SÍLVIA MELO-PFEIFER *

An interactional perspective on intercomprehension between Romance Languages: translanguaging in multilingual chat rooms

Abstract.   In this contribution, an interactional perspective on intercomprehension will be presented through the discussion of common features in multilingual communication. For this, a socio-constructivist perspective on intercomprehension is theoretically relevant and will be exemplified in terms of the empirical analysis. Since in multilingual interaction in Romance Languages the focus of the speakers is not always to juxtapose several linguistic codes, but instead the co-construction of meaning resorting to all semiotic resources mobilized and shared, the concept of translanguaging will also be called upon: a) to illustrate how the bounded nature of linguistic codes is irrelevant to the speakers during multilingual interaction and b) to avoid a "linguistic bias" in the analysis of multilingual interaction.

1.   Introduction

Much of the research about intercomprehension between Romance Languages (RL) carried out so far could be said to study receptive multilingualism, understood as the ability to understand multiple languages on the basis of their interlinguistic transparency or/and previous knowledge of languages of the same linguistic family (DOYÉ/ MEISSNER 2010; MEISSNER et al. 2012). From this perspective, intercomprehension is usually seen as a cognitive and individual accomplishment in the treatment of unknown or partially known linguistic material, resorting to reading or listening strategies, contextual evidence, and linguistic, non-linguistic and para-linguistic cues.

This contribution, however, deals with intercomprehension between RL from an interactional perspective, based on the analysis of on-line multilingual interaction (MELO-PFEIFER 2011; MELO-PFEIFER/ARAÚJO E SÁ 2010). As the main concern of this perspective is the observation and description of the co-construction of meaning between social actors in situated settings, heuristic tools such as "translanguaging" (GARCÍA 2014; GARCÍA/WEI 2014), "multimodality" (BLOCK 2014) and "plurisemioticity" (GARCÍA/WEI 2014), as representatives of the actual "multilingual turn" (MAY 2014) in applied linguistics and language education are mobilized to describe the com-

---

*   **Address for correspondence**: Prof. Dr. **Sílvia MELO-PFEIFER**, Universität Hamburg, Didaktik der romanischen Sprachen, Von-Melle-Park 8, 20146 HAMBURG.
E-Mail: silvia.melo-pfeifer@uni-hamburg.de
Research areas: Intercomprehension, heritage language education, on-line communication.

plex, situated and collaborative accomplishment of meaning in multilingual chats, where all RL share the communicative floor and are treated as equal (status, hierarchy, roles, …). A socio-constructive perspective is thus more suitable and will be adopted in this article.

In the scope of this contribution, translanguaging communicative episodes from a Galanet session (www.galanet.eu) will be analyzed, in order to show how multilingual participants: i) negotiate languages and meanings on equal terms; ii) focus mainly on practices and meanings and not exclusively on forms; and, iii) collaboratively expand their semiotic repertoires, building up a collective plurilingual competence.

Furthermore, as none of the languages is specifically seen as a "target-language" to be learnt and the focus is on communicative achievements through collective multilingual performance (BONO/MELO-PFEIFER 2012), we will reflect upon the utility of such an approach in the contemporary foreign language education landscape, currently facing a multilingual turn, but still biased by monolingual and monoglossic viewpoints of teaching and learning (namely in the practice of intercomprehension in the classroom).

2. Intercomprehension between Romance Languages from an interactional perspective

Intercomprehension has gained a stable place in the *academia*, defying theoretical and empirical standpoints in language education and disturbing some of the "well founded" principles of foreign language learning and teaching (MELO-PFEIFER/ARAÚJO E SÁ/SANTOS 2011). Among some of these fundaments, and related to the main topic of this contribution – multilingual interaction – we may refer to the assumption that successful communication can only occur when interlocutors rely on a common language. This shared language is expected to assure the comprehension between interlocutors, whether they have the same relationship to this language or not. From this "monolingual orientation" (CANAGARAJAH 2013: 1), communication is expected to occur between interlocutors:

- within a same mother language (monolingual and endolingual interaction),
- sharing a same foreign language (monolingual and exolingual interaction),
- having different relationships to a same language, i.e., between interlocutors to whom a language is a mother tongue and a foreign language (monolingual and exolingual interaction).

Indeed, most traditional perspectives on interaction have not engaged with plurilingual and exolingual interaction. This type of interaction develops when communication occurs in several languages, to which interlocutors resort in order to make sense of it and to engage with each other, even if they have very uneven linguistic competencies (an example of exolingual plurilingual interaction, according to LÜDI/PY 2003). In such a situation, so-called "native-speakers" of the languages being used may or may not be present. At the same time, even if a communicative encounter is expected to produce a

plurilingual-exolingual communicative situation, it does not automatically entail it, as some studies have described situations where individual agency surpasses the importance of the communicative and linguistic contract, helping to continuously redefine context, contract and communicative goals (BONO/MELO-PFEIFER 2011 and 2012).

As CANAGARAJAH puts it, such complex and dynamic communicative situations

"violate our assumption that a text [or a discourse] should be constructed in only one language at a time and that meaning should be transparent. This expectation is partly motivated by a broader assumption we hold about all communication. We believe that for communication to be efficient and successful we should employ a common language with shared norms. These norms typically come from the native speaker's use of the language. We also believe that languages have their own unique system and should be kept free of mixing with other languages for meaningful communication" (2013: 1).

Intercomprehension from an interactional perspective and in the field of a same linguistic family, understood as a communicative process where each interlocutor speaks one language and understands the language(s) of the other(s), is a very powerful practice capable of challenging a monolingual orientation to communication. Indeed, interactional intercomprehension in RL posits the following principles:

- languages belonging to this family are part of a linguistic *continuum*, without clear borders, that are afterwards generated and reified through legislation;
- this linguistic *continuum* allows interlocutors to engage in conversations where they share different compounds of the linguistic richness available (also known as "languages"), with relative little occasions of repair, repetition and problem solving;
- in multilingual communication, interlocutors implement creative and supplementary strategies to engage with each other, to negotiate intelligibility, and to collaboratively achieve meaning;
- performing multilingual communication actively engages interlocutors in the co-construction of context, of community solidarity and linguistic well-being, that could also be labeled as "cooperative disposition" (CANAGARAJAH 2014: 90);
- the so-called productive and receptive skills can be deployed in several languages at the same time (and even this dual division between receptive and productive abilities can be challenged, as the production must be oriented to the reception and vice-versa, in an interdependence that becomes difficult to isolate);
- intercomprehension relies on much more than words and should not be biased by a linguistic hegemony: it involves and depends on context and scenario, and on several semiotic resources, such as gestures, gazes, paces, signs, …

As we can observe, such a treatment of intercomprehension asks for a socio-constructivist stance, as meaning making is a social practice that engages holistically with ecological and contextual affordances (CANAGARAJAH 2013: 12). This approach to intercomprehension also challenges traditional perspectives on code-switching (GARCÍA/ WEI 2014), as the focus of attention is shifted from the linguistic codes (coming from

distinct and isolated linguistic ensembles) to the subjects and their joint cooperation and active doing through languages and languaging.

Even if the focus of applied linguistics, sociolinguistics and language education has not traditionally been multilingual interaction, some recent concepts have emerged as potentially useful to refer to and to describe the complexity of interaction that resorts to different languages in different contexts: "polyglot dialog" (POSNER 1991), "metrolinguistics" (PENNYCOOK 2010), "poly-languaging" (JØRGENSEN 2008), "translanguaging" (GARCIA/WEI 2014) and "intercomprehension", among others (see CANAGARAJAH 2013 and GARCÍA/WEI 2014 for a distinction between these and other concepts). CANAGARAJAH proposes the use of "translingual practice" (2013) as an umbrella term that encompasses all sort of multilingual interactions.

Although intercomprehension has also been recently seen as occurring outside the scope of a same linguistic family (DEGACHE/MELO 2008), we consider that this concept is the one that better describes the interaction going on in a same linguistic family. Such is the case of the communicative situation we will be dealing with in the empirical section of this work. However, because intercomprehension has traditionally been defined in quasi-linguistic terms ("to speak one's language and to understand the one of the other", as we could simply put it; see MELO-PFEIFER 2011 for a recent critique on this assumption), we admit that the concept of translanguaging should be called upon to complete the description of what is going on in multimodal and transsemiotic plurilingual communication. As GARCÍA/WEI observe:

> "Translanguaging (…) liberates language from structuralist-only or mentalist-only or even social-only definitions. Instead, it signals a trans-semiotic system with many meaning-making signs, primarily linguistic ones that combine to make up a person's semiotic repertoire. Languages then are not autonomous and closed linguistic and semiotic systems" (2014: 42).

3. Methodological design

3.1 The Galanet project: aims and participants

Galanet (www.galanet.eu) is an on-line platform developed to create multilingual learning conditions among individuals who master one or more RL. It includes synchronic (chat) and a-synchronic communicational settings (discussion forum and e-mail) designed to arrange for intercomprehension situations (previously referred to as "exolingual plurilingual" communicative situations). The aim of this platform is the development of collaborative projects between teams of university students from different RL countries, consisting in the production of a "press dossier" on an intercultural theme previously negotiated between the participants.

The Galanet session develops in 4 interdependent and sequential phases (ARAÚJO E SÁ/DE CARLO/MELO-PFEIFER 2010) [Table 1,]:

Phase	Activities
breaking the ice and choice of a theme	– Participants define their profile, get to know other students' profiles and exchange ideas about the project and their expectations and motivations. – They propose different themes as topics of discussion, leading them to express their opinions and to choose one of the themes for ensuing reflection.
brainstorming	– Participants identify sub-themes in order to prepare a "press dossier" and define its editorial guidelines.
collecting documents and debate	– Participants look for, present and discuss documents and web references to illustrate each sub-theme.
elaborating and publishing the press dossier	– Each team prepares a written synthesis of each debate and establishes the press dossier, integrating the diverse contributions to the discussion.

Table 1: The chronological development of a session[1]

During the "Canosession" (the second intercomprehension session in the Galanet platform, between February and May 2004), 13 teams from different countries participated in the session (students and tutors are counted together). Table 2 clarifies the constitution and characteristics of each team.

Teams	Countries	Number of participants	Languages of reference[2]	"Target" languages[3]
Lusomaníacos	Portugal	17	PT, FR	FR, ES, IT
Os Quinas	Portugal	17	PT, FR	FR, ES, IT
Les Canuts de Lyon	France	9	FR, IT, ES	FR, ES, PT
Che, Rio Cuarto.	Argentine	14	ES, FR	FR, IT
Le rane di Grenoble	France	19	FR, IT, ES	FR, IT, ES
Gli spagnoli di economia	Italy	15	IT, FR	FR, ES
forum2004BCN	Spain	34	ES, FR	FR, ES
RA & C° Lyon 2	France	16	FR, PT, ES	PT, ES, FR
"Les Dahuts" di Monica	France	18	FR, IT	IT, ES, FR
Madrid	Spain	36	ES, FR	FR, IT, PT
Cassino-Martine	Italy	19	IT, FR	FR, IT
Le Dino-saure, unicas2	Italy	14	IT, FR, ES	FR, ES, IT
Les Montois	Belgium	8	FR	ES, IT, PT

Table 2: Profile of participant teams in Canosession

---

1   See ARAÚJO E SÁ/DE CARLO/MELO-PFEIFER 2010.
2   These languages are indicated by the participants, while filling out their team profile.
3   These languages are indicated by the participants, while filling out their team profile.

As we can observe, almost all participant teams share at least a bilingual background (see languages of reference) and all of them have a multilingual goal (see target languages). All the participants, both students and tutors, have declared some degree of proficiency in different "linguistic mobile resources" (BLOMMAERT 2010), acquired at school or in other contexts. We can thus characterise the communicative situations shaping this project (and being elicited by it) as "multi-plurilingual" situations (see EHRHART 2010), as we observe the co-existence of plurilingual individual repertoires (pluri) in a multilingual virtual social space (multi). As French, Portuguese and Spanish are "pluricentric languages", we notice the co-presence of different varieties of some of these languages. Furthermore, there was a RL that was not declared initially by the participants but which was still mobilised and thematised: Catalan. From this perspective, the multilingual chats we will deal with could be seen as complex "contact zones", i.e., as spaces where diverse social groups with different backgrounds interact, even if this complexity is, in our case, framed by a learning and interaction communicative contract that reduces much of the asymmetry, power relations and clashes potentially emerging during communication in such complex "contact zones".

The chosen theme in the analysed session was "*Ridiamo per le stesse cose?... Y a-t-il un humour romanophone?*" / "*Do we laugh at the same things?... Is there a Romance Language humour?*", and the examples discussed in this contribution originate from discussions around this intercultural theme.

3.2 Selection of sequences of multilingual chat conversations: a rationale

The selection of chat excerpts was made keeping in mind the goals of this contribution, i.e., the illustration of how intercomprehension in RL is collaboratively achieved in the *hic et nunc* of the communicative process. We selected illustrative examples of this achievement where the focus of the communication is, according to the categories announced in the introductory section: i) the negotiation of languages and meaning on equal terms; ii) the focus on practice and on meanings, and iii) the collaborative expansion of the semiotic repertoires (both verbal and non-verbal repertoires). As we will later see, these three categories are highly interdependent, as they reflect interlocutors' dispositions and stances towards intercomprehension and its concerted accomplishment in an on-line environment.

All chosen sequences illustrate the mobilization of several sense-makers and sense-containers (or semiotic resources), demonstrating the multimodality attached to multilingual interaction in chat rooms. This multimodality will allow us, in turn, to avoid a "linguistic bias" on the analysis of multilingual interaction, understood as "the tendency to conceive of communicative practices exclusively in terms of the linguistic (morphology, syntax, phonology, lexis)" (BLOCK 2014: 56). Even if this "linguistic bias" can be easily justified through the overwhelmingly impact of linguistic diversity in the communicative process, the chosen excerpts will highlight how semiotic resources merge in a shared and dynamic communicative repertoire (BONO/MELO-PFEIFER 2012) to accomplish meaning. In other words, the selected episodes will

exemplify how interlocutors "translanguage" (i.e., move between and across semiotic resources) in multilingual chat rooms.

4.   Multilingual conversation analysis: translanguaging in chat rooms

4.1   The negotiation of languages and meanings on equal terms

In our chats interlocutors "are co-constructing meaning by adopting reciprocal and adaptive negotiation strategies in their interaction" (CANAGARAJAH 2013: 26), focusing on languages and on meaning, both perceived as being intertwined. This means that, even if RL have a fluid linguistic border, these borders are thematised, if a problem (usually related to lexical opacity) emerges and must be solved in order to develop interaction and to come back to the theme of conversation.

Example 1[4] illustrates how opacity emerges in the multilingual interaction and how it is collaboratively solved, with and without reference to the languages being used:

[laura] he oido a la televisiòn que ahier en Alicante en un banco ha estado una rapina, que ha ocurrido?
[PauV] rapina????
[laura] si ladri, come si dice in spagnolo?
[PauV] un robo
[PauV] ladri= ladron
[PauV] en catalan= lladre
[laura] ha, que ha ocurrido?

In this excerpt, between an Italian (Laura) and a Spanish (PauV) interlocutor from Catalonia, the Italian interlocutor is trying to communicate resorting to the language of her interlocutor. During the producing phase, some syntactic shortcuts related to the Spanish norm are made, but the only problem thematised by PauV is the lexical opacity of a keyword that Laura introduces in the sentence: "rapina". This problem is communicated both by resorting to the repetition of the unknown lexical item and by using expressive punctuation to signal lack of comprehension. This strategy is also common in other incomprehension situations, namely in "exolingual" interaction (when interlocutors possess different repertoires in the language being used as a communicative tool), the repeated punctuation being used here to substitute the intonation related to "ask for help" or communicating a problem ("*rapina????*") in face to face interaction. The signalization of the lexical problem brings Laura back to the communicative contract (communicate in the "reference language"): she provides a synonym ("*ladri*") of the unknown word, integrating it in an Italian sentence, and uses the *hic et nunc* of the

---

[4]   All the examples are reproduced in their original form and format, without any additional correction in terms of syntax or orthography.

communicative situation to learn the Spanish word she was looking for ("come si dice in spagnolo?" / "How do you say it in Spanish?"). PauV provides the direct translation of "ladri" in Spanish ("ladron") and in Catalan ("lladre"), resorting to a mathematic symbol meaning "equal to" (=), clearly distinguishing languages and displaying an understanding of languages as autonomous and discrete entities, but providing an opportunity for plurilingual learning.

In this episode, both interlocutors exhibit cooperative dispositions towards multilingual interaction, displaying marks of individual repertoires and of multi-semiotic strategies aiming at the co-construction of meaning. Laura and PauV orient themselves towards the communicative partner and their difficulties, and as long as the lexical problem is solved, they return to the thematic path they were engaged in ("*ha, que ha ocurrido?*") before the problem had popped up.

Through this "lateral sequence", it is possible to observe that the choice of the language of communication is quite flexible, despite the communicative contract, depending on the events that emerge during the conversation. Furthermore, even if that contract establishes that the co-constructing of meaning is the goal of the communication, it does not prevent interlocutors from orienting themselves towards learning: as we saw, Laura is producing in a "target" language, being confident of the "just-in-time-learning" offered by this particular situation. PauV does not seem disturbed by this teaching role ascribed to him and assumes a bilingual identity, by providing both the Spanish and the Catalan "equivalents" of the desired lexical item. As soon as the problem is solved and the multilingual dictionary is achieved ("ladri", "ladron", "lladre"), Laura returns to her learner role.

This excerpt thus exemplifies the tangled imbrication of language management, language use, and language learning in this multilingual setting, according to personal communicative goals, to collaborative dispositions, and to the shared used of semiotic resources (languages and other semiotic conventions in chat conversations).

4.2   Focus on practices and on meanings

Even if sometimes interlocutors acknowledge the individual nature of each language in other multilingual moments, interlocutors manage to put some distance between themselves and a monolingual and monoglossic norm, as they merge different and dynamic semiotic repertoires. Translanguaging thus turns out to be "a creative process that is the property of the agent's way of acting in interactions, rather than belonging to the language system itself" (GARCÍA/WEI 2014: 25). Indeed, in some moments, communicative features taken for granted, such as "who is speaking which language to whom", do not seem to have a particular significance, as practice and focus on meaning clearly overwhelm linguistic boundaries and linguistic contracts.

[lusitana] c sympa les blagues de blonde
[lusitana] ;9
[lusitana] ;)
[AntonioR] ¿Que son blagues?
[guidiguidi] hi hi hi hi hi hi hi
[esmeralda] blagas sao piadas, anedotas
[SilviaM] Blagues son anedotas.... piadas!
[Chegade] PROPOSITION : chat jaune: LES BLAGUES
[colombia] blagues=bromas
[glory] As vezes é rir para não chorar!
[lusitana] blagues sao historias que fazem rir
[guidiguidi] hi hi hi hi
[mokab] E está provado k rir faz bem à saúde...
[guidiguidi] eh eh eh eh
[qalbu] Quem conta uma??
[xander] depende
[SilviaM] Blagues sobre o quê????? Sobre mi misma?????
[CristinaV] tambien pueden ser chistes
[xander] se se estao a rir de ti
[xander] õu tu deles
[esmeralda] Blagas sobre cada nacionalidade
[mokab] Sobre cada nacionalidade!!! BOA
[tita] rir é o melhor remédio!;)

This episode illustrates how linguistic boundaries are surpassed (or deemed irrelevant) by the willingness to communicate. Several instances of translanguaging are observed in this episode, within or across utterances. Lusitana, a Portuguese student, produces different utterances resorting to different verbal and non-verbal resources. Guidiguidi, another Portuguese participant, seems to take her place in the interaction by providing non-verbal cues only ("hi hi hi", "eh eh eh eh"). SilviaM clearly moves in the continuum of the RL in her repertoire, as in the following interventions: "Blagues son anedotas.... piadas!" and "Blagues sobre o quê????? Sobre mi misma?????". Bits of languages (that we could identify as belonging to Spanish, French and Portuguese) are integrated in sentences, regardless of the communicative and linguistic contract or of any other rules limiting the creative composition of the message.

Another interesting translanguaging behavior is observed in Esmeralda's verbal production: this Portuguese student adapts "blagues" to her Portuguese repertoire ("Blagas"), adjusting her communicative resources to what she feels is appropriate to this communicative situation, as such an adaptation may hinder lexical opacity and facilitate intercomprehension. So, interlocutors explicitly adopt a multilingual modus while communicating, preventing misunderstandings and clashes. It does not seem to be important to the "native" if the "just-in-time" created new word exists or not in the norm of her "mother tongue", provided it accomplishes a communicative goal: a theme

proposition. As we can observe here, the theme is accepted by the interactional partners on the basis of the neologism created.

The visualization of this episode also clarifies the interconnection between verbal and non-verbal elements. Alongside with linguistic codes, non-linguistic features like smileys, (laughter) interjections, capitalization and effusive punctuation are used to improve the sense of the verbal cues. Indeed, like in face to face communication, the accomplishment of intercomprehension in chat rooms is made through the interpenetration of linguistic and non-linguistic codes, the last ones helping to select meaning among possible significances and communicative intentions, and providing a friendly translanguaging atmosphere (humor, play, complicity, and membership).

4.3   The collaborative expansion of semiotic repertoires

As we will observe through the analysis of one more excerpt, in plurilingual RL inter-action individuals tailor their language use reciprocally, by selecting more transparent words, by borrowing from diverse languages and symbol systems, and by reducing the opacity of the sentences (even if they do not always succeed in this goal). All of these features could be said to belong to a communicative code typical of chat conversations, as the pragmatic opacity can lessen comprehension and produce additional difficulties. However, in these multilingual chat conversations such strategies attain a much higher visibility, being the theme, the support and the means by which communication proceeds in a linguistic well-being environment.

In unknown RL new words and expressions gain referentiality through use and are integrated in the individual and collective repertoires. This is valid both for linguistic and non-linguistic resources. The following example provides evidence on the collaborative expansion of linguistic repertoires (see also the excerpt discussed in section 4.1, on "rapina", and in section 4.2, on "blagues"):

> [Chegade] C'est qui Menda?
> [AnnaïkG] Christian on discute de moi et de menda!!
> [SaulL] Menda es una palabra típica del español
> [bogdana] palabra = ?
> [colombia] mot = palabra
> [SaulL] word
> [AnnaïkG] =parole
> [bogdana] merci
> [Chegade] ah oui
> [colombia] conocen la canción "palabras palabras palabras"?
> [SaulL] Mmm
> [bogdana] si !!!
> [SaulL] De quien es?
> [romautos] parolé... parolé... parolé

In this excerpt, "palabra" is the lexical item that prompts a lateral sequence focused on the collaborative solving of a communicative problem. Through the sequence, the unknown Spanish word, elicited by Bogdana, a French participant, is continuously translated into French, English and Italian, until the problem is confirmed as being solved ("Merci"), and a new communication theme emerges ("conocen la canción "palabras palabras palabras?""). The sign that the collaborative expansion of linguistic repertoires took place is the fact that even the new communicative theme is multilingually developed without the need to refer to the languages employed, as this information would appear to be misplaced.

5.   Synthesis and perspectives: Plurilingual interaction in the contemporary foreign language education landscape

The analysis we carried out points out to two main conclusions regarding the achievement of multilingual interaction in RL. The first is that "difference is the norm on which communicative success is built" (CANAGARAJAH 2013: 17). The second is that "sharedness is achieved and not given" (idem: 17).

Regarding the first assumption, we noticed that a great effort concerning the management of diversity is made and that this diversity is valued and perceived as positive, and as having a positive impact on communication. An argument that supports this finding is that languages not covered by the communicative contract are introduced in the interaction. Furthermore, the multilingual subjects do not abide by the monoglossic contract ("speaking one language") and orient themselves towards a heteroglossic norm, where the languages are not kept in isolation.

As regards the second statement, we have illustrated how interlocutors orient themselves towards each other, facilitating understanding and communication and thus the co-construction of intercomprehension. Besides, in this multilingual situation, meaning is achieved resorting to a variety of semiotic codes, which are solicited, mobilized and mutualized in specific moments depending on what is "happening". Thus, intercomprehension depends not only on individual agency and on individual semiotic repertoires, but also on the collective dispositions, knowledge and know-how. A socio-constructivist approach to intercomprehension is therefore important to understand this interactional alignment and development of semiotic repertoires, attitudes, motivations and goals.

From this perspective, intercomprehension between RL (seen through an interactional lens) is not the result of the juxtaposition of several linguistic "solitudes" in a void (to recall CUMMINS 2008), but the flexible ongoing process of sharing and crisscrossing multi-semiotic resources through specific and situated multilingual communicative strategies. Such a perspective recognizes that the co-construction of meaning in multilingual interaction depends on "the interdependence of skills and knowledge across languages" (CREESE/BLACKLEDGE 2010: 103), in an interindividual level. It further acknowledges the agency, voice, and creativity of participants in the cross-con-

tamination of all semiotic resources available. Within our particular multilingual situation, this accomplishment of intercomprehension questions the validity of the linguistic boundaries around languages ascribed in the communicative contract and also the distinction between "reference language" and "target languages". It further justifies the mobilization of a heuristic concept such as "translanguaging" to describe the coordinated mobilization of multi-semiotic resources in the co-construction of meaning.

Finally, from a teaching and learning perspective in formal settings, the communicative excerpts analyzed clearly destabilize the notions of "linguistic norm", "communicative norm" and desacralize some principles of communication each of us has internalized as being appropriate. Some of the issues named by KRAMSCH (2014) can be applied here, as being deconstructed and reconstructed in multilingual communication:

- the existence of standardized languages with their stable grammars and dictionaries;
- the clear boundaries between native and foreign languages and among foreign languages;
- the codified norms of correct language usage and proper language use that language learners have to abide by for fear of not being understood or not being accepted by native speakers.

These communicative situations can thus help teachers and students to discuss and problematize concepts such as power, face, comprehension, error, native-speaker and monolingual norm, useful to understand what is at stake in foreign language learning and teaching behind the curtains of linguistic codes and linguistic borders. As KRAMSCH declares, new linguistic practices in the era of globalization "seriously put into question the notion of the foreign in FL [Foreign Language] teaching" (2014: 297), dismantling well-established constructs such as "native speaker" and "native speaker like", anchored in double/triple monolingualism perspectives about plurilingual repertoires. She also argues that, under certain circumstances, such kind of communicative performance could be included in the classroom routines, as a sign of authentic communicative use and of adaptive practices, as they frame the real linguistic world outside the classroom. This integration could provide opportunities to: i) foster metalinguistic, metapragmatic and metacommunicative awareness, metaphoric imagination and symbolic competence in language education; and ii) multiply the possibilities of meaning-making and meaning interpretation by expanding the semiotic horizons of communication. We argue, following KRAMSCH's perspective, that

> "The purpose is not to abandon all standard pedagogic norms of language use as the goal of instruction. It is, rather, to strive to make our students into multilingual individuals, sensitive to linguistic, cultural, and above all, semiotic diversity, and willing to engage with difference, that is, to grapple with differences in social, cultural, political, and religious worldviews" (2014: 305).

References

ARAÚJO E SÁ, Helena / DE CARLO, Maddalena / MELO-PFEIFER, Sílvia (2010): "'*O que diriam sobre os portugueses?????*' [What would you say about Portuguese people?]: intercultural curiosity in multilingual chat-rooms". In: *Language and Intercultural Communication* 10.4, 277–298.

BLOCK, David (2014): "Moving beyond 'lingualism': Multilingual embodiment and multimodality in SLA". In: MAY (ed.), 54–77.

BLOMMAERT, Jan (2010): *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BONO, Mariana / MELO-PFEIFER, Sílvia (2011): "Language negotiation in multilingual learning environments". In: *International Journal of Bilingualism* 15.3, 291–309.

BONO, Mariana / MELO-PFEIFER, Sílvia (2012): "La compétence plurilingue dans une perspective socio-constructiviste et (co-)actionnelle". In: ALAO, George / DERIVRY, Martine / YUN-ROGER, Soyoung / SUZUKI, Elli (eds.) (2012): *Didactique Plurilingue et Pluriculturelle: L'acteur en Contexte Mondialisé*. Paris: Éditions des Archives Contemporaines, 61–72.

CANAGARAJAH, Suresh (2014): "Theorizing a competence for translingual practice at the contact zone". In: MAY (ed.), 78–102.

CANAGARAJAH, Suresh (2013): *Translingual Practice. Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. Oxon: Routledge.

CREESE, Angela / BLACKLEDGE, Adrian (2010): "Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: a pedagogy for learning and teaching?" In: *The Modern Language Journal* 94.1, 103–115.

CUMMINS, Jim (2008): "Teaching for transfer: challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education". In: CUMMINS, Jim / HORNBERGER, Nancy (eds.): *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Vol 5. *Bilingual Education*. Boston: Springer Science + Business Media, 66–75.

DEGACHE, Christian / MELO, Sílvia (2008): "Introduction. Un concept aux multiples facettes". In: *L'intercompréhension, Les Langues Modernes* 1, 7–14.

DOYÉ, Peter / MEISSNER, Franz-Joseph (eds.) (2010): *Lernerautonomie durch Interkomprehension: Projekte und Perspektiven*. Tübingen: Narr.

EHRHART, Sabine (2010): "Pourquoi intégrer la diversité linguistique et culturelle dans la formation des enseignants au Luxembourg". In: EHRHART, Sabine / HÉLOT, Christine / LE NEVEZ, Adam (eds.): *Plurilinguisme et Formation des Enseignants: Une Approche Critique*. Frankfurt/M.: Lang, 221–238.

GARCÍA, Ofelia (2014): "Countering the dual: transglossia, dynamic bilingualism and translanguaging in education". In: RUBDY, Rani / ALSAGOFF, Lubna (eds.): *The Global-Local Interface, Language Choice and Hybridity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 100–118.

GARCÍA, Ofelia / WEI, Li (2014): *Translanguaging. Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.

JØRGENSEN, J. Normann (2008): "Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents". In: *International Journal of Multiligualism* 5.3, 161–17.

KRAMSCH, Claire (2014): "Teaching foreign languages in an era of globalization: introduction". In: *The Modern Language Journal* 98.1, 296–311.

LÜDI, Georges / PY, Bernard (2003): *Etre Bilingue*. Frankfurt/M.: Lang.

MAY, Stephan (ed.) (2014): *The Multilingual Turn. Implications for SLA, TESOL and Bilingual Education*. Oxon: Routledge.

MEISSNER, Franz-Joseph / CAPUCHO, Filomena / DEGACHE, Christian / MARTINS, Adriana / SPITA, Doina / TOST, Manuel (coord.) (2011): *Intercomprehension: Learning, Teaching, Research / Apprentissage, Enseignement, Recherche / Lernen, Lehren, Forschung*. Tübingen: Narr.

MELO-PFEIFER, Sílvia (2011): "De la dissociation à l'articulation de compétences: apports théoriques au concept d'Intercompréhension". In: MEISSNER et al., 219–242.

MELO-PFEIFER, Sílvia (2014) "Intercomprehension between Romance Languages and the role of English: a study of multilingual chat-rooms". In: *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 11.1, 120–137.

MELO-PFEIFER, Sílvia / ARAUJO E SÁ, Maria Helena (2010) : "La construction de l'intercompréhension dans l'interaction: images des langues et conscience plurilingue dans des clavardages romanophones". In: DOYÉ/MEISSNER (eds.), 267–280.

MELO-PFEIFER, Sílvia / ARAÚJO E SÁ, Maria Helena / SANTOS, Leonor (2011): "As 'línguas que não sabemos que sabíamos' e outros mitos: um olhar sobre o percurso da Didática de Línguas a partir da Intercompreensão". In: *Cadernos do LALE, Série Reflexões* 4, 33–55.

PENNYCOOK, Alastair (2010): *Language as a Local Practice*. London: Routledge.

POSNER, Roland (1991): "Der polyglotte Dialog. Ein Humanistengespräch über Kommunikation im mehrsprachigen Europa". In: HAFNER, Heinz / SCHWARZ, Alexander (eds.) *Semiotik und Didaktik: Festschrift für Otto Keller zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*. Frankfurt/M.: Lang, 6–10.