

INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN TO PROMOTE TRANSLINGUAL PRACTICES IN AN ENGLISH FIRST ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE CONTEXT

¹Kufakunesu Zano, ²Vimbai Mbirimi-Hungwe

¹Research Associate, Department of Academic Literacy and Science Communication, Sefako Makgatho University, South Africa

²Senior Lecturer, Department of Academic Literacy and Science Communication, Sefako Makgatho University, South Africa

*Corresponding Author Email: kufazano@gmail.com

Article Info	Abstract
Article History Received: March 2023 Revised: April 2023 Published: April 2023	Debatably, research based on instructional design to promote translanguaging practices in an English first additional language classroom in the Further Education and Training phase in South Africa is scarce. Thus, this study was driven by the need to explore the instructional design used to promote translanguaging practices in an English first additional language context in the Further Education and Training phase. For this qualitative study, eight (8) English first additional language teachers in the Further Education and Training phase were used as respondents. These teachers were stationed at four (4) high schools in one district of South Africa, meaning two (2) teachers per school were selected. The researchers used telephone interviews to collect data. The results revealed that translanguaging can be used in conjunction with collaborative activities like co-teaching, peer tutoring and group work in the English first additional language classroom. Besides, all learners have prior knowledge gained from schooling and life experiences and English first additional language teachers can build on those experiences. Also, based on the findings, it is indispensable to take advantage of modern technological facilities like WhatsApp in aiding the task of teaching English first additional language.
Keywords Translanguaging; Multilingualism; Prior knowledge; English first additional language, multilingual practices	
How to cite: Zano, K. & Mbirimi-Hungwe, V. (2023). Instructional Design to Promote Translanguaging Practices in an English First Additional Language Context, <i>JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching</i> , 11(2), pp. 238-250. DOI: https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v%vi%i.7331	

INTRODUCTION

Due to the political and socio-economic changes in our globalised world, various opportunities open up for today's global citizens and learners as well. As a result, not only different languages but also various cultures can co-exist in today's educational settings (Byram, Golubeva, Hui & Wagner, 2017). As English First Additional Language (EFAL) learners get enrolled in multilingual/multicultural classrooms, they find themselves surrounded by peers with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. We believe that these languages and cultures influence one another, and eventually, they even blend. Therefore, as in recent years, more EAL learners in the Further Education and Training (FET) phase are exposed to multilingual/multicultural educational settings in South Africa. The issue of incorporating multicultural literature and perspectives into the curriculum, encouraging learners to share their cultural backgrounds and experiences, and promoting respectful dialogue and collaboration among students from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds are essential for readers

Language in Education Policy (LiEP) promotes additive and functional multilingualism, sociolinguistic as well as cultural integration (Department of Education DOE, 1997). LiEP anchors on an educational system or model of "structured bilingual education, found in dual-medium (also known as two-way immersion) programmes" (DOE 1997:1). The result of this

language policy is that two or more languages will be perceived and used as languages of learning for all learners in the country (DOE, 1997:13).

LiEP promotes the additive approach to multilingualism that allows schools to take different approaches as long as the “underlying principle is to maintain home language(s), while providing access to and the effective acquisition of additional language(s)” (DOE 1997:1). Cenoz and Gorter (2015:2) highlight the aims of the school and define multilingual education as “the use of two or more languages in education, provided that schools aim at multilingualism and multiliteracy”. This definition suggests that multilingualism is the main objective but it can also be present in school settings even if it is not an educational goal. For example, Garcia, Lin and May (2017:2) extend the term to situations, in which several languages, spoken by minoritised students, are used “to make subject matter comprehensible and enhance the development of a dominant language”.

Since this study is about EFAL in the FET phase, it becomes essential to find out an instructional design used to promote multilingual practices in an EFAL context. The best system to maintain, preserve and promote all languages existing in a country is to utilise them in a multilingual sense. The idea is to preserve the funds of knowledge, encompassing the knowledge, skills and experiences acquired through historical and cultural interactions of learners in their community and family life and culture through everyday living (Estes 2017).

Thus, this study was driven by the need to explore the instructional design used to promote translanguaging practices in an English first additional language context in the Further Education and Training phase

LITERATURE REVIEW

Multilingualism is a complex concept that can be defined in a multitude of ways, through a variety of real-world contexts. We assume the two definitions below provide a basic idea of what multilingualism can mean, informing later discussions about how it could be pursued as a potential solution for language loss. Multilingualism is defined as ‘the ability to use more than two languages’ (Krulatz, Dahl & Flognfeldt 2018:53). At the individual level, multilingualism refers to the speaker's competence to use more than two languages, and at the societal level, it refers to the use of more than two languages in a speech community (Department of Higher Education and Training 2015).

Activating prior knowledge and building new knowledge for EFAL is a crucial component of language development. Learning something new predicated on what one already knows is prior knowledge (Dong, Jong & King 2020). The more prior knowledge possessed by readers about a topic, the easier it is to read a text, understand it and retain the information. Mwaniki (2014:1) also argues that a learner’s home language should be given priority in classrooms as: “The mother tongue is the basis upon which all other learning is anchored...it is a sound educational principle to proceed from the familiar to the new”. Therefore, the collective prior knowledge of the child is wrapped up in their mother tongue or tongues. At the core of most teaching training programmes is the central idea that lessons should begin with what students know, and then move them into the new learning they need. The mother tongue is an inextricable part of this learning process. Similarly, Shapiro (2004) has shown that background knowledge plays an enormous role in an additional language learning context. Since learners come from diverse backgrounds and cultures, through oral and written activities, teachers can draw out from learners what they already know about the subject. Their understanding is tinted by a cultural filter they come from.

One way of promoting learners' home languages is engaging in translanguaging (Charamba 2020a; Charamba 2020b; Mbirimi-Hungwe 2020a; Mbirimi Hungwe 2021). Translanguaging is a rapidly expanding conceptual-cum-theoretical, analytical and pedagogical lens that directly draws from contemporary perspectives on bi/multilingualism, and it informs

and challenges existing monolingual theoretical positions and pedagogical practices in EFAL classrooms. According to Lewis, Jones and Baker (2012), translanguaging is seen as a natural way of simultaneously developing and extending a child's bilingualism within a curriculum context while also deepening understanding of the subject area. Besides, translanguaging may be viewed as a tool for meaning-making through the use of languages within the reach of learners as they attempt to access discipline-specific knowledge (Zhou & Landa 2019). By description, translanguaging is more about communication than language proficiency. Translanguaging highlights the difference between a named standardised language and the ability to use multiple languages for various tasks including academic tasks and purposes.

Studies have revealed that translanguaging has several advantages in an additional language context (Sefotho 2022, Zano 2022a). According to Zhou and Landa (2019), translanguaging emphasises dialogic learner-centred instruction that always puts the learner first. Since literature indicates that the success of academic endeavours is irretrievably linked to the medium of instruction (Magwa 2015) and language of assessment, translanguaging becomes handy in revolutionising EFAL classroom practices by disrupting social conventions of subtractive educational contexts and dominant monolingual perspectives. Besides, Vogel and García (2017:4) have put forward three core premises as fundamental to translanguaging theory: it posits that individuals select and deploy features from a unitary linguistic repertoire (i.e., an individual's repertoire possibly comprising features drawn from differently named languages) in order to communicate; it takes up a perspective on bi- and multilingualism that privileges speakers' dynamic linguistic and semiotic practices above the named languages of nations and states, and it still recognises the material effects of socially constructed named language categories and structuralist language ideologies, especially for minoritised language speakers.

Language teaching is enhanced through collaborative activities. Not only is team teaching seen as a means for providing learners with the language skills they need, but it also is revealed as a way of enabling the teacher's professional development. Team teaching has been proposed as a way to spread the best practical linguistic skills (Chopra 2013) and as a vehicle for pedagogical changes as it helps spread new pedagogical practices (Conn 2010). Team teaching is mainly helpful when the member of staff best qualified for a particular subject or topic teaches the topic to the whole group.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This case study was designed as a qualitative research project, as it sought to explore the instructional design used to promote translanguaging practices in an English first additional language context in the Further Education and Training phase. The choice of the qualitative approach was informed by the need to gain an in-depth understanding of the instructional design used to promote translanguaging practices in an English first additional language context in the Further Education and Training phase.

For this qualitative study, only EFAL teachers in the FET phase were used as respondents. These teachers were stationed at four (4) high schools in one district of South Africa, meaning two (2) teachers per school. The respondents were referred to as either T1 to T8 to ascertain anonymity and confidentiality. The researchers used telephone interviews to collect data. Before the respondents took part in the telephone interviews, they were informed of the general aim of the study. During the telephone interview sessions, the researchers audio recorded the session and also wrote some notes.

Data Analysis

This study employed the content analysis method to analyze the qualitative data gathered. The analysis was conducted through an interpretive approach, which involved the identification of significant patterns from the information obtained, resulting in the reduction

of the volume of data. The analysis of the respondents' responses involved finding links and similarities in their answers, which were subsequently coded appropriately. The researchers then proceeded to condense and organize the results into coherent themes. By employing this rigorous method of analysis, the researchers were able to derive meaningful insights from the qualitative data that provide valuable contributions to the study's overall objective.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

Translanguaging

Translanguaging is the process where multilinguals intentionally and strategically use languages in their repertoire in an integrated form for communication and learning (Song 2016). It is accepted as a legitimate pedagogical approach involving the use of one language as a scaffold for language development and learning in another. As defined by Csillik and Golubeva (2020), translanguaging practices imply the practice of alternating or switching between two or more languages in a given communication for various reasons (e.g., missing word in one language, a better fitting word in another language, strong cultural attachment, time saving to use shorter word[s], sounding fancier, leaving others out of the conversation, etc.), between interlocutors who belong to the same bilingual culture. At the tertiary level, Mbirimi-Hungwe and McCabe (2020) recommend that lecturers adopt a 'transcollab' model of teaching, and the use of this 'transcollab' is based on the combination of translanguaging and collaborative strategies for pedagogic purposes. The model caters for the diversity found in classrooms where learners come from different linguistic, cultural and social backgrounds. Thus, in support of translanguaging and collaborative learning, the respondents declared that:

When teachers allow learners to use their home languages in understanding English, this can help in facilitating and enhancing the development of EFAL learners who require extra help. This will minimise the need for remedial work. T8

This enables learners to work towards establishing a relationship between the home and the school environment. A school is then regarded as a mirror of the community in which it is located. T2

Besides, translanguaging can be used in junction with collaborative activities like peer tutoring and group work in the EFAL classroom. Even Kohnert and Pham (2010) report that peer tutoring is potentially beneficial for teaching and learning. Learners can express themselves and relate to their peers in a more constructive way than they can with a teacher. Besides, we believe that grouping creates a sense of belonging, promotes co-operation and helps develop negotiation skills. Hence, the respondents claimed thus:

I think that if I task a learner to teach his or her classmates in my presence, this will develop their speaking skills. Through practice, they become expert speakers of the language, especially English which is taught and learnt as an additional language in our situation. Besides, as learners work in groups, language develops because of the interaction between competent and incompetent users of the language. T1.

Learners need to be afforded vast opportunities for oral language development. In such instances, they tend to rely on their 'language' backgrounds to present better the task at hand. For example, when learners are working in their groups, they have more 'chances' to practise their language use, thus becoming good speakers. T6

One of the goals is to promote pedagogical practices which consider translanguaging as a resource, and building background knowledge is one of them. Dochy et al. (1995) provide an

elaborate definition, describing prior knowledge as the whole of a person's knowledge, including explicit and tacit knowledge, metacognitive and conceptual knowledge. Background knowledge is supposed to consist of two main components: "our assimilated direct experiences of life and its manifold activities, and our assimilated verbal experiences and encounters" (Swales 1990:9). Effective teaching takes students from where they are and leads them to a higher level of understanding (Vygotsky 1978). All learners have prior knowledge, gained from schooling and life experiences and teachers can build on those experiences. Activating prior knowledge and building new knowledge for EFAL in the FET phase is a critical component of literacy development. The respondents had this to say:

If I give learners a task whose content they know, then, it won't be difficult for them to work on it. They won't struggle much to understand the work, and even recalling or remembering the content won't be demanding. T5.

I think prior knowledge implies the knowledge the EFAL learners have about how language is used in a given text, and this knowledge is important when analysing a text in an EFAL classroom since they use it to interpret newer formal and informal tasks. T3.

When introducing a topic or new subject to students, research shows that if we discuss the topic and concepts prior to teaching it, learners are better able to relate to the topic (Gupta & Lee 2015). Sometimes it is called, domain-specific knowledge or topical knowledge. Without such prior knowledge, it becomes more difficult to construct meaning from the text for EFAL in the FET phase. Similarly, Francois (2016) advocates for prior knowledge activation because new information is better integrated with existing information. Helping students bring to mind prior knowledge can have a strong positive impact on learning. Similarly, helping students relate new information from peers to the knowledge that they already have aids them to understand and organise information in meaningful ways (Zano 2022a; Zano 2022b; Zano 2020a; Zano 2020b). The respondents noted thus:

Learning is a combination of what I experienced with newer information. It's like blending subject matter in one subject with another subject. Learning becomes a union of concepts to make one. By doing so, learners understand the newly introduced content much faster. T4.

Codeswitching

Codeswitching is instrumental in activating previous knowledge in an EFAL classroom. Lin (2013) defines codeswitching as the use of two languages' codes by either teachers or learners in a classroom setting. Codeswitching as a debatable phenomenon can be viewed based on the pro and cons side. Codeswitching, viewed by affirmatives, is believed to bridge the teaching and learning process (Üstunel 2016). This concept is seen as an opportunity to apply the right function of codeswitching rather than the hurdles it gives. In line with that, Enama (2016) states that the target language learning should be accompanied because it serves the precise function in the classroom to learners. As the EFAL classroom demands a whole-English classroom situation, the use of the home language is also encouraged because it will activate the prior knowledge of the target language. Moreover, Peregoy and Boyle (2013) propose that the home language facilitates both teaching and learning such as confidence, security, motivation, and friendship. The respondents echoed this interpretation, thus:

I support the use of codeswitching in the EFAL classrooms because it gives learners a more relaxed situation in which they can speak freely with no strict rule of English-only policy. Some learners use it to deliberately avoid the use of an additional language,

English, because they doubt their content mastery. In this case, codeswitching is a good survival tactic. T7.

It is a healthy strategy to use codeswitching because sometimes learners battle to find a second language equivalent. In some cases, I encourage codeswitching when I see a want to restate a fact or a point. T6

Different Teaching and Learning Styles

Through the creation of interactive, collaborative and differentiated learning environments, learners often show superior levels of effortlessness and curiosity in contributing to their learning, which results in improved ease with and understanding of the course material (Crow & Smith 2003). Such environments also facilitate constructivist-type classrooms in which teachers model the creation of new knowledge through their interaction, collaboration and debate (Crow & Smith 2003). Learners, thereby, intuit their abilities to generate and apply new knowledge through the intersection of their individual standpoints and knowledge with new ones that they encounter in class and elsewhere (Dick, Carpenter, Lindy Crawford & Ron 2007). Thus, the respondents advanced that:

It is important to know that mixed-ability classes are an unavoidable phenomenon in any EFAL educational environment, so individual preferences are varied and needed to be applied. The teacher's task to meet their learners' language needs should be counted as a goal to be reached. T1

There are many teaching and learning styles that EFAL teachers can use. These methods include pair work, group work and class discussions to name a few. All these teaching and learning styles help learners use their different languages in an EFAL classroom. T3.

Culture and language form a tightly woven tapestry, rich with vibrant colours, shadows and highlights. When an individual is learning culture and language, the tapestry also includes learning strategies, that is, conscious, learner-regulated thoughts and actions for developing specific skills and general proficiency. Learners benefit from employing strategies, defined earlier. A few examples of learning strategies are: (a) using background knowledge about culture and language to predict what will come next in a story or a news program; (b) collaborating with someone else to learn culture and language; (c) combining intuition, logic, and facts with cultural experience to communicate more effectively in the language; and (d) asking a native speaker some questions to understand the target culture (Oxford & Gkonou 2018). The respondents declared thus:

The EFAL teacher needs to set the teaching and learning stage by providing a friendly, culturally-welcoming atmosphere before introducing a task to the learners. Besides, the teacher can set the scene by creating an atmosphere of support, kindness and understanding and by helping learners develop confidence. This will help EFAL learners open up to the teacher as the lesson progresses. T8.

A tense atmosphere is bad for EFAL learning in the FET phase. Learners in this phase won't handle a tense learning setting where they can't freely express themselves in a culturally-appropriate way. T2.

Use Technology to Promote Multilingual Practices

Another strategy for promoting multilingualism is the directed use of technology such as computers, smartboards and tablets. For example, when learners are struggling with the acquisition of a medium of instruction, the use of a digital translator may be encouraged to provide the necessary assistance. Technology in education has been shown to improve learner

learning outcomes and achievement if it is used purposively and meaningfully (De Bruyckere, Kirschne & Hulshof 2016). It is well-known that our new life is highly affected by the era of information technology, and technology plays an important role in today's human society development. Based on this fact, it is indispensable to take advantage of modern technological facilities, such as WhatsApp which enables audios, pictures and messages in aiding the task of English language education. Students trying to learn English as an additional language need further language support through technological support, hence the respondents shared thus:

Learners in an EFAL classroom have different needs, and technology can help in fulfilling these needs so that they can feel valued and empowered. T4.

In most EFAL classrooms, only English is officially allowed to be spoken, thus using technology like WhatsApp enhances dealing with the challenges encountered in teaching and learning in a classroom that has different languages. Using WhatsApp, a concept can be explained in different languages to all group. T5.

Allow Co-teaching

One approach to enhancing transformative teaching in a bid to promote multilingual practices in an EFAL context involves creating community and promoting collaboration through team teaching. As Murchú and Conway (2017) observed, the term 'team teaching' has been used "as a catch all for various configurations of actions undertaken by two teachers and their learners in one classroom" (p. 45) and represents "an overarching title for a range of activities instead of other similar terms, such as 'collaborative teaching', 'co-teaching', 'cooperative teaching', and 'coteaching'" (p. 47). Barahona's (2017:147) definition goes beyond the dyad to focus on "two or more teachers engaged in the process of teaching, including preparation, planning, material design, actual teaching and assessment". Dong, El-Sayed and El-Sayed (2011) explained that team teaching is a method of coordinated classroom instruction involving several educators working together with a single group of students. Team teaching is perhaps most commonly practised in contexts of foreign-language learning (Glasgow 2018) between two teachers such as a content specialist along with a second or foreign language teacher (Honigsfeld & Dove 2012). The respondents echoed the following, thus:

Team teaching because I feel like it is a clever way of providing EFAL language learners with the necessary language skills they need in learning in their classrooms. T7.

Crow and Smith (2003) assert that team-taught learning environments take on the spirit and example set by the teachers, so that, if the teachers are amiable, work well together, use and enjoy humour, interact, collaborate and model different perspectives on issues, the environment takes on the same spirit and learners assume the same attitudes and approaches to learning. Hecht, Roberts and Schoon (1996) contend that encouraging results are more likely to occur given the positive effects of team teaching on the teachers themselves. The respondents asserted thus:

EFAL learners will 'copy' that team teaching spirit and relate it to that of a family or a community that practises Ubuntu. This spirit of Ubuntu will be necessary when learners work in pairs or groups as they will learn to appreciate language diversity. T1

I have witnessed that when team teaching is practised in an EFAL context, we see some changes in a positive way to the traditional ways of teaching like teacher-centred methods. Modern ways of teaching include using WhatsApp. Moreover, through our team teaching, the learners' individual learning styles are catered for through the

obvious differences in my teaching styles to that of the other teacher practising team-teaching with me. T4.

Allow learners to be assessed in both languages

Assessment is a continuous, planned process of identifying, gathering and interpreting information about the performance of learners, and may take various forms (DOE 2011). According to the Virtual Assessment Centre (2006), teachers assess students to find out whether instruction was effective, whether learners need more instruction, whether learners are ready for the next step, whether a different approach is required and to find out how instruction can be improved the next time the lesson is taught. It is a two-pronged process by which teachers can do self-assessment, deliberately reflecting on what they are teaching as well as do learners' assessments, to find out what they are learning in turn. In line with the above, the respondents had this to say:

I think it's important to let learners assess each other using their home languages like isiZulu and Sesotho. Luckily, in all the classes I teach EFAL, none can't speak Sesotho, therefore, if assessed using Sesotho as well, they will understand the feedback so clearly. Even the rubrics and memoranda need to embrace diversity in language where possible. T8.

If the teacher is comfortable with the learners' home languages, he/she can use them to share feedback with them. This will better the learners' understanding of the task at hand. T5.

Tellingly, the assessment makes much sense if it caters for the learners' language background. Thus, I feel it makes sense if the language used in the assessment is much known to the learners. Learners use English as an additional language, meaning if both their home language and English are used in the assessment, it enables effective learning in an EFAL classroom. T2

Peer assessment can be used to assess the learners in an EFAL setting in the FET phase. Peer assessment entails one learner or a group of learners making assessment decisions about the work of another learner or a group of learners. It can be an individual task such as a business letter or it can be a cooperative task such as a group assignment (Dreyer 2017). The respondents advanced, thus:

Debatably, learners like it more when they receive feedback from their classmates than from their teachers in an EFAL classroom. This could be because learners usually get quite encouraging comments from their classmates, unlike those from their respective EFAL teachers. T6.

I think learners prefer peer assessment to teacher assessment because teachers are in authority, thus seemingly threatening. Besides, sometimes the teachers do not mind using fewer motivating comments. However, teachers should always use comments that are positive to boost the learners' confidence. T7.

Discussion

One of the findings is that translanguaging is critical in promoting multilingual practices in the EFAL classrooms in the FET phase. Therefore, the study advocates for an understanding of bilingual education through a translanguaging lens to open up spaces where EFAL learners can develop not only their bilingualism and biliteracy but also a criticality that resists social arrangements of language normativity that differentiate and exclude learners in an EFAL classroom. The use of translanguaging in an EFAL context in the FET phase should be encouraged by the teachers because it is (translanguaging) is not a conscious but a subconscious

act. It just happens artlessly. Revealingly, EFAL learners in the FET phase cannot help but translanguage when communicating with others in the classroom. This resonates with Sefotho's (2022) finding that translanguageing is unavoidable in South African classrooms because teachers believe that it increases learner participation. Besides, this finding supports Canagarajah's (2011) view that although monolingual policies and practices are prevalent in many educational contexts, translanguageing cannot be completely restrained because it is a naturally occurring phenomenon for multilingual learners.

Describing the translanguageing practice of bilingual Chinese children, Wei, and Wu (2009:193) write that it is "the most distinctive behaviour of the bilingual speaker; there is no better behavioural indicator to show that a speaker is bilingual than when s/he is using two languages simultaneously in social interaction". In the majority of studies on translanguageing in school contexts, Canagarajah (2011) found that acts of translanguageing occur with minimal pedagogical effort from the teacher. Even in classrooms with English-only policies, learners were found to still use translanguageing behind the backs of their teachers. Doubtfully, although the natural and spontaneous translanguageing of multilingual learners in English-only contexts may be of pedagogical value in their language learning, it has been rarely institutionally endorsed in most EFAL classrooms in the FET phase in South African schools.

Another finding of the study revolves around the use of multiple modalities during instruction in an EFAL classroom in the FET phase. This is in line with the finding that a teacher who can "purposefully exhibit a wide range of teaching styles is potentially able to accomplish more than a teacher whose repertoire is relatively limited" (Smith & Renzulli 1984:49). Due to the availability of multiple platforms of communication and learning, innovative ways to deliver instruction are evolving. Besides, in one study, Dunn and Dunn (1979) found that only 20-30% of school-age children appear to be auditory learners, that 40% are visual, and that the remaining 30-40% are tactile/kinesthetic, visual/tactile or some other combination.

Researchers have found that children tend to be mostly tactile/kinesthetic and gradually develop other strengths such as visual and auditory (Price, Dunn & Sanders 1980). Multiple learning modalities (such as read it, write, do it, and talk it, see it, hear it, interact with it) are used in the integrated approach. Teachers should use interactive teaching styles and various learning modalities to meet the needs of their EFAL learners in the FET phase. New modalities have changed multimodal digital platforms by presenting the EFAL teachers in the FET phase with the possibility of providing meaningful opportunities for engagement and creativity by employing different cognitive and audio-visual senses and the ability to interact. EFAL teachers in the FET phase can provide audio feedback to learners which is shown to provide more elaborate detailed responses where teachers provide not only more information but richer language and greater elaboration of concepts (Swan-Dagen et al. 2008). In fact, technologies such as WhatsApp provide space for the development of unique learners' voices, ideas, thoughts and opinions.

Another finding to enhance transformative teaching in a bid to promote multilingual practices in an EFAL context involves creating community and promoting collaboration through team teaching. Not only was team teaching seen as a means for providing learners with the skills they need, but it also was revealed as a way of enabling the teacher's professional development. Team teaching has been proposed as a way to spread the best practical skills (Chopra 2013) and as a vehicle for pedagogical changes as it helps spread new pedagogical practices (Conn 2010). Team teaching is mainly helpful when the member of staff best qualified for a particular subject or topic teaches the topic to the whole group. Thus, topics in EFAL in the FET phase can be delegated among the EFAL teachers, and this can be chiefly done to give the EFAL learners the benefit of the best possible instruction available on the topic. It becomes imperative for EFAL teachers in the FET phase to coordinate their work regularly to avoid repetition of the tasks at hand.

Lastly, another finding concerns allowing assessment to be conducted in a language the assessor and assessee are comfortable with, be it teacher-assessor or learner assessor. In an EFAL context in the FET phase, learning should be assessed regularly. Learners should be assessed on what they have been taught and what is relevant to the grade level content. This calls for the use of multiple modalities to assess learners in the EFAL classroom in the FET phase, meaning using diagrams, visuals, oral and written components to mention a few. Multiple assessments should be used, and EFAL teachers in the FET phase should use their professional judgements based on the outcomes of the assessments to provide objective and quality instruction to the EFAL learners in the FET phase. Another strategy could be that teachers can also teach learners to self-monitor by using teacher-provided rubrics and memoranda.

CONCLUSION

Teachers in multilingual classrooms have the special task of supporting students who speak many different languages. Although this can be challenging, it is also an exciting opportunity to draw upon the translanguaging abilities that these emergent bilingual students bring to the classroom. As found in the findings above, regardless of educational guidelines establishing otherwise, the use of multiple languages in classrooms by EFAL teachers and learners is prevalent in the classroom in the FET phase. The goal should therefore be to promote pedagogical practices which consider this approach (translanguaging) as a resource.

The question for a classroom teacher then becomes, How can I create classroom spaces that support my learners' translanguaging skills? This question is important to teachers in culturally and linguistically diverse schools, for honestly, they grapple with this question. Also, considering that EFAL itch for translanguaging, there is a need for scientific research on the outcomes of translanguaging pedagogies for students when they are implemented systematically in EFAL settings. It is incumbent upon researchers to look into the effects of translanguaging on sustained academic growth while rejecting hierarchies of languages in schools.

We contend that such understandings will better position teachers to manage their classrooms for equity and learning for all EFAL learners in the FET phase. Indeed, these more robust understandings of language and interaction are necessary if teachers are to capitalise on the flexibility and intelligence displayed by multilingual learners as they engage in hybrid language practices in order to guide them in the development of bilingual/bicultural academic identities that would support their continuing success in school. In fact, we believe that teachers are the professionals best positioned to capitalise on such understandings. As arbiters of their own classrooms' language policies, they hold one of the most important keys to educational opportunities for multilingual children.

REFERENCES

- Barahona, M. (2017). Exploring models of team teaching in initial foreign/second language teacher education: A study in situated collaboration. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(12), 144-161. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2017v42n12.9>
- Byram, M., Golubeva, I., Hui, H., & Wagner, M. (2017). *From Principles to Practice in Education for Intercultural Citizenship*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2(2011), 1-28. doi: <http://doi.org/10.1515/9783110239331.1>

- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(10), 901-912. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2017.1284855>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2015). *Towards a holistic approach in the study of multilingual education. Multilingual education: between language learning and translanguaging*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://doi.org/10.1017/9781009024655.002>
- Charamba, E. (2020a). Pushing linguistic boundaries: translanguaging in a bilingual Science and Technology classroom. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, DOI:10.1080/01434632.2020.1783544
- Charamba, E. (2020b). Translanguaging in a multilingual class: a study of the relation between students' languages and epistemological access in science. *International Journal of Science Education*, 42(11), 1779-1798. doi: <http://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2020.1783019>
- Chopra, P. (2013). Acuminating Pedagogical Skills through Team Teaching. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, ISSN (Online), 2319-7064.
- Conn, C. E. (2010). Learning the Hard Way (but still learning!): Using Team Teaching as a Vehicle for Pedagogical Change. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 73(1), 87-91.
- Crow, J., & Smith, L. (2003). Using co-teaching as a means of facilitating interprofessional collaboration in health and social care. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 17(1), 45-55.
- Csillik, E., & Golubeva, I (2020). Dealing with Language Gap in a Hungarian-English Early Childhood Classroom. In E. M. Gómez Parra & C. A. Huertas-Abril (Eds.). *International Approaches to Bridging the Language Gap* (pp. 168–194). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-7998-1219-7.ch011
- De Bruyckere, P., Kirschne, P. A., & Hulshof, C. D. (2016). *Technology in education: What teachers should know*. American Educator, Spring.
- Department of Education. (2011). *National Curriculum Statement: Curriculum and Assessment Statements Further Education and Training Grades 10-12, English Home Language* (Accessed on 19 February 2023). South Africa: Government Printers.
- Department of Higher Education and Training. (2015). *Report on the use of African languages as mediums of instruction in higher education*. Pretoria, Republic of South Africa.
- Dick, M., Carpenter, II., Lindy, C., & Ron. W. (2007). Testing the efficacy of team teaching, *Learning Environ Res*, 10, 53–65. DOI 10.1007/s10984-007-9019-y
- Dochy, F. J. R. C., & Alexander, P. A. (1995). Mapping prior knowledge: A framework for discussion among researchers. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 10, 225-242. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF03172918>
- Department of Education. (1997). *Language in Education Policy*. Department of Education, Pretoria.
- Dong, A., Jong, M. S. Y., & King, R. B. (2020). How does prior knowledge influence learning development? The mediating roles of cognitive load and help-seeking. *Front Psychol*, 11.591203, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.591203.
- Dong, Y., El-Sayed, J., & El-Sayed, M. (2011). Methodology for team teaching with field experts. *International Journal of Process Education*, 3(1), 43-50.
- Dreyer, J. M. (2017). *The educator as an assessor*. South Africa: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Dunn, R. S., & Dunn, K. J. (1979). Learning styles/teaching styles: Should they . . . can they . . . be matched? *Educational Leadership*, 36, 238-244.
- Enama, P. R. B. (2016). The impact of English-only and bilingual approaches to EFL instruction on low-achieving bilinguals in Cameroon: An empirical study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(1), 19-30. doi: <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0701.03>.

- Estes, J. S. (2017). Preparing Teacher Candidates for Diverse Classrooms. *Advances in Higher Education and Professional Development*, 52-75. doi: <http://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-0897-7.ch003>
- Francois, J. (2016). *The impact of teacher prompting and questioning on third-grade students' comprehension*. Honors Program Thesis 216, The University of Northern Iowa.
- Garcia, O., Lin, A., & May, S. (2017). *Extending understandings of bilingual and multilingual education*. Bilingual education. Encyclopedia of language and education. Berlin: Springer, 1–20, doi: <http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319>
- Gupta, A., & Lee, G. L. (2015). Dialogic teaching approach with English Language Learners to enhance oral language skills in the content areas. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 2(5), 10-17.
- Hecht, J. B., Roberts, N. K., & Schoon, P. L. (1996). Teacher teams and computer technology: Do combined strategies maximize student achievement? *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 28, 318-328.
- Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. (2012). *Coteaching and other collaborative practices in the EFL/ESL classroom: Rationale, research, reflections, and recommendations*. Information Age Publishing, Inc, USA
- Krulatz, A., Dahl, A., & Flognfeldt, M. E. (2018). *Enacting Multilingualism*. Cappelen Damm Akademisk, Oslo.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice*, 18(7), 655-670. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718490>
- Lin, A. M. Y. (2013). Classroom code-switching: Three decades of research. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 4(1), 195-218. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2013-0009>.
- Magwa, W. (2015). Attitudes towards the Use of Indigenous African Languages as Languages of Instruction in Education: A Case of Zimbabwe. *Journal of Education Policy and Entrepreneurial Research (JEPER)*, 2(1), 1-16.
- Mbirimi-Hungwe, V., & McCabe, R. (2020). Translanguaging during collaborative learning: A 'transcollab' model of teaching. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 38(3), 244-259. DOI: 10.2989/16073614.2020.1847670
- Mbirimi-Hungwe, V. (2020). An Insight into South African Multilingual Students' Perceptions about Using Translanguaging During Group Discussion. *Applied Linguistics*, 1-18.
- Mbirimi-Hungwe, V. (2021). Translanguaging as an act of emancipation: Rethinking assessment tools in multilingual pedagogy in South Africa. *Per Linguam*, 37(1), 16-29.
- Murchú, F., & Conway, P. (2017). (Re)Positioning team teaching: The visibility and viability of learning in classrooms. *Education Research and Perspectives*, 44, 43-69. http://www.erpjournal.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/03_ERPV44_Finn.pdf
- Mwaniki, M. (2014). Mother tongue education in primary teacher education in Kenya: a language management critique of the quota system. *Multilingual Education*, 4(1), 11.
- Oxford, R. L., & Gkonou, C. (2018). Interwoven: Culture, language, and learning strategies. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(2), 403-426. doi: 10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.2.10
- Peregoy, S. F., & Boyle, O. F. (2013). *Reading, writing and learning in ESL: A resource book for teaching K-12 English learners* (6th ed.). Boston, US: Pearson.
- Price, G. E., Dunn, R., & Sanders, W. (1980). Reading achievement and learning style characteristics. *The Clearing House*, 5, 223-226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.1981.9957163>

- Sefotho, M. P. M. (2022). Ubuntu translanguaging as a systematic approach to language teaching in multilingual classrooms in South Africa. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 56(1), 1-17.
- Shapiro, A. (2004). How including prior knowledge as a subject variable may change the outcomes of learning research. *American Educational*. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312041001159>
- Smith, L. H., & Renzulli, J. S. (1984). Learning style preferences: A practical approach for teachers. *Theory Into Practice*, 23, 44-50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405848409543088>
- Song, K. (2016). Okay, I will say in Korean and then in American: Translanguaging practices in bilingual homes. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 16(1), 84-106.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swan-Dagen, A., Rinehart, S., Mader, C., & Ice, P. (2008). *Can you hear me now? Providing feedback using audio commenting technology*, *Navigating the Literacy Waters: Research Praxis and Advocacy*. College Reading Association Yearbook (pp. 153-166). <https://doi.org/10.20955/es.2008.1>
- Üstünel, E. (2016). *EFL classroom code-switching*. Turkey: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Virtual Assessment Centre. (2006). Why assess? Available at http://www.carla.umn.edu/assessment/VAC/WhyAssess/p_1.html.
- Vogel, S., & García, O. (2017). Translanguaging. In G. Noblit & L. Moll (Eds.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind and Society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wei, L., & Wu, C. J. (2009). Polite Chinese children revisited: Creativity and the use of codeswitching in the Chinese complementary school classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(2), 193-211. doi: <http://doi.org/10.1080/13670050802153210>
- Zano, K. (2022b). Translanguaging in an English first additional language context in the further education and training phase. *EUREKA: Social and Humanities*, 3, 40–48. doi: <http://doi.org/10.21303/2504-5571.2022.002448>
- Zano, K. (2020a). For Children Without the Language of Feedback: Multilingualism in Promoting Peer and Teacher Feedback. *Gender & Behaviour*, 18(2), 15541–15550.
- Zano, K. (2020b). We Speak English in Sesotho: Multilingualism at Centre Stage in an English First Additional Language Classroom. *Ponte Journal*, 76(8/1), 113-135.
- Zano, K. (2022a). A Multilingual Turn: Translanguaging by Design Activity in an EFL Context. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 10(2), 199-210. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v%vi%i.4826>
- Zhou, S., & Landa, N. (2019). Translanguaging as Foundational Pedagogy: Disrupting Hegemonies for Academic Access in Multilingual Spaces. *Alternation*, 26(2), 290-310.