



This is a repository copy of *Conversation through art*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/173376/>

Version: Accepted Version

Book Section:

Bradley, J. orcid.org/0000-0002-4232-1983 and Atkinson, L. (2023) Conversation through art. In: Ainsworth, S., Griffiths, D., McCrory, G. and Pahl, K., (eds.) *Multimodality and Multilingualism: Towards an Integrative Approach*. Multilingual Matters (Channel View Publications) , Bristol . ISBN 9781800413382

© 2023 The Authors. This is an author-produced version of a chapter subsequently published in *Multimodality and Multilingualism: Towards an Integrative Approach*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Conversation through art

Jessica Bradley, University of Sheffield* and Louise Atkinson, Artist-Researcher

*Corresponding author (jessica.bradley@sheffield.ac.uk)

‘Thus we cover the universe with drawings we have lived.’

Bachelard, (1958) 1994: 12

Introduction

In this chapter we reflect on [Visual Representations of Multilingualism](#) (2018-19), a project which began as an initial question around how the British Association for Applied Linguistics (BAAL) ‘represented’ and might ‘represent’ research into and around multilingualism. We open up discussion on multimodality (Kress, 2010) in the context of the project which brought together fine art and applied linguistics, and consider these intersections. Having started as a small-scale endeavour with specific aims and objectives, as we outline later on in this chapter, the project evolved into a larger and more complex inquiry asking a series of questions which relate to how we work collaboratively, across sectors and across named disciplines. Our purpose in writing this reflective chapter is to explore some of the questions and tensions which arose when undertaking this interdisciplinary project. We consider what happens when we engage in a short-term project with a particular objective, and how these small-scale endeavours then become embedded in longer-term inquiry.

Our argument here is that these kinds of reflections are important as they offer us the chance to reflect on these small, tangential and side projects, which offer a slight detour or ‘sideways glance’ (cf. Ingold, 2008) leading to ‘imagining otherwise’ (Pahl, 2021; Phipps, 2019). Imagining otherwise (Walsh et al., 2020), or ‘the not yet’ (pg. 67), in the context of the work described here, allows us to engage both with theories of dynamic multilingualism and lived experiences of dynamic multilingualism, and how these might be understood through and beyond language.

We, the chapter authors, have collaborated across a number of research projects which focus on languages, and in particular on multilingualism. Jessica’s research is ethnographically informed, and she has explored multimodality and translanguaging in street theatre (Bradley, 2018) and young people’s experiences and understandings of linguistic landscapes (Bradley et al., 2018). Louise is an interdisciplinary visual artist, curator and researcher, with interests in the relationship between art and ethnography. Louise is committed to socially engaged practice and authorship. Together we approach from different disciplinary perspectives, but with shared research questions and underpinning philosophies around participation and working with communities. We outline our working relationship because it is important to contextualise collaboration (Jungnickel & Hjorth, 2014), and because collaboration ‘perpetually requires translation as it moves through different

transitions and modes' (p.143). This chapter, therefore, also serves to translate our collaboration.

In writing this chapter we want to shed light on some of the complexities of developing research across disciplinary spaces, through attention to the images of the artworks and conversations in and around them, which emerge and then intersect. It is evident that, more and more, inter- (and indeed trans-) disciplinary research is valued and understood both within and outside the academy (Facer & Pahl, 2017). However, there are still challenges in terms of how this research can be undertaken meaningfully and how it might be received by research communities and by public audiences. As a researcher and an artist working in and around education, we see the pervasiveness of interdisciplinarity, and the creative possibilities for researching collaboratively when our focus is on 'education' (broadly configured, and broadly construed). Research and teaching in education are inherently interdisciplinary, as they are similarly in the broad areas of language(s) and linguistics. A modern languages degree will include linguistics, literature, cinema, philosophy, history, politics, art, culture, and, of course, education, in addition to the learning of the 'language(s)' themselves (Burdett et al., 2018). Likewise, applied linguistics is interdisciplinary to its core: an umbrella for multiple intersecting and diverging approaches to language in 'real world problems' (cf Brumfit, 1995, p.27; Widdowson, 2019).

And yet, the intricacies and lived experiences of conducting research which is interdisciplinary can be often glossed over or edited out of research publications, which instead focus on the data and findings - although increasingly exceptions to this are becoming visible. For example, the 2016 Creating Living Knowledge report (Facer & Enright) for the UK-based Connected Communities research programme focused on interdisciplinary research and how universities and communities work together and research undertaken within this broader portfolio sought to make visible the mechanisms and processes of interdisciplinarity (and the tensions therein) (e.g. Facer & Pahl, 2017; Campbell et al., 2018; Facer, 2020). For interdisciplinary research with artists, the artworks or artistic or creative outputs might be conceived as outputs for dissemination or data to be analysed, and there is a tension here in terms of the artist's role and the artistic output itself (Pool, 2018). The risk here is of instrumentalising the arts and therefore reducing the artists' potential contribution. Likewise, the arts might be incorporated within the 'multimodal', meaning that complex histories and traditions are rendered invisible (Atkinson & Bradley, 2019). This risk of reductivism does not lie in the use of images and art processes, but in the way that the histories of these practices may not be incorporated or considered when choosing a particular media or genre to use within research in applied linguistics.

For Jessica's doctoral research with street artists in the UK and Slovenia (2018; 2020), she observed educational workshops, development of productions for the street and street performances themselves. Something she documented frequently related to how street arts educators trained performers to engage audiences in order to participate in a performance. The street performers were taught that once they had made eye contact and brought someone - whether adult or child - into their game, or play, they were then responsible for that person until the performance had finished or the person's participation had ended. This way of working, of engaging with another person and taking care of that person for the duration of the 'play', is one which can also inform interdisciplinary and co-produced

research. We use it here as a way to guide our working practices when engaging in conversation across disciplines and practices, as we do for this project.

Visual Representations of Multilingualism: [inter]disciplinary discomfort

[Visual Representations of Multilingualism](#) was a project inviting artists to contribute images of artworks which engaged with ideas of multilingualism and living multilingually. Initiated by Zhu Hua as part of a drive to increase the visibility of the wide range of multilingualism research within the British Association for Applied Linguistics (BAAL), it sought to open up new understandings of multilingualism in dialogue with cutting edge research which expands beyond more additive views of language (e.g. Otheguy et al., 2015; Creese et al., 2014-18). Zhu Hua invited Jessica to participate in the project due to her research into multilingualism and art, as her doctoral research had focused on translanguaging in street arts production and performance, as part of the AHRC-funded [Translation and Translanguaging project](#) (Creese, 2014-2018) and she co-convoked the International Association for Applied Linguistics (AILA) Research Network for Creative Inquiry and Applied Linguistics. Jessica then invited Louise, an artist-researcher who had collaborated with her on a number of creative arts and multilingualism projects (e.g. Bradley et al., 2018; Bradley & Atkinson, 2020) and whose research interests also cohered around communication and identity. Louise directs the international artist opportunity platform, [CuratorSpace](#), which offered a wider potential audience for the project, enabling us to engage with artists from around the world. It is ideas of the role of conversations in 'opening up new understandings' that we want to consider in this chapter, while framing it as a conversation in itself. We argue that opening up to interdisciplinary understandings of languaging requires an openness to challenge and discomfort.

The Visual Representations of Multilingualism project was originally conceived as a competition, with three prizes for winning entries and plans for an exhibition to be held in Manchester at the Annual Meeting of BAAL (see Bradley et al., 2021 for a longer discussion of this process). We have previously considered the artworks from the perspective of the postmonolingual condition and monolingual paradigm (Yildiz, 2012), including how artworks might conceptualise languaging in ways which might go beyond the postmonolingual condition. We have also set out some of the implications of our findings for future transdisciplinary research and practice, under the broader umbrella of creative inquiry and applied linguistics (Bradley & Harvey, 2019), including possibilities for artists and linguists to continue to collaborate in meaningful ways. In the current chapter we adopt a reflective stance. It reflects on how 'conversations' (Kester, 2004) took place within and across the process, and became realised in the form of artworks, which again, continue the conversation.

By way of a theoretical framework, we found it useful to return to Louise's own doctoral research (2016) for which she had explored ideas from Alfred Gell's *Art and Agency* (1998) which define the work of art as having three main characteristics:

- 1) It is made to be seen by an audience.
- 2) It is an index of social agency, i.e. it reflects the agency and desire of the person who made it.
- 3) It has an element of difficulty of captivation.

(Atkinson, 2016: 13)

Louise's doctoral research (2012-2016) was practice-based and she maintained a [blog](#), 'Practice as Research' on the 'a-n The Artists Information Company' web pages, an artist membership organisation which seeks to support artists and inform cultural policy. The blog aimed to document her progression through academia as a visual artist, enabling her to make her engagement with literature visible as she also created artworks and curated exhibitions. It was also utilised as a narrative framework for the thesis, enabling the reader access to her thought processes, as she continued to make work. Jessica's doctoral research explored meaning making in street arts production and performance, and she too was using blogging in her fieldwork to describe experiences and bring them into dialogue with theory.

It was through blogging, and through engagement with the idea of blogging through research, that we first began to collaborate academically, although we had worked together previously in arts engagement for a university. We found we had shared interests in making processes visible, including our own thought processes and reading, and documenting the multiple intersecting connections between theory and practice in our work. We explored some of these ideas initially in a conference paper for the Society for Artistic Research annual conference in 2016 (Atkinson & Bradley, 2016), for which the conference theme was the relationship between writing and artistic practice. It has been interesting when writing about the Visual Representations of Multilingualism project to reflect on how these ideas have developed over time and across our collaborative work together over the past five years. For one of our earliest collaborations in 2016, we had sought to create a taxonomy of writing in digital space, to explore how we understood writing in these different projects, and we use the concept of the conversation then too. We stated:

By creating this taxonomy, we use the collaborative and inductive research methods that we are bringing together through our conversations, to question how knowledge is produced and then defined. For Louise, in practice-led arts research, she questions the duality of the form her doctorate will finally take and the inherent paradox. On the one hand, her artwork cannot speak for itself – despite it being considered a form of knowledge. On the other hand, the writing itself is not considered to be a practice.

Our conversations have centred on what our writing does. At the different stages of our research, we have considered the 'how'. We ask whether when we write, or when our writing practice is carried out in 'digital space', whether this writing can itself be considered to be a cultural object. It was through this process that we embarked on the task of starting to categorise our writing practice. Through this joint endeavour, we are able to draw on our different disciplinary backgrounds. This process allows us to conceptualise that which is different and that which aligns.

(Atkinson & Bradley, 2016)

The idea of the ‘work behind the work’, as identified in Louise’s blog and in our extract above, is important for our discussion here (see also Pahl & Pool, 2018). On 8 January 2014 Louise wrote about how Gell’s ideas shaped her creative processes, explaining that taking Gell’s framework into account, the art making process can be said to index the maker’s social agency, including the multiple decisions involved. Each decision, as it is considered and then made, marks a point at which another possible avenue is closed down. At each of these points, multiple other possibilities existed. Likewise, as a decision is made, another series of possibilities opens up, related to the particular direction the artist has chosen. These points, these decisions, and these unspoken, unseen possibilities, are so often invisible. Yet they are an important part of the production of creative outputs. Louise writes about how what she describes as mutability in her own practice comes from her desire to ensure that the possible permutations of the work are maintained, in order that audiences for her work can visualise and engage in her decision-making processes. Similarly, Jessica’s doctoral research, as a visual and linguistic ethnographic study, sought to take account of decision making at all stages of the research process, making these visible as ethical practice, a methodological framework she theorised as ‘liquid’ (see Bradley, 2017; 2020).

There is an interdisciplinary discomfort, or tension, inherent in any kind of project which crosses disciplines and practices and which invites engagement. In this particular context, inviting the participation of artists in an endeavour which seeks to enhance visibility of multilingualism within a language and linguistics focused field is also inviting artists into a conversation. This links with what Grant Kester (2004) describes as ‘procedural knowledge’, with a focus on ‘empathetic insight made available through a process of active listening’ (p. 158). The point here is to challenge the perception of a collective identity, instead ‘opening to the transformative experience of others’ (ibid). Although perhaps those initiating the conversation have some ideas for what they envisage might be discussed within the conversation, it is not known at the outset where that conversation might lead, nor what those invited to be involved might like to talk about. The nature of the conversation itself is therefore also a point of discomfort, in terms of its positioning within a particular field of research. What do we envisage when we invite people into ‘our field’? Where might things lead? As the project continued, we therefore asked ourselves what would happen if the questions were broader, if we sought to widen the conversation beyond ‘applied linguistics’ and ‘multilingualism within applied linguistics’. Framing as a conversation allows us to do this, and gives the project life beyond its bounded dates and timeline. It is here that we see the real value of a small-scale bounded project and the opportunities it gives us to imagine otherwise, in the way that Pahl describes (2021).

Defining conversation: as conversation

We therefore deliberately choose to frame our discussion also as a conversation, inspired by Kester, in order to shed light on these points which we both described in our practice and research as decisions, and which we identified during the Visual Representations of Multilingualism project as symbolic. It should be noted that although some of the conversations we describe are more conventional, taking place verbally and face-to-face, the majority did not: those we define as multimodal conversations, with and through the artworks

themselves and often digitally enabled by email and video technology. We conceptualise conversations here as something much broader: from those taking place within the project team, for example, to those using video calls and email, to those encapsulated within the artworks themselves, and to those which took place with audiences when the artworks were exhibited.

Intersecting conversations

The conversations we describe in this chapter undoubtedly intersect. At times they also unravel. They are messy (Law, 2004). Here we discuss some of the kinds of conversations within the project, which we structure in what might be considered a loose taxonomy of sorts, mirroring the work we described previously from 2016. We do so in a linear way, as we are bound by the need for coherence, for the reader to be able to follow a thread, and by the genre of a book chapter of this kind. But we acknowledge the ways in which these conversations are circular, their intersections and their simultaneity. By opening up these conversations and describing them, we seek to shed light on the processes and move beyond a focus on the 'end product' itself. We also consider this as a tentative framework for considering project processes for small-scale, 'sideways glance' (cf Ingold, 2008) initiatives of this kind, allowing researchers and practitioners to reflect.

But first we start at the end, with the artistic outputs themselves (Bradley & Simpson, 2021) (the longlisted exhibited artworks are available to view [here](#)). Following Gell, we position these artworks, these things, as social agents. As social agents they derive their meaning from the research and from the conversations surrounding them and which bring them together into a curated exhibition. But, unless they are discussed, unless the conversations take place, unless the conversations emerge, they have no agency in themselves within the context they have been placed. Their agency emerges through their impact on other people and through their discussions. In the context of the Visual Representations of Multilingualism project, their agency within the field of applied linguistics emerges through conversations with and around the artworks, and through engagement with them. It is therefore important to consider these less visible, circular and intersecting conversations as important as they help us to understand both the agency of the artworks and perceptions and experiences of multilingualism.

Creativity and creative inquiry in applied linguistics

The project has particular relevance with discussion of creativity, creative practice and creative inquiry (Bradley & Harvey, 2019) in applied linguistics and language education more broadly. Rodney Jones foregrounds the need for researchers and educators to be more honest about what he describes as the 'messiness' of language learning situations (see also Carter, 2004). Moreover, Jones suggests that language itself is messy, therefore requiring acknowledgement and attention to this messiness:

In short, what is missing from most discussions of creativity and language education is an honest engagement with the 'messiness' of most situations in which people are

trying to learn language, the ‘messiness’ of creativity, and the ‘messiness’ of the whole business of language itself (Jones, 2018). (Jones, 2019: 536).

This messiness also links to theories of dynamic multilingualism such as translanguaging which see language use as flexible and going beyond named languages linked to nation states (Moore et al., 2020) which served as a catalyst for the project itself (Bradley et al., 2021), which move away from language(s) as bounded and countable entities:

Most considerations of creativity in language learning and teaching have taken place within the framework of dominant monolingual ideologies that see languages as discrete and abstract codes, separate from one another and from the messy social contexts in which they are used (Jones, 2019: 536).

The project, in itself situated across disciplines and practices, therefore offered the potential to shed a different kind of light on the messiness and the non-bounded nature of language(s). We now go on to consider a series of conversations we identified within the process, which serve to position the artworks in dialogue with applied linguistics through an exhibition and accompanying artist talk. These conversations foreground Gell’s ideas for what makes an artwork into being, in terms of bringing the artworks into contact with an audience, creating ways for the artists’ agency and desires to be made visible while also retaining the sense of ‘difficulty of captivation’.

Initial conversations: establishing the idea

The first conversations we consider are those which took place at the outset, and from which the project developed. These conversations were between applied linguists within BAAL, some of whom had been engaging with artists and with creative practice as part of their research at the project’s inception. With these initial conversations came the ideas for what might be possible, a timeframe within which it could take place and the first draft of a proposal. The conversations began with ideas of possibility. Within these conversations it was also important to have these first ideas approved by BAAL as the leading organisation and to set out a draft framework for what was desirable in terms of outcomes. These conversations were necessarily disciplinary, and they looked forward and outwards towards inviting others in.

Expanded conversations: inviting others in

The next series of digital conversations took place as plans started to be developed and ideas realised. These can be conceptualised as reaching outwards, reaching beyond the discipline to include creative practitioners and to co-write a ‘call’, a multimodal article which could then be disseminated to the international arts community through CuratorSpace.

Outward-facing conversations: the ‘call’ as a limiting medium

Beyond the organising group, the conversation with artists began through the open call for artworks on CuratorSpace. This call set out the main brief for the competition and exhibition, with a number of points to which artists could respond.

The broadcast medium of an open call announcement, coupled with the thematic element and photographic nature of the call, in some ways limited the opportunity for conversation. However, it was hoped that artists would find commonalities between their practice and the research questions, in order to enrich linguistic understandings through their work. A particular challenge lay in how to communicate dynamic multilingualism within the call. It can be easier to explain what it is not (for example the co-presence of named but distinct languages) rather than what it is. In some ways this also lent weight to the purpose of the project itself, which sought to bring together multiple perceptions of language.

Conversations around process: engagements through CuratorSpace

Following the open call, we published an article on CuratorSpace, linking to the original call and further elaborating on the ways in which 'dynamic multilingualism' has been theorised by different scholars and with connections to the arts. As with the open call, this included links to key theorists (e.g. Gardner-Chloros 2014; Lee 2015) in interdisciplinary applied linguistics to enable artists to contextualise their work within the field.

Making conversations: artistic conversations through the creating process

Although many artworks contain imagined, often unknown, processes, the descriptions of, and motivations for, the work submitted offered understandings of how each responded to the brief. As discussed earlier in this chapter, the work of art is only a part of the conversation, and often relies on the dialogue between itself and the accompanying text (for example the exhibition text or description) to give context to the ideas it contains. This interplay, rather than closing down interpretations, can create an introduction to the artist's experience and process to enable deeper engagement with the work.

In addition, many of the submitted works contained elements of conversation and participation, often across and beyond language. Here we consider a number of the submitted artworks. First, we take the example of Linda Persson and her collaborators, Wongatha women, Geraldine and Luxie Hogarth, with parts of the community of Leonora, Desert of Eastern Goldfields, Australia, who explored the politics and histories of minority languages with communities in the Australian outback, bringing together place, people, and heritage, through the generations.

[ADD FIGURE 1]

Figure 1: 'Light Language Landscape installation' Linda Persson with Wongatha women, Geraldine and Luxie Hogarth, with parts of the community of Leonora, Desert of Eastern Goldfields, Australia

Persson was based in the Western Australia Goldfields area for two years, working with the communities there to explore language and the link with the land. Together they created

artworks made from solar-panelled LED lights, which were worked into words from different languages. This culminated in an installation, which is documented in the images above. The project sought to make visible what is invisible and Persson is interested in the complex relationship between language and the land, and parallels between the Scandinavian environ and the desert environ.

The Greek Language Lab worked with refugees using dreams as a way to explore methods of communication through drawing and photography, and Elina Karadzova created an immersive digital environment with young people to convey the ways in which speakers of different languages understood time. Communication, within a community of participants and then beyond, is central to these examples. Yet the images and descriptions allow only a glimpse into the experience of creating the work and, in the case of Persson and colleagues and Kharadzova, the immersive experiences of the works themselves.

[add examples of GLL and EK's work]

Figure 2: 'My Dream is' Muhamad Nakam, Chloé Chritharas Devienne, and the Greek Language and Multilingualism Laboratory, University of Thessaly, Greece (George Androulakis, Roula Kitsiou, Mariarena Malliarou, Iro-Maria Pantelouka, Karolina Rakitzi, Sofia Tsioli).

Figure 3: 'Installation Image 1 Languages : Times Dreams Avatars' Elina Karadzova

Critical conversations: establishing the long and short lists

After receiving over 90 submissions from 26 countries, it was necessary to select the long list for the exhibition from which the three competition winners would be chosen. The panel of judges was made up of Louise and Jessica, with organiser Zhu Hua and external collaborator Abigail Harrison Moore, an art historian and art educator. The panel first selected works individually according to agreed criteria and then met to agree a longlist of works which would be exhibited and a shortlist of three entries to be recommended for the prizes offered by BAAL in collaboration with the publisher Multilingual Matters. These were then considered by the BAAL executive committee for confirmation and approval, with the announcement of the winners made in a blogpost published by BAAL.

The artworks submitted were created within a rich context that is difficult to communicate through the artistic outcome alone. This, coupled with the single photographic representation of the work, limited the potential for expressing the artistic ideas in full. Jessica noted the following:

The problem of an image. The images of the artworks are flat, some are taken with smartphones, some are better quality than others. Some images show moments from a longer immersive experience. Others show woven, collaged artworks, flattened. The images are at once a problem and not a problem. They allow for ease of presentation, they allow for ease of exhibiting. But for many of the submitted artworks, much is lost.

Curatorial conversations

When we launched the project in 2018 we stated that we would show selected artworks as part of the BAAL Annual Meeting, hosted by Manchester Metropolitan University in August 2019. In Spring 2019, once we had selected the artworks to be exhibited, we contacted the conference organisers to ask how we might do this and arrange to visit the available space. We were offered the opportunity to hold the exhibition in The Cave, an immersive exhibition space, which gave us different possibilities in terms of projection and lighting. For the exhibition itself we selected the longlisted entries, as agreed by the judging panel, and decided to show them in alphabetical order by artist name. We contacted the artists and asked if there are more images which they could send to us for the exhibition. We also asked if they could provide any additional information about their work which might help us in our descriptions of the artworks.

Exhibition conversations

We invited selected artists to discuss their work in a chaired discussion as part of the exhibition at the BAAL conference. This further consolidated the sense of the artists' practice as a whole and the ways in which their work intersected with the research, giving the opportunity for those attending the conference to hear more about the exhibition and the work behind the work, and engage in conversation with the artists directly.

Persson was one of the artists who participated in the conversation and she spoke to conference delegates about the complexity of representing the experiences of those two years and of the installation itself through static images (see Bradley & Simpson, 2021 for a longer discussion of this with reference to Elina Karadzova's installation). She described the processes behind the work, and, in particular, the collaborations involved in this project, which was co-produced with the desert communities. Although the images themselves served to document the artworks and the process, the commentary enabled a deeper understanding and appreciation of the process, offering additional layers of engagement, allowing the works to be seen by the audience and shedding light on the agencies involved in the creation of the artworks.

Continuing conversations

The curating process and the exhibition then elicited continued engagement with the artists, who provided further information, images and in some cases essays related to language and multilingualism within their work. As the artworks continued to be exhibited across different spaces in 2019 and 2020 the conversations continued, and the focus also shifted, for example, with the potential for future continuations of certain aspects of the project, including video works which might show multimedia or multiple stills to create a narrative approach to artistic practice. These conversations also opened up other challenges, for example, the project call and subsequent communication was in English (cf Piller, 2016). This raised questions for us about how we might respond to the challenge of the monolingual lens on multilingualism this inevitably gave the project, and how we might respond dynamically given the internationalism of the call. Is it a question of translation or a re-focusing on 'welcoming'?

Conclusion

The processes involved in curating the exhibition and through the conversations discussed above, have enabled us as authors to continue to develop our own thinking about the possibilities for artists to continue in dialogue with linguists, and how the arts can be understood as spaces for disrupting accepted understandings of multilingualism and how we research it. In conclusion we return to the three characteristics of an artwork, as defined by Gell and as we outlined at the beginning of the chapter:

- 1) It is made to be seen by an audience.
- 2) It is an index of social agency, i.e. it reflects the agency and desire of the person who made it.
- 3) It has an element of difficulty of captivation.

An open call of this kind has tensions inherent within it. We initiated the conversation - as applied linguists - and we invited people to engage with us in and through that conversation. In this case, we asked artists to engage with us through their artworks. Ideally, with a call of this kind, this will be part of a wider conversation that the artist might be already having through their work. The artworks would be part of a practice that is already developing. It is not the case that we are asking an artist to tailor their practice to a particular brief. Instead, we are looking to find commonalities and find artworks that express something beyond what we can get to through our more logocentric applied linguistics research (cf Harvey, 2020). We are seeking something that pushes out thinking further, that challenges us, that enables us to imagine otherwise. Following this argument, the word 'representation' in this context is potentially a misnomer, as what the artworks do goes far beyond 'representation'.

As conversations progressed, the project became a holding space for different dreams and desires, symbolising what were sometimes competing aspirations for where things needed to travel, or when and where things ought to end. It also asked what is the role of multimodal conversation in interdisciplinary research, and what does focusing on multimodal conversations tell us about the possibilities for the arts in understanding languaging? We now ask ourselves *how do we keep the conversation going?* There is also much that is not seen, as the project offered only a tiny glimpse into the artistic processes behind each artwork. Returning to the theoretical beginning, and where the project began, the project also asks whether through this work we are in fact moving beyond concepts such as translanguaging, which cannot adequately capture the complexity of what is expressed within the artworks and within the artistic processes. Do we need, in fact, to imagine otherwise if we are to really go 'beyond language', bringing in creativity to understand the complexities of living multilingually? And if we do, will we be able to 'treat creativity as if it really mattered', as Jones states we need to, and to see 'creativity as the deeply political act it is' (Jones, 2019: 536).

References

Atkinson, L. (2012-2016) *Practice as Research blog*. A-n The Artists Information Company. [Online]. <https://www.a-n.co.uk/blogs/practice-as-research/> [last accessed 3-1-20].

Atkinson, L. (2016) Souvenirs from the British Isles. *Unpublished thesis*. University of Leeds.

Atkinson, L. & Bradley, J. (2016) Writing as practice, practice as writing: conversations between art, linguistics and ethnography in digital space. Conference paper given at Society for Artistic Research, The Hague, April 2016.

Atkinson, L. & Bradley, J. (2019) Art education as communicative repertoire: Questions for creativity in applied linguistics. Conference paper given at Annual Meeting of BAAL, Manchester Metropolitan University, August 2019.

Bachelard, G. (1958 [1994]) *The Poetics of Space*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Bradley J. (2017) Liquid Methodologies: Researching the ephemeral in multilingual street performance. In: Conteh J (eds.) *Researching Education for Social Justice in Multilingual Settings: Ethnographic Principles in Qualitative Research*. London, UK.

Bradley, J. (2018) Translation and translanguaging in production and performance in community arts. *Unpublished thesis*. University of Leeds.

Bradley, J. (2020) Ethnography, arts production and performance: Meaning-making in and for the street In Lähdesmäki, T., Ceginskas, V., Koskinen-Koivisto, E. & Koistinen, A-K. (eds), *Ethnography with a Twist: Methodological and Ethical Challenges and Solutions in Contemporary Research* (pp. 197-212). London: Routledge.

Bradley, J. & Atkinson, L. (2020) Translanguaging beyond bricolage: Meaning making and collaborative ethnography in community arts In Bradley, J., Simpson, J. & Moore, E. (eds), *Translanguaging as transformation: The collaborative construction of new linguistic realities*, (pp. 135-154). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Bradley, J, Atkinson, L & Zhu Hua. (2021, in press) Visual Representations of Multilingualism: Exploring Aesthetic Approaches to Communication in a Fine Art Context In Macleroy, V., Anderson, J., Ros i Sole, C. & Lytra, V. (eds), *Decentring Language Education* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Bradley, J. & Harvey, L. (2019) Creative Inquiry in Applied Linguistics: Language, Communication and the Arts. in Wright, C., Harvey, L. & Simpson, J. (eds) (pp. 91-107). *Voices and Practices in Applied Linguistics: Diversifying a Discipline* White Rose University Press.

Bradley, J., Moore, E., Simpson, J. & Atkinson, L. (2018) Translanguaging space and creative activity: theorising collaborative arts-based learning. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 18(1), 54-73.

Bradley, J. & Simpson, J. (2021) *Reflections on transdisciplinary approaches to multilingualism, pre- and post- COVID19*. iHuman research blog [Online]. (link here) [Last accessed 12-4-21].

- Burdett, C., Burns, J., Duncan, D. & Polezzi, L. (2018) *Transnationalising Modern Languages: Reframing language education for a global future*. Policy Report 35: September 2018. Bristol: PolicyBristol.
- Brumfit, C. J. (1995) Teacher professionalism and research. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (eds.), *Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, E., Pahl, K., Pente, E. & Rasool, Z. (2018) *Re-imagining Contested Communities Connecting Rotherham Through Research*. Policy Press.
- Carter, R. (2004) *Language and Creativity: The Art of Common Talk*. London: Routledge.
- Creese, A. et al. (2014-2018) Translation and Translanguaging: Investigating Linguistic and Cultural Transformations in Superdiverse Wards in Four UK Cities' Arts and Humanities Research Council (AH/L007096/1)
- Facer, K. (2020) Convening Publics? Co-produced Research in the Entrepreneurial University. *Philosophy and Theory in Higher Education*, 2(1), 19-43.
- Facer, K. and Enright, B. (2016) *Creating Living Knowledge: The Connected Communities Programme, community-university partnerships and the participatory turn in the production of knowledge*. Bristol: University of Bristol and Arts and Humanities Research Council.
- Facer, K. & Pahl, K. (2017) *Valuing Interdisciplinary Research: Beyond Impact*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (2014) Multilingualism and the arts: Introduction. *International Journal of Bilingualism*. 18(2), 95-98.
- Gell, A. (1998) *Art and Agency*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, L. (2020) Entangled Trans-ing: Co-Creating a Performance of Language and Intercultural Research. In Moore, E., Bradley, J. & Simpson, J. (eds) *Translanguaging as Transformation: The collaborative construction of new linguistic realities*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Ingold, T. (2008) Anthropology is not ethnography. *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 154, 69-92.
- Jones, R. H. (2019) Creativity in language learning and teaching: Translingual practices and transcultural identities. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 11(4), 535-550.
- Jungnickel, K. & Hjorth, L. 2014. Methodological entanglements in the field: methods, transitions and transmissions. *Visual Studies*, Special Issue: Transformations in art and ethnography, 29(2), 138-147.
- Kester, G. (2004) *Conversation Pieces: Community and Communication in Modern Art*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

Kress, G. (2010) *Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Communication*. London: Routledge.

Law, J. (2004) *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. London: Routledge.

Lee, T.K. (2015) Translanguaging and visuality: Translingual practices in literary art. *Applied Linguistics Review* 6(4): 441–65.

Moore, E., Bradley, J. & Simpson, J. (2020) *Translanguaging as Transformation: The Collaborative Construction of New Linguistic Realities*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Otheguy, R., García, O. & Reid, W. (2015) Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6 (3), 281-307.

Pahl, K. (2021, in press) Commentary. In Macleroy, V., Anderson, J., Ros i Sole, C. & Lytra, V. (eds), *Decentring Language Education* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Pahl, K. & Pool. S. (2018) Re-Imagining Artistic Subjectivities within Community Projects. *Imaginaries of the Future 01: Bodies & Media*. 4(2) pp 1-22

Phipps, A. (2019) *Decolonising Multilingualism: Struggles to Decreate*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Piller, I. (2016) Monolingual ways of seeing multilingualism, *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 11(1), 25-33.

Pool, S. (2018) *Everything and nothing is up for grabs: Using artistic methods within participatory research*. Bristol: University of Bristol and Arts and Humanities Research Council.

Walsh, A., Sutherland, A., Visagie, A. & Routledge, P. (2020) *Imagining Otherwise: A glossary of arts education practice on the Cape Flats*. *ArtsPraxis*.

Widdowson, H. (2019) Disciplinarity and Disparity in Applied Linguistics. In Wright, C., Harvey, L. & Simpson, J. (eds) *Voices and Practices in Applied Linguistics: Diversifying a Discipline*. York: White Rose University Press.

Yildiz, Y. (2012) *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Word count - 6275