‘We Learn Together’—Translanguaging within a Holistic Approach towards Multilingualism in Education

Joana Duarte and Mirjam T. Günther-van der Meij

Abstract

Within two multilingual education projects in the north of the Netherlands a holistic model for multilingualism in education is being tested. This is done through design-based interventions in which in- and pre-service teachers, teacher trainers and researchers co-develop and evaluate multilingual activities for different school types. Results show that through experimenting in a safe environment teachers gradually embraced their pupils’ multilingualism. This contradicts earlier findings on teachers strongly favouring monolingual instruction and viewing migrant languages as a deficit.

Keywords

Translanguaging · Holistic approach · Multilingual education · Design-based research

J. Duarte (✉)
University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands
e-mail: j.duarte@rug.nl

M. T. Günther-van der Meij
NHL Stenden University of Applied Sciences, Leeuwarden, The Netherlands
e-mail: mirjam.gunther@nhlstenden.com

J. A. Panagiotopoulou et al. (eds.), *Inclusion, Education and Translanguaging*, Inklusion und Bildung in Migrationsgesellschaften,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-28128-1_8

1 Introduction

Since the rise of modern nation-states, dominant monolingual language ideologies have perpetuated in much of the industrialized world—with Europe being no exception. In particular, over the past two decades, academic success for those who find themselves speaking a plurality of languages, has been pressured by monolingual standards in dominant languages (Pulinx et al. 2017). These ideologies have failed to comprehend and cater for the rich complexities of human collective existence and thus, at times have been implemented as weapons in ever persisting battles for nationalistic control. As the world undergoes processes leading to superdiversity through the intensification of migration (Vertovec 2007), it is unlikely that nation building tactics from the past, such as the continuation of a monolingual habitus (Gogolin 2002), will be able to manage the composition of modern states. This is already evident across a plethora of institutional platforms, where multilingual identities are often denied full participation, contributing to the degradation of intercultural existence and equality. One such platform capable of moulding shared beliefs, expectations and norms is the school, which behaves as a microcosm for its surrounding environment and can provide an insight into future societal operations.

Nowadays, pupils from minority language backgrounds face a gap between their academic achievement and that of their majority speaking peers (Samson and Lesaux 2015). Typically, in explaining this gap, educators take a deficit approach to multilingualism, where insufficient linguistic capabilities in the dominant language of the school are seen as the key cause for poor academic performance (Pulinx et al. 2017; Young 2014). Conversely, those within the scientific community have seen the vast benefits of multilingualism as a resource to learners and classrooms, if fostered in an appropriate way by the teaching staff (Tolbert and Knox 2016). Currently however, the special linguistic and cognitive benefits available to multilinguals are typically allotted mostly to children belonging to a socially privileged background, where the transnational human capital offered by migration is commonly acknowledged (Fürstenau 2016). Equally, students deriving from socially disadvantaged migrant families, often presenting multilingual skills in languages low on the linguistic hierarchy, are seen as problematic or worse—a threat (Angelis 2011; Fürstenau 2016; Pulinx et al. 2017).

The current study is set in the officially bilingual Province of Friesland, in the North of the Netherlands. In this region the minority language Frisian and the dominant language Dutch are spoken next to other minority and migrant languages. Friesland has known a growing number of migrants in the last decade

(CBS [Central Bureau voor de Statistiek] 2016). Language maintenance of Frisian is of high importance for the region, especially because of the high interference of Dutch (Gorter et al. 2001). This has led to strict language separation in education (Duarte and Günther-van der Meij 2018a). With the arrival of other minority and migrant languages, schools are nowadays faced with a new challenge: incorporating these languages into their everyday practice. This is the motivation behind recent multilingual education projects based on a holistic model for multilingualism in education (Duarte and Günther-van der Meij 2018b) that aims at acknowledging and using both migrant and minority languages of pupils in education, next to the majority and foreign languages and is suitable for different school types (e.g., trilingual, mainstream, newcomer schools). Official or pedagogical translanguaging is one of the approaches of the model (Duarte 2018).

The aim of the present chapter is to shed light on the potentials of (official) translanguaging as a part of a holistic approach for multilingualism in education (Duarte 2017; Duarte and Günther-van der Meij 2018b), in which also other approaches for the use of multiple languages in education are featured. It looks at translanguaging at two levels: classroom practices and professional development of pre- and in-service teachers. Further, it wishes to address the following research questions:

- What interactional functions can translanguaging-based pedagogies fulfil for knowledge acquisition?
- To what extent can translanguaging-based sequences deploy teachers' professional development for multilingualism in education?

2 Translanguaging (Functions) and the Holistic Model

According to Li Wei (2017), "the term translanguaging seems to have captured people's imagination" (p. 9). As such, it has almost shifted from a descriptive label for the flexible use of pupils' linguistic repertoires to make meaning (García 2009) to a prescriptive concept that researchers and practitioners in education should be using as a theoretical lens proposing an alternative view of bi- and multilingualism (Vogel and García 2017). The term has been widely applied to pedagogy, but also to the analysis of everyday social interaction, cross-modal communication (Gort 2015), linguistic landscape, visual arts, music, and

transgender discourse (MacSwan 2017; Li Wei 2017). García and Kano (2014) refer to translanguaging in education as

> a process by which students and teachers engage in complex discursive practices that include ALL the language practices of ALL students in a class in order to develop new language practices and sustain old ones, communicate and appropriate knowledge, and give voice to new socio-political realities by interrogating linguistic inequality. (p. 261)

In terms of the use of the concept in pedagogical settings, a plethora of studies has examined multiple advantages of a translanguaging lens on how teachers act multilingually and how learners acquire and use their respective languages in classroom settings. Concrete examples of studies looked at how learners use two languages in small group activities to support bilingual learning (Childs 2016; Martin-Beltrán 2009), the co-construction of knowledge in content classes (Duarte 2016), interaction of emergent bilinguals in school settings (Gort 2015), the general use of two languages in classroom settings (Palmer et al. 2014; MacSwan 2017), the effects of using two languages for the teaching of reading (Soltero-Gonzalez et al. 2016), within science classrooms (Jørgensen 2008), as a means of balancing the power-relations among languages in the classroom (Canagarajah 2011), in promoting minority languages (Cenoz 2009), for raising participant confidence and motivation (Creese and Blackledge 2010), as a maximiser of learning literacy skills (Hornberger and Link 2012), and for general empowerment and early language learning (Latisha and Young 2017).

Duarte (2018) described translanguaging spaces, in which various interaction practices serve different functions depending on a) whether the aim of the teachers is to acknowledge or actively use the different languages; b) whether the teachers are proficient in the languages involved in the translanguaging moment, and c) the types of languages involved. Instances of official translanguaging (see Tab. 1) with a *symbolic function* are aimed at recognizing and valorizing migrant languages within mainstream education and require no proficiency in those languages from the teacher. A *scaffolding function* is achieved when temporary but systematic bridges towards other languages are incorporated in everyday teaching attributing equal value to all languages. Teachers require no knowledge of migrant languages to do this, as long as pupils are perceived as the experts for their own family languages. Similar aims can be reached by scaffolding the acknowledgement of various instruction languages present within the teaching

Tab. 1 Functions of official translanguaging. (Note. Adapted from Duarte 2018, p. 13.)

Functions of official translanguaging	Aims (acknowledgement or use)	Proficiency of teacher in the language	Types of languages
Symbolic function	Acknowledgement	No proficiency is needed	Migrant
Scaffolding function	Acknowledgement and use in daily routines	No proficiency is needed (except in instruction languages)	Migrant, minority and foreign
Epistemological function	Use for content- and language learning	Teacher (or assistant teacher) is proficient	Migrant, minority and foreign

model (such as Dutch, Frisian and English). Jones and Lewis (2014) also refer to "scaffolded translanguaging" in the context of bilingual education. Finally, official translanguaging can likewise fulfil an *epistemological function* when the different languages are actively used to enhance both content- and language knowledge. This is appropriate for exploring migrant, minority and foreign languages in their full potential as learning instruments. However, a teacher proficient in those languages is needed to interact with the pupils.

Criticism to translanguaging pedagogies stresses its lack of empirical verification in terms of measurable effects on educational outcomes. In addition, teachers often complain that its goal is too philosophical and it lacks a clear definition in terms of pedagogical tools (Ticheloven et al. 2019). Conteh (2018) also delivers a critical review of translanguaging as pedagogy, claiming that the emphasis of research has so far been on understanding processes of interaction rather than on exploring its pedagogic potential. Jaspers (2018) states that the implementation of translanguaging at school is likely to be less transformative and socially critical than implied, as research a) has much in common with the monolingual ideologies it criticizes, b) trades on causality effects that cannot be taken for granted, c) is becoming a dominating rather than a liberating force.

In sum, although enjoying positive echoing in research and, to a certain extent, pedagogical practice, the implementation of translanguaging as a pedagogy does not yet belong to the pedagogical *status quo* across schools in Europe. On the one side, a translanguaging pedagogy clashes against prevailing monolingual ideologies often translated into immersion models for language teaching which lead to strict language separation. On the other side, ideas of teachers in relation to the

value and functions of pupils' other languages lead translanguaging practices to be perceived as 'illegitimate' in mainstream education (Kamwangamalu 2010).

For these reasons, in the current study translanguaging was included in a wider holistic approach towards multilingualism in education (Duarte 2017; Duarte and Günther-van der Meij 2018b). Research on multilingual approaches has recently called for the development of such holistic or integrative models that "recognize that language learning and teaching is more than the sum of the elements of that equation seen as isolated units – language, learning and teaching – and should therefore be seen from a more holistic and ecological perspective" (Melo-Pfeifer 2018, p. 193). The model presented here (Duarte 2017; Duarte and Günther-van der Meij 2018b) combines five approaches to teaching and knowledge along a continuum that oscillates between the acknowledgement of different languages and their actual use in instruction. By doing so, teachers can choose whether to focus on, for example, language awareness with activities in which languages and dialects in the classroom and the environment are explored, on language comparison in which typologically related and unrelated languages are compared or on conveying content-knowledge through a foreign language using the CLIL-approach (Content and Language Integrated Learning). Finally, the model addresses attitudes, knowledge and skills of both teachers and pupils (Herzog-Punzenberger et al. 2017) within a multilingual approach. Language awareness, language comparison and receptive multilingualism approaches focus more on attitudes whilst CLIL and immersion focus more on knowledge and skills in the language(s). As the model shows, translanguaging is a feature that appears in each of the five approaches and is mostly manifested in interaction. For more detailed information about the model see Duarte and Günther-van der Meij (2018b). The present study looks at the role of translanguaging as a part of a wider pedagogical approach for professional development of primary school teachers for multilingual education.

3 Research Design

In general, classroom interaction in most European schools is dominated by national languages, with the exception of foreign or, to a lesser extent, regional minority languages used in education (Duarte 2016; Duarte et al. 2013). Across the literature on professional development (PD) there is a clear correlation between multilingual teacher training, exposure and experience, and the degree of monolingual ideology permeating teacher beliefs, practices and knowledge. Other factors that became clear throughout the studies pertained to practical

implications, such as a lack of multilingual resources, time and the demands of standardized testing (Haukås 2016; Lee and Oxelson 2006; Young 2014). These too, however, could be associated with an absence of appropriate multilingual training. In the current study, we look at the role of translanguaging as integrated within a holistic approach towards multilingualism in education in the North of the Netherlands aiming at addressing the PD needs of primary schools and teachers in our particular setting.

3.1 The Research Context and General Design

For this chapter we discuss data from two research projects. The 3M-project (*Meer kansen Met Meertaligheid*—More Opportunities with Multilingualism) works with 12 schools in order to develop multilingual activities for pupils aged 8–10, the Languages4all-project (*Talen4all*) focuses on pupils aged 10–12 in 8 schools. Despite the fact that each project focuses on different age groups, in both projects other age groups were involved as well. Both projects focus on different school types such as trilingual Frisian-Dutch-English schools, refugees/newcomer schools, schools with a high percentage of migrant language speakers and schools with a high percentage of Dutch speakers. In the activities developed, all (home) languages that are present at the school are involved. Within both projects a large team of teachers and researchers jointly develop the educational experiments, following the holistic model for multilingualism in education. A design-based approach (McKenney and Reeves 2013) was used to work with teachers in order to co-develop the multilingual teaching activities. Design-based research acknowledges the complexity of educational contexts by carefully examining the different processes, levels and actors involved in carrying out a jointly engineered educational experiment (Cobb et al. 2003). Previously assembled theoretical knowledge is used together with an iterative cyclic design to improve the original experiment. Regular school visits as well as the organisation of workshops for the teachers add to their theoretical knowledge and experiences which are useful in the development of the activities. During these visits, the implementation of teaching activities was captured in video observations.

In both projects, the intervention phase lasted for about 18 months, spreading over two school years. Six professional development workshops with key experts in the field were conducted, alongside individual feedback sessions during regular school visits. Student, teacher and principal-questionnaires were conducted before and after the intervention. The evaluation of this phase was conducted in a final workshop on the basis of data collected in the school visits.

3.2 Data Collection: Classroom Interaction

For the current study a total of 29 hours of video observations were recorded in three project schools. The recordings were conducted in subject lessons in which the language of instruction varied. After careful consideration by the research team, two excerpts were selected for the present paper that exemplify the functions of official translanguaging as in the model proposed by Duarte (2018), such as different types of interaction patterns and including different languages (national, foreign, migrant and regional minority). More examples can be found in Duarte and Günther-van der Meij (2018b).

3.3 Data Collection: Teacher's Attitudes, Knowledge and Skills towards Multilingualism in Education

At the end of the intervention phase of the two projects, an evaluation workshop took place, aiming at a reflection on the teaching approaches developed, its effects and how participating teachers saw their future role within their schools. In order to elicit this information and foster a discussion, we used vignettes (Bloor and Wood 2006; Steiner et al. 2016). For the current research, the concept of vignettes was redefined to translanguaging-based vignettes, in order to present participating teachers with a representative sample of translanguaging interaction taken from the implementation of the activities developed throughout the intervention. For the development of the five different translanguaging-vignettes, we repeatedly reviewed all video-data and stipulated five different criteria that should be as different as possible in the selected video data:

1. different ages of the pupils (ranging from 4- to 14-years old);
2. different subjects involved;
3. translanguaging as embedded in different approaches such as CLIL;
4. diverse interactional perspectives (teacher or pupils-led);
5. different languages involved (Frisian, English, Dutch, migrant languages).

The discussion on the vignettes was conducted during a PD-workshop in June 2019 with 30 teachers and 4 preservice teachers, distributed into 7 groups (4 to 5 participants per group). All interaction of the participants was recorded (N = 164 min) and transcribed (N = 74.127 words). Data was analysed using the

MaxQDA-software (release 18.2.0). Transcripts were coded by applying thematic analysis (Clarke and Braun 2013), pre-divided into 6 large coding categories: attitudes, knowledge, skills, challenges, examples of pedagogic activities and changes occurred through project participation. In total 107 codes were applied to the transcripts of the vignette discussions, ranging from 45 to 149 words.

4 Results

4.1 Interactional Functions within Translanguaging-Based Pedagogies

Below two excerpts are discussed that show examples of the different functions of translanguaging (Duarte 2018). In the first excerpt, the research team's Polish pre-service teacher performed an activity with the class of 3rd graders. While explaining the story of the Tower of Babel she involves a group of five Polish-speaking pupils and asks how several words in the story are uttered in other languages present in the classroom (Tab. 2).

The teacher asks the pupils to translate different words from the story from Dutch to Polish, Arabic and Frisian. All languages are allowed. This interaction illustrates both a symbolic and a scaffolding function of translanguaging as the teacher acknowledges all languages in the classroom by explicitly involving them in her story. In addition, the teacher uses the languages to check comprehension of the key-terms of the story. The Dutch language is used as a bridge to the other languages.

Tab. 2 Building the Tower of Babel using multiple languages

Speaker	Dutch | **Polish** | Arabic | *Frisian*	English translation
T2	Hoe zeg je macht in het Pools? NAME?	How do you say power in Polish? NAME?
PP	**Wladza.**	Power.
T2	De koning wil niet alleen maar macht, hij wil ook beroemd zijn. Hoe zeg je beroemd in het Pools?	The king doesn't only want power but he also wants to be famous. How do you say famous in Polish?
PP	**Slawny.**	Famous.
T2	En nog één taal …	And one more language…
PP	.(mashhur) مشهور	Famous.
T2	En hoe zeg je beroemd in het Fries?	And how do you say famous in Frisian?
PP	Ook *beroemd*.	Also famous.

Tab. 3 Discussing the role of words in communication

Speaker	Dutch | **English** | *Frisian* | French	English translation
T3	**For language we use words.** Wij gebruiken woorden. Wat zeggen we in het Fries? *Wat sizze wy yn it Frysk?*	For language we use words. We use words. What do we say in Frisian? What do we say in Frisian?
T3	(Pupils all talk) *Ien ien*. Ssst. Niet allemaal tegelijk. Vinger even omhoog doen. N?	One one. Ssst. Not all at once. Raise your finger. N?
PP	Eh, een *wurd* ofzo?	Eh, a word or something?
T3	*In wurd. Mar at wy, eh, it mearfâld dêrfan is dan wurden*. **And lets try and go to French**. Weet iemand wat het woord 'woorden' in het Frans betekent?	A word. But if we, eh, the plural of that is words. And lets try and go to French. Does somebody know what the word 'words' is in French?
T3	(Pupils all talk) Ssst. Ik zal hem erbij schrijven. Les mots.	Ssst. I'll write him down. The words.

In the second excerpt a grade 5 teacher discusses the theme "communication" in a language lesson at a mainstream city school with a high percentage of Dutch speakers. The teacher uses English, Frisian and Dutch as languages of instruction (Tab. 3).

The teacher switches back and forth between English, Dutch and Frisian. The pupil in this excerpt answers in Dutch with the Frisian word for "word". In this excerpt translanguaging has three functions. By including French translanguaging has a symbolic function. It also has a scaffolding function as translanguaging is used as a bridge between the three languages. Finally, because of the topic of the lesson translanguaging also has an epistemological function as the both content (about the function of language) and knowledge in the languages are enhanced.

In sum, these two excerpts show how translanguaging can fulfil different pedagogical functions. The teachers are consciously using translanguaging to attain several communicative aims: to acknowledge different languages, as a lever between different languages and to enhance both content and language knowledge.

4.2 Analysis of Translanguaging Sequences for PD

The recordings of the group discussions on the translanguaging-based vignettes were transcribed and then coded. From the six codes applied, the largest amount was coded as "skills" (33%), followed by "knowledge" (20%), "examples of activities" (15%), "changes through project participation" (14%), "attitudes" (9%) and "challenges" (9%). In the following, the categories skills, knowledge and attitudes will be discussed.

4.2.1 Reported Skills in Translanguaging-Based Approaches

Teachers describe a variety of practical skills that they apply in their teaching and that are related to the use of several languages. They often relate these skills to different functions they have identified from their use of multilingualism in class. Four main functions of translanguaging were coded in the data. The largest amount of skills was attributed to the code *facilitating content comprehension*, which contains various accounts of how teachers use the different languages in their classes in order to enhance knowledge acquisition and comprehension of the pupils. An example of this is presented in the excerpt below. A teacher in a school for newly arrived pupils explains how she pauses her class to allow the Arabic-speaking pupils to discuss new content, using several dialects, and then reach a group conclusion that is translated into Dutch:

> Because in Arabic you also have different dialects. At least that's what they say in my class. They go back and forth in their own language. I listen to them, but I don't understand it. Then they come to a conclusion and then we also talk about it in the group. I think this is very valuable.

The importance of connecting the home languages to the Dutch language to enhance comprehension is often highlighted. One of the teachers for example describes how she teaches new concepts by looking them up in the home languages—e.g., asking parents, other pupils or using Google Translate—and then explicitly links them to the Dutch concept.

Next to content comprehension, teachers identify *acknowledgment and awareness* as one of the main functions deriving from the use of several languages in instruction. In the excerpt below, a group of teachers is commenting the interaction in one of the vignettes:

S3 For which function does the teacher use the different languages?
S1 Well not so much to learn that language, I think.
S4 Awareness.
S1 Yes, awareness that there are multiple languages, more languages.
S3 And appreciation that someone can speak them

The teachers in this group comment how valorizing the different languages present in the class can be just as important as developing activities to learn different languages. In terms of the didactic implementation and classroom management of the use of several languages to enhance comprehension, teachers report on how

they explicitly use *peer-mentoring*. In the excerpt below, two teachers report on the experience of their school with a high percentage of newly arrived pupils:

S1 The peer-system works nicely at our school. There are often children who are already further in their language skills.
S3 Who already know the language.
S1 And in this way that they can help each other again. They can then translate and enhance comprehension for the new children but also for the teacher. And if there are problems, they help translate and understand the problem

In two of the groups there is a discussion on the relevance of developing an own *micro-language policy* when official institutional policies are mainly monolingual:

> We speak Dutch every day. We also have different days for English and Frisian. On a Dutch day, when a child asks something in Frisian, I answer in Frisian. It facilitates reading comprehension. Then a child also learns faster, because he understands it better. I would like to use the languages interchangeably much more. Children have no problems with that at all, we only think that. In this way you can develop your own policy a bit. When the director comes in, I stick to the official language policy.

4.2.2 Reported Knowledge in Translanguaging-Based Approaches

The segments coded under the category "knowledge" were sub-divided into six thematic categories: language acquisition in multilingual settings, teaching methodologies, role of translation, interconnectedness between languages, advantages of a comprehensive approach and parental participation. The majority of the segments were attributed to the teaching methodologies sub-category. In the following excerpt, for example, the teacher demonstrates knowledge on *receptive multilingualism*:

> Sometimes it does not matter what language you speak, as long as you understand each other, like with receptive multilingualism. You may not speak a language but understand it, like with Frisian and Dutch. Then the point is that you get the message even though you speak a different language.

While commenting on the excerpts in the vignettes, teachers also provided their views on the *combination of different teaching approaches*:

S4 I ask myself what the goals here are in terms of language. If we look, we also see that this segment is done from a CLIL perspective, where you have content and language goals. What do you actually want in such an interaction that the children learn?
S1 Yes, this is also translanguaging.
S3 But translanguaging and CLIL can work together.
S1 Yes!

This excerpt clearly shows that teachers are aware of the *different teaching approaches* that can be implemented in order to use several languages in instruction and how to combine them.

Next to knowledge on specific teaching methodologies, teachers also shared their experiences on language acquisition in multilingual settings. In the excerpt below, teachers discuss the *importance of pupils' home languages* for learning new concepts:

S2 Yes, these are all important principles, that you first have to understand something in your own language so that you can then build the other language more easily.
S3 Because then you are learning something useless. You just learn an empty word.
S1 Yes, because you don't know what it means, and you don't know how to apply it

A teacher in another group provides an account of the skills of pupils with and without prior instruction in the home languages:

> If a child is eight or ten, and they speak Chinese at home and no one else speaks this language in class, it is difficult but possible. They have learned how to learn, they know how to sit on a chair at a table, how to pay attention, how to write. Skills like that enhance learning of a new language. We also had children from Eritrea who had no education at all in their home country. They don't even know what it is like to sit on a chair at a table all day or to write with a pencil. So, they first have to learn the motor skills to write.

This teacher is thus aware of the transfer of skills that pupils with prior schooling can accomplish within the Dutch education system and that teaching needs to accommodate to this situation. Another teacher discusses phases in the language acquisition of multilingual pupils:

> You also see that students first have some sort of intermediate phase in that they use words in Dutch but sometimes in their own language and that it is very logical for them but not always for us.

4.2.3 Reported Attitudes in Translanguaging-Based Approaches

Explicit attitudes are difficult to elicit, in particular in a group discussion. As a result, only 9% of the coded segments were attributed to this category. Three main sub-categories were distinguished: change in attitudes, awareness and vision development and bidirectionality of teaching and learning. In terms of *changes in attitudes* a teacher in one of the groups reports that the "*whole attitude of the staff and how we deal with multilingualism*" has changed within the school. In another group, this is made more concrete in terms of changes in attitudes at different levels:

S1 Yes, if you talk about the use of multilingualism in the classroom: the social aspect, the linguistic, the pedagogical aspect. What comes out of that.
S2 I think that is great and special because it also implies a change in thinking about these aspects.
S1 Yes, indeed

In one of the groups, teachers reported on the need to *develop their own vision on multilingualism* and to cooperate with other teachers:

> "That is certainly the first big change, awareness, understanding, how do you deal with multilingualism, what is your vision, that kind of thing and the other teachers help you with this. Awareness and vision development are important."

Another discussion focused on the need to acknowledge that *learning is bidirectional* and for this to take place, teachers should be open to pupils' cultures:

S2 Okay. So, you refer again to the home situation. Things from the home country.
S1 And that ultimately happens because you are open to your pupils' cultures.
S2 That is different than: 'we will teach you how things are around here'. You learn together

Finally, another group summarizes changes in attitudes within their school in the following way: "But you know it is no longer 'me laughing at you', but 'we laugh together'. You see what I mean? And I noticed that this change is due to our general positive attitude."

5 Discussion and Conclusion

In this chapter we set out to outline the potentials of translanguaging-based approaches as part of a holistic approach for multilingualism in education (Duarte 2017). We investigated classroom interaction in three schools participating in a two-year intervention for multilingualism in education (see description in Duarte and Günther-van der Meij 2018b) in order to pinpoint several functions of translanguaging. In addition, we used vignettes as an impulse to elicit teachers' skills, knowledge and attitudes towards translanguaging-based approaches.

Both data sources point towards the relevance of the symbolic function of translanguaging (Duarte 2018) for both pupils and teachers. At the interactional level, teachers often make bridges towards the pupils' home languages in order to enhance learning. They also emphasise the importance of linking home languages to the Dutch language. In our sample, we found this to happen mainly at a semantic level, i.e., teachers asking for single words in the pupils' languages. The exception was one school for newly arrived pupils that encourages pupils to engage in longer interactions in their home languages during official classroom talk. Other schools also stimulated interaction in pupils' languages by using peer-coaching during group work. These recurring translanguaging spaces make use of "diverse multiple meaning-making systems" (Li Wei 2017, p. 24) and seem to occur naturally at the project schools.

At the PD level, teachers in fact reinforced the relevance of acknowledging the different languages of the pupils and of linking them to concepts in Dutch. In their discussions, several skills were mentioned in order to realize this, such as asking the pupils themselves or their parents, using translation or involving peers.

As seen in both interaction excerpts and in several accounts of the teachers, the symbolic function of translanguaging—the awareness and acknowledgement of different languages—is often perceived to be linked to cognitive aspects of learning. Teachers reported that such awareness moments facilitated content comprehension and learning in both language and content subjects. This happened often without the teachers themselves being proficient in the pupils' languages and being able to check the pupils' answers in their family languages.

Another aspect that emerges in both interaction and teacher discussions is related to the process of language learning itself. The data shows how both explicit language comparisons and making language a topic in class can also enhance (meta-)linguistic knowledge of all pupils. In teachers' accounts of the use of translanguaging they reported more often on the benefits of using several languages in instruction to enhance knowledge on languages in general but not to learn one specific language.

The current study, although based on a small sample of video observations and vignette-based discussions, points towards the importance of addressing pedagogical skills, knowledge and attitudes of teachers in PD (Fürstenau 2016; Pulinx et al. 2017) while developing and implementing programmes for multilingual education. Teachers in our sample gradually embraced and used their pupils' multilingualism through experimenting in class in a small and safe scale, discussing the results with colleagues and researchers before engaging in another cycle of experimenting. The iterative design-based approach (McKenney and Reeves 2013; Cobb et al. 2003) used to co-develop the multilingual teaching activities seemed to provide enough possibilities for teachers to develop their knowledge on language development and teaching in multilingual settings, to experiment with and implement different pedagogical skills in a translanguaging-based pedagogy and to report having developed a positive attitude towards the use of multilingualism in education. As such, our results so far contradict earlier findings on teachers perpetuating monolingual myths, (Angelis 2011; Fürstenau 2016; Gkaintartzi et al. 2015), on the perception of migrant languages as a deficit (Kaptain 2007; Pulinx et al. 2017; Tolbert and Knox 2016) and on home languages having little value, cognitively or otherwise (Gkaintartzi et al. 2015; Pulinx et al. 2017; Vaish 2012; Young 2014).

References

Angelis, G.D. (2011). Teachers' beliefs about the role of prior language knowledge in learning and how these influence teaching practices. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *8* (*03*), (216–234). https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2011.560669.

Bloor, M. & Wood, F. (Eds.). (2006). Keywords in Qualitative Methods. London: Sage.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *2* (*01*), (1–28).

CBS (2016). Bevolking [Population]. Retrieved from https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/cijfers.

Cenoz, J. (Ed.). (2009). *Towards Multilingual Education. Basque Educational Research from an International Perspective*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Childs, M. (2016). Reflecting on translanguaging in multilingual classrooms: harnessing the power of poetry and photography. *Educational Research for Social Change, 5* (*01*), (22–40).

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (Eds.). (2013) *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners.* London: Sage.

Cobb, P., Confrey, J., diSessa, A., Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2003). Design experiments in educational research. *Educational Researcher*, *32* (*01*), (9–13).

Conteh, J. (2018). Translanguaging as pedagogy—a critical review. In A. Creese, & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Superdiversity* (pp. 473–487). London: Routledge.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: a pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, *94* (*01*), (103–115).

Duarte, J. (2016). Translanguaging in mainstream education: a sociocultural approach. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *22* (*02*), (150–164). https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1231774.

Duarte, J. (2017). *3 M: Meer Kansen Met Meertaligheid – projectaanvraag* [3M: More opportunities with multilingualism – project application]. Leeuwarden/Ljouwert: NHL Stenden Hogeschool.

Duarte, J. (2018). Translanguaging in the context of mainstream multilingual education. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1512607.

Duarte, J., Gogolin, I., & Siemon, J. (2013). Sprachliche Interaktion im Unterricht - erste Ergebnisse der LiViS-Videostudie [Language interaction in the classroom – first results of the LiViS video study]. *OBST - Osnabrücker Beiträge Zur Sprachtheorie*, *83*, (79–94).

Duarte, J., & Günther-van der Meij, M.T. (2018a). Drietalige basisscholen in Friesland: een gouden greep in tijden van toenemende diversiteit? [Trilingual primary schools in Friesland: a silver bullet in times of increasing diversity?] In O. Agirdag & E.-R. Kambel (Eds.), *Meertaligheid en onderwijs: Nederlands plus* [Multilingualism and education: Netherlands plus] (pp. 90–102). Amsterdam: Boom.

Duarte, J., & Günther-van der Meij, M.T. (2018b). A holistic model for multilingualism in education [Special issue]. *EuroAmerican Journal of Applied Linguistics and Languages*, *5* (*02*), (24–43).

Fürstenau, S. (2016). Multilingualism and school development in transnational educational spaces. Insights from an intervention study at German elementary schools. In A. Küppers, B. Pusch & P. U. Semerci (Eds.), *Bildung in transnationalen Räumen [Education in transnational spaces]* (pp. 72–89). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

García, O. (Ed.). (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

García, O., & Kano, N. (2014). Translanguaging as process and pedagogy: Developing the English writing of Japanese students in the US. In J. Conteh & G. Meier (Eds.), *The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges* (pp. 258–277). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Gkaintartzi, A., Kiliari, A., & Tsokalidou, R. (2015). "Invisible" bilingualism – "invisible" language ideologies: Greek teachers' attitudes towards immigrant pupils' heritage languages. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *18* (*01*), (60–72).

Gogolin, I. (2002). Linguistic and cultural diversity in Europe: a challenge for educational research and practice. *European Educational Research Journal*, *1* (*01*), (123–138). https://doi.org/10.2304/eerj.2002.1.1.3.

Gort, M. (2015). Transforming literacy learning and teaching through translanguaging and other typical practices associated with "doing being bilingual". *International Multilingual Research Journal, 9* (*01*), (1–6).

Gorter, D., Riemersma, A., & Ytsma, J. (2001). Frisian in the Netherlands. In G. Extra & D. Gorter (Eds.), *The Other Languages of Europe* (pp. 103–118). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Haukås, Å. (2016). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *13* (*01*), (1–18). https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2015.1041960.

Herzog-Punzenberger, B., Le Pichon-Vorstman, E., & Siarova, H. (Eds.). (2017). *Multilingual Education in the Light of Diversity: Lessons Learned*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Hornberger, N.H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 15* (*03*), (261–278).

Jaspers, K. (2018). The transformative limits of translanguaging. *Language & Communication, 58* (*01*), (1–10).

Jones, B., & Lewis, G. (2014). Language arrangements within bilingual education. In E. M. Thomas & I. Mennen (Eds.), *Advances in the Study of Bilingualism* (pp. 141–170). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Jørgensen, J.N. (2008). Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 5* (*03*), (161–176).

Kamwangamalu, N. (2010). Multilingualism and code-switching in education. In N. Hornberger, & S. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Education* (pp. 116–142). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kaptain, H.J. (Ed.). (2007). *Teacher Attitudes Toward Bilingual Education: The Power and Possibility of a Two-way Immersion Program to Effect Change* (Master's thesis, University of Iowa). https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/b24b/f63ff430fcdd021937fc9e317cfd6963e816.pdf.

Latisha, M., & Young, A. (2017). From silencing to translanguaging: Turning the tide to support emergent bilinguals in transition from home to pre-school. In B. Paulsrud, J. Rosen, B. Straszer & A. Wedin (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Translanguaging and Education* (pp. 108–128). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Lee, J. S., & Oxelson, E. (2006). "It's not my job": K–12 Teacher Attitudes Toward Students' Heritage Language Maintenance. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *30* (*02*), (453–477). https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2006.10162885.

MacSwan, J. (2017). A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal*, *54* (*01*), (167–201).

Martin-Beltrán, M. (2009). Cultivating space for the language boomerang: The interplay of two languages as academic resources. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *8* (*02*), (25–53).

McKenney, S., & Reeves, T. (2013). Systematic review of design-based research progress: is a little knowledge a dangerous thing? *Educational Researcher*, *42* (*02*), (97–100).

Melo-Pfeifer, S. (2018). The multilingual turn in foreign language education. In A. Bonnet & P. Siemund (Eds.), *Foreign Language Education in Multilingual Classrooms* (pp. 192–2013). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Palmer, D., Martinez, R., Henderson, K., & Mateus, S. (2014). Reframing the debate on language separation: toward a vision for translanguaging pedagogies in the dual language classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 98* (*03*), (757–772).

Pulinx, R., Van Avermaet, P., & Agirdag, O. (2017). Silencing linguistic diversity: the extent, the determinants and consequences of the monolingual beliefs of Flemish teachers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *20* (*05*), (542–556). https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1102860.

Samson, J. F., & Lesaux, N. (2015). Disadvantaged language minority students and their teachers: a national picture. *Teachers College Record*, *117* (*02*), (1–26).

Steiner, P., Atzmüller, C., & Su, D. (2016). Designing valid and reliable vignette experiments for survey research: a case study on the fair gender income gap. *Journal of Methods and Measurement in the Social Sciences, 7* (02), (52–94).

Soltero-Gonzalez, L., Sparrow, W., Butvilofsky, S., Escamilla, K., & Hopewell, S. (2016). The effects of paired literacy instruction on the Spanish and English literacy outcomes of emerging bilingual children in grades first to third. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *48* (*01*), (80–104).

Ticheloven, A., Blom, E., Leseman, P., & McMonagle, S. (2019). Translanguaging challenges in multilingual classrooms: scholar, teacher and student perspectives. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1686002.

Tolbert, S., & Knox, C. (2016). "They might know a lot of things that I dont know": investigating differences in preservice teachers' ideas about contextualizing science instruction in multilingual classrooms. *International Journal of Science Education*, *38* (*07*), (1133–1149). https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2016.1183266.

Vaish, V. (2012). Teacher beliefs regarding bilingualism in an English medium reading program. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *15* (*01*), (53–69). https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2011.594496.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *30* (*06*), (1024–1054). https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701599465.

Vogel, S., & García, O. (2017). Translanguaging. In G. Noblit, & L. Moll (Eds.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. Oxford: University Press.

Wei, L. (2017). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics, 39* (*01*), (9–30).

Young, A.S. (2014). Unpacking teachers' language ideologies: attitudes, beliefs, and practiced language policies in schools in Alsace, France. *Language Awareness*, *23* (*1–2*), (157–171). https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2013.863902.