Transitions, translanguaging, trans-semiotising in heteroglossic school environments: Lessons from (not only) South African classrooms

Michał B. Paradowski
Institute of Applied Linguistics, University of Warsaw

Introduction

The collection of the preceding contributions to this volume are evidence of the multiple challenges faced by students and teachers-practitioners in South Africa's linguistically and culturally diverse classrooms. Chief amongst them is the inadequate development of many students' literacy and academic language proficiency, manifested in dismal reading scores and matriculation results. While challenges inherent in multilingual classrooms are a staple of schools throughout the world, one uniqueness of the South African scenario resides in many students' having to switch to new languages of instruction at successive levels of their education.

This concluding chapter commences with a succinct portrayal of the language policies in the country and its education system, and a critical synthesis both of the multiple transitions during the scholastic process and the educational challenges inherent in the system. The subjective selection of issues deemed most vital and critical in the education landscape of the Motherland will then expand into a discussion of school realities and challenges that are not exclusive to South Africa, but which are experienced by all countries and educational institutions bringing together people from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Since this is by no means a given in mainstream language policies and practices, we shall subsequently present the rationale behind the maintenance, development, and principled in-class use of students' home (and other) languages and dialects. Such considerations beg the question of an appropriate course of action. One that naturally presents itself as well-suited in this context is the theoretical stance, set of communicative practices, and pedagogical approach that have collectively been referenced under the umbrella term of *translanguaging*. The philosophy is explicated, followed by proposals of compatible techniques and strategies for linguistically diverse classrooms, as well as a set of additional recommendations which, whilst not pertaining to the translanguaging ideology *per se*, are believed to be potentially relevant to and beneficial for South African and other heteroglossic classroom contexts.

Although the concept of translanguaging has now gained world recognition and popularity in the scholarly literature and among teachers 'on the ground', its interpretation and implementation are by no means without problems and limitations. The chapter concludes with recommendations of critical, reflective plurilingual pedagogies that always take into account the circumstances and ecologies of the classroom and the subjectivities of the students.

Language realities in South African education

Like many others, South Africa is a country where within the space of one hour one can experience multiple languages in any given communication scenario (Paradowski & Bator 2018:647). This diversity extends to the multilingual composition of school and university classrooms. After the long period of colonial and apartheid rule, with the Group Areas Act of 1950 separating all the different ethnic groups, and individual legislative documents subsequently developed for each of the racial constructed groups (Kretzer & Kaschula 2021:110) and a policy of *moedertaalonderwys* (mother-tongue education) for Black pupils that stigmatised the usage of African languages (Alexander 2003:9; De Wet & Wolhouter 2009:368), following the first free democratic elections the policies have been replaced with more progressive and inclusive ones. Art. 6(1) of the *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996* (Government of South Africa 1996:4), superseding the 1993 interim Constitution (Section 1(3), Government of South Africa 1993) declared 11 languages (Sepedi, Sesotho, Setswana, siSwati, Tshivenda, Xitsonga, Afrikaans, English, isiNdebele, isiXhosa, and isiZulu) as official. Art. 6(2) in turn contains an 'affirmative action clause' (Malan 2011:395), elevating the status and usage of the indigenous languages. The country and its classrooms are simultaneously alive with many migrant languages, stemming from both domestic and cross-border migration.

The regulation of language policies in schools was attempted by *The Incremental Introduction of African Languages in South African Schools* draft policy (Department of Basic Education 2013), which, aiming to improve the footing of African languages, tried to ensure that all public schools in the country offer at least three official languages, so that every pupil can acquire at least one African language.

South African educational challenges

Unsurprisingly, the combination of the complex linguistic realities and the requirements of the language policy provisions leads to a number of challenges for students, teachers, and programme administrators.

Results of both the National School Effectiveness Study (NSES; Taylor 2011) as well as international surveys such as those carried out by the Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ) or the last three editions of the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PiRLS) have consistently been pointing to pupils' alarming lack of adequate reading comprehension, irrespective of the language of testing, with the relative scores deteriorating as one progresses up the educational ladder. The most recent data demonstrate that as many as four out of five learners are unable to retrieve basic information to answer simple questions – an ability that is critical for school success – with South Africa ranking last on the list of 50 participating countries (Spaull 2017 cited by Campbell & Prinsloo-Marcus, this volume). These findings are naturally being interpreted as a reflection of the failure of the current classroom practices in equipping learners with the requisite literacy skills. The problem is particularly pervasive in rural and peri-urban (township) schools, consequently only widening the achievement gap for lower-SES learners and furthering the growing disparities.

One reason for the situation may be that despite the formal recognition of 11 official languages and the constitutional – and elementary – right to receive education in one's home language (HL[1]), instruction from Grade 4 onwards is carried out in a language that for most pupils is *not* their HL. For some, such as children with more than one mother tongue or immigrant children, the language of instruction/language of learning and teaching (LoLT) will often not even be their second, but third or further language. Nor is English – one of the dominant and coveted LoLTs in the country – the home

---

[1] The abbreviation 'HL' will be used throughout this chapter to refer to 'home language', not necessarily 'heritage language' as can also be found in the literature.

language for many African teachers (Pennycook 2017a:16; Sundkler 2018).

Consequently, the majority of the learners are thrown into an education system that expects them to comprehend and acquire content knowledge while they may not have yet developed foundational communicative and literacy skills in the language of instruction.

To make matters more complicated, many learners have to transition into a new LoLT at multiple stages of their schooling. In brief, the South African education landscape is composed of as many as five phases of formal schooling:

- the Foundation Phase (from pre-school 'Reception' Grade until Grade 3, at 5–8 years of age, respectively). At this stage, most learners receive their schooling *in an African HL*. The Curriculum Assessment Policy Statements (CAPS) for this phase expect on average 1 hour and 48 minutes of the HL and 24 minutes of the First Additional Language (FAL, usually English) per day (DBE 2011a:6, 9), which is expected to lead up to the learner being able to understand 1,500–2,500 FAL words in context by the end of Grade 3 (*op. cit.*:22);
- the Intermediate Phase (Grades 4–6). This often sees an abrupt shift to *English* (usually) *or Afrikaans* as the medium of instruction (DBE 2010; Heugh 2013) and to corresponding monolingual textbooks and assessment, 'snatching the blanket of the familiar language away' (Childs 2016:34). Sometimes, however, this switch is *delayed* until high school or even university. According to CAPS, though, by the end of Grade 4 alone learners of English as the FAL are now expected to know 2,000–3,500 'common spoken words' *plus* 1,000–2,500 new 'reading' words (DBE 2011b:30). Compared with the exit expectations for the Foundation Phase, this means that 1,500–3,500 new words are expected to be acquired over the period of just one school year! Meanwhile, experience shows that many learners during this phase usually lack not only adequate proficiency in English, but also grade-appropriate reading skills in their HL;
- this is followed by the Senior Phase (Grades 7–9, although this division does not necessarily overlap with the administrative structure of the schools, where 'primary' school ends after Grade 7 and 'secondary' or 'high' school begins with Grade 8), and
- the Further Education and Training Phase (Grades 10–12 of ordinary school as well as technical and vocational education and training colleges), with increased splits into more granular subjects and an accompanying increase in the demand for subject-specific 'scientific literacy' (Laugksch 2000; Lelliott 2014), in some private schools followed by an optional 'post-matric' grade; and
- finally culminating with Higher Education (university), which almost exclusively takes place *in English*.[2]

Irrespective of the unrealistic expectations of the CAPS provisions, it is not helping that the implementation of the official language policies has been inconsistent across the nine provinces and School Governing Bodies, and where it has been implemented at all in theory, it has often been sorely lacking in practice (Kretzer & Kaschula, this volume) – a problem that appears to be shared by the majority of sub-Saharan countries (Kaschula & Wolff 2016).

Reaching out to the class in a language everyone can understand is additionally hampered by the multiplicity of languages in the classroom. In Gauteng, for instance, almost half the teachers have a pupil with whom they share no common language and with whom they therefore cannot or can barely communicate (Kretzer & Kaschula, this volume). The challenge is further compounded by the different

varieties of the officially endorsed languages that are spoken by the learners. Furthermore, many teachers themselves have immigrated to South Africa (with the majority of foreign educators hailing from Zimbabwe; Ranga 2015:259).

Apart from facing a language barrier, the migration experience is often traumatic for the learners due to racism and xenophobia, which often lead to a hostile atmosphere towards Africans from other countries (Vandeyar & Vandeyar 2017) and naturally do little to increase their educational attainment.

These problems are exacerbated by a range of additional issues identified in a recent study (van der Berg, Spaull, Wills, Gustafsson & Kotzé 2016), from undue union influence, poor administration, teacher absenteeism, insufficient teacher content knowledge and pedagogical skills, and inadequate teaching and learning time for pupils.

In 2019, there were over 13 million students in the basic education system taught by nearly 445,000 educators, yielding on average 29 learners per teacher (Department of Basic Education 2020:1); the learner-teacher ratio typically being higher in primary schools (DBE 2018:3-6).

Educational realities and challenges beyond the South African context

Many of the realities and challenges of the South African educational setting are more universal and go beyond the context of this country.

We are living in times of enhanced contact between people of diverse backgrounds, whether due to migrations (both voluntary and forced, fleeing violence or poverty), temporary study or work abroad, by virtue of living in traditionally multicultural milieus, or thanks to digital technologies. Consequently, linguistically and culturally diverse classrooms have become a reality in an increasing number of school environments experiencing the intersection/convergence of different communicative repertoires (see e.g. Vertovec 2007; Aronin & Hufeisen 2009; García, Flores & Chu 2011; Nazario 2015; Shah 2016). For a fair share of the pupils, the transitions experienced are frequently traumatic. For instance, many of the unaccompanied minors who arrive in the US suffer not only from family separation and culture shock (Nazario 2007; Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco & Todorova 2010), but also post-traumatic stress disorder, depression and anxiety (Shah 2016), on top of gaps in disrupted school education and often lower SES[3] than their classmates.

The resulting classrooms of today are often melting pots of allophone learners – both migrant and local minority language speakers – sometimes so heterogeneous that few of them share a common HL. Many learners simultaneously acquire and use multiple languages and dialects in their homes and communities (Maseko & Mkhize 2019), resulting in 'interdependent multilingualism' (Makalela 2016:192). Meanwhile, mainstream language policies usually assume ideal schooling scenarios, often blatantly disregarding realities 'on the ground', whilst many other educational contexts still grapple with the official pedagogical prescription of the use of only one language in the classroom (Lin 2013).

Akin to the situation in South Africa, for many pupils the transition from the home to formalised school environments – and further up the educational ladder – not only means a new chapter in their language, literacy and numeracy development and a shift to the next educational phase, but often coincides with periods of intense changes on many other levels – in their personal, emotional, cognitive,

---

[2] The same takes place e.g. in India (Niranjana 2015).

[3] Which often has consequences in slower achievement, as it did in lower scores in early intelligence tests comparing bi- and monolinguals that were carried out between the 1890s and the 1960s (see Paradowski 2017:232; Paradowski & Bator 2018:650).

and social growth. For instance, in high-income countries the shift from Grade 3 to 4 has been identified as a cognitive and linguistic 'gear shift' from the 'learning to read' to the 'reading to learn' phase (Chall 1996; Pretorius & Stoffelsma, this volume). Transition to higher education in turn requires:

i)   familiarity with academic literacy, writing conventions and specialised genres, vocabulary, and prerequisite subject knowledge, as well as navigating new subjects and concepts (in South Africa exacerbated for instance by the challenge of the integrated Natural Science and Technology curriculum; Mahabeer, Gumede & Peerthipal, this volume). Academic language and specialised scientific registers present a different challenge from that of dealing with 'general language'[4] (Paradowski 2018); they are nobody's 'home language' (Gee 2008) and are therefore difficult not only for second/foreign/additional language users and speakers of vernaculars, but are experienced as a 'foreign register' also by native speakers of the 'standard' variety (Lemke 1990; Tyler & McKinney, this volume). For emergent bilinguals, the academic language of science only adds levels of unfamiliarity and manifests as doubly alien (Setati, Adler, Reed & Bapoo 2002; Probyn 2009; Tyler & McKinney, this volume). Just because the learners have graduated from high school, it cannot be taken for granted that their BICS, CALP, or prerequisite subject knowledge are in place (just as receptive language use does not usually match production), hence assistance with CALP only may be insufficient (Campbell & Prinsloo-Marcus, this volume);

ii) the know-how of navigating the new academic system, its unfamiliar conventions and school scripts – hence, for example, orientation sessions organised for future students (and sometimes their parents as well) by many United States universities;

iii) socialisation challenges, where suddenly not knowing anyone around often leads to feelings of homesickness, loneliness and isolation, while the sheer class sizes may be found too intimidating to ask questions; this also creates the need to establish relationships with the new peers and teachers (Paradowski *et al.* 2021a, b); and

iv) financial challenges, especially in tuition-charging institutions (but also free ones if the students may still need to find employment in order to simply afford their subsistence costs). These are recognised for instance by initiatives such as food pantries[5] supporting students who may not be able to afford meals on a regular basis.

All these challenges explain the need for – and provision of – psychological counselling in many western universities.

   Challenges that often add to the above and hamper academic achievement in multilingual milieus, whether for some or most students, on top of their financial situation, are the families' not infrequently relatively lower cultural capital, overcrowded and under-resourced classrooms, and limited access to target-language materials.

   Meanwhile, schools' proficiency requirements in the LoLT often serve as a gate-keeping device, not infrequently marginalising and alienating the majority of the potential or actual learners by either acting as a barrier to accessing (higher) education, or constraining participation therein (Auerbach 1993; McKinney, Carrim, Marshall & Layton 2015:116, 121; Mahabeer, Gumede & Peerthipal, this volume). This problem thus becomes a social justice issue, especially in contexts where the medium of instruction is a post-colonial language (e.g. English or Afrikaans in South Africa, even though these languages are not dominant in the country's language demographics[6], with the former being the HL of less than 10% of the population; Kotzé, Van der Westhuizen & Barnard 2017:1; Tyler & McKinney, this volume) and where the teachers and students remain trapped in the reproduction of entrenched colonial language ideological regimes (though as commented by Annelie __, p.c., 14 May 2020, the preference for English as the LoLT is now often a choice of the parents and School Governing Boards due to the perceived importance of the language).

   As a consequence of the above, students may fail to ask questions or attend office hours to ask for assistance not because they do not have anything to discuss, but because their lack of confidence in their command of the LoLT prevents them from crossing the threshold of the lecturer's office (Campbell & Prinsloo-Marcus, this volume). Likewise, when a student cannot answer a question, this may be due to i) their not knowing the subject matter, or ii) their not having understood the question, or iii) their not knowing how to answer it in their L2 (Childs, Markic & Ryan 2015:422). A language challenge ought not to be mistaken for a learning challenge[7] (Hall, Griffiths, Haslam & Wilkin 2012:1). Standardised monolingual assessment administered only in students' non-dominant language cannot properly gauge their academic competence or progress as it gives them less room to unleash their true potential, creativity, critical insight, knowledge and achievement (Mahabeer, Gumede & Peerthipal, this volume; Sah & Li 2020:16); consequently, it 'can lead teachers to believe that emergent bilinguals are functioning at low cognitive levels' (Allard, Apt & Sacks 2019:81), thus again perpetuating social inequalities.

   Another factor compounding the problem of teaching and learning in either second/foreign/additional language classrooms, or in content classrooms where the language of instruction is not the HL of most of the students, is wide individual variation. Even within an L1-homogeneous group, the same age and/or grade level need not mean comparable HL or LoLT knowledge (Pretorius & Stoffelsma 2017) or familiarity with cultural knowledge[8], especially for children from low SE backgrounds due to the lower quantity and quality of vocabulary input from parents and other caregivers.

   This issue gains particular importance in relation to vocabulary acquisition, which requires frequent and repeated exposure, especially given that communication outside[9] the classroom or lecture

---

[4] We could here think back to Cummins' (1979) distinction between Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), remembering that while these may be helpful shorthand, everyday and academic language are better viewed as a fluid continuum than an essentialist dichotomy (see also Lin 2019:12*f.*).

[5] During my sabbatical at a large university in the American Midwest I recall an ad for a food pantry explaining that the fact that a student is able to bear the expense of the high tuition fees need not mean that they can afford regular meals. Indeed, a recent report from a survey carried out among 123 colleges showed that 49% of students in two-year institutions and 47% in four-year colleges could not afford a balanced diet, 51 and 44% respectively worried that their food would run out before they got money to buy more, 41%/34% had experienced that scenario, and 40%/35% had had to cut meal size or skipped meals altogether (Goldrick-Rab *et al.* 2019:7).

[6] According to the 2011 Census, English ranks 4th with 9.6% of the population speaking it as a first language, Afrikaans 3rd (13.5%), isiXhosa 2nd (16%) and isiZulu 1st (22.7%; Statistics South Africa 2012:24).

[7] Mirroring the situation of bilinguals' performance on IQ tests in the first half of the previous century (Paradowski 2017:232; Paradowski & Bator 2018:650).

[8] Familiarity with which is sometimes taken for granted in classroom materials.

[9] Research found that students generally only use the TL as long as the teacher exerts control over classroom activities, switching into their L1s for most of the remaining interaction (see e.g. Wong-Fillmore (1980) in the context of a Cantonese-English bilingual programme and Fröhlich, Spada and Allen (1985) in L2 classrooms in Canada).

halls tends to revert to the students' HL. Likewise, the learners may fail to get support and practise the target language/LoLT at home, as their parents may be unable to assist them in the process.

As a consequence of the above factors and despite policy expectations, many students – including those who have got through the relevant prior stages of education – may still not have developed requisite target language (TL) proficiency to cope with academic discourse.[10] This contrasts starkly with the expectancy of anglonormativity – that people will and should be proficient in English (McKinney 2017:80), and with the concomitant, schizophrenic positioning of bilingual learners by the education system as English monolinguals – often 'deficient'[11] English monolinguals (Tyler & McKinney, this volume).

The importance and pedagogic value of home language maintenance and development
The two previous sections considered challenges that are directly or indirectly related to contexts of teaching in a language that is different from the L1 of most of the learners. Before heading to proposals of remediation and solutions, we will first focus on the importance and pedagogic value of the use, maintenance, and development of the students' home and other already known languages, and on why mastering the LoLT should not take place at the expense of the learners' forsaking their HLs.

Formal recommendations for the provision of instruction in students' mother tongues as a 'linguistic human right' (UNESCO 2016:22) were made already in 1953 by UNESCO. It seems a given that expository talk and explanations offered (at least partly) in the learners' L1 are able to provide – whilst the lack thereof may deny – more expedient epistemic access to grade-level content (Cook 2001; Martin 2003; Paradowski 2007a:98*f.*; Probyn 2009, 2015; García & Kano 2014; Madiba 2014; Seltzer & Collins 2016; Duarte 2019; Vaish 2020).[12] In doing so, they not only allow students to 'get through' their class, but often do so at a level of 'depth, complexity, or nuance of information and understanding' that could not be afforded e.g. via simplified L2 text and illustrations (Allard, Apt & Sacks 2019:80; see also Hu & Lei 2014; Baker & Wright 2017:280*f.*; He, Lai & Lin 2017). Unsurprisingly, learners often appreciate instruction in their L1; for instance, Johnson, Chan, Lee and Ho (1985) showed that fewer than 3 per cent of Grade 9 students questioned in Hong Kong preferred English-only instruction. Despite the smaller range of written materials available in the local languages, research in developing countries (e.g. Dutcher & Tucker 1997; Heugh 2006) found that the use of these languages as a medium of instruction lowers drop-out and repetition rates.

In the context of language classes, learning an L2 via this same L2 is again no easy task (Paradowski 2008a:233; 2014a:311*f.*), while code-switching 'as a more accessible and cost-effective alternative to the sometimes lengthy and difficult target-language explanation' (Ur 1996: 17) may quickly clarify any confusion (Atkinson 1987; Harbord 1992; Lucas & Katz 1994:539; Cook 2001; Wilen, Bosse, Hutchison & Kindsvatter 2004; Zhao & Macaro 2004; Temple, Ogle, Crawford & Freppon 2005:498). Cook (2003:287) makes the relevant point that

[i]f the students' conscious understanding of grammatical rules is a crucial element in learning, one needs to ask which language acts best as a vehicle for conveying the actual rules. There is no virtue in making the grammatical explanation deliberately difficult by using the students' weakest language.

Likewise, from the receiving end of education – both in and out of class – the insertion of a word from another language in an otherwise TL utterance upon encountering difficulty in expression often actually enables the learner to continue using the target language instead of either giving up or 'regressing' to the other tongue entirely (Al Masaeed 2016, 2018; Trentman 2021a:116; 2021b:128). Second language acquisition research demonstrated that the use and promotion of learners' L1 in SLA actually aids the process and academic learning (Thomas & Collier 1997–8, 1999, 2002). In South Africa, Makalela (2015b) showed that encouraging learners of Sepedi to mobilise all their linguistic resources increased their TL vocabulary. In the US, Sheltered English Immersion classes proved to perform poorly in comparison with bilingual programmes, evidencing lower graduation (Arias & Faltis 2012; Rios-Aguilar, González Canché & Moll 2012; Moore 2014), higher dropout rates (Gándara & Orfield 2012), and traumatised learners (Combs *et al.* 2005).

The ordering of the languages used in instruction may matter as well. By commencing in the learner's first or other known language, the teacher begins with what the student can understand[13]; '[s]tarting with the L1 provides a sense of security and validates the learners' lived experience, allowing them to express themselves. The learner is then willing to experiment and take risks with [L2] English' (Auerbach 1993:29). This rationale of connecting new information to prior knowledge (Moll 2007; Paradowski 2008a:229; Cenoz & Gorter 2011; Llanes & Cots 2020:12) may be seen as an extension of the ideas behind Vygotsky's (1934a) concept of the Zone of Proximal Development and Feuerstein, Rand, Hoffman and Miller's (1980) cognitive mediation theory (Paradowski 2007a:94). This general truth has also been incorporated in policymaking, for instance in Chapter 5.1 of the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* under the label of *savoir apprendre* – the ability to learn, knowledge how to learn effectively – which is recognised as part of the general (i.e., not circumscribed only to the linguistic domain) competences of the language learner/user:

In its most general sense, *savoir-apprendre* is the ability to observe and participate in new experiences and to incorporate new knowledge into existing knowledge, modifying the latter where necessary. (Council of Europe 2001:106)

This easing of the cognitive load via the use of the students' HL alleviating the fear of 'sink-or-swim' can thus provide a less stressful transition to new content[14], and enhance participation, involvement,

---

[10] A case in point may be a trilingual international school in Thailand, where students who were communicative in Chinese-language conversation turned out to be largely unable to engage with a text written in that language, a mode with which they had not had much experience.

[11] Which is why, in order to avoid the deficit perspectives implicit in the label 'language learner', Cook (e.g. 2002) prefers 'language user' and García, Kleifgen and Falchi (2008) introduced the term 'emergent bilingual', both of which labels are used throughout this chapter.

[12] Meeting Halliday's (1994) ideational function (Lin 2013:202) or Duarte's (2020) epistemological function.

[13] This is one of the pivotal tenets of the Interface Model, where TL instruction commences with an explication of how relevant grammatical, discursive or pragmatic principles operate in the learners' first language or culture, before an explanation of pertinent TL/culture rules and norms (Gozdawa-Gołębiowski 2003a:201–9, 2003b, 2005; Paradowski 2007c, 2008a, 2014a:309*f.*).

[14] For instance, comparing an EMI (English as a medium of instruction) and a regular track, Santos and colleagues (2018) divulged that, due to limitations in their English proficiency, students in the former felt higher levels of communicative anxiety. In turn, in a Korean university the teacher's policy of allowing L1 use contributed to students' feelings of relaxation and confidence and consequently increased their willingness to use L2 English. Relief at the licence to use the L1 was also reported by students in EMI courses in the Basque Country (Cenoz & Etxague 2013), while sustained effort to follow the teacher's explanations in L3 English often resulted in student exhaustion (Muguruza, Cenoz & Gorter 2020:12*f.*).

the complexity of discussions, and investment in learning (Lin & Martin 2005; Woodley & Brown 2016; García, Johnson & Seltzer 2017), 'engag[ing] all students, including newly-arrived emergent bilinguals who would have been silenced in a [target language]-only environment' (Allard, Apt & Sacks 2019:75). In the words of one teacher, '[j]ust having the essential question and the actual problem itself in their language gets [the pupils] more involved and engaged in the lesson' (cited in Woodley & Brown 2016:87). The same study (carried out in the United States) demonstrated increased engagement also of many English-dominant learners who had struggled with reading comprehension, and had previously been disengaged and written off by former teachers (Woodley & Brown 2016:96). Lin (1999) similarly showed how via a skilful intertwining of the use of L1 Cantonese for a story focus and L2 English for a language focus, a teacher in a Hong Kong school managed to positively transform the habitus of working-class students, engage them in learning English, and boost their confidence in reading story books in a language which they had hitherto regarded as alien and irrelevant to their daily lives. Likewise, using students' L1s in EMI science lessons brought about an increase in classroom participation and access to literacy and content knowledge in Kenya (Kiramba 2019).

Apart from enabling access to class content, the sanctioning of HL use in class has been argued to 'liberat[e] the voice of language minoritized students' (García & Leiva 2014:200; García 2009, García & Kleifgen 2010) by also facilitating *expression* and the conveying of not infrequently complex ideas at a level beyond the learners' abilities in the TL. In the words of one student, 'I really love [being able to mix languages in class], because normally if you don't know something you are just like whatever let it go, but now you can really, really discuss it' (quoted in Ticheloven *et al.* 2019:11) – which might be more difficult to achieve in a [Language$_x$]-only classroom[15], especially at lower stages of proficiency (Carroll & Sambolín Morales 2016; Kiramba 2019). Learners deserve to contribute to the class discussion and say what they want to convey – including expression of misunderstandings or lack of understanding – and to hear and understand what their classmates have to say (Woodley & Brown 2016:96); by giving them a voice, we give students more credit and agency and avoid the infantilising nature and deficit perspective of the separatist TL-only classroom (Auerbach 1993). In the words of Allard, Apt and Sacks (2019:74), using the students' HLs 'allows teachers to connect with them as whole human beings (not only as "English learners").' Reformulation in the HL can also help check comprehension (Dakowska 2005:31; Fennema-Bloom 2009/2010:29; Aguilar & Rodríguez 2012; Hu & Lei 2014; Roothooft 2019). Use of students' L1s, whether via translanguaging or by developing bi-/multilingual assessment, at once allows the teacher to more accurately and fairly *assess* their actual content knowledge and academic abilities (Coelho 2003; García 2009; Gathercole *et al.* 2013; Flores & Schissel 2014:475; Makalela 2015b; Vaish & Subhan 2015; Gorter & Cenoz 2017; Allard, Apt & Sacks 2019:83; Antia 2021:145*f.*, 12), .

No less importantly, one's HL constitutes an important part of emotional and social *identity*[16] and self-image formation, maintenance, and expression (Cummins 2001a, 2009b; Androutsopoulos 2007; Gawinkowska *et al.* 2013; Creese & Blackledge 2015; Young & Mary 2016; Pulinx, Van Avermaet & Agirdag 2017; Pfeiffer, this volume). In the place of a deficit model of education (Zinn & Rodgers 2012), the acknowledgment and celebration of the learners' home languages and dialects by the teacher can

valorise their both utilitarian and symbolic value and the students' self-esteem, making them feel that their culture and language are both recognised and welcomed, letting them embrace where they are from, and foster pride in their identity and ethnolinguistic background (Canagarajah 2013). Such a positive approach can contribute to elevating the prestige of the respective language(s). Rather than compartmentalise learners along the lines of nationalist, target-language-only, or one-language-at-a-time monolingual pedagogical ideologies (Li 2018a:16), the acknowledgment and sanctioning of the use of all of the learners' languages in class alongside the LoLT/TL can help them to not only negotiate different identities and subjectivities (others than merely those imposed by monoglossic educational policies), position themselves as they see fit (Ferguson 2003:39), and establish an author's voice, but also to co-construct and affirm their *multilingual* and/or *cosmopolitan identities* (Madiba 2014; Palmer *et al.* 2014; Bucholz, Casillas & Lee 2017; García-Mateus & Palmer 2017; Kirsch 2020:8)[17] and develop pride in being able to speak multiple languages and to translate between them (Manyak 2004; Cenoz & Santos 2020:8; Pfeiffer, this volume). Indeed, in the words of one student, 'when … I have the opportunity to … express myself in … three languages I feel like I'm a complete person, but in each of the three [separately] I feel like there's something missing'[18] (quoted in Trentman 2021a:113*f.*). Meanwhile research has shown that when not formally supported, particularly in the early years of school, home languages may become lost (Isurin 2000; Pallier *et al.* 2003; Janssen, Bosman & Leseman 2013; Cenoz & Gorter 2017).

The HLs also perform a vital interpersonal function, connecting the pupil with her/his environment, family[19] and community. Apart from creating a bridge between the school and the home, use of HLs in translanguaging spaces in the classroom can help create alignment, allegiance, solidarity and co-membership (Blackledge & Creese 2017) both in-group and along teacher-student lines, and thus foster a more inclusive, safe and welcoming climate and a sense of belonging in the classroom (Seltzer & Collins 2016; Kirsch 2020:5) and prevent alienation.HL use can also help connect, build rapport and bring down the barrier between the *teacher* and the learner, express 'shared identity and solidarity' (Arthur & Martin 2006:196; García, Flores & Woodley 2012; García & Leiva 2014), develop a less formal and instead a more convivial atmosphere, and interpersonal connection (Arthur & Martin 2006). This 'momentary boundary-levelling effect' (Simon 2001:326) during the reverting to the students' HL and the resulting demonstration of alignment helps the teacher show that s/he 'side[s] with' the learners (Creese & Blackledge 2010:111) by 'meet[ing] them on their territory' (Carstens, this volume), thereby creating a safer space of a non-threatening environment (see Canagarajah 2011a:415). For instance, Lin (1996, 2013) showed that in secondary schools in Hong Kong, Cantonese-speaking teachers and students tended to convey urgent and shared messages in the common L1, while Seltzer

---

[15] In a recent interview, Polish actor Tomasz Kot said: 'In English I feel a simpler version of myself' ['[W] angielskim czuję się prostszą wersją siebie'] (Gruszkowski 2019:21).

[16] Although a language does not necessarily equal an identity (Creese & Blackledge 2015).

[17] See also Canagarajah's (2001) study on the use of Tamil and English by students and teachers in Sri Lanka, and Noguerón-Liu and Warriner's emphasis on the explicit link between translanguaging and identity among Latinx communities in the US, for whom 'translanguaging practices have been an integral part of identity and belonging' (2014:183).

[18] ‏... عندما ...عندي فرصة ل ... أعبر نفسي بهذه الثلاثة لغات أشعر إن أنا شخص كامل بس بالثلاثة الحين أشعر إنه فيه شيء ناقص‎

[19] Nwaubani (2019) writes thus about her childhood in Nigeria, where her parents had chosen to only speak English to their children:

[My great-grandmother] enjoyed telling stories. But, apart from popular words like 'TV' and 'rice', she knew no English. Her one and only language was Igbo. This meant that her storytelling sessions often involved vivid gesticulations and multiple repetitions so that my siblings and I could understand what she was trying to say, or so we could say anything that she understood.

and Collins (2016) illustrated how thanks to translanguaging, Latinx students with interrupted formal education were able to discuss their experiences of linguistic discrimination and bullying, embarrassment about their low English proficiencies, and pressures to drop out of school (Allard, Apt & Sacks 2019:76).

Evidence from South African classrooms shows that the exclusion – or strict separation – of African languages leads to poor development of reading literacy among bi-/multilingual learners (Makalela & Fakude 2014; Mkhize 2016). Acknowledgment and strategic use of students' HLs in the classroom can not only help develop *L1* literacy and genres (Allard, Apt & Sacks 2019:81), but also enhance *L2* literacy (for the correlation between the two, see e.g. Hornberger's (2002, 2005, 2008) ecological model of continua of biliteracy, where changes to one language or literacy will bring about changes in the other). This is especially helpful in the case of languages with high intercomprehension potential (Doyé 2005; see Mkhize 2014; Sefotho & Makalela 2017). More broadly, translanguaging has recently been framed by Woodley and Brown (2016) in Gutiérrez' (2012) metaphor of mirrors and windows, emphasising a balance of a consistent, reflexive, meaningful instruction, on the one hand bringing into the classroom students' worlds, including their HLs, cultures and lived experiences ('mirrors'), while on the other giving them access to new diverse ideas, perspectives, language, and multilingual and multicultural awareness ('windows'). The acknowledgment of learners' languages and dialects can thus mean viewing these as an asset and potential to be harnessed. Rather than being banished[20] as an obstacle and hindrance to academic success, the respective languages ought to be seen as a resource (Ruiz 1984) which the learners should be not only allowed, but encouraged to bring into the classroom as part of their cultural and linguistic capital (see Bourdieu 1991).

One should also not forget that bi- and multilingualism usually helps with school performance, particularly in mathematics and other fields requiring problem-solving (Rafferty 1986; Andrade, Kretschmer & Kretschmer 1989; Armstrong & Rogers 1997; Greene 1997; Paradowski 2017:238). It also empowers learners with confidence and can counteract linguistic insecurity in the classroom (Hélot 2014). However, to achieve productive bi-/multilingualism, the increasing dominance of a majority language outside the home ought to be counterbalanced by a growing maintenance and development of the remaining/other HL (De Houwer 2003, 2007; Gabriel, Stahnke & Thulke 2015).

Finally, Arcand and Grin (2013) found that in their sample of ex-colonies – mainly in Sub-Saharan Africa – societal multilingualism (ethnolinguistic diversity or 'fragmentation' – a reflection of the widespread use of local languages) actually increases rather than decreases per-capita income.

All in all, the take-home message of this section is to not leave the students' HLs behind. After all, the purpose of learning a new language is (in the vast majority of cases) to become bi-/multilingual, *not* to overwrite the learner's L1 and turn her/him into a new monolingual (Paradowski 2007a:91; Li 2018a:16).

A promising lens for looking at the issues: Translanguaging and trans-semiotising

A promising perspective with explanatory potential when examining the use of learners' languages in the classroom, both by themselves and by the teacher, both spontaneously and in a planned manner,

is that of translanguaging.[21] There have been a profusion of interpretations surrounding this concept (Cenoz & Gorter 2017; Leung & Valdés 2019:359), but in a nutshell translanguaging can be viewed as an umbrella term for four related phenomena (Paradowski, under revision):

i) speakers' *natural cognitive capacity* and drive to draw on all the available cognitive, semiotic, sensory and modal resources at their disposal (García & Li 2014:32; Li 2016b:541; 2018a);

ii) the observable manifestations thereof in everyday *communicative practices*[22] (usually taking place among participants with different linguistic backgrounds and trajectories, but also in monolinguals[23]) that, instead of being constrained within prescribed sets of communicative resources (Blackledge & Creese 2017:267), to make sense of the world and maximise understanding (Lewis, Jones & Baker 2012; García & Li 2014:21, 65; Baker & Wright 2017), strategically deploy a full range of users' semiotic repertoires – or a *single* complex and dynamic (w)holistic repertoire (Cook 1992; Grosjean 2008; Celic & Seltzer 2011:1; Li 2011a) 'that the speaker then learns to separate into two [or more] languages, as defined by external social factors, and not simply linguistic ones' (García & Kleyn 2016:12) 'without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named … languages' (Otheguy, García & Reid 2015:281) or boundaries between language and other semiotic systems;[24]

iii) a bi-/multilingual resource-based set of *pedagogical practices* (traditionally for emergent bilingual students acquiring the societally dominant language) where the medium of instruction is different from the HL of the learners (García 2014; Li 2018a; what Williams (2012) referred to as 'official translanguaging' and Probyn (2015) and Cenoz (2017) as 'pedagogical translanguaging'[25]); and

iv) an *ontological orientation to language* criticising its entrenched conceptualisations and the hegemonic ideological regimes of monolingualism (Poza 2017:118) along with the accompanying asymmetric power structures of 'standard' and 'prestige'.

The term *translanguaging* was originally coined in the 1980s in Welsh as *trawsieithu* to refer to a pedagogy which encouraged principled use of this historically suppressed minority language alongside English with the goal of revitalising the former and producing active balanced and biliterate bilinguals (Williams 1994, 1996). Williams (*ibid.*) found that the deliberate use of one language as input (e.g. via reading materials or by the teacher asking questions or providing information) and the other as output

---

[20] Which is infeasible anyway, as it is only natural to think predominantly in one's currently more dominant language.

[21] The term 'Languaging' in turn, borrowed by Becker (1988, 1991:34) from Maturana (1980), has been used in the literature to distinguish language as a socio-politically constructed object from the discursive practices used to make sense, articulate thoughts, negotiate meaning, and gain knowledge and understanding through language (Swain 2006:97; Li 2011a; Thibault 2011, 2017; Jaspers 2018).

[22] After all, multilinguals' thought processes do not take place unilingually in a socially and politically defined linguistic entity, but across and beyond the artificial boundaries of named languages (Grosjean 1989; Cook 1992; Lin & Lo 2017; Li 2018a:18*f.*).

[23] Since no two individuals' idiolects are identical (Otheguy *et al.* 2015; Li 2018a).

[24] It thus harks back to Cook's concept of multicompetence, understood as the coexistence of two or more languages in the same mind (1991:112; 1992, 1996, 2009, 2013), as well as the notion of plurilingual and pluricultural competence (Coste, Moore & Zarate 1997/2009) that views individuals' linguistic and cultural resources as an integrated composite repertoire.

[25] Although contra Cenoz (2017) and Cenoz and Gorter's (2020:4) stricter definition, and like Kirsch (2020), I do not treat the scripted nature of the activities as a *sine qua non* for classifying them as pedagogical translanguaging, as long as they retain an instructional objective and are deployed on a systematic basis, even if they take place in response to a momentary need.

(e.g. in learners' responses) allowed the students to engage more deeply with the content and to more easily develop and sustain features and practice of Welsh (Poza 2017:105).[26] The term gained traction and expanded its scope after its translation into English and subsequent uptake in literature on dual language and literacy learning in response to changing linguistic realities in schools and communities (Baker & Wright 2017). In the South African context, it has informed analyses by Makalela (2013, 2014a, 2015a, b), Madiba (2014), Probyn (2015), Krause and Prinsloo (2016), Dowling and Krause (2019), and Maseko and Mkhize (2019).

Translanguaging differs from the superficially similar concept of *code-switching* in that it does not refer simply to the alternating use of more than one identified language in a particular communicative episode (Otheguy *et al.* 2015:82; Li 2018b), but leads away from the speaker-external structuralist Saussurean (1983) and Jakobsonian (Alvarez-Caccamo 2001:23*f.*) conceptualisation of languages as distinct 'codes' with solid boundaries (Lin 2013) and the focus on shuttling between these, to a usage-based (Ortega 2014) focus on the user, their agency, and their complex fluid sense- and meaning-making practices that cannot be easily assigned to traditional definitions of a language (García 2009; Creese & Blackledge 2010, 2015:26; Pennycook 2010; García & Li 2014; Noguerón-Liu & Warriner 2014).[27] Translanguaging reconceptualises such linguistic behaviours, viewing them as speakers' manifold social discursive *modus operandi* that utilises and makes up their complete semiotic repertoire – practices that have been part and parcel of everyday social life characterising communities throughout the world, especially in pre- and post-colonial contexts (Makoni & Pennycook 2005, 2012; Franceschini 2009; Blommaert 2010; Canagarajah & Liyanage 2012; Canagarajah 2013; Cenoz 2013; Lin 2013; Lamb 2015; Makalela 2015b; Maher 2017; Jaspers & Madsen 2019), including most African communities (Nkadimeng & Makalela 2015; Makalela 2016, 2017a):

> in everyday social interaction, language users move dynamically between the so-called languages, language varieties, styles, registers, and writing systems, to fulfil a variety of strategic and communicative functions. The alternation between languages, spoken, written, or signed; between language varieties; and between speech, writing, and signing, is a very common feature of human social interaction. It constructs an identity for the speaker that is different from a L_a identity or a L_b identity. (Li 2018a:26)

For instance, Makalela's South African students immediately recognised translanguaging pedagogy as 'the way we talk *ko kasi*' [in the townships] (2014b, 2017b:21). In this way, the philosophy echoes a recognition of the inherent diversity of indexical resources *within* languages and speakers (Bailey 2012) and the realisation that even the idiolects of so-called monolinguals consist 'of lexical and grammatical

features from regionally, social class-wise, and stylistically differentiated varieties of the same named language' (Li 2018a:19; see also Canagarajah & Liyanage 2012).

Intra-sentential code-mixing and inter-clausal code-switching (Lin 1990, 2008) not only refer merely to a subset of possible (predominantly oral) translanguaging practices (Jones 2017), but are a perspective that is not necessarily adequate or helpful in the realities of superdiverse (Vertovec 2007) classrooms and other environments. Creese and Blackledge (2015) provide a sample of typical, everyday discourse from a Panjabi complementary (i.e. community/heritage language) school in Birmingham, Li (2018a) cites creative examples from his 'New Chinglish' corpus (Li 2016a), Dowling and Krause (2019) showcase flexible amalgamated English-Xhosa forms in a Khayelitsha classroom, and Fei and Weekly (2020) analyse a conversation carried out in Putonghua and Wu, all illustrating the difficulty of meaningfully capturing and accounting for the speech samples from a structuralist perspective of separate languages.

In line with the on-going 'multilingual turn' (Ortega 2013; Conteh & Meier 2014; May 2014a; Tullock & Ortega 2017) within applied linguistics that views multilingualism as 'a new linguistic dispensation' (Aronin & Singleton 2008), translanguaging flatly rejects i) the myth of monolingualism as the (individual and societal) norm (Makoni & Meinhof 2004; Canagarajah 2007; Hall & Cook 2012; May 2014b; Paradowski 2017:221–225; Paradowski & Bator 2018:649), ii) views of language diversity as something to be silenced, and iii) dominant-language policies such as 'English Only' as the 'great equalizer' (Woodley & Brown 2016:95). Instead, it aims to provide space for institutional multilingualism (Creese & Blackledge 2010).

Translanguaging also does away with the orthodox practice of the rigid separation of conventionally identified languages, which labels are seen as often arbitrary, historically, politically and ideologically charged 'cultural–political concepts associated with the one-nation/race-one-language ideology' (Li 2018a:19, 27) that have their origins in the European nation-state – where linguistic and national boundaries were expected to be mutually reinforcing, subsequently were exported with colonialism (Makoni & Pennycook 2005, 2012; Makalela 2015b), where the imposition of linguistic boundaries served to construct new racial boundaries and enact racial hierarchies (Rosa & Flores 2017), and have since been associated with particular national or territorial groups (Beacco & Byram 2007; Makoni & Pennycook 2005; Milroy & Milroy 2012; Canagarajah 2013; May 2014a; Cenoz & Gorter 2015). Translanguaging also contests the 'two solitudes' premise (Cummins 2005:588, 2007, 2008) viewing bi-/multilinguals as storing their two (or more) languages as discrete, compartmentalised, clearly demarcated[28], autonomous, stable, namable and enumerable entities separately in the mind (Gravelle 1996:11; aka 'parallel/multiple monolingualism' or 'separate bilingualism', Heller 1999:271; Piccardo 2013; Marshall & Moore 2018; Blackledge & Creese 2010).

In the educational context, including 'foreign'/'world' language classrooms, translanguaging consequently goes counter to pressures of prevalent monolingual '[Language$_X$] Only' policies (Lemke 2002:85) – what Li (2011b:374) called the preference for 'One Language Only (OLON)' – or two-way bilingual immersion programmes such as those in the US, approaches that Swain (1983:4) referred to as 'bilingualism through monolingualism'.–These ideologies would mandate the separation and maintenance of the 'purity' of languages in order to avoid 'interference' and maximise exposure to the

---

[26] See also Shohamy (2011:427) where '[i]n many classes in Arab schools in Israel, a text in history is read in English, students are asked to summarize the article in Hebrew, and the oral discussion takes place in Arabic, either Modern Standard or a spoken dialect', as well as the plurilingual comprehension scale of the *Companion volume* to CEFR (2018:160).

[27] A number of alternative terms have emerged over time to refer to flexible meaning-making practices, including such proposals as 'hybrid language practices' (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, Álvarez & Chiu 1999; Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López & Tejeda 1999), 'transidiomatic practices' (Jacquemet 2005), 'flexible bilingualism' (Creese & Blackledge 2010), 'codemeshing' (in composition; Young 2004, 2007; Canagarajah 2009, 2011a, b; Young & Martinez 2011, Young, Barrett & Lovejoy 2014), 'polylingual languaging' (Jørgensen 2008, Jørgensen, Karrebæk, Madsen & Møller 2011; Madsen 2011), 'metrolingualism' (the complex language practices within urban centers; Otsuji & Pennycook 2010, 2011), 'contemporary urban vernaculars' (Rampton 2011), and 'translingual practice' (Canagarajah 2013). However, translanguaging has outpaced the competitors as the 'term of choice' (Pennycook 2016:202; Rosiers, Van Lancker & Delarue 2018:15).

[28] As if forgetting that a vast part of scientific vocabulary in for instance English had been borrowed from other languages (Finkenstaedt & Wolff 1973; Paradowski 2007a:240–6).

L2 (Littlewood & Yu 2011; the 'time-on-task'; Rossell & Baker 1996, or 'maximum exposure' hypothesis; Cummins 2001b). Consequently, the ideal classrooms were assumed to be those having 'as little of the L1 as possible' (Cook 2001:404; 2016; Byrd Clark 2012; Lin 2013; Young 2014; Kramsch & Huffmaster 2015; Karabassova & San Isidro 2020:10; Woll 2020), while moving between languages – and the use of a local language alongside the 'official' one – was usually stigmatised as a failure to remain exclusively in the TL, with teachers and learners often feeling guilty about the practice (Martin 2005:88; Paradowski 2007a:34; Creese & Blackledge 2010:105; Karabassova & San Isidro 2020:13).[29]

The primary motivation behind the translanguaging paradigm is that the separation of languages is often abstract to the learners (Creese & Blackledge 2010; Blommaert & Rampton 2011), for many of whom hearing, seeing, and speaking multiple languages and dialects may be part of daily experience (Woodley & Brown 2016:85). Translanguaging recognises that in bilingual families and communities around the world 'in indigenous everyday life, the two – or in some cases three or more – languages are needed many times in connection to one another' in order to construct meaning (López 2008:143; García & Leiva 2014; Otheguy, García & Reid 2019). What changes is that the familiar flexible heteroglossic (разноречие; Bakhtin 1963, 1975, 1979) discursive practices naturally used by the students when out of class are now incorporated into the (linguistically diverse) classroom, allowing learners in both individual and group learning to freely draw on all the linguistic features and other semiotic repertoires and ecological affordances at their disposal (García 2007, 2009; Jørgensen 2008; Creese & Blackledge 2010; Blommaert & Backus 2011; Jørgensen, Karrebæk, Madsen & Møller 2011; Hornberger & Link 2012b; Canagarajah 2013; García & Li 2014; Makalela 2015c; Otheguy, García & Reid 2015; Tyler 2016; Antia 2017; Blackledge & Creese 2017; Kusters, Spotti, Swanwick & Tapio 2017; McKinney 2017; Li 2018a). In the context of second/foreign/additional language classes, ignoring the learners' knowledge of and competence in their background languages would moreover treat them as linguistically ignorant *tabulae rasae* (Paradowski 2017:68), instead of helping them build on their prior knowledge (Gabryś-Barker 2006; Ó Laoire 2006; Hufeisen & Marx 2007; Paradowski 2007a-c, 2008a, 2014a, 2017; Horst, White & Bell 2010; Marx & Mehlhorn 2010; Peyer, Kaiser & Berthele 2010; Woll 2019).

Through the above, by giving voice to minoritised languages and the primary 'locus of control' of language choices (García, Flores & Chu 2011) to the learners, and by liberating multilinguals from the dictate of monoglossic and monomodal communicative practices (Tyler & McKinney, this volume) and instead allowing the use of the totality rather than fraction of their repertoire and 'bringing together different dimensions of their personal history, experience and environment' (Li 2011a:1223), translanguaging has been claimed to alter the existing asymmetric power relations (García, Johnson & Seltzer 2017:117). Unlike some other fluid languaging practices, translanguaging has been argued to have a *transformative and liberating potential* (Childs 2016) to remove existing disempowering

hierarchies that place some languages above others (García 2009; García & Leiva 2014; Li 2018a:15) and relegate emergent bilinguals to positions of little say and influence (Allard, Apt & Sacks 2019:82; Kiramba 2019), and to positively reinforce students' sense of belonging in their learning environment, especially for students from traditionally oppressed groups, such as racial and linguistic minorities, who often do not see themselves in the education system (Woodley & Brown 2016:92) despite coming to the classroom with strong translanguaging skills and the ability to adapt their linguistic practices to diverse social settings (Flores & Rosa 2015). The use of learners' HLs in the classroom thus has its roots in liberatory education, culturally relevant and culturally responsive teaching, multicultural education, and culturally sustained pedagogy (Freire 1970; Ladson-Billings 1995; Nieto & Bode 2011; Paris 2012; see Woodley & Brown 2016:91). It can also be seen as an ecological approach (van Lier 2008) in that it considers that which is already established in the learner's mind (e.g. existing languages) in the development of the new (see also the Interface Model; Gozdawa-Gołębiowski 2003a, b; Paradowski 2007c, 2008a, 2014a) and embraces this multilingual ecology as a resource. Moreover, translanguaging could be positioned in the spirit of the 'can do' statements of the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (Council of Europe 2018:26, 32*f.*, 43), especially given the current place of English as a nearly global *lingua franca* (Paradowski 2013).

Ideally, translanguaging not only allows, but *encourages* teachers to actively draw on learners' traditionally ignored or marginalised semiotic resources[30] and to create opportunities for the students to use these. It goes beyond mere acceptance and tolerance of students' wider languages and dialects to the cultivation thereof (García, Skutnabb-Kangas & Torrez-Guzman 2006), hence promoting both teacher- and learner-directed translanguaging. Its goal is thereby to not only help students acquire a new language, but also to continue the upkeep and development of their HLs (even if the teacher does not speak them).

By allowing students to utilise both 'the languages they know and the languages they are getting to know' (van der Walt 2013:12), translanguaging is seen as creating a climate conducive to learning and facilitating academic success for students from all language backgrounds (Carstens, this volume), capable of helping them to fully participate in the lesson 'no matter where they [are] on the [LoLT/language abilities] or content-knowledge spectrum' (Woodley & Brown 2016:92).

An added benefit of the approach is that it helps learners understand linguistic diversity and explore their classmates' varied worlds. Thanks to translanguaging, the learners may learn to be accepting, proud, and interested in other as well as their own languages (Woodley & Brown 2016:94).

Possible teaching techniques and strategies for linguistically diverse classrooms
There exist a number of techniques, strategies and solutions allowing teachers in linguistically heterogeneous classrooms to put the theoretical premises of translanguaging into practice. A non-exhaustive list is offered in this section.

The teacher may prepare translations of the materials or their synopses in the learners' HLs to be provided individually, or in multilingual versions, whether printed or made available electronically. Where the teacher may not be fluent in the relevant language(s), they can consult with more advanced students, other community members, or even fall back on – imperfect as they are but continually

---

[29] For a similar sense of 'shame' for codeswitching in a formal conversation outside of an educational setting, see Fei and Weekly (2020:16). Similarly, in the context of an intensive Arabic study abroad programme in Egypt, some students reported frustration and regret at their failure to meet the unrealistic monolingual standard and what they saw as a tension between the need to practise Arabic and the desire to develop friendships:

I regret it, but I do allow myself to … respond in English if I can't come up with [the response] in Arabic quick enough, just because … it's so hard to be an actual part of the conversation … if I tell myself I can speak only in Arabic, I limit myself so much, and it's … my ability also to … really engage with [my Arab friends] as people … (quoted in Trentman 2021b:122)

[30] Just as the learners may be encouraged to make connections between the currently taught content and their own knowledge and experiences.

improving – machine translation (MT) tools such as DeepL, Google Translate or Microsoft Translator (Toczyski *et al.*, subm.), in this way reaching out even to 'language singletons' and sending out a message of inclusion (Allard, Apt & Sacks 2019:84). Anna Mendoza (p.c., 28 Aug 2019) remarks that teacher-made handouts in learners' HLs legitimate the L1s in ways that simply allowing oral HL use does not. Even if such handouts contain an occasional linguistic, this offers an opportunity for learners to teach the instructor and (also for students) to learn how to provide helpful and respectful language feedback, a skill that can transfer to other situations (*ibid.*).

A shorter variant of the above is L1 annotations and glosses of teaching materials and multimedia presentation slides (e.g. of the key terms and questions; García & Kleifgen 2010:64; Creese & Blackledge 2011:17; Lin 2013:202; Allard, Apt & Sacks 2019:79; Liu, Lo & Lin 2020:8*f.*),[31] as well as the provision of word banks with HL translations and multilingual glossaries preceding texts to be used in class (see e.g. Madiba 2014:84 for an example from a South African context). Macaro (2009:47) hypothesised that the provision of L1 equivalents or definitions of L2 words may afford 'deeper processing opportunities' than target-language-only explanation[32]. A straightforward translation is often not only the simplest and most cost-effective, but also a frustration-saving means of conveying FL meaning overcoming the limitations of TL-only instruction,

> given its speed and efficiency, and especially at elementary level where explanations in the target language may be over the heads of the students. A refusal to translate may also mean that learners make their own unmonitored and possibly incorrect translations (Thornbury 1999:41),

. The value of translation as a semanticising device (i.e., 'convey[ing] the meaning of a given unit'; Titone 1968) was defended already by Henry Sweet and Harold Palmer, and later by proponents of the Comprehension Approach (e.g. Winitz 1981; see Paradowski 2007a:99*f.*), all of whom stressed the absolute need for the student to comprehend the learning material before committing it to memory: through semanticising 'the learner's precise understanding of the material in the target language is given priority over the fact that for a minute or two the learner is deprived of the target language input and/or practice' (Dakowska 2005:31). The provision of translation at once affords more autonomy to the student by enabling her/him to take more control of their learning and diminishing their reliance on the teacher's explanation every time when they do not comprehend something in the TL (Valdes 2001). Allard, Apt and Sacks (2019:80) found that through the use of translated texts, Spanish-speaking learners in the US were better able to do their work without the teacher's help.

Here, digital technologies such as machine translation can often be put to good use. Vogel and colleagues (2018), Chen and colleagues (2019), and Beilier and DeWilde (2020) demonstrated how MT can serve as a key means of leveraging emerging bilingual students' communicative resources to write

in English as an additional language and produce quality academic writing. Recent affordances such as voice and camera input (with the latter's OCR and subsequent AR functionalities) enabling on-the-fly output additionally expand the in-class possibilities offered by MT tools – just as these tools are often already being actively deployed by the students in out-of-school interaction and mediation.

Another pedagogical possibility is the provision and encouragement of access to supplementary content-related online (text and multimedia) materials in the different languages, including topical and currently relevant ones such as news outlets, as well as consulting resources such as students' own family and community members (Woodley & Brown 2016:92). Students may be allowed to consult sources in multiple languages not only for their class study, but also individual research (Sayer 2013; Martin-Beltrán 2014; Mazak & Herbas-Donoso 2014). One online aid that can facilitate the teaching and learning of abstract concepts is the different language versions of the relevant entries in the Wikipedia (Paradowski 2018:55). The teacher her-/himself may develop and maintain a collection of supplementary materials on the themes taught (Allard, Apt & Sacks 2019:84).

By reformulating her/his message into the learners' better-known language (for instance through the use of the 'sandwich technique'), the teacher becomes a 'language broker'. S/He can accommodate students' languages even when not proficient in them,[33] for instance by engaging bi-/multilingual and multidialectal students themselves as mediators and interpreters (see Jang 2017 for a pertinent example from a Korean context), whether in order to translate instructional content, or other learners' contributions or questions. For instance, Suresh Canagarajah (p.c., 13 Mar 2020) recalls how in a township school in theStellenbosch suburb of Kayamandi, he once observed how a Xhosa student served as a mediator for his peer who did not know English and the coloured teacher who did not speak Xhosa. In this way, the student interpreters may gain the status of knowers/experts, boosting their self-esteem while raising the footing of their HL (Link, Gallo & Wortham 2014), whereas the teacher's self-positioning as a learner can turn her/him into a role model and reinforce solidarity and shared identity (Arthur & Martin 2006:196; Kirsch 2020:5).

If not for 'presentational' talk, translanguaging could be allowed at least in 'exploratory' talk for epistemic access – to help learners in their task planning, drafts, discussions[34], sense- and meaning-making, understanding and acquisition of the subject matter (essentially as 'code-scaffolding'; Fennema-Bloom 2009/2010:29) to help learners complete tasks and, where desired, deliver a richer monolingual product (Barnes 1992:126; Adendorff 1993; Setati, Adler, Reed & Bapoo 2002; Probyn 2009; Msimanga & Lelliott 2014; Duarte 2020; Trentman 2021b:128). To these ends it can again be used even if the teacher is not conversant in all the languages concerned (see e.g. Pacheco & Miller 2016; although the feedback potential is then limited[35]). This can at once foster a more student-centred learning environment, in line with social constructivist theories (Vygotsky 1934a, b; García & Flores 2012; García, Johnson & Seltzer 2017).

A creative solution used by a teacher showcased by Dowling and Krause (2019) was the combining of English lexemes with Bantu morphology (e.g. agreement markers) that helped the learners

---

[31] Alternatively, information may be displayed in one language while the lesson explained in more than one (e.g., Mazak, Mendoza & Pérez Mangonéz 2017).

[32] For similar reasons, Atkinson (1993:94*f.*) points out some limitations of monolingual dictionaries:
- most are not suitable for beginner and elementary students, restricted by their gaps in vocabulary, while a certain level of proficiency in the language is necessary to understand even the simplest entries;
- the circularity of many definitions;
- the difficulty of looking up words one does not know (how to say '…' in English?).

A good bilingual dictionary will instantly provide the meaning of the word or phrase, frequently combining the provision of a functional equivalent with examples and relevant information about the grammar and use of the new lexeme or expression.

[33] See e.g. Pease-Alvarez and Winsler (1994) for how Anglo teachers made space for Spanish students even when they did not know that language.

[34] For instance, Storch and Wigglesworth (2003:763) observed speakers of Putonghua and Bahasa Indonesia preferring to use the L1 for clarification and planning activities in pair-work.

[35] I have witnessed university translation courses where the instructors were unable to verify the quality of or advise on the students' outputs, not speaking the languages involved.

disambiguate the referents.

The class may also be organised into groups or pairs of learners sharing a common tongue – e.g. partnering them up in 'think-pair-share' dyads (Woodley & Brown 2016:88) – to allow them to discuss issues and gain new information while being able to more directly draw on classmates' experiences for deeper individual and collaborative understanding (*ibid.*). It is vital, however, to avoid the segregation of students with different HLs (García & Sylvan 2011:13) and the creation of cliques, and to not allow language differences to cause tensions. In the foreign/second/additional language classroom it is also crucial to prevent the dominance of the L1 (Paradowski, Chen, Cierpich & Jonak 2012:124), and to encourage the learners to deliver the final product in the target language (which is often the most inclusive language[36]; Bonacina-Pugh 2012; see also Lin 2016).

If pedagogical translanguaging is to go beyond mere oral code-switching on the part of the instructor, the languages that the learners feel more comfortable in should – where possible – also be allowed when the students want to ask a question, in their compositions and other written assignments (Kiramba 2017), as well as *testing and assessment* (see Shohamy 2011; Flores & Schissel 2014; Gorter & Cenoz 2017:244*f.*; Schissel *et al.* 2018; Schissel 2019; Costley & Leung 2020:10). Given the power with which examinations are able to determine the future of the test takers (Shohamy 2001), this could help level the playing field, for instance for immigrants, heritage speakers, or HL speakers of African languages (Annelie ___, p.c., 14 May 2020). Instead, we frequently witness a disconnect between classroom teaching activities on the one hand and (often high-stakes) test rubrics on the other, where standardised evaluation and assessment at the end of the day are usually decontextualised and administered *solely* in the official language of instruction. Wright and Xiaoshi (2008) and Shohamy (2011) demonstrated how the use of tests framed only in the national dominant language denies immigrant students their academic knowledge obtained through the medium of other languages – while transmitting a message about the preferred languages (*op. cit.*:421) and suppressing the study of others, as was the case for instance after the introduction of English-language tests in the US through the 2001 No Child Left Behind act (Menken 2008a, b). In Shohamy's study carried out in Israel, students from the former USSR who were tested with a bilingual Hebrew-Russian test significantly outperformed students subjected to a monolingual Hebrew-only test; importantly, many students utilised both language versions for a more complete understanding (2011:427). She thus makes the point of the higher fairness and construct validity of multilingual testing. Examinations in two or more languages – or at least the HLs dominant in the classroom – are not overly difficult to arrange (though of course they require the subsequent assessors to have at least receptive knowledge of the language(s) in question); indeed, Prinsloo and Krause's (2019) ethnographic research carried out in Intermediate Phase classrooms in the Cape Town township of Khayelitsha shows how the comprehension of English exam questions can be aided by the provision of explanations in the local variety of isiXhosa. However, maintaining compatibility of instructional and evaluation practices requires a congruent, consistent gradation of the relative proportions of the languages used in assessment throughout the educational stages and at the end of the road.

Code-switching may also be employed to signal topic shifts or transitions between activities (meeting Halliday's (1994) textual function; Lin 2013:202) and for other classroom management purposes (Probyn 2015; Lin & He 2017; Liu *et al.* 2020).

Beyond the immediate needs of the current lesson, the teacher may want to create a 'multilingual ecology' in the classroom – a linguistic landscape (Landry & Bourhis 1997; Gorter 2013) or 'schoolscape' (Brown 2012) – for instance with the use of labels, signs, or posters (Allard, Apt & Sacks 2019:75), and by allowing pupils' L1 use for the symbolic function (e.g. in greetings, valorising the home languages and cultures without requiring the teacher's competence therein; Duarte 2020). If using story-telling, role-play, or creative writing activities, at least one of the characters may be made a speaker of only a minority language, creating the need for the use of that language (Seals & Olsen-Reeder 2020:7).

Some teachers suggest organising 'translanguaging blocks' within a lesson that could prevent slowing it down (Ticheloven *et al.* 2019:16; Galante 2020:7).

In agreement with social semiotics theory and the concept of multiliteracies (Cope & Kalantzis 2000), (trans)languaging recognises the inherently multimodal and multisemiotic nature of communicative repertoires (García 2010; Creese & Blackledge 2015; Kusters, Spotti, Swanwick & Tapio 2017; Pennycook 2017b; Canagarajah 2018a, b; Li 2018a; García & Otheguy 2020)[37], and the realisation that their corporeal dimension is not separate from, but integral to communication, where language is but one of many affordances and channels (Jewitt *et al.* 2001; Jewitt 2008; Kress 2009; Block 2014; Guzula *et al.* 2016; Blackledge & Creese 2017; Zhu, Li & Jankowicz-Pytel 2020; for an exposition of embodied language and embodied cognition see also Paradowski 2014b:23–34). Thereby it goes beyond the traditionally logo- and verbocentric notions of literacy (Janks 2002; Johnson & Vasudevan 2012; Lau 2020) to include para- and extralinguistic features. For instance, Shohamy (2011:425) showed how – irrespective of their language background – students' performance levels on a maths test significantly increased when graphs and images were used in the instructions in place of a purely verbal mode. Scaffolded instruction may thus be provided, and multimodal and multisensory meaning-making fostered, via the use of visuals (images, diagrams, graphs, etc.; Paradowski 2011), emojis, symbols, audio and video recordings, digital and mobile technology, as well as sign language, gestures[38] (Paradowski 2014b:33; Guzula, McKinney & Tyler 2016; He, Lai & Lin 2017:5; Zhang & Chan 2017; De Meulder *et al.* 2019; Wray 2019; Hua, Li & Jankowicz-Pytel 2020; Williams 2020), facial expression, posture, eye gaze, nods and head shakes, shrugs and smiles, and other cues (Rymes 2014) – or what Goffman (1963) called the 'body idiom'.

Further recommendations and solutions

Apart from the recommendations for pedagogical practices specifically connected with translanguaging and already discussed herein, there are several other proposals and solutions that may benefit South African classroom pedagogy specifically, and possibly other contexts as well.

A recommendation relevant for every teaching context is the development of rich, meaningful

---

[36] As Lee Kuan Yew, the first prime minister of Singapore, motivated the decision to replace Chinese with English as the official medium of school instruction, 'With English, no race would have an advantage' (2000:170). Another example is the successful series of annual conferences on Foreign Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics that were organised in Sarajevo between 2011 and 2016 by my good friend and colleague Azamat Akbarov, where English as the language of presentations and Q&As provided an equitable platform for the participants hailing from all over the former Yugoslavia.

[37] It would actually be sensible to investigate translanguaging practices beyond spoken languages, also in sign language users.

[38] Gestures in particular are intentional communicative moves (Kendon 2004) and sometimes essential to a full understanding of the message (Blackledge & Creese 2017:252; Kita, Alibali & Chu 2017).

learning activities that will engage the students and trigger true understanding. For instance, it is advisable during longer periods of instruction to make regular checks and gauge comprehension, preferably in ways going beyond general *Yes/No* questions (which can often be answered without true or even any understanding). Likewise, checking content knowledge, instead of requiring learning by heart, ought to allow flexibility in the wording of explanations (see Lemke 1990:91) and focus on understanding of the content rather than on the medium.

The content and instruction ought to always be germane and meaningful to the students (for instance seeking local relevance where possible). This can be achieved by offering engaging, provocative or controversial [39] texts and open-ended, authentic questions allowing for learners' contribution to the discussion, by the assignment of activities with real-world application, by uptake of and follow-up questions on students' responses, and by showing appreciation for their effort. Likewise, it helps to provide real, engaging language beyond repetitive formulae and teacher talk, but without overwhelming the learners (where this does not harm the content, it is more effective to simplify the language; Paradowski 2013:318).

Just like the natural process of language development, the transition to a new LoLT should be progressive and gradual. To facilitate a smooth adjustment, it makes sense for the teacher to allow for the continuation and use of Indigenous languages alongside the official LoLT, while progressively boosting learners' confidence in communicating in the language of instruction. For instance, one bilingual primary school in the Swiss town of Biel/Bienne spends the first half-year teaching in Swiss German (Schweizerdeutsch) – the local variety of German commonly heard in the playground and the street – before shifting to High German (Hochdeutsch), which is the formal language of schooling and pedagogic materials. At that stage it is not uncommon to observe the teacher 'translating' standard German instructions from the textbook into Swiss German. One possible way to avoid an abrupt change may also be the introduction of the eventual LoLT at an earlier stage via Content-and-Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) or content-based instruction (CBI).

The teaching – and learning – of the subject content and the LoLT can also be aided by the development of heteroglossic language-focused and metalinguistic awareness-raising activities (Jessner 2017; Woll 2018), for instance via cross-linguistic comparisons and contrasts (Auger 2004; Paradowski 2007b), which may focus on phonology, morphosyntax,lexis (especially cognates; e.g., White & Horst 2012; Arteagoitia & Howard 2015), semantics, pragmatics, and discourse, and aid development of vocabulary (Kieffer & Lesaux 2007; Laufer & Girsai 2008; Cummins 2009a; Woll 2018), morphology (Lyster, Quiroga & Ballinger 2013), syntax (White, Muñoz & Collins 2007; Ammar, Lightbown & Spada 2010) and both HL and L2 literacy and reading comprehension (Nagy, Berninger & Abbott 2006; Rauch, Naumann & Jude 2012; Ballinger 2013; Dault & Collins 2017; Schwartz, Mendoza & Meyer 2017; Velasco & Fialais 2018; Vaish 2019). This may be accompanied by the preparation of 'crib sheets' outlining the key differences and similarities across the languages (Lau *et al.* 2020:306). One of the more expedient strategies is teaching the art of register transfer in the different languages (see Lemke 1990:173), for instance of translating a definition in the 'standard' variety of the HL to a more informal or vernacular explanation, or vice versa (Tyler & McKinney, this volume; see also the Swiss example in the previous paragraph).

It is also helpful to develop the required vocabulary knowledge, for instance by preparing the learners for the words that will occur in the textbook or class and that will be crucial to understanding. The teacher may also aid students by developing materials for them to learn from at home (ideally adjusted to different levels of linguistic competence, though this naturally renders the task more time-consuming).

Given the plurilingual nature of an increasing number of linguistic interactions in the world and the diversity of globally connected societies and workplaces, as well as the unpredictability inherent in many if not most communicative situations, one of the teacher's tasks is to prepare students to navigate such (plurilingual) realities in life out of class (The New London Group 1996; Hall & Cook 2012; García & Li 2014; Kramsch & Huffmaster 2015; Trentman 2021b:111). Apart from dispelling monolingual stereotypes (Paradowski & Bator 2018; Trentman 2021a) and helping students learn to mobilise all their semiotic resources, the development of communicative competence ought to therefore foreground important 'soft skills' that used to be overlooked in language classrooms in the past, but are increasingly crucial today, such as negotiation for meaning, strategic and intercultural communicative competence (Byram & Wagner 2018), accommodation skills, interaction and rapport building strategies, as well as the ability to learn 'small cultures' of what to say when (Holliday 2016).[40] As Trentman rightly points out, increased proficiency in a foreign language need not mean more exclusive or monolingual use thereof, but rather a greater awareness of one's plurilingual repertoire and an increased ability to deploy it to meet functional goals (2021a:110*ff.*).

At the same time, the students could be taught learning strategies to aid them in taking ownership of their own learning process, thereby again helping them develop autonomy, agency[41] and confidence as learners. Explicitly teaching students the separate skills of test-taking can in turn prepare them for the format, rubrics, and examiners' expectations. Likewise, learners need guidance prior to the commencement of university study, and this provision had best go beyond run-of-the-mill orientation sessions to also explain both written and unwritten expectations, conventions, and codes of conduct in the academia.

Given that the LoLT is frequently an L2 also for the teachers (Dowling & Krause 2019), they too ought to be supported in the development of their own linguistic knowledge. The experience of their own transitioning may at once make them more sensitive and empathetic to what their learners will be faced with (Campbell & Prinsloo-Marcus, this volume). It is also worthwhile to instil teachers' confidence in using languages they themselves speak, albeit less proficiently than their dominant tongues, as research has shown that otherwise they tend to avoid even revealing their knowledge thereof and consider referring to their weaker languages as unprofessional or even harmful (Otwinowska 2014:115).

Ideally, teachers (and mentors/advisers) would be conversant in the HL of the learners (and – where relevant – parents). However, ideal scenarios are rarely realistic. Assistance for subject teachers could then come in the form of language instructors co-teaching alongside content-area specialists, for

---

[39] While taking care to avoid questions and topics that could antagonise or alienate some learners, or pitch some against others.

[40] All just as in the case of learners of English, which – in the current global situation – is being learnt and used by most L2 speakers as a *lingua franca* predominantly to communicate with other *non*-native users, often in fluid combination with other languages (Crystal 2012; Seargeant 2012:181; Paradowski 2013; Pawlas & Paradowski 2020), where instead of prioritising conformity with the prescriptive norms of 'standard' varieties, teachers' attention had better – again – shift instead to learners' intelligibility in conveying and facility in comprehending information.

[41] Although this cannot be taken for granted with every student (Paradowski 2014c:8, 2015:43).

instance via the aforementioned CLIL methodology, or by teaching in teams of instructors fluent in students' different HLs. Introducing language assistants may also be a way forward, although not merely relegating them to the role of 'mechanical' interpreters, but actively involving them in lesson design and consulting them as culture brokers (Martin-Jones & Saxena 1996; Anna Mendoza, p.c., 10 Mar 2020).

An alternative that does not require the teacher to use other languages is the provision of texts written in a simplified form of the target language (Allard, Apt & Sacks 2019:79).

The design and implementation of classroom language policies and practices may benefit from involving the learners in the process, by both explaining the pedagogies and their underlying rationale, and eliciting ideas to support mutual goals (Allard, Apt & Sacks 2019:85). It is beneficial both for the classroom and society to dispel pernicious prevalent myths and misconceptions surrounding multilingualism and bilingual education (Paradowski & Bator 2018), and to challenge the *status quo* of other deep-seated hegemonic language ideologies and practices and pedagogical dogmas (Lin 2013; Arocena Egaña, Cenoz & Gorter 2015; Martínez, Hikida & Durán 2015) that still profoundly shape and constrain language use in many education policies and the larger society, replacing them instead with revised teaching and semiotic practices (Tyler & McKinney, this volume). Although they are often 'rooted in racist, classist, and imperialist histories of language standardisation' [in nation-states and colonised territories] (Poza 2017:103; Makoni & Pennycook 2005) which would elevate one 'prestige' language or variety – that of the contemporaneous political elite in an empowered urban centre – over other, peripheral ones (Scott 1988; Anderson 2006), some of the entrenched mindsets and language attitudes still prevail among different stakeholders (learners, parents or legal guardians, teachers, principals, ministries…), and include beliefs such as the 'monolingual principle' (Cummins 2007) as the norm, upholding a native speaker paradigm as the benchmark of linguistic proficiency (Grosjean 1989, 2010; Cook 1997, 1999; Paradowski 2008b), or the assumption that translation and code-switching are harmful to language development (Probyn 2001, 2009; Childs 2016:24). Because teachers' (and students') expectations are shaped by past learning experiences (e.g. Włosowicz 2016), changing language practices is also a way of leading to a paradigm shift in the future generations.

It is not just the learners' task, but also that of the teachers to continually transition and adapt – to new classrooms, pupils, and circumstances; to endeavour to adequately respond to and address students' needs – linguistic, academic, affective and others; and to customise (language) teaching strategies and policies to every classroom. Thus, the teachers should not make *a priori* assumptions about the students' expectations, but rather should make the effort to learn about the students and their backgrounds and to develop reflective practice and personalised, culturally responsive pedagogy ('what *I* [as the teacher] need to do to help [the] students in their … transitioning', rather than passing the envelope to the students; Campbell & Prinsloo-Marcus, this volume). This may also highlight the necessity for improved communication between the learners, lecturers, advisors, and educational institutions.

In the promotion of LoLT development, of multilingual pedagogy, and of the status of HLs, one should neither neglect to educate – and seek support from – students' (extended) families, other caregivers, and the community. Involving the parents and community in the decision-making, e.g. via ongoing consultations and public workshops to address hopes and allay fears, and subsequent sharing of evidentiary record of successful praxis (Seals & Olsen-Reeder 2020), can boost their dignity and confidence and help garner their support, which is important for most learners. At the same time,

where possible it is also advisable to encourage the parents to speak and read to their children to develop their vocabulary.[42]

Many other practical solutions exist that can aid instruction and learning in heteroglossic classrooms. Reflective teachers may seek out and follow other examples of good practice, as long as these seem applicable to their current context.

Conclusions

As teachers, we practically always deal with mixed-ability classrooms in terms of both subject knowledge, LoLT/L2 proficiency, and – in the case of earlier stages of education – literacy (even if all the learners represent the same background languages); a reality often reflecting the diversity outside the school walls. In this respect, many of the realities and challenges of education in South Africa, while having some specific characteristics, are not globally unique, one of the key differences of course being the – sometimes several – transitions between different LoLTs, and the teacher demographics not always reflecting that of the student population.

The perennial dilemma of the choice of the most suitable, effective, and equitable language(s) of instruction can be viewed as a continuation of the long-standing debate in post-colonial countries. It is important that the answer to the question not be eclipsed by negative stereotypes about multilingualism and entrenched language hierarchies, discourses and ideologies. Dispelling such latter attitudes might prevent the marginalisation of languages and dialects and the perpetuation of linguistic hierarchies.

A promising perspective in addressing the challenges of linguistic diversity in the classroom[43] seems to be the lens of translanguaging. It entails viewing multilingual discursive practices not as marked and unusual, but as replicating a normal mode of communication characterising (super)diverse communities around the world (Celic & Seltzer 2011:1; Canagarajah 2013), establishing corresponding pedagogic procedures as an organic part of the class and a legitimate, natural, strategic sense- and meaning-making practice in the educational space, and vindicating and valuing students' HLs. Thus, instead of seeing only a binary choice between the LoLT vs non-LoLTs and fixating on *which* language is used, it may be more tenable and beneficial to focus on the fostering of *successful* comprehension, development and communication of the relevant knowledge (Trentman 2021b:125; Liu *et al.* 2020:9). Such an attitudinal change is not a mission impossible; even scholars who had once argued against bilingual practices have subsequently changed their stance (e.g., Merrill Swain going from describing bilingual-medium practices in Hong Kong as an instantiation of 'the mixing approach' (1986:3) to publishing a handbook titled *How to Live a Guilt-Free Life Using Cantonese in the English Class*; Swain, Kirkpatrick & Cummins 2011; see Lin 2013). This calls for adequate, state-of-the-art professional education and development programmes for both pre- and in-service teachers (Woll 2020), and role models, guidance and support in the implementation of the plurilingual pedagogies (*op. cit.*; Mazak & Carroll 2017) – ideally not only from colleagues and administrators, but also compatible language-in-

---

[42] The importance of an early support is especially critical in the case of lower-SES learners. While findings of similar word growth rates across English as a first additional language (EFAL) and HL classrooms (Pretorius & Stoffelsma, this volume) suggest that the language configuration a student starts out with does not void their chances, learners who had already known more words at the outset subsequently learnt more words.

[43] Obviously, more institutions than just schools should accommodate to linguistic diversity, but this issue goes beyond the concerns of this chapter.

education policies.

However, despite its theoretical popularity and practical allure, teachers should resist the easy temptation of straightforward transferability of the benefits of translanguaging to new contexts (Lin 1999; Blommaert & Van Avermaet 2008; Canagarajah 2011b, 2014; Hornberger & Link 2012a; García & Kleyn 2016; Gevers 2018; Lundberg 2019; Galante 2020; Seals & Olsen-Reeder 2020).[44] As with any other approach, translanguaging is not without pitfalls and drawbacks, its implementation may encounter steep challenges (Hornberger & Link 2012b; Ticheloven *et al.* 2019), and there are limits to the utility, applicability, and benefits of the particular practices (Jaspers 2018; Allard, Apt & Sacks 2019; Wiley 2020; Paradowski, under revision). Pertinently, in the South African context the full benefits of translanguaging are somewhat constrained by the fact that the demographics – and therefore concomitantly language repertoires – of university lecturers do not align with those of the student population (Govinder, Zondo & Makgoba 2013; Carstens, this volume), making the definition of translanguaging by García and Kano as 'complex discursive practices that include ALL the language practices of ALL students in a class' (2014:261; emph. in original) and García and Li's postulate that '[*a*]*ll* teachers in the 21st century need to be prepared to be bilingual teachers' (2014:122; emph. added) unrealistic and idealistic. Moreover, just like the monolingual approaches they criticise (Bauman & Briggs 2003), translanguaging practices may unintentionally reproduce disadvantages and reinforce inequalities and the hegemony of majority languages (Axelrod & Cole 2018). For instance, a recent thesis (Kamanga 2019) revealed how 'students of colour' at Stellenbosch University sometimes failed to participate in group discussions and were therefore alienated from opportunities because white students spoke Afrikaans.

Sustainable, ethical and equitable instructional choices should always be a reasoned, strategic and socially and culturally appropriate response to the local circumstances and ecology of the classroom, tailored to the educational goal, the curriculum, the stage of education[45], the needs and abilities of the learners, the political and other systemic barriers and confines, 'success indicators [the teachers] did not create, … review systems' (Seals & Olsen-Reeder 2020:9) and other situational constraints (see e.g. Cenoz & Gorter 2015, 2017; Borg 2017:86; Leung & Valdés 2019; Sah & Li 2020). Pedagogical decisions ought therefore to be a reflective, critical and judicious choice rather than a reflexive use of bandwagon solutions (García 2009; Weber 2014; Mård-Miettinen, Palviainen & Palojärvi 2018; Kirsch *et al.* 2020). Translanguaging is not a 'one-size-fits-all approach' (Prada & Nikula 2018:4). The conditions and contingencies may be dissimilar and require disparate approaches in largely linguistically homogeneous settings such as Poland or language-dominant ones such as rural US vis-à-vis more heterogeneous and multilingual milieus such as South Africa. A bilingual setting and a multilingual one will require fundamentally different translanguaging pedagogies (Lewis, Jones & Baker 2012; Allard, Apt & Sacks 2019:76), where in the latter case translanguaging will come more 'from the students up' (García & Sylvan 2011:397) and where – for the sake of fairness – whole-class discussions have been recommended to take place in the majority language (García, Flores & Chu 2011; García & Sylvan 2011), since otherwise a 'disjuncture … can occur when a program employs policies premised

---

[44] For instance, in the context of teaching L2 writing, Matsuda warns that '[t]o successfully bring translingual practices into the classroom, writing teachers need to know a lot more about the use of multiple languages than what can be learned from tour guides' (2014:483).
[45] For instance, students developing disciplinary knowledge at tertiary level usually have a higher level of academic literacies in their L1 than in contexts where they are still in the process of developing these (Liu, Lo & Lin 2020:4).

on bilingualism in the dominant languages when more than two languages are represented in their student body' (Allard, Apt & Sacks 2019:83). In a similar vein, Jaspers adds that

> the effect of introducing particular linguistic resources in class always needs to be considered against the background of continuing inequalities, predominant discourses, local circumstances, and personal considerations. […] evidence of 'what worked' never guarantees 'what works or will work' (Biesta 2007: 18). We would be wise therefore not to presume that the mere occurrence or introduction of fluid language use will be beneficial, nor to promise that it will transform *more* than the actual language use in class. (2018:7, emph. in original; see also Poza 2017:120 for a similar take)

Whether they are supported by or have to contend with LoLT policies, it is teachers who are the first implementers thereof and who determine what actually occurs in the classroom (Ricento & Hornberger 1996; Liddicoat 2013; Jones 2017; Barr & Seals 2018) – including whether and how much translanguaging is allowed – and whose 'choices regarding what utterances (and languages) are accepted as "normal", which are challenged, which are ignored, and which are rejected' (Seals & Olsen-Reeder 2020:3; Lo Bianco 2010:165) send out a message of what is and what is not acceptable. Whichever solutions are eventually adopted, it is beneficial if – in line with social constructivism – they help position learners as critical agents in their own learning (Tyler & McKinney, this volume).

Acknowledgments

🆔 0000-0002-0710-3075

References:

Adendorff, R. (1993) Codeswitching amongst Zulu-speaking teachers and their pupils: Its functions and implications for teacher education. *Language and Education*, 7(3), 141-162. doi: 10.1080/09500789309541356

Aguilar, M. & Rodríguez, R. (2012) Lecturer and student perceptions on CLIL at a Spanish university. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(2), 183-197. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2011.615906

Alexander, N. (2003) *Language Education Policy, National and Sub-National Identities in South Africa. Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe: From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education. Reference Study*. Strasbourg, Council of Europe.

Allard, E.C., Apt, S. & Sacks, I. (2019) Language policy and practice in almost-bilingual classrooms. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 13(2): 73-87, doi: 10.1080/19313152.2018.1563425