



HAL
open science

Discovering transculturality at international conferences

Laura Déléant, Marie Dincher, Jérémy Filet, David Gocel-Chalte, Alexis Olry,
Dominique Macaire

► To cite this version:

Laura Déléant, Marie Dincher, Jérémy Filet, David Gocel-Chalte, Alexis Olry, et al.. Discovering transculturality at international conferences: early-career researchers' experience of mobility. *Etudes en didactique des langues*, 2020, *Voyages, parcours & cheminements / Travels, journeys & pathways*, 35, pp.51-65. hal-04011626

HAL Id: hal-04011626

<https://hal.science/hal-04011626>

Submitted on 2 Mar 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Discovering transculturality at international conferences: early-career researchers' experience of mobility

Université de Lorraine

Laura DÉLÉANT

Laboratoire de Psychologie Ergonomique et Sociale pour l'Expérience Utilisateurs,
PErSEUs, EA 7312

Marie DINCHER

INRA, Unité de recherche Biogéochimie des écosystèmes forestiers, BEF, UR 1138

Jérémy FILET

Manchester Metropolitan University – Laboratoire Interdisciplinarité
dans les Études Anglophones, IDEA, EA 2338 & History Research Centre

David GOCEL-CHALTÉ

Laboratoire Interdisciplinaire des Environnements Continentaux, LIEC, UMR 7360

Alexis OLRV de RANCOURT

Laboratoire de Psychologie Ergonomique et Sociale pour l'Expérience Utilisateurs,
PErSEUs, EA 7312

Dominique MACAIRE

Inspé, Laboratoire Analyse et Traitement Informatique de la Langue Française,
ATILF, UMR 7118, équipe Didactique des langues et sociolinguistique



(In the same order as the names above)

Introduction

There are significant differences in how education should be approached and implemented at the international level (OECD, 2015). Although some disparities are inescapable, higher education aims at self-regulating performance, including knowledge transfer (Bloom *et al.*, 1969). Across academic disciplines, scientific progress is only effective when the methods and results obtained are widely disseminated (Elliott *et al.*, 2011).

Knowledge transfer requires the ability to identify the objectives to be reached as well as the criteria and standards expected by the scientific community. This is attained, according to Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick (2006), by clarifying the nature of a “good performance” at the university level and by promoting reflexivity in regards to one’s work. Educators should also foster self-esteem and a positive belief in one’s abilities by providing the opportunity to bridge the gap between actual and expected performance.

We have sought to mobilize these four principles (expectations, objective identification, reflexivity, self-esteem fostering) when developing a workshop delivered at an International Summer School in Asia intended for Master and PhD students.¹ Its primary purpose was to improve students' communication skills by preparing a talk for an international and multicultural audience.

We were six French PhD students from the University of Lorraine (one of them did not participate in this publication) who designed and conducted the workshop. We came from various disciplines including ergonomics, history, English literature and environmental sciences. This presentation on the way early-career researchers (ECRs) perceive themselves – from defining their mission to building their identity internationally – was therefore external to our disciplinary fields or research interests. We had to adapt to each other's skills in order to address students from several partner universities throughout the world. The cultural differences among the audience participants constituted a positive manifestation of diversity as well as a challenge for the team.

We will first present the design of the workshop itself and highlight the characteristics of oral communication in an international research context. When designing the workshop, we presupposed that common principles help to communicate on research at the international level. We conceived a specific framework that aimed to reinforce student reflection on how they might meet international standards. We also hypothesized that the Asian context could affect our preparation as well as its delivery. In this paper, we examine what is frequently referred to as good practice and how it can be called upon while collaborating. During the workshop, we were confronted with interculturality and transculturality, two concepts which will be discussed in the second section of this paper. As such, our workshop should be seen as a contribution that may be adapted to other situations. We have intended here to reflect on the pathways between theory and practice while using our workshop as a case study.

Between conception and practice

Background

The workshop discussed in this article was designed for and delivered at the International Postgraduate Roundtable and Research Forum cum Summer School (IPPRFSS) of the Education University of Hong Kong (EduHK). The participants came from different geographical areas and cultures. Among the multitude of countries represented were Australia, France, Germany, Japan, Kazakhstan, Korea, Macau, Mongolia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Russia, Singapore, Taiwan, the United Kingdom and the USA. The attendees were mainly from Asia and Europe, with a majority being from China or the Philippines.

¹ The workshop "Get your audience!" was held during the *International Postgraduate Roundtable and Research Forum cum Summer School 2018* (IPPRFSS) at the Education University of Hong Kong (event period: 3 July-6 July 2018). It was associated with Dominique Macaire's plenary session (*Build your own brand: how to share your research within an intercultural community*).

Due to the ECRs working in different fields, the workshop preparation team had to adapt to the different scientific backgrounds. For example, the ECRs studying environmental sciences tended to summarize their ideas whereas those from the humanities were more likely to develop each of their points with a profusion of examples. Our first task was to understand the way each of us functions in order to harmonize the presentation and make it understandable for attendees from different scientific backgrounds and countries. Upon agreement, our workshop was divided into three interconnected parts.

Identification of oral and visual conventions for international conferences

The first part of the workshop focused on producing visual support that is both understandable and attractive. In order to structure this part of the workshop, we found that several renowned universities offer useful resources on the creation of visual supports for scientific research². We then relied on publications that address some guidelines to follow (e.g. Erren & Bourne, 2007; Gundogan *et al.*, 2016 for a poster) as well as on the expertise in ergonomics of three of the organizers, who suggested their own resources for the visual design and the organization of information. The elements collected were divided into three main categories.

Organization and layout

In order to determine the elements that make up the support, the outline must be clearly defined, usually consisting of an introduction, the data, the method, the results, the discussion part, and a conclusion leading to perspectives for future research. Drawing on the works of Koffka (1922) and Wertheimer (1944), we applied the theory of form – also called *Gestalt Theory* – to offer a set of recommendations based on human perception. The overall idea is that a presentation must be considered a whole rather than a sum of independent parts. For example, in poster design, elements confined in an enclosed space are regarded as being related, as emphasized by the “common region” principle. The principles of “similarity” and “proximity” express our tendency to associate similar objects and to group the elements closest to each other. As such, the principle of “distance/proximity” opposition leads to a vision of duality. These principles can also be interconnected in a more holistic and comprehensive approach to diversity as well as be more respectful of diverse points of view.

Accessible and concise text

Doctoral training programs have highlighted the importance of summarizing research as succinctly as possible. The first step is to choose relevant keywords so that the audience can quickly identify the topic. These keywords form a common thread allowing the addressees to retain the research objectives throughout the talk. The construction of the presentation, the vocabulary and the notions we used

² Cornell (<https://hsp.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/ScientificPosters.pdf>) and New York University (<https://guides.nyu.edu/posters>).

assumed the pre-existing knowledge of the intended audience. A visual aid has limited space; words displayed on the screen should be wisely chosen and uncommon abbreviations carefully explained.

Design and attractiveness

“Visual support” is aptly named; its sole purpose is to support the discourse. It helps with decision-making about the message conveyed and can contribute to a streamlined presentation, which is easier to understand. It also aims at attracting the audience’s attention. The speaker must be innovative when creating an original visual theme that captures the public’s attention. The aesthetic aspect is crucial, both on slides and paper. This leads us to a recommendation about visual support creation: design should not take precedence over content. Illustrations or iconographic details can vary from one culture to another, so one of the difficulties is to understand these unfamiliar elements.

These three characteristics were central to how we presented the designing of visual supports for academic purposes. We weighed the pros and cons of using illustrations while constantly expecting input from the group. It was clear that iconography does not have the same value across cultures, nor was it seen as a valid tool in this instance. More precisely, some colors are associated with certain logos in some countries but completely neutral in others. For example, a green logo, which is not systematically paired with any other color in the United States or Brazil, is likely to be paired with yellow, white or black in Hong Kong or Taiwan (Madden *et al.*, 2000).

All the attendees ended up agreeing on the usefulness of visual elements, especially considering that ECRs are usually more likely to be part of the generations X, Y or Z³ than their elders. Graphs can summarize numerical results making them quickly accessible to a broad audience, while images often easily illustrate complex ideas or concepts. These may help memorization or even a better grasp of the content. In addition, a homogeneous and uncluttered graphic design, with bright colors and distinct shapes, makes the presentation accessible and attractive. For the attendees who did not feel creative, we introduced them to many design tools, such as *Canva*[®], *Illustrator*[®], *Photoshop*[®], etc. These can inspire the speakers when creating their visual support.

We also pointed out some codes common to many cultures. We used examples found on posters that should enable anyone to understand the research subject without even reading the text, regardless of the culture of the target audience or their level of knowledge. In addition, we mentioned the use of English, the *lingua franca* mostly found in multicultural contexts and at international conferences.

³ The term “generation X, Y, or Z” refers to groups sharing similar characteristics (practices and representations) according to their date of birth: Generation X was born between 1965 and 1980, Generation Y between 1981 and 2000 and Generation Z since 2001.

The performance of the speaker

The second part of the workshop focused on the speaker's performance. We laid out three points to maintain the audience's attention (Atkinson, 2005):

- *attitude* plays an essential part: self-confidence, credibility, authenticity, and sympathy are assets that help maintain attention (Collins, 2012);

- *gestures* should support the discourse instead of distracting the audience from the message conveyed by the scholar. In other words, speakers must control their movements and avoid transmitting their stress through hyper-gestures or exaggerations (Anderson, 2016);

- *discursive structures* give life to the oral speech by guiding the audience (Leith, 2011). Silence carries as much weight as speech; it is thus crucial to use a calm speaking voice, to survey one's intonation and to control the pace of speech⁴. After identifying key elements for a relevant and impactful oral communication, we tried to formalize them while being aware that cultural differences can create misunderstandings.

Practice significantly reduces the speakers' stress level and increases the quality of their delivery (Daly *et al.*, 1995). Our workshop intended to help participants adapt to fit their performance space and to adopt an appropriate mindset before their own presentation. Theater-inspired warm-up exercises were practiced to help attendees relax and manage their anxiety as well as to train their intonation and voice. The exercises enabled the speakers to focus on their breathing and free themselves from stress. The participants walked throughout the room in different ways like in a role play, and with different attitudes: confident, clumsy, heavy-footed, etc. The aim was to visualize space and the way the attendees should position themselves while speaking and according to the type of message that they want to deliver.

Once the participants were relaxed and aware of their environment, we moved on to some diction training. Every participant had the same text but had to recite it with different intonations and attitudes. The choice was based on the position previously occupied on stage in order to better understand the relation of these two factors when information is transmitted to any given audience (Hardison & Sonchaeng, 2005). We then emphasized the importance of repeating the text and placing structural pauses when rehearsing. A fair amount of information is conveyed by a speaker's facial expression. By holding a mirror, participants were able to observe themselves and learn how to adjust their behavior according to the message they wanted to deliver.

⁴ The activities are mainly based on concepts studied at a seminar entitled "Effective public speaking" given by David Shirley (Royal Academy of Dramatic Art & Dean of the Western Australian Academy of Performing Arts) as Director of the Manchester School of Art at Manchester Metropolitan University, England.

A collaborative experience at the end of the workshop

The third and last part of the workshop was thought of as the building of a co-working experience, with activities involving the participation of the audience and emphasizing the importance of a touch of originality to capture and hold attention. If the “visual support” and the “theater” activities were representative of precise parts of the workshop (the importance of the support and of the acting in a streamlined presentation), we also wanted to summarize the entire workshop by a final collaborative activity. This last section took the form of a final test making it possible to review each part (design, message, layout, theater, etc.) in a short, fun and dynamic way, the aim being that each attendee could make an assessment of what he or she had learned or, on the contrary, required improvement.

By encouraging audience participation, we were able (1) to ensure that the public had a good understanding through interactive quizzes, (2) to break the rhythm in order to maintain the participants’ attention and (3) to respect everyone’s attitude towards public speaking, even allowing them to discuss their cultural differences. Considering these three points, *Kahoot!*[®] seemed particularly adapted to an international workshop involving so many participants: it shows a clear and accessible interface, which displays the answers of the audience to each question. Attendees can choose to have their scores visible or create a pseudonym to play the game anonymously.

The game-based learning platform *Kahoot!*^{®5} enables participants to respond to an online quiz on a smartphone or a computer with a simple PIN code. It was added to the formal part of our workshop to stimulate interactions with our audience. The software was suggested by one of us, who often used it for university courses and who was familiar with its functioning. The workshop participants were not acquainted with *Kahoot!*[®] but the ECRs had already used smartphone applications for this purpose and were familiar with such activities. Still, they would not have imagined it as part of academic interaction. The questions were also projected on the screen so that people without a smartphone were able to follow the talk although they could not participate. Several questions were asked for each theme. Below are some examples of original questions that we created for the workshop.

You did statistical analysis and you would like to talk about a Generalized Linear Model in a conference.

What do you call it?

- GLM
- Gen. Lin. Mod.
- Generalized Linear Model
- **Generalized Linear Model (GLM) then GLM**

What is the first thing to do when you prepare your presentation?

- Write your whole speech
- **Define the objectives of your presentation**
- Find the visuals for your PowerPoint

⁵*Kahoot!*[®] is a creative learning platform, which engages students in diverse tasks while making them act on and share their learning. For more information, see: <https://kahoot.com>.

What percentage of your poster presentation should be illustrations?

- 70%

- 20%

- **40%**

The 30-minute *Kaboot!*[®] session completed the workshop as a review.

The participation rate of the audience was close to 100% with a majority of right answers. This shows that the format was attractive and accessible and that the concepts discussed were well understood (1). After each question, we explained the answers and shared the participants' viewpoints (2). As such, the *Kaboot!*[®] quiz enabled us to have a brief, direct and playful feedback about our intervention.

During the workshop, we considered improvisation as a collaborative strategy for the attendees to construct knowledge in a way that makes sense to each of them. This type of strategic improvisation will retain the richness endemic to all human communication.

Between a theoretical framework and practice: reflecting on the training session

Learning in situation, a key for mediation

As Lave & Wenger (1991) argued, learning takes place in context, it is “situated.” Situated learning theory⁶ states that every idea and human action is a generalization, adapted to the ongoing environment; it is founded on the belief that what people learn, see and do is situated in their role as a member of a group or a community. Lave & Wenger further suggested that interaction creates mental structures that are not individual mental representations but “participation frames”, which are adaptive and less rigid.

Vygotsky (1978) had previously developed the concept of “zone of proximal development” (ZPD). Notably, he had suggested that learners can make more significant achievements with the assistance of a skilled peer. According to Clancey (1995), “put it another way, the ZPD is mutually constructed to maintain a correspondence between other- and self-regulated behaviour achieved through scaffolding” (1995: 4). Knowledge is socially embedded and learning is a process that occurs in a participation framework from socially-mediated processes. The ZPD is the difference between what a learner can do alone and what he or she can achieve through problem-solving in collaboration with peers (also called “expert-novice dyad”). The theory of situated cognition is related to Vygotsky’s activity theory. Situated learning explains how human knowledge develops in the course of activity and especially how people create and interpret descriptions (representations) of what they are doing (Clancey, 1995). For the design of our workshop, we adopted the following definition of situated learning:

Situated learning environments place students in authentic learning situations where they are actively immersed in an activity while using problem-solving (critical thinking) skills. These opportunities should involve a social community which

⁶ See: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/computer-science/situated-learning-theory>. Also: Woolf (2010).

replicates real-world situations. In the end, the situated learning experience should encourage students to tap their prior knowledge and to challenge others in their community (Stein, 1998).

By combining this with the theory of “learning by doing” (Bruce & Bloch, 2012) and putting forward the “action” – the involvement of the students – we enabled our peers to learn *from* and *about* their own experience(s). Therefore, we expected them to remember information better, for themselves and their learning community (*i.e.* the participants of the workshop, composed of the attendees at the workshop and the ECRs). If participants from various cultures validate communication activities, it can be assumed that disseminating them in a broader context will minimize cultural misunderstandings.

From “good” practices to “relevant” practices

A good practice is an example of what and where a method or a technique is effective. Supposedly consistent and measurable, it is related to some examples of what could be transferred to another training context, learning environment, educative culture or research domain. It depends on the reflective ability of the participants to adopt techniques or specific practices, or even on models.

We have retained the practices that are valid for our specific context. We had to adapt accordingly in order to fit the situation and be relevant and valid in context. We wagered that participants and ECRs were able to step back and distance themselves from practices in order to look for meaningful experiences and not simply provide solutions during training activities. Relevant practices make adaptation possible, and open a new space for discussion. Even though the “Quiz activity” was popular and successful, it had its limitations.

Firstly, compared to the “Theater” and “PowerPoint conception” activities, which demanded the implication of learners, the use of an online platform with a quick chain of questions limited the dialogues between the ECRs and the audience. This could reinforce the feeling of a traditional teacher/learner(s) interaction instead of an exchange between animator(s) and participants – more conventional for a workshop.

Secondly, the “Quiz” format reduces the opportunity for the participants to express their opinion on the workshop content. The reactions of each participant at the end of the questions were very brief, reducing the amount of time spent on the discussion part of the workshop. However, the participation rate and the interest for the *Kaboot!*[®] application confirmed that the originality was attractive and stimulating. This application should be used several years in a row within the context of the summer school in order to confirm or refute its long-term benefit on the participants.

In order to better know the participants’ expectations for following editions of the workshop, a final survey was proposed to attendees of the EduHK International Summer School. By gathering the participants’ feedback about the different sessions, the ECRs from the University of Lorraine were able to adapt their next intervention. ECRs from European countries discovered some of the

tools that we presented although they already knew about the approach itself. The exchanges with the participants during the workshop were enriching. They enabled us to improve the resources that we used and also enabled the participants to improve their own designs.

Cultural differences at international conferences

During the workshop, we were able to identify two main aspects of oral communication: the knowledge that is transmitted (the content) and the way it is disseminated (the form). Content and form must remain flexible and adaptive to the responses of the whole group, including the ECRs.

It is interesting to note that the reactions differed depending on the origins of the participants in our workshop. The most remarkable one was the enthusiasm and high spirit of the attending Filipinos. They were mostly willing to participate and their good mood was often contagious. Students from Mainland China were more reserved but diligent and hardworking. Asian culture is often characterized by modesty, the control of the body, and respect for an ascending hierarchy (Capdeville-Zeng, 2014), while European culture is often considered to be rather demonstrative and to accept more readily horizontal relationships between individuals (Lotzer, 2004). The Asian education system has a tendency to favor formal talks, which perfectly illustrates the effect that cultural aspects can have on academic presentations. For instance, interlocutors with an Asian cultural background were likely to avoid confrontations and strong opinions so that none of the participants “lost face” (Bryant, 2019).

However, the “theater” activities seemed to go beyond some of these participants’ comfort zones. Only the Europeans attendees seemed unsurprised by this part of the workshop. In an informal exchange with the German participants, some of them explained that public speaking activities as well as this type of exercise were frequent from the very first years of schooling in their country. In spite of this, they are used to reading a written text during conferences. Before attending our workshop, they greatly privileged scientific content over an effective way of conveying their message. They found the possibility of engaging in theater exercises with ECRs from all over the world all the more interesting. The workshop gave the German PhD students the opportunity to reflect on the meaning of scientific communication at an international level.

We experienced cultural differences at the International Summer School. Dialectical practices based on the English-speaking culture were not the norm during the formal exchanges of panel chairs, round tables or workshops. While we expected some spontaneity from our international counterparts, contributions were often fully scripted in advance. Interactions lacked fluency, making debates and dialogues sometimes challenging. Some of us had difficulties in delivering a presentation in English, but we have learned to rely on each other’s strengths in order to receive help and support from the other members of the team.

In order to show the quality of their research, the presenters had to overcome intercultural discrepancies by using commonly understandable

communication conventions. As part of the International Summer School, we attempted to identify these principles and present them to participants. There was an opportunity to implement these notions directly in our workshop and to question their relevance with our audience. According to Sadler (1989), goals can only be achieved if they can be understood clearly. Therefore, we have sought to identify criteria which define what is expected of an academic speaker.

Since the participants of the workshop were coming from different scientific cultures all over the world, we had identified culture mixing and a shared space of interest as the two main focuses on our workshop (Macaire, 2020). This space of interest was not an accumulation of different cultures but a type of transcultural space. The diversity of scientific cultures was at the heart of the conception of the workshop and was experienced by the students during the session. The relationships between the concepts of transculturing and translanguaging have been studied by academics such as Narcy-Combes who puts forward the idea that “so-called intercultural competence results from the same emotional and cognitive processes as the theory of mind (social comprehension) that we all develop to relate to others” (2019: 155).

The experience of transculturality

Our workshop intended to highlight transcultural experiences and aimed at raising transcultural sensitivity. These two central concepts were combined so that they could lead to personal well-being and professional development at the same time. Regardless of the different cultures of the research communities, one common element remains: the need to share one’s work with the greatest possible number of peers.

In addition to some external differences that we noted between Asian and European participants, there were also internal ones within the learning community. Some of them are related to the scientific and research context of educational sciences while others depend on different and varied research disciplines, ranging from exact sciences to humanities. Other internal differences refer to the representations and conceptions that ECRs have of their field and of their own image. However, according to Welsch (2011), the traditional concept of cultural differences or even the concept of interculturality is not sufficient to communicate information and knowledge in the modern world, which simultaneously deals with globalization and diversity.

On the one hand, globalization implies the notion that individuals may have common characteristics (*i.e.*: “We all understand English”). On the other hand, diversity characterises individuals according to their culture (*i.e.*: “Spanish and Arabic people do not eat the same food”). For Welsch (2011), people’s culture changes as soon as they meet or work with a person belonging to another culture. Transculturality is built by doing and in Welsch’s own words:

Cultural determinants today – from society’s macrolevel through to individuals’ microlevel – have become transcultural. The old concept of culture misrepresents cultures’ actual form, the type of their relations and even the structure of individuals’

identities and lifestyles. Every concept of culture intended to pertain to today's reality must face up to the transcultural constitution (2011: 6).

Transculturality is “rather intrinsically linked with the production of diversity” (*ibid.*: 9) and even appears as the “most adequate concept of cultures today” (*ibid.*: 1).

Conclusion

Globalization has made collaboration in research projects more wide-ranging than ever, reflected in ECR mobility, which has increased over the past 20 years. Although the Anglo-Saxon culture is prevailing in scientific research, interculturality must be considered while transmitting ideas and research. Following our experience at the workshop, we have noticed that multiculturalism can be encountered in contexts where groups with different cultural backgrounds come together around a common interest. We experienced diversity in the learning community itself, where we see transculturality as an opportunity to share knowledge which connects people together and enables them to work with one another. This includes at the same time globalization (*i.e.* sharing of common principles) and particularization through co-building experiences related to diversity.

In order to push the frontiers of multidisciplinary research, openness and adaptability have become essential skills for researchers communicating abroad, while mastering English as a *lingua franca*. These issues concern not only research but also innovative doctoral training. This workshop had a twofold function: stimulating the exchange of scientific content and encouraging the circulation of ideas.

This experience has also enabled us to reflect on our own practices, their relevance for an international audience, the contents that we presented, and our role and contribution to the team. In addition to the multi-culturality we were going to approach in the workshop, we had to face our own differences and turn them into strengths. We no longer came from different disciplines, but rather from the same university to present our work that was accessible to everyone: we built a research and training community. We were able to take a step back from our own research and our input by injecting a multidisciplinary approach to this teamwork – an added value in nowadays' research.

As part of the exchanges between our two universities in Europe and Asia, we have identified the importance of interculturality in training for ECRs and for PhD students. While the format was chosen to be suitable for a university workshop, we developed content that provided a standard frame of reference for oral presentations in a transcultural context. We were able to test the model designed with flexibility and according to the various cultures and student representations. The keyword for interculturality is respect for others and their unique characteristics. The diversity of these characteristics may be a source of productivity, but they are also potential sources of misunderstanding during training sessions. Nevertheless, transcultural experiences help ECRs understand the differences between research cultures and scientific communities in order to embrace them as elements of the learning community.

We increased our knowledge by working on transculturality in relation to transdisciplinarity for our case study, with regards to both the mobility of doctoral students to Hong Kong and the co-construction of shared objects with the ECRs at the Summer School. We had included Li & Zhu's (2013) conception, which adds variability to the notion of translanguaging.

We extend the notion of translanguaging that, in our view, best captures both the dynamic nature of multilingual practices of various kinds and the capacity of the de-/re-territorialized speaker to mobilize their linguistic resources to create new social spaces for themselves (2013: 4).

We have followed Narcy-Combes (2019) for whom transculturality means more or less conscious “behaviours” (2019: 166).

If Wei (2017) tells us that pluri-culturals/linguists constantly construct their socio-cultural identities and values through a translanguage production, we would rather say that this production reflects and translates their feelings, and that the behaviors which result from them and the way in which feelings and behaviors are interpreted depend on the epistemological positions of those who interpret them, and therefore on their conception of what “culture” means (our translation).⁷

This program of conception of an international workshop could be offered to ECRs during their postgraduate training and be part of a core module for university training. This experience has enabled our team to cooperate and train in international communication. This was as beneficial to the attendees as to the organizers in a shared reflexive posture. The French early career researchers placed themselves as “co-designers” of this workshop since they experienced it alongside their counterparts who then became “co-authors” of this cooperative enterprise. Collaborations and exchanges at the international level have also helped to maintain mutually beneficial long-term relationships between those involved, including both organizing universities: the collective is the catalyst for new connections and new schemes⁸.

This experience enabled French doctoral students to be more aware of their modes of communication. It is also essential to consider a transcultural approach and take into account the others' vision and the “surprise” that can come from their encounter. The awareness of the coexistence of these models and the issues arising is a way of providing ECRs with tools for better communication. This is probably the reason why our workshop has been the basis for what is now the inter- and transcultural communication course for ECRs at the Education University of Hong Kong.

⁷ Original text in French: “Si Wei (2017) nous dit que les pluri-culturels/lingues construisent constamment leurs identités socioculturelles et leurs valeurs au travers d'une production translangagière, nous dirions plutôt que cette production reflète et traduit leur ressenti et les comportements qui en découlent, et la façon dont le ressenti et les comportements sont interprétés dépendent des positions épistémologiques de ceux qui les interprètent, et donc de leur conception de ce que ‘culture’ recouvre” (Narcy-Combes, 2019: 166).

⁸ Positive feedback on this format and its content resulted in the renewal of the project the following year.

Finally, this experience demonstrates the importance of taking cultural and disciplinary diversity in cross-cultural situations into account, thus offering greater flexibility and adaptability for ECRs at international conferences (Déléant *et al.*, 2017a; 2017b). This workshop has highlighted the importance of reiterating questions about the meaning of training when dealing with ECRs. Such activities lead to a better comprehension of inter-/transculturality and scientific codes, which can be facilitators for scientific communication in our contemporary world.

The global research environment has never been so interconnected, and yet so specialized. This current situation is therefore calling for more transcultural, collaborative and reflexive approaches, akin to the ones our team has tried to put into practice with this international workshop.

References

- ANDERSON, Chris. 2016. *TED talks: the official TED guide to public speaking*. Boston, Maass.: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. URL: <https://www.ted.com/read/ted-talks-the-official-ted-guide-to-public-speaking>.
- ATKINSON, Max. 2005. *Lend me your ears: all you need to know about making speeches and presentations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- BLOOM, Benjamin Samuel, Max ENGELHART, Edward FURST, Walter H. HILL & David. R. KRATHWOHL (eds.). 1969. *Taxonomie des objectifs pédagogiques* (vol. 1). Montréal, Canada: Éducation nouvelle/Les Presses de l'UQAM.
- BRUCE, Bertram C. & Naomi BLOCH. 2012. Learning by doing. Norbert M. SEEL (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the sciences of learning*, Boston, MA: Springer.
- BRYANT, Sue. 2019. 10 cultural differences between China and the US. *Countrynavigator*. URL: <https://countrynavigator.com/blog/global-talent/cultural-differences-us-vs-china>.
- CAPDEVILLE-ZENG, Catherine. 2014. Comparaison des modes d'éducation passés et contemporains en Asie (Inde, Asie du Sud-Est, Chine). *L'Homme. Revue française d'anthropologie* 210, 91-110. URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/lhomme/23559>.
- CLANCEY, William J. 1995. A tutorial on situated learning. John SELF (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer and Education*, Charlottesville, VA: AACE, 49-70.
- COLLINS, Philip. 2012. *The art of speeches and presentations: the secrets of making people remember what YOU say*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- DALY, John A., Anita L. VANGELISTI & David J. WEBER. 1995. Speech anxiety affects how people prepare speeches: a protocol analysis of the preparation processes of speakers. *Communications Monographs* 62: 4, 383-397.

- DÉLÉANT, Laura, Lisa JEANSON, Jérémy FILET & Dominique MACAIRE. 2017a. Chercheurs, soyez collaboratifs! *The Conversation* (03.09.2017). URL: <https://theconversation.com/chercheurs-soyez-collaboratifs-81278>.
- DÉLÉANT, Laura, Lisa JEANSON, Jérémy FILET & Dominique MACAIRE. 2017b. When researchers get involved “elsewhere”. *The Conversation* (03.09.2017). URL: <https://theconversation.com/when-researchers-get-involved-elsewhere-83816>.
- ELLIOTT, Imelda, Michael MURPHY, Alain PAYEUR & Raymond DUVAL. 2011. *Mutations de l'enseignement supérieur et internationalisation. Change in higher education and globalisation*. Bruxelles: Éditions De Boeck Supérieur.
- ERREN, Thomas C. & Philip E. BOURNE. 2007. Ten simple rules for a good poster presentation. *PLoS computational biology* 3: 5, e102. DOI:10.1371/journal.pcbi.0030102.
- GUNDOGAN, Buket, Kiron KOSHY, Langhit KURAR & Katharin WHITEHURST. 2016. How to make an academic poster. *Annals of Medicine and Surgery* 11, 69-71. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amsu.2016.09.001>.
- HARDISON, Debra M. & Chayawan SONCHAENG. 2005. Theater voice training and technology in teaching oral skills: integrating the components of a speech event. *System* 33: 4, 593-608.
- KOFFKA, Kurt. 1922. Perception: an introduction to the *Gestalt-Theorie*. *Psychological Bulletin* 19: 10, 531-585.
- LAVE, Jean & Étienne WENGER. 1991. *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LEITH, Sam. 2011. *You talkin' to me?: Rhetoric from Aristotle to Obama*. Londres: Profile Books.
- LI, Wei & Hua ZHU. 2013. Translanguaging identities and ideologies: creating transnational space through flexible multilingual practices amongst Chinese university students in the UK. *Applied Linguistics* 34: 5, 1–21. DOI:10.1093/applin/amt022.
- LOTZER, Francis. 2004. France-Asie, deux modes de management. *Journal du net* (Management). URL: http://www.journaldunet.com/management/0409/040949_lotzer.shtml.
- MACAIRE, Dominique. 2020. La “recherche-formation”, une contribution aux approches collaboratives en formation initiale d’enseignants de langues. *RDLC (Reberches en didactique des langues et des cultures)* 17: 1. URL: <https://journals.openedition.ORG/rdlc/7697>.
- MADDEN Thomas J., Kelly HEWETT & Martin S. ROTH. 2000. Managing images in different cultures: a cross-national study of color meanings and preferences. *Journal of International Marketing* 8: 4, 90-107. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25048831>.

- NARCY-COMBES, Jean-Paul. 2019. Comment la réflexion sur le transculturing conduit à repenser la compétence interculturelle. *Neofilolog* 52: 2, 353-371. URL: <http://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.desklight-fddb92c1-6711-476c-a941-50684ff44825>.
- NICOL, David J. & Debra MACFARLANE-DICK. 2006. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: a model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education* 31: 2, 199-218.
- OECD. 2015. *PISA 2015. Results in focus*. URL: <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisa-2015-results-in-focus.pdf>.
- SADLER, Royce D. 1989. Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science* 18: 2, 119-144.
- STEIN, David. 1998. Situated learning in adult education. *ERIC Digestst*. URL: <http://www.ericdigests.org/1998-3/adult-education.html>.
- VYGOTSKY, Lev. S. 1978. *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- WELSCH, Wolfgang. 2011. Transculturality – the puzzling form of cultures today. Mike FEATHERSTONE & Scott LASH (eds.), *Spaces of culture: city, nation, world*, London: Sage, 194-213. URL: http://www.westreadseast.info/PDF/Readings/Welsch_Transculturality.pdf
- WERTHEIMER, Max. 1944. Gestalt theory (with a foreword by Kurt Riezler). *Social Research* 11, 78-99.
- WOOLF, Beverly Park. 2010. *Building intelligent interactive tutors: student-centered strategies for revolutionizing e-learning*. Burlington, MA: Morgan Kaufmann.