發現他們會做這樣的事，我跟他講英文他懂，他轉頭過去就講印尼文，他們又身兼班上最大宗的來源，所以幾乎班上三分之二的人都 cover 了，我的國語就變成是班上還有哪些同學聽不懂英文，聽不懂印尼文，可以聽得懂國語的。
>
> *I speak English to the class. Then I repeat what I say in Chinese, which could be a waste of time for those who have understood my English. But I think they are so sweet. They would go explain what I say to their Indonesian peers. I found they would do this. They understand my English, and then they turn to speak Indonesian. Since we have many students from Indonesia, this way two-thirds of the class were covered. So then my Chinese helps those who do not understand English, nor Indonesian, but can understand Chinese.*

Here Carol described the "language brokering" (Orellana, 2009) phenomenon among her Indonesian students. Note that Carol cast her Indonesian "language brokers" in a positive light, describing them as "可愛" (*sweet*). Accordingly, Carol started to ponder how to incorporate students' L1 for teaching and learning. She gradually adopted and encouraged translanguaging practices that harness students' entire linguistic as well as cultural repertoire to teach and learn.

Indeed, besides qiaosheng diverse linguistic repertoire, Carol also transformed her understanding of their cultural backgrounds. She empathized with their challenges in adapting to the lives in Taiwan and their having to negotiate with the imposed image or imagination of them in Taiwanese society. She would consciously create moments of affective bonding (Garcia et al., 2012) by chatting with qiaosheng to learn from their culture. In response to the question about how she developed close connection with her students, she stated,

> 他們來這邊有很多的不舒服，國語聽不懂，怕被人家講說很笨，所以我就先理解他們，然後，我們偶爾會聊一下天，我覺得僑生其實很有趣耶，你請教他們，好像，馬來西亞航空的事件，我就問他們說: "Do you know anything about that?"

然後他們就會告訴我，因為他們不會看台灣的新聞，他們都會看自己國家的新聞或是國際新聞，所以就問他們，請教他們。

They have a lot of discomfort living here, not understanding Mandarin, being afraid of being viewed as not bright. So I first try to understand them. And sometimes I chat with them. I think qiaosheng are very interesting. When you ask them, for example, when the Malaysian Airline plane crashed, I asked them, "Do you know anything about that?" Then they would tell me about it. They do not watch Taiwanese news. They watch news in their own countries or international news. So I ask them and learn from them.

Thus, contrary to her earlier qiaosheng classes, which were characterized by strict behavior control, largely Chinese-only pedagogy, and a distant relationship, Carol was socialized through her interactions with qiaosheng over time to recognize and engage in their full linguistic and cultural repertoire. Such multilingual, multicultural classroom interactions were abundantly observed in our fieldwork, as will be illustrated in the next section.

"So We Develop a Very Special Language Mechanism in Class": Translanguaging in Action

Although Carol has never heard about the concept of "translanguaging", she translanguaged to teach and encouraged qiaosheng to translanguage to learn. She described her approach this way: "所以就變成一個非常特別的語言機制" (*So we developed a very special language mechanism in class.*) As will be shown below, this "very special language mechanism" is embodied in classroom interactions that encompass leveraging students' multilingualism, and relatedly, engaging students' multicultural identities, as well as developing students' pluriliteracy.

Leveraging students' multilingualism

In the translanguaging space (Li, 2011) that Carol consciously created, not only were students' L2s (English and Chinese) dynamically and flexibly used to teach and learn, but also students' L1s were harnessed for meaning-making in the classroom. Although Carol cannot provide instructions through students' L1, she encouraged translanguaging among them, as they posed and

answered questions of each other. Such multilingual realities with the teacher's and students' entire linguistic repertoire harnessed to teach and learn were observed every day in the focal classroom.

One of the most common ways in which students' multilingualism was leveraged to teach and learn is in the instruction of grammar. Different from her grammar instruction pedagogy in local classrooms where she uses primarily Chinese to explain grammar rules, in the focal qiaosheng classroom, Carol explains grammar rules in English first, followed by Chinese. During her explanation in Chinese, those who have understood the English explanation turn to explain the grammar rules in L1s to those who have limited abilities in both English and Chinese, and those who have good Chinese proficiency listen to Carol's Chinese explanation.

An equally common situation where students' multilingualism is leveraged for teaching and learning arises in the contextualization of key words or concepts (cf. Garcia et al., 2012). This often emerges spontaneously through oral conversations between Carol and her students. For example, Carol once had the class read an article on food safety. During the silent reading time, Justin, an Indonesian student, consulted his cellphone about the word "preservative". The result showed its Chinese translation "防腐劑". Not knowing what the Chinese term meant, he asked Carol "防腐劑是什麼?" (*What is fangfuji*?). Carol explained in English that it is something that prevents food from going bad. Other Indonesian students chimed in to give Justin a simple Indonesian translation "*pengawet*", and a Thai student shouted out the Thai translation. Many instances such as this occurred spontaneously when students feel that they can jump in to offer L1 support for their friends.

Other times, when the concept is more complex than just a simple translation of a term, and after Carol's explanation in English and/or Chinese, some students still do not grasp it, the students would start eagerly posing and answering questions of each other in their L1s. When this happens, Carol would stop lecturing and wait for the negotiation of meaning among the students to be completed. She would then say thank you to whoever helped, praise their deeds, and then continue her teaching.

There are also times when Carol realizes that some students do not quite grasp what she says, so she would actively enlist students' help in explaining for others (e.g. "你們現在跟同學解釋一下" '*Can you please help explain this to your friends?*'), in that way making it comprehensible for all.

In addition, oftentimes throughout a class, students were seen

whispering in side conversations in their L1s. As an example, the following exchange happened to occur near where the researcher sat during one class observation (See Appendix for transcription symbols). It occurred when Carol was discussing the results of an exam with the class.

Example 1

1 Carol: ((To class)) Take over means conquer, to defeat.

2 Alice: ((To Melody, whispers in Indonesian)) How to spell conquer?

3 Melody: ((In Indonesian)) c-o-n-q-u-e-r

Exchanges in soft voices are not easily audible. The researcher was only able to catch the content of the conversation because of her close proximity to the two female students. As in many instances like this, Carol noticed their exchange but did not interrupt the students or ask them to stop “talking”, as she used to when she first taught qiaosheng classes. She narrated,

> 我以前上課，學生只要一講話，我就會說“你在講甚麼?”“你在聊甚麼天?”我現在回想發現那個時候，可能學生根本不是在聊天，他們說不定是在討論，可是因為我沒辦法容忍聊天這件事，我就斷然的壓制他們，我現在就不會。
>
> *In the past whenever students chatted with each other, I would say “what are you talking about?” “What are you chatting about?” Now I think back, I think they were probably not chatting. They were probably discussing [what I taught]. But back then, I couldn’t tolerate any chatting. I would stop them immediately. Now I don’t.*

As it happens, teachers in multilingual classrooms often need to balance between maintaining classroom management and allowing students to have side conversations in their L1 to discuss the learning content. As Tsai & Garcia (2000) reported on a conflict between an English-speaking teacher and two Chinese-speaking preschools in a mainstream US classroom. The two students were perceived by their teacher as being “disrespectful” for talking privately in Chinese during film watching and were reprimanded

despite the teacher's best intention to value immigrant children's home culture. The authors show that the students were aware of the teacher's rule of participant structure, but the long stretch of English in the movie was too difficult for them. They thus chose to discuss the film in Chinese. Carol had to do the balancing work as well, "只要他們沒有太大聲，吵到其他人，就算他們在聊天，也是因為從課堂討論延伸的，我都讓他們討論。" (*As long as they are not too loud and interfere with others' leaning, even if they are chatting, I assume they are chatting about things derived from the learning content, I allow them to talk privately.*) Here we see that Carol relaxed her classroom rule about no chatting privately in class in response to qiaosheng needs for learning from each other.

Thus in the translanguaging space Carol consciously created, qiaosheng feel that their L1 is respected and they can flexibly and freely use it to facilitate their English learning. In addition to using it to help each other understand the class materials or lecture content, they were observed actively invoking their metalinguistic awareness between their L1 and English in the process of adding more English to their language repertoire. For example, one day when Carol was teaching students to read aloud an English sentence, which contains the target word "engaged," the following exchange occurred:

Example 2 (I Ss: some Indonesian students)

1 Carol: ((led the class)) I'm engaged.

2 Matt: In Spanish 念 en-ga-gei. '*In Spanish, we say en-ga-gei.*'

3 I Ss: 在印尼文也是。 '*The same in Indonesian.*'

4 Carol: 在印尼文也是喔! en-ga-gei 該不會大家最後都念 en-ga-gei 吧！好，還是要記得念 en-geyjd. '*Really, Indonesian too! en-ga-gei. So is everyone going to pronounce en-ga-gei now? Okay. But remember it's en-geyjd [in English]*'

In this exchange, Carol was leading the class to read aloud the sentence "I'm engaged." Before the class repeated the sentence, a Mexican student (Matt) offered the Spanish transliteration of "engaged" and several students from Indonesia chimed in to say Indonesian had the same transliteration. Rather than treating their

input as an interference, Carol was engaged by listening and by expressing her surprise at the fact that the Indonesian transliteration sounded the same as the Spanish one. She then drew students' attention to the different pronunciations between English and the transliteration in students' L1. Here, students' L1 was used as a tool for facilitating their English language development. Carol articulated what she thought about this exchange when asked about this and other similar instances in the interview: "他們可能學過或知道相同的語言符號，但是用不同聲音系統去學。" (*They might have learned or known the same linguistic symbols, but they learned it with another sound system.*)

At other times, students demonstrated their knowledge of English words through transliterations in their L1. Those words might be so technical that even Carol, an EFL speaker herself, does not know. In such exchanges, the teacher and student roles were reversed in that Carol learned a new English word from her students. For example, the following exchange occurred during a lesson on the reading "The Long-Haired Spirits and the Thao," in the textbook. This text introduces a Thao legend about the longhaired spirits in Sun Moon Lake.[7] As a warm-up activity, Carol asked the students what can be found in a lake. Matt responded "piranha" immediately. Other students chimed in to say piranha, in various pronunciations. As it happened, Carol had never heard this word. Perhaps seeing Carol lost in a cacophony of unknown sounds, one student who happened to know the Chinese name of the fish offered the Chinese translation, 食人魚. Carol remarked on the fact that students knew an English word that was unknown to her.

Example 3

1 Carol: What can you find in a lake?

2 Matt: Piranha

3 Ss: ((Say piranha in various iterations in pronunciation.))

4 S: ((Translates piranha into Chinese)) 食人魚 '*shirenyu'*

---

[7] Thao is one of Taiwan's indigenous tribes.

5 Carol: 你們都知道如何講食人魚的英文，只有我不知道!
'You all know how to say shirenyu in English. I am the only one who doesn't know!'

While Carol has been assuming an expert status in English, students' knowledge of L1 enriches the class discussion and Carol gains by learning from the students. As Li (2014) documented in his work with a Mandarin class in a Cantonese school in London, a Mandarin teacher gains knowledge about the origin of the Chinese word 曲奇 (pronounced as *kuk-kei* in Cantonese, transliteration of cookie) from her students. Naming this kind of process of translanguaging as "co-learning," Li argued that it empowers the learner and moves the teacher and students toward a more mutual dynamic engagement in knowledge construction.

The above analysis demonstrates the ways that translanguaging occurs in the focal classroom with students' entire linguistic repertoire leveraged to teach and learn. It demonstrates that translanguaging can be used in ways that foster English language development and metalinguistic awareness, while promoting students' multilingual identities and affirming the languages which students bring.

Engaging students' multicultural identities

In the translanguaging space Carol created, we also observed Carol and students translanguage in chatting about students' cultural backgrounds. Although Carol cannot speak her students' L1s, she asked questions to connect to their cultural backgrounds. For example, the exchange below occurred one day when Henry was late for class. He knocked on the door and asked for Carol's permission to enter. Carol was curious to know more about the qiaosheng door-knocking habit before entering the room, as Taiwanese students do not have this habit.

Example 4

1 Carol: 你們上課遲到的話, 會這樣敲門。*'When you are late for class, you would knock on the door like this'*
((Goes to the door and imitates how students knock on the door with a finger.)) 你們為甚麼要這樣? *'Why do you do it this way?'*

2 Benson: 這是給你一個 respect. ‘*This is to give you a* *<u>respect.</u>*’

3 Carol: ((smiles))

Benson responded to Carol’s query with a mix of Chinese and English. Although by monolingual standards, his utterance was not grammatical in either Chinese or English, he strategically translanguaged, using the two common elements in his and Carol’s linguistic repertoire to communicate with Carol. Pleased with the answer, Carol smiled and proceeded with teaching.

This kind of translanguaging about cultural backgrounds also often happened in the contextualization of key words. Carol would often initiate conversations to connect to students’ cultural backgrounds and students would actively participate. Example 5 is typical of such interactions. It occurred when Carol was reviewing the word “paradise.”

Example 5:

1 Carol: Many people say that Bali is a paradise. But after I went there, there’re so many tourists. 就沒有那個感覺。‘*Then I don’t feel it is a paradise.*’

2 I Ss: ((nod)) 很多 tourists. ‘*Many <u>tourists</u>.*’

3 Carol: 那我相信旁邊的小島應該人會比較少吧? ‘*Then I think the nearby small island should have fewer people, right?*’

4 I Ss: Lombok.

5 Carol: 那有很多人嗎? ‘*Are there many people there?*’

6 I Ss: Nope.

7 Carol: 中文是什麼? ‘*What is the Chinese name of that island?*’

8 I Ss: 不知道 ‘*Don’t know*’

9 Carol: 那邊有甚麼? ‘*What can you see there?*’

10 I Ss: Beaches. Sea.

While reviewing the word “paradise”, Carol engaged in a conversation with a group of students about a famous scenic spot in Indonesia. The students and Carol collaboratively translanguaged in this stretch of substantive conversation. As mentioned earlier, Carol consciously develops relationships with her students through asking questions to learn about their countries. Here we see not only did the teacher and the students translanguage for English language development but also co-created “a moment of affective bonding” (Garcia et al., 2012, p. 67).

The above analysis illustrates that Carol consciously engages qiaosheng multicultural backgrounds in English language teaching. By positioning students as the culture expert of their countries and herself as a cultural novice, and through blending the frame of language learning with the frame of cultural conversation (for frame blending, see Gordon, 2008), Carol promoted students’ multicultural identities while developing their English language skills.

Developing students’ pluriliteracy

Last but not least, Carol’s “very special language mechanism” includes providing support for their Chinese academic literacy development while teaching English. Concerned that qiaosheng lack sufficient Chinese skills to excel in their studies in Taiwan, Carol provided Chinese as a second language (CSL) support in her English class when appropriate. For example, the CSL support often occurred in the beginning of each class when she reviewed vocabulary words which would be quizzed immediately after. In the quiz, students needed to write down the Chinese translation and the part of speech of each word. During such routine review sessions, Carol would write down on the blackboard the Chinese translations which she considered potentially challenging for the students to write. Sometimes she would add explanations of the orthographical structure of the Chinese character. The following excerpt is typical of such instances.

Example 6

1 Carol: slim

2 Thomas: 可以寫“瘦”嗎? ‘*Can we just write down 瘦 for its Chinese meaning*?’

3 Carol: 你們會寫瘦嗎?會不會寫錯? ‘*Do you know how to write 瘦? Are you sure you will get it right?*’ ((writes 瘦 on the blackboard. Circles the radical of the character)) 這是什麼意思? ‘*What does this mean?*’

4 Ss: 病字旁。‘*A radical meaning illness.*’

5 Carol: 為甚麼是病字旁?因為以前的人生病時才會瘦。(.) 那 “叟”是甚麼意思? 就是老人沒精神，駝背。*‘Why does it have this radical? It’s because people in the past became slim when they were sick. (.) Then what does 叟 mean? It means older people, lacking energy, and hunched over.’* So Chinese attitude toward slim is positive or negative?

6 Ss: Negative.

Usually in the review session before the quiz, Carol would read each English word and ask students to say its Chinese translation. On this day, right after Carol read the vocabulary word “slim”, a Thai student (Thomas) offered its Chinese translation. Carol went on to explain the orthographic structure of the character and what cultural meaning the components in the orthography collectively index. Carol revealed that she consciously developed her students’ metalinguistic awareness and related the orthographic components of Chinese characters to morphemes in English words:

> 教僑生最會遇到的問題，主要是他們很多的中文都不會，那我們就會看學生遇到甚麼問題，無論是中文或英文都會一併解決…因為中文的筆劃很難，所以就用 interpretation 的方式去做，這會是一個幫助他們學習中文字的技巧啦，英文也會有像 international, intersection, interpersonal 這些字[用分析字首解釋]啊，都會用相同的概念去帶。
>
> *The most common challenge in teaching qiaosheng is that they do not know many Chinese words [in writing]. So whatever language problem I see them encounter, in Chinese or in English,*

> *I help them solve the problem. ... Since writing Chinese characters is hard for them, I used interpretation [of the components of the character] to help them. This is a useful strategy for learning to write Chinese characters. English words have similar concepts of structure. For example, international, intersection, interpersonal [share the same component inter].' I will talk about that too.*

In Carol's view, promoting students' metalinguistic awareness across Chinese and English when appropriate is adding to students' English language development as well as facilitating their Chinese academic literacy development, which is key for their content mastery in other subjects.

Through interactions such as Example 6, Carol positioned students as CSL learners. Students take up such positioning willingly as well, as illustrated in Thomas' question in Turn 2. This demonstrates qiaosheng need for, and interest in, developing their Chinese literacy. Indeed, our classroom observations show that students frequently asked Carol how to write certain Chinese characters. For example, once in discussing a reading about leisure activities, Carol asked students what leisure activities they loved to do. Students shouted out answers "gym" and "museum" among others. Some then asked Carol how to write gym and museum in Chinese. Carol responded accordingly by writing down the Chinese translations on the board. In the meantime, several students seemed to have a side conversation about their experiences in doing a leisure activity. Somehow, the expression déjà vu came up in their conversation. They then asked Carol, "déjà vu 中文怎麼寫?" (*How to write déjà vu in Chinese?*). After Carol wrote 似曾相識 on the board, all the students tried to pronounce the Chinese expression. The first character 似 (si) proved to be harder for some, who mispronounced it as "shi." Through translanguaging like this between English and Chinese across the speaking and writing modalities, students further develop their multilingualism and pluriliteracy.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study explored the interconnections among language, identity, and interaction in linguistically and culturally diverse classrooms through a case study of a Taiwanese EFL teacher (Carol) and her qiaosheng class. We explored the role of language

ideologies (Kroskrity, 2000) in shaping the process and results of multilingual multicultural language socialization (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002) in Carol's class. We have demonstrated that through language-mediated interactions with qiaosheng over time, Carol was socialized into recognizing and subsequently addressing qiaosheng linguistic and cultural diversity in her teaching. She transformed her largely monolingual pedagogy to a translanguaging pedagogy that encompasses leveraging students' multilingualism, engaging students' multicultural identities, and developing students' pluriliteracy.

As we see, in this classroom where students' multilingual multicultural identities are promoted, students are willing to participate, and they have "a secure sense of self that allows them to appropriate new language practices" (Garcia & Li, 2014, p. 79). We entered the classroom with an aim to explore why this focal classroom was known for its students' active engagement. We left with a deeper understanding of how a teacher's reflection on the taken-for-granted language ideology of qiaosheng started a journey into creating a classroom where all participants collaboratively translanguage to teach and learn, as well as to embrace their multilingual multicultural identities.

We have shown how language ideology plays a powerful role in structuring classroom interactions (Davila, 2020; Li & Zhu, 2013). Carol's translanguaging pedagogy to address qiaosheng linguistic and cultural diversity was made possible by her recognizing the language ideology about qiaosheng that has been naturalized through Taiwan's modern history. Only through unlearning the language ideology that misrecognizes qiaosheng as Chinese speakers and that "erases" their diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds can a teacher begin to ponder issues of language use in classrooms involving qiaosheng.

If we move beyond the Taiwan-centered view of qiaosheng, disconnecting qiaosheng from the historical nationalist framework, we can begin to see that they are better perceived as transnational migrant students (Shin, 2012), similar to immigrant students or international/foreign students. And we can start using qiaosheng education as a site for exploring issues related to multilingualism, identity, and classroom interactions in general. Most studies on the education of immigrant and international students were done in Western cultures, recognizing that these students speak the language of the host country as L2. In this study, we found that qiaosheng ethnic identity prevents teachers from recognizing their true linguistic identity – that they speak Chinese as an L2. This study has

revealed that the specific historical political context has framed the views of, and interactions with, qiaosheng in specific ways that one would not observe in *waijisheng* (foreign students) in Taiwan. For example, while foreign students are often misrecognized as English speakers (Lin, 2018, 2022), qiaosheng are misrecognized as Chinese speakers. Taiwanese classrooms are becoming increasingly diverse with both Taiwanese and non-Taiwanese students, due to the internationalization of education in Taiwan in the 21st century (Chan, 2021). How to handle the linguistic and cultural differences between Taiwanese and non-Taiwanese students (including both qiaosheng and foreign students) is a very relevant and current issue. The findings of this study thus provide important and timely implications for teaching linguistically and culturally diverse students in Taiwan today.

The present study appears to be the first applied linguistics research to focus on multilingual multicultural classroom interactions involving qiaosheng. Since the study was limited to one class in a school over one semester, readers should be cautious about generalizing the findings to other classrooms. Notwithstanding this limitation, this work offers valuable insights into the rich interactions in diverse classrooms involving qiaosheng. While this study highlights the teacher's perspective and experiences, future work might explore the interplay of multilingualism, identity, and classroom interactions from a qiaosheng perspective.

REFERENCES

Bauman, R., & Briggs, C. L. (2003). *Voices of modernity: Language ideologies and the politics of inequality*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Chan, S.-J. (2021). Internationalization and universities in Taiwan: Policies, practices, and prospects. In A, Y.-C. Hou, T.-L. Chiang, & S.-J. Chan (Eds.), *Higher education in Taiwan: Global, political and social challenges and future trends* (pp. 103–121). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2011). Separate and flexible bilingualism in complementary schools: Multiple language practices in interrelationship. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(5)*,* 1196–1208.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35*, 20–35.

Davila, L. T. (2020). Multilingual interactions and learning in high school ESL classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, *54*(1), 30–55.

Department of Statistics Ministry of Education (2019a). The overview of international students in colleges in 2018. Retrieved from http://stats.moe.gov.tw/files/brief/107%E5%B9%B4%E5%A4%A7%E5%B0%88%E6%A0%A1%E9%99%A2%E5%A2%83%E5%A4%96%E5%AD%B8%E7%94%9F%E6%A6%82%E6%B3%81.pdf

Department of Statistics Ministry of Education (2019b). *The overview of overseas Chinese students in schools at all levels*. Retrieved from ttp://stats.moe.gov.tw/files/brief/%E5%90%84%E7%B4%9A%E5%AD%B8%E6%A0%A1%E5%83%91%E7%94%9F%E5%8F%8A%E6%B8%AF%E6%BE%B3%E5%AD%B8%E7%94%9F%E6%A6%82%E6%B3%81.pdf

Duff, P. A. (2002). The discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: An ethnography communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied Linguistics, 23*(3), 289–322.

Duff, P. A. (2011). Second language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 564–586). Oxford: Blackwell.

Farr, M., & Song, J. (2011). Language ideologies and policies: Multilingualism and education. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, *5*(9), 650–665.

Garcia, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*. London: Palgrave MacMillian.

Garcia, O., Flores, N., & Woodley, H. H. (2012). Transgressing monolingualism and bilingual dualities: Translanguaging pedagogies. In A. Yiakoumetti (Ed.), *Harnessing linguistic variation to improve education* (pp. 45–75). Oxford: Peter Lang.

Garrett, P. B., & Baquedano-Lopez, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *31*, 339–361.

Goh, C.-M. (2010). Taiwan's overseas compatriot student education and the transformation of Taiwanese national imagination, 1951–2008. *Router: A Journal of Cultural Studies*, *10*, 103–138.

Gordon, C. (2008). A (p)parent play: Blending frames and reframing in family talk. *Language in Society*, *37*(3), 319–349.

He, P., Lai, H., & Lin, A. (2017). Translanguaging in a multimodal mathematics presentation. In C. M. Mazak, & K. S. Carroll (Eds.), *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies* (pp. 91–120). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Hsiau, A-C. (1997). Language ideology in Taiwan: The KMT's language policy, the Tai-yu language movement, and ethnic politics. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *18*, 302 –315.

Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities* (pp. 35–84). Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Johnson, D. C., Johnson, E. J. & Hetrick, D. (2020). Normalization of language deficit ideology for a new generation of minoritized U.S. youth. *Social Semiotics*, *30*(4), 591–606.

Kachru, Y. (1994). Monolingual bias in SLA research. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*(4), 795–800.

Kanno, Y. (2000). Bilingualism and identity: The stories of Japanese returnees. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *3*(1), 1–18.

Kanno, Y. (2003). *Negotiating bilingual and bicultural identities: Japanese returnees betwixt two worlds*. Mahwah: Erlbaum.

Ke, I.-C. & Lin, S. (2017). A translanguaging approach to TESOL in Taiwan. *English Teaching & Learning, 41*(1), 33–61.

Kroskrity, P. V. (Ed.). (2000). *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Kubota, R. (2013). Language and education for returnees. In C. Chapelle, (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Lau, K., & Lin, C.-Y. (2017). Internationalization of higher education and language policy: The case of a bilingual university in Taiwan. *Higher Education*, *74*, 437–454.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18*(7), 655–670.

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.

Li, W. (2014). Who's teaching whom? Co-learning in multilingual classrooms. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education* (pp. 167–190). New York: Routledge.

Li, W., & Zhu, H. (2013). Translanguaging identities and ideologies: Creating transnational space through flexible multilingual practices amongst Chinese university students in the UK. *Applied Linguistics, 34*(5), 516–535.

Lin, S. (2009). How listening is silenced: A monolingual Taiwanese elder constructs identity through television viewing. *Language in Society, 38,* 311–337.

Lin, S. (2015). Circulating discourses of minority education: The linguistic

construction of modernity in globalizing Taiwan. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 46*(1), 71–87.

Lin, S. (2018). To speak or not to speak in the new Taiwanese university: Class participation and identity construction in linguistically and culturally diverse graduate classrooms. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 18*(2), 184–203.

Lin, S. (2022). Negotiating language choice in multilingual lab meetings: Voices from domestic and international students in Taiwan. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 25*(1) 117–130.

Liu, Y.-Q. (2019, April). How much unfriendliness will college students from Southeast Asia face? *Opinion@ CommonWealth Magazine*. Retrieved from: https://opinion.cw.com.tw/blog/profile/52/article/8007

Lin, F.-R. (2010). *"Overseas Chinese students" from Burma: The formation and identity crisis of transnational subjects* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Chiao Tung University, Hsinchu.

Ma, A.-H. S. (2014). The development of international student recruitment policies in Taiwan: A 60-year trajectory. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 18*(2), 120–140.

May, S. (Ed.). (2014). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education*. New York: Routledge.

Mazak, C. M., & Carroll, K. S. (Eds.). (2017). *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Miller, P. J., & Hoogstra, L. (1992). Language as tool in the socialization and apprehension of cultural meanings. In T. Schwartz, G. M. White, & C. A. Lutz. (Eds.), *New directions in psychological anthropology* (pp. 83–101). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. (1986). Introduction. In B. B. Schieffelin, & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 1–13). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2012). The theory of language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 1–21). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

Orellana, M. F. (2009). *Translating childhoods: Immigrant youth, language and culture*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Ortloff, D. H., & Frey, C. J. (2007). Blood relatives: Language, immigration, and education of ethnic returnees in Germany and Japan. *Comparative Education Review, 51*(4), 447–470.

Overseas Chinese Affairs Council. (2021). Regulations regarding study and counseling assistance for overseas Chinese students in Taiwan. Retrieved from https://law.moj.gov.tw/ENG/LawClass/LawAll.aspx?pcode=H0100001

Park, M. S. (2013). Code-switching and translanguaging: Potential functions in multilingual classrooms. *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, 13*(2), 50–52.

Park, J. S.-Y., & Wee, L. (2012). *Markets of English: Linguistic capital and language policy in a globalizing world*. London: Routledge.

Pham, Y.-M. (2011). Decentering homeland: The geopolitics of Taiwan's post-war homeland policy. *Taiwan: A Radical Quarterly in Social Studies*, *83*, 137–177.

Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 15*, 163–191.

Shin, H. (2012). From FOB to cool: Transnational migrant students in Toronto and the styling of global linguistic capital. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 16*(2), 184–200.

Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In P. R. Clyne, W. F. Hanks, & C. L. Hofbauer (Eds.), *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels* (pp. 193–247). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Silverstein, M. (1996). Monoglot standard in America: Standardization and metaphors of linguistic hegemony. In D. Brenneis, & R. K. S. Macaulay (Eds.), *The matrix of language: Contemporary linguistic anthropology* (pp. 284–306). Boulder: Westview Press.

Tsai, M.-L., & Garcia, G. E. (2000). Who's the boss? How communicative competence is defined in a multilingual preschool classroom. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 31*(2), 230–252.

Tong, Q.-F. (2016). The controversy of the overseas Chinese education policy in Taiwan. Yazhou Zhoukan, 51. Retrieved from https://www.yzzk.com/article/details/%E6%96%B0%E6%80%9D%E7%B6%AD%E5%8F%8A%E5%85%B6%E4%BB%96%E5%B0%88%E6%AC%84/2016-51/1481773115624/%E5%8F%B0%E7%81%A3%E5%83%91%E6%95%99%E6%94%BF%E7%AD%96%E7%88%AD%E8%AD%B0

APPENDIX

Transcription Symbols

Underlined	Utterances spoken in English in the original
(( ))	Additional observation
(.)	Short, untimed pauses of a second or less
Italics	English translation of original utterances

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank the participants of this study. We thank the anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments to help improve earlier versions of this paper.

CORRESPONDENCE

Shumin Lin, Institute of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, National Yang Ming Chiao Tung University, Hsinchu City, Taiwan
Email address: smlin@nycu.edu.tw

Jouyi Wu, New Taipei Municipal Banqiao Senior High School, New Taipei City, Taiwan
Email address: sparkling@mail.pcsh.ntpc.edu.tw

PUBLISHING RECORD

Manuscript received: September 30, 2020; Revision received: June 19, 2021; Manuscript accepted: June 21, 2021.