

The Effect of Pedagogical Translanguaging on Foundation Phase Classrooms in a South African Private School

Joanne Christine Schoeman*, Salomé Geertsema, Mia le Roux & Lidia Pottas

University of Pretoria

*Correspondence to: joanneschoeman@gmail.com

Abstract

Classrooms across the world are becoming more diverse, forcing mainstream teachers to accept responsibility for teaching second language (L2) learners. As a result, pedagogical translanguaging has come to the fore as a potential practice to help L2 learners perform academically. In South Africa pedagogical translanguaging had not previously been studied where teachers and learners do not share a linguistic repertoire. Through design-based research we aimed to determine the effect of pedagogical translanguaging in a private school's foundation phase (FP) classrooms. The results indicate that teachers use pedagogical translanguaging for symbolic, scaffolding, and epistemological functions. While no direct academic benefit was observed for the L2 learners, their classroom participation and confidence improved because of the symbolic function of pedagogical translanguaging. The teachers deemed pedagogical translanguaging appropriate to their context. However, the monolingual mindset proved to be pervasive, despite participation in the study. Work needs to be done at all levels of the education system if we are to use multilingual practices to harness the abilities of all our learners.

Keywords: Design-based research; foundation phase; L2 learners; linguistic repertoire; pedagogical translanguaging

Introduction

Background

With the upsurge in the number of immigrants and refugees across the world, there is an increase in schools that have both first language (L1) and second language (L2) learners in the same class. The issue of learning in an L2 is becoming internationally relevant as countries are becoming more diverse (Carnes, 2019). Diversity in classrooms forces mainstream teachers to increasingly accept responsibility for the language and literacy needs of learners whose home language differs from the language of learning and teaching (LoLT) (Ollerhead, 2016).

South African classrooms have been multilingual for more than a century, although African languages were not considered equal to English and Afrikaans until 1994 (Heugh et al., 2017). With the advent of democracy in 1994 the government adopted a Language in Education Policy (LiEP) that gave 11 languages an official status, aimed to promote multilingualism, and allowed for multilingual practices such as code-switching and translating (Department of Education, 1997). Despite efforts from the government to elevate the status of African languages, African language-speaking parents increasingly choose to send their children to schools that have English as the LoLT (Kretzer & Kaschula, 2021). An important reason for this is that English is the language of access to secondary and higher education, and to the

upper end of the economy (Heugh et al., 2017). The perception of higher quality education in English may also offer another reason for the increase of English private schools in South Africa (Van der Walt & Steyn, 2016).

While multilingual practices like code-switching are commonplace in many South African schools (Heugh et al., 2017), the submersion model is followed in English private schools (Robertson & Graven, 2020). Learners are taught in their L2 from the start of schooling and the L1 is not used for additional comprehension of content (Robertson & Graven, 2020).

The preProgress in International Reading Literacy Study (prePIRLS) 2011 shows that the submersion model does not provide equal education to all. South African L2 learners performed poorly in the prePIRLS when compared to English L1 learners (McLeod Palane & Howie, 2019). Similar results were obtained in a previous phase of the current study's larger project, in which the Grade 1 teachers from English private schools indicated that their L2 learners and L1 learners were on vastly different academic levels (Schoeman et al., 2022). This may be because the submersion model does not allow learners to benefit from their full linguistic repertoire (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020).

The linguistic repertoire of a learner refers to the individual learner's entire language knowledge store, including competence in linguistic, pragmatic, and discourse skills (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020). A multilingual learner does not have multiple monolingual systems, but rather naturally and consistently accesses multiple linguistic resources (Kato & Kumagai, 2020). If learners are not allowed to access their full linguistic repertoire, they have to compete academically using only some of the knowledge that they have at their disposal (Vogel & García, 2017). This may lead to poor academic achievement, a lack of participation in class, weak memorisation, and misunderstanding of concepts (Mweli, 2018). Socio-culturally it could result in the discreditation of a learners' linguistic and cultural identity, unequal power relations between different languages, poor relationships between teachers and parents of L2 learners and a decline in home language use (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020; Yilmaz, 2021). The primary concern for teachers therefore becomes how one can utilise and develop learners' multilingual capabilities in order to achieve the kind of proficiency in English that permits access to education and economic spheres (Heugh et al., 2017), all the while being cognizant of how L2 learners' home languages are being positioned, so as not to further epistemic injustices (Meighan, 2022). A framework conceptualised for the use of multilingual capabilities is discussed in the following section.

Theoretical framework: Pedagogical translanguaging

The term translanguaging was originally coined in Wales to refer to the alternation of Welsh and English for academic purposes (Williams, 1994). This deliberate and systematic use of translation was called functional multilingualism in South Africa in 1995 (Heugh et al., 2017). Translanguaging and functional multilingualism had the goal of using multiple languages to develop proficiency in the target language(s) (Heugh et al., 2017).

The contemporary use of translanguaging differentiates between spontaneous translanguaging and pedagogical translanguaging (Goodman & Tastanbek, 2020). Spontaneous translanguaging refers to natural, fluid discursive practices that occur inside and outside the classroom, while pedagogical translanguaging refers to explicit strategies by teachers to use several languages in class (Duarte, 2020). Pedagogical translanguaging can have a symbolic, scaffolding, or epistemological function (Duarte, 2020). The symbolic function acknowledges

and valorises L2 learners' languages, the scaffolding function builds temporary but systematic bridges towards other languages, and the epistemological function actively uses different languages to enhance content and language knowledge (Duarte, 2020).

In the South African context Heugh et al. (2017) proposes pedagogical translanguaging, as opposed to spontaneous translanguaging, to ensure that learners become proficient in English—the language of access to higher education and employment opportunities (Heugh et al., 2017). According to these authors, both horizontal multilingualism (multi-directional communication through permeable linguistic boundaries) and vertical multilingualism (developing expertise in writing at an academic level) are required for long-term equity and social justice. The goal is to maintain and extend proficiency in multiple languages, rather than prioritising competence in English (Charamba, 2020).

L2 learners can benefit from their multilingualism if planned instruction strategies utilising the learners' whole multilingual repertoire are employed to develop language and metalinguistic awareness (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020). The theoretical framework of pedagogical translanguaging, with specific reference to the functions of pedagogical translanguaging, was used for the current study. This was deemed appropriate because it provides a systematic, planned use of L2 learners' linguistic repertoires to improve their academic performance and provides a framework within which to analyse teachers' use of pedagogical translanguaging.

Literature review

A range of international studies has shown the educational advantages of translanguaging at different levels. It has been shown to balance the power relations among languages in the classroom (Cenoz, 2017) and to encourage higher cognitive engagement in content matter learning (Duarte, 2019). International research on translanguaging is mostly conducted in contexts where L2 learners are refugees or immigrant learners (e.g., Duarte, 2020; Slaughter & Cross, 2021).

The context in which pedagogical translanguaging has been studied in South Africa is different to the European and North American context (Heugh et al., 2017). Pedagogical translanguaging has been studied in South African classrooms where learners and teachers speak a variety of African languages, but the LoLT is English, which is the L2 of both the teachers and the learners. The results of the studies show that pedagogical translanguaging can be effective in collaborative learning in the case of multilingual medical students (Mbirimi-Hungwe & McCabe, 2020). There is also evidence of positive outcomes in secondary schools when the teachers and learners have a shared linguistic repertoire, but the LoLT is their L2 (Charamba, 2020; Ngubane et al., 2020). In primary schools, reading comprehension has improved when learners' (non-English) L1 was used (Makalela, 2015) and pedagogical translanguaging has been used to engage learners in content matter (Krause & Prinsloo, 2016).

On a socio-cultural level, South African studies have found that pedagogical translanguaging reinforces learners' plural identities (Charamba, 2020). It brings dignity, respect and value to learners' home languages and enables learners and teachers to challenge monolingual English ideologies (Ngubane et al., 2020). Furthermore, learners' realise the social benefit of speaking one's home language, which is pertinent in the South African context, where the majority of the country have a home language other than English (Makalela, 2015).

The studies mentioned above are examples of pedagogical translanguaging that fulfils an epistemological function by actively using different languages to enhance both content and language knowledge (Duarte, 2020). They all indicate that if learners' linguistic repertoires are used to their full potential, there are academic and sociocultural benefits. These outcomes are possible because the teachers speak the same languages as the learners (Duarte, 2020). However, to our knowledge, no research has been done in South Africa on the use of pedagogical translanguaging in contexts where the teachers and the L2 learners do not share the same linguistic repertoire.

The current study

The current study was the final phase of a larger study that aimed to provide support to FP teachers of L2 learners. In the previous phase of the study, it became clear that the teachers at the research site would benefit from practices that reduce the LoLT as barrier to learning. Pedagogical translanguaging, which the teachers had not been exposed to previously, was identified as a possible solution for this context. Therefore, the research questions were:

RQ 1: What translanguaging practices do FP teachers implement after exposure to the translanguaging framework?

RQ 2: How do FP teachers perceive the implementation of translanguaging practices in the classroom?

Method

Author positionality

It is helpful to discuss the authors' positionality within the social sciences, because their ontological and epistemological beliefs may influence their research (Holmes, 2020). The first, second and fourth authors of this paper are qualified speech-language therapists and/or audiologists, and the third author is a linguist. All authors are fluent in Afrikaans and English, with Afrikaans being their L1. The first author was an L2 learner throughout her primary school years, as well as for tertiary education. She currently lives and works in the community where the data was collected. As such she can be considered an insider, and therefore had prior knowledge about the participants. As an insider she could ask more meaningful or insightful questions and produce more nuanced descriptions (Holmes, 2020).

Study design

Design-based research (DBR) was utilised for this study. DBR is a form of action research that merges research and practice to allow researchers and participants to solve practical problems collaboratively (Cernusca et al., 2014). It occurs in naturalistic settings and involves participants in the design and research process (Cernusca et al., 2014). DBR is particularly useful in education for researching the use of new teaching methods (Štemberger & Koper, 2016).

Participants

Two of the participants had participated in the larger project of which the current study is a part. During the previous study we determined the needs of these teachers regarding teaching

L2 learners. For the current study the participants were purposively sampled because the researchers knew that this study would address their needs regarding teaching L2 learners. The participants had to meet the criteria for selection, namely being a FP teacher who teaches L2 learners alongside L1 learners and who has the appropriate teaching qualification (Bachelor of Education degree or Postgraduate Certificate in Education) as well as South African Council of Educators SACE registration.

The sample consisted of five participants. These participants all taught at the same private school in English LoLT classrooms. The school serves a community with a relatively high socio-economic status (SES). All teachers were female. They spoke English as a home language but were fluent in Afrikaans as well. Participant C was also fluent in Xhosa. Table 1 provides an overview of the sample.

Table 1. Participant demographics.

Participant Code	Age group	Highest qualification	Grade	L2 learners (%)
A	30-39	Postgraduate Certificate in Education	1	36
B	60+	Honours Degree	1	47
C	50-59	Bachelors Degree	2	39
D	30-39	Bachelors Degree	2	42
E	40-49	Bachelors Degree	3	30

The participants all taught in the FP (six- to nine-year-old learners). The class sizes ranged from 14 to 25 learners per class—small classes compared to the national average of 33 learners per class in government schools (West & Meier, 2020). A variety of home languages were represented in the classes. In these classes English is the LoLT, but it is considered an L1 or an L2, depending on the individual learners’ home language. Table 2 provides an overview of the learner sample.

Table 2. Learner sample.

Demographic Characteristics	N	
Learners’ gender	F	42
	M	54
Learners’ home languages	English	59
	Afrikaans	9
	Xhosa	19
	Shona	5
	Chichewa	1
	Arabic	1
	Dutch	2

Equipment and apparatus

The equipment and apparatus used in this study related to recording data for analysis.

Computer	A MacBook was used for recording lessons and keeping the research journal.
Recording software	Otter.ai was used on the MacBook to record the translanguaging lessons and focus group.
Mobile phone	A Samsung mobile phone was used as additional recording device.

Data collection procedure

In DBR, experiments are developed and implemented in a cyclic design (Cernusca et al., 2014). The first author had preliminary conversations with the FP head about the proposed focus of the DBR. The proposed focus of the DBR was to address the problem that the participants had identified in the previous phase of the research project, namely that the LoLT posed a barrier to learning for L2 learners. In a discussion with the five participants the identified problem was defined and pedagogical translanguaging was proposed as a research focus. In a subsequent meeting the framework was explained in detail by discussing the article entitled “Translanguaging in the context of mainstream multilingual education” by Duarte (2020). This article was chosen because it provides theory on translanguaging as well as suggestions for practical implementation in classrooms.

Following the DBR approach, the participants developed their own tailored research questions and experiments which they implemented cyclically (Cernusca et al., 2014). Each participant decided in which subjects she wanted to attempt pedagogical translanguaging, whether it be Mathematics, English home language or Afrikaans additional language lessons. Each lesson was seen as a cycle, with participants making adjustments and improvements from one lesson to the next. The first author arranged on which days and times she would observe a lesson in which the participants implemented pedagogical translanguaging. Immediately after each lesson the researcher made notes in a research journal. The researcher and participants reflected on each lesson on the same day or the soonest possible date after the lesson. Each participant was observed five times over the course of five weeks (a total of 13.5 hours of footage), except for one participant who was unable to do her last lesson due to illness.

Once all the lessons had been completed the first author convened a focus group to review the participants’ experience. Four of the participants attended in person on the school premises, and one participant attended via the video conferencing platform (Teams) due to illness. The focus group lasted approximately 60 minutes.

The researcher guided the discussion using the following questions: (a) What were your goals for your translanguaging lessons? To what extent was translanguaging successful in reaching those goals? (b) What have you incorporated, or will you continue to incorporate in your teaching? (c) Which aspects of translanguaging was useful and which need to be adapted or discarded? (d) What, if any, was the effect on your L2 learners? (e) Is translanguaging applicable to this setting?

Data analysis

Data was analysed from the classroom observations, the research journal, and the focus group. Data from these three sources were analysed using a theoretical thematic analysis (Thornberg & Charmaz, 2014). The functions of translanguaging, namely symbolic, scaffolding, or epistemological purposes (Duarte, 2020), were used as pre-existing theoretical codes. The first author transcribed the classroom observations and read through the transcripts multiple times. Thereafter, excerpts that contained translanguaging were identified and separated from the larger dataset. These excerpts were coded for functions of translanguaging, and the codes were discussed with the relevant participant until the first author and the participant agreed on the translanguaging function for each excerpt.

An inductive analysis was performed for the focus group. No pre-existing theory was used to generate codes; rather, coding allowed for new ideas to surface (Gibbs, 2014). The first author familiarised herself with the data through repeated readings of the transcript. Initial codes were generated and sorted into themes that accurately represented the data. The initial codes and how it collapsed into the final themes are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3. Development of themes.

Codes	Themes
Draw on L1 Increased understanding	Effect on L2 learners: Academic effect
Belonging Equality Emotional well-being	Effect on L2 learners: Emotional effect
Increased focus on vocabulary L2 learner inclusion	Effect on teachers
Linguistic and experiential environment of learner Teacher challenges	Challenges

Validity and reliability

During the theoretical analysis of the classroom observations, the first author coded specific excerpts for translanguaging functions by comparing each one to the existing literature on the functions of translanguaging, which increases the validity of the study. To increase validity further the excerpts were analysed in collaboration with the participants, and codes were discussed until the first author and participant agreed on the code.

Data collection by objective devices such as audio recordings contribute to internal reliability. In addition, the research has been documented in such a way that it is clear how the research has been carried out and how conclusions have been drawn from the data.

Results

Research question 1

For the results section, excerpts were selected that the participants and researchers found to be representative of the dataset. Excerpts were chosen that show different functions of pedagogical translanguaging so that the extent of translanguaging use can be displayed. Pseudonyms were used to ensure confidentiality.

Grade 1 class

In this class, the LoLT was English and many of the learners spoke English as L1. The majority of the L2 learners spoke Xhosa, but there was also one Afrikaans learner and one learner who had recently immigrated from Belgium. The Belgian learner's L1 was Dutch but she had French as LoLT in school prior to moving to South Africa. All the language represented are alphabetic languages. In Excerpt 1 the isiXhosa learners (including the individual named Themba) and the Belgian learner (named Juliette) are L2 learners.

As part of a Mathematics lesson, Teacher B asked a Xhosa parent and the Belgian parent to record counting to five in their respective languages. It was not necessary to make a recording

of Afrikaans counting since that is part of the additional language curriculum and the teacher herself knows Afrikaans. The learners listened to the recordings and then Teacher B flashed the Xhosa, French, and Afrikaans number names to the class various times. Thereafter the class sorted the numbers in ascending or descending order in the various languages. In Excerpt 1 Teacher B also asks a Xhosa learner to translate keywords of the instruction into Xhosa.

Excerpt 1

Teacher B: Yes, let's just see for fun if we ask the children in the different languages to say that we can see what is going to... what the numbers are going to be. Let's see, should we go from biggest to smallest, or smallest to biggest?

Class: Smallest to biggest.

Teacher B: Smallest to biggest. Okay, help me.

Class: One, two, three, four, five.

Teacher B: Right, Juliette, and the rest of the children who can help? Can you count in French for me? Let me hear.

Juliette: Un. [*One.*]

Teacher B and Juliette: Deux. [*Two.*]

Teacher B: Everybody.

Class: Trois, quatre [*Three, four.*]

Teacher B: And? How do you say that one?

Juliette: Cinq. [*Five.*]

Teacher B: All right. I'm not so good at that one. Right. And the Xhosa children, everybody let's try.

Xhosa learners: Inye, zimbini, sithathu, sine. [*One, two, three, four.*]

Teacher B: And the last one is?

Xhosa learners: Sitlanu. [*Five.*]

Teacher B: Sitlanu [*Five*]. All right, oh my goodness. Everybody in Afrikaans, let's quickly go.

Class: Een, twee, drie, vier, vyf. [*One, two, three, four, five.*]

Teacher B: Right, can we try it in Afrikaans again? But we're going to go from the biggest to the smallest. Okay, children, just wait. From the biggest to the smallest, all right. What's biggest in Xhosa?

Themba: Inkulu. [*Biggest*]

Teacher B: Inkulu [biggest], and the smallest one?

Themba: Incinci. [Small]

Teacher B: Okay, if we're going to do it in Afrikaans, everybody should be able to.

Class: Vyf, vier, drie, twee, een. [*Five, four, three, two, one.*]

Thereafter Teacher B practiced word sums in which the learners had to answer in any language except English. The teacher reported that this activity had a symbolic function for the Belgian learner, because she could share her linguistic knowledge. It had a scaffolding function for the Xhosa learners who knew the number names in Xhosa because they could use Xhosa as a temporary bridge when doing their calculations. Finally, it had an epistemological function with regard to the Afrikaans number names, since all the learners could use their stronger language for content learning of the weaker language (Afrikaans).

In another lesson Teacher B used pedagogical translanguaging during group reading. Two of the learners were Xhosa-speaking. She let them read in English, but then asked the Xhosa learners to explain what happened in Xhosa. In Excerpt 2 Themba and Nobomi are isiXhosa home language speakers, and therefore L2 learners, with English as the LoLT.

Excerpt 2

Teacher B: Look at this page and tell me a little bit in Xhosa about it. What do you understand from this page? Who's making the scarf? Can you talk [*sic*] in Xhosa?

Themba: Aneena

Teacher B: Okay, right. And what is Aneena making?

Themba: Isikhafu. [*Scarf.*]

Teacher B: Tell me what about the scarf.

Themba: Isikhafu sikhulu. [*The scarf is big.*]

Teacher B: Isikhafu [*Scarf*] is inkulu [*big*]. Right, good let's turn over. Nobomi, are you going to try and tell us in Xhosa what's happening on this page? Themba? What do you notice? What have the children gone to do? They've gone to...

Themba: Play with Aneena.

Teacher B: Can you tell me in Xhosa, what are they going to do?

Themba: Baza kudlala noAneena. [*They are going to play with Aneena.*]

This activity had a scaffolding function as it aimed to increase the Xhosa learners' comprehension of the story. The one learner, Themba, was able to produce a semantically richer utterance in Xhosa than in English, which indicates that he benefitted from describing the picture in his L1. Prescribing that he uses Xhosa to explain the story may diminish the

cognitive benefit of allowing him to access his full linguistic repertoire for meaning making. However, being asked to speak Xhosa elevated the status of the learner's home language.

Grade 2 class

In this class the LoLT was English and many of the learners spoke English as L1. The L2 learners spoke Afrikaans, Xhosa, or Shona at home. Teacher D used greeting in English, Afrikaans, and Xhosa as an introduction to translanguaging, as seen in Excerpt 3. This had a symbolic function.

Excerpt 3

Teacher D: How do we greet in English, how do we greet one another in the morning?

Class: Good morning.

Teacher D: How would we do it in Afrikaans?

Class: Goeiemôre. [*Good morning.*]

Teacher D: In isiXhosa, how do we do it?

Xhosa learners: Molo. [*Hello.*]

Teacher D: Molo! [*Hello!*] All right, so everybody say “good morning” to each other in isiXhosa.

Class: Molo. [*Hello.*]

Teacher D: Right. In Afrikaans, say “goeiemôre.”

Class: Goeiemôre. [*Good morning.*]

Teacher D: And everyone say, “good morning.”

Class: Good morning.

Teacher D created a culture of bilingualism in her class by telling her learners that they all have the ability to speak English and another language. The L2 learners were therefore not singled out during the pedagogical translanguaging lessons; all learners could alternate purposefully between languages.

In the lessons that followed, Teacher D let the learners alternate between their two languages. The Xhosa learners alternated between Xhosa and English, the Shona learners between Shona and English, the Afrikaans learners between Afrikaans and English, and the English learners between English and Afrikaans. During an English lesson (Excerpt 4) Teacher D first illustrates the alternation between English and Xhosa in a dialogue between her and a Xhosa learner. The Xhosa learner could compile a response in her L1, before translating it to English, which potentially allowed her to provide a better response. In Excerpt 4 Nonhle is a home language Xhosa speaker who is being taught in her L2—English.

Excerpt 4

Teacher D: So, Nonhle, your languages are going to be English and Xhosa. So, maybe, I ask you in English, “How are you?” and you answer back in isiXhosa. Say loudly.

Nonhle: Ndiphilile. [*I am fine.*]

Teacher D: And then I say, “I’m fine. Should we go and buy some sweets at the shop?”

Nonhle: Ewe, ndingayithanda lonto. [*Yes, I would like that.*]

Teacher D: Which means?

Nonhle: Yes, I would like that.

After this exchange the learners divided into groups of three, according to their L1. They wrote a dialogue together, alternating between two languages, and then presented it to the class. In Excerpt 5 two Xhosa learners (named Nonhle and Nomlanga) present the dialogue that they had written in Xhosa (their L1) and English (their L2).

Excerpt 5

Nonhle: Molo [*Hello*], Chris.

Teacher D: Sorry, sorry. What does “molo” mean?

Class: Hello!

Teacher D: So immediately you can pick up the words. Okay, I want you to pick up the words you know. “Molo [*Hello*], Chris.”

Nonhle: Unjani namhlanje? [*How are you today?*]

Teacher D: So, “unjani” means?

Class: How are you?

Nonhle: Singathetha ngendlovu? [*Can we talk about elephants?*]

Nomlanga: Do you know people kill animals for their tusks?

Teacher D: Right, so what did you say, you said, “Hello, Chris? How are you?”

Nonhle: I said, “Hello Chris, how are you today? Can we talk about elephants?”

In this lesson the teacher used translanguaging for various functions. The primary function was scaffolding because she used alternation of languages to help the learners to better understand the concept of dialogues. The use of Xhosa and Shona in class also had a symbolic function. Encouraging English L1 learners to try to understand Xhosa and Shona gave status to these languages. The class reacted positively to this multilingual engagement.

Translanguaging also had an epistemological function in Afrikaans additional language lessons. During Afrikaans additional language lessons the English, Xhosa and Shona learners are L2 learners, since the LoLT for that lesson is Afrikaans. The learners discussed the Afrikaans story using their L1 for better comprehension. As they read the book the teacher focused on the meaning of specific words and then wrote those words on the board in English. In Excerpt 6 the text of the story is written in bold. Leo, Taigan and Joan's L1 is English, and Khwezi's L1 is Xhosa. Alissa's L1 is Afrikaans, therefore she is not an L2 learner during this lesson, but the English and isiXhosa learners are L2 learners.

Excerpt 6

Teacher D: Let's just read the title, it says, "**Hoe vervelig.**" [*How boring*]. What's "verveeld" [*bored*]?

Leo: Bored.

Teacher D: How did you know that? "Jy is so verveeld!" [*You're so bored!*] I'm sure your mom sometimes says that sometimes. "Gaan doen net iets." [*Just go do something.*] What is "bored" in Xhosa?

Khwezi: Udikiwe. [*Bored.*]

Teacher D: **Mev. Milt word wakker. "Dit reën," sê sy. "Hoe vervelig.**" [*Mrs. Milt wakes up. "It's raining," she says. "How boring."*] What's happening?

Taigan: She's bored.

Teacher D: Why?

Taigan: Because it's raining.

Teacher D: Raining. That's our next word. What's "raining" in Afrikaans, Joan?

Joan: Dit is reën. [*It is rain.*]

Teacher D: Dit reën, okay, so dit reën. [*It's raining, okay, so it's raining.*] Now why would that be boring?

Alissa: Because she can't go outside.

Teacher D: Sy kan nie buite gaan nie. She can't go outside. Wat's "buite" in Xhosa? [*What's "outside" in Xhosa?*]

Khwezi: Phandle. [*Outside.*]

Teacher D: Phandle. [*Outside.*] She can't go and "phandle" because it's raining, because it's...

Xhosa learners: Kuyanetha. [*It is raining.*]

After they had finished the story Teacher D asked the learners to use the words on the board to write a sentence in their L1. They read their sentences to the class. In the excerpt below the Xhosa learner used the English words on the board to create a sentence in Xhosa. He shared it

with the class in Xhosa and translated the sentence back to English to explain the meaning to the class. In addition to the scaffolding function, this interaction also had a symbolic function because the Xhosa learner was seen as the language expert with regard to his L1. In Excerpt 7 Lonwabo is the Xhosa L1 learner and Leo is an English L1 learner. Lonwabo is therefore an English L2 learner, with English being the LoLT.

Excerpt 7

Lonwabo: Ikati nenja zazitshatile. Ikati nenja pillow fight. Kwaphumelelainja. [*A cat and a dog were married. The cat and the dog had a pillow fight. The winner was the dog.*]

Teacher D: What do you think? What did you hear in that sentence that you can pick up?

Leo: There was a fight.

Teacher D: With who?

Lonwabo: With the dog and the cat.

Teacher D: With the dog and the cat. I heard those words. Yes.

Lonwabo: I said that the cat and the dog were married, and they had a fight, and the winner was the dog.

Later in the day they had to write English sentences for an assessment, using the same words. Teacher D therefore used the pedagogical translanguaging lesson skillfully to allow her learners to fully engage with the English words that they were to be assessed on later. When L2 learners compiled a sentence in their L1 they could write sentences that were richer in language and possibly more creative.

The other Grade 2 class brainstormed creative writing ideas in L1 groups in their pedagogical translanguaging lessons. Here they were given the instruction to communicate using Xhosa, Afrikaans or English, depending on the group's L1. In these groups they were allowed to freely access their shared linguistic resources. In the Xhosa group the learners seamlessly switched between Xhosa and English for the purposes of brainstorming. After brainstorming together they wrote their essays in the LoLT—English. Teacher C reported better, more descriptive content from her Xhosa-speaking learners when she approached creative writing in this manner.

Grade 3 class

Teacher E experienced her class as challenging because of emotional and behavioural issues among the learners. The LoLT is English, and many of the learners in class speak English as L1. The L2 learners speak Xhosa, Chichewa, or Afrikaans at home. Teacher E's aim was to use pedagogical translanguaging to help L2 learners who struggle comprehending English content matter. She asked L2 learners to translate keywords into their L1, and then used the keywords in her English instructions and explanations to augment understanding. Translanguaging therefore served a scaffolding function.

In Excerpt 6 Teacher E revised nouns. She started off by giving the definition in English, with keywords being translated into Afrikaans and Xhosa by the learners. In Excerpt 8 Fezile and

Aphiwe are L2 learners who speak Xhosa at home, and Stiaan is an L2 learner who speaks Afrikaans at home.

Excerpt 8

Teacher E: A noun is a “isibizo.” Now, what is a noun? It is a person—in Afrikaans a person is a “mens.” What is “person” in Xhosa?

Fezile: Umntu. [*Person.*]

Teacher E: Umntu. [*Person.*] And “animal?”

Stiaan: Dier. [*Animal.*]

Teacher E: Is 'n dier. [*Is an animal.*] And “animal” in Xhosa is a ...

Aphiwe: I learnt a lot of Xhosa, but not “animal.”

Teacher E: Oh, I see. That’s fine. Okay, so that one I’m going to write down, I’m going to find out for us.

Teacher E: A place

Stiaan: Is 'n plek. [*Is a place.*]

Teacher E: A place in Afrikaans is “'n plek.” Aphiwe?

Aphiwe: Indawo. [*Place.*]

Teacher E: Indawo. [*Place.*]

Teacher E: Or a thing, what is a “thing?” Thing?

Stiaan: Ding. [*Thing.*]

Teacher E: 'n Ding. [*A thing.*] And ...

Aphiwe: Into. [*Thing.*]

Teacher E: “Into,” with a “t.” Right, let’s read it now. Look here, Dumisa, you must look here now, boy. Okay let’s see, what is a noun? What is “isibizo?” It is a person, “'n mens,” “umntu,” an animal, “'n dier” and we don’t know, we’re gonna find out. It is a place, “plek,” or “indawo.” Or it’s a thing, a “Into.”

Stiaan: 'n Ding. [*A thing.*]

Teacher E: 'n Ding. [*A thing.*]

Following the excerpt, the class looked at examples of nouns and translated the words into Afrikaans and Xhosa. Finally, Teacher D divided the learners into groups where they made a visual summary of what a noun is. The groups were comprised of learners with different L1s and learners were encouraged to teach each other words in their L1s. They did not use the

groups to deepen understanding of concepts; the groups served a purely symbolic function by valorizing the L1s.

In a Mathematics lesson Teacher E asked the learners to translate keywords in word sums into their L1 to increase comprehension, as illustrated in Excerpt 9. Once again, Aphiwe is an L2 learner who speaks Xhosa at home and Stiaan is an L2 learner who speaks Afrikaans at home. During the interaction the Xhosa learners initially do not understand the English word used in the question. The teacher used synonyms for the keyword until the Xhosa learners could translate it.

Excerpt 9

Teacher E: How many remaining? “Remaining” means, “left,” “left over.”

Stiaan: Daar is ... [*There is ...*]

Teacher E: Hoeveel is daar oor? [*How many remaining?*] What is “remain” or “left over” in Xhosa.

Aphiwe: Remain?

Teacher E: How many is left?

Aphiwe: Into ishiyekile. [*Something left.*]

Teacher E: Ishiyekile [*left*], which ones are left over? Are remaining? Into ishiyekile [*Something left*]? Hoeveel is daar oor? [*How many are left over?*] How many—say that word for me.

Aphiwe: Into ishiyekile. [*Something left.*]

Teacher E: ... natural disasters, is there, are left over?

In the same lesson translanguaging helped L2 learners to clear up a misunderstanding about the content of the lesson. Had the translation not happened the teacher would not have been aware that her learners misinterpreted the word. In Excerpt 10 Aphiwe is an L2 learner who speaks Xhosa at home, Stiaan is an L2 learner who speaks Afrikaans at home and Joe is an L1 learner, who therefore speaks English at home.

Excerpt 10

Teacher E: Yes, so the earthquake...what is an earthquake, “n aardbewing,” when everything is shaking, an “aardbewing.” Shaking, so the earth shakes. In Xhosa what does it mean when the earth shakes?

Stiaan: What is “earth” and “quake” together in Xhosa?

Teacher E: What is earthquake in Xhosa?

Aphiwe: “Quick” is “khawuleza.”

Teacher E: Not “quick.” “Khawuleza” means “quick.” Not “quick,” “quake.”

Joe: Like shake?

Teacher E: Yeah, shake, what's "shake" in Xhosa?

Stiaan: Uyasheyikha. [*Shake.*]

Teacher E: Uyasheyikha. [*Shake.*]

Research question 2

The inductive thematic analysis of the focus group with the teacher participants revealed themes related to the effect of translanguaging on L2 learners, the changes it brought about in the teachers, and the challenges that they experienced in relation to pedagogical translanguaging.

Effect on L2 learners: Academic effect

The participants felt that pedagogical translanguaging did not directly help the L2 learners to learn English. However, they perceived pedagogical translanguaging to enable learners to draw on their L1 knowledge more readily. Although infrequent, instances of increased understanding were observed, as one participant stated:

Every now and again I could see, oh there's a spark, but I'm not 100% sure that it helped him to learn those difficult concepts. (Teacher E, line 60–61)

Effect on L2 learners: Emotional effect

By far the more profound effect on L2 learners, as experienced by the teachers, was the effect on L2 learners' confidence, participation, engagement, feelings of cohesion and equality. L2 learners were more confident in all learning areas, they participated more in class and were more engaged in learning.

I don't know what it is, it's like a little switch went off in her head and as soon as we included it in the class she just lit up. She's like a new person now. (Teacher A, line 378–380)

She's never understood what's going on. So for her I just think it's actually been, "Wow! I am clever, I can actually. I do know this, it's just a different language." (Teacher A, line 392–393)

Translanguaging facilitated a sense of belonging and unity. There was increased connection between the teachers and the L2 learners and the teachers felt that they had better insight into their L2 learners.

Growth and confidence. I got them to participate more. And they've, it's almost like there was a breaching of a cultural barrier ... that sense of belonging. (Teacher C, line 34–44)

It also spilled over in other areas like mathematics where Bongani is known for putting up this wall, I could connect with her on that level. So, yeah, overall confidence, engagement, connection. (Teacher C, line 53–55)

Another important outcome was the perception that the L2 learners were more equal in status because of the translanguaging. The English L1 learners were impressed and interested to hear

their peers speaking different languages. The teacher and all of the learners could learn from each other. This elevated the status of L2 learners' home languages.

You know little people, they're so impressed by someone who can speak another language. You know they're all blown away that the friends can speak something else. (Teacher A, line 265–268)

Translanguaging has given teachers more insight into their learners. The emotional effect that translanguaging had on the L2 learners was unexpected for all the participants. They saw the emotional effect as a very important, worthwhile outcome, because, as one participant stated aptly:

That's actually the most important thing, because if you get the emotional thing right with a child, then they can learn. (Teacher E, line 254–255)

Effect on teachers

The DBR approach changed some teachers' classroom practices because pedagogical translanguaging made them more aware of the vocabulary that they are aiming to teach. This had a positive effect on both L1 and L2 learners.

You're so conscious of making sure everybody understands, then you explain words that you might in the normal language lessons just gloss over, but actually the other people also ... don't have the vocab ... You're not actually thinking of the English children, but because you're conscious of everybody understanding what you do, it wasn't a waste for them (English L1 learners). (Teacher A, line 260–265)

The teachers report that they included L2 learners more frequently in their lessons now by allowing them to add what they understand about the topic. Previously they taught English as a separate entity, but the action research has changed their approach to teaching L2 learners, as one participant explains:

I don't know why but, you know, before I ... it never occurred to me to incorporate ... because you know when you're teaching English, you're teaching English. You know, it never occurred to me, whereas now, in everything we do, you know, if there's something they can add then I would ask them to, which before I wouldn't. (Teacher A, line 321–324)

Challenges

The participants could not speak the majority of the L2 learners' home languages. This prevented them from knowing whether the learner understood correctly or not. According to the participants many of the L2 learners in the class do not speak their own L1 particularly well either. They have limited vocabulary and therefore find it difficult to translate concepts into their L1. Learners with a well-developed L1 reportedly benefitted the most from translanguaging because it helped them to draw on their linguistic repertoire. However, the learners who were not academically on par with their peers had difficulty comprehending in the LoLT and/or their home language:

I think something that would make it more successful is if, when they're younger, somehow the message gets across: Speak your home language, make it strong, and speak it properly.

Don't mix your languages and, you know, speak a proper home language and then I think it will work even better. (Teacher A, line 262–265)

Discussion

The aim of the study was to determine which pedagogical translanguaging practices FP teachers in higher SES private schools employ after exposure to the concept, and how they experience employing pedagogical translanguaging. After exposure to pedagogical translanguaging, the participants all aimed to use it to help their L2 learners understand the academic work better and to perform to their ability. Their goal was, therefore, mostly one of scaffolding.

In teaching Afrikaans as additional language they were able to gain an epistemological function because they could all speak Afrikaans. Using pedagogical translanguaging is not new to them in the teaching of Afrikaans as additional language. The action research has, however, broadened the way in which they use pedagogical translanguaging, because they now add the other L2s in their lessons as well, instead of simply alternating between English and Afrikaans. This has reportedly had a positive effect on L2 learner engagement in Afrikaans additional language lessons.

Duarte (2020) alludes to the fact that languages cannot be used to their full potential as learning instruments if the teacher is not proficient in the L2. The participants experienced this because they felt limited in the extent to which they could use pedagogical translanguaging for content-matter learning. They felt unable to use the L2 to enhance content and language knowledge if they could not speak the L2. The subject matter therefore influenced how pedagogical translanguaging was implemented.

The participants' initial academic goal became of secondary importance when they experienced the emotional effect that pedagogical translanguaging had on the L2 learners. For some participants their expressed goal changed to one of symbolic function during data collection, because they saw how pedagogical translanguaging improved L2 learners' engagement and confidence. Indeed, L2 learners who are in classrooms where most students are English speakers have been shown to experience affirmation and inclusion when translanguaging is incorporated (e.g., García & Kleyn, 2016; Yilmaz, 2021).

It was important to ascertain whether pedagogical translanguaging benefitted the English L1 learners too, since inclusive education should benefit all (Department of Basic Education, 2010). The participants all agreed that it was beneficial to the English L1 learners, and some participants even perceived it to improve the English L1 learners' comprehension and vocabulary. This points to the fact that pedagogical translanguaging changes the way in which teachers approach the language they use in the classroom. In our study, teachers were more intentional about the language they used and were more aware of the understanding of vocabulary, or lack thereof, among all their learners. All learners could therefore experience a richer language environment as a result of pedagogical translanguaging.

The participants indicated increased motivation on the part of the L2 learners as a result of translanguaging. Learner motivation has been found to be an important predictor of achievement (Lavrijsen et al., 2021). The participants also indicated an increase in self-confidence among L2 learners. Increased self-confidence is arguably linked to learners' perceived academic competence, which is the motivational construct with the largest effect on

achievement (Lavrijsen et al., 2021). Similarly to in our study, translanguaging has been found to increase weaker learners' engagement in class (Nagy, 2018). Our study therefore shows that even pedagogical translanguaging with a symbolic function has the power to benefit L2 learners. It benefits them on an emotional and socio-cultural level, and therefore indirectly on an academic level.

The participants realized that they had made themselves guilty of benign neglect of learners' L1, because, although they did not actively suppress the use of the L1, they previously had not actively incorporated the L1 into the classroom either (Cummins, 2019). This realization resulted in a shift in classroom practice. The participants became aware and acknowledged the socially constructed language hierarchies that caused learners to only want to speak English. Vogel and García (2017) see translanguaging as a vehicle to elevate people whose language practices have traditionally been seen as non-standard (Vogel & García, 2017). However, the participants did not shift their view on the importance of speaking pure languages during the course of the study.

While the field of translanguaging recognizes socially named languages (external view of language), it aims to go beyond them by realizing that each speaker has a unitary system in which languages are not separate entities (internal view of language) (Makalela, 2019). It remained important to the participants to maintain standardized languages, and encouraged learners to alternate between named languages, instead of encouraging fluid discursive practices. While it can be argued that the adherence to named languages is appropriate for the South African context (Heugh et al., 2017), our participants' insistence that L2 learners' linguistic repertoires should consist of standardized languages shows that they still have a monolingual mindset. The monolingual mindset is deeply ingrained in Western cultures and is reflected in the increasingly monolingual trend of the language policies of many South African schools (Robertson & Graven, 2020). Encouraging multiple monolingualisms arguably do not give learners the cognitive benefit of writing and discussing content without any restrictions placed on their language use, since they can still not freely access their linguistic repertoire to enhance their understanding.

Work needs to be done at all levels of education policy and practice if we are to enable teachers to truly use learners' unitary linguistic repertoire to expand their linguistic repertoire whilst gaining access to the language of education, commerce, and power.

Limitations and future directions

While DBR is effective in finding solutions for specific problems, a limitation of this type of action research is that the results are not easily generalizable to other communities. Our study was only conducted at one school; therefore, experiences of teachers from different schools could not be compared. We also did not attempt to objectively measure academic or affective progress in learners as a result of pedagogical translanguaging. Future research should include a wider variety of schools and use objective instruments to measure learner progress.

In this study teachers were exposed to the concept of pedagogical translanguaging for the first time by discussing a published article with them. From how the teachers implemented pedagogical translanguaging it is clear that in future studies more will have to be done to make them aware of and challenge the monolingual mindset.

Conclusion

Our study showed that teachers who had been trained in the submersion model could adopt an approach of pedagogical translanguaging after exposure to the basic principles. Through DBR the participants witnessed the socio-cultural effect of pedagogical translanguaging on L2 learners. While it had a clear affective and symbolic role, evidence of academic benefit could also be seen, albeit indirectly in many cases.

The ease with which English South African teachers took to pedagogical translanguaging affirms what has been said previously: Multilingualism is the South African lingua franca (Fardon et al., 1994). The monolingual mindset is, however, still pervasive in private schools and should be addressed at all levels of the education system if it is to change. Multilingualism has been around for centuries in South Africa and our teachers should be equipped and encouraged to use multilingual practices to harness the abilities of all our learners.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

The work was supported by the Shuttleworth Foundation [AOJ114].

Notes on contributors

Joanne Schoeman obtained her Master's degree in 2016, and is currently researching for her PhD in Speech-Language Pathology, with a focus on the support of second language learners and their teachers. She works in private practice as a paediatric speech-language therapist, with a special interest in language acquisition for academic purposes.

Salomé Geertsema completed her PhD in Motor Learning Principles and Speech Sound Disorders in 2016. She has publications on this subject, language, and literacy development in English second-language speakers, and Specific Learning Disorder (Developmental Dyslexia), which are her main areas of interest. She is a rated researcher and senior lecturer from the University of Pretoria, South Africa.

Mia le Roux completed her DPhil Linguistics in acoustic phonetics, English second language learning, and literacy acquisition in 2016. She has publications on these subjects which are her main area of interest, as well as on language acquisition, Specific Learning Disorder (Developmental Dyslexia) and dysfluency. She is a rated researcher and senior lecturer from the University of Pretoria, South Africa.

Lidia Pottas is a dually qualified speech-language therapist and audiologist with a specific interest in auditory processing disorders and providing support to learners and teachers within the educational context. She has several publications in this regard and is an associate professor at the University of Pretoria, South Africa.

References

- Carnes, N. (2019). Supporting middle grades teacher candidates in becoming culturally competent. *Current Issues in Middle Level Education*, 24(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.20429/cimle.2019.240103>
- Cenoz, J. (2017). Translanguaging in school contexts: International perspectives. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 16(4), 193–198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1327816>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes*, 39(2), 300–311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12462>
- Cernusca, D., & Ionas, I. G. (2014). Design-based research as a form of action research. In J. W. Willis & C. Edwards (Eds.), *Action research: Models, methods, and examples* (pp. 195–220). Information Age Publishing, Incorporated.
- Charamba, E. (2020). Translanguaging in a multilingual class: A study of the relation between students' languages and epistemological access in science. *International Journal of Science Education*, 42(11), 1779–1798. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2020.1783019>
- Cummins, J. (2019). Should schools undermine or sustain multilingualism? An analysis of theory, research, and pedagogical practice. *Sustainable Multilingualism*, 15(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.2478/sm-2019-0011>
- Department of Basic Education. (2010). *Guidelines for inclusive language*. http://www.ddsb.ca/AboutUs/EquityInclusiveEducation/Documents/Guidelines_Inclusive_Language.pdf%5Cn
- Department of Education. (1997). *Language in education policy document*. Government Printers.
- Duarte, J. (2019). Translanguaging in mainstream education: A sociocultural approach. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2), 150–164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1231774>
- Duarte, J. (2020). Translanguaging in the context of mainstream multilingual education. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 17(2), 232–247. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1512607>
- Fardon, R., & Furniss, G. (1994). Introduction: Frontiers and boundaries – African languages as political environment. In R. Fardon & G. Furniss (Eds.), *African languages, development and the state* (pp. 1–29). Routledge.
- García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). *Translanguaging with multilingual students*. Routledge.
- Gibbs, G. (2014). Using software in qualitative analysis. In U. Flick (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp. 277–294). Sage Publications Ltd.

- Goodman, B., & Tastanbek, S. (2020). Making the shift from a code switching to a translanguaging lens in English language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 55(1), 29–53. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.571>
- Heugh, K., Prinsloo, C., Makgamatha, M., Diedericks, G., & Winnaar, L. (2017). Multilingualism(s) and system-wide assessment: A southern perspective. *Language and Education*, 31(3), 197–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2016.1261894>
- Holmes, A. G. D. (2020). Researcher positionality - a consideration of its influence and place in qualitative research - a new researcher guide. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, 8(4), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v8i4.3232>
- Kato, R., & Kumagai, Y. (2020). Translingual practices in a ‘Monolingual’ society: Discourses, learners’ subjectivities and language choices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 25(5), 1681–1696. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1799318>
- Krause, L. S., & Prinsloo, M. (2016). Translanguaging in a township primary school: Policy and practice. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 34(4), 347–357. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2016.1261039>
- Kretzer, M. M., & Kaschula, R. H. (2021). Language policy and linguistic landscapes at schools in South Africa. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 18(1), 105–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1666849>
- Lavrijsen, J., Vansteenkiste, M., Boncquet, M., & Verschueren, K. (2021). Does motivation predict changes in academic achievement beyond intelligence and personality? A multitheoretical perspective. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 114(4), 772–790. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000666>
- Makalela, L. (2015). Moving out of linguistic boxes: The effects of translanguaging strategies for multilingual classrooms. *Language and Education*, 29(3), 200–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2014.994524>
- Makalela, L. (2019). Uncovering the universals of ubuntu translanguaging in classroom discourses. *Classroom Discourse*, 10(3–4), 237–251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1631198>
- Mbirimi-Hungwe, V., & McCabe, R. M. (2020). Translanguaging during collaborative learning: A ‘transcollab’ model of teaching. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 38(3), 244–259. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2020.1847670>
- McLeod Palane, N., & Howie, S. (2019). A comparison of higher-order reading comprehension performance for different language of instruction models in South African primary schools. *Perspectives in Education*, 37(1), 43–57. <https://doi.org/10.18820/2519593X/pie.v37i1.4>
- Meighan, P. J. (2022). Coloniallingualism: Colonial legacies, imperial mindsets, and inequitable practices in English language education. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15595692.2022.2082406>

- Mweli, P. (2018). Voices of grade four teachers in response to mazibuye izilimi zomdabu! (bring back African languages!): A decolonising approach. *Journal of Education*, 72, 39–54. <https://doi.org/10.17159/2520-9868/i72a03>
- Nagy, T. (2018). On translanguaging and its role in foreign language teaching. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica*, 10(2), 41–53. <https://doi.org/10.2478/ausp-2018-0012>
- Ngubane, N., Ntombela, B. X., & Govender, S. (2020). Translanguaging pedagogy in selected English first additional language writing classrooms. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 38(2), 142–151. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2020.1771190>
- Ollerhead, S. (2016). Pedagogical language knowledge: Preparing Australian pre-service teachers to support English language learners. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 46(3), 256–266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2016.1246651>
- Robertson, S. A., & Graven, M. (2020). Language as an including or excluding factor in mathematics teaching and learning. *Mathematics Education Research Journal*, 32(1), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13394-019-00302-0>
- Schoeman, J. C., Geertsema, S., Le Roux, M., Pottas, L., & Graham, M. (2022). Professional development for teachers of Grade 1 second language learners. *Independent Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 17(2), 137–158. <https://hdl.handle.net/10520/ejc-jitl1-v17-n2-a10>
- Slaughter, Y., & Cross, R. (2021). Challenging the monolingual mindset: Understanding plurilingual pedagogies in English as an Additional Language (EAL) classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(1), 39–60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820938819>
- Štemberger, T., & Koper, C. S. I. (2016). Design based research: The way of developing and implementing. *World Journal on Educational Technology: Current Issues*, 8(3), 180–189. <https://doi.org/10.18844/wjet.v8i3.621>
- Thornberg, R., & Charmaz, K. (2014). Grounded theory and theoretical coding. In U. Flick (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp. 153–169). Sage Publications Ltd.
- Van der Walt, H., & Steyn, H. (2016). Afrikaans as taal van onderrig en leer in skole en ander onderwysinstansies: “Ou” wyn in nuwe sakke. *Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif Vir Natuurwetenskap En Tegnologie*, 56(4–1), 1034–1047. <https://doi.org/10.17159/2224-7912/2016/v56n4-1a10>
- Vogel, S., & García, O. (2017). Translanguaging. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.181>
- West, J., & Meier, C. (2020). Overcrowded classrooms – The Achilles heel of South African education? *South African Journal of Childhood Education*, 10(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajce.v10i1.617>
- Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog*. Bangor University.

Yilmaz, T. (2021). Translanguaging as a pedagogy for equity of language minoritized students. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 18(3), 435–454. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1640705>