BRITISH COUNCIL

UCL Institute of Education

Exploring the language orientations of third-sector ESOL teachers in London towards translanguaging

by Daniel Calvert

British Council's Master's Dissertation Awards 2021

Commendation

www.teachingenglish.org.uk/publications/elt-masters-dissertations

Student Number: CAL15137374
Module Code: CCME0053
Module Title: Dissertation Applied Linguistics and TESOL
Programme Title: MA Applied Linguistics
Title: Exploring the language orientations of third-sector ESOL teachers in London towards translanguaging
Word Count: 16,441
Submission Deadline: 15 September 2020
Actual Date of Submission: 9 September 2020

Student Declaration:

By submitting this coursework, I affirm that the work is my own and that any material derived or quoted from the published or unpublished work of other persons has been duly acknowledged. I confirm that I have read the UCL and Departmental guidance on plagiarism.

This dissertation may be made available to the general public for borrowing, photocopying or consultation without the prior consent of the author.

Contents

Acknowledgements.... 4

Abstract.... 5

Chapter 1: Introduction 6

1.1 Background and aims of the research 6

1.2 Motivation for the research.... 7

1.3 Research questions 9

1.4 Structure 10

Chapter 2: Literature review.... 11

2.1 Translanguaging theory and pedagogy.... 11

2.2 Sociocultural theory.... 15

2.3 Language orientations and language ideologies.... 17

2.4 Sociolinguistic citizenship.... 21

2.5 Summary 23

Chapter 3: Methodology.... 24

3.1 Methodology and methods 24

3.2 Research participants.... 26

3.2.1 Sampling strategy.... 26

3.2.2 Participant information.... 27

3.3 Research design 29

3.3.1 One-to-one interviews.... 29

3.3.2 Focus group.... 30

3.3.3 Thematic analysis.... 31

Chapter 4: Findings and discussion.... 33

4.1 Theme one: translanguaging as a bridge to learning English 33

4.1.1 Teacher-led and pupil-directed translanguaging.... 33

4.1.2 Affective–cognitive benefits 35

4.1.3 Translanguaging-as-temporary-resource 36
4.1.4 Conclusion 37
4.2 Theme two: maximising time speaking English 37
4.2.1 Language ideologies 38
4.2.2 The influence of Communicative Language Teaching 39
4.2.3 The role of "immersion" 41
4.2.4 Conclusion 42
4.3 Theme three: translanguaging woven through the social fabric of the class 43
4.3.1 Social togetherness 43
4.3.2 Social tensions 45
4.3.3 The fairness issue 45
4.3.4 Conclusion 47
4.4 Theme four: translanguaging as the fruit of participatory pedagogy 48
4.4.1 Participatory curriculum development 48
4.4.2 Sociolinguistic citizenship 50
4.4.3 Ideologies in tension 52
4.4.4 Conclusion 52
4.5 Summary 53
Chapter 5: Conclusion 55
5.1 Summary 55
5.2 Limitations 56
5.3 Recommendations 57
References 59
Appendices 68
Appendix 1: Dissertation proposal 68
Appendix 2: Information sheet and consent form for participants 79
Appendix 3: Interview questions (adapted from Burton and Rajendram, 2019) 84
Appendix 4: Focus group screenshots 86

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor Emma Brooks for her insight and unceasing support, as well as Jennifer Burton and Shakina Rajendram for the encouragement and practical help they gave me.

I am grateful to the teachers who gave their time and enthusiasm to my research in spite of everything else that was going on in the world.

Thank you to my partner, family, colleagues and the students I never cease to learn from. Sacáis lo mejor de mí.

Abstract

This study explores the views and classroom practices of ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) teachers regarding translanguaging, specifically the practice of bilingual and multilingual speakers to make meaning by fluidly drawing on their full linguistic repertoire. Previous research has found that although implementing a translanguaging pedagogy can offer learners cognitive, affective and social benefits, teachers and students sometimes view the use of other languages in the ESOL classroom as a problem that gets in the way of learning. This study uses Richard Ruíz's orientations in language planning – alongside the concept of language ideologies – to interpret teachers' views and informal language policy about the use of other languages in the ESOL classroom. The five ESOL teachers involved in this research either work or volunteer at third-sector charities or community groups in London. These teachers took part in one-to-one, semi-structured interviews followed by a focus group, data from which was subject to thematic analysis. Findings were that teachers viewed translanguaging as a valuable resource for learning. Their informal policy of promoting translanguaging was moderated however by a wish to maximise the time spent speaking English in the classroom and to maintain fairness for speakers of all languages. Finally, translanguaging pedagogy was viewed as a way to contest the rise of linguistic xenophobia in the UK and to affirm the right of language-minoritised groups to assert their linguistic and cultural identities.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background and aims of the research

According to the Learning and Work Institute, over 50% of ESOL provision in the UK takes place in London (Stevenson, Kings and Sterland, 2017). The 2017 report states that ESOL learners broadly consist of four overlapping groups: settled communities residing in the UK; spouses, partners and dependents of British or EU citizens; migrant workers; and people seeking asylum or those with refugee status. Central-government funding for ESOL in England fell by 60% from 2009–10 to 2015–16, most affecting women – particularly those with childcare responsibilities – and others in low-paid work. Partly as a result of these funding changes, ESOL provision increasingly takes place in the third sector, which is made up of non-profit organisations that include charities, voluntary groups and community organisations. The third sector can provide a steppingstone to formal education, especially for those with limited or no experience of formal education (Stevenson, Kings and Sterland, 2017).

With this background in mind, the aim of this research is to explore the views and informal policy of ESOL teachers, specifically regarding translanguaging, in third-sector organisations in London. In this research translanguaging is used to mean learners and teachers fluidly drawing on their all their linguistic resources – especially languages other than English – in the ESOL classroom (García and Li Wei, 2014). Researchers such as García and Li Wei posit that translanguaging benefits learners in cognitive, affective and social ways, including supporting their metalinguistic awareness and promoting socioemotional as well as identity development. Using an interpretivist approach to qualitative research, I conducted semi-structured interviews with five teachers. Following these interviews I held a focus group in which the teachers discussed their translanguaging pedagogy. The interview transcripts and focus group recording were used to conduct a thematic analysis, both inductively from the data and deductively using Richard Ruíz's (1984) framework of language

orientations. I then used the four themes identified in the analysis to consider the teachers' views and informal policy regarding translanguaging practices in the classroom.

1.2 Motivation for the research

My motivation for this research came from the particular context in which it emerged. All the participants interviewed either worked or volunteered as ESOL teachers in third-sector organisations in London. Third-sector organisations that provide ESOL learning tend to work with some of the most socioeconomically marginalised groups in UK society. In my own professional life I run an ESOL project in south London for people seeking asylum and those with refugee status. As evidenced by several case studies in Cooke and Peutrell (2019), third-sector organisations often adopt the kind of sociocritical orientation reflected in the values statement of the charity where I work: "CARAS will strive for social justice following a rights-based approach in all of our work and challenging instances when rights are not upheld in wider society" (*ESOL Coordinator Job Description*, 2020). The interviewees who took part in this research teach at organisations that arguably ascribe to similar values.

Like the organisations at which teachers in this study taught, translanguaging theory itself has a sociocritical orientation, not least because it emerged in part from research with US-based migrants who face many of the same obstacles as those in the UK. García and Li Wei's (2014) theory of translanguaging is significant in this research not least because it overturns a deficit view of migrant ESOL learners as linguistically – and by implication socially – "low level" or "weak". Instead it repositions these individuals as multilingual speakers who bring to the classroom extensive meaning-making resources that happen to fall outside the construct of English dominant in the UK. García and Li Wei (2014) recognise that the sociocritical positioning of translanguaging pedagogy is often met with resistance in mainstream education, hence it is more often adopted in the kind of non-formal education settings featured in this research. While the teachers in my study reported a wide range of

views and classroom practices, it should be recognised that they teach at organisations broadly receptive to translanguaging pedagogy. For example, English for Action, a third-sector organisation named in this study, has worked with King's College London to research sociolinguistic concepts – including translanguaging – with their students.

Adopting the sociocritical orientation just described, I was motivated to conduct this research by a professional objective to improve outcomes for the groups I work with. Partnering with the Greater London Authority, I am a co-founder of the ESOL Peer Networking Group (*Supporting informal ESOL organisations*, 2020), and my ambition is to use this research to influence the views and practices of ESOL teachers within this network and hopefully beyond. As Valdés (2017) argues in regard to translanguaging pedagogy,

> The process of translating theory to pedagogical practice is a difficult one. Teachers cannot imagine what they have not seen. Once socialized into their disciplines and professional identities and accompanying language ideologies, they cannot change their practice unless they have a solid understanding of the alternatives (p.vi).

One purpose of this research therefore is to help me to develop training in translanguaging pedagogy for ESOL teachers. As Simpson (2020) has argued, ideologies antipathetic to translanguaging exist in the UK ESOL sector. Teachers' ideological positions are not fixed however: positions can and do change through formation in translanguaging pedagogy (Deroo and Ponzio, 2019; Menken and Sanchez, 2019). My hope therefore is that this research may contribute to ideological shifts already underway in the third sector in London, and to potentially influence such shifts in the wider UK ESOL sector.

1.3 Research questions

My research questions and methodology were guided by Burton and Rajendram (2019), whose study is titled "Translanguaging-as-Resource: University ESL Instructors' Language Orientations and Attitudes Toward Translanguaging". Burton and Rajendram interviewed five teachers at a large Canadian university to find out how they viewed translanguaging in the classroom and the extent to which languages other than English featured in their classroom practices. From analysing these interviews, Burton and Rajendram found that teachers accommodated translanguaging practices to a limited extent, however the teachers viewed these practices as potentially slowing down the learning process rather than supporting it. On the occasions when teachers saw translanguaging as a useful resource, they positioned it as a temporary scaffold for lower-proficiency learners who made use of their home languages out of necessity.

Given that I was motivated to compare Burton and Rajendram's findings with the context in which I work, my research questions are based on two of theirs:

1) How do teachers at third-sector organisations in London view translanguaging in their ESOL classes?
2) How do the teachers enact informal language policy regarding translanguaging in their reported classroom practices?

In this research teachers' "informal language policy" is understood in terms of Ruíz's (1984) language orientations, while teachers' "views" are considered in relation to both Ruíz's orientations and Kroskrity's (2010) framing of language ideologies. These terms are more fully explored in section 2.3 below.

"Informal language policy" in my research refers to a combination of what teachers do in the classroom and the rationale they give for their actions (Burton and Rajendram, 2019). The teachers I interviewed did not identify any organisational policies regarding the use of languages other than

English in the classroom, therefore they did not see themselves as enacting any kind of formal language policy on the matter. Instead these teachers can be understood as enacting informal policy through their “classroom practices”, broadly defined as the application of their teaching methods and beliefs about language (Menken and García, 2010). It should therefore be considered that teachers’ informal language policy is influenced by a great range of factors, including their training, ongoing teaching experience, learner groups, colleagues and workplaces, not to mention the wider education system, society and the myriad of language ideologies that intersect all these.

1.4 Structure

Now that I have introduced the background, aims and motivations of this research, the next chapter will review literature relevant to my research questions, evaluating the theoretical frameworks of translanguaging, sociocultural theory, language orientations and language ideologies that are used in this study. Subsequently Chapter 3 sets out my chosen methodology and research design as well as introducing the teachers interviewed for this study. Chapter 4 integrates both the findings of the research and discussion in reference to the literature. Finally, the concluding chapter summarises the main themes of the research and makes some recommendations as to how it can be used to support the development of translanguaging pedagogy.

Chapter 2: Literature review

This chapter starts by detailing the theory of translanguaging that is used throughout this study. It evaluates research into the benefits of translanguaging pedagogy and considers some significant contextual factors. The second section considers the contribution of sociocultural theory to the development of translanguaging pedagogy. The penultimate section considers how a framework of language orientations can be used as a heuristic tool in the analysis of teachers' informal language policy, as well as exploring how the literature on language ideologies can frame teachers' views and classroom practices. Finally, the fourth section introduces the concept of "sociolinguistic citizenship" as a way to understand the sociocritical orientation of translanguaging pedagogy.

2.1 Translanguaging theory and pedagogy

The theoretical framework of translanguaging that has arguably been the most influential in the field of TESOL, and which is used in this research, is that elaborated by García and Li Wei (2014). The authors define translanguaging in terms of "dynamic bilingualism", a way of viewing the language practices of bilingual speakers as fluidly drawing on linguistic features that transcend languages as bounded entities. Dynamic bilingualism therefore defines itself against the structuralist notion of "additive bilingualism", understood as the addition of an autonomous second language to a discrete first-language system. According to translanguaging theory, speakers are understood to have one linguistic repertoire made up of "a single array of disaggregated features" such as phonemes, morphemes and syntactic rules (García and Li Wei, 2014, p.15). Although speakers may identify a feature as belonging to a named language, dialect, register and so on, the named feature (for example "English") is understood to be a social construct rather an abstract linguistic system independent of the speaker. Within this poststructuralist frame of reference, languages are named as social constructs while also rejecting their psycholinguistic reality (García, 2020).

Although translanguaging overlaps with other poststructuralist concepts such as "code-meshing" (Canagarajah, 2011) and "polylingualism" (Jørgensen, 2008), it has been chosen for this research because of its application to multilingual education settings. The term first appeared in Welsh as "trawsieithu" and emerged from research into bilingual education in Welsh schools. From the outset it described how bilingual teachers and learners made use of their full linguistic repertoire in the classroom (García and Kleyn, 2016a). Building on evidence that multilinguals have a "translanguaging instinct" (Li Wei, 2014) – which is to say that teachers and learners instinctively draw on linguistic features from across their repertoire with or without institutional approval (Creese and Blackledge 2010; Heller and Martin-Jones 2001) – educational researchers have argued for the intentional and strategic use of translanguaging in the course of teaching and learning, known as translanguaging pedagogy (García, Johnson and Seltzer, 2017).

Translanguaging pedagogy has been the subject of research in many different contexts for well over a decade. García, Johnson and Seltzer (2017) argue that translanguaging pedagogy is made up of three main strands: a "translanguaging stance" or belief in "bringing forth bilingual students' entire language repertoires" (p.27); a "translanguaging design" in which teachers plan how to make use of these language repertoires in class; and "translanguaging shifts", referring to teachers' capacity to make use of these language repertoires as and when the moment arises. García, Johnson and Seltzer's model of translanguaging pedagogy was informed by a major research project led by the City University of New York (CUNY) called the New York State Initiative on Emergent Bilinguals, or CUNY-NYSIEB for short. The "emergent bilinguals" in question were migrant schoolchildren from many countries, chiefly Latin American, who were viewed in translanguaging terms not as acquiring English as a second language but as newly incorporating linguistic features from "English" into a repertoire that already contained many features from other languages. The findings of this action research have generated what Li Wei (2018) terms "practical theory", in that the theory emerged out of practice and has informed practice in turn.

In the spirit of Li Wei's practical theory, CUNY-NYSIEB researchers conducted action research in 67 New York schools. They identified many beneficial effects of translanguaging pedagogy, including enabling emergent bilinguals to understand complex content and texts in English, gain metalinguistic awareness, and benefit from socioemotional and identity development. The CUNY-NYSIEB case studies can be evaluated in terms of the four criteria of "trustworthiness" set out by Guba and Lincoln (1985), namely credibility, confirmability, dependability and transferability. In Guba and Lincoln's terms, the findings of CUNY-NYSIEB researchers gain credibility from the prolonged engagement and persistent observation they made in schools where the action research took place. However the CUNY-NYSIEB analysis is sometimes limited in its confirmability, in that the researchers do not always detail the theoretical, methodological or analytical choices they made in the course of interpreting the data. For example, Seltzer and Collins (2016) cite instances in which the research team encouraged students to express their emotions using Spanish – their "expert" language – stating that this led to the students' socioemotional development. The difficulty however is that Seltzer and Collins quote these interactions and state their interpretation without explaining how they concluded that socioemotional development had occurred, for example in reference to theory or a measurement tool such as learner self-report.

As well as the confirmability issue just identified, the transferability of the CUNY-NYSIEB research should be considered in light of other studies into the socioemotional development of students who were encouraged to engage in translanguaging. In particular, Charalambous, Charalambous and Zembylas (2016) explored how Turkish-speaking students in Greek-Cypriot schools were reluctant to use Turkish in the classroom, concerned that it would be perceived as the language of an "enemy group". The unintended effect of the teacher encouraging the use linguistic features from Turkish was to silence those students. The researchers found that encouraging translanguaging led in this case to "emotional difficulties" rather than socioemotional development. Their findings suggest that the benefits of translanguaging pedagogy are contingent on factors beyond the teacher's control, such as the sociocultural positioning of linguistic features that persist regardless of the theoretical

"disaggregation" of these features from named languages and nationalities. Rajendram (2019) concurs that translanguaging pedagogy needs to be implemented with attention to the particular linguistic and cultural features of each setting.

While the CUNY-NYSIEB research took place in settings quite different from my own, other research into the benefits of translanguaging pedagogy has been conducted in closer contexts. For example, Park and Valdez (2018) conducted linguistic ethnographic research into the implementation of translanguaging pedagogy in a classroom of older Nepali-Bhutanese adults with a refugee background in a US community college. Consistent with García, Johnson and Seltzer (2017), they found that translanguaging pedagogy assisted emergent bilinguals' metalinguistic awareness, negotiation for meaning and ability to comprehend and produce texts in English. The translanguaging pedagogy used was also found to help a learner develop literacy in his home language, an instance of what García and Kleyn (2016a) would call a "culturally sustaining" practice. In a further example, Kalocsányiová (2017) conducted a linguistic ethnography of volunteer-led French-language classes for adult refugees from diverse backgrounds in Luxembourg. While the teacher's translanguaging pedagogy was not theoretically grounded in the way that the teacher's in Park and Valdez (2018) was, learners were nevertheless encouraged to draw on whatever linguistic resources they had in the classroom. Kalocsányiová found that translanguaging in this way enabled learners to check their understanding, arrange ideas and give more accurate explanations. In a final example, Creese and Blackledge (2010) used linguistic ethnographic research to demonstrate how teachers and learners in Gujurati complementary schools in the UK co-constructed a translanguaging pedagogy that enabled them to convey and negotiate meaning as well as comprehend texts and vocabulary.

The ethnographic nature of the studies above means they resist simple extrapolation to other contexts; however they add to the theoretical validity and breadth of translanguaging, suggesting that it has the potential to benefit students in a variety of settings. Furthermore, while the studies explored in this section have demonstrated theoretically grounded benefits of translanguaging

pedagogy, they are not effectiveness studies seeking to measure impact on educational outcomes. Duarte (2018) argues that translanguaging pedagogy lacks the kind of empirical verification that such effectiveness studies would provide, suggesting that more research is needed to build a case that will convince language planners and policy makers of its efficacy. With that caveat in mind, the next section of this literature review will consider research in the field of sociocultural theory that provides an understanding of how translanguaging pedagogy may be beneficial.

2.2 Sociocultural theory

Ever since Colin Baker (2001) first translated the term "trawsieithu" into English, translanguaging has been closely connected to the concept of "languaging" that emerged from Merrill Swain's work on neo-Vygotskian sociocultural theory (SCT). Swain (2006) uses the term "languaging" to describe the use of language to mediate cognition, for example to problem solve or internalise knowledge in the process of learning a language. García and Li Wei (2014) likewise frame the learner's linguistic repertoire as a symbolic artifact that can be used as a mediational tool in the process of learning new linguistic features. Seen in terms of SCT, languaging and translanguaging both foreground language as a social activity in which speakers co-construct meaning, distinct from the view of language as an abstract object of study (Becker, 1988). (Trans)languaging can therefore be considered a useful resource for learning language as a social practice rather than a skill.

Sociocultural theorists such as Swain and Lapkin (2005) were describing a learner's "first language" as a "formidable cognitive resource" for languaging well before translanguaging theorists sought to dissolve the separation of "first" and "second" languages (p.181). SCT and translanguaging research have found common ground however in the conceptualisation of languaging as a social practice that benefits learners most when they can use whatever linguistic resources they have. Martin-Beltrán (2014) has advanced translanguaging theory in this area through her SCT-informed research into

bilingual students in a US high school. She analysed observations of 600 language-related episodes (LREs) in which students discuss the language they are producing, for example by questioning, giving feedback and offering each other corrections. Martin-Beltrán found that translanguaging was integral to this languaging process in that learners drew on their Spanish and English linguistic resources fluidly during LREs, and that doing so enhanced their conceptual and linguistic understanding. These LREs can be considered instances of "collaborative dialogue" or "peer scaffolding" (Swain, Kinnear and Steinman, 2015), creating a classroom environment that Martin-Beltrán calls a "collective zone of proximal development" in which bilingual students enhance each other's linguistic and conceptual understanding in a way they could not do on their own. García, Johnson and Seltzer (2017) similarly refer to this phenomenon as "the bilingual zone of proximal development". Martin-Beltrán *et al*. (2017) are careful to point out that the analysis of moment-to-moment interactions like the ones in Martin-Beltrán's earlier study (2014) does not evidence linguistic development as such but rather demonstrates learners "making sense" of language through their (trans)languaging practices. This admission demonstrates how the researchers are practising reflexivity in "uncovering their epistemological assumptions" (Guba and Lincoln, 1985, p.248), thereby increasing the credibility of their research.

Further considering Guba and Lincoln's trustworthiness criteria, Martin-Beltrán (2014) overcomes a limitation of Seltzer and Collins (2016) identified in section 2.1 above, namely that Seltzer and Collins do not always adequately demonstrate how they reached their conclusions. By contrast Martin-Beltrán presents "microgenetic analysis" of five LREs chosen as "telling cases" from the 600 recorded. Theory is tested and refined through this close analysis, enabling the reader to assess the confirmability of Martin-Beltrán's findings to an extent that Seltzer and Collins do not allow. Martin-Beltrán's research has some limitations of its own however, such as the claim that the five LREs chosen are "representative of the range of LREs we observed across 39 transcripts" (Martin-Beltrán, 2014, p.216). No explanation is given of what makes these LREs representative, or how it is possible

that five “telling cases” could represent a range of 600 LREs collected over the course of two years. This lack of explanation limits the transferability of the findings to other domains.

While studies such as Martin-Beltrán (2014) and others like Rajendram (2019) provide evidence that learners can use translanguaging to mediate collaborative dialogue, teachers should be cautious about assuming that harmonious collaboration is a given in the classroom. Storch (2002) notably observed adult ESOL learners engaging in pair-work exercises, using SCT to analyse the interactions that occurred. From her research Storch concluded that not all patterns of “dyadic interaction” were equally conducive to collaborative dialogue. She found that pairings in which there was a low degree of mutuality (i.e. engagement with the partner’s ideas) led to low degree of knowledge sharing and transfer. Collaborative pairings with a high degree of mutuality and equality (in terms of distribution of turns) did lead to knowledge transfer, however these pairings were far from universally present. Storch’s study points to some of the difficulties of instigating collaborative dialogue in the classroom, and the findings can be used to caution that the SCT model given in translanguaging pedagogy manuals such as García, Johnson and Seltzer (2016) may be somewhat idealised.

2.3 Language orientations and language ideologies

While SCT can be used to make sense of translanguaging pedagogy, a different lens is required to understand teachers’ informal language policy, referring to a combination of what teachers do in the classroom and the rationale they give for their actions (Burton and Rajendram, 2019). A useful framework can be found in Richard Ruíz’s elaboration of “language orientations” that emerged from the field of language planning and policy.

Ruíz (1984) defined a “language orientation” as a “complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society” (p.16). His three orientations are not mutually exclusive in that they may coexist within a society, school or even within the classroom practices of a

single teacher. Ruíz defined three broad orientations that language planners or policies can have regarding multilingualism, each of which is characterised by many possible dispositions:

1. language-as-problem: this orientation holds that linguistic diversity is a problem that needs addressing through language policy. A disposition characteristic of this orientation could be that an emergent bilingual's use of their expert language gets in the way of learning English. A teacher with a language-as-problem orientation might enact informal policy that tried to minimise the learner's use of languages other than English.
2. language-as-right: this describes the orientation that individuals and social groups have a legal or human right to maintain minority languages. A teacher with this orientation would enact informal policy that encouraged the use of minority languages in the classroom in accordance with their belief in the learner's right to do so.
3. language-as-resource: the orientation that linguistic diversity is a valuable resource for society. A characteristic disposition could be that the speaker of a minority language has expertise from which everyone can benefit. A teacher with this orientation would enact informal policy that made use of learners' other languages on the grounds that they were a useful resource.

Hult and Hornberger (2016) argue that Ruíz's framework of language orientations is a useful heuristic with which to analyse "what is thinkable about language in society" (p.31). While various issues have been identified with Ruíz's orientations, for example his emphasis on the instrumental benefits of multilingualism (e.g. for military purposes) or his ambivalence towards the language-as-right orientation, subsequent researchers adopting his orientations have developed them beyond these perceived limitations (De Jong *et al.*, 2016). For example, while the language-as-resource orientation was originally aligned with Jim Cummins' concept of additive bilingualism, it has since been applied to the dynamic bilingualism of translanguaging theory (Catalano and Hamann, 2016; Kleyn, 2016).

As well as being aligned with translanguaging theory, Ruíz's orientations have also been used in research on language ideologies. Ruíz (1984) related his language orientations to "language attitudes", however he acknowledged in a footnote that language ideologies were also related, albeit "the brevity of the discussion of this concept makes me reluctant to claim a perfect match" (p.29). Since then the study of language ideologies has expanded in the field of linguistic anthropology, allowing for a greater match with Ruíz's orientations. Kroskrity (2004), drawing on the work of Michael Silverstein, describes language ideologies as "beliefs, or feelings, about languages as used in their social worlds" (p.498). Taken together, Ruíz (1984) and Kroskrity (2010) pose that both orientations and ideologies serve the interests of specific social groups and promote certain cultural identities. Another similarity is that both Kroskrity's "beliefs" and Ruíz's "dispositions" can be dispersed across groups in largely subconscious ways that are nonetheless detectable in the form of language practices or policy.

While language orientations and ideologies emerged from different disciplines and are by no means synonymous, they have found a productive union in research on language policy. Fredricks and Warriner (2016), in a linguistic ethnography of an Arizona school where 90% of students were defined as "English language learners" (ELLs), position language ideology as an umbrella term that covers Ruíz's language orientations. Their research took place in response to the US state of Arizona passing legislation that requires schools to provide ELLs with "Sheltered English Immersion" in order to promote their acquisition of English. What students were being "sheltered" from in fact was their "native language", as the law mandated that teachers minimise the use of languages other than English in the classroom. The researchers interpreted this as an example of a language-as-problem orientation, in that the policy sought to prevent the maintenance of minority languages. They also viewed the policy as embodying monolingual ideology in that it arguably served the interests of the dominant language. Fredricks and Warriner found a monolingual ideology and accompanying language-as-problem orientation to be widely dispersed in the school. For instance, learners

described a hierarchy in which "English Language Development" classes were seen as "the lowest" and mainstream classes were positioned as more desirable.

Fredricks and Warriner's findings support Kroskrity's (2010) argument that language ideologies are a particularly useful concept with which to analyse "subordinated identities", in that they found a widely shared deficit view of ELLs, with ELLs themselves attributing their poor academic performance to their bilingualism. In contrast, they also found that some otherwise monolingual English-speaking students used Spanish words and phrases in the classroom, which Fredricks and Warriner interpreted as a way for them to show affiliation with the subordinated ethnic group. This interpretation is consistent with Kroskrity's argument that language ideologies do not exist homogeneously across all social groups and are likely to produce divergent perspectives. Furthermore, Fredricks and Warriner argue that the way that some ELLs shared their knowledge of Spanish with non-ELL students indicate that the ELLs had a language-as-resource orientation. They do not present evidence however that the ELLs in question saw Spanish as a resource in this way. Given that the researchers themselves profess a language-as-resource orientation, their positionality may have influenced their interpretation.

While Fredricks and Warriner demonstrate how a monolingual ideology aligns with a language-as-problem orientation, Kleyn (2016) argues that translanguaging ideology is consistent with Ruiz's language-as-resource orientation. In support of Kleyn's position, García, Johnson and Seltzer (2017) state that a "translanguaging stance" (one of their three strands of translanguaging pedagogy) is an "ideological or belief system" in which teachers "have a firm belief that their students' language practices are … a resource (Ruíz, 1984)" (p.27). Translanguaging pedagogy can therefore be framed as an ideological construct that competes with more dominant ideologies, with teachers implementing informal language policy that either resists or supports translanguaging ideology (Carroll and Sambolín Morales, 2016; Simpson 2020).

2.4 Sociolinguistic citizenship

The "translanguaging stance" just discussed is arguably characteristic of a language-as-right orientation as much as it is a language-as-resource orientation:

> translanguaging is not solely a scaffold to learn the dominant ways of using languages … [it] is a way to enable language-minoritized communities who have been marginalized in schools and society to finally see (and hear) themselves as they are, as bilinguals who have a right to their own language practices. (García, 2020)

It is in this sense that García, Johnson and Seltzer (2017) label their translanguaging stance a "social justice stance". Looking to a UK context, Rampton, Cooke and Holmes (2018) use the term "sociolinguistic citizenship" to locate a language-as-right orientation within a wider social-justice discourse. "Sociolinguistic citizenship" adapts Christopher Stroud's concept of Linguistic Citizenship, which in turn emerged from the Linguistic Human Rights agenda in post-apartheid South Africa. While the South African state used Linguistic Human Rights legislation to promote the use of non-colonial languages in schools, Linguistic Citizenship goes further in legitimising the use of non-standard language – including translanguaging – in recognition of students' full linguistic repertoire. Rampton, Cooke and Holmes (2018) thereby frame the practice of translanguaging as an "act of citizenship" that makes a claim on rights not yet legally afforded to migrants in a host country.

Like Stroud's concept of Linguistic Citizenship, the idea of sociolinguistic citizenship has been advanced not by state-sanctioned language policy but by collaboration between academic researchers and grassroots organisations. In particular, researchers at King's College London collaborated with the third-sector organisation English for Action to advance the concept of sociolinguistic citizenship (Cooke, Bryers and Winstanley, 2019). Their action research introduced the concept of translanguaging to a class of adult ESOL learners and encouraged them to make use of their language repertoires beyond English. While learners initially regarded translanguaging practices as unacceptable, their discussion of the concept led many to recognise the value of their multilingual

repertoires and identities, resulting in them drawing on these wider repertoires in the classroom. Cooke, Bryers and Winstanley argue that translanguaging practices thus became a way for these learners to "participate and seek recognition in the public space", in other words to make a claim on sociolinguistic citizenship even when they did not have the "fixed legal status" of legal citizenship (p.139). The *Our Languages* (2019) teaching resources that emerged from this action research seek to develop what García, Johnson and Seltzer (2017) term "critical metalinguistic awareness", enabling learners to develop into "critical sociolinguists" (García and Kleyn, 2016b) in a way that promotes the social-justice stance of translanguaging ideology. Both García, Johnson and Seltzer (2017) and Cooke, Bryers and Winstanley (2019) draw on the principles of participatory pedagogy (Freire, 1993) to frame the development of critical metalinguistic awareness as *conscientização* or critical consciousness raising with learners who are "assumed to be the experts in their own reality and very much involved in researching that reality with teachers" (Auerbach, 1992, p.19). It should be acknowledged however that while translanguaging practices may be understood as "acts of citizenship" on the part of migrant groups, they may not be recognised as such by settled communities who have not gone through a process of *conscientização*.

While a translanguaging pedagogy that advocates for sociolinguistic citizenship can be thought of in Stroud's terms as a "transformative remedy", Rampton, Cooke and Holmes (2018) caution that transformation at the margins does not necessarily lead to wider societal change. They point to macro-level historical shifts in UK language education policy since the 1980s that have moved schools from a language-as-resource to a language-as-problem orientation. They argue that students attending community groups such as English for Action are few in number compared to the millions who pass through state-funded schools and colleges not so amenable to the concept of sociolinguistic citizenship. Even if language-as-resource policies were adopted in schools, Jaspers (2017) cites Bourdieu in cautioning that "any well-intentioned change at school would be quickly re-infected by the unequal structures around it" (p.7). Heller and Martin-Jones (2001) however counter Bourdieu's pessimism through linguistic ethnographic research showing how symbolic domination can be

consciously recognised and contested, suggesting that change from the bottom up is at least possible even if it is not a given.

Jaspers, who positions himself as favourable to the sociocritical orientation of translanguaging theorists, further cautions that their transformative agenda risks becoming discredited if school-based translanguaging practices do not lead to wider societal transformation. On balance however, the quotation from García (2020) which introduced this section holds true, in that translanguaging begins the process of transformation from the learner outwards. It is surely the case then that translanguaging pedagogy is worthwhile at a classroom level, even if the only outcome was to affirm that learner's existence as a multilingual subject. Seen as an act of citizenship, translanguaging can "offer the chance for individuals to imagine – even if only momentarily – how the future could be different from their current reality" (Cooke, Bryers and Winstanley, 2019, p.143).

2.5 Summary

This literature review has considered some possible benefits of translanguaging while also suggesting that research on translanguaging pedagogy is in its early stages and has more to do to establish its effectiveness. Furthermore, we have seen that translanguaging can be a site of ideological contestation, such that careful attention must be paid to the underlying orientation of teachers' informal language policy. Finally, this chapter has also demonstrated that translanguaging has many aspects, including as theory, social practice, instinct, pedagogy, ideology and means to achieve sociopolitical transformation. Jaspers (2017) has warned that the polysemy of translanguaging can be confusing, and researchers must be clear in which sense they are using the term without confusing the purposes of each. It will be important to keep this in mind as I turn to my methodology section.

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Methodology and methods

My original proposal (see Appendix 1) was to investigate translanguaging by conducting a linguistic ethnography at a London-based, third-sector ESOL organisation. Subsequent to submitting the proposal however the organisations where I might have conducted a linguistic ethnography closed their services in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Rather than wait to see if ESOL classes would move online in time for me undertake a linguistic ethnography, I sought an alternative method that would allow me to investigate translanguaging pedagogy even while classes were suspended. Further reading in the literature led me to Burton and Rajendram (2019), a study I chose to partially replicate not least for pragmatic reasons, as it offered a way to pursue my research interests within the contextual constraints.

Burton and Rajendram conducted one-to-one interviews with five English language teachers at a large Canadian university to explore their attitudes towards translanguaging in the classroom. They did so by asking the teachers questions about how they viewed translanguaging, what informal language policy they held regarding the use of languages other than English, and the role of their linguistic background and personal language-learning experiences in forming their attitudes and classroom practices. Burton and Rajendram then conducted an inductive thematic analysis of their interview data, combining this with a deductive analysis of teachers' language orientations using Ruiz's (1984) and Hult and Hornberger's (2016) frameworks as a heuristic device. The next chapter discusses the results of their analysis in comparison with my own findings.

Following Burton and Rajendram (2019), I conducted semi-structured interviews with five ESOL teachers in order to answer my research questions about these teachers' views of translanguaging and their informal policy regarding translanguaging enacted in their reported classroom practices. The methodology used has a social constructivist or interpretivist epistemology. This means that on the

one hand, teachers' perceptions or interpretations are taken as the primary source of data, while on the other it is accepted that there is no objective reality for the researcher to uncover (Mason, 2002). Ontological categories such "view" or "policy" are taken not as pre-existing facts but as objects that are co-constructed by participants through the socially and culturally scripted practice of interviewing (Briggs, 2007). This leads to acceptance that: a "full and neutral account" is not possible; the researcher's personal subjectivity is central to the knowledge they construct; and acts of reflexivity are therefore important to challenge the researcher's assumptions and role in the research process (Mason, 2002).

My data analysis revealed some readily identifiable examples of how the chosen research method has influenced the data I collected. For example, teachers were interviewed not in their classroom environment but at home via online video conferencing software. One interviewee reported that she was sat at her computer facing the kitchen during the interview, and that this had caused her to recall an example of when she had asked learners to name kitchen vocabulary in their expert language. This shows how the physical space of the interview can prompt some memories over others. Another example came in the focus group when one teacher was discussing whether her informal policy differed from her organisation's: "I realised a lot of it maybe after we had that interview because you [the researcher] were asking me these things." This is a telling commentary on how a participant's understanding can be co-constructed through the communicative practices of interviewing.

While the methodological approach outlined above is consistent with that of Burton and Rajendram (2019), replication is not an exact science in the field of qualitative research. My replication of Burton and Rajendram (2019) should be considered partial for a number of reasons:

- Firstly, my interviewees do not work at one university but rather at four different third-sector organisations that form part of a community of practice in London. A fuller description of the participants can be found in section 3.2;

- Secondly, I did not seek to answer one of Burton and Rajendram's research questions, for reasons set out in section 3.3.1;
- Thirdly, I chose to add an extra stage to Burton and Rajendram's research method, namely the focus group. The rationale for this is given in section 3.3.2.

Finally, Burton and Rajendram chose "teacher attitudes" as a category of investigation alongside language ideology, however I have chosen just the latter for my study. Whereas research into individuals' attitudes comes from psychology, language ideology comes from linguistic anthropology and ethnography, and the use of both attitudes and ideologies to analyse interview data therefore risks epistemological ambiguity. Given that the translanguaging theory used in this research emerged from linguistic anthropology and ethnography, language ideology is arguably a more ontologically consistent category of analysis. Furthermore, it allows me to connect individual teachers' ideological stances with macro-ideological patterning in wider society in a way that analysis of attitudes would make it harder to do.

The final issue to consider here on the question of replication is Burton and Rajendram's focus on the use of languages other than English. Researchers are increasingly interested in the multimodal components of translanguaging, including the use of non-linguistic features such as imagery, gesture and facial expression in communication (Adami and Sherris, 2019). My study is consistent with Burton and Rajendram however in focusing on the use of languages other than English, which helps ensure the comparability of my findings while also limiting the scope of the investigation.

3.2 Research participants

3.2.1 Sampling strategy

I used strategic sampling as defined by Mason (2002) to select a range of participants not on the basis of representational logic (as in quantitative research), but rather because of relevance to my research

questions, theoretical position and argument. This meant selecting participants not for characteristics such as age or gender but in order to illustrate a range of experiences and views. The number of third-sector organisations in London that provide ESOL learning is relatively small, and four of the five participants were known to me before I began my research. My position as Head of Learning at an established third-sector organisation, and the professional knowledge and contacts I brought to my research, undoubtedly influenced my sampling decisions. In addition, the challenging circumstances presented by the COVID-19 pandemic also restricted my pool of available participants.

3.2.2 Participant information

Using the sampling strategy just outlined, I recruited five participants to take part in the research. Their names and some other biographical information have been changed to help ensure anonymity.

Rachel has been teaching ESOL for 13 years and has been employed at her current third-sector organisation for the last seven. She speaks German and spent four years learning Arabic as a pupil at an international school in Jordan. Rachel's ESOL teacher training primarily consisted of a CELTA certificate and a DTLLS diploma specialising in ESOL. Until the nationwide lockdown in response to the COVID-19 pandemic began (two months before the interview took place), she was teaching a class of women from Bangladesh, many of whom hadn't gone to school and were learning to read and write for the first time. All Rachel's learners in the classes she discussed spoke either Bengali or Sylheti, and she described them as Entry 1 (beginner-level) learners of English.

Elena started her ESOL teaching career at her current organisation, where she has been for six years. She grew up in Poland, learnt Spanish as an adult and describes her Spanish-language proficiency as intermediate. She completed the Certificate in TESOL as well as a degree in English Language Teaching. The two classes she focused on in her interview consist of Spanish-speaking adult learners. Elena described one of the classes as Entry 3 to Level 2 (intermediate to advanced level) and the

other as mostly Entry 2 (elementary level) with some Entry 3 (lower-intermediate-level) learners. Since lockdown started her classes restarted online using video conferencing software.

GC taught at their third-sector organisation for 7 months until classes stopped due to lockdown. Unlike the other teachers I interviewed, GC taught their classes as a volunteer in their spare time. GC did their CELTA 18 months ago and last year started their main job of teaching English at a private language school in London. They studied Chinese and Portuguese at university and can speak both languages. Students in GC's third-sector classes were all adults, came from a wide variety of countries and spoke many languages, including Spanish, Portuguese, Turkish, Mandarin Chinese, Tigrinya and Arabic. GC described 75% of the learners as being at Entry 2 (elementary) level, with some at higher or lower levels.

Gemma has been teaching ESOL for 26 years, most of those at Further Education colleges. She has taught at her current organisation, English for Action, for the last five years. She has a Certificate in TESOL and a DELTA, as well as a Level 5 ESOL Skills for Life subject specialisation. Gemma taught English in Italy for five years and describes English and Italian as her home languages. Before the interview she had recently started learning Sylheti. The students in the class she discussed were adults and all spoke Sylheti except for one Thai speaker. She described the level of the class as Entry 1 (beginner). Gemma is unique in this participant group in being a sociolinguistics researcher who brought to the interview a knowledge of translanguaging theory and pedagogy.

Clara has been teaching ESOL for 14 years, mostly at Further Education colleges. She has been with her current third-sector organisation for 18 months. Before that she taught English in Austria for six years. She has a PGCE with an ESOL specialisation. She speaks French and German and knows some Kurdish. She's currently teaching two classes that went online after lockdown. Her learners know more than 20 languages, including French, Spanish, Tamil, Arabic and Kurdish. All but one of the learners are women. Clara described one class as being at Entry 3 (intermediate) level and the other class as ranging from Entry 2 (elementary) to Level 1 (upper-intermediate level).

3.3 Research design

3.3.1 One-to-one interviews

Following Burton and Rajendram (2019), I started by preparing questions for semi-structured interviews with the five teachers above. I followed the procedure set out by Mason (2002) to turn "big" research questions into a loose interview structure guided by some prompt questions. I then triangulated my devised interview questions with those Burton and Rajendram provided on request, helping to ensure that my findings would be comparable with theirs. The questions were designed to be open rather than leading (Codó, 2008) and as recommended by Heller, Pietikainen and Pujolar (2018), they were kept ideologically "polyvalent" in that they did not endorse a translanguaging stance.

The interviews lasted one hour and were conducted online using video conferencing software. Because the interviews were only semi-structured I could respond to issues and examples that participants raised, following leads strategically as they presented themselves in the conversation (Mason, 2002).

Following the one-to-one interviews I reviewed the data I had collected and found it was insufficient to answer the third of Burton and Rajendram's research questions, "How do instructors' linguistic background and personal language-learning experience play a role in their attitudes and reported practices?" I also found that pursuing this research question prompted me to think of my participants in essentialist terms, for example as representing categories such as "first language user" or "second language user" and "native" or "non-native" speaker. Since García and Li Wei's (2014) critical poststructuralist conception of translanguaging rejects the hierarchisation of language users in this way, I decided it was preferable to drop this research question and more fully explore the first two.

3.3.2 Focus group

Having completed the one-to-one interviews, I then started planning a focus group for the five participants. Burton and Rajendram (2019) did not include a focus group as part of their research method, however I chose to include one as it allowed me to develop scenarios for discussion that came from participants themselves. Mason (2002) describes situational questions as a helpful way to ascertain reasonings and judgments. Burton and Rajendram (2019) devised hypothetical scenario-based questions for the interviews, however Mason advises that hypothetical scenarios are less preferable, arguing from an interpretivist standpoint that knowledge is contextual and best explored through situations that evoke participants' actual experiences. For that reason I removed Burton and Rajendram's hypothetical scenarios and instead used the interview data to identify ten scenarios based on examples of actual classroom-based translanguaging that interviewees had provided. I then presented these situations for discussion in the focus group without identifying who they came from. Given that my participants all belong to a community of practice that spans third-sector organisations in London, they had many common points of reference to help them explore their informal language policy. Research into language ideologies has found that in this way group interviews allow the researcher to explore often unaddressed issues within a community (Atkinson and Kelly-Holmes, 2016).

Having decided to include a focus group stage, I planned two activities for participants to complete. The first activity was a discussion of the ten classroom-based translanguaging scenarios just described. The second was a participatory "card-cluster" activity in which teachers started by responding to the topic of translanguaging pedagogy by writing three "cards". Participants were told these cards could take any number of forms, for example an idea, feeling, experience, quotation or question. Participants then took it in turns to share the statements on their cards, which they grouped into themes before giving each theme a title.

As I could find no date and time when all participants were free to attend a 90-minute focus group, I found a way for everyone to participate using an online collaboration tool called Padlet. Elena, Clara and Rachel attended the 90-minute focus group, adding comments or cards that captured their discussion on the Padlet "wall". GC and Gemma were then able to access Padlet asynchronously and write further comments/cards in response to other participants and the activities themselves. While the recording of the focus group conversation was arguably the most useful for my analysis, the activity outputs on Padlet also provided helpful data for analysis.

3.3.3 Thematic analysis

Having collected data using the methods described in the last two sections, I then followed Burton and Rajendram (2019) in conducting an inductive thematic analysis as set out in Nowell *et al.* (2017). Systematically following their six phases of data analysis, I used NVivo 12 to inductively code the data. This enabled me to generate themes relating to the research questions. In line with Burton and Rajendram (2019), who followed recommendations from Hult and Hornberger (2016), I combined an inductive analysis of the data with a deductive analysis using Ruíz's orientations as a heuristic tool. This made my findings more comparable with Burton and Rajendram's, which in turn gave further insight into my data.

As advised by Nowell *et al*. (2017), I took a number of steps to ensure that my thematic analysis would have trustworthiness as defined by Guba and Lincoln (1985), who present four criteria as an analogue to validity, reliability and objectivity from quantitative analysis:

1. credibility: this refers to the "fit" between participants' views and how the research represents them. One way I tried to ensure credibility was to present an initial analysis of the one-to-one interviews in the focus group to allow for member checking.

2. transferability: although qualitative data is not generalisable in the way quantitative data claims to be, providing detailed descriptions can help other researchers judge how well the findings can be transferred to their own contexts. I have tried to ensure transferability by sampling participants strategically as well as including plenty of contextualisation and direct quotation from participants.
3. dependability: this refers to how clearly documented and easy to trace the research process is. One way I have done this is by providing an "audit trail" of methodological steps and decisions in this section, as well as storing my coding as an NVivo file for future reference.
4. confirmability: this concerns how well the researcher's interpretations come from the data. One way I sought to achieve this was by practising reflexivity, aided by a reflective journal in which I documented my emerging impressions and made diagrams that helped with theme development.

Following the methodology and research design set out in this chapter produced the findings which will now be presented in the next chapter. These findings are structured by the four themes that emerged from my thematic analysis, presented alongside a discussion that considers the data in reference to the literature.

Chapter 4: Findings and discussion

4.1 Theme one: translanguaging as a bridge to learning English

All research participants spoke about ways in which they viewed translanguaging as providing some sort of a "bridge" to learning English: as a mediational tool for collaborative dialogue; for promoting metalinguistic awareness; and for affective–cognitive benefits. As a whole this theme is indicative of a language-as-resource orientation, although teachers also displayed what Burton and Rajendram (2019) call a "translanguaging-as-temporary-resource orientation" in which other languages are seen as a problem in certain contexts.

4.1.1 Teacher-led and pupil-directed translanguaging

Gemma described an informal policy of using translanguaging as a "mediational tool" to "bridge" the gap between English and learners' expert languages. For example, when her Bangladeshi students were struggling to understand the difference between "what", "when" and other "wh-" words, Gemma drew on her own linguistic repertoire to point out that all these words start with a "k" in Sylheti. This is an example of Gemma engaging in what García, Johnson and Seltzer (2017) call "translanguaging shifts", namely the teacher responding with translanguaging in the moment, for example by providing on-the-spot translations or explanations in other languages. In a similar way Elena used her knowledge of Spanish to help her learners identify Spanish–English cognates, while GC talked about spontaneously drawing on their linguistic repertoire to explain false friends like "sensible" and "sensível". GC felt that using Portuguese in this way made the moment more memorable: for example, they thought that telling students that "I'm boring" translated to "não sou interesante, sou uma pessoa chata" [*I'm not interesting, I'm a boring person*] meant "they'll probably

remember that moment for the next couple of hours, hopefully the rest of the day, if we're really lucky like the rest of their life."

The interviewees' informal policy of teacher-led translanguaging shifts is indicative of a language-as-resource orientation, which Rachel reflected when she described Elena's knowledge of Spanish as an "asset". Gemma's reference to translanguaging as a "mediational tool" makes explicit reference to SCT, and the examples given above can be viewed as language-related episodes in which teachers make use of translanguaging to scaffold their learners' understanding of new grammar and vocabulary. Specifically, the examples are instances of cross-linguistic transfer (Rajendram, 2019), which García and Li Wei (2014) describe as one of the goals of translanguaging pedagogy, although they would prefer to shed the concept of "transfer" (based on Cummins' model of linguistic interdependence) and instead conceptualise the process as one of integrating new features into an existing repertoire.

As well as the examples of teacher-led translanguaging above, interviewees had an informal policy of allowing or encouraging what Lewis, Jones and Baker (2012) call "pupil-directed translanguaging". Instances the teachers gave included learners using an expert language to explain the task, translate vocabulary or discuss a grammar point. Interviewees could all recall examples of when they had paired up learners who shared an expert language with the intention that they would make use of this language to help each other with a task. The way that translanguaging mediated "peer teaching" in these examples can be understood through the SCT lens of collaborative dialogue. More specifically, the examples given of learners explaining vocabulary or grammar to each other using their expert language may have been instances of language-related episodes in which they scaffolded each other's metalinguistic awareness (García and Li Wei, 2014; Martin-Beltrán, 2014).

This section has made a distinction between teacher-led and pupil-directed translanguaging, however both these manoeuvres are indicative of a translanguaging stance, which is to say the belief that

drawing on the learner's entire language repertoire is beneficial for scaffolding learning. Both kinds of translanguaging are therefore indicative of a language-as-resource orientation.

4.1.2 Affective–cognitive benefits

One of the ways in which teachers viewed translanguaging as a "bridge" to learning English was in the affective benefits they saw in the practice, especially around boosting learners' confidence. Rachel talked about attempting to say Sylheti words with the intention that the older women in her class – who were reluctant to say anything in English – could laugh at her mispronunciation and thereby be more willing to risk saying new words themselves. Elena commented that the way she made mistakes while talking to learners in Spanish signalled that mistakes were a "valid" part of classroom activity. Gemma said that encouraging learners to make use of their full linguistic repertoire meant that newly arrived students could gain "a bit of confidence to have a go", knowing they could "fall back on Sylheti" if they wanted.

These examples from Rachel, Elena and Gemma show them helping students to feel more confident and secure about trying out new linguistic features, suggesting that they saw translanguaging as a way of looking after their students' socioemotional wellbeing (García, Johnson and Seltzer, 2017). In SCT learners are understood to internalise the affective environment in the classroom. Elena allowing herself to make mistakes when speaking Spanish can be seen as attempting to regulate how learners perceive errors (Swain, Kinnear and Steinman, 2015). This "other-regulation" can potentially lead to better "self-regulation" in which learners perceive their own mistakes as legitimate. Cognition and affect should be viewed here not as separate but integrated (Kramsch, 2009): Rachel making mistakes for learners to laugh at seeks an affective response that can shape what learners think about taking risks with new language. Vygotsky referred to strong emotional experiences as *perezhivanie*, arguing that learners can use the memory of an enjoyable learning experience to regulate their emotions when faced with challenges later on (Swain, Kinnear and Steinman, 2015).

Teachers in this study viewed translanguaging as offering further affective–cognitive benefits for learners that can be understood in Vygotskian terms. A commonly recurring trope through the interviews and focus group was that the use of expert languages gave students a “break”. Elena had an informal policy of using increasing amounts of Spanish towards the end of a lesson as learners got tired. GC said they gave learners permission to use other languages during the break, believing this helped learners to “decompress”. During coronavirus-related lockdown Clara gave learners homework that involved reading texts in their expert languages, explaining that she felt learners were struggling with being at home all day with their children and needed homework that would “ease” them into the topic of the next class. She believed that relieving learners of the cognitive strain of reading in English helped them to “relax” when they were doing their homework. These are arguably all examples of teachers viewing translanguaging as a way to achieve what García, Johnson and Seltzer (2017) might describe as acting *con cariño*: with care for the learner’s socioemotional wellbeing.

4.1.3 Translanguaging-as-temporary-resource

Most teachers in this study viewed translanguaging as a bridge primarily for emergent bilinguals who were new to learning English. Rachel reported that she had an informal policy of encouraging her Bangladeshi students to speak Sylheti because some of them were “really really beginner”. Clara said that she used Kurdish occasionally to help a Kurdish-speaking woman in her class because she was one of the “lower-level” students. Conversely Elena said that she didn’t use Spanish much in her class of Entry 3 and Level 1 students “because they tend to speak in English quite automatically”. Similarly GC said that by the time learners reach Entry 2 level they could understand concept-check questions in English, and therefore GC felt that the use of other languages wasn’t necessary by that point.

This finding is comparable to Burton and Rajendram (2019), who report that the teachers they interviewed believed that translanguaging should be limited to “beginner classes or students with

lower proficiency levels" (p.34). Burton and Rajendram point to other research suggesting that it is common for teachers to perceive the usefulness of translanguaging in relation to the students' proficiency level and to act accordingly. They coin the term "translanguaging-as-temporary resource" as a way to describe this orientation, arguing that it positions translanguaging as a problem in many cases. Confirmation of Burton and Rajendram's interpretation can be found in Ruíz (1984), who argued that "transitional" programmes seeking to wean learners off their minority languages were indicative of a "problem-orientation" (p.20).

4.1.4 Conclusion

This theme has shown that teachers' informal policy was to use translanguaging to mediate learners' metalinguistic awareness through language-related episodes. Furthermore, translanguaging was a way for teachers to show care for learners' socioemotional wellbeing.

Simpson (2020) argues that ESOL teachers seldom make systematic use of translanguaging pedagogy. Given Gemma's background in academic research and theoretical knowledge of translanguaging, she did report making systematic use of translanguaging pedagogy in the classroom. Other teachers did not express an awareness of translanguaging pedagogy as a concept, however their approach nonetheless evidenced aspects of translanguaging design, for example in pairing learners who shared an expert language so that they could use their linguistic resources to help each other. Seen in terms of SCT, a less systematic use of translanguaging is likely to be less effective in achieving the goal of scaffolding learning (García, Johnson and Seltzer, 2017).

4.2 Theme two: maximising time speaking English

Elena explained that while her informal policy was to draw on languages other than English when it was "conducive to learning", nevertheless "I do try to maximise people's time speaking English

because … that's what they want to do and that's what I'm there to do." Both Elena and GC described the use of languages other than English as "the easier option", referring to the "danger" of "falling back" into the expert language as a kind of "comfort zone". In addition, GC said they preferred for one learner to not translate for another: "I don't think allowing another learner to speak on their behalf is helpful. It reinforces the idea that they can't do it themselves." Sociocultural theorists may question GC's suggestion that learners translating for each other is necessarily unhelpful, as it discounts the possibility that students are learning from each other in this way through a process of peer scaffolding (Martin-Beltrán, 2014). Furthermore, regarding the use of languages other than English as "the easier option" does not account for research indicating that translanguaging pedagogy can enable learners to access more complex texts and promote higher-order thinking (García, Johnson and Seltzer, 2017). As such the theme of teachers maximising time speaking English aligns with a language-as-problem orientation.

4.2.1 Language ideologies

Related to the theme of maximising time speaking English is the informal policy commonly articulated by interviewees that languages other than English are only there to be used "if necessary". On several occasions during the interviews teachers framed the use of languages other than English as "missed opportunities": for example, on observing a learner asking to borrow a pen in another language, GC would say "English please!" and provide the phrase in English, arguing "this is a learning opportunity or a revision opportunity for everyone in the class". Clara's learners appeared to hold a similar view to GC, as she said they seemed surprised when she set them the task of reading a text in their expert languages for homework: "I could sense that they were thinking, 'well I'm not supposed to read in my own language, I'm supposed to read in English'." Finally, Elena said of her learners, "it has to be like a rational decision almost for them to say, 'OK, I'm going to speak English now'."

The belief that something is *supposed* to happen, that its happening is rational and obvious, can be indicative of ideological influences (Kroskrity, 2004). Further to this, Clara reasoned that she had an informal policy of saying to students "we try to speak English" because "you're teaching ESOL in an English-speaking land; they are going to have to need it when they go shopping." Describing the UK as an "English-speaking land" may reflect a monolingual ideology in which one language stands above the rest. A different ideological position would be to regard the UK as a *multilingual land* in which learners habitually draw on many languages outside the classroom. Indeed the *Translation and Translanguaging* project (Moore, Bradley and Simpson, 2020) found that multilingual speakers in linguistically diverse UK cities draw on their entire linguistic repertoire throughout their personal and working lives, including – to use Clara's example – when they go out shopping. As a result, Simpson (2020) argues, "the walls of ESOL classrooms need to be porous: that is, the multilingual concerns of students' lives outside the classroom should closely inform the teaching and learning processes that happen inside" (p.55). To draw on the example above of when GC said "English please!", it is useful to teach the English phrase for borrowing a pen, however signalling to students that the request can only be made in English denies the translanguaging reality of their lives outside the ESOL classroom.

4.2.2 The influence of Communicative Language Teaching

Teachers reflected on how their informal policy of maximising time speaking English was informed by their training and related understanding of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). GC, like Gemma and Rachel, reported that when they did their CELTA training, "English only" was presented as a "rule" to follow: "I was always told on the CELTA, 'that's what students expect and that's what you should encourage them to do'." While Elena and Clara didn't recall being taught this in their teacher training, Elena drew on her degree in English Language Teaching to support her position of "maximising" English: "it's not easy to automatise the language use in your head … if you spend that time [in class] speaking Spanish … the automatic way of producing language is not being developed." Elena's

rationale derives from a cognitive model of skill acquisition theory, in which a learner is understood to automatise the use of new language skills through a process of repetition (Segalowitz, 2003). Elena also referenced Krashen's (1982) comprehensible input hypothesis when she said, "the more input [in English] you get, the more you're going to learn, obviously only *if* the input is processed." Krashen's cognitive-interactionist hypothesis posited that *i+1* – meaning language input that learners can understand (*i*) which also contains something new to be learned *(+1*) – was necessary and sufficient for second language acquisition. Subsequent research in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) has not supported Krashen's hypothesis and the consensus is that it is no longer tenable (Ortega, 2009).

Simpson (2020) argues that CLT is particularly susceptible to a "monolingual bias", while Ortega (2014) points to a monolingual ideology in the field of SLA, arguing that the target language user is taken to be a monolingual "native speaker" of English. By contrast, Li Wei (2020) posits that the target language user of translanguaging pedagogy is a bilingual or multilingual speaker who draws on their full language repertoire to convey meaning. May (2014) argues that many assumptions of SLA therefore need rethinking to incorporate the dynamic bilingualism of translanguaging. May concludes that this "multilingual turn" has the potential to retheorise much of what is understood in the fields of SLA and TESOL research. Realising this potential would impact on much of the ESOL teacher training that the teachers referenced in their interviews.

According to Jaspers (2020), teacher training is one of many "ideological centres" that teachers must negotiate during their professional practice. Other such "centres" include their colleagues, learners, school and wider education system. Kroskrity (2004) argues that there is always "multiplicity and contention" in language ideologies, such that a teacher's disposition to translanguaging may go against their teacher training or expectations from learners themselves that they should only be speaking English in the classroom. Gemma conveyed this point when she spoke of how the "strong monolingual imprint of training" left her feeling "guilty" about speaking languages other than English

in the classroom: "even though I'm totally 100 percent pedagogically convinced by this … I still myself feel like I should be speaking English." The necessity of negotiating competing ideological centres can lead teachers to what Jaspers calls "chronic ambivalence", evidenced not only in Gemma's profession of guilt but also in the opposing orientations of translanguaging as problem and resource that have emerged in these first two themes.

4.2.3 The role of "immersion"

A further ideological tension relating to this theme emerged during the card-cluster activity in the focus group, in which participants generated a theme they later titled "Immersion is important". Clara explained that the rationale behind her informal policy of "try and keep to English" was: "these students get two hours a week, that's all, and at home they are not speaking English at all, so … trying to immerse them in English … is the best way for them to learn I think, or that's the best way I have learned." Elena drew on her own experience of moving to the UK from Poland to support this point: "when I first came to the UK, I was really actively trying not to spend time with Polish people because I knew that wasn't going to help me with learning English." Elena identifies with students who work as cleaners, because it was a job she did herself in which she didn't get much exposure to English, especially compared to when she started working in a restaurant, where "I felt like I had 10 hours English lessons a day at work". Rachel then questioned whether their point that immersion is important "goes against everything that we're saying" about the benefits of translanguaging.

The common-sense proposition that monolingual immersion – defined as maximising English in the ESOL classroom – is preferable to what I would term "multilingual immersion", or exposure to translanguaging in the classroom, also featured in Burton and Rajendram's study. One of the teachers they interviewed reported that she began each semester by giving students the slogan "Live Your Life in English", while another said to learners: "English everywhere, everything you do". Burton and Rajendram relate this assumption to what Cummins termed the "maximum exposure hypothesis",

according to which English-only immersion at school is the best way to improve the language skills of language-minoritised students. Cummins (2001) drew on research into school-based bilingual education programmes in the US to argue that making use of bilingual students' home languages helped them to build language skills more successfully than any attempt to remove these languages from the classroom.

Even though Clara and Elena argued that their informal policy of monolingual immersion provided the best method to learn a language, we know from the previous theme that they also employed a translanguaging design that drew on learners' other languages in classroom and homework activities. Linguistic ethnographic research has suggested that teachers' professed notions of linguistic purism often go against their observed translanguaging practices (Martínez, Hikida and Duran, 2015; Zúñiga, 2016), which would appear to be the case here as well. This finding further evidences Jaspers' argument that teachers face "chronic ambivalence" as they make pedagogical decisions based on competing ideological centres of experience.

4.2.4 Conclusion

This theme is the closest to any that emerged from Burton and Rajendram's thematic analysis, which they labelled "languages as mutually exclusive". Like several participants in this study, most teachers that Burton and Rajendram interviewed saw languages in competition with each other for classroom time, with any time spent on other languages seen as a detriment to English language learning. In reality, translanguaging need not undermine language learning in the way that teachers in both studies are concerned, evidenced by the many examples of translanguaging as a resource given in theme one. García, Johnson and Seltzer (2017) do not propose a free-for-all situation in which any language is used at any time unsystematically: "a translanguaging classroom is purposeful and strategic, not chaotic and messy" (p.10). In a similar way Rachel and Gemma acknowledged the risk of learners shying away from using English, however they framed this as an aspect of classroom

management to be skilfully navigated. Rachel said, "you've got to have *some* English speaking going on, otherwise you're not going to learn, so you know sometimes I'm like [claps three times] 'time for some English'."

4.3 Theme three: translanguaging woven through the social fabric of the class

When asked at what stages in her lesson students spoke other languages, Rachel replied that other languages "weaved through" the lesson as a whole, later adding that they were "woven in constantly". The image of languages "woven" into the social fabric of the classroom conveys a view of translanguaging as integral to multilingual speakers' communicative practices. Elena described how using Spanish was an "intuitive" process that happened "quite naturally" both for herself and her students. Likewise GC commented that students "instinctively" or "naturally" worked together in languages other than English. This supports the observation that humans have a translanguaging instinct (García and Li Wei, 2014) which finds expression in social encounters in the classroom.

This theme brings together teachers' views of translanguaging both as an important resource for learners to create social bonds and as a problematic force for social exclusion or division.

4.3.1 Social togetherness

All participants spoke about how they viewed translanguaging as useful for building student–teacher relationships in the classroom. Rachel and Clara had the informal policy of using common Arabic phrases in rituals of greeting and departure, with Rachel observing that students "automatically feel more relaxed" when this happens, and Clara adding it was a way of bringing the class together. Elena reported that she sometimes drew on her Latin American students' cultural identities in the classroom: "I made an example - a sentence with 'empanadas' in it and … it feels like we're closer to one another … more like friends maybe than like a student–teacher relationship."

As well as promoting good rapport between teachers and students, participants also viewed translanguaging as an important resource for relationship building between students. GC acknowledged the broader aims of the community organisation where they volunteer, recognising that students wanted to speak languages other than English before class and during the break "to help with their social networking and support networks in the UK." Translanguaging is here viewed as strengthening a social fabric that stretches beyond the classroom, especially important, GC said, for "ESOL learners [who] may have few friends and networks in the UK." Rachel likewise stressed the importance of translanguaging in her classroom, where all the learners are mothers of children who attend a school for students with autism: "this is their one time when they get together … out of their homes and are able to tell other people about their worries … so it's not just a language class, I see it also very much as an important time for them to help each other and support each other." Rachel's informal policy is to promote translanguaging in this learner group more than any other, explaining that they have lived in the UK for up to 30 years and that their motivation for attending ESOL classes was as much social as educational.

These findings reflect one of García, Johnson and Seltzer's (2017) four "primary purposes" of translanguaging, namely supporting students' bilingual identities and socioemotional wellbeing: "translanguaging classrooms are like familias, always acting together to promote the wellbeing of the whole" (p.157). GC's informal policy that other languages are allowed during the break compares to Goossens (2019), who reported on a multilingual Dutch-medium school in Brussels that allows students to use their home languages only in the corridors and the playground. I would term this a "language-as-limited-resource" orientation, as it positions translanguaging as a resource outside the classroom and a problem academically. Related to this, Rachel reflected on how she makes less use of other languages in classes where students' motivation is less social, for example in a class she had of women from South America "who have been in the UK less than a year and they just want to learn English, they want to get work". This suggests that Rachel too has a language-as-limited-resource

orientation, as she viewed translanguaging as more problematic for those whose main motivation was to learn English.

4.3.2 Social tensions

While teachers cited many instances in which they viewed translanguaging as valuable for strengthening the social fabric of the class, they also gave examples of when it had caused tensions. Rachel observed that while many students spoke Sylheti in class, some would get "very cross" at others for using the language. Gemma was also aware that some students might not feel happy or comfortable with languages other than English being used in class, and she reported that learners could be "rude" about other students in languages she didn't understand.

Rachel's and Gemma's examples temper García, Johnson and Seltzer's somewhat idealistic notion that classroom *familias* always act harmoniously for the wellbeing of all. As the discussion of Storch (2002) showed in section 2.2, interactions between learners don't always lead to collaborative dialogue. Gemma made the point that "rudeness" happens in the class regardless of the language that's used, however she reflected that she might be "blissfully unaware" that pejorative comments were being made in a language she didn't understand. This is an issue rarely addressed in translanguaging pedagogy textbooks such as García, Johnson and Seltzer (2017), but it doubtless should be. Rachel commented that although some Sylheti speakers in her class got "cross" when others spoke the language, this was an aspect of classroom management like any other, and it wouldn't cause her to stop the use of Sylheti, "you just need to manage that as well, don't you?"

4.3.3 The fairness issue

While Rachel held translanguaging in positive regard in her class where learners shared an expert language, she felt very differently about multilingual classes where the only language that learners

have in common is English: “When you’ve got 50 percent from Turkey and then you’ve got 50 percent from all other countries, and when they go off in Turkish, it can - I do think there’s a limit to how much that should go on, because it’s not fair on the others when they feel left out.” All teachers in this study could think of classes where they had a majority of learners who shared an expert language and a minority who spoke a variety of other languages. The dilemma as to how to respond fairly in this situation emerged as arguably the most substantial and problematic issue relating to translanguaging in this study.

Rachel’s sentiment that translanguaging practices could be unfair in some circumstances was shared by all teachers. Elena expressed concern that a linguistic majority speaking Spanish in class could “exclude” those who didn’t, while GC described an informal policy of withholding their use of Chinese and Portuguese because doing so gave all students “the same opportunity … to understand what’s going on”. When faced with multilingual classrooms like the ones described above, most teachers in this study responded with an informal policy of “limiting” the use of other languages due to concern about the social division it could cause. In a focus group discussion of a scenario where 70-to-90 percent of learners used an expert language that the rest didn’t understand, Clara said it was something she would try to “break” or “come down on”, while GC stated that they would not make use of other languages in this context.

These findings are comparable to Burton and Rajendram (2019), in which three of the teachers enforced an informal English-only policy in part due to concerns around the fairness of translanguaging and its potential to exclude some students. Another teacher they interviewed however allowed translanguaging and put the onus on the students to “broker” their use of other languages in the class. In the current study however Gemma took a more directive approach to managing the fairness issue in a way that allowed translanguaging to continue. In her class, where all learners were Sylheti speakers except for one Thai speaker, Gemma acknowledged that the use of Sylheti could be “unhelpful” at times, and she therefore addressed the matter with students directly.

For example, during a small-group activity she would say “this has to be in English because Sarai is here, but if you want to help each other out [in Sylheti] do it quietly”. She would also spend time supporting the Thai learner individually, encouraging her to use Google Translate and other digital resources that enabled her to draw on her Thai language resources. Gemma’s strategies fit with García, Johnson and Seltzer’s (2017) recommendations for what to do in multilingual classrooms where students and teachers have many different languages to draw on, most of which they do not have in common.

It is perhaps unsurprising that researchers advocating for translanguaging pedagogy are disinclined to regard the use other of other languages as unfair in the kind of multilingual classroom under consideration. As part of the CUNY-NYSIEB research project reviewed in section 2.1 above, Woodley (2016) investigated a classroom where students had eight home languages, commenting that it is unlikely a teacher exists who would speak all the languages students knew. Instead Woodley highlighted ways that the teacher helped students to make the most of their expert languages. Woodley’s teacher, like Gemma, sought to promote the use of other languages in a way that was equitable for students in the linguistic minority. With her informal policy of encouraging learners to use their full language repertoires in ways that did not disadvantage other students, Gemma also countered a hierarchy in which English occupies the highest status in the classroom (Fredricks and Warriner, 2016). Her policy sought to achieve fairness in a way that avoided the symbolic violence of “breaking” or “coming down on” languages other than English.

4.3.4 Conclusion

The informal policy of most teachers in this study was to limit languages other than English out of a desire to ensure that all students had a fair chance to participate. Given however that an instinct for translanguaging was “woven” into their classrooms regardless of their policy, it is arguably neither possible nor desirable to unpick other languages from the social fabric. As Gemma has shown, it is

possible to enact informal language policy in a way that enables learners to draw on their full repertoire of languages while also ensuring fairness.

Although teachers acknowledged that translanguaging helped learners to build their friendship groups and social networks, some argued that other languages needing limiting to certain contexts, for example during the break. I have described this as a "language-as-limited-resource" orientation, which like Burton and Rajendram's "language-as-temporary-resource" orientation positions translanguaging as a problem for learners in certain contexts.

4.4 Theme four: translanguaging as the fruit of participatory pedagogy

In their discussions of translanguaging, Gemma, Elena and Rachel made explicit reference to the tradition of participatory pedagogy developed by Paulo Freire (1993). Gemma's organisation, English for Action, were lead actors in the development of *Our Languages* (2019), discussed in section 2.4 above. During her interview she described her organisation's translanguaging stance as "the fruit … of our participatory pedagogy research". Rachel shared that the organisation where she works, and where she did part of her teacher training, also promotes participatory pedagogy. Although she reported that her organisation did not have a formal policy on using languages other than English, she joked: "I think if I was to say I only allow English in the classroom, I'd probably be fired."

4.4.1 Participatory curriculum development

One of Elsa Auerbach's (1992) principles of participatory pedagogy, namely that students themselves should decide the content of the curriculum, is identifiable to a greater or lesser extent in most interviewees' discussions of translanguaging. During the focus group Clara and Elena both agreed that listening to learners during breaktimes enables the teacher to identify student interests and make these into the topics of future classes. Elena, who could understand her learners as they spoke

Spanish, affirmed that “this really links to basing the curriculum around the students and active listening, so it’s just helpful knowing the language of the students.” Elena, whose organisation implements participatory pedagogy, is here referencing Auerbach’s (1992) technique of “conscious listening” – also referred to as “listening between the lines” – to identify curriculum topics.

Rachel, who unlike Elena doesn’t share her students’ expert language, nonetheless has an informal policy of combining translanguaging with active listening to generate curriculum topics: “I’ll say ‘please share with me what you’re talking about [in Sylheti] and … for example, someone’s mother’s in hospital, and then that will lead into the English language we would use to say, ‘Oh I’m so sorry, get well soon’.” García, Johnson and Seltzer (2017) describe how encouraging learners to bring their personal experiences into the classroom in this way helps them to both learn new content and support their “socioemotional growth”.

Clara also instanced how she enabled her learners to draw on their wider linguistic repertoires to generate content for a lesson. She described setting a homework task of asking learners to read or listen to news articles produced in their expert languages. Learners then had to report back in English on stories that interested them. The stories they chose covered politics, environmentalism and COVID-19 outbreaks in countries they had migrated from. García, Johnson and Seltzer (2017) argue that a translanguaging design like this helps learners to process more complex content and concepts. They further suggest that students perform better in English when they can draw on their entire language repertoire first.

Gemma and Rachel also cited how they combined translanguaging with students’ engagement in world events to enable their “meaning making”, explaining how they would invite learners to express their thoughts using “multilingual resources in the way they see fit.” Both shared the view that allowing learners to draw on whatever meaning-making resources they had enabled them to “voice their ideas” and remove “the barrier of not being able to express themselves in English”. This approach reflects Seltzer and Collins’ (2016) point that translanguaging helps by “releasing students’

voices and enabling them to bring their whole selves into the classroom” (p.153). This in turn relates to the principle of participatory pedagogy that learners are “experts on their own reality” (Auerbach, 1992, p.19), and that the goal of lessons is to bring this reality to the fore in a process of *conscientização*.

4.4.2 Sociolinguistic citizenship

Reflecting on her organisation’s participatory pedagogy, Gemma explained that English for Action’s support for translanguaging was linked to their “fight against linguistic xenophobia” in the UK: “more recently, particularly since the 2016 [Brexit] referendum, it feels like monolingualism has become much more aggressive and … it feels even more politically essential to be bringing multilingual pedagogies into the classroom, because it feels like otherwise we’re kind of also mirroring the world outside.” Gemma’s argument that monolingual ideology is turning increasingly aggressive in the UK is supported by Simpson (2019), who states that the 2016 vote to leave the European Union was followed by an increase in linguistic xenophobia, including disapproval, hostility or violence towards those speaking languages other than English in public spaces. Responding to an idea I introduced in the focus group that translanguaging is ideologically and politically opposed to linguistic purism, Rachel, Elena and Clara expressed the view that they were “rebel teachers” who stood apart from much of the ESOL teaching profession in the UK in the way they chose to “break the rules” of English-only classrooms.

Using translanguaging to oppose monolingual ideology aligns with a language-as-right orientation, which affirms the learner’s entitlement to use their minority languages. Clara expressed a wish to counter the linguistic discrimination that she believed a Kurdish-speaking learner from Iraq would have experienced in the past: “just to say ‘Hello, how are you?’, ‘It’s here’, ‘Is that OK?’ to her in Kurdish is … sort of reaching out, I suppose, just to say, ‘You’re welcome, we’re happy you’re here’.”

Rachel describes how she is aligned with her organisation's language-as-right orientation when she says to ESOL learners: "you should be proud of your languages and your culture and use it."

In identifying themselves as "rebel teachers" who seek to "fight" linguistic xenophobia by welcoming and embracing minority languages, participants in this study can be seen as sharing Freire's (1998) idea of "armed love … the fighting love of those [teachers] convinced of the right and the duty to fight, to denounce, and to announce" (p.209). In this context, Rachel's informal policy of encouraging learners to be proud of their languages can be seen as promoting their sociolinguistic citizenship, and the action of speaking those languages an "act of citizenship" on the part of her students (Rampton, Cooke and Holmes, 2018). From this perspective, giving recognition to minority languages in the ESOL classroom seeks to prefigure recognition in wider society, what Stroud (in Rampton, Cooke and Holmes, 2018) called "a better way of living that is *foreshadowed* in the present (and past) but is as yet *unrealized*" (p.22).

Nancy and Carmen, two teachers interviewed in Burton and Rajendram (2019), shared Clara and Rachel's language-as-right orientation in saying to their students, "all languages are welcome" and "your language is important". One difference however is that all the teachers they interviewed worked at a university that imposed institutional constraints on implementing a policy of translanguaging, constraints that no participants in this study expressed when asked if their organisation had a policy about the use of other languages in the classroom. It is worth noting that the relatively small third-sector organisations at which the interviewees teach do not have the extensive policy structures of those at the university where Burton and Rajendram's interviewees worked.

4.4.3 Ideologies in tension

Given that participants' students were not interviewed for this research, it is not possible to say whether their teachers' participatory-cum-translanguaging pedagogy led to *conscientização*, assuming it would be possible to measure critical consciousness. There is however some indication from interviewees that not all students were ideologically aligned with their teachers' social-justice orientation. Rachel could think of a learner in her class whom she described as "old fashioned" and likely to "get cross" when other students spoke Sylheti. Clara observed that "learners are almost shocked the first time it happens, when you say, 'OK, use your L1', because … they feel it's against the law in the classroom for them to use their own language." This may reflect Kroskrity's (2010) point that bilingual learners who are exposed to institutional monolingual ideology may come to view their translanguaging practice as a deficiency, "a crutch-like compensation for their imperfect command of either language" (p.204). Gemma conceded that English for Action's participatory pedagogy sits uneasily with the preference for English-only classrooms expressed by some students. This highlights a tension in participatory pedagogy between the social-justice principle of resisting linguistic xenophobia and the principle of giving learners the power to decide what happens in the classroom. Gemma feels however that it is possible to work towards resolving such ideological tensions: "It's important to have a clear idea of *why* you're asking the learner to use their own language, and convey that as much as you can, so that the learner feels secure." Kleyn (2016) supports Gemma's position, arguing that students must understand the rationale for including languages other than English in the lesson.

4.4.4 Conclusion

This theme has shown how some teachers' informal policy makes use of translanguaging to achieve the goals of participatory pedagogy, such as basing the curriculum on students' lives and developing

their sociocritical awareness. It has also shown how these teachers displayed a language-as-right orientation in the way they promoted translanguaging in the classroom.

This research has highlighted a tension between the translanguaging ideology of some teachers and the monolingual ideology of some learners. Nonetheless, education research suggests that an individual's language ideology can and does change (Menken and Sanchez, 2019), and that introducing learners to the concept of translanguaging can be a way to develop their "critical metalinguistic awareness" in a way that may lead to ideological shifts (Cooke, Bryers and Winstanley, 2019).

4.5 Summary

To a differing extent all the teachers in this study viewed translanguaging as a resource that built bridges in their ESOL classrooms, for example a bridge to vocabulary or grammar knowledge. They portrayed translanguaging as a tool that could mediate the development of metalinguistic awareness, boost learners' confidence and sense of wellbeing, or just give them a break from the cognitive strain of language learning.

Viewing translanguaging as a bridge went alongside the informal policy some teachers had of maximising time speaking English in the classroom. They pointed to their teacher training, informed by Communicative Language Teaching and Second Language Acquisition research, to give a rationale for this policy. Addressing this language-as-problem orientation requires a conceptual shift from the idea of monolingual immersion to that of multilingual immersion, in which ESOL classes create a translanguaging environment that reflects the linguistically diverse capital city where learners live.

Participants viewed translanguaging as a chance for teachers to build bonds with students as well as between students themselves. However they did not think that translanguaging served the purpose of strengthening the social fabric of the class in all situations, as they thought that other languages could

exclude or even antagonise some students. This reflected either a language-as-limited-resource or language-as-problem orientation, depending on the context.

Finally, some teachers viewed their participatory pedagogy as cultivating translanguaging practices. They argued that if teachers and students should have equal power and status in the classroom, so too should all the languages they speak. Welcoming, valuing and using other languages can here be understood as according sociolinguistic citizenship, which is to say recognising a multilingual speaker's right to public acceptance, starting in the ESOL classroom. Interviewees thought that not all their learners necessarily shared this language-as-right orientation however, which is why it is important to discuss with learners the role of translanguaging in the classroom.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

5.1 Summary

This study set out to explore the views and informal language policy of ESOL teachers in third-sector organisations in London. As Burton and Rajendram (2019) also found, teachers' views and policy are not neatly categorisable into language orientations but rather are susceptible to change depending on the context. For example, the view that translanguaging is useful for emergent bilinguals might express itself as a language-as-resource orientation in a beginner class and a language-as-problem orientation in a higher-level class. Faced with this, the researcher can either create a new orientation such as "translanguaging-as-temporary-resource" (as Burton and Rajendram did) or pigeonhole the view as a language-as-problem orientation (as Ruíz did). The issue with the latter option is that it neither acknowledges the nuance of the teacher's position nor reflects the contention of ideologies underlying it.

While it is not possible to make neat categorisations of which teachers held which orientations, it is possible to plot the extent of teachers' translanguaging stance to the degree of systematicity with which they enacted an informal policy of translanguaging design and shifts. At one end of the spectrum, Gemma's strong translanguaging stance was accompanied by reports of clear translanguaging design and shifts. At the other end of the spectrum, GC's much weaker translanguaging stance was reflected in the way they reported mostly avoiding a translanguaging design and a reluctance to engage in translanguaging shifts. One possible explanation for this is that Gemma had already developed her stance through research into translanguaging theory and pedagogy, whereas GC had not. Other participants can be placed at points along this spectrum, with Rachel closer to Gemma, Clara closer to GC and Elena in the middle.

While a teacher's ideological support for translanguaging can be related to their willingness to engage in the practice pedagogically, this study also found that teachers' views and informal policy regarding

translanguaging moved in both directions along a spectrum from language-as-resource to language-as-problem in the course of their interviews. This may be partly due to the nature of the qualitative interview process, with different questions helping to generate contrasting responses. Equally however the interviewees' responses also indicate that teachers have to negotiate many ideological centres in the course of their professional formation and practice. If their views and informal policy therefore reflect a mixture of language orientations, it should be considered that these orientations have been shaped by the multiple and contested nature of language ideologies themselves. When a teacher views translanguaging as both problem and resource, their informal policy can reflect what Jaspers terms "chronic ambivalence". The most telling example of chronic ambivalence emerged in theme two, where some teachers expressed an informal policy of maximising time speaking English in the classroom. This appears to contradict the policy that teachers expressed in other themes of encouraging translanguaging for the social, cognitive and affective benefits – not to mention the political support for linguistic minorities – they felt it offered.

5.2 Limitations

Reflexivity involves critically questioning the choices made in the course of research. In this regard, one epistemological limitation of my study is that I only elicited teachers' reported classroom practice rather than observing this practice through ethnographic participant observation. Existing linguistic ethnographic research suggests that there is a difference between what teachers say and what they do about translanguaging (Martínez, Hikida and Duran, 2015), and these differences can be explored for their ideological components (Codó, 2008). While it was still possible for me to compare teachers' views with their reported classroom practice, it would undoubtedly add to the credibility of the research to triangulate interview data with participant observation (Mason, 2002). This suggests a direction for future research.

A further limitation comes in the way I operationalised "translanguaging" in my research questions. I could not assume that participants would bring a knowledge of translanguaging theory into the interview, so following Burton and Rajendram's example I substituted "translanguaging" with the phrase "using languages other than English" in my interview questions. Not only did this phrase help ensure my results would be comparable to Burton and Rajendram's, it can be justified through its repeated use in the literature: for example, García, Johnson and Seltzer (2017) use the phrase "languages other than English" so often that they shorten it to "LOTE" throughout. That said, there are at least two limitations to using this phrase. Firstly, the phrase represents only a partial operationalisation of translanguaging, which more broadly incorporates how speakers make meaning by fluidly drawing on other linguistic features such as register or dialect, or even multimodal components such as imagery or paralinguistic cues (gesture, facial expression and so on). Secondly, the use of LOTE as a substitute for translanguaging risks conveying to the interviewee or reader a structuralist notion of speakers shuttling between languages, as in code-switching, which contrasts with the poststructuralist notion that speakers fluidly draw on "disaggregated" linguistic features that take the form of named languages due to sociopolitical pressures (Creese and Blackledge, 2015, García and Kleyn, 2016b).

5.3 Recommendations

Translanguaging theory contrasts starkly with much of SLA research in the way the latter positions the language practices of bi/multilingual speakers as deficient when compared to "nativelike" use of the target language (May, 2014). Given the influence of SLA on TESOL through teacher training and university degrees, further research is recommended to continue the "multilingual turn" in SLA, for example to retheorise notions such as cross-linguistic interference and fossilisation. Redressing this monolingual bias in SLA would make it productive to do further, necessary research into the efficacy

of translanguaging pedagogy. Both translanguaging theory and SLA have much to gain from reconciling their two polarities.

The introduction to this research quoted Valdés saying that teachers who haven't been exposed to translanguaging pedagogy cannot imagine alternatives to their monolingual teaching practices. The findings of this study demonstrate however that even teachers who haven't been exposed to the literature on translanguaging pedagogy still find ways to enact informal policy that favours translanguaging in the classroom. Nonetheless, Valdés is likely correct to argue that training in translanguaging pedagogy could help teachers both to develop their translanguaging stance and to implement translanguaging design and shifts more systematically. Studies by Deroo and Ponzio (2019) and Menken and Sanchez (2019) support the idea that teachers' translanguaging ideology can shift as a result of in-service training. If this is indeed the case, my research could be used to inform teachers' professional formation in translanguaging pedagogy. For instance, this study has identified many concerns that teachers have about implementing translanguaging pedagogy, be it that the use of a language other than English is unfair in a class where not all students share that language, or that translanguaging slows down language development in emergent bilinguals. It may be helpful to anticipate teachers' concerns like these and address them directly in training. Those involved in teacher training – including myself – can use these research findings to understand some of the views and informal policy that teachers have, to find examples of good classroom practice and to consider some of the potential benefits and pitfalls of translanguaging pedagogy.

References

Adami, E. and Sherris, A. (eds.) (2018). *Making Signs, Translanguaging Ethnographies: Exploring Urban, Rural and Educational Spaces*. Blue Ridge Summit, Pennsylvania: Multilingual Matters.

Atkinson, D. and Kelly-Holmes, H. (2016). 'Exploring language attitudes and ideologies in university students' discussion of Irish in a context of increasing language diversity', *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 16 (2), pp.199–215.

Auerbach, E.R. (1992). *Making Meaning Making Change: Participatory Curriculum Development for Adult ESL Learners*. McHenry, Illinois: Delta Systems.

Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism.* (Third ed.) Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Becker, A. (1988). 'Language in particular: A lecture' in Tannen, D. (ed.) *Linguistics in context.* Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex, pp.17–35.

Briggs, C. (2007). 'Anthropology, Interviewing, and Communicability in Contemporary Society'. *Current Anthropology*, 48 (4), pp.551–580.

Burton, J. and Rajendram, S. (2019). 'Translanguaging-as-Resource: University ESL Instructors' Language Orientations and Attitudes Toward Translanguaging', *TESL Canada Journal*, 36 (1), pp.21–47.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). 'Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguaging', *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, pp.401–417.

Carroll, K.S. and Sambolín Morales, A.N. (2016). 'Using university students' L1 as a resource: Translanguaging in a Puerto Rican ESL classroom', *Bilingual Research Journal*, 39 (3–4), pp.248–262.

Catalano, T. and Hamann, E.T. (2016). 'Multilingual pedagogies and pre-service teachers: Implementing "language as a resource" orientations in teacher education programs', *Bilingual Research Journal*, 39 (3–4), pp.263–278.

Charalambous, P., Charalambous, C. and Zembylas, M. (2016). 'Troubling translanguaging: Language ideologies, superdiversity and interethnic conflict', *Applied Linguistics Review*, 7 (3), pp.327–352.

Codó, E. (2008). 'Interviews and Questionnaires' in Li Wei and Moyer, M.G. (eds.) *The Blackwell Guide to Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp.158–176.

Cooke, M., Bryers, D. and Winstanley, B. (2019). 'Our Languages: Towards Sociolinguistic Citizenship in ESOL' in Cooke, M. and Peutrell, R. (eds.) *Brokering Britain Education Citizens: Exploring ESOL and Citizenship*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp.137–155.

Cooke, M. and Peutrell, R. (eds.) (2019). *Brokering Britain Education Citizens: Exploring ESOL and Citizenship*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Creese, A. and Blackledge, A. (2010). 'Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching?', *The Modern Language Journal*, 94 (1), pp.103–115.

Creese, A. and Blackledge, A. (2015). 'Translanguaging and Identity in Educational Settings', *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, pp.20–35.

Cummins, J. (2001). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society.* (Second ed.) Los Angeles: California Association for Bilingual Education.

De Jong, E.J., Li, Z., Zafar, A.M. and Wu, C.-H. (2016). 'Language policy in multilingual contexts: Revisiting Ruiz's "language-as-resource" orientation', *Bilingual Research Journal*, 39 (3–4), pp.200–212.

Deroo, M.R. and Ponzio, C. (2019). 'Confronting ideologies: A discourse analysis of in-service teachers' translanguaging stance through an ecological lens', *Bilingual Research Journal*, 42 (2), pp.214–231.

Duarte, J. (2018). 'Translanguaging in the context of mainstream multilingual education', *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 17 (2), pp.232–247.

ESOL Coordinator Job Description (2020). Retrieved from: https://www.charityjob.co.uk/jobs/community-action-for-refugees-and-asylum-seekers/esol-coordinator/704590 (Accessed 13 August 2020).

Fredricks, D.E. and Warriner, D.S. (2016). '"We speak English in here and English only!": Teacher and ELL youth perspectives on restrictive language education', *Bilingual Research Journal*, 39 (3–4), pp.309–323.

Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Translated by M.B. Ramos. London: Penguin.

Freire, P. (1998). *Teachers as Cultural Workers: Letters to Those Who Dare Teach*. Translated by D. Macedo, D. Koike and A. Oliveira. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

García, O. (2020). 'Foreword: Co-labor and Re-Performances' in Moore, E., Bradley, J. and Simpson, J. (eds.) *Translanguaging as Transformation: The Collaborative Construction of New Linguistic Realities*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp.xvii–xxi.

García, O., Johnson, S.I. and Seltzer, K. (2017). *The Translanguaging Classroom: Leveraging Student Bilingualism for Learning*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Calson.

García, O. and Kleyn, T. (2016a). 'Translanguaging theory in education' in García, O. and Kleyn, T. (eds.) (2016) *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments*. New York, New York: Routledge, pp.9–33.

García, O. and Kleyn, T. (2016b). 'A Translanguaging Education Policy: Disruptions and Creating Spaces of Possibility' in García, O. and Kleyn, T. (eds.) (2016) *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments*. New York, New York: Routledge, pp.181–201.

García, O. and Li Wei (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Goossens, S. (2019). 'Embracing multilingualism, experiencing old tensions. Promoting and problematising language at a self-declared multilingual school', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, pp.1–14.

Guba, E.G. and Lincoln, Y.S. (1985). 'Epistemological and Methodological Bases of Naturalistic Inquiry', *Educational Communication and Technology*, 30 (4), pp.233–252.

Heller, M. and Martin-Jones, M. (eds.) (2001). *Voices of Authority: Education and Linguistic Difference*. Westport, Connecticut: Ablex.

Heller, M., Pietikainen, S. and Pujolar, J. (2018). *Critical Sociolinguistics Research Methods: Studying Language Issues That Matter*. New York: Routledge.

Hult, F.M. and Hornberger, N.H. (2016). 'Revisiting Orientations in Language Planning: Problem, Right, and Resource as an Analytical Heuristic', *The Bilingual Review*, 33 (3), pp.30–49.

Jaspers, J. (2017). 'The transformative limits of translanguaging'. Paper 226, *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*. King's College London.

Jaspers, J. (2020). 'Linguistic dilemmas and chronic ambivalence in the classroom: introduction', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, pp.1–15.

Jørgensen, J.N. (2008). 'Polylingual Languaging Around and Among Children and Adolescents', *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5 (3), pp.161–176.

Kalocsányiová, E. (2017). 'Towards a repertoire-building approach: multilingualism in language classes for refugees in Luxembourg', *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 17 (4), pp.474–493.

Kleyn, T. (2016). 'Setting the Path: Implications for Teachers and Teacher Educators' in García, O. and Kleyn, T. (eds.) (2016) *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments*. New York, New York: Routledge, pp.202–220.

Kramsch, C. J. (2009). 'The embodied self' in Kramsch, C.J. (ed.) *The multilingual subject: what foreign language learners say about their experience and why it matters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.53–77.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kroskrity, P.V. (2004). 'Language Ideologies' in Duranti, A. (ed.) *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology.* Oxford: Blackwell, pp.496–517.

Kroskrity, P.V. (2010). 'Language ideologies – Evolving perspectives' in Jaspers, J., Östman, J.-O. and Verschueren, J. (eds.) *Society and Language Use*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: John Benjamins, pp.192–211.

Lewis, G., Jones, B. and Baker, C. (2012). 'Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation', *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18 (7), pp.655–670.

Li Wei (2014). 'Epilogue: multi-competence and the translanguaging instinct' in Cook, V. (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Multi-Competence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.533–543.

Li Wei (2018). 'Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language', *Applied Linguistics*, 39 (1), pp.9–30.

Li Wei (2020). *Trans-ing Language and Cognition: Debates and Directions of Translanguaging Research.* Available at: https://aovivo.abralin.org/lives/li-wei/ (Accessed: 13 August 2020).

Martin-Beltrán, M. (2014). '"What Do You Want to Say?" How Adolescents Use Translanguaging to Expand Learning Opportunities', *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 8 (3), pp.208–230.

Martin-Beltrán, M., Daniel, S., Peercy, M. and Silverman, R. (2017). 'Developing a Zone of Relevance: Emergent Bilinguals' Use of Social, Linguistic, and Cognitive Support in Peer-Led Literacy Discussions', *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 11 (3), pp.152–166.

Martínez, R.A., Hikida, M. and Duran, L. (2015). 'Unpacking Ideologies of Linguistic Purism: How Dual Language Teachers Make Sense of Everyday Translanguaging', *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9 (1), pp.26–42.

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative Researching*. (Second ed.) London: Sage.

May, S. (2014). 'Disciplinary Divides, Knowledge Construction, and the Multilingual Turn' in May, S. (ed.) *The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and Bilingual Education*. New York, New York: Routledge, pp.7–31.

Menken, K., and García, O. (eds.) (2010). *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policy makers*. New York, New York: Routledge.

Menken, K., and Sánchez, M.T. (2019). 'Translanguaging in English-only schools: From pedagogy to stance in the disruption of monolingual policies and practices', *TESOL Quarterly*, 53 (3), pp.714–767.

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

Nowell, L.S., Norris, J.M., White, D.E. and Moules, N.J. (2017). 'Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria', *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16 (1), pp.1–13.

Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Ortega, L. (2014). ‘Ways Forward for a Bi/Multilingual Turn in SLA’ in May, S. (ed.) *The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and Bilingual Education*. New York, New York: Routledge, pp.32–53.

Our Languages (2019). Retrieved from: http://ourlanguages.co.uk/ (Accessed 13 August 2020).

Park, K. and Valdez, V.E. (2018). ‘Translanguaging Pedagogy to Support the Language Learning of Older Nepali-Bhutanese Adults’ in Shapiro, S., Farrelly, R. and Curry, M.J. (eds.) *Educating Refugee-background Students: Critical Issues and Dynamic Contexts*. Blue Ridge Summit, Pennsylvania: Multilingual Matters, pp.49–65.

Rajendram, S. (2019). *Translanguaging as an Agentive, Collaborative and Socioculturally Responsive Pedagogy for Multilingual Learners*. PhD thesis. University of Toronto. Available at: https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/handle/1807/97590 (Accessed: 13 August 2020).

Rampton, B., Cooke, M. and Holmes, S. (2018). ‘Promoting Linguistic Citizenship: Issues, problems and possibilities’. Paper 233, *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*. London: King’s College.

Ruíz, R. (1984). ‘Orientations in Language Planning’, *NABE Journal*, 8 (2), pp.15–34.

Segalowitz, N. (2003). ‘Automaticity and Second Languages’ in Doughty, C.J. and Long, M.H. (eds.) *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp.382–408.

Seltzer, K. and Collins, B.A. (2016). ‘Navigating Turbulent Waters: Translanguaging to Support Academic and Socioemotional Wellbeing’ in García, O. and Kleyn, T. (eds.) (2016) *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments*. New York, New York: Routledge, pp.140–159.

Simpson, J. (2019). ‘Policy and Adult Migrant Language Education in the UK’ in Cooke, M. and Peutrell, R. (eds.) *Brokering Britain Education Citizens: Exploring ESOL and Citizenship*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp.25–42.

Simpson, J. (2020). 'Translanguaging in ESOL: Competing Positions and Collaborative Relationships' in Moore, E., Bradley, J. and Simpson, J. (eds.) (2020) *Translanguaging as Transformation: The Collaborative Construction of New Linguistic Realities*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp.41–57.

Stevenson, A., Kings, P. and Sterland, L. (2017). *Mapping ESOL Provision in Greater London*. Available at: https://learningandwork.org.uk/resources/research-and-reports/mapping-esol-provision-in-london/ (Accessed: 13 August 2020).

Storch, N. (2002). 'Patterns of Interaction in ESL Pair Work', *Language Learning*, 52 (1), pp.119–158.

Supporting informal ESOL organisations (2020). Retrieved from https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/communities/migrants-and-refugees/english-speakers-other-languages-esol/supporting-informal-esol-organisations (Accessed: 13 August 2020).

Swain, M. (2006). 'Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language proficiency' in Byrnes, H. (ed.) *Advanced Language Learning: The Contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky.* London: Bloomsbury, pp.95–108.

Swain, M., Kinnear, P. and Steinman, L. (2015). *Sociocultural Theory in Second Language Education: An Introduction through Narratives.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Swain, M. and Lapkin, S. (2005). 'The evolving sociopolitical context of immersion education in Canada: some implications for program development', *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15 (2), pp.169–186.

Valdés, G. (2017). 'Foreword' in García, O., Johnson, S.I. and Seltzer, K. (2017) *The Translanguaging Classroom: Leveraging Student Bilingualism for Learning*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Calson, pp.v–viii.

Woodley, H.H. (2016). 'Balancing Windows and Mirrors: Translanguaging in a Linguistically Diverse Classroom' in García, O. and Kleyn, T. (eds.) (2016) *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments*. New York, New York: Routledge, pp.83–99.

Zúñiga, C.E. (2016). ‘Between language as problem and resource: Examining teachers’ language orientations in dual-language programs’, *Bilingual Research Journal*, 39 (3–4), pp.339–353.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Dissertation proposal

Applied Linguistics and TESOL (ALT) group

DISSERTATION PROPOSAL

STUDENT NAME: XXXXXXX XXXXXXX

PROGRAMME: MA Applied Linguistics

WORD COUNT (EXCLUDING REFERENCES): 2,682 words

1. Provisional Title of the Dissertation

   Exploring translanguaging in the ESOL classes of a refugee charity in London

2. Research area

   Bilingualism and multilingualism: translanguaging in education

3. Research aims and rationale

   The principle aim of my research is to investigate translanguaging practices in the ESOL classes of the refugee charity where I work in southwest London. The charity in question brings together a community of young people and adults from countries including Afghanistan, Sudan, Syria, Vietnam and Albania. It is a multilingual environment, with over 30 languages spoken by the beneficiaries who participate each year. All those who access the services could be described as multilingual or emergent bilingual speakers.

   As the charity's ESOL manager, I observe beneficiaries, volunteers and staff engage in translanguaging (Garcia and Li Wei, 2014), which is to say drawing on wide repertoires of meaning-making – including languages other than English – as they take part in the

organisation's ESOL classes. At the same time translanguaging pedagogies do not feature systematically, with the result that the practice tends to occur spontaneously and in largely student-directed ways.

As a linguistic ethnographer, I now wish to engage in research on how translanguaging occurs in the ESOL classes I manage, the affordances and challenges it presents, and the possible factors constraining it. There is much in the existing literature investigating the nature of translanguaging, as well as factors like language ideology that may limit its occurrence (Garcia and Li Wei 2014). Nonetheless, from an ethnographic perspective behaviours and actions are seen as context specific, embedded within wider culture, but knowable only through an understanding of how actors construct meaning in a particular locale (Blackledge and Creese 2010). In this respect there is little research into translanguaging practices at the kind of community organisations sought out by those with refugee and asylum-seeker (RAS) status when they find themselves excluded from mainstream education and work. It is with an ethnographic orientation then that I set out to research translanguaging at my place of work.

Translanguaging is especially relevant to my research interests because of its sociocritical orientation, since the linguistic diversity of RAS and other groups in the UK is often stigmatised (Simpson, 2019). This research will therefore inform the concept of "sociolinguistic citizenship" (Rampton, Cooke and Holmes 2018) that challenges the widespread practice of "English-only" classrooms in the UK ESOL sector (Simpson, 2019).

The findings of my research will subsequently feed into my professional practice, helping my organisation to better recognise, advocate for and enable the multilingualism of RAS beneficiaries. It may also help my organisation to identify what can be done to address some of the unhelpful factors constraining translanguaging. As a founding member of a network of community ESOL organisations across London, I also hope for this research to influence others in the third sector who work with similar groups, enabling them to better understand

the potentially empowering effects of translanguaging for RAS groups.

4. Provisional research questions

- How does translanguaging occur in the ESOL classes of a refugee charity in London: under what circumstances and with what effects?
- What factors constrain translanguaging in the ESOL classes in question?

5. Literature review

The theoretical framework of translanguaging that has arguably been the most influential in the fields of TESOL and Applied Linguistics is that set out by Garcia and Li Wei (2014). The authors elaborate a model of "dynamic bilingualism" that rejects additive/subtractive models and seeks to collapse the distinction between the L1 and L2 as separate linguistic systems. Furthermore it distinguishes itself from notions of code-switching built on structuralist categorisations of language. Garcia and Li Wei's concept of translanguaging is important for my research not least because it overturns a deficit view of RAS learners as linguistically (and by implication socially) "low level" or "weak". Instead it would reposition these learners as "emergent bilinguals" who bring to the classroom extensive meaning-making repertoires that happen to fall outside a hegemonic social construct of English.

While Garcia and Li Wei (2014) argue that bilingual learners have a "translanguaging instinct" that expresses itself regardless of official sanction in the classroom, they go further in advocating for a more systematic, teacher-led translanguaging pedagogy. The authors martial considerable evidence for the transformative potential of translanguaging pedagogy, in particular for language-minoritized Latinx students in US high schools, whose educational outcomes fall behind that of more expert English-speaking peers. That said, it cannot be assumed that introducing translanguaging pedagogy will be inherently transformative. Jaspers and Madsen (2018) point to examples in which translanguaging may not be felt as a liberating force, such as Turkish-speaking Bulgarian students in Greek-Cypriot schools who

were silenced when their teacher prompted them to speak Turkish, believing they would be at risk if they used a language associated with the "aggressor". Therefore rather than consider translanguaging practice as emancipatory *a priori*, its effects should be understood as contingent and contextual.

Garcia and Li Wei's translanguaging pedagogy framework emerges from – and to some extent depends on – a specific context in which teachers and students co-construct translanguaging practices through a shared linguistic repertoire. This makes it less than straightforward to apply the framework to linguistically diverse classrooms in London where teachers and RAS learners do not share a common language besides English. Kalocsányiová's (2017) linguistic ethnography resituates translanguaging in a context closer to my own, analysing translanguaging and translation practices in a beginner French language course for RAS groups in Luxembourg. She found that translanguaging helped RAS learners to expand their linguistic repertoires and more quickly adapt to life in a country with three official languages. Even then however the contextual factors differ significantly, as Kalocsányiová's teachers and students shared English as a lingua franca, which they used to mediate their learning of French.

Rampton, Cooke and Holmes (2018) locate translanguaging in a UK context through the lens of what they term "sociolinguistic citizenship". They adapt the term from Christopher Stroud's concept of Linguistic Citizenship (LC), which in turn emerged from the Linguistic Human Rights (LHR) agenda in post-apartheid South Africa. While LHR sought to enable multilingual practices in schools, LC further legitimises students' use of non-standard language, recognising that it forms part of their full linguistic repertoire. As such Rampton et al. (2018) draw on political theory to frame individuals' translanguaging practice as an "act of citizenship" that makes a claim on rights not yet afforded to them. Translanguaging as act of citizenship is a usefully politicising concept for the context I wish to research. That said, it cannot be concluded from the analysis presented by Rampton et al. that the translanguaging

of RAS groups will necessarily be recognised as "acts of citizenship" by their host community, or by their teachers, or that translanguaging *per se* will alter the disenfranchisement they experience.

An example of sociolinguistic citizenship in an educational context can be found in Cooke, Bryers and Winstanley (2019). Their action research prompted learners to discuss sociolinguistic concepts such as translanguaging and subsequently put them into practice with the aim of "seek[ing] recognition in the public space". Nonetheless the arguments presented by Rampton et al. could temper the optimism of Cooke et al. (not to mention Garcia and Li Wei) by pointing to macro-level historical shifts in UK language education policy that have worked against the more utopian ambitions of translanguaging advocates. Translanguaging at the margins has transformative potential, including at the refugee charity where I propose to do my research, but this potentiality must be considered alongside the hegemonic policies and practices that constrain it.

6. Proposed methodology

To answer my research questions I propose to undertake a linguistic ethnography at the refugee charity I work for. An ethnographic approach belongs within a qualitative research paradigm. It has a social constructivist or interpretive epistemology which posits that there is no objective reality for the researcher to uncover, but rather that knowledge is to be understood as constructed by social interaction between participants (Robson and McCarten 2016). Linguistic ethnographers would hence take ontological categories such as "multilingualism" and "translanguaging" to be social constructs that can be understood through the study of social and cultural practices that are assumed to be empirically observable, a position that Heller (2008) describes as poststructural realism.

In one respect linguistic ethnography is a research methodology with a recent pedigree, with UK-based researchers first convening under the label in the 2001 Linguistic Ethnography

Forum (Tusting 2019) – the same year that “translanguaging” first appeared in English (Jaspers 2017). Linguistic ethnography however has its antecedents in the work of US linguistic anthropologists, whose principal “metatheorists” include Hymes (with his ethnography of communication), Gumperz (interactional sociolinguistics), Goffman (dramaturgical analysis) and Erikson (micro-ethnography). The heterogeneous and interdisciplinary nature of linguistic ethnography has advantages for my research in that it enables me to select from a range of analytical frameworks as data emerge, rather than setting out to test theoretically preconceived hypotheses (Dörnyei 2007).

Linguistic ethnography is suitable for answering my proposed research questions because translanguaging can be considered ontologically as a composite of interactions and behaviours of social actors in a particular setting. In epistemological terms this leads to an acceptance that a “full and neutral account” is not possible and that the researcher’s personal subjectivity is central to the knowledge they construct (Mason 2002: 89). My reading has persuaded me that evidence of complex social phenomena is best gathered through observation and participation. Ethnography can therefore “allow us to get at things we would otherwise never be able to discover” (Heller 2008: 250) through an “emic” or insider perspective that can “reveal the meanings and interpretations of [participants’] experiences and actions” (Dörnyei 2007: 38).

Linguistic ethnography is consistent with a sociocritical orientation that understands language practices in terms of power and inequality (Heller 2008). Furthermore it gives me the tools to reflexively consider my positionality as both a student researcher at UCL and the organisation’s ESOL Manager, a particular insider/outsider duality that is both advantageous and problematic (Rampton, Maybin and Roberts 2015). Ethnographic data collection is not detached from the social processes observed but rather forms part of the meaning-making process under investigation (Copland and Creese 2015).

7. Data collection and analysis

Linguistic ethnography, like much qualitative research, does not come with a set of standardised procedures (Copland and Creese 2015). Nonetheless linguistic ethnographers share an "analytic disposition" towards making sustained contact with the target group as a participant observer, and towards research which is therefore data driven and closely analytical (Snell and Lefstein, 2012). Based on Copland and Creese (2015), I propose three broad phases of data collection and analysis: observation, interactional data and interviews. These phases are not discrete or linear, as data collected in one phase could (and should) influence analysis and collection of data in other phases. The emergent nature of ethnographic projects requires pragmatically adjusting plans as you go along (Heller 2008).

In the initial phase of my research I will conduct "wide-angled" ethnographic observation (Copland and Creese 2015). This will involve sitting in on adult ESOL classes at the organisation and observing people, spaces, social practices and rituals with translanguaging as an "orienting idea". I will capture observations of how translanguaging occurs (alongside my accompanying feelings or beliefs) in the form of descriptive and explanatory fieldnotes. As a participant observer I will interact with learners and volunteers before and after classes and during breaks, as this can generate further data on their beliefs, values and actions. Fieldnotes themselves are a form of analysis which can in turn be thematically coded and related to a theoretical or empirical framework (Copland and Creese 2015). This analysis should help narrow the focus down and help me to identify participants for the next two phases of research.

In the second main phase of my research I will record interactional data in the classroom to investigate at a more micro level the circumstances and effects of translanguaging. My fieldnote analysis will help guide what interactional data to record and when. Data analysis then begins by reviewing recorded data and identifying critical moments that warrant further

investigation, guided by a "sensitising" theoretical framework selected post-hoc (Rampton 2007). Rampton describes this careful avoidance of *a priori* theory as characteristic of linguistic ethnography, and his process of "micro-analysis" (drawing on Conversation Analysis) is one possible method I could use.

Informal interviews will likely occur in the first two phases of research, but in the third and final phase I will undertake semi-structured interviews, either one-to-one or in small groups. These will help build an emic perspective of translanguaging practices and the less easily observable factors constraining them. Interview data can also be used to compare what people do and what they say, adding "thickness" to data and potentially identifying further influencing factors. Reflexivity is important during data analysis, as the knowledge generated in interviews is co-constructed interactionally and mediated by understandings of the interview as a cultural practice (Codó 2008).

8. Ethics

Informed by medical research, the social sciences tend to follow four broad ethical principles: autonomy, non-maleficence, beneficence and justice. Applying these principles to educational research is not straightforward, and within the field of linguistic ethnography there can be a tension between "macro-ethical" requirements from the academy and "micro-ethical" considerations from the field (Copland 2018).

Regarding the principle of autonomy, I must gain informed consent from all participants, who need to know they can withdraw at any time. Given that I am the manager of the project I wish to research, I must be careful to ensure that participants know they can withhold or withdraw consent without repercussion.

Considering autonomy in the initial observation phase, I must inform all participants about my investigations and give them the choice to not be included in my fieldnotes and other data, what Dörnyei (2007: 70) terms "passive" consent. When it comes to recording interactional

data and formal interviews, I will need to gain “active” consent by preparing a detailed consent form in different languages. Relating to this, it is important to consider the intercultural ethics of giving consent and signing forms, for example how these acts will be understood by my research participants (Copland 2018). Some ESOL learners I work with have no or limited literacy, so I will offer oral recorded consent as an alternative.

The principle of non-maleficence requires me to ensure the anonymity of participants as far as possible (Dörnyei 2007). Equally importantly, it means being sensitive to “ethically important moments” that can occur throughout the span of the research (Copland 2018), for example by identifying if taking part in the research is causing undue stress or other harm to participants. For ethical and practical reasons I will conduct research only with adult beneficiaries, as I know that social services (as legal guardian of unaccompanied asylum-seeking children) are extremely cautious about non-maleficence and will not consent to young people participating in the research. Finally, as I do not speak the community languages of the research participants, I will need to source a translation and interpreting service that will uphold the principle of non-maleficence.

Regarding beneficence (Dörnyei 2007), I should consider how my research can be of use to the organisation and its beneficiaries, for example by making the findings accessible and promoting the insights gained within the networks of influence available to me.

Finally, the principle of justice would include a fair portrayal of the perspectives and experiences of research participants, ensuring that more powerful actors do not unduly influence my data.

9. Timeline

Note that this timeline has external dependencies (e.g. ethics approval) that may alter the dates at which certain stages begin.

- Early March – meet with supervisor; write and submit ethics application

- Mid-to-late March – gain ethics approval; begin data collection phase 1 (approx. 3 weeks): observation of adult ESOL classes; producing field notes; initial analysis; identifying classes for phase 2
- April – phase 2 (approx. 3 weeks): recording of interactional data in selected classes; initial analysis; selection of key participants for interviews
- May – phase 3 (approx. 3 weeks): interviews with key participants, e.g. beneficiaries, volunteers and staff; data analysis
- June – finish data collection and analysis; begin formal write-up
- July – submit first draft to supervisor
- August – submit final dissertation

10. References

- Blackledge, A. and Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: a critical perspective.* New York: Continuum
- Codó, E. (2008) Interviews and Questionnaires. In Li Wei and M. G. Moyer (eds.) *Blackwell Guide to Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing
- Cooke, M., Bryers, D. and Winstanley, B. (2019) 'Our Languages': Towards Sociolinguistic Citizenship in ESOL. In M. Cooke and R. Peutrell (eds.) *Brokering Britain, Educating Citizens: Exploring ESOL and Citizenship*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters
- Copland, F. (2018) Reflecting on the ethics of researching communication in superdiverse contexts. In Creese, A. and Blackledge, A. (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Superdiversity: An Interdisciplinary Perspective.* Londona and New York: Routledge
- Copland, F. and Creese, A. (2015) *Linguistic Ethnography: Collecting, Analysing and Presenting Data*. California: SAGE Publications
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007) *Research methods in applied linguistics: quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Garcia, O. and Li Wei (2014) *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

- Heller, M. (2008) Doing Ethnography. In Li Wei and M. G. Moyer (eds.) *Blackwell Guide to Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing
- Jaspers, J. (2017) The transformative limits of translanguaging. Paper 226, *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*. London: King’s College
- Jaspers, J. and Madsen, L. M. (2018) Fixity and Fluidity in Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice. In Jaspers, J. and Madsen, L. M. (eds.) *Critical Perspectives on Linguistic Fixity and Fluidity: Languagised Lives*. London and New York: Routledge
- Kalocsányiová, E. (2017) Towards a repertoire-building approach: multilingualism in language classes for refugees in Luxembourg. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 17:4 pp.474-493.
- Rampton, B. (2007). The micro-analysis of interactional discourse in linguistic ethnography: An illustration focused on the job interview. In Rampton, B., Lefstein, A. and Bezemer, J. *Illustrations of Linguistic Ethnography in Action: Indicative Analyses of a Job Interview*. London: King’s College
- Rampton, B., Cooke, M. and Holmes, S. (2018) Promoting Linguistic Citizenship: Issues, problems and possibilities. Paper 233, *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*. London: King’s College
- Rampton, B., Maybin, J. and Roberts, C. (2015) Theory and Method in Linguistic Ethnography. In Snell, J., Shaw, S. and Copland, F. (eds.) *Linguistic ethnography: interdisciplinary explorations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Robson, C. and McCartan, K. (2016). *Real world research: a resource for users of social research methods in applied settings* (4th edition). Chichester: Wiley
- Tusting, K. (2019) General introduction. In Tusting, K. (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Linguistic Ethnography*. London and New York: Routledge

Appendix 2: Information sheet and consent form for participants

---

Research on linguistic diversity in ESOL classes

May to September 2020

Information sheet for ESOL teachers

As well as working at a charity called CARAS, I am also a master's student at UCL Institute of Education. I am currently doing dissertation research on a project titled "Exploring the language orientations of ESOL teachers at third-sector organisations in London". That means I'd like to find out more about how teachers and learners make use of different languages in their ESOL classes ("translanguaging") and what you think of this.

I very much hope that you would like to take part. This information sheet will try and answer any questions you might have about the project, but please don't hesitate to contact me if there is anything else you would like to know.

Who is carrying out the research and why?

I'm the sole researcher on this project, but I have a dissertation supervisor at UCL. My research questions are:

1. How do teachers at third-sector organisations in London view translanguaging in their ESOL classes?
2. How do the teachers enact formal or informal language policy regarding translanguaging in their reported classroom practices?
3. How do the teachers' linguistic background and language-learning experiences influence their views and reported practices regarding translanguaging?

My hope is that this research will support better language learning at my own organisation and others in the third sector, helping to identify how we can support and make the most of our students' linguistic diversity.

Why am I being invited to take part?

I'd like to invite you to take part because you are an ESOL teacher at a third-sector organisation in London. Finding out your views and asking you about your teaching practices will help me to answer the research questions above.

What will happen if I choose to take part?

My hope is to interview five teachers from a range of organisations and linguistic backgrounds. I'd invite you to a one-hour interview, which would take place remotely by phone or online. I might then invite you to join a focus group with other teachers I have interviewed, which should last around 90 minutes. I'd record the interviews and transcribe them for use in my research.

You can agree to take part in just the one-to-one interview if you do not want to take part in the focus group.

Will anyone know I have been involved?

Unless you tell me otherwise I will assume you want me to keep your identity anonymous, for example by changing your name, the name of your organisation and other personal details in the published research.

Personal information you share with me will be kept confidential. The only time I would have to share confidential information without asking your permission first is if I was concerned about your safety or the safety of others.

What will happen to the results of the research?

I'll be presenting the results of the research in my MA dissertation, as well as sharing it with other individuals and organisations in a more accessible form, for example in training sessions and blogs. I may also publish my research with my university or in a journal.

I will show you a transcript of your interview and focus group before I write up my analysis. This will give you the opportunity to remove or change anything you have said.

The data I collect will be encrypted and kept on secure storage systems. Only my supervisor and I will have access to the data.

Do I have to take part?

It is entirely up to you whether or not you choose to take part. I hope that if you do choose to be involved then you will find it a valuable experience.

If you agree to take part now you can change your mind at any time.

Data Protection Privacy Notice

The data controller for this project will be University College London (UCL). The UCL Data Protection Office provides oversight of UCL activities involving the processing of personal data, and can be contacted at data-protection@ucl.ac.uk. UCL's Data Protection Officer can also be contacted at data-protection@ucl.ac.uk. Further information on how UCL uses participant information can be found here: https://www.ucl.ac.uk/legal-services/privacy/ucl-general-research-participant-privacy- notice

The legal basis that would be used to process your personal data will be performance of a task in the public interest. The legal basis used to process personal data will be for scientific research or explicit consent.

Your personal data will be processed so long as it is required for the research project.

If we are able to anonymise or pseudonymise the personal data you provide we will undertake this, and will endeavour to minimise the processing of personal data wherever possible. If you are concerned about how your personal data is being processed, or if you would like to contact us about your rights, please contact UCL in the first instance at data-protection@ucl.ac.uk.

Contact for further information

If you have any further questions before you decide whether to take part, you can email me at xxxxxxxx@ucl.ac.uk. My supervisor can be contacted at xxxxxxxx@ucl.ac.uk.

If you would like to be involved, please complete the consent form below and return to me as soon as you can or by 19 May at the latest. This project has been reviewed and approved by the UCL IOE Research Ethics Committee.

If you have any questions about the above research project, wish to exercise your rights as a research participant, or wish to make a complaint, please send an email with details to the UCL Institute of Education Research Ethics Committee on ioe.researchethics@ucl.ac.uk so that we can look into the issue and respond to you. You can also contact the UCL Institute of Education Research Ethics Committee by telephoning 020 79115449.

Consent Form

If you are happy to participate in this study, please complete this consent form and return it to me by email.

I have read and understood the above information sheet about the research.	Yes	No
I understand that if any of my words are used in the published research they will be anonymised.	Yes	No

I understand that I can withdraw from the project at any time, and that if I choose to do this, any data I have contributed will not be used.	Yes	No
I understand that I can contact XXXXX XXXXXX at any time and request for my data to be removed from the research.	Yes	No
I agree to take part in a recorded one-to-one interview.	Yes	No
I agree to take part in a recorded focus group (optional).	Yes	No
I understand that the researcher's supervisor will have access to this data only if they agree to preserve the confidentiality of the information as stated in this form.	Yes	No
I understand that the research may be published at UCL and in other sources such as blogs or journals.	Yes	No

Name: Signed:

Date:

XXXXXXX XXXXXXX

UCL Institute of Education

20 Bedford Way London WC1H 0AL

xxxxxxxxxxx@ucl.ac.uk

XXXXXXX XXXXXXX (supervisor)

UCL Institute of Education

20 Bedford Way London WC1H 0AL

xxxxxxxxxxxx@ucl.ac.uk

Appendix 3: Interview questions (adapted from Burton and Rajendram, 2019)

Theme 1

1. How many years have you been teaching ESOL?
2. What teacher training have you had? Any other relevant qualifications?
3. Do you teach accredited ESOL classes, non-accredited or both?
4. What age are your students?
5. What levels do you currently teach?
6. Where do you teach now?
7. How long have you been teaching there for?

Theme 2

1. What languages do your students use in the classroom? At what stages in the lesson do languages other than English feature? Can you think of an example?
2. What languages do you use in the classroom? Why is this? At what stages in the lesson? Can you think of an example?
3. Are there times when you think it's particularly helpful/unhelpful for you or your students to use languages other than English? Tell me more … during what activities/when.
4. Can you think of examples of when the use of other languages has been helpful/unhelpful in the lesson?
5. Does your organisation have policies or guidelines about the use of languages other than English in the class? What (if anything) do you say to students about them?

6. Do you have your own rules or guidelines about the use of languages other than English in class? What are your rules/guidelines? Why do you have them? What (if anything) do you say to students about them?
7. Do you factor the use of other languages into your lesson planning? Tell me more …

Theme 3

1. What languages do you speak?
2. When did you start learning/speaking those languages?
3. Do you think your linguistic background influences how you approach the use of other languages in your classroom now? Can you think of examples of when your linguistic background has influenced your approach?
4. How did you learn the languages you speak? If you learned languages in a classroom setting, did you only speak that language in class, or did you use other languages as well? What were the advantages and disadvantages of this approach?
5. Do you think your own language learning experiences influence how you approach the use of other languages in your classroom now? Can you think of examples of when this has happened?

Appendix 4: Focus group screenshots

padlet

1mo

Translanguaging focus group: activity 2

Friday 19 June 2020

Topic: translanguaging pedagogy

> *It is not at all obvious that if they were not politically prevented from doing so, "languages" would not mix and dissolve into one another ... Could it be that all our current pedagogical methods in fact make multilingual development more difficult than it need be, simply because we bow to dominant political and ideological pressures to keep "languages" pure and separate?*

Lemke, J. (2002) Language development and identity: Multiple timescales in the social ecology of learning. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization* (pp. 68-87). London: Continuum.

Instructions for card-cluster activity

1. **Read the topic and quotation in the left-hand column.**
2. **Write three or more "cards" in response to the topic and/or quote. We will then group the cards into themes.**
3. **Here are some ideas of what you might choose to write on each card:**

- an opinion
- an anecdote
- a fact
- an experience
- a feeling
- an idea
- a quote
- a question
- a theorist/theories
- a reservation/concern

Adapted from Byers, D. and Winstanley, B. (2020) Sociolinguistics, participatory pedagogy in language teacher education card cluster - collective exploration

What is a language anyway?

Languages are blended and come from similar roots - they're not neatly separated.

Historically borders between nation states haven't existed or have changed. Languages have developed fluidly in response to these shifting borders.

If you watch Bollywood films you can hear that translanguaging (Hindi and English "dissolving" into each other) is a normal occurrence

Has there been any research done about languages "mixing and dissolving" into one another?

Research from psycholinguistics: languages aren't separated in the brain - they only exist as a social construct.

I think the most important thing as a teacher is viewing language as a set of tools, and working out which parts of which English(es) are going to help the learner communicate in ways that will empower them to improve their quality of life.

English has so many versions, all of which are 'correct' despite colonialism telling us otherwise. The most useful versions of English for any individual will depend on their circumstances.

Rebel teachers

In fact not all teachers are politically prevented from translanguaging in the class - we do it as a matter of practice, consciously or unconsciously.

Learners are surprised or even shocked when you say "you can speak your own language". They feel it's "against the law".

Do **all** pedagogical methods really make translanguaging more difficult as the quote says? Teachers develop their own practices in the classroom that may go against prescribed methodologies.

Learners are surprised when asked to use their expert language in English classes. Some resist it, saying they want to 'think in English'. It's important to have a clear idea of WHY you're asking the learner to use their own language, and convey that as much as you can, so that the learner feels secure.

Current models of language teaching are constrained by recent histories of language teaching which have tended to separate languages in the classroom. It is something that all language teachers take with them into the classroom, and often we have been specifically trained to do this. This doesn't however mean this is the most effective way to teach languages

Political aspect

A potentially racist discourse saying "you must speak English and only English" is evident in wider society.

Link between saying "speak English", colonialism and power.

What are we doing when we say "speak English" to our students? I do it when I feel it's conducive to learning, but am I exercising my power in a way I shouldn't? Is it ever correct to tell people to "speak English"?

When in a classroom setting teaching ESOL to students, I don't think there's anything wrong with asking learners to speak English.

It's important to be aware of the racist discourse that exists around this in society generally, and of course to avoid giving the instruction in a mocking or disrespectful way.

It depends on the exact context of the class and learner - but by coming to an ESOL class, I would think the learner is expecting to be encouraged to speak English and maybe be pushed a little out of their comfort zone in order to learn.

English class can be a 'safer space' for learners' English to be challenged and corrected in a respectful, non-shaming way.

... but immersion is important

learners sometimes pick the easier option and fall back on their L1, so there are times when it's conducive to learning or group building to say "speak English"

often students only get the chance to speak English during class, e.g. if they're working as a cleaner

my experience was of avoiding people who spoke my language when I moved abroad - it helped me learn the language of the host country

given that immersion is important, does that go against the idea of translanguaging?

Keeping an immersive environment in class gives learners the chance to practise and rehearse for English-speaking situations they might encounter outside the classroom

More than just words

communication is so much more than using a **pure** language

gesture is important to communication

emojis have transformed communication - so much can be said, e.g. to convey tone

Culture plays such a huge part in what we say to each other. It's valuable to talk with students about what they say in their own language in certain situations, as sometimes this can be SO different to English. For example, in Beijing I observed that if people bumped into a colleague/neighbour at the local shop, often they wouldn't say "oh hi, how are you?" - they'd say "buying things?" or "on your way home?" or if it was around a mealtime "have you eaten?". Translated into English, these greetings may sound unnatural, but I learned that in Mandarin, it sounds weirder to say "how are you" ... it kind of implies you think something might be wrong!