

**TEACHERS' IDEOLOGIES TOWARDS IMPLEMENTATION OF
TRANSLANGUAGING IN SELECTED MULTILINGUAL GRADE 4 CLASSROOMS
OF THE ZAMBEZI REGION, NAMIBIA**

BEGANI ZIAMBO MASHINJA

**A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of a degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Linguistics.**

The University of Zambia

Lusaka

2025

ABSTRACT

Namibian schools face challenges with English as a language of teaching and learning, especially for transitional grade learners, leading to consideration of translanguaging strategies by the government. However, the implementation of translanguaging faces resistance in multilingual classrooms. Therefore, this study examined the teachers' ideologies towards the implementation of translanguaging in selected multilingual grade 4 classrooms of the Zambezi Region, Namibia. The study employed a qualitative approach, utilising classroom observations, interviews (one-on-one), and document analysis data collection sources. Purposeful sampling was used to delimit the primary population and to come up with ten (10) teachers and eight (8) HODs, totalling eighteen (18) participants in the study. The documentary analysis involved documents such as the grade 4 English language lesson plans. These documents were analysed to see whether teachers deliberately planned for translanguaging and purposefully used it as a pedagogic practice. Data were analysed using thematic analysis, which involved looking for naturally occurring units and reducing them to natural meaning units to check for regular patterns of themes. The study findings showed that while most teachers were familiar with the language policy, they were, however, not familiar with translanguaging. Further, while some teachers held positive ideologies about translanguaging implementation, others held negative ideologies leading to resistance to applying it. In terms of classroom application, of the ten teachers whose lessons have been presented, four of them had lesson plans while six did not have them, implying that while the policy was accepted by some, others contested it. Moreover, although teachers had lesson plans, they did not intentionally plan for translanguaging, implying that teachers did not deliberately plan to use it in their teaching. However, observations provided that most teachers implemented translanguaging practices spontaneously in their lessons, implying that teachers were willing to implement it even if they did not plan for it. In addition, the study observed that other teachers held monolingual ideologies in which they used English exclusively during classroom interaction. Finally, the study found that several factors promoted and constrained the implementation of translanguaging in the classrooms. The study concludes that while translanguaging is practicable in Namibia, a lot has to be done, especially in teacher training, to equip teachers with the necessary knowledge and skills to use translanguaging and decolonise the negative ideologies for its successful implementation. The implications of these findings suggest the need for professional development programs focused on multilingual pedagogies to assist teachers in reframing their language ideologies and understanding the benefits of translanguaging as an instructional strategy. Therefore, the study has suggested a structured training program designed to enhance teachers' understanding and application of translanguaging strategies within their classrooms, serving as part of their continuous professional development (CPD) in Namibia.

Keywords: language ideologies, translanguaging, language policy, lesson planning, Zambezi region, Silozi

DECLARATION

I, **BEGAN ZIAMBO MASHINJA**, declare that '*Teachers' Ideologies Towards Implementation of Translanguaging in Selected Multilingual Grade 4 Classrooms of Zambezi Region, Namibia*' is my own work, that it has not been submitted for any degree or examination in any other University, and that all the sources I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by complete references.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

DEDICATION

To my beloved child, sister, and friend: Zondiwe (Zoe), Rakiwe (Shokila), and Memory (Auntie Boo). You paid part of the price for being there for me during my PhD study. May the Lord God continue giving you wisdom and long life, and I hope my achievement means something to you. I thank you!

COPYRIGHT

All rights reserved. No parts of this dissertation may be reproduced, stored in any retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means: electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the consent of either the author or the University of Zambia.

© **BEGAN ZIAMBO MASHINJA, 2025.**

APPROVAL

This thesis by Begani Ziambo Mashinja is approved as fulfilling the requirements for the award of the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Applied Linguistics.

Examiner 1

Signature

Date

.....

.....

.....

Examiner 2

Signature

Date

.....

.....

.....

Examiner 3

Signature

Date

.....

.....

.....

Chairperson

Signature

Date

Board of Examiners

.....

.....

.....

Supervisor

Signature

Date

.....

.....

.....

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I praise and thank God for the opportunity, good health, and life I have had during my study period.

This thesis would not have been possible without the assistance and support of all the individuals mentioned below; thus, I express my sincere gratitude for their support in different ways in the completion of this thesis.

First and foremost, my supervisor, Professor David Sani Mwanza, I sincerely thank you for your wonderful supervisory skills and mentorship, which have led to the completion of this thesis. Without your endless support and through extensive discussion and insightful comments, I would not have been able to accomplish this work. Your "*eagle eye*," vision, and unwavering encouragement have not only enabled me to progress this far but also to achieve the level of scholar I aspired to be. If being a role model means being a helpful, dedicated, kind, and wise person, then you have undoubtedly been my role model and an amazing professor who has guided me in the right direction along this journey. You taught me how to conduct good research and present my results in the clearest and most concise manner. Your belief in my abilities and unwavering optimism have given me the confidence to tackle challenging tasks and overcome obstacles. I am grateful for all you have given and taught me, and I would like to pay my respect for your friendship, sensitivity, and amazing sense of humour.

I am also thankful to Dr. Benson Mkandawire; you have been a source of inspiration in this journey. I am more grateful for the *cup of tea* you always offered every time I visited your office, which was later accompanied with a question: "*How far are we with our studies, Mr. Mashinja?*" I can't thank you enough for your hospitality, Dr.

My gratitude also goes to Prof. Jame Abah and Mr. Brian Kabuku, from the University of Namibia, who have taught me so much about writing and survival over the years. You always see potential in me and believe in my capabilities. You people have always provided me with excellent opportunities and insightful perspectives throughout my studies. Aside from that, I would like to express my gratitude for your unconditional love and undying support in both great and hard times.

I would want to express my heartfelt thanks to my family members, particularly my loving mother, 'Mama Judy,' my dearest uncle, Mr. Lucious Chata, my siblings, and other family members who have encouraged me to pursue success in all areas of my life. I cannot thank you

enough for your unquestioning emotional support and generosity in helping me get this far. To George Kanyanga, I wish to thank you for opening your house for me. May God open the windows of heaven and retain the favour to you. Further, I would like to express my utmost gratitude to my fondest sister, Rakiwe. You are one in a million. Thank you for taking care of my daughter during my absence and for inspiring me to pursue this degree. I would like to express my gratitude to my partner and friend for her love, patience, understanding, and encouragement.

I would like to convey my heartfelt gratitude to my friends, Mr. Wise Mwelwa, Ms. Merium Chuma, and Ms. Emmayo Lyakuwa. Thank you for everything you have done for me during this very intense academic year. I am grateful to have you in my life. You have been the bright spots in an otherwise dreary world. Your support and sympathy have propelled me onwards and enabled me to complete this thesis.

I must express my gratitude to the Zambezi Region Education Directorate for allowing me to research at their respective schools. My heartfelt gratitude goes to my participants for their availability and willingness to participate in this research, as well as to all authors whose works I cited.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
DECLARATION	ii
DEDICATION	iii
COPYRIGHT	iv
APPROVAL	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Overview	1
1.2 Background of the Study	2
1.3 Statement of the Problem.....	9
1.4 Purpose of the Study	9
1.5 Objectives of the Study	9
1.6 Research Questions	10
1.7 Significance of the Study	10
1.8 Delimitation of the Study.....	11
1.9 Limitations of the Study.....	12
1.10 Operational Definitions.....	13
1.11 Thesis Chapter Organisation	14
1.12 Chapter Summary	15
CHAPTER TWO	16
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	16
2.1 Overview	16
2.2 Teachers Language Ideologies	16
2.3 Translanguaging in the Classroom.....	21
2.3.1 Genesis of Translanguaging and its Development.....	21

2.3.2 Translanguaging as Classroom Pedagogical Practice	23
2.3.3 Spontaneous and Pedagogical Translanguaging	25
2.3.4 Translanguaging as a Pedagogy	27
2.3.5 Translanguaging versus Code-switching	29
2.4 Teachers' Language Ideologies and Practices in Namibia	31
2.5 Teachers' Familiarity with the Language Policy in Relation to Translanguaging	40
2.6 Teachers' Ideologies Towards Implementation of Translanguaging.....	45
2.7 Implementation of Translanguaging in Language Classrooms.....	53
2.8 Factors Affecting Teachers' Implementation of Translanguaging in Grade 4 English Language Classrooms.	58
2.9 Chapter Summary	64
CHAPTER THREE	65
THEORETICAL AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK.....	65
3.1 Overview	65
3.2 Theoretical Framework	65
3.2.1 Richard Ruiz's Three Language Orientations Model	66
3.2.2 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA).....	73
3.2.3 The Code and Pedagogic Discourse Theory	78
3.3 Analytical Framework.....	83
3.3.1 The Translanguaging Classroom Framework	83
1. Stance.....	83
2. Design	84
3. Shift.....	85
3.4 Chapter Summary	86
CHAPTER FOUR.....	87
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	87
4.1 Overview	87

4.2 Research Paradigm.....	87
4.3 Research Approach	88
4.4 Research Design.....	89
4.5 Study Population.....	90
4.6 Study Sampling Method and Sample.....	90
4.7 Methods of Data Collection	91
4.7.1 Interview Guide	92
4.7.2 Classroom Observation.....	92
4.7.3 Document analysis	93
4.8 Data Analysis	94
4.9 Quality Assurance	95
4.9.1 Credibility and Confirmability.....	96
4.9.2 Transferability and Dependability.....	96
4.10 Ethical Assurance.....	97
4.10.1 Respect for person.....	97
4.10.2 Dissemination of findings	98
4.11 Chapter Summary	99
CHAPTER FIVE.....	100
PRESENTATION OF RESULTS.....	100
5.1 Overview.....	100
5.2 How familiar are the teachers with the language in education policy in relation to translanguageing?	100
5.2.1 Teachers' Familiarity with the Language Policy in relation to Translanguageing..	100
5.2.2 HODs' Familiarity with the Language Policy in relation to Translanguageing	102
5.3 What are the teachers' ideologies towards translanguageing pedagogic practice?	103
5.3.1 Positive Ideologies about Translanguageing	104
5.3.2 Negative Ideologies about Translanguageing.....	107

5.4 How do Teachers Implement Translanguaging in Multilingual Grade 4 Classrooms? ...	110
5.4.1 Interview Results	111
5.4.2 Observed Lessons and Lesson Plans.....	112
5.4.3 Lesson 1: Grammar Lesson (Topic: Adverbs)	113
5.4.4 Lesson 2: Literature Lesson (Poem: On the Moon).....	116
5.4.5 Lesson 3: Grammar Lesson (Topic: Sentences).....	119
5.4.6 Lesson 4: Grammar Lesson (Topic: Countable and Uncountable Nouns).....	122
5.4.7 Lesson 5: Grammar Lesson (Topic: Plural and Singular Nouns)	124
5.4.8 Lesson 6: Reading Comprehension Lesson (Reading a Chart)	126
5.4.9 Lesson 7: Listening Comprehension (Taimi's Family)	128
5.4.10 Lesson 8: Reading Comprehension (Reading Instructions).....	130
5.4.11 Lesson 9: Literature Lesson (Poem: If he hits you)	132
5.4.12 Lesson 10: Grammar (Reflexive pronouns).....	134
5.5 What factors affect teachers' implementation of translanguaging in multilingual grade classrooms?	136
5.5.1 Factors Promoting the Implementation of Translanguaging.....	137
5.5.2 Factors Constraining the Implementation of Translanguaging	139
5.6 Chapter Summary	143
CHAPTER SIX	145
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	145
6.1 Overview	145
6.2 Teachers' Familiarity with the Language Policy in Relation to Translanguaging	145
6.3 Teachers' Ideologies toward Translanguaging Pedagogical Practice.....	151
6.3.1 Positive Ideologies about Translanguaging	151
6.3.2 Negative Ideologies about Translanguaging	160
6.4 Application of Translanguaging in Grade 4 English Language Classrooms	169
6.4.1 Interview Results	169

6.4.2 Document Analysis of Lesson Planning	170
6.4.3 Classroom Implementation of Translanguaging in Multilingual Grade 4 Classrooms.....	174
6.5 Factors Affecting Teachers' Implementation of Translanguaging in Multilingual Grade 4 Classrooms.....	185
6.5.1 Factors Promoting Translanguaging Implementation	186
6.5.2 Factors Constraining Translanguaging Implementing	189
6.6 Support Needed to Successfully Implement Translanguaging in Multilingual Classrooms 198	
6.6.1 Teacher training	198
6.6.2 Adapting Curriculum and Assessment	199
6.6.3 Fostering Collaboration	200
6.6.4 Adjusting Language Policy	201
6.6.5 Releasing Linguistic Control	201
6.7 Chapter Summary	202
CHAPTER SEVEN.....	203
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	203
7.1 Overview.....	203
7.2 Conclusions.....	203
7.3 Teachers' Familiarity with the Language Policy in Relation to Translanguaging	203
7.4 Teachers' Ideologies About Translanguaging Pedagogical Practice	204
7.5 Application of Translanguaging in Grade 4 English Language Classrooms	205
7.6 Factors Affecting Teachers' Implementation of Translanguaging in Multilingual Grade 4 Classrooms.....	206
7.7 The Contribution of this Research	207
7.7.1 Contributions to the Theory	207
7.7.2 Contribution to Practice	208

7.8 Proposed Training Program in Translanguaging as part of CPD for Namibian Teachers	210
7.9 Recommendations.....	213
7.10 Suggestions for Further Research	215
7.11 Chapter Summary	215
REFERENCES	216
APPENDICES	248
APPENDIX 1: ETHICAL CLEARANCE.....	248
APPENDIX 2: RESEARCH PERMISSION LETTER	251
APPENDIX 3: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TEACHERS.....	252
APPENDIX 4: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION GUIDE FOR TEACHERS	254
APPENDIX 5: DOCUMENT ANALYSIS GUIDE	256

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

Language ideologies are beliefs, feelings, and conceptions held by individuals toward language structure and language use (Kroskrity 2010). Language ideologies do not only concern certain languages but also language users, learners, and teachers (Lou, Xiong, & Peng, 2022). Mainly, teachers' language ideologies play a critical role in shaping language practices at schools and language education (Cai, 2021; Gu, Kou, and Guo, 2019). Literature shows that language practices in educational settings align more with teachers' language ideologies than with formal or official language policies (Maseko, 2021; Lou et al., 2022). Thus, in Namibia, where multilingualism is a reality in the classroom, teachers' ideologies about translanguageing become a subject of utmost importance. Teachers are vital agents in initiating and facilitating the adoption of translanguageing practices in classrooms. Their ideologies, beliefs, and attitudes play a crucial role in determining the success of this approach.

Namibia, a multilingual country with over 30 indigenous languages, presents a unique context for examining teachers' ideologies towards translanguageing in the classroom. The diverse linguistic landscape of Namibia reflects the complex interplay of languages, cultures, and identities, which has significant implications for educational policy and practice. Thus, the coexistence of multiple languages in both urban and rural settings underscores the need for educational approaches that honour and leverage this linguistic diversity. However, the historical legacy of colonialism and the dominance of English in formal education have influenced language attitudes and policies in Namibia (Frydman, 2011), shaping the ideologies of teachers towards translanguageing in the classroom.

The dominance of English as the Language of Learning and Teaching (LoLT) in Namibian schools (as well as schools in other African countries) has led to challenges that demand the implementation of translanguageing strategies to improve learners' English language proficiency (Mwinda & van der Walt, 2015: 101). Translanguageing is a pedagogical approach that recognises the fluidity and interconnectedness of languages. It recognises that learners bring with them their own linguistic resources and seeks to capitalise on these resources to enhance their understanding and engagement. In the Namibian context, translanguageing allows for the use of learners' first languages together with English in the classroom when learners

transition to English as MoI in grade 4. Thus, it encourages teachers and learners to use their entire linguistic repertoire to enhance understanding and promote active participation in the learning process. This approach challenges the traditional view of language as static and separate entities, instead highlighting the complex and dynamic nature of language use in real-life contexts.

Against this overview, this exploratory case study examines the teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging in the Namibian multilingual Grade 4 English language classrooms in the Zambezi region, where the language policy recommends (Silozi) a minority and unfamiliar language to most learners to serve a supporting role when learners transition to English medium. This section outlines the background of the study, the statement of the problem, and key research questions to be addressed. It further presents the significance of the study, the definition of terms, the delimitation of the study, the thesis outline, and the chapter summary.

1.2 Background of the Study

Namibia is a multicultural and multilingual country (Ministry of Education, 2015). However, before independence, Namibia had a mixed-up official language of Afrikaans and English, with Afrikaans dominating as the medium of instruction in schools (Ashikuti, 2019). Nonetheless, at the dawn of independence, the newly formed Namibian government reformed its education system and reviewed the language policy for schools to decolonise the curriculum and address the language issues in the country and afford equal education for all its population. Consequently, the policymakers' desire to remove Afrikaans, considered the language of colonial oppression and apartheid politics, from its position at the top of the language hierarchy, resulted in its replacement with English, viewed as the "language of liberation" (Frydman, 2011; Ashikuti, 2019; Ipinge and Banda, 2020; Norro, 2023). The decision to adopt English as the official language was based on decolonisation and internationalisation ideologies informed by the sociopolitical situation of the country at the time (Ashikuti, 2019). Primarily, the decision was informed by the need for national unity, political stability, and the international reach of English. In other words, English was considered a neutral and unifying language that would open the country to broader communication worldwide; thus, English was considered the best choice for an official language. However, instead of decolonising the language policy (LP), choosing English as the only official language led to the rise of a new elite class of English-proficient Namibians (cf. Ipinge and Banda 2020; Norro 2023). Internationalisation

ideology may thus be said to have overcome the decolonisation ideology (cf. Kamwangamalu 2013) in this respect.

Nevertheless, today, English is a compulsory school subject in Namibia and the medium of teaching in schools and universities. The Language in Education Policy (LEP) was reformed by the Ministry of Education, Arts and Culture in 2015 and states that English should be the medium of instruction in all Namibian schools, particularly government institutions, from Grade 4 to 12. However, it is crucial to note that the adoption and use of English as a MoI at senior primary level, particularly grade 4, and the poor English teaching practices in African countries where exposure to English beyond the classroom is limited, often result in learners' failure to learn the content knowledge presented in English at subsequent phases of school (Ashikuti, 2019). Hence, the adoption of English as an official language and MoI in schools from early on in schooling in Namibia is a pedagogical challenge to many and at different levels. Shikalepoh (2016) notes that learners are not ready for the language transition at grade 4. These learners begin grade 4 with limited English vocabulary, resulting in serious communication challenges and low levels of literacy skills. As a result of problems beginning at primary school, learners continue to lag behind their required level of language proficiency, and the majority never really reach the language proficiency in English that their age and school level demand (Jones, as cited in Wolfaardt, 2005). Thus, the dominance of English as the Language of Learning and Teaching (LoLT) in Namibian schools (as well as schools in other African countries) has led to challenges that demand the implementation of translanguaging strategies to improve learners' English language proficiency (Mwinda & van der Walt, 2015: 101).

The coinage of the concept and the introduction of the idea of '*translanguaging*' by Colin Baker (2001), based on Cen Williams' (1994) observations in Welsh revitalisation classrooms (Wei, 2023). Cen Williams coined the term translanguaging in the 1980s in his unpublished thesis titled "An Evaluation of Teaching and Learning Methods in the Context of Bilingual Secondary Education" (Williams, 1994). Thus, the idea of translanguaging originated in Welsh, for the planned and systematic use of two languages for teaching and learning inside the same lesson (Baker, 2003, 2011; Williams, 1994, 1996), which differed from many previous bilingual education methods that tried to separate languages by class, time, or day. Cen Williams and colleagues were investigating strategies for learners to use two languages (Welsh and English) in a single lesson. They (Cen Williams and Dafydd Whittall) coined the term '*trawsieithu*' to describe reading or hearing input in one language (e.g., English) and writing or speaking about

it in another (e.g., Welsh or vice versa) (Chaudhary, 2024). Thus, in the original Welsh version, the input was often meant to be in one language, and the output was primarily in the other (Baker 2011, 288). Nevertheless, in its origin, the concept meant ‘*translanguifying*’ before it was changed to ‘*translanguaging*’ (Ralushai, Ntombela, & Rammala, 2024: 58). Their colleague Colin Baker translated the term ‘*trawsieithu*’ into English and popularised it as translanguaging (Baker, 2011; Lewis & Baker, 2012). Since then, the term has expanded to cover multiple languages in many contexts.

The translanguaging teaching approach involves ‘the systematic alternation of two languages so that children receive information in one language and produce a piece of work in the other language’ (Williams, 1994; Baker, 2011: 99). The main idea of translanguaging is that one language supports the other to enhance understanding as well as encourage pupils’ classroom participation in both languages (Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012). In other words, translanguaging is about ‘making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge by using two languages’ (Baker, 2011: 288). According to Garcia and Wei (2014) and Wei and Ho (2018), translanguaging refers to a process of meaning-making that entails flexible and integrated use of the learner’s linguistic repertoire that goes beyond the borders of named languages; it, therefore, permits the purposeful shifting of languages to aid knowledge construction and enhance learners’ and teachers’ linguistic resources in problem-solving (Macawile & Plata, 2022). As a pedagogical practice, Norro (2023) notes that translanguaging denotes how teachers and learners “engage in complex and fluent discursive practices” to communicate, enhance understanding of the content, appropriate it, and develop academic language practices (García 2014: 112). In Garcia’s work (2009), the concept of translanguaging is generally known to emphasise the importance of using familiar languages.

As a translanguaging scholar, I build on Cen Williams’ (1994) early ideas of *trawsieithu* (as he originally coined it in Welsh) and Colin Baker’s (2001) ‘TRANSLANGUAGING,’ which invoked the extensive scholarship on ‘LANGUAGING.’ Therefore, in this study, translanguaging refers to a teaching approach that involves the intentional and planned use of learners’ multilingual resources in English language teaching in Grade 4 classrooms in the Zambezi region of Namibia. Thus, translanguaging denotes the utilisation of a speaker’s full linguistic repertoire while disregarding the socially and politically defined boundaries of named languages (Garcia, Johnson & Seltzer, 2017; Otheguy, Garcia & Reid, 2015). Within the classroom perspective, Garcia and Kano (2014: 260) define translanguaging ‘as a process by which [learners] and teachers engage in complex discursive practices that consider all the

language practices of all [learners] in a class to develop new language practices while sustaining prior experiences and giving voice to new sociopolitical realities by cross-examining the inequality of languages. Equally, Garcia (2009), Baker (2011), Lewis, Jones, and Baker (2012) refer to translanguaging as a planned and systematic alternation of two languages in one lesson in a school context. All the translanguaging definitions quoted above emphasise the deliberate and systematic utilisation of two or more languages by bi/multilingual speakers for meaning-making.

Therefore, translanguaging pedagogy involves all the languages in a classroom in group work and discussions, using vocabularies and digital translation, creating word and cognate walls, using peer assistance, and leveraging the learners' language communities as linguistic and cultural resources (Norro, 2023). According to Wei (2023), the idea of translanguaging was founded considering the learners' bilingualism as an integral part of the learners' lives. In that regard, weaving these lives into classroom practices became the bedrock of translanguaging pedagogy. Thus, it recognises that learners bring with them their own linguistic resources and seeks to capitalise on these resources to enhance their understanding and engagement in the classroom. Hence, it is a language practice that involves a deliberate alternation between the language of input and output in the classroom. Translanguaging can give learners appropriate linguistic input and allow them to perform linguistic output in meaningful, collaborative ways. Norro (2023) alludes to the fact that translanguaging enables learners to work in their bi-/multilingual zone of proximal development, which is truncated in the foreign language without assistance. Translanguaging is therefore helpful in meaning-making, where learners can utilise multiple languages to negotiate meaning and facilitate learning. In a translanguaging framework, meaning-making involves learners' practices in utilising their multiple languages and experiences to attain academic comprehension, amplify or reinforce competency in dual or triple languages, and create identities (Macawile & Plata, 2022). Therefore, learners need opportunities to use all the resources—the mediation of teachers, peers, and materials (dictionaries, multilingual texts, images, videos, etc.) to perform in the bi-/multilingual zone of proximal development (Norro, 2023).

Consequently, in recognition of the value of translanguaging, the Namibian MEAC (2015:13; 2016:29) states that in the transitional grade, namely Grade 4, the mother tongue may play a supportive role to enable learners to understand difficult concepts during the primary cycle. In other words, in educational contexts, where learners struggle to understand subject matter in English (or any given LoTL), learners' comprehension can be facilitated through using

translanguaging practices (Shifidi, 2014: 24). Thus, utilisation of learners' familiar languages alongside English helps them learn academic content and the new language, leading to improved learning outcomes. By implication, the use of translanguaging "a pragmatic response to the local classroom context and its practicality may be seen as teachers' and learners' local, pragmatic, coping tactic and responses to the dominance of the English language" (cf. Shifidi, 2014: 24). Put differently, in educational contexts, where learners struggle to understand subject matter in English (or any given LoTL), learners' comprehension can be facilitated through using translanguaging practices. Therefore, within the Namibian multilingual grade 4 classroom context, in terms of pedagogical practices and instructional efforts, translanguaging calls for teachers to soften the borders between named languages, since ESL learners often employ their entire linguistic repertoire in meaning-making (Ambele, 2022). This will, in turn, engage learners in collaborative interactions with peers and facilitate comprehension of new concepts and content since the L1 will serve as a scaffold in completing classroom tasks and retaining newly learnt content (Ambele, 2022).

However, Murray (2007: 76) states that although the Language in-Education Policy (LEP) of Namibia supports multilingualism and the use of languages alongside English in learning contexts, many schools do not fully embrace this principle. Similarly, Simasiku, Kasanda, & Smit (2015:317) note that "[e]ven though the Namibian government has recognised the use of local languages in English medium classrooms to help learners to understand difficult concepts and terms, the idea of using the local language to bridge communication barriers has not taken root." Thus, despite the recognition of multilingualism and its pedagogic approach, translanguaging, as a means to bridge the linguistic gaps, aid comprehension, and support the second language learning process of Grade 4 learners, many Namibian schools and teachers are hesitant to fully embrace this practice in their classrooms (Mwinda & van de Walt, 2015; von Wühlisch, 2018). Torpsten (2018) reports that many schools only use the target language in their teaching, even though translanguaging has been shown to develop a deeper and broader knowledge of the language. Thus, despite the benefits of translanguaging practice, public schools continuously use monolingual practices in the classrooms (Garcia and Wei, 2014). According to Garcia & Kleyn (2016), many teachers avoid using the practice of translanguaging in their classrooms, because it goes against what the schools have traditionally used as methods in the language classrooms. In other words, the implementation of translanguaging practices in educational contexts often faces opposition due to prevailing

ideologies that prioritise monolingualism or view languages other than the dominant language as inferior. Thus, language ideologies influence teachers' beliefs and practices in the classroom.

Language ideologies are social constructs that “include the values, practices, and beliefs associated with language use by speakers and the discourse that constructs values and beliefs” (Blackledge and Pavlenko 2006: 123). Language ideologies are sets of beliefs about which languages and varieties may be considered legitimate or appropriate in various contexts and situations, constructed from specific political and economic perspectives (Heller and Martin-Jones 2001; Kroskrity 2004). Thus, socially held beliefs about languages impact the way legitimate language is determined by rationalising and justifying the roles given to different languages. Moreover, language ideologies are defined as systems of beliefs about language (e.g., beliefs about what kinds of language are appropriate in particular spaces or institutions, etc.) and are performed in context, at the intersections of language and social power structures (Ruiz, 1984). According to Kesvan (2016:147), ideologies are “world views that an individual, group, or society holds to be important or true; these views are shared by a society and form the basis for how it should function.” Pomuti and Weber (2012) understood ideologies as belief systems, attitudes, views, and mindsets of educationists that inform and guide their work. In other words, language ideologies that teachers subscribe to will shape (often encouraging or limiting) the implementation of translanguaging practices in Grade 4 classrooms. Put differently, while language teaching is shaped by language in education policy, classroom language practices are mediated by the decisions of the teacher. Thus, in the classroom, teachers are language policy makers, making choices about which languages or kinds of language are acceptable (Benstein et al., 2018).

De Angelis (2011) notes that teachers have much policy power, as they can choose whether to integrate minority languages into their teaching, turning learners' multilingualism into a useful resource for the entire classroom, or can choose to ignore minority languages, closing a source of linguistic knowledge for their learners. Thus, as classroom language managers, teachers create language policies for the learners in their classes. By implication, teachers play a central role in teachers' decisions, judgements, and behaviours in their teaching process, influencing various aspects of teaching, including pedagogical decision-making, what approaches, techniques, and classroom activities are adopted, and how learners should be chosen and evaluated. In other words, ideologies influence the ideas that a school or individual teacher holds towards a certain issue, such as the implementation of translanguaging in the teaching of the English language in the context of multilingual grade 4 classrooms in the Zambezi region

in Namibia. These ideologies imply what kinds of language practices are valued in enacting language policy and are disclosed as discourses in curricula, syllabi, and teachers' practices and interactions with learners (Wei, 2016). Therefore, considering that teachers construct ideologies and often "become the main agents through whom ideology is spread," it is important to examine their beliefs and practices, as these are shaped by the underlying "dominant language ideology" that is embodied in curricula, school manuals, teaching materials, and pedagogic practices (Ganuza & Hedman, 2017). It is important to study the ideologies of grade 4 English language teachers concerning translanguaging because they influence how teachers interact with learners and which learning opportunities they create in the classroom.

Despite the perceived benefits of translanguaging, there is still resistance to the application of this pedagogical practice in Namibian classrooms (Muray, 2007; Simasiku, Kasanda, & Smit, 2015), particularly in the language education context. Thus, while research on translanguaging has gained traction globally, there is a conspicuous dearth of studies specific to the Namibian educational context. Existing literature addressing teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging (Simasiku, 2015; Ipinge & Banda, 2020; Norro, 2023) shows that there is little uptake of studies examining the ideologies of English language teachers in utilising translanguaging and the extent to which they are willing to accommodate other languages in their classrooms. Most existing work addressing teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging is derived from a context outside Namibia, which may not accurately reflect the sociolinguistic dynamics at play within Namibian classrooms. Thus, it leaves a gap in understanding how local cultural and linguistic variables influence teachers' ideologies about translanguaging. Furthermore, much of the research focuses on higher or secondary education, neglecting Grade 4, a critical period for language development and identity formation in learners. Consequently, the unique ideologies of primary school teachers remain underexplored. Alemania et al. (2022) write that one way of closing this gap and implementing translanguaging as an effective pedagogy is to address teachers' underlying ideologies toward language diversity in their classrooms. Richardson (1996) notes the importance of teachers' ideologies in understanding classroom practices, and Rivera and Mazak (2017) stress the need to examine ideologies toward translanguaging because they can determine how effective a translanguaging pedagogy is. Thus, the present study sought to examine teachers' ideologies about the implementation of translanguaging in selected multilingual grade 4 classrooms in the Zambezi region of Namibia.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Grade 4 is a critical transitional stage in Namibia's educational system, moving from mother-tongue instruction to English. The language policy for schools in Namibia considers translanguaging as an alternative pedagogic strategy and a resource for meaning-making, linguistic awareness, as well as the development of adequate literacy competencies required to handle learning in English when learners transition to English medium in Grade 4. According to the Ministry of Education, Arts and Culture (MEAC) (2015:13; 2016:29), in the transitional grade, Grade 4, the mother tongue may still play a supportive role in enabling learners to understand difficult concepts during the primary cycle. However, many teachers do not fully embrace this practice in their classrooms (Murray, 2007; Simasiku, Kasanda, & Smit, 2015; Mwindi & van de Walt, 2015; von Wühlisch, 2018). This means that language teachers hold diverse ideologies toward translanguaging in their classrooms. Available literature shows that there is little uptake of scholarship exploring teachers' ideologies towards the teaching practice and its implementation in the Namibian multilingual classrooms' context (Simasiku, 2015; Ipinge & Banda, 2020, Norro, 2023). Ideologies play a significant role in shaping the implementation of translanguaging in multilingual classrooms. Therefore, the present study sought to examine the teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging in multilingual grade 4 classrooms in the Zambezi region of Namibia. Understanding teachers' ideologies and language positions can provide information on the possible constraints and misapprehensions that impede them from using translanguaging in their multilingual L2 classes (Alemania et al., 2022:153). This knowledge can inform the development of supportive language policies that provide guidance and resources for teachers to implement translanguaging practices effectively.

1.4 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the teachers' ideologies towards the implementation of translanguaging in multilingual Grade 4 classrooms in the Zambezi region of Namibia, a pedagogical approach that encourages the use of multiple languages in the classroom to enhance comprehension and build on learners' linguistic repertoires. By focusing on teachers' perspectives, the study sought to illuminate the interplay between language practices, teaching philosophy, and learner engagement within multilingual classrooms in Namibia.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

1. To assess the teachers' familiarity with the language policy in relation to translanguaging.
2. To examine the teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging pedagogical practice in multilingual grade 4 classrooms.

3. To analyse teachers' implementation of translanguageing in multilingual grade 4 classrooms.
4. To establish factors affecting the implementation of translanguageing in multilingual grade 4 classrooms.

1.6 Research Questions

1. How familiar are the teachers with the language in education policy?
2. What are the teachers' ideologies towards translanguageing pedagogic practice?
3. How do teachers implement translanguageing in multilingual grade 4 language classrooms?
4. What factors affect teachers' implementation of translanguageing in grade 4 language classrooms?

1.7 Significance of the Study

Studying teachers' ideologies may enhance teacher buy-in of translanguageing. Teachers' ideologies and beliefs regarding translanguageing strongly influence its implementation in classrooms. Therefore, understanding teachers' perspectives may help identify challenges, misconceptions, and concerns that may hinder the integration of translanguageing practices. Such insights may then be used to develop targeted professional development programs to improve teacher buy-in. Moreover, teachers may gain a deeper understanding of their learners' unique linguistic abilities and cultural perspectives. This understanding promotes culturally responsive teaching, hence allowing teachers to create engaging and relevant instruction that resonates with their learners. Furthermore, teachers who convey a positive ideology towards translanguageing may serve as role models for other teachers in the school. Their commitment to embracing learners' linguistic diversity may inspire fellow teachers to reflect on their own practices and beliefs. As a result, schools may witness a transformational shift in the overall teaching and learning environment, with more teachers adopting translanguageing strategies in their classrooms. Thus, teachers may seek out further training and resources to enhance their skills. As a result, these pioneering teachers may become leaders in their schools, sharing their knowledge and expertise with colleagues.

Policymakers and curriculum developers also play a crucial role in shaping educational practices. The findings of this study may influence policy decisions regarding language instruction and assessment practices. By understanding teachers' preferences and challenges, policymakers may design effective policies and supportive frameworks that align with teachers'

needs and beliefs. This may ultimately lead to evidence-based changes in educational systems and curriculum design. Moreover, when policymakers observe the positive impact of translanguaging ideologies on learner outcomes, they may be more likely to support multilingual pedagogies, including translanguaging, and advocate for inclusive language policies. Moreover, teachers' positive ideologies may challenge prevailing bias towards dominant languages and advocate for the inclusion of all languages in the educational system. Thus, their ideologies may encourage policymakers to adopt inclusive language policies that value and promote linguistic diversity, fostering a more equitable education for all learners.

Additionally, teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging may impact school managers by creating opportunities for professional development and growth. This may lead to a more inclusive school culture and provide school managers with a pool of talented teachers who can contribute to the school's success. Moreover, when school leaders understand the significance of translanguaging, they may be compelled to advocate for its integration into the curriculum and ensure resources are provided to support its implementation. By prioritising translanguaging ideologies in school leadership, administrators create an environment that promotes equity, multiculturalism, and academic success. Moreover, when school leaders understand the significance of translanguaging, they may be compelled to advocate for its integration into the curriculum and ensure resources are provided to support its implementation. By prioritising translanguaging ideologies in school leadership, administrators create an environment that promotes equity, multiculturalism, and academic success. Furthermore, teachers' embracing translanguaging may have a significant impact on the overall reputation and standing of the school within the community. By recognising and affirming learners' linguistic abilities, schools may position themselves as inclusive and supportive institutions. This positive reputation may attract parents seeking an environment that values and celebrates diversity, leading to an increase in enrolment and overall community support. School managers who are aware of the impact of teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging may leverage this reputation to attract resources and opportunities for their schools.

1.8 Delimitation of the Study

The study was confined to the selected multilingual grade 4 classrooms of the Zambezi region of Namibia. The participants were drawn from ten (10) schools, of which five (5) were urban and five (5) were rural on the basis that translanguaging is more common as one moves from urban to rural schools (Shifidi, 2014).

1.9 Limitations of the Study

The study is not free from limitations. Limitations inherent in this study pertain primarily to participant selection and the methodological approach employed. The selection of participants, while purposeful, may not have fully captured the diversity of perspectives within the population of interest, potentially skewing the findings. Moreover, the reliance on a qualitative case study design, through semi structured interviews, observations, and document review as data gathering methods, introduces the possibility of subjectivity and social desirability bias, thereby compromising the objectivity and validity of the study's conclusions (Antony et al., 2024). Furthermore, the study's exclusive focus on a specific cultural and educational context in Namibia may restrict the applicability and generalisability of the findings to broader contexts. The study was undertaken in the Zambezi Region, where the medium of instruction (Silozi) in the junior primary is not the home language for the majority of learners in the selected schools of study. This means there are aspects of the findings that cannot be generalised and utilised in understanding the teachers' language ideologies and translanguaging practices. Due to these factors, the study is not generalisable as a general understanding of Namibian senior primary teachers towards translanguaging. Therefore, to lessen these limitations and enhance the robustness of future research endeavours, it is crucial to have more inclusive sampling strategies that encompass a broader range of demographic characteristics and educational settings to generate insights into the phenomenon. Additionally, employing mixed methods approaches that integrate both qualitative and quantitative data could yield a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomena under investigation. This interdisciplinary paradigm would allow for triangulation of findings, thereby consolidating the authenticity and reliability of the research outcomes. Furthermore, conducting comparative studies across diverse cultural and linguistic contexts would facilitate the identification of universal principles as well as context-specific factors influencing teachers' ideologies toward the implementation of pedagogical translanguaging. Additionally, future research endeavours could make a detailed study into the perspectives of administrators (school principals), school inspectors, curriculum developers, and policymakers regarding the implementation of translanguaging strategies, elucidating the challenges and facilitators encountered in multilingual classroom environments. Nevertheless, the current study could serve as a guide for further research to examine teachers' ideologies and awareness of translanguaging in Namibia.

1.10 Operational Definitions

Language ideologies are sets of beliefs about which languages and varieties may be considered legitimate or appropriate in various contexts and situations, constructed from specific political and economic perspectives (Norro, 2023a). According to Woolard (1998), language ideologies are “shared assumptions about language” that “influence social practices and perceptions.” In this research, this notion allowed me to examine how teachers' philosophies about language affect their instructional strategies, interactions with learners, and attitudes towards diverse dialects and languages. Hence, teachers’ ideologies are interpreted as the set of beliefs, values, mindsets, and assumptions that inform and guide their instructional choices, communicative practices, and ultimately, the learning experiences of learners.

Translanguaging is the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and acquiring knowledge using two languages (Baker, 2011: 288). In the context of this study, translanguaging refers to the intentional and purposeful use of both the learners' mother tongue and the target language in educational settings, with the aim of enhancing cognitive, language, and literacy skills.

Spontaneous translanguaging involves the innate and unplanned use of multiple languages in both educational and non-educational settings. It is a practice where individuals switch between languages without intentional design or instructional strategies. In this research, it refers to natural and unplanned translanguaging, often occurring as a result of learners' linguistic preferences or communication needs.

Pedagogical translanguaging refers to intentionally designed instructional strategies that incorporate two or more languages in educational settings (Cenoz and Gorter, 2017). In the context of this research, it denotes the purposeful integration of the learners’ native language alongside the target language to facilitate language acquisition in grade 4 classrooms.

Code-switching is a process by which a person or multiple persons will alternate from their L2 to their L1 or between varieties of language when speaking with others who share the same linguistic background

Multilingual contexts refer to environments where individuals use and interact with multiple languages, both inside and outside of educational institutions. In the context of this study, it highlights the importance of understanding translanguaging in settings where learners navigate various linguistic influences.

Teachers' stance refers to the attitude, perspective, or position that a teacher adopts towards a particular teaching approach, methodology, or pedagogical philosophy. It encompasses their beliefs, values, and opinions regarding teaching and learning practices.

Grade 4 marks the transition from the foundational phase (Pre-Primary and Grades 1 to 3) to the intermediate phase (Grades 4 to 7), moving from learning in the mother tongue to English instruction. This is a critical period where learners are expected to build on the foundational skills acquired in the early grades while beginning to engage with more complex content.

1.11 Thesis Chapter Organisation

This study will be covered in seven different sections as delineated beneath:

Chapter 1 is an introduction to the study, covering the background and context of the study in which the researcher explained the complexities of challenges Namibia Grade 4 learners experience when they transition to English medium. It further presents the statement and analysis of the problem, research questions, and the study's significance. The rationale and aim for the study were also explained, along with a clarification of concepts to provide the reader with a clearer understanding of the topic.

Chapter 2 is the review of related literature for the study, which comprises three parts. The first part of the literature review studied the teachers' ideologies. Moreover, the chapter provides a review of related studies conducted in relation to teachers' familiarity with the language policy about the implementation of translinguaging in Grade 4 classrooms. Also, the chapter examines the ideologies of teachers towards translinguaging. The chapter further discusses and analyses how teachers implement translinguaging. In addition, the chapter deliberates on the factors that influence the implementation of translinguaging.

Chapter 3 comprises the theoretical framework chosen for the study and the conceptual framework. These are the three-language orientation theory, critical discourse analysis theory and the pedagogical discourse theory. The theories were used as a guide to present and organise the argument for the study. Also, theories were selected due to their familiarity with the literature on education. This framework was also used to guide the researcher to discuss and interpret the findings. A conceptual framework has also been presented at the end of the chapter. The conceptual framework was important as it frames teachers' language ideologies and practices.

Chapter 4 outlines the research design and methodology, which were used for the study. A qualitative research approach was used, consisting of observations, semi structured interviews, documentation, and photos to establish the ideologies teachers have towards translanguaging.

In **Chapter 5**, the findings of the study are presented based on the themes in line with research objectives. Themes consisted of the teachers' familiarity with the language policy, teachers' ideologies towards the implementation of translanguaging, and factors that influence translanguaging. This chapter provides details of what was discovered during the research process by also providing accounts of what was said by teachers within the study. These findings were related to the purpose, research questions, theoretical framework, and literature of the study.

Chapter 6 is the discussion of findings, where the literature review, research questions, and theoretical framework were related to the results of the study. Similarities and differences between the findings and existing literature are also discussed.

Finally, **chapter 7** includes the conclusions of the study and recommendations for future research.

1.12 Chapter Summary

The chapter introduced the study providing the background to the study, problem statement, purpose of the study, objectives, research questions, significance of the study, delimitations, limitations of the study, definition of key concepts and the thesis outline. The next chapter discusses related literature underpinning the study.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Overview

The study's primary purpose was to establish teachers' ideologies towards the implementation of translinguaging in multilingual grade 4 classrooms in Namibia. With the limited research on teachers' ideologies towards translinguaging in Namibian language classrooms, it was necessary to study how teachers perceive the integration of this practice in the teaching of English language in grade 4 classrooms. Therefore, this chapter adds to the background of the study provided in the previous chapter, expounding literature related to the phenomenon of the study.

The first part of this chapter presents a discussion on teachers' language ideologies. Language ideologies play a crucial role in shaping teaching practices and learners learning experiences. In multilingual contexts like Namibia, where a range of languages coexist, it is important to examine teachers' ideologies and understand their significance in the implementing translinguaging practices in grade 4 classrooms. The second section covers the concept of translinguaging, focusing on its origin and efficacy within the classroom context. The next section provides literature on teachers' language ideologies and practices from a Namibian perspective to contextualise the study and illuminate how teachers conceptualise and actualise language within their classrooms. The fifth section provides studies related to teachers' awareness/knowledge of the language policy regarding the implementation of translinguaging. The subsequent section presents related literature on the teachers' ideologies towards translinguaging. The sixth section explores related studies on the application of translinguaging in the classrooms. The seventh and final section reviews the factors affecting the implementation of translinguaging. The last section provides the chapter summary.

2.2 Teachers Language Ideologies

The choice of which approach each teacher uses is usually linked to an ideology they have and believe is the most effective for their learners' language learning. However, the approach that each teacher prefers and selects to use may have a decisive effect on learners in the classroom. Therefore, to understand how language ideologies influence teachers' language choices and pedagogical practices, we first must understand what language ideologies are and the relations of domination and subordination. According to Kesevan (2016:147), ideologies are described

as “world views that an individual, group, or society holds to be important or true; these views are shared by a society and form the basis for how it should function.” In that sense, the importance of language ideologies is that they can bring to light beliefs and ideas that restrict what can be done with language, constrain discourse, and intersect with other types of ideologies related to class, gender, and race. One can better comprehend the sources of power that frequently characterise the language use that occurs in the classroom and elsewhere by bringing language ideologies to the fore.

Makoe and McKinney (2014:659) define language ideologies as a “set of beliefs, values, and cultural frames that continually circulate in society, informing the ways in which language is conceptualised and represented as well as how it is used.” Put differently, language ideologies are what people think about certain languages, which in turn influences how they use these languages. Further, language ideologies are a “set of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (Silverstein, 1979:183). This definition also describes “the collective representation of linguistic attitudes of the community” and “the conceptions of issues such as the status, function, norm, and ownership of a certain language” (Lew & Siffrinn 2019:377). Thus, language ideologies are perceptions about specific languages or languages in general, including ideas about how language should be used, learnt, and taught. They reflect the “values, practices, and beliefs associated with language use by speakers and the discourse that constructs values and beliefs at state, institutional, national, and global levels” (Banda & Mwanza, 2020:6). These ideologies influence how language is used, learnt, and taught. Furthermore, linguistic ideologies provide an example of how views about language and its use are rooted in particular histories and expressed through certain perspectives (Woolard, 1998).

For Lou et al. (2022:65), language ideologies are beliefs, feelings, and conceptions held by individuals toward language structure and language use. Thus, language ideologies are systems of beliefs about language (e.g., beliefs about what kinds of language are appropriate in particular spaces or institutions, etc.) and are performed in context, at the intersections of language and social power structures (Ruiz, 1984). This suggests that language ideologies come because of power relations in a society, meaning whoever has power is the one that dictates which languages matter and how they are utilised (Duma, 2021). The rise and hegemony of English as a national language and language of teaching and learning after independence in Namibia serves as one example of how those in power are the ones who make the decision as to what language matters and how. According to Kesevan (2016), rather than

being a feature of a single individual, ideologies are shared by members of a group or society. However, that does not mean that a certain ideology is necessarily shared by all members of a society or group. He, thus, emphasises that members of the same society may have competing sets of ideologies. For instance, teachers in the same educational system may have different views about pedagogical practices. Therefore, ideology functions to organise and control other socially shared beliefs and associated actions (ibid, 2016). For example, an educational ideology may shape and control beliefs about a teaching style, including learner participation, types of activities, seating arrangements, and other classroom-related matters. These views in turn guide teachers' actions in these contexts. In other words, language ideologies that teachers subscribe to will shape (often encouraging or limiting) the learners' translanguaging practices.

In a classroom context, the concept of language ideology tries to capture “the implicit, usually unconscious assumptions about language and language behaviour that fundamentally determine how human beings interpret events” (Kesevan, 2016:1 47). For that reason, the language ideologies in the classroom are not limited exclusively to language use but also arbitrate between language and broad social structures and categories, such as speaker's gender, nationality, and sociocultural background, as well as beliefs about language practices. Thus, language ideologies do not only concern certain languages but also language users, learners, and teachers. This gave Pomuti and Weber (2012) the impetus to define ideologies as belief systems, attitudes, views, and mindsets of educationists that inform and guide their work. Likewise, seeing schools as ‘revealing sites’ of struggle among diverse groups and competing ideologies, teachers' language ideologies include their views towards ethnic minority learners' heritage languages and towards their involvement in mainstream language teaching and learning (Gu, Kou, & Guo, 2017).

Therefore, teachers' language ideologies refer to the beliefs, attitudes, and values that teachers hold about language, its use, and its role in the classroom. These ideologies shape the way teachers approach language teaching and learning and have an impact on their learners' language development and experiences in the classroom. Teachers' language ideologies influence their understanding of language, the goals they set for their learners' language development, and the instructional strategies they employ. Thus, teachers' language ideologies play a critical role in shaping language practice at schools and language education. Their beliefs about language fundamentally determine their interpretations of the reality of language classrooms, including learners, what they should teach, how they should teach, and virtually everything that matters in language education.

In the context of this study, teachers' decision-making in the classroom is heavily influenced by a set of ideologies that teachers hold about learners and pedagogical practices. These ideologies have been shown to influence teachers' choices concerning what to teach and how to teach. Hence, these ideologies imply what kinds of language practices are valued in enacting language policy and are disclosed as discourses in curricula, syllabi, and teachers' practices and interactions with learners (Lew & Siffrinn, 2019). Besides, in educational settings, teachers' language ideologies mediate classroom discourse practices, even though the influence of language ideologies on people's language choices and use is not always directly observable (Fitriati, 2015). Teachers' language choices can show their common-sense assumptions about what a language is and how it functions.

Olivio (2003) stated that language ideologies appear not just in teachers' declared opinions but also more obviously in their real daily practices, such as instructing and discussing their learners' performances. This gave Fitriati (2015: 12) the impetus to argue that ideologies as a social production are constructed within and through everyday language practice, and in turn a teacher's language practice reflects their language ideologies. Therefore, teachers' language choice and behaviour in classrooms are reflections of their language ideologies. Nevertheless, there is not a straightforward connection between a teacher's ideologies about language and the way they use it in the classroom. Instead, "language attitudes may reveal only one of several divergent and competing ideologies that can exist in a community and influence language practices." In that regard, Huckin et al. (2012:115) indicated that "the classroom is a place where power is circulated, managed, exploited, resisted, and often directly impacted by institutional policies and changes." For instance, while the Namibian language policy might frame the use of only English or Silozi as desirable, teachers can challenge ideologies of linguistic purism through practice. Mwanza (2016) clarifies and supports this point by stating that it is in the classroom where government policies and directives, as well as teachers' decisions and practices, are accepted or rejected and/or ignored in the process of teaching and learning. Pacheco, Kang, & Hurd (2019) argue that teachers can negotiate, challenge, and (re)produce these ideologies through multiple forms of mediation in multilingual primary classrooms.

Therefore, there will be an opportunity for learning when teachers align translanguaging with power, producing ideologies of language mixing and appropriate pedagogic practice. In that case, "teachers must move beyond mere acceptance to actually provide spaces and/or times in the classroom in which dynamic bilingualism is modelled and encouraged" (Pacheco et al.,

2019:195). However, the critical argument is that language ideologies can be articulated or contested in forms of engagement that teachers and learners take up in classrooms. For instance, whereas a learner might be marginalised due to lack of English proficiency, teachers might challenge deficit ideologies of home languages by recognising learners' expertise across languages. Thus, when ESL teachers have translingual competence, they view various forms of translanguaging as useful for sense-making, negotiation of meaning, and communication regardless of the individuals' language proficiency. Hence, Canagarajah (2013) maintained that teachers should strategically incorporate learners' translanguaging in the classroom activities.

In a study of bilingual teachers' views and attitudes about teaching and language, Palmer (2011) made the claim that teachers' language ideologies are strongly influenced by their own histories and experiences. Additionally, she asserted that *de facto* language policies in the classroom frequently reflect the linguistic ideologies of the teachers. In other words, when it comes to translanguaging, a teacher's attitudes about language mixing become the policy by which they decide about the language practices in the classroom, including both her own and her learners, and either encourage or prohibit translanguaging. In her statement that "different languages and standards are imposed as a result of an ideology," García (2009: 86) was referring to this interpretation of classroom language policy. The practice of language mixing provides a translanguaging space in classrooms where translanguaging is encouraged by a teacher's philosophy that supports a flexible perspective of languages (Wei, 2011). As a result, the classroom serves as a translanguaging milieu where learners and teachers engage in multilingual language practices to negotiate their cultures, identities, and ideologies. As stated by Razfar (2012:63), "when human beings engage in various language practices (e.g., translanguaging), they are simultaneously displaying their beliefs about the nature, function, and purpose of language."

On the other hand, other teachers and scholars have generally taken the view that there is a clash between using the L1 and L2 that will result in negative transfer and reduce the amount of exposure and learners' opportunities to practice the target language (Aghai, Sayer, & Vercellotti, 2020). Gkaintartzi et al. (2015:66) examined Greek teachers' attitudes towards immigrant learners' use of the heritage language in the classroom. They demonstrated that "teachers' views reveal their teaching strategy in the classroom" and that they frequently include ignoring the use of learners' native language and actively discouraging or even prohibiting learners' use of translanguaging strategies. Hence, when a monolingual approach to teaching is part of a teacher's language ideology, it influences the classroom policy and

teaching strategies, and as a result, English-only rules may be implemented in the classroom. This is also observed in Namibian schools, where Simasiku, Kasanda, & Smit (2015) revealed that even though the Namibian government has recognised the use of local languages in English medium classrooms to help learners to understand difficult concepts and terms, the idea of using the local language to bridge communication barriers has not taken root. Thus, the idea of translanguaging is contested in Namibian classrooms, and a monomodal practice is advocated for.

In sum, English L2 teachers are the agents who shape and influence the implementation of translanguaging practices by encouraging, ignoring, or prohibiting their use in the classroom (Aghai et al. 2020). Therefore, to understand how Grade 4 ESL teachers' ideologies influence their teaching strategies and ultimately the implementation of translanguaging to support learners L2 learning, the study adopted the classic framework in Chapter Three: language as a problem, language as a right, and language as a resource, which was first introduced by Richard Ruiz (1984).

2.3 Translanguaging in the Classroom

Translanguaging is a theoretical and pedagogical concept that has recently gained more ground. This section covers the origin of translanguaging and its development, translanguaging as a classroom pedagogic practice, spontaneous and pedagogical translanguaging, translanguaging as a pedagogy, and the difference between translanguaging and codeswitching.

2.3.1 Genesis of Translanguaging and its Development

The coinage of the concept and the introduction of the idea of 'translanguaging' by Colin Baker (2001), based on Cen Williams' (1994) observations in Welsh revitalisation classrooms (Wei, 2023). This term emerged in the 1980s from the Welsh educational contexts with the works of Cen Williams. He coined the term '*trawsieithu*' to describe the practice of reading or hearing information in one language (e.g., English) and subsequently expressing it in writing or speech in another (e.g., Welsh), or vice versa (Ismael, 2024). Thus, the pedagogical approach encouraged learners to alternate between two languages in an integrated and purposeful manner for both receptive and productive purposes, thereby promoting a more effective learning environment (Santoso & Hamied, 2022; Yusri, Huzaimi, & Sulaiman, 2022; Antony, Ramnath, & Ellikkal, 2024; Wang, Hanafi Zaid, Ibrahim, & Haladin, 2024). Later, the term was translated into English, initially as '*translinguifying*' and then as 'translanguaging' (Baker, 2001) and gained popularity as "*Translanguaging*".

Cen Williams was an experienced teacher and teacher trainer who was doing a doctorate at the University of Bangor and observed a commonly occurring classroom situation where the teacher would give instructions and ask questions in Welsh, as the school policy expected, but the bilingual learners would respond in English, naturally (Wei, 2023). Occasionally they would read something in English and discuss it in Welsh. So, listening, speaking, reading, and writing were done alternatively in either Welsh or English and sometimes a mixture of the two. To the eyes of school administrators, these practices were not desirable, as to revitalise a minoritized language through schooling, the assumption often was (and continues to be) to insist on using the target language monolingually to maximise both input and output in the target language. Cen Williams, however, had a different view and made a different argument. Rather than seeing this alternating between the two languages as a problem or barrier to learning, he viewed it as a way of maximising the bilingual potential in learning. Thus, as an ‘AGENTIVE LEARNER STRATEGY’ to start with, translanguaging was initiated by the learners, rather than the teachers (Wei, 2023).

In his argument, Cen Williams was suggesting respecting the fact that the learners were bilingual, not monolingual, and they lived in a bilingual environment. The idea of translanguaging was, therefore, developed out of considering the learners’ bilingualism as integral to the learners’ lives. And in this respect, weaving these lives into classroom practice became the bedrock of translanguaging pedagogy. Clearly, it was a learner initiative that emerged out of their natural instinct as bilinguals to resist the imposition of monolingual instructional policies. The question then is, and that was precisely the question Cen Williams wanted to address: should teaching be aimed at encouraging and facilitating positive (in the sense of ‘productive’ and ‘beneficial’) use of what comes naturally to the learner, or imposing some other behavioural norms on them? This is a genuine question because the classroom, whether it is a language or a content classroom, is a specific, socially constructed space, often divorced from the everyday social realities of the learners’ and indeed the teachers’ too.

Today, the concept of translanguaging in education is currently widely accepted and used in different parts of the world. Many scholars have adopted the term translanguaging to refer to both multilingual language practices and pedagogical approaches that allow teachers and learners to integrate all their linguistic resources, including different languages and dialects, in the teaching and learning process (García & Li, 2014). Numerous scholars have contributed to the comprehension and development of translanguaging as a pedagogic tool in the classroom.

Among others, Ofelia Garcia is a leading specialist in the field of translanguaging. She describes translanguaging as "the use of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire without regard for arbitrary linguistic boundaries" (Garcia, 2009: 140) and has underscored the significance of valuing and utilising learners' full linguistic repertoires to promote equitable and effective education for all learners. Garcia's work has been influential in underlining the benefits of translanguaging in supporting multilingual learners' academic achievement and sense of identity.

Other scholars are Angela Creese and Adrian Blackledge, who have conducted extensive research on translanguaging in classroom settings. They highlight the importance of seeing language as a resource rather than a barrier to learning and claim that the use of translanguaging can facilitate communication, knowledge transfer, and meaning-making in diverse classroom contexts. Their work has been instrumental in highlighting the practical challenges and benefits of implementing translanguaging in diverse educational settings. Jim Cummins is another well-known researcher in the field of second language acquisition and bilingual education. He has highlighted the importance of developing learners' cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) in addition to their basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) to support their academic achievement. Cummins argues that the use of translanguaging can help learners develop CALP by enabling them to transfer knowledge and strategies across languages and to engage in higher-order thinking. Li Wei is a linguist who has also conducted extensive research on the use of translanguaging in multilingual settings. He has underscored the importance of recognising the dynamic and fluid nature of language use and has argued that the use of translanguaging can help learners to develop metalinguistic awareness and to reflect on their own language use. Wei's work has been influential in highlighting the importance of developing learners' language awareness and metalinguistic skills through the use of translanguaging (Andleeb et al., 2024).

2.3.2 Translanguaging as Classroom Pedagogical Practice

Translanguaging is a teaching method that uses learners' full linguistic abilities to improve their language skills and awareness. It's an inclusive approach that can help learners feel more comfortable and motivated in the classroom. Theoretically, "translanguaging is based on the concept of linguistic repertoire, where the totality of language features to which a person has access are understood as part of an integrated, disaggregated system. This is in contrast to the traditional understanding of languages such as English, Afrikaans, German, etc., as bounded,

separate entities.” (Driouch, 2022: 77). It considers that multilinguals have one unitary linguistic repertoire that they use to understand the world around them, so it calls for a shift from monolingual ideologies in education to a more inclusive, multilingual policy in our educational practices.

Pedagogically, translanguaging is an instructional approach to using learners’ whole linguistic repertoires as resources to improve the act of teaching and learning. It reflects the purposeful use of learners’ full linguistic repertoire to foster and develop their linguistic abilities and language awareness. Therefore, according to Cenoz & Gorter (2022), pedagogical translanguaging is a theoretical and instructional approach that aims at improving language and content competencies in school contexts by using resources from the learner’s whole linguistic repertoire. Further, they explain that it is learner-centred and endorses the support and development of all the languages used by learners. It fosters the development of metalinguistic awareness by softening the boundaries between languages when learning languages and content. Translanguaging offers learners with varied linguistic backgrounds the opportunity to benefit from their linguistic resources and, as teachers, to promote the act of teaching and learning and make the latter a more enjoyable experience. “Translanguaging as pedagogy refers to building on bilingual learners’ language practices flexibly.” (Garcia & Li, 2014: 92) and “the ways in which bilingual learners and teachers engage in complex fluid discursive practices... ‘to make sense’ of teaching and learning, to communicate and appropriate subject knowledge, and to develop academic language practices” (Garcia, 2014b: 112). Therefore, as evidenced from this definition, translanguaging as pedagogy focuses on the practices that are of pedagogical value rather than including practices that are deployed for interpersonal communicative purposes.

Nevertheless, from a linguistic point of view, translanguaging is “the deployment of a speaker’s full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named languages” (Otheguy, Garcia, & Reid, 2015: 281). As García (2009) noted, language classrooms in our century are moving from monolingualism towards translanguaging, encouraging the flexible use of learners’ languages rather than treating this linguistic knowledge separately, not considering it at all, or viewing it as a negative influence. Therefore, it is necessary to change the paradigm to a holistic view of language that involves a new vision of language, speakers, and repertoires (Cenoz, 2017). Therefore, from a pedagogical perspective, translanguaging “is planned by the teacher inside the classroom and can refer to the use of different languages for input and output or to other planned strategies based on the

use of learners' resources from the whole linguistic repertoire" (Cenoz, 2017, 194). Thus, this pedagogical practice involves the intentional alternation or switching between languages for both input and output within the same learning activity (Antony, Ramnath, & Ellikkal, 2024).

In other words, to maximise its effectiveness as a pedagogical tool, teachers must plan translanguaging activities, taking into account learners' diverse backgrounds, proficiency levels, and learning goals. This planning can encompass structured input (reading, listening) and output (speaking, writing) tasks where languages other than the dominant one are utilised strategically. For instance, a teacher might design a lesson in which learners read a text in their home language before summarising it in the target language, thereby enhancing comprehension and retention. In this sense, translanguaging is the practice of using one language in reinforcing the other to deepen the understanding and supplement the learner's performance in both languages. Translanguaging integrates, extends, and makes use of learners' everyday languages and school languages (Wang, 2022). Thus, translanguaging as a pedagogical practice not only helps in understanding the learning content but also helps the minority languages develop through learning the dominant language (Ashadi, 2024).

In this regard, translanguaging is seen as an example of the approach that is rewarding for the bilingual and multilingual learners in several ways. García and Wei (2014) allude to the fact that translanguaging could be used as a scaffolding approach for teachers to ensure that learners engage with rigorous content, access difficult texts, and produce new language and new knowledge. Also, it allows the learners to access and discuss texts in their own languages and not only in the target language(s). With these benefits, "translanguaging in teaching is always used in the service of providing rigorous instruction and maximising interactions that would expand the learners' language and meaning-making repertoire, including practices that fall under—what some consider standard (emphasis added) language" (García and Wei, 2014: 233). To sum up, we can define translanguaging as a pedagogical approach that encourages learners to use all of their language resources, including their home languages, to make meaning and build understanding.

2.3.3 Spontaneous and Pedagogical Translanguaging

Translanguaging as a pedagogy can be divided into two aspects and it is significant to clarify the difference between pedagogical, and spontaneous translanguaging. These terms apply to education in general, including language teaching and learning. Spontaneous translanguaging occurs in natural contexts where bilinguals use different communication systems; the

boundaries between languages are fluid and constantly shifting. Thus, it means the natural occurrence of multilinguals' practices where the boundaries between languages are softened (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020b; Driouch, 2022). Setyarini and Jocuns (2024) note that while spontaneous translanguageing occurs in the natural context of bilinguals' language interactions, it is not planned, although it can have a certain pedagogical value. These definitions align with the study on pedagogical practices by Rajendram et al. (2022), where teacher-directed translanguageing is "Intentional Translanguageing" and aligned with pedagogical practices, while learner-directed translanguageing is "spontaneous Translanguageing." Spontaneous translanguageing involves the unplanned and natural use of multiple languages by learners in their learning environment, while intentional translanguageing refers to the deliberate and planned incorporation of multiple languages by teachers to support language learners.

According to Ching (2024), Spontaneous translanguageing pedagogies take place without planning or design as the bi-/multilingual teacher spontaneously translanguages (or allows learners to spontaneously translanguage or both) to scaffold learners' learning in the ongoing dynamic interaction. Despite its prevalence, numerous studies have illuminated the negative impact of spontaneous translanguageing, termed "decelerator translanguageing," which hampers the learning process due to its unplanned, random, non-purposeful, and non-creative nature. This phenomenon may not necessarily align with language acquisition principles and is employed by both teachers and learners, contributing to a slowdown in the learning process (Wei, 2011). However, it is contended that even if spontaneous translanguageing has not been planned, the teacher can turn it into a learning situation and have a clear pedagogical value (see Lin & Lo, 2016; Lin, 2020).

On the other hand, planned or designed translanguageing takes systematic planning on the part of the teacher (and curriculum designers) and requires an intimate knowledge of the learners' multilingual linguistic resources. Thus, pedagogical translanguageing refers to "a pedagogic theory and practice that...is designed by the teacher but can occur next to the spontaneous use of multilingual resources that have not been planned" (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020b: 2). Therefore, "the teachers deliberately try to draw on their learners' multiple linguistic resources in pedagogy in order to promote and mediate learning" (Ganuza & Hedman, 2017: 210). It is an intentional practice, and it must have a pedagogical value to be distinguished from spontaneous translanguageing (Galante, 2020b). Pedagogical translanguageing is the theory and practice of teaching reflected in teaching strategies planned by teachers using two or more languages. Thus, it means the systematically designed instructional strategies planned by the teacher that

incorporate two or more languages. According to Cenoz (2017), pedagogical translanguaging involves a purposefully designed instructional strategy integrating two or more languages, planned, or facilitated by teachers, and utilizing the full extent of learners' linguistic repertoires. Furthermore, Cenoz and Gorter (2020b) mention that pedagogical translanguaging is different from spontaneous translanguaging because it is designed to make language learning successful by activating and maximising learners' linguistic resources and developing metalinguistic awareness. In that view, Lin (2020) suggests that translanguaging pedagogies need to be carefully designed and adapted to suit the different needs and demands of diverse educational settings and contexts.

Scholars labelled spontaneous and pedagogical translanguaging differently in relation to the educational field. For instance, Williams (2012) labels spontaneous translanguaging as natural translanguaging and pedagogical translanguaging as official translanguaging. Lewis et al. (2012) refer to the former as pupil-directed translanguaging while the latter as teacher-directed translanguaging. Ismael (2024) describes pedagogical translanguaging as aligned with language acquisition principles and supports learners' linguistic development, while spontaneous translanguaging may not always align with these principles and could potentially hinder the learning process, hence described as potentially contradictory. Further, pedagogical translanguaging is said to be creative while spontaneous translanguaging may be non-creative. Another term that has been given to pedagogical translanguaging is intentionally planned translanguaging (Hopewell, 2017). However, many scholars have used the term pedagogical translanguaging more frequently (Cenoz, 2017; Cenoz & Gorter, 2020a, 2020b; Junvonen & Källkvist, 2021; Setyarini & Jocuns, 2024).

2.3.4 Translanguaging as a Pedagogy

Pedagogical translanguaging is an instructional approach in the context of multilingual education. It involves the intentional and planned use of learners' multilingual resources in language and content subjects (Juvonen & Källkvist, 2021). Multilingual approaches might not be new, but there has recently been a multilingual turn in language education scholarship (Driouch, 2022). This turn is accentuated by the changing multilingual ecologies worldwide owing to technology-assisted globalisation and the mobility of people. In this context, the emergence of pedagogical translanguaging has recently shined and is widely celebrated. It is considered a “movement in language education” (García & Kleyn, 2016: 10).

Pedagogical translanguaging takes multilingualism as its cornerstone. It applies to educational contexts and aims to mediate learning through multilingual resources. It is a planned use of learners' linguistic resources to ease the act of teaching-learning in classes. Cenoz (2017: 194) states that it is "planned by the teacher inside the classroom and can refer to the use of different languages for input and output or to other planned strategies based on the use of learners' resources from the whole linguistic repertoire.". Pedagogical translanguaging is used in classes with learners whose linguistic repertoires are varied for developing their linguistic and academic performance. It uses learners' whole linguistic repertoire as prior knowledge to build and support further learning.

Translanguaging as a pedagogical practice perceives learners' pre-existing knowledge as resources that should be invested in to lead meaningful learning and build new knowledge. It works for mobilising learners' familiar resources to scaffold their mastery of the target resources (Lin, 2012). Thus, translanguaging calls for planning and designing instructional materials and activities that capitalise on learners' linguistic and cultural resources to support their learning. Baker and Wright (2017: 280–281) assert that translanguaging in classes efficiently builds understanding because "pre-existing knowledge is a foundation for further learning, and there is the ease of cross-linguistic transfer as two languages are interdependent.".

Translanguaging pedagogy places learners' linguistic and cultural backgrounds at the heart of the teaching-learning process. These backgrounds are recognised as resources in classes. To help teachers conceptualise and implement this pedagogy, García et al. (2017) identified three interrelated components: *stance*, *design*, and *shifts*. Stance refers to the teachers' beliefs and commitment to embrace multilingualism, draw on learners' repertoires, and view their languages as part of a unitary system rather than separate and bounded entities. In other words, it describes teachers' strong beliefs and ideologies that learners' language practices should be used in learning and can be a learning resource. Thus, teachers should value bilingual learners' full language repertoires, i.e., "the totality of an individual's language knowledge" (Deng & Wimpenny, 2022), as a human right and a learning resource. According to Driouch (2022), teachers should have a *stance* towards linguistic diversity and practices in their classes and take advantage of their instructional benefits. Since teachers' ideologies are the basis of teaching, the researcher decided to focus on this particular aspect in the present study and address García et al.'s (2016) stance on the translanguaging classroom framework as ideology.

The design points to the development of instructional materials and activities that consider learners' diverse linguistic and multimodal resources and allow them to connect home and school languages to build new knowledge. In other words, teachers systematically expose learners to several languages that enable them to relate the language(s) they use at home to the one(s) they use at school. Thus, a teachers' lesson designs support and connect home, school and community languages and cultures. Lastly, shift is the teachers' mastery to adjust their pedagogical practices to their learners' needs (García et al., 2016). Put differently, teachers should be ready and flexible to shift or deviate from the design that could occur as they adapt to the learners' needs and responses during translanguaging activities. Thus, the teacher makes shifts in classroom interactions to support meaning-making and learning.

2.3.5 Translanguaging versus Code-switching

The term translanguaging has often been confused with code-switching. However, the two concepts are distinct. Blackledge and Creese (2014) have stated that codeswitching and code-mixing have restrictions that translanguaging can address. They argued that translanguaging challenges traditional concepts of 'target and 'standard 'language and uncovers "the ways in which linguistic resources are deployed in our societies and how this deployment of resources reproduces, negotiates, and contests social difference and social inequality" (cf. Blackledge and Creese, 2014: 193).

There are several distinctions between code-switching and translanguaging. First, Williams (1994) clarified that translanguaging, unlike code-switching, is not merely a set of linguistic structures (Wei, 2018). Second, Lewis, Jones, and Baker (2012: 659) differentiated code-switching from translanguaging, suggesting that "code-switching has associations with language separation while translanguaging celebrates and approves flexibility in language use and the permeability of learning through two or more languages." Thus, in the case of translanguaging, designated languages are acknowledged as social constructions, which are natural to the language user, whereas in codeswitching, the language acts as a distinct entity inside the bi- or multilingual user population (Otheguy et al., 2015; Saha & Rahman, 2022). Third, Garcia and Li Wei (2014) discussed that TL, in contrast with code-switching, is not merely combining separate language entities. Learners use their home language and the target language as part of their full repertoire to express themselves and establish their cultural identities. Lastly, "code-switching preserves named language categories intact while translanguaging theory dismantles named language categories and takes up an internal

perspective to describe the languaging of speakers who are said to be bilingual or multilingual (Vogel & Garcia, 2017: 6)". Sato (2023) distinguishes code-switching and translanguaging by stating that code-switching emphasises language switching due to a lack of L2 proficiency, whereas translanguaging is a pedagogical practice that maximises the use of languages available in the classroom for L2 learning. Thus, translanguaging differs from code-switching in that it does not adhere to the monolingual preconceptions that have traditionally oppressed bilingual speakers (Garcia & Wei, 2014).

By implication, translanguaging transcends mere code-switching or translation; it embraces a holistic view of multilingualism where individuals draw upon their full linguistic repertoires to negotiate meaning and express ideas. Learners use their home language and the target language as part of their full repertoire to express themselves and establish their cultural identities. Lastly, "codeswitching preserves named language categories intact while translanguaging theory dismantles named language categories and takes up an internal perspective to describe the languaging of speakers who are said to be bilingual or multilingual" (Vogel & Garcia, 2017: 6). In this sense, translanguaging can be viewed in a holistic approach of bilingualism or multilingualism, which conceives languages as a unified system that allows one to communicate in a discourse that is different from the reductionist framework of code-switching in bilingualism research, which regards two languages as two separate systems (Macawile & Plata, 2022). Translanguaging, therefore, requires deeper understanding, processing, and relaying of meaning because it focuses on function rather than form and meaning rather than structure.

Nevertheless, the implementation of translanguaging is often influenced by teachers' language ideologies. This means that the beliefs that teachers hold about language directly influence their pedagogical choices and classroom practices. Research by Canagarajah (2011) illustrates how teachers' language ideologies manifest in their instructional approaches. In his study, some teachers employed translanguaging practices to leverage learners' home languages as resources for learning, while others imposed strict language separation policies that stunted learners' communicative abilities. In other words, beliefs regarding the efficacy of translanguaging can lead to varied classroom practices. Teachers who perceive bi/multilingualism as an advantage may design lessons that explicitly incorporate translanguaging practices, while those who prioritise monolingual instruction may avoid integrating learners' home languages into

classroom discourse. Thus, teachers' ideologies act as a filter through which translanguaging is either embraced or resisted.

2.4 Teachers' Language Ideologies and Practices in Namibia

This section highlights how teachers in Namibia conceptualise and actualise language within their classrooms. Teachers' ideologies play a crucial role in the implementation of multilingual practices in the classroom. The ideologies can either support or hinder effective multilingual pedagogies, highlighting the importance of understanding teachers' ideologies within the context of multilingual classrooms. Given Namibia's historical and sociocultural context, marked by linguistic diversity and the legacy of colonialism, teachers' language ideologies and practices play a crucial role in shaping the education system and language development of learners. Therefore, understanding teachers' ideologies can provide insights into the effectiveness of multilingual instructional strategies. As established earlier, language ideologies refer to teachers' beliefs, attitudes, and values towards languages and their use in the classroom and society. On the other hand, language practices refer to the actual ways teachers use and promote language in their teaching. One prevalent ideology among teachers in Namibia is the belief in the importance of English as a medium of instruction and as a global language. English is the official language of instruction in Namibian schools, and teachers view proficiency in English as essential for learners' academic and professional success. Consequently, teachers frequently use English as the primary language in classroom instruction and encourage learners to communicate in English. This section presents a review of studies conducted in Namibia in relation to language ideologies and practices in Namibian classrooms.

In 2010, Ausiku evaluated the implementation of the new Language-in-Education Policy in the upper primary schools in the Oshana Region. The study revealed that the majority of learners in the Oshana Region are Oshikwambi speakers, followed by Oshikwanyama speakers. In addition, the majority of teachers who teach Oshindonga are also not Oshindonga speakers. Furthermore, the findings showed that the majority of learners, teachers, and principals preferred English as the LoLT to Oshiwambo. Another major finding of the study is that despite the fact that English is the LoLT, both teachers and learners are still struggling to communicate in English. In general, successful communication often takes place in Oshiwambo. The study revealed that the majority of teachers, learners, and parents are neither aware of the new LiEP nor were they consulted prior to its implementation. In another study, Mostert et al. (2012) established different language preferences between parents and teachers, the latter favouring

English and the former advocating the mother tongue as a medium of instruction in the first three grades of formal education. Various reasons were given to support both choices.

Harris's (2011) study aimed to provide an understanding of how people in education view their home language, a reflection on how policy makers view the challenges of mother tongue education and to investigate how to encourage the use of home languages. This study was comprehensive enough because the main stakeholders in education were considered. The study included 167 learners from 19 schools, 138 teachers from 20 primary schools, 40 parents, and 38 educational professionals (e.g., regional educational directors, inspectors of education, and language policy makers). The result of this study indicated that, firstly, 83% of learners preferred to use their home language as an LOLT. Secondly, 61% of teachers reported that their learners experienced difficulties with English. With this in mind, one can also posit that teachers too faced numerous challenges when educating their learners through the medium of ELF. The next notable finding was that 100% of parents wanted their children to be taught in English even though they do not use English at home or in their respective communities. Finally, all of the educational professionals were also firmly in favour of ELF as the LOLT.

The studies above show different language ideologies in the Namibian education context. We see that in language education, a monolingual approach towards learning a target language is prominent and seen as the ideal one. In other words, most language teachers and even parents do not encourage learners to use their L1 during the process of learning a target language. Simasiku et al. (2015) established that most Namibian teachers and stakeholders still subscribe to the idea that African languages cannot be used as a medium of instruction in schools. Teachers fear that if mother tongue is used in the classrooms, learners might not be able to be employed, and mother tongue might find its way into their writing. It was found that both educators and politicians' attitudes were the main barriers to the use of translanguaging in the Namibian English Second Language medium classrooms. The prevailing monolingual framework present in educational institutions has contributed to the negative stance among teachers. Teachers are against translanguaging because it can result in learners' lesser exposure to the target language. Both teachers and parents' concerns are that learners would neglect their TL if they used translanguaging strategies. Their inability to accept translanguaging demonstrates that education stakeholders still uphold a monolingual bias toward the dominant languages that restricts them from maximising their advantages. These biases can then be further informed by the language positions held by most teachers.

In 2012, Shilamba (2012) established that translanguaging was widely utilised in most of the grade 8 mathematics classrooms in the Ohangwena region. She established that the teacher translanguaged because the majority of the learners' language familiarity was not good. Translanguaging was mostly used as a strategy to support and promote learners understanding in mathematics. Moreover, Shilamba also found that a few teachers were against codeswitching because examinations were written in English, and the language policy did not recommend the practice. Similarly, Iiping (2018) found that despite teachers' acknowledgement of learners lack of familiarity with the language of instruction, they did not use the learners linguistic resources in their classrooms because of the notion that mother tongue (Oshiwambo) compromised the effective mastery of English and also that the current language policy did not allow it. Moreover, Iiping (2013) found that teachers believed that the learners' sole advantage of using ELF as the language of learning and teaching (LOLT) was that it may benefit them if they further their studies abroad, as possessing knowledge of English would enable them to communicate with people from different countries. Another main finding, in terms of how teachers overcame the challenges posed by using ELF as the LOLT, was that teachers often resorted to code-switching to ensure that their learners understood the concepts they were being taught.

A study by Simasiku (2014) set out to investigate the perceptions of Grade 10 English Second Language teachers about the effects of code-switching in their classrooms in the Caprivi Education Region of Namibia. Concurring with Simasiku (2016b), it was observed that code-switching was prevalent in the Zambezi education region English medium classrooms. Thus, translanguaging was inherent in classrooms that used a second language as a medium of instruction. Majority English second language teachers embraced the practice as they perceived it as having positive effects. In that respect, Simasiku (2016b) contended that due to the Zambezi region context, where English is a second language or a third language after Silozi and other Zambezi region language varieties, translanguaging was critical for pedagogical reasons, especially among learners who were not proficient in English. Simasiku (2014: ii) further argued that "Language classrooms should become learning environments where learners actively participate and grasp the knowledge that they are taught in a language they are comfortable with."

In another study, Mensa (2015) aimed at giving an insight into how linguistic and cultural diversity is managed at Windhoek International School (WIS). The findings of the study are

that the language policy at WIS is articulated in such a manner that it encourages monolingual norms, although the school's community is multilingual. English is the MoI, used in official communication across the school and also as a language of communication with the school's stakeholders. Other European languages, namely French, German, and Portuguese, are officially taught as modern foreign languages. Significantly, none of the local Namibian languages are taught in the school. However, the school does not bar its learners and teachers from using their LotE, especially outside of the classroom. The study also shows that the language ecology at WIS demonstrates a situation of polyglossia where English is on top of the language hierarchy.

The studies indicated there exist opposing ideologies, and majority stakeholders perceive the monolingual ideology as the best approach to teaching L2 in Namibian schools despite learners struggling with the desired language of instruction. Therefore, this study shows a knowledge gap to investigate teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging and how they implement it in Grade 4.

Shifidi's (2014) study aimed at exploring the existence of translanguaging in Namibian schools, the extent to which translanguaging occurs during lessons, as well as looking at opinions from teachers on whether translanguaging has the potential to enhance learners' understanding of the subject contents. In his study, three schools were picked from three regions of Khomas, Oshikoto, and Ohangwena, respectively. There were 30 participants, consisting of 6 learners, 3 teachers, and 1 head of department from each of the three schools. The findings from both teachers and learners indicate that translanguaging is indeed happening in these regions. The findings show that translanguaging is more common as one moves from urban to rural schools, perhaps due to a lack of facilities and expertise. Respondents were positive towards translanguaging; they felt certain that translanguaging helped learners to understand and encouraged them to participate and interact with each other during lessons. The study concluded by suggesting that translanguaging was really necessary in Namibia as a means of communication strategy in case learners seemed not to be on track. The study also found that there were certain schools with internal policies that prohibited learners from speaking their local languages on the school premises, even to the extent of charging them to pay a certain amount as a punishment for using their local languages. This, according to the scholar, was not a good practice because it may lead learners to show contempt for their mother tongues and devalue their cultural and linguistic heritage.

Similarly, Simasiku (2016a) and Simasiku, Kasanda, & Smit (2015a) found that English Second Language teachers were of the view that the use of English as the only medium of instruction in the English Second Language classrooms impacted negatively on the year-end results. The scholars argued that the continuous exclusivity of English as the language of instruction in Namibian schools will continue restraining both teachers and learners in providing and receiving quality teaching and learning. Further, English second language teachers in Simasiku, Kasanda, & Smit (2015b, 2015c) perceived translanguageing as enhancing academic achievement because it fulfilled the linguistic and conceptual gaps, aided multiple communication purposes and enhanced teaching and learning of English as a second language. Thus, the use of familiar language helped learners to attach meaning to the newly acquired English vocabulary. Both studies argued that translanguageing was an additional resource that sped collaboration between learners and teachers in English medium classrooms and should be treated as such by both teachers and educational policymakers. The argument here is that the use of a familiar language in exclusively English medium instruction classrooms enabled learners to access learning, actively involve themselves in their learning, understand the subject matter better, and understand the difficult English concepts. Thus, familiar language enabled epistemic access and enhanced English second language learning and literacy development.

In addition, Denuga, James, & Michael (2017) and Naha, Nkengbeza & Liswaniso (2018) established that teachers utilised translanguageing in their lessons. Denuga, James, & Michael (2017) established that translanguageing through code-switching was a necessary pedagogic practice for teachers to achieve teaching goals in content-based lessons involving learners who lacked proficiency in the instructional language. Equally, Naha, Nkengbeza & Liswaniso (2018) stated that translanguageing has positive effects on English language learning and teaching. It helped learners to understand difficult aspects of the lesson taught and therefore were able to follow the instructions given. Other reasons included giving voice to learners and classroom management.

Ashikuti (2019) explored the enactment of Namibia's national language-education policy (LiEP) in junior primary schools with particular attention to differences between urban and rural contexts. The study found that LiEP interpretation, appropriation, and enactment differed between urban and rural contexts. Linguistic diversity at the classroom level, exposure to the MoI, and availability of teaching resources were key factors. While some schools had adopted the MTE policy, some, especially in urban areas, had adopted English as a medium of

instruction (EMI) policy. The adoption of EMI was the result of language beliefs among teachers and parents that favoured English and the unavailability of indigenous language resources, including teachers. At the classroom level, however, language practices were characterised by the adoption of a translanguaging pedagogy as a means of mitigating the communication barriers between teachers and learners. As a result, teachers transformed national and institutional LIEP at the classroom level in order to meet their own and their learners' linguistic needs.

These studies show the teachers language practices and the reasons they opt for such language practices. Arising from the study is that translanguaging was a strategic methodology that could work to help learners learn better in a multilingual setting. From the findings, it could be fair to argue that schools with internal policies that prohibited learners from their linguistic resources as tools for communication in the school premises viewed language as a problem. Thus, they had a negative view towards the use of alternative models of classroom language practices that facilitated epistemic access and effective learning. Moreover, the studies help us understand that teachers sometimes would negotiate the policy for the purposes of making teaching and learning accessible to everyone in their classrooms. Furthermore, the message from the studies shows that it was possible for teachers to have negative views towards a strategy of mediating learning such as translanguaging and maintained not to use it because of power relations despite their learners' experiencing difficulties with the language of instruction. Thus, teachers would choose to reproduce and uphold the power embedded in the policies.

In 2020, Set investigated how primary school Science teachers and learners meet the demand of the Namibian curriculum of Learner Centered Education (LCE) and the ideologies of monolingualism advocated in the Namibian Language in Education Policy. Set (2020) found that monologic practices were dominant, as evidenced by the constrained Initiation Response Feedback (IRF) discourse structure. This suggests that English monolingual policy places constraints on bilingual learners to use their multiple linguistic resources flexibly and thereby silences their voices in the classroom. This implies that the struggle to break away from rote learning towards conceptual understanding through exploratory talk remains elusive for the Namibian bilingual learners. The study further revealed how the affordances of multiple linguistic resources and modes have positive effects for emergent bilingual learners to gain nuanced understanding of the scientific knowledge, regardless of their limited proficiency in English. Thus, Set (2020) argued that the prevailing monoglossic orientations to the current

Namibian education system are a major contributing factor preventing Namibia from realising its' educational goals of access, quality, equity, and social justice. The scholar suggested that there was a need to support learners from linguistically diverse backgrounds through a deliberate inclusive language policy that harnesses their multilingualism and their cultural identity to enhance equal education access to all Namibian children.

In another study, Iiping and Banda (2020) explored the efficacy of using English as the Language of Learning and Teaching (LOLT) among Oshiwambo-speaking learners in the Omusati region of Northern Namibia. The study found that learners struggle to partake in meaningful classroom interaction and to comprehend instruction and content in English. Although learners may express themselves better in Oshiwambo, they were not allowed. Some ESL teachers would use Oshiwambo to maintain order in class but avoid using Oshiwambo to help struggling learners, believing this would negatively impact learners' English proficiency. Also, the ESL teachers do not use Oshiwambo because the current language in education policy does not allow it (Iiping, 2018). Some ESL teachers were also found to blame ESL content subject teachers for learners' poor English proficiency, as they used Oshiwambo in class to teach and explain content. The study concluded that the ESL classroom practice was teacher-centred by default, and learners were muted as they found themselves with no voice to express themselves efficiently and efficaciously and deaf to classroom content delivered in an unfamiliar language, English.

The studies above show different language ideologies in the Namibian education context. We see that in language education, a monolingual approach towards learning a target language is prominent and seen as the ideal one. In other words, most language teachers and even parents do not encourage learners to use their L1 during the process of learning a target language. Simasiku et al. (2015) established that most Namibian teachers and stakeholders still subscribe to the idea that African languages cannot be used as a medium of instruction in schools. Teachers fear that if mother tongue is used in the classrooms, learners might not be able to be employed, and mother tongue might find its way into their writing. It was found that both educators and politicians' attitudes were the main barriers to the use of translanguageing in the Namibian English Second Language medium classrooms. The prevailing monolingual framework present in educational institutions has contributed to the negative stance among teachers. Teachers are against translanguageing because it can result in learners' lesser exposure to the target language. Both teachers and parents' concerns are that learners would neglect their

TL if they used translingual strategies. Their inability to accept translanguaging demonstrates that education stakeholders still uphold a monolingual bias toward the dominant languages that restricts them from maximising their advantages. These biases can then be further informed by the language positions held by most teachers.

Kela (2021) found that translanguaging through code-switching was predominately employed by teachers and pupils at the school. The study revealed that teachers employed three different types of code-switching, namely situational, educational, and interpersonal code-switching, for pedagogical, teaching, and social reasons. Translanguaging was utilised for different roles, such as encouraging learners to participate in the classroom, for explanations and clarification purposes, to maintain discipline in the classroom, to show solidarity, to reiterate, to translate, and to explain the subject content that learners could not grasp as they were beginners. The study also showed that teachers and learners experienced challenges such as lack of English proficiency, shortage of teaching and scholarship materials, learners' linguistic underpreparedness, and limited exposure to the target language. Lastly, the findings showed that educators had insufficient training on the transition phase, a lack of policy awareness, and that the transition to English as the medium of instruction takes place too early.

Ya Nangoloh (2021) investigated multilingualism in the lecture room, paying particular attention to the presence or absence of translanguaging at the University of Namibia (UNAM) main campus. The study purpose was, firstly, to investigate why lecturers translanguage or why they do not. Secondly, the study aimed at identifying any translanguaging strategies applied in the lecture room. Finally, the study aimed at exploring the opinions of learners regarding the practice of translanguaging in the lecture room and its effect on their experience of learning. The study revealed that when a lecturer used a language that learners understand, it not only enhances their understanding of the taught content but constructs human relations as well. To add on, the majority of the learners feel that using only English in the lecture room affects their academic performance negatively as they sometimes do not understand concepts taught.

Namutenya (2022)'s study explored classroom language practices of English Second Language (ESL) teachers in three primary schools in the Oshana Educational Region of Namibia: one urban school and two rural schools. The findings from this study indicated that the ESL teachers in the Oshana region are intentional in their code-switching practices. Furthermore, it emerged that the ESL teachers' codeswitching practices were induced by factors such as linguistic factors, e.g., a lack of English vocabulary and limited language skills by both teachers and

learners; for repetitive functions; for clarification; for classroom management; for building solidarity with learners; and lastly, a lack of alternative methods from the teachers to help make the learners understand. Similarly, Hashoongo (2022) found that teachers translanguage when they are teaching vocabulary, terminologies, and complex sentences to the learners, and translanguaging helps learners to understand difficult educational texts and contents. She further recommended that translanguaging should not be banned from schools, because it helps learners who struggle to comprehend the subject content and also know some sets of vocabulary. Moreover, she cautions that translanguaging should be used, when necessary, especially when explaining difficult words or terminologies, but should only be done when all meanings of explanations are exhausted.

Norro (2022) analysed Namibian mainstream primary teachers' practices in the multilingual context they work in. The analysis shows that translanguaging strategies such as peer translation or explaining concepts in home languages are used, but rarely as pre-planned pedagogical strategies. Scaffolding is provided mostly through visual aids. She suggested that the translanguaging strategies already in use should be encouraged further, and multilingual pedagogies should be included in both pre-service and in-service teacher education. Also, Hashoongo (2022) revealed that teachers translanguage when they taught vocabulary, terminologies, and complex sentences to the learners and translanguaging helped learners to understand difficult educational texts and contents. The study established that some teachers ignored the policy and continued to incorporate familiar language (Oshiwambo dialects) to communicate with learners during teaching as they believed that it was not necessary to teach in English because they all belonged to one speech community. Moreover, Namutenya (2022) discovered that teachers intentionally translanguage due to among others linguistic factors, e.g., a lack of English vocabulary and limited language skills by both teachers and learners and perception that it was a practical solution because the alternative methods were limited or less accessible to make learners understand.

In another study, Norro (2023) explored Namibian primary school teachers' beliefs about schools' language policy and the medium of instruction, as well as their classroom practices in the multilingual context. The results indicated controversial language ideologies affecting the language policy and teachers' beliefs. Teachers' experiences as learners, their interpretation of the official policy, and practical constraints impact their beliefs, thus impacting their classroom practices. The results reveal differences in teachers' practices according to the school region's

degree of linguistic diversity, the subject taught, and differences between their self-reported and enacted practices. Teachers' multilingual practices are rather unplanned and momentary and do not leverage multimodality. According to the scholar, the study's results demonstrate a need to include multilingual teaching methods in initial and in-service teacher education, combined with opportunities for teachers and learner teachers to reflect on their beliefs and the language ideological constructs behind them.

Katukula, Set, & Nyambe, (2023) investigated parents' and teachers' language ideologies and beliefs; the factors that informed the embodied and expressed language ideologies and beliefs of parents and teachers; and how these dominant language ideologies and beliefs informed parents' and teachers' choice of language of instruction and the general implementation of the language policy in Namibian schools. The study discovered that both parents and teachers harboured monolingual ideological belief systems that did not only construct and perpetuate an "English-only" language zone but also banished all mother tongue languages from the school premises. Not only did the findings point to the hegemonic positioning of the English language in the minds of parents, teachers and school principals as the only language that can lead to success, but its violation was punishable in a derogatory manner. The study concluded that, among others, parents, teachers and school principals' language ideologies and beliefs were shaped and informed by the prevailing English language hegemony.

The reviewed studies distinctly illustrate that Namibia's classrooms embody a spectrum of language ideologies, each bearing consequences for educational equity and learner experiences. The dominance of English as a medium of instruction poses challenges, but growing advocacy for indigenous languages presents an opportunity for reform.

2.5 Teachers' Familiarity with the Language Policy in Relation to Translanguaging

Teachers are powerful language-in-education policy (LEP) implementers. Their interpretations of LEP documents and of LEP discourse in society affect the way they implement it. They can either implement LEP without question or create new implementation space. Thus, teachers may create their own policies, depending on their beliefs. They can work towards more equitable educational policies and practices that support learner agency and can open up spaces for multilingual approaches, even within a primarily monolingual language policy (Norro, 2021). Thus, teachers' knowledge of the language policy is considered to affect teachers' perceptions, values, and attitudes, thus influencing their (language) practices and how they

implement educational language policies. Therefore, studying teachers' familiarity with the language policy may be useful in understanding their ideologies and practices.

Wang (2008) studied teachers' perceptions of the language policy implementation in the Chinese tertiary context. With data collected from classroom observations and follow-up interviews, the findings revealed a discrepancy between policymakers' intentions and teachers' executions. Teachers failed to implement faithfully what was required from policymakers in the classroom. Rather, they conducted teaching based on the classroom and political realities. Their factors were mainly learner and departmental, which included large class size, learners' language proficiency, motivation, learning behaviour, perceptions of teachers' role, and institutional evaluation mechanism on teaching excellence. Another study intended to explore the significance of language policy awareness in English Language Teaching (ELT) was conducted in Mardan, Pakistan; 45 trainee teachers and 25 in-service teachers of ELT from two postgraduate departments participated (Ahmad & Khan, 2011). The study found out that ELT failed in achieving the broader educational aims because teachers lacked awareness about language policy.

In Kenya, Mbaka, Peter, & Karuri (2013) assessed the teachers' awareness of the language policy and actual implementation in the classroom in Kenya. It also analysed the problems that teachers experienced in implementing the policy... The paper established that teachers were aware of the policy, but they did not always implement it in the classroom. Also, Ohanga, Odeo, & Abenga (2021) examined the awareness and attitudes of lower primary school teachers toward the educational language policy in Kenya. The study established that lower primary school teachers were aware of the existing language of instruction. The teachers felt that they ought to be free to select the language of instruction based on their particular pedagogical needs.

In Ghana, Obeng (2020) sought to find out the level of awareness of the stakeholders, teachers, parents, and pupils; their position; and the impact of their position on learning outcomes. The research revealed that among the three stakeholders, teachers were more conversant with Ghana's language policy. All stakeholders endorsed the policy for teaching and learning purposes. Even though most teachers preferred to blend English and a local language, a few could speak the local language of the community or had been trained in the use of the local language for instructional purposes.

The findings in the reviewed studies above are important to the current study as they shed light on the fact that teachers can have knowledge of the availability of the language policy but lack awareness about its directives. Equally, despite adequate knowledge of the language policy, teachers may choose not to implement it. In my opinion, this could be based on the misconception or ideology that policies are managerial issues, and therefore, the teacher's task is to manage teaching and learning. Moreover, teachers may feel that the policy does not meet their pedagogical needs. Consequently, teachers will implement what they perceive as appropriate language and practices, which may also affect learners. Therefore, it was important to establish the teachers' awareness about the language policy, particularly regarding the implementation of translanguaging in the classroom in multilingual classrooms in Namibia. The findings in the context of the multilingual Grade 4 classroom in Namibia are discussed.

Lenis (2015) sought to establish the literacy practices enacted by a Dominican kindergarten teacher and her learners during the language arts block in Western Massachusetts. It was reported that, despite the teacher's obligation to comply with the national and state-mandated curriculum and regulations, she challenged and questioned the policies. Thus, regardless of the state's language policy restricting the learners' familiar language use in the classroom, the teacher made use of Spanish (the learners' home language), both to mediate her teaching practices and learners' second language development process, as well as to validate her learners' home language and culture. The study suggested that teachers should not just receive and implement policies because they are from the central state. Instead, they should question and negotiate changes that will not only be beneficial to them but also enhance and mediate learners learning. Thus, the teacher exercised translanguaging as the classroom language practice to ease teaching and learning for the maximum benefit and development of both languages. Similarly, Lara-Stephanie and Prinsloo (2016) found that teachers, though knowing that the schools did not allow the use of translanguaging, still used it in their lessons. They mixed language resources in creative and helpful ways. Results further showed that teachers apply the language resources at their disposal with some skill to make learners understand subject matter better. They used it knowing that they were going against the schools' language policy as well as knowing that their learners were struggling with monoglossic examination requirements. However, teachers continued to use translanguaging because they appreciated the pedagogic advantages that it brings in teaching and learning (Lara-Stephanie & Prinsloo, 2016).

Analysis of the above studies shows that despite knowing the policy guidelines and school restrictions, teachers may challenge the language in education policy by employing the languages and practices that they see appropriate. Thus, not all teachers agree and implement the policy as it is prescribed. Some teachers may ignore the policy and select a convenient language or teaching practice that they think will resonate well with their learners. Their choice and practice of language of instruction are largely based on the teachers' knowledge and understanding of policy. Thus, teachers adopt classroom language and practices that are based on deep-rooted ideologies that may influence or prevent them from practicing the prescribed language policies. In other words, teachers' decision-making in the classroom is heavily influenced by a set of ideologies that teachers hold about learners and pedagogical practices. These ideologies imply what kinds of language practices are valued in enacting language policy and are disclosed as discourses in curricula, syllabi, and teachers' practices and interactions with learners. These studies are therefore crucial and align well with the current study. They provide an insight on whether teachers adhere to or challenge the language policy. Therefore, the teachers' familiarity and language choices and practices for grade 4 ESL teachers in the selected Namibia public schools are discussed.

In Namibia, Ausiku (2010) evaluated the implementation of the new Language-in-Education Policy (LiEP) in the upper primary schools in the Oshana Region of Namibia. The study revealed that the majority of teachers, learners, and parents were neither aware of the new LiEP nor were they consulted prior to its implementation. Therefore, policy implementation will vary according to contexts. This is evident in Ashikuti's (2019) study, which explored the enactment of Namibia's national language-in-education policy (LiEP) in junior primary schools with particular attention to the differences between urban and rural contexts. The study found that LiEP interpretation, appropriation, and enactment differed between urban and rural contexts. Linguistic diversity at the classroom level, exposure to it, and availability of teaching resources were key factors in policy engagement. While some schools had adopted the mother tongue education (MTE) policy, some, especially in urban areas, had adopted the English as a medium of instruction (EMI) policies. The adoption of EMI policies was a result of language beliefs amongst teachers and parents that favoured English and the unavailability of indigenous language resources, including teachers. At the classroom level, however, language practices were characterised by the adoption of a translinguaging pedagogy as a means of mitigating the communication barrier between teachers and learners. As a result, teachers transformed

national and institutional language in education policy at the classroom level in order to meet their own and their learners' linguistic needs.

In another study, Iiping (2018) established that even though learners in Northern Namibia were not good at English, ESL teachers did not use Oshiwambo in the classroom because of the ideology that the use of Oshiwambo compromises the effective mastery of English. Also, the ESL teachers did not use Oshiwambo because the current LEP did not allow it. This implies that teachers were familiar with the language policy and its mandate in the classroom. However, Hashoongo (2022) established contradictory findings as the findings discovered that teachers translanguaged when they were taught vocabulary, terminologies, and complex sentences to the learners, and translanguaging helped learners to understand difficult educational texts and contents. The study established that some teachers ignore the policy and continue to incorporate familiar language (Oshiwambo dialects) to communicate with learners during teaching as they believed that it was not necessary to teach in English because they all belonged to one speech community.

Critical analysis of the Namibian studies above shows differences in teachers' understanding and implementation of the language policy. First is that, due to misunderstanding of the language policy resulting from unclear guidelines on how it should be implemented, teachers may deploy languages and practices they consider appropriate, as observed from Ausiku and Ashikuti above. Moreover, the interpretation and enactment of the language policy could be due to ideological and attitudinal misconceptions by Africans that the implanted European languages and cultures are more apt for education, whereas the African indigenous languages are inferior and not fit for education. Therefore, while teachers in Iiping (2018) were familiar with the language policy that did not allow them to translanguage, their practices could also result from the existing ideologies that English is the language of opportunity; therefore, any time spent speaking and studying other languages is an opportunity lost. Thus, children learn international languages, which they view as opening doors to economic and educational opportunities (Kavhura, 2018). However, it is also clear that teachers challenge the language policy based on their views, beliefs, and attitudes towards languages and their use in a classroom. Hence, they may deploy languages and practices they consider appropriate. This reflection highlights the need for the current study to understand the teachers' familiarity with the language policy, their ideologies, and the implementation of the policy in grade 4 classrooms with regard to translanguaging pedagogical practice.

2.6 Teachers' Ideologies Towards Implementation of Translanguaging

Language ideologies and educational language practices are tied together as language ideologies and hierarchies are reproduced but also contested in classroom interaction. Language ideologies impact one's perceptions of what language should be, how it should be used and by whom, and consequently, how it can be learnt (Merchán, 2019). Teachers have their own ideologies about language and language learning that can affect how they teach and interact with learners. As ideologies influence teachers' pedagogical decisions, uncovering the ideologies embedded in their classroom practices would help teachers to be more aware of them (Kiramba 2018, 293). One advantage of studying ideologies about translanguaging is that the results can help stakeholders figure out whether it is a good thing to practice in the teaching-learning process. Therefore, it is beneficial to outline different perspectives and examine how it affects learning. This demand of knowing the perspectives about the practice urges the researchers to conduct further studies that aim to understand different views from another category of participants. In recent years, several researchers have become interested in investigating the various stakeholders' perceptions of translanguaging. Scholars assert that despite its widely documented benefits, as previously discussed, existing literature reveals that language teachers hold diverse ideologies towards pedagogical translanguaging.

There is a wide range of opinions among teachers when it comes to translanguaging (Creese and Blackledge, 2011; Wang, 2019). Wang (2019a, b) discovered, for instance, that while some teachers supported translanguaging strategies, others saw no benefit in doing so or felt bad about doing so, so they stuck with monolingual approaches. This is connected to the idea of "continuum of perspective," which was put forth by Macaro (2005) to explain such a wide range of beliefs. This construct consists of three dimensions: virtual position, a monolingual viewpoint that favours only using L2; maximal position, which acknowledges the necessity and value of using different languages but feels guilty when using non-L2; and optimal position, which firmly believes that using multiple languages at specific times can facilitate learning.

In Nambisan's (2014) pioneering study, a semi-structured questionnaire was administered to collect data from 19 teachers working in both mainstream and dual language programs in the United States. Findings showed that the majority believed translanguaging to be effective for different pedagogical purposes (e.g., providing clarification, giving feedback, praising learners). These results are consistent with those of Fang and Liu (2020) and Pinto (2020). The authors of these two studies examined the attitudes of tertiary-level Chinese teachers towards

translanguaging. Most participants in both studies recognised the value of incorporating learners' L1 in the classroom and considered it an effective pedagogical tool, particularly for scaffolding the learning of low English-language proficiency learners and building rapport with them. In like manner, the in-service teachers who participated in Deroo and Ponzio's (2019:221) study "recognised that translanguaging is an inclusive stance toward learners' linguistic diversity."

Yet, it needs to be acknowledged that the literature does not speak with one voice regarding teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging. Doiz and Lasagabaster (2017:157), for instance, carried out a study with English medium instruction (EMI) teachers at the University of the Basque in Spain and concluded that "the majority of the participants are prone to exclude the L1 from their everyday teaching practices because the L1 is thought to hinder the acquisition of the foreign language." Along similar lines, Anderson and Lightfoot (2021) surveyed the attitudes of 169 teachers in India towards translanguaging practices in English language classrooms. More than half the respondents thought that the use of any language other than English should be kept to a minimum. In a different study, Burton and Rajendram (2019:40) examined the attitudes of five English language instructors at a major Canadian university and found that four of the five participants perceived translanguaging "as slowing learners' English learning" rather than "as a resource that can deepen their understandings and extend their knowledge." Likewise, some of the participating teachers in Wang's (2019) study saw no benefit of translanguaging and consequently felt a sense of guilt whenever deviating from the target language; they therefore reported their adherence to monolingualism in their classroom.

Yuvayapan (2019) conducted research that sought to investigate EFL teachers' perceptions towards the practices of translanguaging in their classrooms. There was a total of 50 EFL teachers invited to that study (Hornberger, N. H., 2003), and 5 of them were observed in different classrooms in different institutions. The findings noted that the teachers held a positive belief that the use of Turkish in the classroom enabled low proficiency learners to be engaged. However, most teachers felt pressured by the institutional and contextual factors since the priority of English-only was needed by the policy; thus, school policy discouraged teachers from using translanguaging. However, the findings also illustrated that the results were unable to generalise to a wide range of EFL domains, but a clue was suggested by those findings of that study (Yuvayapan, 2019). With the integration of translanguaging, less time was spent clarifying the contents of the lesson, managing the classroom, and creating rapport with

learners, which may be because of the curriculum and other institutional stresses. Yuvayapan (2019) claimed that teachers should carefully and systematically use translanguaging as a scaffold, and the different forms of interaction (teacher-to-learner, learner-to-teacher, learner-to-learner, and learner-to-self) should be used while teaching the four skills of language (listening, reading, speaking, and writing). Despite the findings indicating that the use of translanguaging was highly dependent on the demand of the class or learners, EFL teachers held the consensus that they had to be aware of how translanguaging potentially supported English language teaching and learning (Yuvayapan, 2019). What was more, the participants also showed that they lacked a systematic way to improve learners' performances while learning English (Yuvayapan, 2019).

The message from the reviewed studies above is that there are existing different views towards translanguaging among teachers. Thus, while some teachers may hold positive ideologies, others may have negative views. This entails that members of the same society may have competing sets of beliefs. One prominent aspect coming out from the analysis is that having positive ideologies does not transcend to positive application of the pedagogical strategy as observed from Yuvayapan's (2019) results. Moreover, teachers' misconception of translanguaging pedagogic practice and ideology that the use of L1 compromises the effective mastery of English also influences not to apply the approach in class. The context of the current study is that teachers in the same educational system may have different views about pedagogical practices such as translanguaging. In that regard, teachers' ideologies towards the implementation of translanguaging in multilingual Namibian grade 4 classrooms were worth finding out, and the results are presented and discussed. (Hillman, Graham, & Eslami, 2018)

In America, Hillman, Graham, & Eslami (2018) examined teachers' translanguaging ideologies and practices at an American IBC in Qatar. The results, however, showed that while teachers reported minimal mixing of languages in classrooms at this IBC due to different ideological tensions, in practice teachers still engaged in translanguaging for various pedagogical purposes, both inside and outside of the classroom space. Similarly, Ambele (2022) examined Thai university English foreign language (EFL) teachers' views on classroom translanguaging and its adoption at tertiary institutions. The data revealed that all the teachers showed a generally positive attitude towards classroom translanguaging practices for L2 and content learning. Moreover, they reported that it was seemingly difficult to completely dismiss the learners' L1 (Thai) in Thai classrooms where English was used as the medium of instruction.

Likewise, Khojan (2022) found that the teachers incorporated the translanguaging teaching strategy in their EMI classrooms, as most of the Thai primary EFL teachers positively believed in the use of translanguaging for teaching and learning in EMI classes (83.67%). This perception was confirmed by their language practice, as the teachers frequently and sometimes used learners' language resources (including English and Thai) in different classroom situations to assist the learners to learn and foster classroom interaction and participation. Despite the strict English-only monolingual policy stipulated for EMI classes, however, the teachers affirmed that the translanguaging practice is helpful for teaching and learning and thus should be incorporated into EMI classroom language use. The teachers further reported that even though there are challenges with adopting such an approach, still, there are more benefits in utilising learners' L1 than just using the English-only approach. Thus, in classes like the Namibian Grade 4 classrooms where English serves as the language of teaching and learning, it is to entirely dismiss the pupils' linguistic repertoires. In other words, translanguaging pedagogic practices cannot be ignored or shunned away in multiannual classes.

Furthermore, Pantalleresco (2021) examined teachers' beliefs on translanguaging practices and their approaches in developing the learners' speaking skills. Five Spanish teachers were interviewed. The interviews revealed that the teacher participants regarded translanguaging as a valuable educational resource, as it facilitated target language comprehension and created a relaxed classroom environment. However, despite the positive views on translanguaging, teachers adopted a Spanish-only approach during speaking tasks, as they believed it was the only time for learners to practice the target language within realistic situations. This study also concluded that teachers' beliefs on language use were influenced by a variety of factors, including previous learning experiences, teacher education, the school's language policies, and the learners' level of ability.

Similarly, Rodríguez-Izquierdo (2021) examined Andalusian teachers' ideologies towards migrant learners' bilingualism and the way teachers perceived the home language maintenance and its use in the school context. Findings revealed that there were slight differences in the ideologies of these two types of teachers. In general, teachers' beliefs towards bilingualism were relatively positive. In rhetoric, language teachers demonstrated a greater appreciation for the bilingualism of the learners and viewed it as a challenge. Conversely, the regular teachers had a less positive orientation towards bilingualism, associating it with problems. Furthermore, teachers advocated assimilationist language ideologies that consider Spanish-only as an

indispensable tool for academic achievement. The results also highlighted that participants did not seem to be aware of the importance of learners' home language—as a right and its use as a democratic condition in a multilingual society such as Spain. The results show a need for professional development for all teachers to move away from monolingualism to advocating for multilingualism to better reflect the realities of the classrooms.

The two studies above are important as they highlight critical points to the current study. First, they provide that, translanguaging may be perceived positively as an appreciated teaching approach by the teacher but does not mean being in harmony with its implementation. In other words, translanguaging may be viewed as a problem, and this could result in the perception among teachers that utilising the L1 and L2 simultaneously would conflict, restrict exposure and chances for learners to practice the target language, and have a detrimental impact on transfer. Therefore, they ignore the use of the learners' familiar language and discourage or even prohibit the use of translanguaging strategies. Further, the studies also show teachers' language ideologies are strongly influenced by their own histories and experiences (previous learning experiences, teacher education, and the school's language policies). Therefore, *de facto* language policies in the classroom frequently reflect the linguistic ideologies of the teachers. Additionally, the privation of understanding of the value of learners' background knowledge and lack of training in multilingual pedagogies compound the implementation of translanguaging in class. These studies helped us understand the Namibian teachers' stances towards translanguaging and if there were other factors influencing them to use or not use it in their classrooms.

Tuskeyeva (2022) investigated Russian and Kazakh-speaking EFL teachers' perceptions and the way translanguaging was used in their teaching. Equally, the study explored how teaching materials reflected the use of translanguaging. The findings revealed that most of all participants held mixed perceptions of translanguaging, which ranged from negative to positive. Regardless of mixed perceptions, all EFL teachers were found to use translanguaging in their teaching. In addition, the study showed that Russian-speaking teachers were more negative towards translanguaging, whereas Kazakh-speaking teachers tended to perceive translanguaging as a beneficial pedagogical tool. Finally, document analysis of teaching materials indicated that there was the scarce presence of planned translanguaging pedagogy. The study recommended professional development courses for EFL teachers, curriculum designers, and policymakers on the benefits of translanguaging in education. This study is

crucial as it suggests that teachers can also (re)produce language ideologies through curriculum. In the current study, documents were reviewed to examine how translanguaging was implemented in their teaching.

In the Philippines, Alemania et al. (2022) and Macawile & Plata (2022) looked at the teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging. Alemania et al. (2022) findings revealed that the participants possessed a positive view of translanguaging for content-orientated and classroom-orientated purposes. There was also a significant difference between the participants' translanguaging attitudes and language positions in relation to their year level. Overall, the results suggested a need for teacher education institutions (TEIs) to explicitly incorporate multilingual practices into their curriculum to increase the acceptance of using translanguaging in multilingual L2 classrooms. Macawile & Plata (2022) also found that the participants leveraged translanguaging as a resource to help learners in knowledge construction, problem-solving, and meaning-making. In addition, the participants allowed translanguaging in formative assessment but not in summative assessment tasks. This paper argued for the need to explore the role of translanguaging in teaching and assessment to ensure equity for all learners.

Equally, Khairunnisa & Lukmana (2020) investigated the attitudes towards translanguaging in EFL classrooms by 50 English language teachers. The findings revealed that Indonesian EFL teachers showed a positive attitude towards the use of translanguaging in their classrooms. Most of them considered the incorporation of Indonesian language and local language beneficial in EFL classrooms. It is also discovered that Indonesian EFL teachers were flexibly using translanguaging to facilitate learners' learning. Moreover, Raja, Suparno, & Ngadiso (2022) the analysis reveals that all participants implemented translanguaging in several typical situations in their EFL classrooms. Despite participants' various feelings towards translanguaging, they still used translanguaging in their teaching and associated translanguaging with positive attributes. Moreover, most teacher participants had positive intentions towards translanguaging in their future class. These findings shed light on multilingual pedagogical practices and further research directions. (Macawile & Plata, 2022)

However, in their study, Santoso & Hamied (2022) investigated the perceptions of translanguaging pedagogy of pre-service English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers in an Indonesian private university to promote reflections in pre-service English teachers regarding their own views of English language teaching. The research results demonstrated that the participants held the maximal position, which put a strong emphasis on maximising the use of

English. They, however, expressed their interest in the implementation of translanguaging pedagogy in their own classrooms, but solely as a scaffold to learn rather than seeing it as an opportunity to create a safe space for learners to legitimate their multilingual dynamic practices.

Mwambula's (2021) study on attitudes and the presence of translanguaging practice in lower primary school classrooms in Tanzania demonstrated positive ideologies. According to the findings, teachers perceived that through translanguaging, a child learns more quickly through their mother tongue than through an unfamiliar linguistic medium. Further, teachers acknowledged the importance of mother tongue and stated that learners were quicker to learn to read and acquire other academic skills when first taught in their mother tongue. The study recommended that teachers should create an instructional space where translanguaging was nurtured without learners having to suppress their linguistic repertoires. Thus, a classroom where learners manifest and utilise their linguistic repertoires constitutes a 'haven' for learners to attain a deeper understanding of the learnt material. Also, Adler & Ljungdahl (2022) examine how English teachers in Sweden perceived the use of translanguaging in their teaching of grades 4-6 (ages 9-12). Also, how they possibly prepared for and implemented this in their lessons. The collected data show that most of the participating teachers had a positive view of translanguaging. Despite some teachers being against it and believing that the target language should be used as much as possible, the school language was still used by all participants to scaffold the learners. Though translanguaging was a relatively new, not very well-known concept, it was being regularly used although not always consciously.

In their study, Yusri, Huzaimi, & Sulaiman (2022) also argued that despite the perceived benefits of translanguaging, there exist differences of perceptions and attitudes among teachers towards translanguaging, which imposed ideological barriers, thus preventing its implementation. Therefore, in trying to understand the issue, their study explored Malaysian teachers' perceptions towards translanguaging in English language lessons. The findings of this study depicted an overall positive perception of translanguaging among the participants, where they implemented several translanguaging strategies such as contextual clues, collaboration, and learner-centredness, as well as two-way translation in their teaching pedagogy. The findings obtained from this study can be beneficial to the stakeholders in the education field in designing lessons by employing translanguaging practices that suit the needs of the learners in the English Second Language (ESL) classroom. (Burton & Rajendram, 2019)

Burton and Rajendram's (2019) research study, which was conducted at a Canadian university, also focuses on the use of translanguaging in schools and explored teachers' views on it in an English language learning context. During this, Burton and Rajendram (2019) discovered that most of the teachers thought the use of translanguaging was regressive rather than progressive in terms of developing the pupils' skills in English. One of the teachers, however, felt translanguaging could be used as a resource to develop language, and the pupils should decide if and how they wanted to use it in the classroom. On the other hand, most of them considered translanguaging as useful when teaching or instructing the pupils about things that involved their real lives, although some felt it was best used with lower levels and beginner pupils. Additionally, some of the teachers mentioned that, due to time constraints, they determined that the limited opportunities the pupils had to speak English were not to be wasted on using other languages (Burton & Rajendram, 2019).

From the foregoing, it is evident that teachers, as managers of the classroom, may have contrasting views towards a teaching method, which could result from their ideologies towards such a method. Moreover, it could also result from a lack of awareness or resistance due to power relations. Nonetheless, it is important to the teachers' understanding and awareness of the translanguaging teaching method, hence their ideologies thereof.

In Namibia, scholars including Simasiku, Kasanda, and Smit (2015a), Simasiku, Kasanda, and Smit (2015b), Simasiku (2016a, b), established that even when their learners could not understand what the language of instruction, teachers still resisted incorporating familiar language in the classroom. The majority of Namibian teachers and politicians, according to Simasiku, Kasanda, and Smit (2015a), continue to hold the belief that African languages cannot be employed as the primary language of teaching in schools. Furthermore, the researchers found that teachers were concerned that if learners spoke their mother tongues in class, they might not be able to get employment and that their mother tongue might creep into their writing. The study came to the conclusion that colonialism served as the primary impediment to the adoption of translanguaging in Namibian classrooms for both teacher and politicians. Simasiku (2016a) suggested that translanguaging should not be shunned but welcomed and incorporated into the Namibian language policy.

Denuga, Abah, & Michael's (2017) findings confirmed and indicated that some teachers were against translanguaging because examinations were written in English, and the language policy did not recommend the practice. Negative ideologies towards translanguaging were also

reported by Ipinge (2018) and Iiping & Banda (2020), who established that despite teachers' acknowledgement of learners' lack of familiarity with the language of instruction, they did not use the learners' linguistic resources in their classrooms because of the notion that mother tongue (Oshiwambo) compromised the effective mastery of English and also that the current language policy did not allow it. However, some ESL teachers would use Oshiwambo (a familiar language) to maintain order in class but avoided using Oshiwambo to help struggling learners, believing this would negatively impact learners' English proficiency. Some ESL teachers were also found to blame ESL content subject teachers for learners' poor English proficiency, as they used Oshiwambo in class to teach and explain content. They concluded that ESL classroom practices were teacher-centred by default, and learners were muted as they found themselves with no voice to express themselves efficiently and efficaciously and deaf to classroom content delivered in an unfamiliar language, English.

The studies above indicate that there is a need to study teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging in Namibia. As shown in the studies above, teachers possess diverse ideologies towards translanguaging.

2.7 Implementation of Translanguaging in Language Classrooms

According to Öztürk & Çubukçu (2022), teachers can employ translanguaging to make challenging subjects more understandable for learners, which will help them develop their critical thinking and understanding. Considering this, it is crucial for teachers to understand how to implement this strategy, avoiding misconceptions about its implementation in their practices. Literature shows that research studies have been done on the implementation of translanguaging in the classroom.

Nsele (2015) investigated whether the practice of translanguaging exists in social sciences classrooms and whether it is effectively adopted. The main finding from the observation is that teachers alternate between isiZulu and English to make lessons understood by learners. The lesson was understood better by learners when both languages were used. Results indicate that home languages play a vital role in the educational activities of learners because it was the language they were most familiar with. The main finding from the reading comprehension inventory revealed that when learners used isiZulu as a language of input and English as a language of output, they performed better. Furthermore, it was discovered that the language of output played no significant role in improving reading comprehension scores of learners. The

significant factor was the language of input. It was evident that teachers were reluctant to use translanguaging in their lessons because it was not prescribed in the language in education policy; however, when they used the prescribed language (English), they did not receive desired responses/output from the learners, and lessons became less interesting. The study recommended a need to review language policies in place and accommodate adjustments to allow flexibility in teaching and curriculum content.

Sefotho (2019) found that learners from experimental groups outperformed those from control groups in all the variables that were used. This meant that the translanguaging intervention that was offered to experimental groups had a positive effect on developing bilingual learners' reading skills using their home language, Sesotho, and English as an additional language. However, despite the benefits of the implemented translanguaging, Sefoto found that teachers in bilingual classrooms still consider languages as separate entities that 'contaminate' each other. As a result, they did not allow their learners to concurrently use both languages even though they themselves used both languages to enhance comprehension. In other words, although teachers acknowledged the positive effects of translanguaging, they did not fully implement it in their classrooms. Correspondingly, in Namibia, Iipinge & Banda (2020) established that even though learners in Northern Namibia are not good at English, ESL teachers do not use Oshiwambo in the classroom because of the ideology that the use of Oshiwambo compromises the effective mastery of English. Also, the ESL teachers do not use Oshiwambo because the current LEP does not allow it. Therefore, because teachers do not use Oshiwambo in the ESL classes even though learners' English proficiency is not up to standard (at least when measured against standard English norms, as opposed to Namibian English norms), it is evident that the learning that is taking place in these classrooms is far from satisfactory.

The two studies above clearly indicate that successful implementation of translanguaging (or lack of it) is dependent on teachers' ideologies. Thus, even though they may acknowledge the advantages of translanguaging and the challenges learners experience with the target language, they may not allow its implementation in the classroom because it is viewed as a problem.

However, among other objectives, Hashoongo (2022) found that when translanguaging was implemented in the lessons, it helped both teachers and learners to manage the language conflict between their first and second languages. The results of the study discovered that teachers translanguaged when they were teaching vocabulary, terminologies, and complex sentences to

the learners, and translanguaging helped learners to understand difficult educational texts and contents. In that case, Hashoong advises that translanguaging should be used, when necessary, especially when explaining difficult words or terminologies, but should only be done when all meanings of explanations are exhausted. She, thus, concludes that translanguaging should not be banned from schools, because it helps learners who struggle to comprehend the subject content and know some sets of vocabulary.

Daniel et al. (2019) explored two elementary teachers' strategies in helping learners understand translanguaging as a valuable practice in an English-only school context. The two teachers first engaged learners in discussing the benefits of translation for communication and learning in school, and then they made translanguaging the new norm of their class instruction by getting learners to translate writing across languages. This means that they scaffolded learners' translanguaging in class by designing well-structured partner work, modelling, and building up learners' translation skills over time. They further introduced translation strategies to learners so that the learners could strategically leverage their translanguaging in school. The teachers' scaffolds on learners' translating skills helped learners recognise the value of translanguaging and developed their writing and spelling skills across languages. In another study, Vaish (2019a) dealt with the superdiversity of linguistic backgrounds in a classroom in Singapore, and the languages present in class included English, Tamil, Chinese, and Malay. Due to the diversity of learners' home languages represented in class, the class had three teachers, two of whom were research assistants. These teachers were all bilinguals (i.e., Chinese-English, Malay-English, or Tamil-English). Translating English texts into learners' home languages, the main translanguaging method was intended to reinforce learners' understanding of English words and increase their "metalinguistic awareness of synonyms or near synonyms between languages" (Vaish, 2019:284). However, the study found that asking learners to translate words across the various language groups was too time-consuming and inefficient.

Further, Cenoz and Santos (2020) studied the implementation of pedagogical translanguaging in trilingual schools. In their study, a group of teachers from different trilingual schools was provided with theoretical and practical information about translanguaging and was asked to implement pedagogical translanguaging in their classes. These teachers were given a guideline for the implementation and therefore they were asked to prepare a lesson plan including activities that involved the use of two or more languages for pedagogical purposes. According to Cenoz and Santos (2020), the teachers used translanguaging for at least one lesson, received

feedback from their learners, and reflected on the implementation. The results of this study showed that pedagogical translanguageing can provide new opportunities for language learning and language awareness in the context of multilingual education.

From the study above, it can be said that successful implementation of new pedagogic practice requires adequate training and guidance. Hence, it can be concluded that effective implementation yields constructive results in terms of language learning, constructing feasible and effective methods, and the right ideologies towards translanguageing. Nevertheless, it is not known how the Namibian Grade 4 English language teachers implement translanguageing in their classrooms. Thus, the study under review helps us understand how translanguageing could be implemented.

In a Canadian university, Galante (2020) examined the implementation of translanguageing in an English language program. According to the results, while teachers were willing to implement pedagogical translanguageing, time to be familiar with the approach was necessary. Moreover, the result showed that learners engaged in spontaneous translanguageing outside of the classroom freely, but pedagogical translanguageing was more controlled and limited to the languages shared in the classroom. While the theory of translanguageing suggests the use of learners' entire linguistic repertoire, they mainly relied on the L1. Moreover, it was found that naming languages, particularly minority languages, was important in multilingual classrooms so they were not deemed invisible. Nevertheless, this study shows that translanguageing was not effectively implemented due to a lack of familiarity with pedagogical translanguageing. Likewise, Dlamini-Nxumalo and Charamba (2021) reported teachers' limited understanding of translanguageing. However, they believed that mixing languages, which they confused with translanguageing, enhanced learners understanding of science.

Aung (2021) studied the perceptions of translanguageing amongst English teachers in township primary schools and why teachers perceived translanguageing in that way. The research participants included seven English-language teachers from Grades 4, 5, 6, and 7. Teachers viewed translanguageing as an effective strategy within their home and first additional English-language classrooms. Teachers from both schools instinctively implemented translanguageing daily. Translanguageing within both schools did not occur only as a pedagogical practice but also as a sociolinguistic phenomenon. What was evident from the findings were the many acts of unplanned and spontaneous translanguageing which took place within the classrooms. The

unplanned acts of translanguaging confirmed that teachers were willing to implement translanguaging, which in turn influenced their perceptions of translanguaging.

In Zhang and Chan's (2021) study, two EFL classes in a Xinjiang university in China were observed for teacher participants' translanguaging practice. As the classes were for Uyghur learners, three languages were present in class: English (the target language), Mandarin Chinese (the national language), and Uyghur (the learners' mother tongue). It is reported that Uyghur teachers used Mandarin Chinese and Uyghur to teach English vocabulary and explain English grammar "to make examples culturally familiar to learners and to involve learners [in]class activities" (Zhang & Chan, 2021: 4-5). For example, the two Uyghur teachers' translanguaged across English, Mandarin, Chinese, and Uyghur to teach English words that are similar to Uyghur and to explain the usage of antonyms. Doing this, learners were actively involved in making cross-linguistic connections among vocabulary items. Similarly, the teacher translated to teach grammar points. For instance, the teachers compared sentence patterns in Uyghur with those of English.

Teng & Fang (2022) explored the development of morphological awareness in learning Chinese as a third language, focusing on how the activation of a learner's multilingual repertoire can influence morphological awareness. The study was conducted for a period of eight weeks with 62 Japanese learners in a Chinese learning program at a university in China. The learners are native Japanese speakers with English and Chinese as their second and third languages. The learners were allocated into an experimental group and a control group. The experimental group received translanguaging instruction, while the control group completed learning through the monolingual approach for which the language of instruction was Chinese. The main aim of the translanguaging intervention was to help learners utilise their multilinguistic repertoire across languages for their morphology learning. The results revealed that morphology learning scores were higher for the participants in the experimental group than the control group. The focus group interviews revealed that the learners in the experimental group favourably perceived the use of translanguaging strategies for morphology learning. Moreover, the learners in the experimental group reported cognitive, interactive, and affective benefits from translanguaging pedagogy.

In a similar study, Karabulut and Dollar (2022) explored the role of translanguaging pedagogy (TP) in writing classes and participants' perceptions regarding its implementation in an English as a foreign language (EFL) context. Throughout one semester, the first experimental group

was exposed to TP in their writing classes, whereas the second one learnt writing through the translanguaging instructional cycle, excluding their mother tongue (L1). The control group had product-focused, English-only writing classes. The results revealed significant gains in task achievement, lexical and grammatical range and accuracy, and cohesion and coherence favouring TP, and the participants found the implementation of TP useful in helping them improve in a variety of aspects in their English writing classes.

Zainuddin and Zaki (2023) explored and compared translanguaging practices and ideologies in Malaysian tertiary and secondary education settings. The results showed that teachers from both educational settings use translanguaging in all three categories of translanguaging strategies proposed by Romanowski (2019), namely the explanatory, managerial, and interpersonal strategies. Nevertheless, there were differences in the usage of the sub-strategies under each category in secondary and tertiary ESL classrooms. Besides that, while translanguaging was generally accepted as an effective pedagogical tool, to some degree, teachers were still restricted by the monolingual approach in ESL classrooms. The study recommends that teachers in different educational contexts should select the most appropriate translanguaging strategies for their learners and be mindful with their implementation.

The reviewed studies suggest that translanguaging is not merely an instructional strategy, but rather a movement towards more inclusive and equitable educational practices. However, teachers' beliefs, perceptions, attitudes, views, and ideologies affect the implementation of translanguaging. Thus, successful implementation requires cooperation among educators, administrators, and policymakers. Most importantly, teachers need support to harmonise their perceptions with the effectiveness of translanguaging strategies in teaching by aligning the existing country's educational policy, which currently says that the first language may be used as the only medium of instruction in the early phase of schooling.

2.8 Factors Affecting Teachers' Implementation of Translanguaging in Grade 4 English Language Classrooms.

In the practice of translanguaging, there are some factors that can influence the use of translanguaging. Thus, there are factors that support or hinder teachers' implementation of translanguaging. However, a successful translanguaging pedagogy can only be achieved through teachers' thoughtful, effective planning and doing (García et al., 2017). Teachers' attitudes toward hybrid language practices (by teachers and learners) also play an important

role in their teaching pedagogy and can structure their assessments. Therefore, all the factors that are involved in the process of teachers' pedagogical planning and practice, their perspective of translanguaging theory, and their navigation of the language separation policy can impact the implementation of translanguaging pedagogy in a classroom. Studies have examined possible factors that influence the implementation of translanguaging.

One of the factors influencing translanguaging is lack of familiarity with the language of instruction, as Kavhura (2018) argues that in schools nowadays learners are taught in languages they neither speak nor understand. In addition, UNESCO (2016) notes that 40 percent of children do not have access to an education in a language they can understand, which has an adverse effect on their learning. Many countries still prioritise national or official languages (second language) as the medium of instruction, which are often not the languages children speak at home (UNESCO, 2016). For instance, Mashinja and Mwanza (2020a) noted that there is no correspondence between the language the learner speaks at home and that used for teaching and learning at school in the Zambezi region in Namibia. Therefore, teachers resorted to translanguaging to ensure that all learners were accommodated in the learning processes.

In other studies, both Nzwala (2015) and Mashinja (2020) identified the language of instruction as one of the major challenges the junior primary teachers experienced. In their findings, they established that teachers resorted to translanguaging when they realised that children had challenges understanding and communicating in the designated language of initial literacy (SiLozi). Similarly, Mukwambo, Mhakure, and Sitwala (2020) established that teachers used different languages in the numeracy lessons to mediate learners understanding of the numeracy literacy because most of the learners' language familiarity was not good.

In another study, Rahmawansyah (2019: 141) found that there are four teacher reasons of the used of translanguaging in English foreign language classroom at High School Level in Bulukumba. The fourth teacher's reasons are (1) helping the learners take a more active role, (2) creating effective communication, (3) the lack of vocabulary, and (4) the need to accommodate the local language. Similarly, Ya Nangoloh (2021) found that lecturers often translanguage for various reasons, which include explaining a concept, clarifying and emphasising a point, lack of knowledge of the word in English, and making the lesson more interesting. The study further revealed that when a lecturer uses a language that learners understand, it not only enhances their understanding of the taught content but also constructs human relations as well. Moreover, the majority of the learners feel that using only English in

the lecture room affects their academic performance negatively, as they sometimes do not understand concepts taught (Ya Nangoloh, 2021).

Motlhaka (2021) investigated pedagogical affordances of collaborative peer-to-peer translanguaging in a trilingual educational context at a South African rural secondary school. The study found that L1 use in the classroom increases the enjoyment and confidence of learners, relieves language anxiety, and provides a sense of security because learners are able to ask and answer questions in a language in which they are proficient. The findings of this study also show that translanguaging as a linguistic-discursive affordance in a trilingual collaborative learning environment facilitates the transfer of knowledge and language skills across languages, scaffolds learners' learning of a new language, affirms their linguistic and cultural identities, and enhances their engagement in learning.

However, studies have also identified the difficulties that prevent teachers from adopting a translanguaging stance in classrooms (Deroo and Ponzio, 2019; Tian & Shepard-Carey, 2020; Wang, 2019; Wang and Kirkpatrick, 2012). For example, the institutional language policy, the lack of implementation guidance, personal linguistic purism or ideology, and assumptions and perceived dangers. Thus, scholars in different national contexts have reported on the difficulties of implementing translanguaging pedagogical practices and of teachers' misunderstandings of translanguaging theory and pedagogic practice. Ticheloven et al. (2019) in the Netherlands, Omidire and Ayob (2020) in South Africa, Vaish (2019) in Singapore, Rajendram (2021) in Malaysia, and Charalambous, Charalambous, and Zembylas (2016) in Cyprus all report on these challenges. These include the institutional language policy, the lack of implementation guidance, personal linguistic purism or ideology, and assumptions and perceived dangers (such as overuse of L1 by learners).

Ticheloven et al. (2019) point out the challenges of implementing translanguaging practices in four multilingual high schools in the Netherlands. And yet, an analysis of the translanguaging practices they identify reveals that these were not all practices that supported the learners' leveraging of their unitary semiotic repertoire, but rather the acknowledgement of their different languages, creating an artificial use of translanguaging, rather than following the learners' own translanguaging *corriente*. This reveals teachers' misunderstandings of the *trans* aspects of translanguaging, understood as simply going across named languages, when translanguaging acknowledges the languaging of bilinguals beyond the strictures of named languages.

Likewise, Omidire and Ayob (2020) in South Africa reported on the challenges of implementing a curriculum where IsiZulu and Sepedi were used in class in addition to English. And yet, the simple use of learners' home languages, without attention to the colonising role of colonial linguists in naming and describing these separate languages, does not constitute a translanguaging pedagogical approach. A translanguaging approach would validate all language practices, emphasising the role that these named languages have had in the systems of oppression that included apartheid. In particular, the constraints included inadequate resources, limited lesson time, complexity of some of the home languages, limited experience of the teachers using a multilingual approach, and existing socio-economic factors. Omidire (2013) deliberates that teachers need additional support and better preparation to make meaningful changes in multilingual classrooms. Omidire (2019) repeats this concern, expressing that teachers do not have sufficient training to deal with L2 learning, and they cannot adjust the curriculum in support of their teaching due to time constraints, especially in overcrowded classrooms. Additionally, teachers find it difficult to include support strategies for their learners as there are not enough resources at many South African schools, which affects learners' schooling.

Moreover, the ideological clash between the implementation of translanguaging-orientated classroom practices and language ideologies in the country in which it is being carried out has also been reported in Vaish (2019) in multilingual Singapore. There, pedagogical practices cannot reverse the negative attitudes towards languages other than English and other named languages that have been assigned to certain populations as 'mother tongues.' This factor of language status prestige in education, especially of English, has also been noted by Rajendram (2021). In Rajendram's study, translanguaging pedagogical practices empowered the learners by asserting their identities and cultures. And yet, parents' beliefs about the higher socio-cultural-economical relevance of English prevailed on learners, who then perceived languages as unequal and were reluctant to use their full linguistic repertoire in the classroom.

Charalambous, Charalambous, and Zembylas (2016) elaborate that despite the positive effects of translanguaging, such as promoting mutual understanding, increasing linguistic hybridity, and giving voice to learners' L1, translanguaging was met with resistance by learners in a Greek primary school class in Cyprus, where despite the teachers' efforts to introduce translanguaging, the Turkish language was discarded due to the ideologies of that society that maintained conflict regarding hybrid linguistic practices. Similarly, Ayob (2020) recommends

that the policy should incorporate teacher training to facilitate translanguaging practices in multilingual classrooms. Moreover, the policy ought to recognise strategies that value the importance of first language as a resource to be implemented in multilingual classrooms.

In Zambia, a study by Nyimbili and Mwanza (2021) focused on the challenges that teachers and learners faced in first-grade multilingual literacy classrooms. Learners were assessed on the literacy skills that were hindering effective implementation of translanguaging practices in the classrooms. Classroom observations, interviews, and document analysis were used as tools for data collection in the class. The study findings indicated that teachers and learners faced challenges in light of using translanguaging practices in the primary school. Primarily, there was a mismatch between the language of instruction and the language of play for learners in the teaching of literacy. The language of instruction was a challenge, which hindered the acquisition of literacy by the learners in the translanguaging class because the learners were forced to write in a different language, which was not theirs. The language policy was not flexible enough to allow teachers to use translanguaging. The rigidity of the policy means that monolingual is the expected practice, thereby making the implementation of translanguaging difficult. Translanguaging was also perceived to be time-consuming, assessment was monolingual-based, and there were inadequate teacher teaching and learning materials. The classroom linguistic environment was not favouring multilingual development, and neither was the school environment.

The study also found that the monolingual ideologies embedded in the curriculum were a hindrance to the teaching of literacy using translanguaging practices in the primary school. It was found that the one language instruction was not the way to teach literacy, as it hindered learners' literacy development in their emergent languages. The other challenge the teacher faced was regarding the management of time in the translanguaging class. In the first week of introducing the teaching practice, the teacher did not manage time very well, and the observation was that learners were given more time to express themselves, which was good on one hand yet turned out to be a challenge as the lessons were not concluded early enough to allow another teacher into the class. The other challenge that was observed regarding the teaching of literacy using translanguaging practices was that assessment was administered in standard Cinyanja, which was read for the learners. This means that assessment and instructions would be different. In that regard, Mungala (2022) suggested that there was a need for language policy changes in African countries to help teachers respond to the sociolinguistics of the

classroom and provide equal benefits to language learning for every learner in sub-Saharan Africa. Such policy amendments will enable the dying African languages to be maintained and improve the identity of the African minority language speakers in the community and a country as a whole.

In Namibia, Simasiku (2014) indicated that the language policy did not empower teachers to use language as the situation dictated, but rather the language policy dictated to teachers to subscribe to its directives. In other words, the institutional policy restricted teachers from implementing translanguaging in the classroom. As a result, this situation, according to Simasiku, pushed teachers to use English in the presence of a ministerial official, but as soon as the official left the classroom, they reverted to the language that accommodated and eased teaching and learning. In that regard, Simasiku (*ibid.*: ii) argued that “language classrooms should become learning environments where learners actively participate and grasp the knowledge that they are taught in a language they are comfortable with.”

In another study, Simasiku et al. (2015) and Ipinge (2020) showed that although translanguaging was prevalent in Namibian schools, teachers were, however, reluctant to use it in their English Second Language classrooms even when their learners failed to understand what they were saying. In that case, Simasiku et al. (2015) examined factors affecting the implementation of translanguaging pedagogical practice through code-switching in English language classrooms. The study established that both teachers' and politicians' attitudes were seen to be the barriers to the implementation of translanguaging in the Namibian English Second Language classrooms. Other factors included incompatible policies, lack of clarity in policy documents, and the inability of teachers to critically examine policies.

Since the studies under review were done in Namibia, they are particularly important to the current study because they provide us with insights into the factors affecting the implementation of translanguaging in Namibian schools. In particular, teachers' ideologies and their familiarity with language policy come out strongly as critical factors that may affect implementation. Hence, the two factors form part of the objectives of the current study: to understand the teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging and familiarity with the language policy. However, it must be understood that although the studies were conducted in Namibia, the focus was on secondary-level English language teachers. For that reason, the current study focused on the Grade 4 teachers, particularly to establish factors affecting their implementation of

translanguaging in the teaching of the English language in Grade 4 classrooms when learners transition to English medium.

2.9 Chapter Summary

This chapter has provided a comprehensive discussion of the related literature review, focusing on the concept of teachers' language ideologies, translanguaging, and language ideologies and practices within the Namibian context. Also in this chapter, teachers' knowledge of the language policy was analysed and its implications in relation to translanguaging. The chapter also reviewed literature on teachers' ideologies about translanguaging. Moreover, the chapter provided a review of related literature on the implementation of translanguaging and factors affecting its implementation. Finally, the chapter provided a summary of the chapter. The next chapter presents the study's theoretical and analytical frameworks.

CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Overview

This chapter presents the theoretical and analytical framework that underpinned the study. It is imperative to reiterate that the aim of this study was to examine the teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging in selected multilingual Grade 4 classrooms in the Zambezi region of Namibia. The study examined how grade 4 teachers in Namibia conceptualise and actualise translanguaging within their classrooms. Theoretically, the study draws on three educational theories. The first theory adopted is that of Richard Ruiz's Three Language Orientations to frame ideologies. This theory, as the name suggests, has three language orientations, namely, language as a problem, language as a right, and language as a resource. This model was adopted for this study because each orientation is intertwined with a particular language ideology. Moreover, the study was informed by the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) Theory and Code and Pedagogic Theory. The rationale for employing a triadic theoretical framework was to provide a comprehensive multidimensional lens through which to understand teachers' ideologies about translanguaging. While the Three Language Orientation Theory provides insights into how teachers conceptualize language use, CDA brings an essential critical perspective to understand power dynamics and social contexts influencing these ideologies. Code and Pedagogic Theory further contextualises teachers' language practices within specific educational settings, emphasising the practical application of these beliefs in teaching strategies. Together, these theories afford a holistic view of the complexities surrounding teachers' ideologies but also establish a foundation for promoting effective translanguaging practices in the classroom. Analytically, the study draws upon the "Translanguaging Classroom Framework" articulated by García, Johnson, and Seltz (2017), which categorises translanguaging into three interconnected elements: stance, design, and shift. The following sections discuss in depth the three theories. Lastly, the analytical framework is also discussed in depth.

3.2 Theoretical Framework

This study was guided by three theories outlined in the following sections.

3.2.1 Richard Ruiz's Three Language Orientations Model

The first central theory guiding this study is the Three Language Orientation Model. It is important to state that while the three-language orientation model is understood and applied differently in different disciplines, in this study, it is viewed as a theory that provides a framework for understanding how grade 4 teachers in Namibia conceptualise and actualise translanguaging within their classrooms.

Ruiz (1984; 16) observes language orientation as a “complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society.” Thus, he describes orientations as an organising frame related to language ideologies that shapes and informs language interventions in that such determine what is thinkable about a language in a society (Vidana, 2020). In other words, orientations are related to language ideologies in that they constitute the framework in which attitudes are formed, they help to delimit the range of acceptable attitudes toward language, and they make certain attitudes legitimate (Haji-Othman, 2005). Thus, language orientations have been used interchangeably with language ideologies. Nonetheless, these orientations may coexist within a school or even within the classroom practices of a single teacher. This is true of the implementation of translanguaging in the teaching of the English language in Namibian grade 4 classrooms in that teachers may have different views towards the practice, hence influencing its application in class. Ruiz outlined three broad orientations that teachers as classroom language planners and managers can have regarding language teaching in Grade 4 classrooms. Ruiz proposed that language can be viewed in three perspectives: as a problem, as a right, and as a resource to the education and school system. In agreement with Burton & Rajendram (2019), I believe that all teachers are policy makers who interpret, negotiate, resist, challenge, (re)structure, and enact language policies through their ideologies about language and their pedagogical practices. Therefore, understanding these orientations can help in assessing whether teachers view translanguaging as beneficial or problematic.

3.2.1.1 Language as a Problem

The first orientation, language-as-problem, involves not only how to use language but also how to both ensure language use for all and address problems associated with languages (Paulsrud, Zilliacus, & Ekberg, 2020). The focus on the language-as-problem orientation is not on promoting linguistic diversity but rather on maintaining unity through the development of the national or majority language. For this orientation, linguistic diversity is a problem that needs

to be remedied. The language-as-a-problem orientation encompasses the ideas represented in deficit thinking (Rodríguez-Izquierdo, 2021). Thus, the orientation draws on a model of disadvantage or a deficit perspective on linguistic minorities that emphasises their lack of competence in the dominant majority language instead of focusing on their multilingual repertoires (Ruiz, 1984).

In an educational context, this may translate into “the idea of compensating for a linguistic deficit by focusing on assimilation and transition to a dominant majority language” (Hult & Hornberger, 2016: 35). This is so because a language-as-problem orientation assumes that learners who are not proficient in a dominant language are deficient in their ability to learn. In this view, educational programs informed by this orientation ‘seek to remedy this deficit with subtractive language teaching that emphasises transition to the dominant majority language’ and ‘immersion in mainstream classrooms, which in extreme cases can become submersion as learners are placed in classes with no structured support for language learning’ (Hult & Hornberger, 2016; Vikøy & Haukås, 2021). According to de Jong (2016: 278), focusing on the official majority school language for teaching and learning is an “assimilationist-orientated language-in-education” policy, one in which “learners’ native languages may be tolerated, but not with the intent to develop or maintain [their own] language and develop advanced bilingual skills.”. Instead, minority languages may be perceived to impede learners’ development and access to knowledge, and these languages are not legitimised in the school context (Johnson, Avineri, & Johnson, 2017).

In general, those who view language as a problem do not support linguistic diversity but rather cling to a deficit perspective (Paulsrud, Zilliacus, & Ekberg, 2020). Thus, in schools with a monolingual orientation, all learners with a minority language will be considered problematic because they come to school already lacking. In other words, minority languages are considered less useful because they are limited in terms of use and do not function as a language of instruction in the main domains, such as the classroom. In this orientation, therefore, using a language other than English creates target language learning problems for learners. Pedagogically, the orientation emphasises instructional models that are monoglossic in structure.

In the classroom perspective, a teacher with a language-as-problem orientation might enact pedagogic practice that tries to restrict the use of a language other than English. In other words, a teacher with this orientation holds a monolingual language ideology, which is shown by the

belief that mono-pedagogic practice is ideal for linguistic 'inclusiveness' and harmonisation and unification in the classroom. When Grade 4 English language teachers hold this perspective, they are more likely to see translanguaging as interfering with English language learning. Therefore, monoglossic language ideologies will prompt teachers to adhere to one classroom language' model, even in officially bilingual classrooms like Grade 4 in Namibia, in the name of supporting learners and creating a unified classroom (Calvert, 2020).

For Ruiz, a monolingual view of bilingualism favours learning the mainstream language at the expense of losing their home language and promotes an assimilationist approach. This orientation reveals misconceptions about bilingualism, such as delays in the development of the school language. According to Gauna (2014), characterising language diversity as a problem and proposing monolingualism as the solution explains how “despite the evident success of at least some forms of bilingual education, politicians and policy makers are often resistant to this evidence and consider that access to the dominant language is both more important than and oppositional to the teaching and learning of minority languages.” (Blackledge & Creese, 2010: 9). Ruiz's (1984) language characterisation of minority languages as a problem is useful to understand the ideology of monolingualism and the matching language practices of subtractive bilingualism in the public schools. Such ideology and practice make the classroom a place where teachers, staff, and administrators purposefully avoid acknowledgement of the value of any other language but the language of the majority. In practice, this ideology is exclusive and discriminatory of those who cannot speak the majority language. Teachers do not scaffold learning through the recognition of learners' home languages. In fact, this ideology corresponds to the purist ideology of language, where teachers and language practitioners perceive language as being pure and that languages cannot be mixed because one is purely separate from the other. It also turns to place other languages above others despite the equality of language use and relevance in language use in communication. In multilingual classrooms. Language as a problem ideology often leads to symbolic violence, where despite being present in class, learners who are not familiar with the sole language of instruction will lack access to learning.

3.2.1.2 Language as a Right

The second orientation, **language-as-right**, according to Paulsrud et al. (2020) refers to the basic human right of language and is linked to issues of democracy and equal access to education. In other words, the orientation builds the ideology of democratization of the

classroom to counteract symbolic violence and clearly highlights the benefits of first language retention. Paulsrud et al. (2020) explain that the language-as-right orientation focuses on both the right to avoid discrimination for language use and the right to use one's own language to access democracy. Furthermore, Vikøy & Haukås (2021) state that this orientation focuses primarily on the protection of indigenous languages and the right of individuals to identify with their mother tongue and the right of minority groups to maintain their languages. According to Robertson & Graven (2020), the language-as-right orientation supports minority language groups' right to mother tongue education. As stated further, the orientation recognises the importance of mother tongue, especially in the foundational years of schooling when children acquire their initial literacy and numeracy. Mother tongue is seen as the medium most likely to optimise a child's conceptual and epistemological access in mastering these core foundational proficiencies. Recognising the linguistic human right to education through the medium of the mother tongue is also to recognise that "the mother tongue is a good thing in itself" (Ruiz, 2010: 165).

This orientation guarantees the freedom of learners to speak in and to preserve his/her home language (Rodríguez-Izquierdo, 2021). The orientation acknowledges that individual learners have the personal, human, and legal right to maintain their heritage language (Burton & Rajendram, 2019). In other words, this orientation maintains that all languages are equal, and, therefore, there is no 'strong and weak' language. Extended to the classroom, the language-as-right orientation entails that all languages available should be valued as equal with the language of instruction and be equally used for meaningful learning, especially in classrooms where pupils with diverse languages are found. A teacher with this orientation would deploy pedagogic practice that encourages the use of languages other than English in the classroom following their belief in the learner's right to do so. Thus, a language as a right ideology establishes the right to use a language other than English in the public school system.

Ruiz (2010) suggests that there is a rapport between language as a right and as a resource. He states that "rights are only rights if they are resources (goods in themselves) first" (Ruiz, 2010: 166), thus, "unless one sees language as a good thing in itself [as a resource], it is impossible to affirm anyone's right to it" (ibid.: 165), acknowledging the connection to the next orientation: language-as-resource. Thus, if language is not valued, the right to access it can be ignored. Context to the current study: if linguistic resources available in the grade 4 classrooms are not appreciated, the right to access them for meaning-making in the English lessons will be

ignored. In practice, this orientation to language permits translanguaging in the sense that every language is recognised as important, and every child is free to communicate and receive instruction in their familiar language because both language and learning are considered as deserved rights that should be enjoyed by all learners regardless of their linguistic backgrounds and abilities.

3.2.1.3 Language as a Resource

The third orientation, language-as-resource, is the antithesis of the language-as-problem orientation (Alstad & Sopanen, 2020). The orientation values linguistic diversity as a valuable resource and as part of society's cultural capital (Rodríguez-Izquierdo, 2021). According to Alstad and Sopanen (2020), this orientation values societal multilingualism, cultural diversity, and linguistic minorities as resources and promotes tolerance and acceptance. Through this orientation, therefore, language is viewed as a resource to be "managed, developed, and conserved" and also "regard language minorities as important sources of expertise" (Ruiz, 1984:28). Following this orientation in education, the language repertoires of all learners, majority and minority, are equally embraced and promoted (Paulsrud et al., 2020).

When applied to the classroom, language as resource orientation allows for the use of multiple languages. Therefore, a teacher with orientation would enact pedagogic practice that made use of learners' other languages because they were a useful resource (Calvert, 2020). In other words, a teacher with this positioning holds a heteroglossic (multilingual) ideology on the belief that bilingualism is beneficial. When teachers hold multilingual ideologies, they are more likely to resist English-only policies in favour of bilingual models, such as translanguaging, that foster the development of both languages. Put differently, when language is viewed as a resource, even in contexts where the language policies reflect monolingual ideologies, teachers, as the 'final arbiters of language policy implementation,' can act based on their language ideologies to appropriate, resist, and/or change dominant and alternative policy discourses. (Bernstein et al., 2018).

Connected with Ruiz's language orientation theory are two competing ideologies of language: the monoglossic and heteroglossic ideologies. The problem-orientation view of language is linked to the monoglossic ideology in that it perceives linguistic diversity as a hindrance or a deficiency rather than a valuable resource. A monoglossic ideology assumes that monolingualism is the norm and any other language usage is viewed as deviant or inferior.

Thus, the concept neglects minority languages and believes that other languages are inferior to the majority language (Larsson, 2016). From a monoglossic perspective, the view on languages is that they are separate entities, and they should also be used separately. In schools, a monoglossic ideology makes a power asymmetry between the home and the school language, where the first is viewed as unimportant and obstacles to be overcome in the school setting, whereas the latter is privileged. Put differently, in a classroom context, the dominant language, English in this case, is considered the primary medium of instruction, and any use of other languages is often discouraged or strictly regulated. This monolingual mindset assumes that using languages other than the dominant language can impede learners' language development, divert their attention from the curriculum, or hinder their integration into society. As a result, teachers and educational policymakers are hesitant to embrace translanguaging, fearing that it might undermine the dominant language's importance.

In that case, since languages are viewed as separate, when learning a new language, learners either add an additional language or subtract one in favour of the target language. A subtractive framework considers bilingualism to be a problem and encourages language shift to the majority language with the potential outcome that the language learner loses his/her first language. The additive framework suggests the addition of a new language to the previous one and the use of both equally (Öztürk & Çubukçu, 2022). In accordance with this division of bilingualism, Namibia's transitional program from mother tongue to English with the maintenance of mother tongue in grade 4 is influenced by a monoglossic ideology with an additive framework. A monoglossic ideology with an additive framework has a positive view on bilingualism and sees it as "an enrichment possibility" (García, 2009: 116). However, the view on language is still within the monolingual norm, meaning they are stored separately and should be used separately. Although the additional framework encourages bilingualism, the view on society is still monocultural, meaning that the speakers of the majority language might add an additional language, whereas the minority speakers maintain their first language and culture but also get proficiency in the dominant language and culture, thus performing biculturalism, which refers to two cultures that co-exist (García, 2009). Nevertheless, the monoglossic ideology is often favourable in times when a society becomes linguistically diverse, and policymakers want to unite the society. Minority languages are thus neglected, either explicitly through policies or legislation or implicitly via attitudes among the majority population (Larsson, 2016).

In contrast to the monoglossic ideology, the heteroglossic ideology encourages a linguistically diverse society and has a multifaceted view on language. Thus, this language ideology embraces the fluid and dynamic linguistic practices of multilingual communities (Iversen & Mkandawire, 2020). A heteroglossic view of language views multilingualism as the norm and multilingual communicative practices as assets, which can, in turn, be leveraged to enhance learning (Schissel & Reyes, 2020). In other words, it views languages as stored within the same system, which enables the speaker to use their full language competence within any situation. The heteroglossic ideology is divided into two frameworks: recursive or dynamic (Larsson, 2016). A recursive framework refers to the ability of individuals to switch between languages and contexts according to their needs and preferences. It allows learners to navigate between their first language (L1) and their second language (L2) without any restriction. In a classroom setting, recursive bilingualism recognises that learners may need to draw from their L1 to enhance their understanding and acquisition of the L2. This approach acknowledges that learners bring to the classroom unique backgrounds and linguistic knowledge, allowing them to create meaningful connections in the learning process. By incorporating recursive bilingualism in the classroom, teachers encourage learners to utilise their L1 as a tool for learning rather than viewing it as a hindrance to their L2 acquisition. Thus, the recursive framework views bilingualism not only as a right but also as essential to the speaker and the community.

García (2009; 2011; 2014) disagrees with the monoglossic notion of adding a language. Rather, she proposes that learning a new language means that new language practices emerge in the linguistic repertoire; hence, the concept of emerging bilinguals. According to García (2011), when not defining languages as single entities, it removes the hegemonic structure of being a “native” or a “second language” speaker, which is needed in today’s multilingual world where people communicate in a much more dynamic way. The dynamic framework is similar to the recursive framework, but whereas the recursive views language it as a right, the dynamic framework views it as a resource.

A dynamic framework, on the other hand, emphasises the constant development and interaction between languages. It highlights the fluidity and active engagement that occur when individuals engage with multiple languages simultaneously. In a classroom context, dynamic bilingualism fosters an environment where learners are encouraged to actively employ both their L1 and L2 in their communication and learning processes. This concept recognises that language learning

is not a linear process but rather an ongoing, ever-evolving journey. By promoting dynamic bilingualism, educators empower learners to embrace their linguistic diversity and utilise it as a resource in the classroom. The dynamic framework supports the discourse of translanguaging (Larsson, 2016). By embracing translanguaging, teachers encourage learners to dynamically use their full linguistic repertoire to express their thoughts and engage in meaningful dialogue. Translanguaging as a pedagogical tool in the classroom allows learners to leverage their linguistic resources to enhance their language learning experience. Instead of suppressing a learner's home language, translanguaging embraces it as a valuable asset. It recognises that learners' first language abilities can positively influence their second language development. A translanguaging approach in class would mean that the first language is used to facilitate the learning of the target language and at the same time strengthen the first language (García & Wei, 2014). Such an approach could, for instance, include reading in the first language and writing in the target language or reading in the target language and discussing in the first language with peers who share the same first language. By encouraging these connections, teachers support learners' language development and contribute to their overall linguistic and cognitive growth.

3.2.2 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is another theory that was used in the analysis of teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging. CDA was used to analyse how language constructs social power relationships and reflects ideologies. In the context of teachers' ideologies, CDA allows for the exploration of teachers' discourses about translanguaging, highlighting how their beliefs may either reinforce or challenge existing power structures. By analysing the language choices made by teachers regarding translanguaging, we can identify the ideological stances teachers take on translanguaging and their implications for classroom dynamics and learner outcomes. Thus, this perspective enables a critical examination of how teachers position translanguaging within the broader socio-political landscape of Namibia's education system.

Setali (2008) argued that the political nature of language is not only at the macro-level of structure but also at the micro-level of classroom interaction. On that basis, CDA was crucial in this study to analyse teacher-learner relations and the influence of government over what happens in the classroom in terms of language choices and practices. Amoussou and Allagbe (2018) state that CDA studies and analyses the relationship between power and discourse; particularly, it examines how authority, dominance, and social inequality are constructed,

sustained, reproduced, and resisted in the discourse of written texts and spoken words. According to Liping (2018: 79), who concurs with this view, CDA "... examines how language is used to construct a position, exert power, and reinforce the ideological position." In the context of this study, CDA is used to examine power relations regarding what teachers deem appropriate language in their classrooms to ensure epistemic access in the teaching and learning of English language in grade 4.

CDA's primary interest is analysing power relations that are observable, such as between the teacher and the learners, and those power relations that are visibly clear but still exist, such as ideologies that people have. In respect of power and dominance, CDA focuses on the feeble, the controlled, and the discriminated against (Mwanza, 2016). Wodak (2002:10) agrees with Mwanza (2016) when she noted that "CDA often chooses the perspective of those who suffer and critically analyses the language use of those in power, who are responsible for the existence of inequalities and who also have the means and the opportunity to improve conditions.". Thus, CDA is not only useful in analysing educational institutions but also in understanding what goes on in the classroom because it provides a good assessment of the nature of interaction and the underlying assumptions behind how the teacher treats the learners and how learners behave in the learning process. From a classroom perspective, CDA focuses on the teacher and especially the learner as the weak, the controlled, and the discriminated against. With this reasoning, CDA in line with the concepts of classification and framing from Bernstein's theory was used to analyse classroom relationships and interactions between teachers and learners with regard to language choices and practices.

Huckin et al. (2012:115) state that "a classroom is a place wherein power is circulated, managed, exploited, resisted, and often directly impacted by institutional policies and changes.". This quote is crucial to the study of teachers' implementation of translanguaging in the grade 4 classrooms. CDA was used to analyse any form of influence the government had through the language policy on the application of translanguaging. Mwanza (2016:104) argued that "the influence of government normally provides direction and sometimes a challenge on what decision a teacher should make," especially on the integration of learners' familiar language in the teaching of English language in the classroom. In that regard, CDA was crucial in analysing teachers' decisions to accept, reject, or contradict the existing condition. CDA is another avenue that reveals how government policies and directives, along with directions given to teachers and their decisions, can be accepted, rejected, and occasionally ignored

(Mwanza, 2016). This provided a clue as to how the teachers' practices may at times contradict the government policies in order to offer sound and relevant education to the learners in some communities for reasons beyond policy. As much as the policy imposes its view on the teaching practices, the teachers have the power to reject and modify what ought to be reasonable to their situation and condition.

Teachers have the pedagogical freedom and power in their classrooms to come up with classroom practices that would promote learning among learners. Thus, language teachers hold a position of authority and influence over their learners, shaping their language learning experiences. On that basis, teachers have the authority to choose pedagogical practices perceived as appropriate and control how they are implemented in their classroom. In other words, while government educational policies provide direction on pedagogical practices to be implemented, the teacher still decides on the suitable pedagogical practices given the school context, classroom environment, and social structures in particular. Therefore, CDA helps to uncover how this power is exercised and how it may favour or disadvantage certain groups of learners. For example, through the analysis of classroom interactions, CDA can reveal how teachers' language choices and pedagogical decisions may perpetuate social hierarchies or marginalise certain learner voices. Therefore, by understanding these power dynamics, it will help to work towards creating more equitable and inclusive language learning environments.

Equally, learners as recipients of the government and teachers' decisions and directives may choose to respond otherwise, especially since the language of instruction may not be familiar to some learners. This means that there are at times contradictions between the government language policy and the actual teachers' language practices in the classroom, a view held by Haugen (2009) when she argued that education policies are normally not characterised by progression or retrogression but by contradictions. Huckin et al. (2012) exemplified the contradictions further when they stated that sometimes, teachers are caught up in an ideological dilemma in their classroom practice as they implement the government's policy directives on one hand and as they respond to their professional need to create a free classroom atmosphere on the other hand.

Drawing attention to the concept and context of power and dominance in documents, Mwanza (2016:104) argued that "power and dominance can be exercised through policies as well as documents.". Thus, power and dominance are not limited to individuals or specific roles but are embedded within social structures, institutions, and policies. Therefore, CDA is not only

used to analyse classroom interaction in terms of what power the teacher had over the learners and what control the government, and the school administration had over what happened in the classroom and the place of the learners in education policies and classroom activities, but also power and dominance in lesson plan documents. As also argued by Huckin et al. (2012:107), CDA can be used to “explain abuses of power promoted by texts by analysing linguistic/semiotic details in light of the larger social and political contexts in which those texts circulate.” With that reasoning, the analysis of documents such as the teachers’ lesson plans was necessary in this study to understand how authority was exerted and relationships between languages were established and how that influenced or affected translanguaging application.

Lesson plans, as pedagogical tools, possess immense power in shaping the educational experience of learners. They are not mere instructional guides but are deeply connected to broader social, cultural, and political contexts. Thus, lesson plans are not neutral documents; they reflect the ideologies, values, and power relations present in society. Through the analysis of lesson plans, CDA was used to identify whether power and dominance were perpetuated or contested. In the context of translanguaging implementation in the Namibian grade 4 classrooms, power and dominance can manifest in several ways. One way is through the choice of language used in the lesson plan. If a lesson plan only highlights and values the dominant language, it reinforces the power imbalance and marginalises the languages of minority or non-dominant groups. For example, in the teaching of English, certain terms, concepts, or narratives (i.e., those in the target language, English) might be favoured, while others (in familiar language) are silenced or marginalised. This process of selection and exclusion can serve to legitimise certain forms of knowledge and marginalise alternative perspectives. Therefore, this exclusionary practice reinforces the dominance of the target language and positions minority languages as inferior or less valuable, perpetuating a linguistic hierarchy. Thus, CDA focused on how linguistic choices reflected and reinforced power relations.

Furthermore, power and dominance can also be observed in the instructional strategies and activities included in the lesson plan. If the activities only focus on monolingual tasks or prioritise the dominant language, it reinforces the idea that bilingual or multilingual learners should suppress their other languages and conform to the dominant language norms. This coercive practice reinforces dominant norms and marginalises the languages and cultures of bilingual learners. Moreover, CDA theory helped the researcher scrutinise the discursive practices present in lesson plans. The linguistic choices made in the directions, materials, and

resources employed in the lesson plan can have significant implications for power and dominance. For example, if certain languages or dialects are disregarded or stigmatised, it creates a power imbalance where the linguistic resources of some learners are overlooked or invalidated. This not only erases the learners' identities but also perpetuates linguistic discrimination. However, CDA was not merely focused on highlighting power imbalances and dominance; it also offered possibilities for resistance and change. Thus, by critically analysing and uncovering power dynamics within lesson plans, teachers could question and challenge dominant ideologies, values, and practices. Through inclusive practices, such as translanguaging and the valuing of learners' linguistic resources, teachers could promote a more equitable and empowering learning environment.

CDA views language as a social practice and is interested in the ways that ideologies and power relations are expressed through language. This means that ideologies and power relations can be observed through beliefs, views, perceptions, and attitudes that an individual holds towards a particular phenomenon, and they may influence and make such an individual behave in a certain manner. In other words, the teachers' language ideologies will affect language choices and practices in the classroom. Pulinx and Van Avermaet (2014) concur with the view and note that language ideologies contribute to the continuation of the institutional circle of collective misrecognition, comprising subtle misrecognition of languages considered as inferior by the dominant group and invisible exertions of symbolic power often disguised as favourable to multilingual practices and equality of opportunity. Thus, ideologies may have a positive or negative power on the teachers' beliefs of the most suitable language teaching practice. CDA was therefore used in the current study to help the researcher establish and examine teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging. For Rahimi and Riasati (2011:107), CDA views language as a powerful means through which specific ideologies, identities, and cultures become dominant in society. So, the choice of language interlocutors of participants reveals their thinking, their understanding, and their ideology towards a certain phenomenon (Rahimi & Riasati, 2011). In this case, CDA was used to analyse how ideologies were manifested in teachers' language practices. Thus, the interaction between teachers and learners in the classroom was analysed to examine the power relations embedded within these interactions. In the classroom context, a teacher's choice to restrict the use of learners' familiar languages may stem from societal or institutional ideologies that prioritise the dominant language.

Language teaching is not a neutral endeavour; teachers bring their own beliefs, values, and assumptions into the classroom, which inevitably influence their instructional choices. By analysing classroom discourse, CDA helped uncover the underlying ideologies that shaped these choices. Furthermore, by analysing the texts and interactions within the classroom, CDA unveiled how teachers negotiate the implementation of translanguaging based on various factors. For instance, it can reveal how teachers' own beliefs, attitudes, and social positioning influence their decisions and practices surrounding translanguaging. CDA can also uncover how power hierarchies within the classroom, such as teacher-learner dynamics or language proficiency levels, affect the extent to which translanguaging is embraced and utilised.

3.2.3 The Code and Pedagogic Discourse Theory

The Code and Pedagogic Theory is used in this study together with its extended notion of recontextualization of educational knowledge. This theory focuses on the relationship between language codes and pedagogical practices. The theory emphasises that the choice of language code in instructional settings reflects broader cultural and social structures. In Namibia, where multiple languages coexist, teachers' choices regarding translanguaging may be influenced by their understandings of appropriateness and effectiveness in teaching. By integrating this theory, the study analysed how teachers negotiate language codes in their classrooms, how these negotiations align with their pedagogical goals, and how they impact learners learning outcomes. In this theory, it is believed that classroom teaching under this theory does not take place in a vacuum. It is affected by several factors, such as government through curriculum, syllabus, teacher training, national exams, school inspections, school administration, and the context of the school on one hand, and informal knowledge and the learners' social cultural background on the other hand (Mwanza, 2016). In the teaching of language, language ideologies and how a particular country conceptualises language also play a part. These factors are critical ingredients in effective classroom practice through the recontextualization of prior knowledge. These factors affect what method/s a teacher will use and how the teacher applies the chosen method/s in the classroom. This is true of the application of translanguaging to the teaching of English in Grade 4. Thus, the classroom application of translanguaging was analysed within this framework.

Bernstein (1971) argued that every pedagogic discourse is characterised by power and control that circulates in the classrooms (Bernstein, 1973). Thus, the teachers circulated power by implementing the pedagogic practices they considered appropriate or as guided by the language

policy to teach the specified curricular content in grade 4 classrooms. Since language is a material form of ideology and is invested by ideology, language ideologies and how a particular teacher conceptualises it were important. This factor is key to the effective implementation of translanguaging. In relation to this study, the theory was used to inform the teachers' language choices and practices in the classroom and how they utilised their authority to implement translanguaging. Bernstein's code theory, according to Haugen (2009), looks at how interactions are framed and how content is organised in order to investigate how power is reproduced in schools. The theory gives a chance to comprehend how the national languages are mandated and how regional languages are preferred above the main community languages that are spoken in classrooms.

Classification and framing are key concepts in the theory. Additionally, the expanded concepts of recontextualization of knowledge and horizontal and vertical discourses are significant to the Code and Pedagogic Discourse Theory. Classification, according to Sadovnik (2001), is primarily concerned with how knowledge is organised within the curriculum. Classification, according to Mwanza (2016), may relate to a government's control over the curriculum and rules for what institutions of higher learning or teachers are expected to perform. As a result, classification decides what is or will be accepted as valid. This suggests that context appropriateness is the central concern throughout the entire educational system. English and Silozi were identified by the Namibian language in education policy as the suitable LoI in the context of the multilingual Zambezi area. However, given that teachers play a key role in putting government language policies into practice within the educational system, this study uses the classification concept to assess the power dynamics between the government and teachers in relation to the government's language preferences and teachers' language practices in the multilingual grade 4 classrooms.

On the contrary, framing is concerned with how much control teachers and learners have over what happens in the classroom. Framing, in the words of Bernstein (1973: 88b), is "the degree of control teacher and pupil possess over the selection, organisation, pacing, and timing of the knowledge transmitted and received." Mwanza (2016) asserted, however, that framing also considers the amount of control (or lack thereof) that teachers have over how the curriculum is implemented. Sadovnik (2001:3) states that "framing is related to the transmission of knowledge through pedagogic practices." As a result, framing dictates how this knowledge will be applied. In other words, it describes the ways in which information and skills are taught and

learnt in the classroom. As a result, for the teacher and learners to interact and transfer knowledge and skills, suitable language must be used. Therefore, the study interrogates the language practices employed by teachers despite the language policy guideline. Bernstein's concept of framing, therefore, helps to analyse how the interactions in the classroom regarding multiple language practices are framed in this study.

Frame also describes the level of control that the teacher and the learner have over the knowledge that is chosen, organised, progressed at a certain rate, and received in the context of the pedagogical interaction (Bernstein, 1973). Furthermore, framing might be either internal or exterior. In contrast to external framing, which refers to the control of pedagogical practice from the outside on communication, internal framing, according to Bernstein (2000), refers to the effect that the learners will have over the teaching. Internal framing examples include the learners' preferences, choices, hobbies, backgrounds, ages, and other unique qualities. Government influence through expectations and policies is an illustration of external framing. The teacher in this situation is positioned between the two frame types and must make sure to strike a balance between them to implement an effective pedagogical strategy that instills the proper literacy skills in the learners.

The decisions regarding the teachers' pedagogical practices may support or dispute the set and recommended teaching practices that are provided for by the language policy. The role of the teacher is critical in the classroom, as it may support internal framing, which may consider learners to be significant to the classroom practices. At the same time, weak framing may lead the teacher to make decisions about considering learners when deciding on the teaching practice. To this, Sadovnik (2001) argues that strong framing refers to a limited degree of options between teacher and learners, and weak framing implies more freedom. Accordingly, the school, a place where power circulates, is managed, accepted, negotiated, abused, and resisted.

This theory looks at how government regulates classroom language choices through legislation and how teachers negotiate their influence given the setting and circumstance of their classrooms to evaluate how power is reproduced in schools. According to Haugen (2009:12), "power relations are exercised and negotiated in discourse" in schools. This means that the theory aids in comprehending how internal framing impacts external framing in the application of translanguaging. In other words, it aids in establishing an understanding of how English language teachers negotiated and exerted authority when in their grade 4 classes. As previously

mentioned, the framing idea can be used in this situation to determine if teachers follow the curriculum and policy rules exactly or use additional language strategies in the classroom to promote epistemic access.

The horizontal and vertical discourses, which are related to the curriculum and instructional methods, were also discussed by Bernstein (1975). He clarified that common sense and informal knowledge are typical examples of horizontal discourse, which is a type of knowledge. Linguistically, horizontal discourse refers to the illegitimized and unrecognised languages, such as Shiyeyi, Subia, Sifwe, and Mbukushu, in the context of Namibia. On the other hand, the vertical discourse refers to a hierarchically organised, cogent, openly principled, structured form of knowledge. This is the formal and legitimised discourse. In other words, this may constitute official languages, including English and Silozi, in the context of this study. In this study, vertical discourse is defined by the school's official language, English, and to a lesser extent Silozi, while the horizontal discourse in the classroom is represented by the informal languages and home literacies that learners bring to class, such as Totela, Sifwe, Subia, Shiyeyi, and Mbalangwe, among others. This suggests that some languages have more influence over others in terms of status and function. As a result, some languages are legitimated while others are not.

The Zambezi region's schools are notable for having both vertical and horizontal discourses. This implies that learners already have some linguistic and literacy skills when they start school. As a result, how well children can connect in the classroom is unavoidably influenced by what they bring with them from their primary sites of socialisation. Haugen (2009), who held that each learner's background is extremely important to every teaching and learning situation in school, supports this interaction between horizontal and vertical discourses in the classroom, as does the educational tenet of learning from the known to the unknown (Mwanza, 2016). Furthermore, Bernstein (1990:169) suggested that "segments of horizontal discourse become resources to facilitate access to vertical discourse" in support of the idea that one might utilise horizontal discourse as a resource to access vertical discourse.

Mwanza (2016) further claimed that it is impossible to teach the formal language without acknowledging the linguistic resources and knowledge that learners bring to the classroom. Consequently, one language is not superior to another. This suggests that the interaction of both horizontal and vertical discourse is crucial for assuring learners' access to knowledge and their ability to make sense of it as they begin to build their literacy. To determine whether and how

teachers permit the co-working of formal and informal language, this study utilises the concept of vertical and horizontal discourse. Do teachers consider learners' sociolinguistic origins while still attempting to teach English, the recognised medium of instruction? This investigation is crucial since the horizontal discourse is typically removed from its context. The teacher's job is to give epistemic access for deep learning by recontextualising the vertical and horizontal discourse to be responsive to the needs of the learners in the class.

This is where the idea of "recontextualization" sets in. Recontextualization, as defined by Bernstein (2000) in Robertson (2017), is the process of moving knowledge and abilities from outside the realm of formal education (such as linguistic expertise or learner sociolinguistic backgrounds) into the framework of formal education. In addition, recontextualization was mentioned by Bernstein (1990), who was quoted by Clark (2005), as a principle for appropriate other discourse and putting them in a unique relationship with one another for the sake of their selective transmission and acquisition. Additionally, according to Robertson (2017), choosing to guide pedagogical concepts (interpretations of how teaching and learning should be accomplished) is a part of the recontextualization process. Recontextualization, according to Bourne (2006), refers to the teacher's interpretation and application of the policy and teaching techniques for those elements to be pertinent and suitable for the particular learning and teaching setting. Recontextualization, which is important to the current study, may entail teachers reinterpreting and reapplying the language in educational policy to make it pertinent and appropriate to their own unique teaching-learning circumstances and contexts.

Classrooms in the Zambezi region are multilingual; as a result, the language in education policy as it is expressed in the document is linguistically decontextualized, necessitating recontextualization of language practices in particular classrooms and locations. Regarding this study, the teacher may employ pedagogical language strategies like translanguaging to tailor the lesson to the learners' linguistic environment since both Silozi and English languages as prescribed in the policy may not be familiar to all learners. This suggests that to guarantee learners' epistemic access in a classroom where it is necessary, teachers should negotiate the medium of instruction policy and implement it using several languages. To determine whether English language teachers thought that learners' sociolinguistic backgrounds were appropriate resources that they could use to help learners make meaning of the lessons, this study used the recontextualization principle to examine classroom interaction. Moreover, it was used to

determine the power relationships between language policy (government) and teachers as well as how teachers interpreted and applied the language policy.

In conclusion, Bernstein's Code and Pedagogical Discourse Theory was used in this study, notably the principles of classification and framing, horizontal and vertical discourse, recontextualization of educational knowledge, and the connection between educational failure and linguistic failure. The theory examined interactions between teachers and learners in the classroom and the impact that learners have on the material that is taught to them by their teachers. It also implies that learners should interact in both their home and school languages in the classroom and that failing to do so results in educational failure on the part of the learners. Thus, the theory was helpful in analysing how power dynamics in the classroom impact language decisions and usage in multilingual classroom settings. It is also useful for drawing conclusions about how pedagogical methods in multilingual situations are influenced by linguistic ideology.

3.3 Analytical Framework

3.3.1 The Translanguaging Classroom Framework

García et al. (2017) argue that the translanguaging classroom framework can serve as a critical lens for analysing educators' beliefs and practices in multilingual settings. Since the study focused on teachers' ideologies about translanguaging, it draws upon the Translanguaging Classroom Framework put forth by García, Johnson and Seltzer (2017) which categorizes translanguaging into three interconnected elements: stance, design, and shift. This framework serves as an analytical lens to examine teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging in multilingual grade 4 classrooms in Namibia.

1. Stance

Stance denotes the ideological beliefs teachers hold concerning language use in the classroom. Teachers' stances about translanguaging can be influenced by their own linguistic backgrounds, professional experiences, and the sociopolitical context in which they operate. This is to say, teachers' stances influence their willingness to embrace translanguaging as a legitimate pedagogical practice. According to Serai (2022), it changes the learners' position from "inferior to English monolinguals to learners with extensive language practices" (Kleyn & Garcia, 2017: 74) that transcend the monolingual norms. García et al. (2017:27) define stance as "the philosophical, ideological, or belief system that teachers can draw from to develop their

pedagogical framework,” contending that without this stance, teachers who do not believe in translanguaging won’t be able to intentionally utilise learners’ varied linguistic practices as valuable learning tools and acknowledge them as fundamental rights that should be incorporated into the classroom (Zano, 2022; Ismael, 2024). Ali (2024) note that a translanguaging stance considers both the linguistic proficiency of learners and the ideological beliefs of teachers toward the language practices of multilingual learners. Thus, it suggests that diverse languaging practices are a resource (Ruiz, 1984) rather than a scaffold to be used only as needed or transitioned away from, as in transitional bilingual education or subtractive models of bilingualism (Christoffersen & Regalado, 2021). In other words, it positions learners’ language practices as fundamental resources rather than as deficits that work together or “juntos.” This position calls on teachers to confront and question prevailing philosophies and hierarchies that might determine the language usage permitted in the classroom (Zano, 2022; Ali, 2024).

In the context of translanguaging, it is imperative for teachers to adopt a positive stance towards learners' linguistic repertoires. This involves recognising the value of all languages spoken by learners and understanding that these languages are integral to their identity and learning processes. In Namibia, teachers' stances may be influenced by their own educational experiences, sociolinguistic contexts, and the educational policies governing language use in schools. In the context of this study, examining teachers’ stances towards translanguaging involves examining their perceptions of linguistic diversity, the value they place on learners’ home languages, and their understanding of translanguaging as a pedagogical strategy. In particular, it analyses how teachers' stances towards the use of multiple languages in their classrooms influence their instructional choices and interactions with learners.

2. Design

Translanguaging design involves instructional planning that is collaborative and cooperative, built on the availability of multilingual resources, and creates space for all a learner’s linguistic resources to be used (Thomas, 2017). Put differently, it refers to the thoughtful planning and structuring of instructional activities that integrate translanguaging practices. It involves instructional strategies and practices that teachers implement to facilitate translanguaging in the classroom. This can include creating opportunities for learners to use multiple languages in their learning activities, integrating language and content instruction, and designing assessments that value multilingual competencies. Thus, it may include activities, tasks,

lessons, assessments, and instructions, among other planned aspects of the subject. Effective translanguage design requires intentional planning that aligns with the linguistic strengths and needs of learners in multilingual environments, which is critical for fostering engagement and academic success in Grade 4 learners in Namibia.

This gave Christoffersen & Regalado (2021) the impetus to describe design as the strategic, intentional, and purposeful planning of the class to leverage learners' full linguistic repertoire, including bilingual and/or bidialectal language practices. Therefore, teachers must intentionally plan for instruction and evaluation to incorporate a translanguage design (Ali, 2024). This allows the incorporation and exploitation of a range of multilingual and multimodal resources. This means that teachers design translanguage the way they design their lesson plans. Thus, it emphasises content creation in which learners use pedagogical translanguage strategies with their teachers. The design aspect is critical because it translates teachers' ideologies into actionable practices that can either promote or hinder effective translanguage. In this study, this section explores how Namibian teachers design their lessons and create opportunities for translanguage through their lesson planning and classroom activities.

3. Shift

Shift refers to the changes in pedagogical practices and classroom dynamics that occur as educators begin to adopt a translanguage framework. This process involves moving away from traditional, monolingual teaching approaches towards more inclusive practices that validate and utilise learners' linguistic diversity. Serai (2022) highlights that the teacher's shifts are the teachers' reactions and the different practices they adopt to respond to their learners' translanguage practices within the classroom. Also, Ali (2024) describes translanguage shift as the anticipated results and promotes adaptability in decision-making and content adaptation to meet the demands of learners with varying learning preferences. In this regard, a skilled teacher should be able to notice when to allow for translanguage during a lesson based on learners' engagement levels or language proficiency, thus creating a more adaptive learning environment. Thus, it involves the practical implementation of translanguage strategies, demonstrating how teachers and learners interact and negotiate meaning across languages during instructional activities. Ali (2024) guides that to adjust translanguage designs and instructional techniques to the changing language practices of multilingual learners in the classroom, teachers and learners must engage in cooperative negotiations.

A successful shift requires teachers to recognise the effectiveness of translanguaging in their instructional strategies and to be willing to rethink traditional practices that prioritise one language over another. It takes a teacher willing to keep meaning-making and learning at the centre of all instruction and assessment to go with the flow of the corriente (García et. al., 2017). Thus, teachers must be willing to make flexible accommodations for the curriculum, lesson plans, materials, and standards to better suit the varied learning preferences and methods of multilingual learners. This recognises that no amount of planning, however thoughtful, can fully anticipate how learners will respond, partly because each learner's linguistic repertoire overlaps with many different languages (as they are socially constructed) and is unique to that individual (Thomas, 2017). In the Namibian context, shifts may involve rethinking assessment methods, incorporating local languages into lesson planning, and engaging with parents and communities to support language use beyond the classroom. In this study, this section examines how teachers in Namibia facilitate this shift in their classrooms, promoting an environment where learners can freely move between languages.

3.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter has provided the theoretical base within the Three Language Orientation Theory, CDA, and Code and Pedagogic Theory as lenses to understand the teachers' ideologies towards the implementation of translanguaging in selected multilingual grade 4 classrooms. The utilisation of a combination of these three theories offered a robust framework for analysing teachers' ideologies about translanguaging in Namibian classrooms. The study has also presented the analytical base within the "Translanguaging Classroom Framework" as a structured lens uncovering the nuanced relationships between language practices and teacher ideologies in multilingual settings. The next chapter presents the methodological design of the study.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Overview

Research methodology is a critical component of any study, serving as the framework within which data is collected, analysed, and interpreted. This chapter outlines the methodology applied in this study. The following sections are covered in this chapter: research paradigm, the research approach, study design (qualitative case study design), data collection and data analysis methods, quality assurance and ethical considerations, and the chapter summary. By presenting a clear and systematic approach, this chapter aims to demonstrate the rigour and validity of the research conducted.

4.2 Research Paradigm

One of the main philosophical tenets underpinning the qualitative research approach is the interpretivist paradigm. Interpretivism entails an approach to social science that holds the view that all knowledge is based on interpretation. As the process of making meaning forms the basis of the interpretivist paradigm (Steyn, 2017), I regard this paradigm as appropriate for my research. In my research, I explored the meaning people make of a certain experience, which is the implementation of translanguaging in multilingual grade 4 classrooms. I want to explore the multiple truths constructed concerning this implementation. The interpretive paradigm contends that there is no singular and objective reality out there, but rather that actors in the conversation construct reality, and reality is multiple and subject to change. This means that research can never be objectively observed from the outside; it should be observed from within through the direct experience of the people involved (Steyn, 2017). My role as a researcher in the interpretivist paradigm is to “understand, explain, and demystify social reality through the eyes of different participants” (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011:19). The interpretive research paradigm is grounded in the principles of hermeneutics and phenomenology, emphasising the subjective experiences and interpretations of individuals (Thanh & Thanh, 2015). Thus, it emphasises the notion that reality is socially constructed and contextually bound. In educational research, this paradigm offers insights into how individuals interpret their experiences and make sense of their roles within complex social phenomena.

The interpretivist paradigm will be suitable for my study, as my main aim is to seek better understanding of a certain phenomenon. It also facilitates understanding of the how and why

of a phenomenon, allows for complexity and contextual factors, and enables the researcher to accommodate changes, should they occur. In this study, the paradigm permitted the researcher to explore the complex and multifaceted nature of teachers' ideologies about translanguaging, considering their personal, cultural, and contextual factors. This approach enabled the researcher to explore the phenomenon under this study with an understanding that there are multiple factors that influence the manner in which Grade 4 teachers implement translanguaging. When applied to teachers' ideologies, the interpretive paradigm allows researchers to delve into the nuances of teachers' beliefs, exploring how these beliefs are shaped by their backgrounds, experiences, and contexts. Therefore, the study delved into the meanings and understandings that teachers attach to translanguaging, gaining insights into their perspectives and decision-making processes. The interpretive paradigm links with approaches that utilise qualitative methods of data collection, such as interviews, observations, and document reviews in the case of this study. Such methods elicit qualitative data that seeks to uncover the insider perspective on the phenomenon. In this regard, this paradigm provides useful and appropriate methods that the study needs to explore; that is, the teachers' ideologies towards the implementation of translanguaging in multilingual classrooms. Through in-depth conversations and observations, the study gathered rich data that captures teachers' narratives, experiences, and interactions, enabling a comprehensive understanding of their ideologies about translanguaging. Additionally, document analysis and discourse analysis provided valuable insights into teachers' written and spoken communication, revealing their underlying beliefs and values. Thus, the paradigm enabled me to uncover the underlying reasons for teachers' adoption or rejection of translanguaging practices.

4.3 Research Approach

The interpretive paradigm is associated with the qualitative research approach. This is so because the paradigm seeks to understand a phenomenon under study from the experiences of the participants using different data-collecting agents. Therefore, this study employed a qualitative research method, allowing for an in-depth exploration of teachers' ideologies and practices regarding translanguaging in multilingual classrooms. Qualitative research is characterised by its focus on understanding the meaning individuals or groups assign to social or human phenomena. Thus, it seeks understanding, understanding of people's interpretations of experiences, construction of their worlds, and attributed meaning to it (Steyn, 2017). The qualitative approach facilitates rich, contextualised insights into the complex and subjective

experiences of teachers within multilingual classrooms. Therefore, the choice to employ a qualitative research approach was driven by the complexity of the research question and the need for rich, contextual insights. Many social phenomena, such as cultural practices, personal experiences, and societal interactions, cannot be adequately captured through numerical data alone. The strength of the qualitative approach is that it accounts for and includes differences ideologically, epistemologically, methodologically, and most importantly, humanly (Steyn, 2017). By using qualitative methods, the researcher aimed to uncover underlying motivations, beliefs, and attitudes that shape participants' experiences. Thus, by adopting qualitative methods, the study may contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of teachers' ideologies about translanguaging and its implications for educational practice in Namibia, paving the way for informed policy development and enhanced teaching practices.

4.4 Research Design

Since the study sought to uncover reality by understanding the phenomena within the participants' real-life context, the research design employed a case study design. Thus, I used the case study design for this study because there was a need to understand the ideologies of teachers about the use of translanguaging in multilingual grade 4 classrooms. Case studies have proven particularly useful for studying educational issues. The most defining characteristic of a case study is the exploration of a phenomenon within its actual context. Therefore, the case study strategy was more applicable because it focused on the social context (multilingual classrooms) with a case (English language teaching) and helped investigate problems (teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging) in its actual environment (Grade 4 classrooms), situated in the Zambezi region of Namibia. Case studies allow for detail to be collected that would not normally be obtained by other research designs, thus producing richer data of greater depth than in other designs. Entrenched in real-life situations, case studies provide richer and more holistic accounts of phenomena. It provides understanding and enhanced insight of experiences and phenomena. Case studies allow researchers to study complex relationships between phenomena, contexts and people (Steyn, 2017).

In this case, the case study design was more appropriate in that it has finite quality in terms of time, space, and the number of cases. Therefore, the design gave me an opportunity to concentrate on the Grade 4 English language teachers in the selected schools within a limited timescale. I deem the case study suitable for this project because it affords me an opportunity to share the participants' experiences. Moreover, I used the case study because I wanted to

witness events unfold. In this study, I was interested in understanding the language of interaction in the grade 4 language classroom and their influence and the case study allowed me to observe teachers and learners interacting during English lessons.

Case study design has been criticised by some scholars as lacking in scientific rigour and reliability, and that it did not provide for data generalisability. However, Jacobs (2020) emphasise the strengths of the design, in its ability to provide the researcher with an in-depth and detailed understanding of a series of events (objects of study), through detailed descriptions that provide a holistic picture of the study problem under investigation. According to Creswell (2013: 76), exploratory designs are employed where scarce knowledge exist about the study objects of investigation. Although a wide scope of translanguaging has been covered in research, there is limited research on ideologies toward translanguaging in multilingual grade 4 classrooms in Namibia (Simasiku, 2015; Ipinge & Banda, 2020, Norro, 2023). Therefore, to arrive at sound conclusions for this current study, the researcher applied an exploratory case study design, with the semi-structured interview, classroom observations and document analysis as a data collection tools, to gain insights from the sampled key participants, regarding their experiences and views of the utilisation of translanguaging in their classrooms.

4.5 Study Population

The study's population comprised all Grade 4 English language teachers and heads of department (HODs) from selected urban and rural schools within the Zambezi region of Namibia.

4.6 Study Sampling Method and Sample

Purposive sampling, also called purposeful, judgemental, or selective sampling (Gill, 2020), was employed to ensure that participants were representative of the various contexts. As Hlatshwayo (2013) noted, purposive sampling is used in order to access people who have in-depth knowledge about particular issues by virtue of expertise or experience. Therefore, a sample of eighteen (18) participants was selected on the basis that they are knowledgeable, have the experience of teaching grade 4 classrooms, and are well-informed of the translanguaging phenomenon. The sample comprised ten (10) grade 4 English language teachers and eight (8) language heads of department (HODs) drawn from ten (10) selected urban and rural schools. The selected teachers and HODs have in-depth knowledge based on their professional roles and experience in teaching in multilingual classrooms. Thus, purposive sampling was deemed appropriate because the study deals with a specific site, that is, grade 4

multilingual classrooms. The selection of Grade 4 classrooms was influenced by the fact that it was at this grade level where change of the language of learning and teaching (LoLT), Silozi to English, was experienced in the context. Therefore, it was purposefully selected because this is the grade phase where the language policy recommends the implementation of translanguaging to help learners understand difficult concepts in English.

Schools were selected because they serve multilingual communities. Thus, the selected schools are situated in multilingual communities, hence forming a research site for the proposed study. The unique feature for the Zambezi region to be sampled in this study was the evidence of multilingualism, and the language of instruction in the region is different from the language of play. Furthermore, the rationale for selecting the ten teachers stemmed from their unique position as the sole implementers of the language policy recommending utilisation of translanguaging within their classrooms. Given that there was only one teacher per grade level in the ten selected schools, this study included all available teachers, ensuring that no voices were left unheard. The teachers represented a diverse array of backgrounds, experiences, and pedagogical philosophies, providing a well-rounded perspective in understanding the implications of the stance on translanguaging in teaching and learning practices. Moreover, HODs were purposively nominated as they were directly involved in the monitoring of the implementation of the policy documents that guide the deployment of translanguaging at Grade 4.

4.7 Methods of Data Collection

The choice of data-collection tools in qualitative research often stems from the specific objectives set forth by the research questions. The tools selected for this study included an interview guide, an observation schedule, and document analysis. The interview guide was used to answer research questions (1), (2), and (4). Whereas classroom observation schedule and document analysis assisted in answering research question (3). Interviews involve gathering information by the interviewer asking the participant pre-arranged questions. Moreover, interviews were recorded with the permission of the participants. Furthermore, observations were carried out to find out the teachers and learners language practices during English language lessons in Grade 4 classrooms. Document review of the teachers' lesson plans was also conducted. The research instruments are further clarified below:

4.7.1 Interview Guide

The interview guide serves as a structured framework for conducting qualitative interviews. They allow researchers to navigate conversations with flexibility while ensuring that all pertinent topics are covered comprehensively. The design of the interview guide involved crafting open-ended questions guided by the central research questions. This format fosters an environment conducive to in-depth dialogue, enabling participants to share their perspectives freely. During the data collection phase, open-ended questions were used to answer research questions (1), (2), and (4) that required getting concrete, subjective, and personal viewpoints from teachers and HODs (Namutenya, 2022) as they required them to explain their views. The flexibility inherent in the use of interview guides enabled the researcher to probe deeper into responses based on the participants' answers, facilitating richer data collection aligned with the research aims. Thus, the interviews provided an opportunity for participants to share their thoughts, attitudes, and experiences related to translanguaging, allowing for an in-depth exploration of their ideologies.

Open-ended questions are fast, practical, easy to administer, and reliable when the right kind of questions are asked (Namutenya, 2022). Questions related to the teachers' knowledge of the language policy in relation to the implementation of translanguaging, their ideologies towards translanguaging pedagogical practice, and the enablers and constraints regarding the implementation of this approach served as discussion points that guided the interview. The interviews were also audio recorded with the participants' permission to ensure the validity of the data and later transcribed. Audio recording of participants' interviews enabled me to capture the true essence of interviewees' intentions. Soya (2017) views the recording of responses as very important because the process provides the researcher with exact answers as they are given. Open-ended questions fit this study because the researcher wanted to understand the teachers' ideologies about translanguaging implementation in multilingual grade 4 classrooms. The researcher interviewed eighteen (18) participants on a one-on-one basis. Ten (10) of them were Grade 4 English language teachers, and seven (8) were HODs. The researcher later transcribed the recorded interviews for data analysis discussed in the next chapter.

4.7.2 Classroom Observation

In addition to interviews, classroom observations were conducted to gain a deeper understanding of how teachers implemented translanguaging practices in their instructional

contexts. Observation schedules are instrumental in capturing behavioral patterns and contextual dimensions that may not be easily articulated by participants during interviews. This tool provides a systematic approach to observe and record phenomena in real-time. Observational strategies were drawn directly from the research questions, ensuring alignment with the overarching aims. During the data collection, Field notes were generated through non-participant observations within the research context, allowing for the collection of contextual data supplementing interview findings. These observations involved the systematic recording of teachers' language use, learners' language practices and the overall dynamics of translanguaging within the grade 4 classroom environment. This approach provided valuable insights into the actual implementation of translanguaging strategies in the classroom.

Observations afford the researcher the opportunity to gather 'live' data from 'live' situations (Soya, 2017). The researcher observed the language practices by teachers when teaching and when asking questions of their grade 4 learners. The researcher also has the opportunity to listen to the language learners use when responding to the teachers and when interacting among themselves. The researcher observed the real grade 4 classroom situation as (Maodi, 2018:30) states that "the distinctive feature of observation...is that it offers an investigator the opportunity to gather 'live' data from naturally occurring social situations." In this study, observations provide an opportunity for the researcher to experience the 'live' world of the participants. As Soya (2017) argues, it becomes easier for the researcher to understand the world of the participants when immersed in it.

During the lessons, the researcher sat at the rear of the classroom in the corner to conduct observations of the teachers and their learners. My focus was on observing the translanguaging that was taking place during the lessons in order to experience the practicality of what exactly transpires in a translanguaging classroom when multiple languages are used in a single lesson plan. Thus, to gain a profound understanding of how teachers employed translanguaging in the lessons, each teacher was observed twice. In addition to my presence at the research sites, I relied on audio and video recordings set up in the classroom to ensure that nothing was overlooked and all recordings were then systematically filed. The researcher later transcribed recorded observation for data analysis presented in the next chapter.

4.7.3 Document analysis

Document analysis involves reviewing existing materials relevant to the research context, providing an additional layer of understanding. The selection of documents was strategically

aligned with the research questions to ensure relevance and comprehensiveness. Teachers' lesson plans were targeted in this study. The researcher explored teachers' lesson plans to understand the methods teachers used to teach ESL learners using English as LoLT. This type of documentation was relevant as it provides a tangible record of instructional strategies, language choices, and pedagogical approaches the teachers used, helping the researcher understand how teachers incorporate or exclude translanguaging in their classrooms. This provided further information to the researcher on planned and unplanned acts of translanguaging within the classrooms. Permission to access teachers' lesson plans was requested verbally from the teachers and the HODs. The permission was granted on the condition that the researcher will make copies of the lesson plans and return the original for filing purposes.

4.8 Data Analysis

To ensure the rigour and trustworthiness of the findings, a process of data analysis was undertaken. Transcripts from interviews and field notes from classroom observations were carefully examined using thematic analysis. Thematic analysis was used to analyse the data that was generated during interviews. Thematic analysis is relevant to this study since it allows themes to emerge and provides a more detailed account of teachers' ideologies towards the implementation of translanguaging in a multilingual grade 4 classroom by focusing on the themes that emerged from the data. In other words, thematic analysis is a method of identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns [themes] within data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The process of thematic analysis is represented as follows:

1. Familiarising yourself with your data
2. Generating initial codes
3. Searching for themes
4. Reviewing themes
5. Defining and naming themes

According to Braun and Clarke (2006), thematic analysis begins with a thorough reading and re-reading of raw data so that the researcher familiarises himself/herself with the data. Thereafter, the researcher will have a deeper understanding of the data and start generating

initial codes. From these codes, a search for themes and possible codes that can be brought together to formulate a theme is undertaken. The reviewing and definition of these themes will then take place and lead to the final stage of producing the report. This process aims at reducing and transforming data and revealing its hidden meanings, and this leads to thick descriptions and the interpretation of data.

In this study, the researcher has followed the above-mentioned thematic analysis process by first reading and re-reading raw data to familiarise himself with the concepts and arguments inherent in grade 4 teachers' narratives of their ideologies, which were produced using interview guides. Thus, I engaged in a hermeneutic cycle of reading, reflecting, and re-reading the data, seeking to identify patterns, themes, and relationships that emerge from the teachers' narratives and experiences. This involved identifying recurring patterns, themes, and categories within the data, allowing for the emergence of meaningful connections and interpretations. The researcher began with transcribing the audio-recorded interviews into Word documents. After all the interviews were transcribed, the researcher repeatedly and attentively listened to each interview whilst going through the transcriptions. This process was done to certify reliability and for me to engage and familiarise myself with the data. Then the researcher coded raw data using different colours to represent each code. Common codes were then put together to identify the themes that emerged. The researcher then reviewed and defined the themes with reference to raw qualitative data and what participants meant, considering how they presented it and what was not said but implied. As McMillan and Schumacher (2006:368) suggest, the researcher should "compare codes for duplication and overlapping descriptions.". With that said, the researcher grouped the codes according to their similarities and then categorised them into themes. Moreover, the transcribed data from the interview was analysed and interpreted with verbatim of the interviewees to make the data more authentic and valid. This was undertaken in detail; in chapters five and six, the report on the findings (the themes that emerge from data) is discussed.

4.9 Quality Assurance

For quality assurance in qualitative research, Aung (2021) states that trustworthiness is of the utmost importance. The criteria for evaluating the reliability of qualitative data collection are credibility (truth value), conformability (neutrality), transferability (applicability), and dependability (consistency).

4.9.1 Credibility and Confirmability

According to Aung (2021), credibility refers to confidence in the ‘truth’ of the data that were collected. To ensure credibility in this study, the researcher did member checks by taking empirical findings summaries to the participants of the study and enquired if the findings reflected their authentic experiences. Member checks were employed in this study as an approach to obtain feedback from the participants on the emanating empirical findings from both semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions. The rationale for this was to avert and ascertain that the researcher does not misrepresent and misinterpret the meanings of what the participants uttered. Audio and video recordings enhanced the trustworthiness of the data generated through classroom observations and the interviews (audio recorded only) (Ayob, 2020). The researcher also had his supervisor check that interpretations of data and conclusions were relevant to the study, as an ‘independent, distanced, and critical eye’ can contribute to the credibility of the study (Aung, 2021).

On the other hand, confirmability is about ensuring that the findings are the results of experiences and ideas of participants rather than the characteristics and preferences of the researcher (Shinga, 2019; Soya, 2017). In this study, the researcher did not only provide a methodological description but also kept and recorded all the procedures that were followed in undertaking this research. The transcriptions and recordings of the semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions were kept for verification. Through the keeping of all the records, the researcher was enabled to represent an audit trail that can allow for tracing.

4.9.2 Transferability and Dependability

Transferability denotes the degree to which results can be “exported” or generalised to other contexts (Soya, 2017; Steyn, 2017). In the current study, transferability was ensured through giving detailed information regarding the number of schools taking part in the study and where they were based, the number of participants involved, the data generation methods employed, and the number and length of the data generation sessions. Thus, the researcher ensured that the context and participants chosen were typical to the phenomenon being studied, which included the multilingual environment and participating schools. The researcher also ensured that the data were closely connected to the specific context in order for the reader to establish whether this would be generalisable to the population’s context. This was done by ensuring that the two schools chosen for the study were within the same context. Thus, if readers and or

researchers believe their situations or study sites to be similar to those described in this study, they may find themselves able to usefully relate the findings to their own situations.

On the other hand, dependability refers to the reliability of the research, in that if the study was repeated within the same context, using the same methods of data collection, the results would be the same (Aung, 2021). For this study, dependability was achieved by providing a detailed inclusion of the methodology and methods deployed in this study. The researcher documented all the processes undertaken, initiating from research design, methodology, and methods applied for data generation. This way the reader could examine the expansiveness to which qualitative research practices are followed.

4.10 Ethical Assurance

When the study was conducted, all ethical considerations were adhered to as prescribed by the University of Zambia. The researcher sent an application letter to the Zambezi Regional Directorate of Education, Arts, and Culture to seek permission to do research in public schools in the region and work with teachers as participants, and permission was granted with reference numbers *Ref:13/2/9/1* (see Appendix 2). Moreover, a letter was also sent to the school principals asking permission to use the schools as research sites and to be allowed to engage with the teachers within the school premises. The researcher also submitted a research proposal to the University Ethics Committee to get ethical clearance to do the study. The Humanities and Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee of the University of Zambia granted ethical approval for the study. The ethical clearance number is HSSREC-2023-JUL.-025 (see Appendix 1). Permission was also sought from the participants, and the following aspects were addressed within the university ethical clearance:

4.10.1 Respect for person

Primarily, a letter to obtain participants informed consent was written (refer to Appendices 2 & 3). Informed consent has been described by Mweli (2018) as the procedure where the individual gives permission to participate in a project with volition. It is important to note that all the participants in this study are competent, and they gave consent voluntarily, and this increased the validity of this study (Mweli, 2018). In this letter, the researcher explained in detail what the study required of the participants. Within the content of the consent form, participants were informed about the nature of the study and were given assurance of the confidentiality of information they would submit and issues of anonymity. This issue enabled

the participants to make an informed decision whether to participate in the study or not. In addition, participants were informed that they had the right to withdraw at any time during the research process, and for them to participate, they had to give their consent to do so by signing the letter. The researcher then scheduled a short meeting of about 15 minutes with the potential participants and explained to them the value of the study and the importance of their participation, including their free will in giving information without fear. Since the Directorate of Education and the schools approved the study, it was explained to the participants that these approvals did not mean that they were obliged to participate in the study.

Moreover, participants were informed about the confidentiality of information in the research process. Participants were made aware that everyone who took part in the study was bound by ethics in research not to publish the information that was rendered in these discussions without the permission of all the respondents and of the researchers, who would ensure that ethical issues are met in this regard. The participants' identities would be protected by using pseudonyms when publishing the results. Nepando (2018) stresses the importance of safeguarding research participants by maintaining anonymity and confidentiality. The participants were made aware that their identity and descriptions of schools were protected by using pseudonyms where it was necessary. Participants then signed the consent form to confirm their participation.

4.10.2 Dissemination of findings

The findings were presented in an honest and trustworthy manner to avoid bias, in the sense that bias is a deliberate attempt either to hide what the research has found or to highlight something disproportionate to its true existence. In this manner, the participants' responses were presented verbatim, and the report was presented to the participants to verify the authenticity of the report. Furthermore, the findings of the study were disseminated through the submission of a written report thesis to the University of Zambia's online database and libraries for other researchers and interested parties to access them. Another copy of the findings was sent to the Regional Directorate of Education, Arts, and Culture as the fulfilment of the requirement of one of the conditions for granting the permission to conduct in departmental schools. In this manner, the findings will be available to policymakers in this country and other stakeholders in education. All the participants will be informed of the availability of the thesis to them through the online system and university libraries.

4.11 Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented the qualitative case study design as the appropriate methodology to explore the teachers' ideologies towards the implementation of translanguaging in multilingual classrooms. The design was influenced by the research questions of the study that required the collection of qualitative data on the ideologies of teachers. The next chapter presents the findings of the study.

CHAPTER FIVE

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

5.1 Overview

This chapter presents the findings of the study on teachers' ideologies towards the implementation of translanguage in selected multilingual grade 4 classrooms in Namibia. The findings of the study are presented in line with the following research questions:

1. How familiar are the teachers with the language in education policy in relation to translanguage?
2. What are the teachers' ideologies towards translanguage pedagogic practice?
3. How do the teachers implement translanguage in multilingual grade 4 classrooms?
4. What factors affect teachers' implementation of translanguage in multilingual grade 4 classrooms?

The research questions were answered using different instruments of data collection. Data will be presented under themes in relation to the research questions. The chapter concludes by providing the summary. The next section presents findings from the first research question.

5.2 How familiar are the teachers with the language in education policy in relation to translanguage?

The first question sought to assess the grade 4 English language teachers' knowledge of the language policy with regard to translanguage. Language policies serve as formal directives guiding the medium of instruction and the expected teaching practices within educational settings. They reflect governmental priorities regarding language use and the promotion of multilingualism. Therefore, teachers' understanding and knowledge of these policies directly influence their instructional practices. Teachers who are aware of and understand language policy are better equipped to implement strategies like translanguage effectively. Thus, for the teacher to function effectively according to the expectations of the government and policymakers, it is important that a teacher be familiar with the language policy. Consequently, it was necessary to assess the teachers' knowledge/awareness of the language policy with regard to the implementation of translanguage in multilingual grade 4 classrooms.

5.2.1 Teachers' Familiarity with the Language Policy in relation to Translanguage

The findings revealed that some teachers were familiar with the language policy as they stated that the policy allowed the use of translanguage although it was not plainly stated. While

recommended by the policy, teachers mentioned that it was supposed to be used appropriately, for instance to clarify concepts and contents that learners found challenging. The following are some of the teachers' responses:

T1: *For grade 4, the policy allows that a teacher can switch... because it is like something that is new to them since they used to learn in their mother tongue (Silozi) as the medium of instruction from grade 0 to three. So, when it comes to grade 4, the medium of instruction is English, which means, where you see that learners did not understand, you switch. Yes, you can switch.*

T2: *You know, we are teaching young ones, so the policy allows us to switch if the learners did not understand. Mostly they don't understand when I teach in English. So, if they do not understand, you can switch so that learners are able to follow the lesson.*

T3: *Code switching is allowed; the policy recommends it but only when words are difficult for learners to understand. We cannot code-switch the whole lesson; we only code-switch when there's a need, for instance, when there's a difficult word that needs understanding. The policy recommends the use of English and Silozi only.*

T4: *The policy entails that we must use English to teach, but since they were using their mother tongue from junior primary, it becomes a huge challenge when they transition to grade 4. They completely do not understand English. So, in this case, the policy says we must code-switch where they do not understand.*

T6: *Based on the language policy, we are not really limited to switching to the other language whenever delivering a lesson, but the limit is just that it mustn't be throughout the lesson. So, in cases where you have observed that learners are failing to comprehend what you are delivering in the lesson, you have the right or I may say, you are allowed to switch between languages to trigger the understanding of learners.*

T7: *The policy indicates that for learners in senior primary, it's ok to code switch so that learners may have a clear understanding of the lesson and that they build background on the topic. Therefore, they would relate the content of the lesson to the background and things they already know. Because they don't necessarily understand English, when we translanguage, they are able to connect their mother tongue with English.*

T8: *Some learners do not understand English when they get to grade 4, where the medium of instruction changes from mother tongue to English. So, the language policy accommodates that the mother tongue be used to help learners understand what is being taught, but it shouldn't be the whole lesson, only when necessary.*

There were also teachers who were not familiar with the language policy. Some teachers explained that they were not sure about what the policy says. Others explicitly stated that they

did not know what the policy recommends, reasoning that they haven't seen (read) it. However, out-of-classroom practical challenges, they mentioned that translanguaging cannot be avoided in those classrooms. The following extracts provide evidence of the teachers' responses:

T5... *I'm speaking under correction. I'm not really sure what it says...As teachers, we are busy with lesson preparations and other urgent tasks every day, with no time to read the policies. But from my understanding... when they get to grade 4, it's a bit challenging to teach everything in English, so we have to translate sometimes where they do not understand from English to Silozi because it is the language that is being taught in schools. So, there's no way I can translate from English to Mbalangwe or these other local languages like Subia.*

T9: *Haa! I can't remember exactly what it says. I am not sure; it has been long since I read it ... I don't have enough time to read and understand all the policies; we are busy teaching and marking. But you cannot ignore code-switching [translanguaging] in these grades because you will end up talking to yourself.*

T10: *The language policy, I don't really know what it says because I haven't seen it here as we are only given syllabuses, but what I have seen is that as teachers we do code-switch to help our learners since they have challenges when they switch to English in Grade 4.*

5.2.2 HODs' Familiarity with the Language Policy in relation to Translanguaging

The heads of department (HODs) were presented with the same question on their awareness of the language policy in relation to the implementation of translanguaging in grade 4. Most HODs were familiar with language policy, as they stated that the language policy recommended the use of learners' mother tongue to assist them in understanding the concepts or contents, they find challenging. Other HODs mentioned that although the policy allowed the integration of translanguaging, it was supposed to be applied appropriately. Here are their statements:

HOD1: *The use of translanguaging is not plainly stated in the policy; it is not in black and white, so its use is questionable, but what it [the policy] says is that when learners transition to English medium in grade 4, their mother tongue should be used to support them where they are lacking to ensure that they understand the concepts or contents they find difficult.*

HOD3: *Since Grade 4 is a transition year where learners transition from mother tongue to English medium...learners in Grade 4 cannot understand English. My understanding of the policy is that a teacher can still change to mother tongue because English is a foreign language, which they are not familiar with. So, the policy allows a mix of languages to help learners understand the lesson for as long as it is applied appropriately.*

HOD5: *Grade 4 is a transition grade ... from mother tongue to English medium as the language of instruction. So... it's like a new thing to them... they are dealing with different teaching*

methods and approaches, so, it becomes a problem. So, with grade 4, the policy allows the use of the mother tongue to help learners, because it's a transition grade; they are new to the language.

HOD7: *The policy allows the use of translanguaging in our lessons because these learners don't understand the medium of instruction, English. So, it states that we can assist learners by using their mother tongue, which is Silozi here in the Zambezi region. So, the policy is not restricting us, as long as it is used to help learners make meaning of the lesson. So yes, translanguaging is allowed but should be used appropriately.*

Some HODs were not familiar with the language policy regarding translanguaging implementation. The HODs explained their classroom language practices but were not sure about the policy requirements. Other HODs claimed to know what the language policy recommended but could not explain its explicit provisions; thus, they were not familiar. Consider the responses provided:

HOD2: *Basically, Grade 4 is a transition grade where learners are moving from the use of mother tongue to English. We normally use or switch over to mother tongues in some other aspect because these learners have not yet mastered the use of English as a medium of instruction, which I think is required by the policy.*

HOD6: *The policy states that if it is English, it should be English, and if it is a mother tongue, it must be that way, no translanguaging.*

The other HOD explicitly stated that he did not know what the policy said. In short, while some HODs were not sure about the policy provisions, others did not know its recommendation regarding translanguaging implementation in grade 4 classrooms. The HOD stated:

HOD4: *I don't know what the policy says, but when learners transition to Grade 4, they are required to change from mother tongue medium to English.*

5.3 What are the teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging pedagogic practice?

Teachers' ideologies represent the deeply held beliefs, values, and assumptions that teachers hold about language, learning, and teaching. Teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging can significantly affect their willingness and ability to implement this pedagogical approach in their classrooms. Therefore, it was essential to examine the teachers' ideologies towards the implementation of translanguaging in multilingual grade 4 classrooms. Understanding teachers' ideologies towards translanguaging is crucial as it can illustrate potential barriers and facilitators to its implementation. The research findings revealed a diverse range of teachers'

ideologies regarding the integration of translanguaging in Grade 4 classrooms. These ideologies, while based on the same fundamental concept, differ significantly in terms of their practical understanding and implementation. For clarity and analytical purposes, the ideologies are categorised into two subthemes: The first one reports positive ideologies while the second one presents negative ideologies. This classification was based on the patterns observed during data collection, which showed that ideologies can either facilitate or hinder the implementation of translanguaging.

5.3.1 Positive Ideologies about Translanguaging

The findings revealed that a significant proportion of teachers and HODs embraced translanguaging with positive ideologies, viewing it as a valuable pedagogical approach that recognises and builds on the linguistic resources of multilingual learners. Teachers who embraced this strategy saw learners' diverse linguistic resources as assets rather than deficits. As observed from the data, this perspective is characterised by the belief that:

5.3.1.1 Translanguaging Enhances Second Language Learning (L2) and Comprehension

The ultimate finding of the study showed that some teachers believe that translanguaging enhances second language (L2) learning and comprehension. These teachers believed that first languages can serve as valuable resources for understanding and processing new information. Teachers observed that when learners are encouraged to draw on their first language (L1) for clarification and support, they can better comprehend complex concepts and grammatical structures in L2. These teachers saw translanguaging to enhance learners' understanding and retention of the subject matter, as were able to make connections between their prior knowledge and new information. The teachers stated that since learners were transitioning to the English language, translanguaging helped learners learn the target language quickly because learners would be making comparisons of the linguistic concepts in the mother tongue and target language, English, enhancing overall language proficiency through meaningful interactions. Consider the following response:

T1: *For me, translanguaging is good, and I recommend it... It is better to switch to help learners understand and learn the target language, but it should not be abused that all the lessons or everything being taught should be translated; it's not good.*

T2: *For grade 4 learners, I think it's the right thing... They are taught in English for the first time, so most of the words are difficult to understand, so it's good to*

translanguage ... Learners will pick the English language quickly and begin asking questions in English and knowing the different words.

T6: *... It is good, for instance, in a classroom situation ... It makes it easier for learners to understand and learn the new language, English, in cases where they are failing to get what the teacher is saying in English...*

HOD1: *...it really helps the grade 4 learners given that they are transitioning from mother tongue medium to English... To learn the target language, English, translanguageing is appropriate... The situation here will not allow you to continue using one language, especially this foreign one to our learners; they will keep quiet. ... Also, they are struggling with Silozi, their mother tongue here at school... when translanguageing is used ... It will familiarise learners with the target language, English, and Silozi could reduce their tension in learning...*

5.3.1.2 Translanguageing Develops Learners Vocabulary

Other teachers believed that translanguageing contributes to learners' vocabulary development. The teachers mentioned that by allowing learners to draw upon their home languages, dialects, and other languages familiar to them, translanguageing can facilitate deeper comprehension of new vocabulary and its connections to existing knowledge. Thus, they are able to access a wider range of vocabulary and develop a profound understanding of word meanings. The teachers said the following:

T7: *For me, translanguageing is a good practice because the learners are still new to English, and we need to lay the background using their mother tongue. So, when we use the language that they know, I think they can learn the second language better because they will develop the vocabulary of the English language when they compare the concepts in the local language and target language. So, learners will build up from there.*

T9: *I feel it's a good thing, more especially for grade 4, like I mentioned; they struggle with English when they come from grade 3. So, translanguageing helps them learn new terms... Translanguageing is really a good thing because it helps both the learners and the teacher in terms of vocabulary development, as teachers sometimes find challenges with some words...*

5.3.1.3 Translanguageing Bridges the Linguistic Gaps between Home and School

The findings also show that some teachers viewed translanguageing as a means to bridge the gap between learners' home languages and the language of instruction. The HOD emphasised that integrating learners home languages into classroom activities can create a sense of familiarity

and comfort, making learners feel more confident and empowered to participate in learning. The HOD observed that when learners are encouraged to draw upon their full linguistic resources, they are more likely to engage with the English language in meaningful ways. Thus, when teachers intentionally integrate learners' familiar languages into activities, they create a more inclusive and welcoming learning environment. Here is what the HOD said:

HOD7: ... *Translanguaging really plays an important role in stimulating learners background knowledge in class, especially here in the rural areas ... Some learners are coming to know the language, English, when they are at school because it is not spoken at home or in communities where they are coming from. So, the use of other languages helps learners to see the link between the languages of instruction and the language they speak at home, helping them learn easily.*

5.3.1.4 Translanguaging Enhances Performance in Assessment Tasks

Another teacher mentioned that translanguaging enhances performance in assessment tasks as it provides them with a more comprehensive understanding of the task at hand, leading to enhanced interpretation, better-informed responses, and ultimately improved performance on assessments. The teacher said the following:

T8: *So, for me, given that these learners struggle with English, I feel translanguaging is good since it helps learners to follow and understand the lesson. You will find that, when I explain to them in Silozi, especially on the tasks, most of them will perform better, because they will have understood what is expected of the...*

5.3.1.5 Translanguaging Engenders Inclusion

Some HODs stated that translanguaging helps create an inclusive environment by recognising and valuing linguistic diversity of learners in the classroom. Thus, translanguaging promotes inclusivity by celebrating the richness that linguistic diversity brings to the classrooms. Consider the extract below:

HOD3: *I think it is the best, yeah, it is the best... here we have learners speaking different languages, when their mother tongue is used, they will feel good and have a sense of belonging because the teacher recognises their languages. This will also motivate them to actively participate in the lessons.*

5.3.1.6 Translanguaging Builds Stronger Teacher-Learner Relationship

Some HODs mentioned that translanguaging promotes solid teacher-learner relationships founded on mutual respect and understanding. Teachers stated that incorporating learners'

languages into interactions helped them to build rapport with learners and gain a better understanding of their individual needs and experiences. Moreover, the HODs mentioned that the use of translanguaging increases motivation by making the learning experience more relevant and relatable to the individual learner, ultimately boosting their inspiration to be actively engaged in the lessons. Consider the following responses:

HOD5: *For me alternating languages when teaching Grade 4 is better, because these learners don't understand English ... when you do that as a teacher, you will have a good relationship with your learners and they will be motivated to engage in the lesson as they may feel free to express their thoughts and ideas when asked questions and to contribute in the lesson.*

HOD6: *... it creates an environment for learners to understand and gives learners the confidence to want to try to participate in the lesson...*

5.3.2 Negative Ideologies about Translanguaging

Despite the potential benefits of translanguaging, the study also revealed negative ideologies among some teachers. These teachers viewed translanguaging as a hindrance to language development and academic achievement. They perceived it as a source of confusion or as a practice that undermines the importance of learning the language of instruction. These teachers also viewed the multilingual Grade 4 learners as linguistically deficient, rather than linguistically diverse, and thus advocate for a monolingual approach to teaching and learning. These perspectives are characterised by a belief that:

5.3.2.1 Translanguaging Lowers Target Language Proficiency

One of the main concerns among teachers was that translanguaging impedes the development of proficiency in the target language. Teachers believed that allowing learners to use their familiar languages in the classroom would lead to a reliance on their first language, resulting in inadequate exposure to and practice with the target language. The teachers argued that this reliance may prevent learners from achieving the required academic language proficiency required in standardised assessments. The following are some of the responses:

T5: *... the bad side of it is that most of the learners, when you give them an essay, you will find that the words they don't know in English are written in Silozi. Also, when speaking, they substitute the words they don't know in English with those they know in their languages, especially in storytelling. So, this negatively affects their English language learning.*

T6: ...I think I can also be against it with the reasons that maybe this is why our learners even fail to express themselves in English because they are getting used to it; they know that they are going to be favoured anyhow. So, I think if teachers were to stick to the use of English only as the medium of instruction, I think our school learners could be at a certain level when it comes to self-expression in English.

HOD6: In my view, it is not a good teaching practice...If Silozi is used too much, learners may not get used to the English language, since they also don't speak it at home. So, you will find that learners find it hard to connect well with the language because of the different languages. So, it was important to just focus on English for them to easily pick the language.

HOD7: ...Using Silozi too much will make learners afraid of using English even when speaking and writing because they will be afraid of making mistakes... This will result in learners not getting used to the English language.

5.3.2.2 Translanguaging is Time Consuming and leads to Confusion in the Classroom

Other teachers perceived translanguaging as a time-consuming process and expressed concern that it affects their ability to adhere to pre-planned lesson structures and cover designated curriculum content within the allocated timeframes. They were worried that integrating translanguaging practices into lessons deviates from the planned lesson structures and impedes progress towards learning objectives. Moreover, the teachers expressed worries that allowing learners to utilise multiple languages will lead to confusion and hamper their ability to follow instructions. They believed that a focus on English as the sole medium of instruction is crucial for academic success. Here is what the teachers said:

T4: ...It is also time-consuming because you need to switch between languages, and that takes time. So, you will find that you also delay in finishing the lessons, such that you get into the other teacher's period, which is not appropriate. This also affects the completion of the syllabus, but there is nothing we can do; the managers must understand us. So, I would suggest that we need to focus more on using English, but translanguaging cannot be avoided in grade 4.

T10: ... I think it causes confusion among learners, especially here in the Zambezi region, where learners find a different language when they get to school. So, sometimes it is confusing for learners, especially when they don't have the vocabulary of both Silozi and English as the school languages. So, I would suggest that we use translanguaging minimally and focus much on English so that they don't lose focus on the English language.

5.3.3.3 Local Languages have no Academic and Professional value

Some HODs held the view that mother tongue has no place elsewhere in education, hence learners transition from it when they get to senior primary in grade 4. Thus, the HOD believes that overusing mother tongue in education can impede language learners' success by limiting their proficiency in the target language, English, which is essential for academic and professional advancement. Here is how the HOD describes the usefulness and uselessness of mother tongue:

***HOD4:** No, English should just be English. I see that mother tongue will not take them anywhere, because wherever they go, they will need to communicate to people outside there in English; they will not use their mother tongue. Not everyone understands their mother tongue, so they must use the international language that can help them communicate anywhere. So, mother tongue is not that important, and that is the reason they transition from it when they get to grade 4.*

5.3.3.4 Translanguaging is a Barrier to Assessment and Evaluation

Some teachers perceived translanguaging as a barrier to accurately assess learners' performance. Teachers were concerned that translanguaging will compromise the validity of assessment. They mentioned that learners rely heavily on their first language when responding to assessment items, leading to inaccuracies in the evaluation of the subject matter. Teachers also highlighted the challenges inherent in designing assessment that accommodate translanguaging practices. The teacher mentioned feeling unprepared to create assessments that effectively evaluate multilingual learners while acknowledging their linguistic flexibility. Consider the following:

***T3:** Honestly, I want to support my learners effectively, but I haven't been trained on how to assess their work when they are using translanguaging. I feel unprepared. Moreover, examination is taken in English, so this translanguaging might compromise with the learners' examination.*

***HOD1:** Translanguaging is good. However, I am worried that when learners translanguage during assessment, it will be impossible for the teachers to gauge their proficiency in either language. Mixing languages might reflect their understanding but could obscure their actual abilities.*

***HOD5:** ... there is a problem, when we give them work, like classwork, and tasks to write essays and compositions, sometimes they interpret mother tongue into English; and then you will find learners are finding it hard, they don't write exactly what is*

supposed to be written because of high dependency on mother tongue and direct interpretation. So, the two languages collide, even when they are speaking, this affect their writing and even speaking skills, because you will find that the learners know what to say and write but English is a challenge. So, for me English should be the focus.

5.3.3.5 Translanguaging is too Complex to Apply Effectively in the Classroom

The finding of the study also showed that some teachers expressed concerns regarding the complexity of implementing translanguaging strategies in their classrooms. The teachers mentioned that they lacked the necessary knowledge and support to effectively implement translanguaging in their teaching practices. The teachers find the concept of translanguaging to be complex to apply. They were concerned about how languages might affect each other negatively, confusion on how to effectively apply it due to unclear syllabus guidance, and the fear of teaching learners. Consider the following responses:

T5: ... I just don't have the skill to structure my lessons around multiple languages. It feels overwhelming. How do I even create a coherent structure that supports translanguaging without losing focus on the subject matter? We, as teachers, really need to be guided on how to go about this strategy.

HOD2: The idea of translanguaging sounds good in theory, but in practice, it can become chaotic, especially since teachers don't really know it; what we know is code-switching... Teachers never received formal training on translanguaging. Teachers do code-switch, but I often feel like they are just guessing what works and what doesn't work. A clear guideline on translanguaging would really help us, I guess.

5.4 How do Teachers Implement Translanguaging in Multilingual Grade 4 Classrooms?

This research question aimed at investigating how teachers implement translanguaging pedagogic practices in Grade 4 classrooms and examines whether these practices were purposeful and systematic or incidental. This was necessary because, in addition to the ideologies presented earlier, teachers' classroom use of translanguaging and to what extent their classroom use communicates their ideologies about translanguaging, language, and incline teaching from a linguistic perspective. Data was collected through interviews, classroom observation, and document analysis. The results are presented in two separate sections. The first section presents the results of the interviews. The second set presents the lesson plans that teacher used in correspondence with the extracts from the observed lessons, which show the classroom language practices of teachers and learners from a translanguaging perspective. This is important because it will be seen whether teachers deliberately planned for translanguaging

and purposefully used it as a pedagogic practice. Below is the data presented, starting with a presentation of the results of the interviews, followed by the lesson plans and later, transcripts of the observed lessons:

5.4.1 Interview Results

The interviews revealed that teachers did not plan for translanguaging in their lessons, yet they observed it occurring naturally. Teachers noted instances of where learners switched languages during discussions, used their home language to explain concepts, and negotiated meaning through code-switching. The teachers utilised Silozi and English during the English lessons. These incidents often arose in response to learners' needs, misunderstandings, and the desire to simplify the subject matter. Consider some of the following responses:

***T1:** When a learner uses their language to explain something to a classmate, it gives me insight into their understanding. I might not be planned for it, but it benefits the classroom.*

***T3:** Like I said earlier, sometimes I switch to Silozi without even thinking about it. These learners are just transitioning to English, so a learner might not understand a concept, and I just start explaining it in their home language because it makes more sense and is more reasonable.*

***T4:** I never plan to use learners' home in my lesson plans, but when my learners struggle with some terms in English, I use Silozi to clarify. I want to ensure they grasp the concept.*

***T6:** For grade 4 learners, translanguaging cannot be ignored. We plan our lessons in English, but we teach using both English and Silozi and sometimes their home languages like Sifwe, Siyeyi, Subia, and others, but mostly Silozi because it is also the only recognised school language here in the Zambezi region since we have a lot of languages.*

***T7:** Well, I don't plan for translanguaging; in the first place, I don't even do it. So, I can't plan for something I don't know. However, if a learner asks a question in their language, I'll respond in that language too. It builds rapport and trust in the classroom.*

***T10:** These learners are new to the language of instruction, English, in Grade 4. So, most of the time I find myself code-switching to Silozi in the middle of the lesson when learners seem to struggle to articulate their thoughts. I just want them to communicate, and if it means using their first language apart from Silozi, I will do it.*

5.4.2 Observed Lessons and Lesson Plans

This set of data present the lesson plans which teachers used in correspondence with the extracts from the observed lessons which show the classroom language practices of teachers and learners from a translanguaging perspective. This is important because it will be seen whether teachers deliberately planned for translanguaging and purposefully used it as a pedagogic practice. Below is the data presented starting with a presentation of lesson plans and later, transcripts of the observed lessons:

5.4.3 Lesson 1: Grammar Lesson (Topic: Adverbs)

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION ARTS AND CULTURE			
Tel: _____		Email: _____	
Week 4	Term 2	Monday	
Teacher: _____	Domain: _____	Duration: 35 minutes	
Date: 8/08/22	Grade: 4th - 5		
Theme: Skill Grammar Usage			
Topic: Adverb			
Teaching Materials and Resources to be used: Learner's book, Internet			
Competencies (refers to syllabus): identify and use adverbs correctly.			
Adverbs describe verbs or sometimes adjectives e.g. the children sang beautifully. John is exceptionally bright.			
Learning Objectives: Learners will: Apply knowledge of grammatical structures and conventions at word and phrase levels.			
Lesson Presentation:	New: ☒	Continuation: ☐	Repeat: ☐
1. Monitoring of homework done: No home work was given.			
2. Introduction (arouse and direct): Introduce a topic to them by explaining it and give examples.			
3. Presentation of subject content and learning tasks:			
Teach about adverbs by referring the topic to verbs. Teach them that most adverbs end with "ly" e.g. quickly, softly etc. Learners will give examples of adverbs using their prior knowledge. They will as well be able to identify adverbs into sentences given.			
4. Consolidation: Re-cap the lesson in brief			
5. Assessment:	Homework: ☐	Task: ☐	Exercise: ☒
6. Learning Support Activities: work on different examples with the rest of the class.			
7. Enrichment activities:			
Ask them to go find more examples of adverbs at home.			
8. Reflections:			
The lesson was successful, learners were able to identify adverbs into sentences.			
Signature: Teacher		Principal/HOD/Subject Head	
Remarks: _____		Date: _____	

Figure 1: Grammar Lesson Plan (Adverbs)

This lesson was presented at an urban school. In this lesson, the class had 60 learners in attendance. Learners were using their different languages to communicate with each other and during discussions on group tasks. The familiar languages that were spoken by the learners were Subia (dominant), Silozi, Sifwe, Totela, Yeyi, Oshiwambo, and English. The teacher is Mbalangwe by tribe, but she is also familiar with Silozi and English. She had 6 years of teaching experience, teaching English as a second language. The teacher had prepared a lesson plan. The lesson went as follows:

Teacher: Our lesson today will be focused on adverbs. What are adverbs, or what is an adverb? Class, do you know what an adverb is? Who can try? Yes, X, try.

Pupil: I don't know.

Teacher: X says he doesn't know what an adverb is. Are you hearing this word for the first time?

Pupils: Yes [in chorus]

Teacher: Alright, adverbs are words that we use to describe verbs. *Adverb mwa Silozi ki matalusi. Ki manzwi ale atalutasa kezo moiezahalezi, lwautwisisa? (Lozi: Adverbs are words that describe how an action happened; do we understand?).* Let us see if we can still remember what verbs are. What is a verb? X, tell us what a verb is.

Pupil X: It's a doing word.

Teacher: Good, a verb is a doing word or an action. So, an adverb is used to tell us more about the action that has been done. For example, she speaks slowly. What is the action in this sentence? X, give us the answer.

Pupil X: Speaks

Teacher: Very good. So how does this girl speak? X [she points at another learner].

Pupils: She speaks slowly.

Teacher: Good, so, what is slowly in this sentence, class?

Pupils: Adverb [in chorus]

Teacher: Excellent" is slowly an adverb in this statement because it is describing the action, speak. It is telling us how this girl speaks. *Haukatalimisisa pulelo ye, ikutaluseza kamo musizana abulelela. Kuti ubulela kabunya. Kona kuli bunya kwateni kilona*

litalusi kapa adverb kasikuwa kakuli linzwi leo litalusa kezo, ili kubulela. (Lozi: When you look at this sentence, it tells you how the girl speaks. She speaks slowly. Slowly is the adverb or [adverb] in English because that word describes the action, speak. Now I want us to work in groups of five and identify the adverbs in the sentences on the chalkboard so that I see if you have understood. Do you understand?

Pupils: Yes [in chorus]

Teacher: Let us give feedback. What did you find? What are the adverbs in the sentences? I need five learners from different groups to come give us a report. *Nibata banana bafai fi kuzwa mwalikwata zeshelana mutahe kwapaata kwanu mutobiha zemufumani mwalikwata zamina. Mukabiha momuitatelela ona cwalo. (Lozi: I need five learners from different groups to come give us a report of what you discussed in your groups. You will report in the order you are following each other).*

5.4.4 Lesson 2: Literature Lesson (Poem: On the Moon)

Lesson Preparation form		
Teacher:	Grade: 4	Date: 17.08.22
Subject: ENGLISH 2ND LANGUAGE	Time:	
Theme and Topic: Reading Poem (Literature)		
Teaching Materials and Resources to be used: Chalkboard, handouts		
Competencies (refer to syllabus): Learners should be able to: Read a poem and demonstrate understanding of various elements of literature.		
Lesson objectives: Learners will: Read and identify rhymes similes and metaphors.		
Presentation of the lesson:		
1. Monitoring of the homework done: Do the homework corrections for the previous lesson.		
2. An appropriate short introduction: Introduce the topic for the day to the learners. Ask them to describe the moon.		
3. Presentation of the subject matter and learning activities:		
Teacher's activity		Learner's activity
# Read the poem with the learners	# They will follow.	
# Discuss the content of the poem.	# They will give their own views.	
# Tell the learners to answer questions based on the poem.	# They will carry the task given.	

Figure 2: Literature Lesson Plan (Poem: On the Moon)

The lesson was presented at a rural school by a female teacher. In this lesson, there were 40 learners in attendance. Learners were using their different languages to communicate with each other and during discussions on group tasks. The familiar languages that were spoken by the learners were Totela, Oshiwambo, Silozi, and English. The teacher was Lozi by tribe, but she is also familiar with Sifwe, Silozi, and English. She had 12 years of teaching experience in teaching English as a second language. The teacher had a lesson plan. The lesson went as follows:

Teacher: Last time we said that there are important elements that we should remember in a poem. What are they? What should we remember about?

Pupil: The title.

Teacher: Yes. Most importantly, you should know the title of a poem. What else? I mentioned about five aspects: what else? Yes [she points at one learner].

Pupil: The poet.

Teacher: The poet, good. The poet is the writer of the poem. So, you need to know who the poet is, and the other thing, the third one? Yes.

Pupil: The stanzas.

Teacher: The stanzas. They will always ask how many stanzas the poem has. What else? Yes, X.

Pupil: The lines

Teacher: Yes, the lines, sometimes you can be asked, how many lines does the poem have? The last one. I mentioned five aspects: the title, the poet, stanzas, the lines, and the last one?

Pupil: The writer.

Teacher: No, the writer is the poet. The other one, okay, I will remind you today, but you have to keep that in mind. It is the rhyming words. Words that rhyme together. So, you have to remember that those are the most important elements of a poem. The title, the poet, the lines, the stanzas, and the rhyming words. Do you understand?

Pupils: Yes (in chorus).

Teacher: Now the title of the poem we are going to read is, Let Us Read This.

Pupils: Only the Moon

Teachers: Only the Moon" is the title of the poem we are going to learn today. So, do you know what a moon is? What is a moon? In Silozi, is it? Yes

Pupil: *Kanaleli*

Teacher: *Shaa! Kanaleli, batili.* What is the moon in Silozi? Yes

Pupil: Kweli

Teacher: *Kweli*, do we all agree? *Kana moon kikweli mwaSilozi?*

Pupils: *Eni.*

Teacher: Alright, in Silozi the moon is known as kweli. So now we are going to read the poem together, and I want you to pay attention so that we see if the elements we mentioned are there in the poem. Also, we are going to answer some questions based on the poem. X, you will read the first stanza, and others will follow.

Pupil Reads the first stanza aloud to the whole class.

Teacher: Thank you all for reading. Now let us see. Who is the author of this poem? The author is the writer. So, who wrote this poem? Yes, X.

Pupil X: E. Thumboo

Teacher: Is it E, Thumboo class?

Pupils: No [In chorus]

Teacher: Alright, so who is the author? Yes, X.

Pupil X: Wong May

Teacher: Wong May, is the answer correct, class?

Pupils: Yes

Teacher: Now let us look at the questions on the board. I want us to understand the questions before we start answering them.

5.4.5 Lesson 3: Grammar Lesson (Topic: Sentences)

ENGLISH SECOND LANGUAGE

GRADE: 4 **DAILY PREPARATION FORM** **DATE** 19. 08. 20 22

THEME/TOPIC Grammar and Usage

Learning objective: Learners will apply knowledge of grammatical rules at sentence level.

Basic Competency: Learners should be able to construct and use simple sentence.

Lesson Stages:

Pre: The learners will guess the topic.

While: Learners will copy the sentences. In each sentence, draw lines between the subjects, verb and object.

Post: Questions will be asked and the learners respond.

TEACHER'S ROLE	LEARNER'S ROLE
- Give handouts	- Will receive handouts
- Ask for previous day's lesson	- Respond to the previous work done
- Ask the learners about types of sentences	- Will answer how they know it.
- Explain to learners	- Listen and follow
- Write few work	- Copy the work
- Feedback	- Will consider it

Teaching aids Handouts, chalkboard and textbook

Assessment: Homework or Classwork: Homework

Evaluation: The lesson was good because all the learners participated even the weaker ones respond easily.

Date/ Controller's Signature: _____

Figure 3: Grammar Lesson Plan (Types of Sentences)

The lesson was presented at a rural school by a female teacher. There were 24 learners in attendance. The learners spoke the familiar languages of Totela and San. The teacher is Subia by tribe, but she is also familiar with Silozi and English. She has 10 years of experience in teaching English as a second language. This teacher had prepared a lesson plan and presented the lesson with one. The lesson went as follows:

Teacher: Today, we are going to discuss sentences. We use sentences in different situations when we talk and write, but we first need to know what a sentence is. So, I want you to tell me what you understand a sentence to be. Class, what is a sentence?

Pupils: Quiet

Teacher: Class, are you saying you don't know what a sentence is, or are you scared of the new teacher?

Pupils: No [In chorus]

Teacher: Alright, so tell me what a sentence is.

Pupils: Quiet

Teacher: Alright, [distributes a handout with notes] X read for us the definition of the sentence.

Pupil X: reads aloud to the whole class.

Teacher: Good, so a sentence is a group of words that makes sense. Who can give us one example of a sentence that we can hear that has sense in it?

Pupil: I think so.

Teacher: Umm, umm. A sentence is a group of words that makes sense. When you write a sentence, it must always start with what [reads on the handout].

Pupils: A capital letter [in chorus]

Teacher: Yes, a capital letter to show that you are starting. Alright

Pupils: Yes [in chorus]

Teacher: Then, what should our sentence end with?

Pupils: A full stop. [In chorus]

Teacher: A full stop shows us that we can't continue anymore. We have ended here. Who can give us one sentence that ends with a full stop to show that it has ended? Make your own, don't copy from the ones on the handout. Yes X, try your luck.

Pupil X: No way to go.

Teacher: Good. So, the full stop shows that the sentence has ended. So, without sentences, we can't write anything. That means sentences are important. Why are you coming this time? Where were you?

Pupil: *Neniinzi fande, nebanilumile bomuluti (Lozi: I was outside, I had been sent by the teacher).*

Teacher: *Wena (Lozi: You)*, we are in English, most of the time I tell you to express yourselves in English when it is English time. Do you understand?

Pupils: Yes [in chorus]

Teacher: So, we said a sentence is a group of words that makes sense. Also, we said, you write your sentence beginning with a capital letter and end with a full stop, question mark, or an exclamation mark. Do you know what an exclamation mark is? If you can't remember, go back to your notes. We talked about punctuation marks, and the exclamation mark is one of them, so master those punctuations because they are very important, as you can see in our lesson today.

5.4.6 Lesson 4: Grammar Lesson (Topic: Countable and Uncountable Nouns)

LESSON PLAN FOR ENGLISH GRADE 4-7

DATE : 09-10/02/20 GRADE: 4A-D

PERIOD : 1,3,5,6,7,8 SKILL : Grammar usage

- THEME/TOPIC:**
People we love: Countable and Uncountable nouns
- LESSON OBJECTIVE/COMPETENCY:**
Identify and use different types of nouns (countable and uncountable nouns).
- RESOURCES AND TEACHING AIDS:**
Flash cards, Potatoes, onions, Bananas, salt, sand, Rice
- MONITORING OF HOMEWORK:**
Homework marked correction given.
- VOCABULARY/NEW WORDS:**
Countable, Uncountable, Nouns
- INTRODUCTION:**
Ask learners name things brought to class
ie sand, Rice, water, onion etc.
- PRESENTATION: TEACHERS ACTIVITIES:**
 - Teacher will define what countable & uncountable nouns are and give examples.
 - Ask learners to give more examples.
 - Give notes.
 - Use flash cards and to reinforce the lesson.
- LEARNERS ACTIVITIES:**
 - Listen attentively and participate when given asked questions.
 - Give more examples.
 - copy down notes.
 - do the Flash card activity.
- CONSOLIDATION:**
Give more examples to struggling learners.
- ASSESSMENT: CLASSWORK, HOMEWORK, ASSIGNMENT:**
Sort nouns into countable and uncountable nouns.
- TEACHER'S REFLECTION:**
The lesson went on very well, learners were very active.
- CONTROLLER'S REMARK:**

SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____

Figure 4: Grammar Lesson Plan (Countable and Uncountable Nouns)

This lesson was presented at an urban school. In this lesson, the class had 65 learners in attendance. The familiar languages that the learners spoke were Subia (dominant), Silozi, Sifwe, Totela, Yeyi, Oshiwambo, Khoekhoewab, and English. The teacher is Subia by tribe, but she is also familiar with Silozi and English. She had 2 years of teaching experience in teaching English as a second language to Grade 4 at the time of the study. This teacher had a lesson plan. The lesson went as follows:

Teacher: All the things we have named are names of things. *Ki mabizo a (Lozi: these are names)*. They are names of things. So what is the name of a thing? That word we use to describe the name of a person, the name of a place, and the name of an object—what is that word?

Pupil: Noun

Teacher: In our previous lesson, we said a noun means a name, *libizo lasika (Lozi: name of a thing)*. Wherever you see this word ‘noun,’ it’s referring to the name of an object, the name of a person, or the name of a place. Ok.

Pupils: [agree in chorus] Yes

Teacher: So, for today we are going to talk about the ‘countable and uncountable nouns.’ Forget about the table at the end; I just want us to focus on the word ‘count’ first. What does the word count mean? *Linzwi leo ‘count’ litalusañi? (Lozi: What does the word count mean?)*. [She points at one learner to answer the question]. Yes, X.

Pupil X: *Kubala (Lozi: reading/count)*

Teacher: Does the word count mean reading?

Pupils: Yes, No [In chorus with confusion, some agree, while others disagree.]

Teacher: Is it yes or no?

Pupils: No [In Chorus]

Teacher: Ok, what does the word count mean in Silozi? *Linzwi leo ‘count’ litalusañi mwaSilozi? Count kiñi? (Lozi: that word, count, in Silozi. What does it mean? What is to count?)*

Pupils: ‘*Ki kubala*’ (Lozi: Is to count/read) [In chorus]

Teacher: Count mean *kubala* [writes on the chalkboard]. So when we say countable and uncountable, we mean countable means things that we can count. *Lika zelukona kubala, sha! Nautwahala? (Lozi: things we can count, ok! Is it clear?)*

Pupils: Eni (yes) [Agreement].

Teacher: [Explains in detail and asks learners to give examples of countable nouns]. When we talk about countable, it means *like zelukona kubala, sha! (Lozi: Things that we can count)* and uncountable are things that we cannot count. So we said count means *kubala* in Silozi. So countable nouns mean names of things that we can count easily,

mabizo elukona kubala kabunolo, and uncountable means the things that we cannot count. If we start counting now, it will take us forever. So, that is the difference between countable and uncountable nouns. We said countable are names of things we can count, and uncountable are names of things we cannot count. **Cwale hanu nisaka kuti munihe mazina azintu zituola kubala** (Subia: *So, now I want you to give me names of things we can count.*).

Pupil: Apples.

Teacher: Apples, good. If we were to bring a bag of apples, it was going to be easy for us to count the apples. What else? [She points at one learner.] Yes, X.

Pupil: Oranges

Teacher: Yes [She points at another learner].

Pupil: Bananas

Teacher: Good. Now can I have the names of things we cannot count? *Lika zelusakoni kubala, ki likamañi zani?* (Lozi: *Things we cannot count, which are those?*). **Zintu zitusaoli kubala njezihi zina?** (Subia: *Things we cannot count, which are those?*). [She points at one learner and mentions her name].

Pupil X: Sugar

Teacher: Sugar. Can we count sugar? I have sugar here. Tell me how many grains of sugar are in my hands. What else?

Pupil: Water.

Teacher: Can we count water? Let us count how much water there is as I pour this water out. So you must know that for all the grains, they are uncountable. **Magrains onse katuoli kuabala cingi awambwa kuti ma** uncountable nouns (Subia: *All grains cannot be counted; that is why they are said to be uncountable nouns*). We cannot count them. And all the liquids, be they water, milk, petrol, or honey. All the liquids cannot be counted. Lukona feela kulibala halibeilwa mwamabotela, kamutala lukona kubulela kuli mabotela amabeli amezi. (Lozi: *We can only count them when they are packaged in bottles. For example, we can say two bottles of water. So we are only counting the bottles, not the water.*

5.4.7 Lesson 5: Grammar Lesson (Topic: Plural and Singular Nouns)

This teacher did not have a lesson plan, as she explained that she had submitted it in the preparation file to the supervisor for checking. Thus, she taught her lesson without one. The lesson was presented at an urban school. The class had 48 learners in attendance. The familiar languages that the learners spoke were Subia (dominant), Silozi, Sifwe, Totela, Yeyi, Oshiwambo, and English. The teacher is Subia by tribe, but she is also familiar with Silozi and

English. She had 4 years of experience in teaching English as a second language. The lesson went as follows:

Teacher: What does the word singular mean? Nouns are names given to people; now, what about this singular? What does it mean? Anyone to try? Yes.

Pupil: It means one thing.

Teacher: Thank you very much. Ok, singular means one. What does it mean?

Pupils: One (in chorus)

Teacher: We are talking about one thing. So, when we are talking about singular nouns, we are talking about names that mean only one thing, *kwautwahala?* (Lozi: *Is it clear?*). Do you understand? We are talking about nouns in singular, just one thing. Do you understand?

Pupils: Yes [in chorus]

Teacher: Ok, from the examples that you have given me, like the table. How many tables are we talking about here?

Pupils: One [in chorus]

Teacher: It's just one, so it's a singular noun. Do you understand? The paper is singular. We move on to plural. What does it mean? In singular, we said we are talking about one thing. What about plural nouns? [Points at one learner].

Pupil: More than one.

Teacher: Okay, that's very good. Here, we are talking about more than one thing. If we talk about one table, we are talking about more than one table. Do you understand? *Shaa?* So, if we say it in Silozi, we will say ki *buñwi ni*?

Pupils: *Buñwi ni buñata* (Lozi: *Singular and plural*).

Teacher: *Buñwi ni buñata* (Lozi: *Singular and plural*), I don't know if you have done that in Silozi, but we are talking about singular and plural nouns. *Buñwi ni buñata* (Lozi: *Singular and plural*). So, *fa* (Lozi: here) it is going to be Table, *fa* (Lozi: here) Tables. Do you understand?

Pupils: Yes [in chorus]

Teacher: Ok, now, there are rules when we want to change nouns from singular to plural that we should follow. So, for most nouns like these, table, paper, and many

others, you just add an -s at the end to make them plural. So, a table in the plural is going to be...? Yes, X.

Pupil: Tables

Teacher: Correct, and paper? X, what is the answer?

Pupil: Papers:

Teacher: Correct. [Selects a few learners to write the plurals of some selected words on the board following the given rules.]

5.4.8 Lesson 6: Reading Comprehension Lesson (Reading a Chart)

This teacher explained that she had planned but submitted the lesson plan in the preparation file for monitoring to the supervisor. The lesson was presented at a rural school by a female teacher, and the class had 28 learners in attendance. The familiar languages that were represented in this class were Silozi, Totela, and Subia. The teacher is Totela by tribe, but she is also familiar with Silozi and English. She had 12 years of teaching experience in teaching English as a second language to Grade 4 at the time of the study. The lesson went as follows:

Teacher: Look at the words written on the board. Can you pick one of these words and use it in a sentence? *Halunope kwamanzwi a, luasebelise mwapulelo* (Lozi: *Let's pick from these words and use them in sentences*). Yes, X.

Pupil This is my book.

Teachers: Very good. Who else wants to try? *Ki mañi yomuñwi yabata kunopa manzwi faale nikuabeya mwapulelo? Halulike lusike lwasaba* (Who else wants to pick words and use them in a sentence? *Let's try; let's not be shy.*

Pupil: The look

Teacher: *Muutwile monibulelezi?* (Lozi: *Did you hear what I said?*) Do you see all these words? They can be used in more than one sentence. So I want you to choose just one word. For example, what is this word?

Pupils: Book

Teacher: Ehee! Book, *alusebelise book mwa sentence, mwalipulelo*. (Lozi-English: Let's use the word book in a sentence.).

Pupil: My book.

Teacher: *Ehe! Yomuñwi (Lozi: Yes, Another one). Nibulela book, eh! Book mwaSilozi ki sikamañi? (Lozi: I am referring to the word book. What is a book in Silozi? Pupi*

Ki buka (It's a book) [in chorus]

Teacher: *Ehe! Ki buka, cwale aluisebelise mwalipulelo, nikufile mitala kuli*, this is my book, where is my book, whose book is this one? Eh, yes. *(Lozi: Good, it's a book, so now let's use it in sentences. I have given you examples that...*

Pupil: The book is mine.

Teacher: Good. You have all done well. Now, let's look at the chart on the chalkboard. The chart shows you the number of learners and names and the activities they liked. So now, let's go to Taimi. What does Taimi like? [Points at one learner].

Pupil X: Running.

Teacher: Running. Is it only running?

Pupils: And reading.

Teacher: Ehe, running and reading. Let's go to John. What does John like? Yes, X.

Pupil X: Soccer.

Teacher: Soccer, aha! What else does John like?

Pupils: Are quiet.

Teacher: Are we together? *Mwautwa sesiezaha? (Lozi: Do you understand what is going on?)* What does John like? Besides soccer, what else does he like?

Pupil: Running

Teacher: *Aha, Alufe likalabo kaufela luna. X (Lozi: Good, let us all give answers).*

Pupil X: Arts

Teacher: He likes arts. *Sesiñwi salata ki sikamañi? X. (Lozi: What else does he like?)*

Pupil X: Reading

Teacher: Aha! Looks like John likes everything. Alright, now can we read the questions on the board? Yes, X, number 1.

Pupil X: How many learners are on the chart? [Reads the questions on the board.]

Teacher: How many learners are on the chart? [Repeats reading the question]. Here, you count them and write the number for me. Number 2. X, can you read to us question number 2?

Pupil X: keeps quiet.

Teacher: Can somebody read us question number 2?

Pupil X: What is everybody in the chat good at? [Reads the questions on the board.]

Teacher: What is everybody on the chat good at? *Fo senibata ki sakuli mutalime kuli kisikamañi sesitabelwa ahulu kibabana kaufela, kamutala mutalima mwa soccer*, are we together (*Here I want you to look at all the activities and tell me which one is liked most; for example, look at soccer.*). What is everybody in the chat good at? Which of these activities is liked by everyone? Meaning there is a tick under that column. Do you understand?

Pupils: Yes [in chorus].

5.4.9 Lesson 7: Listening Comprehension (Taimi's Family)

This lesson was presented at an urban school. In this lesson, the class had 48 learners in attendance. The familiar languages that the learners spoke were Subia (dominant), Silozi, Sifwe, Totela, Yeyi, Oshiwambo, Khoekhoewab, and English. The teacher was Mbalangwe by tribe, but she is also familiar with Silozi and English. She had 23 years of teaching experience in teaching English as a second language. The teacher had no lesson plan; she had submitted it in the preparation file for monitoring. The lesson went as follows:

Teacher: Today you are going to listen to a story; after listening, you are going to answer the questions. So, you are asked to listen attentively. After listening to the text, you are going to answer the....

Pupils: Questions (in chorus)

Teacher: This is the title of our story. Who can read this title?

Pupil: [Reads], Taimi's family.

Teacher: Good, Taimi's family. We are going to read about Taimi. Can we all read this title?

Pupils: Taimi's family' [in chorus]

Teacher: We all have families, but now we must find out what is happening in Taimi's family, not your family but Taimi's family. Ok, first we must understand the questions, then I will read the story, and you are going to answer these questions. Look at the chalkboard; these are the questions you are going to read. You must understand the questions before you listen to the text. Who can read the first question for us? Yes, girl [points at one learner].

Pupil: How many children are in Tami's family?

Teacher: Good, how many children are in Taimi's family? Everybody.

Pupils: How many children are in Taimi's family? [In chorus]

Teacher: If we say, 'How many,' we mean *Ki babakai? (Lozi: How many?)* You must understand that one. In Taimi's family, family means *lubasi (Lozi)*. How many children are in Taimi's family? You must understand how many, and the word children *ki banana (Lozi)*, family *ki lubasi (Lozi)*. How many children are in Taimi's family? *Ki banana babakai babainzi mwalubasi lwa Taimy? (Lozi)*. If they talk about how many, we need a number of the children in Taimi's family. So, you must give a number here; we don't need names but a number. Do you understand?

Pupils: Yes (in chorus)

Teacher: If they are 20, you have to say 20 children; if they are 8, after listening, you'll know how children are in Taimi's family. Number 2. Who can read question number 2 for us? Yes [points at another learner].

Pupil: Where do Taimi and her family live?

Teacher: Where do Taimi and her family live? Where do they live? *Bapila kakai? (Lozi)*. Do they live in Greenwell Matongo? Do they live in Choto? After listening to the text, you will know where this family lives. *Bapila kakai? (Lozi)* Number 3. Who can read number 3 for us? Stand up and try, just try. [Points at another learner].

Pupil: What does Taimi like doing?

Teacher: Ehe, but you did want to raise your hand. What does Taimi like doing? Do you understand that question?

Pupils: Yes [in chorus]

Teacher: *Taimi salata hahulu kuesa sikamañi sani? (Lozi: What does Taimi like doing?)* After listening to the story, you will understand what Taimi likes doing. You can compare what Taimi likes doing with yourself. What do you like doing? Yourself, what do you like doing when you are at home? Yes.

Pupil: Playing soccer

Teacher: Good. You?

Pupil: Doing homework.

Teacher: Ok, after listening to the story, you will hear what Taimi likes doing. The last question. Umh! [Points at another learner.]

Pupil: Why is Taimi's brother in a wheelchair?

Teacher: Why is Taimi's brother in a wheelchair? There's a member of Taimi's family who is in a wheelchair. After listening to the story, you will find out why that person is in that wheelchair. What happened to him so that he is in a wheelchair? We will find out after listening to the story. Those are our questions. Do you understand the word wheelchair? Do you know what a wheelchair is?

Pupils: Yes [in chorus]

Teacher: Ok, wheelchair *ki sipula sani sakukasha kwasipatela kwani mokuina mukuli haiba mwasibonanga* (Lozi: a wheelchair is that chair they push a patient at the hospital if you have seen it). So, those are our questions. Now we are going to listen to the story.

5.4.10 Lesson 8: Reading Comprehension (Reading Instructions)

The teacher taught this class without a lesson plan; she claimed that she had submitted her preparation file that contained the lesson plan to the supervisor for checking. The lesson was presented at a rural school, and the class had 55 learners in attendance. Learners were familiar with Sifwe, Thimbukusku, and Silozi. The teacher is Subia by tribe, but she is also familiar with Silozi and English. She had 10 years of teaching experience in teaching English as a second language. The lesson went as follows:

Teacher: In today's lesson we are going to read about instructions. Are we together?

Pupils: Yes [in chorus].

Teacher: Instructions, what is an instruction? What are the instructions? Halloo! Instructions, *ki litaelo, shaa! Litaelo* (Lozi: They are instructions, ok, instructions). An instruction is something that tells you to do a certain thing. Are we together?

Pupils: Yes [in chorus].

Teacher: So, we are reading instructions about... Now who can tell us, what is the title of the text? What is the title of the text we are reading about today? Yes, X. [Points at one learner and mentions her name].

Pupil: How to plant a tree [Reads on paper].

Teacher: How to plant a tree. *Yakalutolokela yona toho yata, italusañi?* (Lozi: The title explains itself; what does it mean?) How to plant a tree? What do you understand by the title How to Plant a Tree? *Shaa! Yakalutaluseza yona, hamuiutwi?* (Lozi, it explains itself; don't you understand it?)

Pupils: *Lwautwa* (Lozi: We understand) [in chorus].

Teacher: *Shaa!* [Probing].

Pupils: *Lwautwa* (Lozi: We understand) [in chorus].

Teacher: *Mwautwa?* (Lozi: Do you understand?).

Pupils: *Eni.* (Lozi: Yes Agreement).

Teacher: *Munitolokele kona nikalumela kuli mwautwa. Itolokañi,* how to plant a tree? X (Lozi: Explain to me that is when I will believe that you understand. What does how to plant a tree mean? [Points at one learner by mentioning his name].

Pupil: *Mokucalelwa licalano.* (Lozi: How to plant plants).

Teacher: *Mokucalelwa licalano, Shaa!* (Lozi: How we plant plants). The title of the text is How to Plant a Tree, *Mokucalelwa koo.* (Lozi: How to plant a t...)

Pupils: *Kota* (Lozi: Tree) [in chorus].

Teacher: *Mokucalelwa kota, tukotanyana totuswana inge* (How to plant a tree, small plants like), mango tree, guava tree, and lemon trees. How are we supposed to plant them? Now when we look at the text, we are given steps. We are going to read the steps on how to plant a tree. How many steps are in the text? When you look at this text, how many steps are in there? Yes, X. [Points a learner by mentioning her name].

Pupil: There are 9 steps.

Teacher: 9 steps, shaa! Are we all together?

Pupils: Yes [in chorus].

Teacher: Can you see where the numbers are written?

Pupils: Yes [in chorus]

Teacher: Yes, there are 9 steps in the text. Can we now read step 1?

5.4.11 Lesson 9: Literature Lesson (Poem: If he hits you)

This teacher taught this class without any lesson plan. She explained that the lesson was a repeat, there was no need to prepare again, and thus she did not prepare one. This lesson was presented at an urban school. In this lesson, there were 48 learners in attendance. The familiar languages that the learners spoke were Subia (dominant), Silozi, Sifwe, Totela, Yeyi, Oshiwambo, and English. The teacher is Lozi by tribe, but she is also familiar with English. The lesson went as follows:

Teacher: We looked at a poem in the previous lessons last term, and we talked about different elements that make up a poem. These elements might also be asked in the final exam, so you need to know them. What is the title of the poem? Do you know what a title is?

Pupils: Yes [in chorus].

Teacher: *Title kiñi?* (English-Lozi: what is a title?). *Mwa Silozi title kiñi?* (Lozi: In Silozi, what is a title?)

Pupils: [in chorus] *Toho yalikande* (Heading of the story)

Teacher: *Ehee! Teleza, Lukatalima fatoho yamukanga wani. Kibabañata babasakumbangi nto yani. Puzo kikuli, what is the title of the poem? Hababuza title, kitoho yamukanga, ki yona yotokwa kuziba. Kuutwahezi?* (Lozi: Good! Listen, we are going to look for the title of that poem. Many of you always miss this. The question is, what is the title of the poem? When they ask about the title, it's the heading of the poem that is what you ought to know. Is it clear?)

Pupils: Yes [in chorus].

Teacher: Are you going to forget that?

Pupils: [in chorus] No

Teacher: Ok, so what did we say a title is?

Pupil: *Ki toho ya likande.* (It is the heading of a story.)

Teacher: *Kana kitoho yalikande.* (Lozi: Is it the heading of a story?)

Pupils: Eni [Agreement]

Teacher: *Batili, ki toho yamukanga, luambola kazamukanga fa.* (Lozi: No, it's a title of the poem; we are discussing a poem here). Poem *kiñi*? (English-Lozi: What is a poem?)

Pupils: *Ki mukanga* (It's a poem) [in chorus]

Teacher: So when you look at the board, what is the title of our poem? Let us all read.

Pupils: If he hits you [read in chorus].

Teacher: Good, who is going to read the first stanza? Anyone. Please, we are learning how to read also. So can someone read for us? Ok, she is going to read. [Points at one learner].

Pupil: [Reads to the whole class aloud].

Teacher: Um, the second stanza, who is going to read? [She points at another learner].

Pupils: [Reads to the whole class].

Teacher: Ok, so the poem says, if he hits you, hit him back, is that right?

Pupils: [In chorus] No.

Teacher: Alright, why do you say it is not right?

Pupil: Because you will get in trouble with parents and teachers.

Teacher: Another one?

Pupil: It is not good because she will get injured.

Teacher: Yes, you.

Pupil: It's not good to hit someone because it's painful.

Teacher: Reads the poem aloud twice to the whole class. So, what is the title of the poem?

Pupil: If he hits you.

Teacher: How many stanzas does the poem have? Do you know the stanzas?

Pupils: Yes

Teacher: Stanza, *kizani zeswana ni lifiha mwapina. Hamukatalima famukanga, sifiha sapili kisona selubiza kuli stanza mwamukanga.* (A stanza is like a paragraph in a song. When you look at the poem, the first paragraph is what we are referring to as a stanza in a poem. So, how many stanzas does the poem have?

Pupil: 2

Teacher: Good, it has two stanzas. Now, who is the poet? Poet, *ki muñoli wamukanga. Kono cwale uswanela kuziba kuli poet italusa muñoli wa muuna mwasikuwa mi poetess ki musali, kwautwahala?* (Lozi: A poet is the writer of the poem. However, you must know that a poet is a male writer in English, while a poetess is a female. Is it clear? So who is the poet?

Pupil: John Foster.

Teacher: Kana muñoli yo ki muuna kamba musali? (Is this writer male or female?)

Pupils: Ki muuna (Lozi: He is male).

5.4.12 Lesson 10: Grammar (Reflexive pronouns)

This lesson was presented at a rural school by a male teacher who had one year of teaching experience. He spoke Silozi as his mother tongue. The class was composed of 38 learners in attendance. The familiar languages that the learners spoke were Totela (dominant), Subia Silozi, and English. The teacher did not have a lesson plan. Here is how the lesson went:

Teacher: Reflexive forms of pronouns are some of the pronouns that we use to stand in place of a noun. These types of pronouns are used when the subject is the same as the object. We also need to understand what a subject and object are. What do you understand by the two words subject and object?

Pupils: Quiet

Teacher: Alright, I see that we don't know. So, a subject is something or a thing that performs an action. For example, I am writing on the board. In this sentence, I (me) am the subject because I am the one doing the action, writing. Okay. The object is the thing that receives the action. In Silozi *ki Sieza ni siezwa kapa muezi ni muamuheli wakezo* (Lozi: ...it's a subject and object or the doer and receiver of the action). Let's go back to the example we gave earlier. What is the thing that is receiving the action? *Kisikamañi sesi amuhela kezo?* (Lozi: What is receiving the action?). What am I writing on? X, what is the answer?

Pupil X: the board.

Teacher: Good, so in our lesson, when the subject and object are the same, it means that the action comes back on the thing that did it. For example, she hurt herself. In this sentence, the action hurt goes back to her. So the reflexive pronoun is?

Pupils: herself [in chorus]

Teacher: Very good. So, singular reflexive pronouns end with -self, like in the first three statements on the board, a, b, and c. What are the answers? X

Pupil X: myself, herself, and himself.

Teacher: Excellent, and plural reflexive pronouns end with -selves, like the sentences in d and e on the board. X, give us the answers.

Pupil X: Ourselves, themselves.

Teacher: Very good. Now let us look at the other examples written on the board. John is looking at... What will be the reflexive pronoun? In this sentence, I did not use a pronoun but put a noun. *Fasibaka saliyemeli nibeile fateni* noun (Lozi: *In the place of a pronoun, I put a noun*). So there's a pronoun that is supposed to be here; let us find the pronoun first. What pronoun can we put here? Instead of John, can we say?

Pupil: He.

Teacher: We can say, He [writes on the board]. Now let us look at the reflexive pronoun. What reflexive pronoun can we put here? [He points at a learner and mentions her name].

Pupil X: Himself.

Teacher: [writes on the board] John is looking at himself. Let us have another example, [writes on the board] Zita and Ronnah are talking to. Let us work out the pronoun first; we have Zita and Ronnah. This is plural; there are two people involved, plural *ki mwabuñata, ki batu babañata* (Lozi: *plural means many*). So, then what pronoun are we going to use in the place of these two names, Zita and Ronnah? We say...? [He points at one learner].

Pupil X: They

Teacher: They [writes on the board], they are two, so we say 'they'. So what is going to be the reflexive pronoun? Reflexive pronoun *ikaba ifi cwale foo?* (Lozi: What will be the reflexive pronoun?) [He points at a learner and mentions her name].

Pupil X: Themselves.

Teacher: Themselves [writes on the board]. Zita and Ronnah are talking to themselves. Do we have any questions?

Pupils: No [in chorus].

Teacher: We said we use reflexive pronouns when the subject and the object are the same. The action is being done to the subject. We said earlier that ‘I am cleaning myself. It’s me; I am the subject, and I am still the object. *Kina sieza hape kina siezwa* (Lozi: *I am the subject and still the object*). So *sieza* (Lozi: *subject*), it’s I, and then *siezwa* (Lozi: *object*), *koiya kezo yeo* (Lozi: *where the action is going*). I am cleaning, *cwale* cleaning *yeo iya kai?* (Lozi: *So where does that cleaning go?*) *Koo siezahala* (Lozi: *where it happens*). Where the action is being done. I am cleaning myself. I am still the object. So that’s where we use reflexive pronouns. We also said that at the end of the pronoun we add –self when it is singular and add –elves when they are many. Let us look at another example [writes on the board]. We are mumbling within. We are mumbling, *lusweli kuno shobotashobota* (we are whispering/mumbling). We are mumbling within; the pronoun here is given already. Someone give us an answer.

Pupil X: Ourselves.

Teacher: Good, ourselves, [writes on the board]. We are mumbling within ourselves. Now I want you to identify and write the correct reflexive nouns in the sentences on the task I handed to you just now. It’s an individual work.

5.5 What factors affect teachers’ implementation of translanguaging in multilingual grade classrooms?

The implementation of translanguaging in grade 4 classrooms is particularly crucial since this stage marks the transition from learning to read and write in a primary language to acquiring more complex literacy skills across subjects. Understanding the factors affecting the successful implementation of translanguaging can help teachers develop effective teaching strategies that accommodate multilingual learners. The findings of the study pointed to major factors engendering and constraining the full integration of translanguaging. Thus, the first set of data presents the factors that facilitate or support its effective implementation. The second set of data will be a presentation of factors that hinder or limit the successful implementation of translanguaging. Below is the data presented under two separate subheadings, starting with factors promoting translanguaging implementation and later factors limiting successful translanguaging implementation:

5.5.1 Factors Promoting the Implementation of Translanguaging

Factors promoting translanguaging refer to various elements and conditions that contribute to creating an environment where the utilisation of multiple languages is encouraged and supported in the multilingual grade 4 classroom. The following were the factors that supported the implementation of translanguaging:

5.5.1.1 Learners' Low Mastery of the English Language

Teachers stated that learners lacked background knowledge of the English language, which is the language of teaching and learning in grade 4. Respondents explained that some learners could not speak English, and this challenge was more prominent in rural areas. Teachers added that most learners, particularly in rural areas, had no televisions as compared to their counterparts in urban areas, where they could learn the language when watching their programs. Most of them came from communities where the dominant language of communication was an indigenous Namibian language, such as Subia, Fwe, Totela, Yeyi, etc. Thus, most learners were more familiar with their home language than with English and Silozi. Such learners spoke their familiar languages even when they went to school. Respondents further mentioned that when such learners were asked to speak in class, they resorted to keeping quiet since they could not express themselves in English while some would respond in Silozi. The teachers explained that this lack of English background knowledge meant that they were compelled to use translanguaging since learners would not understand if they stuck to English exclusively. Here are some of the selected responses recorded:

T5: Lack of English background, which leads them to mispronunciation of words and shyness in expressing themselves.

T6: The background of the learners, you will find that, in the junior primary, learners are used to their mother tongue, so when they transition to English medium in Grade 4, these learners completely don't understand anything.

T7: One of the reasons I use translanguaging, is their lack of English background, it becomes easier to relate the concepts or what is being taught,

HOD4: Learners here in the rural areas lack exposure to English. Compared with their counterparts in town, those are exposed to people who speak English, even at home they listen to cartoons on TV and phones, but here those are rare. So, learners in rural areas are different from urban learners. So, the teachers will have no choice but to use different languages to help these learners.

HOD6: *Learners are not exposed to the English language vocabulary, so they lack basic vocabulary, and this creates a challenge for them to understand. So, you will find that teachers will go to the extent of using vernacular language. The background of these learners is below average; they are mostly influenced by their vernacular languages, not even Silozi which they learn at school. So, they can only engage when it's an English lesson, but most of the time they speak their dialects.*

5.5.1.2 Teachers' Judgement of their Learners as being of 'Poor Quality'

Another factor mentioned in the study was the learners' lack of thorough preparation in the early grades. Some respondents stated that learners in the junior primary are not adequately prepared for the senior primary. Thus, teachers in the senior primary translanguage support their learners. This is what they said:

T9: *For me, these learners are not adequately prepared in the junior primary because most times they learn in their mother tongue. So, the delay of English introduction in that phase contributes to learners' poor English command, especially here in the rural areas... This also influences us as teachers to mix languages with the hope that learners will improve their language.*

HOD2: *The learners in the junior primary are not well prepared for the senior primary because of class teaching. You will find that some junior primary teachers are not fully qualified as they are still studying, so they sometimes struggle in these grades. When learners go to upper primary, where they are required to use English, learners will struggle, and the teachers in the upper primary will be forced to code switch to help these learners...*

5.5.1.3 Overcrowded Classrooms

Another factor prompting translanguaging is the overcrowding of learners in classrooms, which was against the policies and staffing norms. This, according to some HODs, influenced the integration of translanguaging by teachers to reach out to all learners, particularly those who had challenges in the classrooms. Consider the extract below:

HOD2: *The staffing norm does not correlate with the policy ... The teacher-learner ratio should be 1:35, but that is not the case in our school. So, this affects the teacher; as a result, the teachers cannot attend to individual learners' needs in the target language, particularly those who might face challenges. As a result, the teacher uses both the mother tongue and English intending to help these learners because they might understand better in the mother tongue.*

5.5.1.4 Implementation of the Double Shift School System (Platoon System)

The operation of a platoon school system where some learners attend the morning sessions while others in the afternoon contributed to the implementation of translanguageing. The participant mentioned that teachers do not have time to attend to individual learners' needs; hence, they deploy translanguageing to help such learners during lessons. The HOD said the following:

***HOD2:** We do operate a double shift schooling here at our school, we do not have time for extra classes and remedial teaching to assist struggling learners... We need to accommodate the junior primary who comes in the afternoon. So, there is no time to address all the needs, and due to this system, our periods are also reduced to 35 minutes. So, the teachers use translanguageing to help learners in the little time they have since they do not come back in the afternoons...*

5.5.2 Factors Constraining the Implementation of Translanguageing

Constraints of translanguageing, on the other hand, are factors that impede its effective implementation in multilingual grade 4 classrooms. The following were the factors that limited the successful implementation of translanguageing:

5.5.2.1 Inadequate Teacher Training and Support

Some teachers stated that the absence of appropriate teacher training was one of the factors that hindered the implementation of translanguageing. The teachers felt that they lacked the necessary skills, understanding, and confidence to efficiently integrate translanguageing practices into their teaching. Thus, they mentioned that their integration of translanguageing was minimal as they struggled to navigate the complexities of incorporating multiple languages in their classrooms. The teachers said the following:

***T1:** We as teachers are not trained on these ... I think this is why we are struggling in these classes, especially grade 4 ... We need to adjust our teaching practices to accommodate approaches like translanguageing for grade 4 learners... I would love to undergo that training, especially for grade 4 teachers, if it comes.*

***T2:** Like I said earlier, I don't know what translanguageing is, and I have not received any training. At the workshops we attend, they don't talk about such strategies, and I hope that this study will help us because we are struggling in these classes. Sometimes you find yourself teaching the whole lesson in your mother tongue, which is not appropriate at this level. So, training is important for us teachers.*

5.5.2.2 Monolingual Assessment Practices

Another teacher also mentioned that assessment practices limited the integration of translanguaging because activities in the books, including examinations, are monolingual. Thus, these assessments are designed for one language and neglect the diverse linguistic skills that learners bring to the classroom. Therefore, the traditional assessment methods do not align with translanguaging practices, making it challenging to accurately evaluate learners' understanding and proficiency when they utilise multiple languages. As a result, translanguaging is hindered when assessments do not recognise or value these multilingual abilities. Consider the response below:

T1: I think the other challenge I have is assessment; all the activities in our books, including examinations, are written in one language, which is English. So, I sometimes get mixed feelings on whether to correctly mark my learners' correct answers that are written in Silozi but sound in English when you read them. This is why I need the training, as I said earlier; mostly, I would like to learn how to assess my learners while translanguaging because I think that's where the big challenge is. If you have noticed in class, immediately, I immediately switch; it's like giving them direct answers, so sometimes I am hesitant to use it.

5.5.2.3 Inadequate Knowledge of Translanguaging Pedagogical Practice

The other factor hindering teachers from integrating translanguaging into their lessons is a lack of familiarity with pedagogic practice. Some teachers mentioned that they lacked sufficient knowledge of the pedagogical practice, thus, they struggled to grasp its principles and practical application. This lack of understanding led to uncertainty about how to effectively incorporate it into teaching. Consider the following extracts:

T7: ... I am implementing something that I don't understand...I have no idea, but I just do it my way, although I don't know if I am doing the right thing ... I haven't received any training or workshop to fully understand how it should be implemented.

T4: ... That term is new; I have never heard of it before, so sometimes it's challenging to acknowledge that I use it because I don't know what it is. However, I wish to know more about it...

5.5.2.4 Lack of Availability of Multilingual resources

One of the main constraints mentioned by teachers was the lack of resources for implementing translanguaging in their classrooms. They stated that although they were mandated to implement translanguaging, they did not have the necessary materials. Here are their views:

T2: Our curriculum is primarily in English... It does not allow flexibility for multilingual practice, making it hard for teachers to innovate... We need to adapt it to include multilingual perspectives, but resource limitations stop us from integrating translanguaging.

T10: The language policy requires us to implement translanguaging, but we don't have resources. Without access to multilingual materials, it is challenging to implement translanguaging. These learners have so many languages to offer, but if they don't have the right resources, it limits what we can do.

HOD1: We don't have the required resources to implement translanguaging. Most of the materials we use are in English, and while they may be accessible, they don't reflect the languages the learners speak at home... while we understand the importance of supporting our learners, our budget doesn't allow us to invest in a wider variety of resources.

5.5.2.5 Learners' Resistance of the Target Language due to Lack of Proficiency in the Target Language

Some participants cited learners' resistance to the target language, stemming from a lack of proficiency, as another factor that constrains the implementation of translanguaging. The teachers mentioned that learners were not confident with the target language and, thus, were reluctant to use it in situations and various learning activities where the target language is expected to be used. Consider the following extracts from the teachers:

T2: ... learners just want you to speak Silozi so that they get what you are saying ... When you are codeswitching too much, learners will be using that language as well, even asking for permission; you will hear the learner saying "nikupa sibaka bomuluti" [I am asking for permission teacher.] ... As a teacher, I become hesitant to use my mother tongue, Silozi, in my lessons.

T4: ... learners write English words in their mother tongue in activities and tasks given to them because this is the language they are more familiar with. They are hesitant to use English because they are not proficient in it and are scared to make mistakes.

***HOD3:** So, you will find that learners will write English in Silozi... meaning they write the English word in Silozi. They are more familiar with the mother tongue sounds. Writing is the biggest challenge; they can express themselves, yes, but writing is a problem.*

5.5.2.6 Translanguaging Perceived to be Time Consuming

Some teachers felt that utilising multiple languages disrupts the flow of the lesson and makes it seem less time efficient. Thus, translanguaging was time-consuming as the time allocated to the lesson was not enough. Consider the response below:

***T4:** ... but it's time-consuming for us because everything that you say, you still have to break it down in the language that they understand. So, you will find that we don't finish the lessons on time... I don't have time to translate everything into different languages. I have to cover the curriculum and prepare learners for standardised tests.*

5.5.2.7 Teachers' Low Mastery of Learners' L1

The reluctance to implement translanguaging in grade 4 classrooms also stems from teachers' limited mastery of learners' first language (L1). Some teachers said that they were not familiar with the learners' first languages and hence were reluctant to use them. Thus, to avoid communication challenges and misinterpretations, teachers felt it was appropriate to stick to the policy-recommended languages. The teachers said the following:

***T5:** I am not familiar with learners' languages here, so I cannot use them to help them; that's why we follow the policy and use Silozi since this is the language they have been using in the lower primary. So, I believe they know it much better.*

***T6:** ... I also don't know the learners' mother tongues; I am not good in their languages like Sifwe and Siyeyi, which puts me at a disadvantage. I am unable to assist the learners in their mother tongue so that they understand better, so that's where Silozi comes in.*

5.5.2.8 Learners Lack of Proficiency in the Regional Official Language (Silozi)

Some teachers also mentioned that learners lack proficiency in the regional official language (Silozi). Thus, the proficiency gaps limited learners' ability to effectively use and alternate between languages in the classroom. The teacher mentioned that some learners come from diverse linguistic contexts like Zimbabwe and other regions in Namibia where the regional language is not spoken; this limited the integration of translanguaging.

T5: *Some learners do not understand Silozi, like those from Zimbabwe, and the northern regions here in Namibia find it difficult. So, for those learners who completely do not understand, I ask fellow learners, especially those who speak the same language, to translate or help them explain. I don't know other languages; that's why I base it on English and Silozi, so I might not be able to assist, hence I use other learners to assist them.*

HOD2: *Locally here in town, you may not be able to cater to all learners because they come from different backgrounds. Like the mother tongue we use here at school is not the same as the one they use at home. For instance, apart from the local languages here, we also have learners who speak languages like Oshiwambo, Damara, Rukwangali, and others, especially here in town. So, it is a bit challenging for them to comprehend teachers' translanguaging using Silozi. Even the local learners struggle with Silozi since some of them are not Silozi speakers at home...*

5.5.2.9 Teachers' Negative Attitudes Towards Indigenous Languages

The hesitation to integrate translanguaging in grade 4 classrooms is also influenced by the teachers' negative attitudes towards indigenous languages. Some HODs mentioned that teachers avoid translanguaging because of perceived prestige. Thus, teachers believe that using a second language is more prestigious and aligns better with academic standards. The HOD added that the current language policy limits the use of languages other than the designated languages in the region; hence, other languages are less prestigious. Thus, translanguaging was limited in the classroom.

HOD7: *...one of the challenges preventing teachers from using learners' actual languages in class is the language policy and the teachers' attitudes towards these languages. The language policy here in the Zambezi region refers to Silozi as the mother tongue, and yet it is not spoken by the majority, especially for these young ones. So, when it says mother tongue should be used to support learners in grade 4, it means Silozi, not these other local languages, and teachers adhere to that because it is the recognised national and school language. Also, teachers themselves, I feel less educated and incompetent when they use the local language in their English lessons. So, they try to avoid those languages because they think they are not good for learning English.*

5.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the findings of the study on the teachers' ideologies about translanguaging and its implementation in multilingual grade 4 classrooms in the Zambezi region. These results indicated that teachers hold diverse ideologies towards translanguaging, and this influences how it is applied in their classrooms. In this study, the teachers also

elaborated that different factors enable and constrain the implementation of translanguaging in multilingual classrooms. The findings were presented in line with the research objectives. The next chapter proceeds by presenting the analysis and synthesis of the findings.

CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

6.1 Overview

This chapter presents a discussion of the findings. The study will refer to the literature review and theories presented in the earlier chapters of this study. The analysis and discussion of the findings follow the research questions presented in the previous chapter.

6.2 Teachers' Familiarity with the Language Policy in Relation to Translanguaging

The implementation of translanguaging in schools requires teachers to have a clear understanding of the language policies that govern its use. Research suggests that teachers' knowledge of the language policies is crucial for the effective implementation of translanguaging. Studies have suggested that teachers who were well-informed about the language policy were more likely to integrate translanguaging into their teaching practices (Baker, 2011; García, 2009). Conversely, teachers who were unaware or unclear about the policy may be hesitant to use translanguaging, fearing that it may violate school regulations. Therefore, this objective discusses the findings on teachers' familiarity with the language policy about the integration of translanguaging in the teaching of English in multilingual grade 4 classrooms.

The findings of this study revealed that while most teachers were familiar with the policy about translanguaging, a few were unfamiliar. The study unveiled a paradox where teachers exhibited a clear awareness of the established language policy that advocates for the inclusion of translanguaging practices. However, the same teachers demonstrated limited knowledge of the concept of translanguaging itself. This finding is particularly alarming, given that successful implementation of translanguaging requires teachers to not only be familiar with the policy but also to understand the theoretical underpinnings and practical application of the teaching approach. Nevertheless, those who were familiar indicated that the policy did not restrict them to using English as the sole medium of instruction, especially during the initial stages of transitioning learners to English medium because learners were not familiar with the target language of instruction. They mentioned that policy recommended the integration of translanguaging to assist learners in understanding concepts or content, which they found challenging. However, the teachers also mentioned that given the multilingual nature of the Zambezi region, the language policy restricted teachers to using English and Silozi only when

translanguaging because they were the recommended school languages. This suggests that teachers may fear using other languages in the classroom, believing that it may be a violation of the language policy and could result in repercussions. Consequently, teachers may stick to the prescribed language of instruction and refrain from using translanguaging.

These findings are similar to those of Uugwanga (2023), who reported that the majority of the participants were aware of the language policy for schools in Namibia; they had access to the document either as an individual copy or at the school. Moreover, the findings align with those of Obeng (2020) in Ghana and Ohanga, Odeo, & Abenga (2021) in Kenya, who also reported that teachers were familiar with the policy recommendations and felt that they ought to be free to select the language of instruction based on their particular pedagogical needs. Therefore, when teachers are familiar with language policy regarding translanguaging, they can design instructional strategies that promote language integration. Teachers can promote cross-linguistic understanding, raise learner engagement, and foster a sense of belonging and identity by skilfully leveraging their multilingual resources. Lehman & Welch (2022) established that teachers who knew the language policy had higher self-efficacy levels when teaching English language learners than teachers who did not know a language policy. Therefore, it can be concluded that teachers who are familiar with the policy's goals, guidelines, and expectations are more likely to adopt translanguaging practices in their classrooms. Moreover, when teachers are familiar with the various languages and cultures represented in their classrooms, they can better understand and meet the diverse needs of their learners by integrating culturally responsive teaching practices such as translanguaging. This positively affects the academic success and well-being of the learners as they develop a stronger sense of cultural and linguistic continuity.

The findings on teachers' lack of knowledge about translanguaging conceptualisation are supported by those of Niazi (2022) in the United Kingdom, Bolkvadze (2023) in Georgia, Mungala & Mwanza (2024) in Zambia, and Norro (2024) in Namibia. Niazi (2022) reported that although teachers had a heteroglossic language ideology and an assertive view toward bilingualism, the concept of translanguaging as a new pedagogy was unfamiliar to them. Bolkvadze (2023) pointed out that teachers are hardly familiar with the concept of translanguaging, which eliminates the chance of using it consciously and following the trends blindly becoming a norm. In Zambia, Mungala & Mwanza (2024) found that lecturers at a selected university were not familiar with translanguaging despite the country being

multilingual. This also implies that the prospective teachers graduating from the institution are unfamiliar with the pedagogic practice because they are not trained on how to implement it in multilingual classrooms. Similarly, Norro (2024) in Namibia noted that the notions of ‘multilingual practices’ or ‘translanguaging’ were not familiar to the participants, as they do not figure in curricular documents or in-service training. The disconnect between policy awareness and practical knowledge of translanguaging among teachers raises critical questions about the efficacy of professional development programs and policy implementation. The findings highlight that while policies may outline theoretical principles, mere exposure does not guarantee understanding or competence in application. Thus, while teachers may comply with the language policies established, their lack of awareness about translanguaging risks limiting the effectiveness of these policies in actual pedagogical practices. To support the effective implementation, language policies must be adapted to reflect current linguistic realities. Moreover, the findings indicate the need for continuous professional development training that not only addresses the theoretical aspects of translanguaging but also provides practical strategies for its integration into lesson plans.

However, familiarity with the language policy does not inherently translate to favourable support. Studies have demonstrated that teachers may disagree with language policies in their classrooms for a variety of reasons, including perceived inequalities, ideologies, or personal experience with linguistic discrimination. Mbaka, Peter, & Karuri (2013) established that although Kenyan teachers were aware of the policy, they did not always implement it in the classroom because its objectives were not clearly outlined. Equally, Mungala & Mwanza (2024) pointed out that even with intensive training on translanguaging, some teachers in Zambia can't apply translanguaging pedagogy in the classroom due to the anecdotal ideological assumption that all university learners are proficient in English. In Namibia, Hashoongo (2022) noted that some teachers ignore the policy guidelines and continue to incorporate familiar language (Oshiwambo dialects) to communicate with learners during teaching as they believed that it was not necessary to teach in English because they all belonged to one speech community. This means that despite teachers’ awareness of the language policy in this study, they can still challenge it during actual application in the classroom based on their views, beliefs, attitudes, and ideologies towards other languages. Thus, they can either implement language-in-education policy without question or create new implementational space by creating their policies, depending on their beliefs. Moreover, teachers may feel that the policy does not meet their pedagogical needs. Consequently, they will implement what they perceive

as appropriate language and practices, which may also affect learners. Lenis (2015) found that despite the state's language policy restricting the learners' familiar language use in the classroom, the teacher made use of Spanish (the learners' home language), both to mediate her teaching practices and learners' second language development process, as well as to validate her learners' home language and culture. This implies that teachers as language-in-education policy implementers may not just receive and implement policies because they are from the central state. Instead, they will question and negotiate changes that will not only be beneficial to them but also enhance and mediate learners' learning. In other words, teachers can work towards more equitable educational policies and practices that support learner agency and can open up spaces for multilingual approaches, even within a primarily monolingual language policy (Norro, 2021).

On the other hand, the findings of this study also established that some teachers were not familiar with the language policy. While some teachers were not sure about the policy provisions, others did not know its recommendation regarding translanguaging implementation in grade 4 classrooms. Teachers said that they were not aware of the policy because it was not distributed to them. Some mentioned that they had limited time to read and understand the policies that applied to their work. Others claimed that they did not have time to read the policies because they were busy with lesson preparations and other urgent tasks. Chukwuemeka, Chinwe, & Buba (2023) reported that teachers in the Christian schools in Zaria (Nigeria) were not aware of the language policy stated by the government. Lehman & Welch (2020) emphasise that teachers can be unaware of the language policies in schools, even when there is a formal policy in place. In their study of teachers in English medium international schools, they found that a significant number of teachers reported that their school did not have a formal written language policy. The findings of this study are also in line with Ahmad & Khan (2011), who also found that teachers failed to achieve the policy aims because they lacked awareness of the language policy. Thus, despite the availability of language policies in schools, many teachers lack awareness of their implications. This lack of familiarity may result in monolingual practices that exclude learners from diverse linguistic backgrounds. Therefore, if teachers are not familiar with the language policy, they may not be able to effectively implement translanguaging strategies in their classrooms. This lack of familiarity could lead to confusion and inconsistencies in language use, which can ultimately hinder learner learning and academic success. In other words, a lack of familiarity with the language policy can lead to misperception and inconsistency in its implementation.

The study findings show that institutional challenges, such as lack of policy dissemination, insufficient support, and time constraints, were major contributing factors to teachers' lack of familiarity with language policies. Aleem & Irshad (2021) emphasised that teachers lack awareness of language policy, mainly because it is not accessible. According to Awuor (2019), school managers often assume that teachers will automatically understand and follow policies without clearly stating expectations, leading to misconceptions and confusion. Thus, school leaders may fail to develop a well-defined plan for disseminating information about new policies, resulting in inconsistent or fragmented communication. Therefore, without proper training and guidance from school managers, teachers may struggle to understand the rationale behind the policy or how to incorporate it into their teaching practices, leading to resistance to change and unwillingness to engage with the new language policy. In their study, Probyn et al. (2002) noted that teachers failed to implement the language policy because they did not know the language policy, did not clearly understand the extent of their powers and responsibilities, and lacked experience and expertise in developing their policies. Moreover, they did have support because education department district officials, who might advise schools, also lacked knowledge of the language-in-education policy.

The study findings also suggest that the lack of training and professional development opportunities for teachers is a significant factor in their unfamiliarity with language policies. Many teachers receive little to no training on language policies and multilingual education, leading to a lack of understanding of the benefits of translanguaging and its implementation in their classrooms. This lack of knowledge and expertise can result in teachers feeling overwhelmed and ill-equipped to implement the policy effectively. Sun and Tan (2019) argue that teachers need ongoing training and support to understand language policies and effectively practice translanguaging in the classroom. Without such opportunities, teachers may be unaware of the policy or lack the necessary skills to implement it. This discomfort and reluctance can lead to underutilisation of translanguaging in the classroom. This is consistent with Kombe and Mwanza (2019), who also found that teachers in Zambia were not familiar with the 2013 language in education policy, and as a result, they were not implementing the policy. Chukwuemeka et al. (2023) suggest sensitisation through seminars, workshops, and retraining of teachers on language policy. Teachers' unfamiliarity with the language policy can have significant implications on the implementation of translanguaging in multilingual grade 4 classrooms. One of the main implications of teachers' lack of familiarity with the language policy is limited support for multilingual learners. Teachers who are unaware of a school's

language policy may unintentionally deviate from it if it requires bilingual instruction or the use of a particular language for certain subjects. This may result in uneven instruction delivery, with certain learners receiving instruction that complies with the language policy while others do not. Learners might not have equal access to educational opportunities as a result, which might have an impact on their academic success.

Put in another way, teachers' unfamiliarity with the language policy perpetuates monolingual ideologies and practices within the classroom. In contrast to perceiving multilingualism as an asset to be harnessed, teachers' classroom language policies and practices may regard it as a problem to be solved. As a result, teachers may perceive translanguaging as the use of "broken" or "unprofessional" language, which can result in potential discrimination against learners who participate in this practice. Therefore, the lack of support for translanguaging can also perpetuate social and linguistic inequalities. This means that learners who lack proficiency in the target language might be disproportionately impacted by these policies and might not have equal access to educational opportunities as their monolingual peers. Furthermore, it can impede academic achievement by fostering feelings of discouragement or exclusion, thereby hindering learners' active engagement in the classroom. This not only limits the potential of individual learners but also has broader implications for social and economic equity.

Another implication of teachers' lack of familiarity with the language policy is restrictions on language use in the classroom. In some cases, teachers may enforce a strict monolingual approach, prohibiting learners from using languages other than the dominant one. This can lead to a stifling and oppressive learning environment, particularly for learners who are more comfortable using their mother tongue or a language they are proficient in. The restriction can also limit the resources available to learners, hindering their ability to fully engage in and understand the material being taught. In addition, restrictions on language use may cause learners to feel embarrassed or ashamed of themselves for using their familiar language or for struggling to communicate in the target language. According to García (2009), this could obstruct learning and lead to learners acting out or withdrawing from the classroom. Ultimately, this results in a negative and unwelcoming learning environment for learners who are not proficient in the target language, limiting their ability to reach their full potential.

6.3 Teachers' Ideologies toward Translanguaging Pedagogical Practice

This theme discusses the teachers' ideologies about translanguaging. The data was collected through interviews. The ideologies are discussed under two sub-themes. The first one discusses positive ideologies while the second one will discuss the negative ideologies about translanguaging. This classification was based on the patterns observed during data collection and presentation, which showed that ideologies can either facilitate or hinder the implementation of translanguaging.

6.3.1 Positive Ideologies about Translanguaging

The analysis of the interview data revealed that teachers held a range of positive ideologies about translanguaging. The first sub-theme discusses the positive ideologies held by teachers about translanguaging. These ideologies encompass the beliefs and attitudes of teachers who view translanguaging as a valuable and beneficial practice in the classroom. These ideologies are based on the understanding that translanguaging can facilitate learning and promote language development. The following are some of the key positive ideologies identified in the study:

6.3.1.1 Translanguaging Enhances L2 Learning and Comprehension

Most teachers interviewed expressed strong support for translanguaging as a pedagogical practice. Teachers said that it enhances comprehension and L2 (English) learning. They believed that translanguaging facilitates understanding and reduces language barriers by allowing learners to access and process information in their home languages. Moreover, they said that translanguaging provides opportunities for grade 4 learners to practice and develop their L2 skills by using it as a tool for comprehension and communication. These findings are in tandem with those of Nhongo & Tshotsho (2019) in Zimbabwe, who argued that adopting translanguaging as a teaching method in bilingual classroom contexts aids learners' cognition, thereby enhancing comprehension of concepts better than when only the English language is used in teaching and learning. Hungwe (2019) and Nur et al. (2020) respectively reported that learners' reading comprehension improved significantly and concluded that the translanguaging strategy enhances the reading comprehension of the learners. Nur et al. (2020) found that the learners who learnt reading through the translanguaging strategy had better improvement than the learners who learnt through the translation strategy. Similarly, Robillos's (2023) finding in Thailand revealed a significant difference in participants' listening comprehension performance as manifested by a higher mean score after the translanguaging intervention. Also,

an improvement was shown regarding their L2 learning as manifested in their four listening comprehension activities. This gave Hashoongo (2022) in Namibia the impetus to argue that translanguaging should continue being legalised in schools because it helps learners who struggle to comprehend the subject content and know some sets of vocabulary.

Therefore, allowing grade 4 learners to use their familiar language alongside the target language helps them make connections and transfer knowledge more effectively. Teachers held that by tapping into learners' linguistic resources, they could facilitate target language learning, scaffold comprehension, and create a supportive language environment. Thus, translanguaging has been found to enhance comprehension and second language (L2) learning (Goli, 2023; Chaika, 2023; Hodgson, 2023). In this sense, translanguaging was seen as a pedagogical strategy that promoted access to curriculum content and enabled meaningful engagement. Moreover, these findings show that translanguaging supports the development of critical thinking skills by encouraging learners to compare and contrast ideas across languages, fostering a deeper understanding of concepts and cognitive flexibility. This positive ideology highlights the belief that translanguaging is a powerful strategy for enhancing learners' cognitive development and academic achievement.

6.3.1.2 Translanguaging Develops Learners Vocabulary

Furthermore, the study found that teachers believed that translanguaging was a means of developing and enhancing learners' vocabulary in the classroom. Teachers firmly held the viewpoint that the utilisation of translanguaging permits learners to access their diverse linguistic repertoire and employ words and phrases from multiple languages to aid in the communication of meaning and the acquisition of new vocabulary within the target language (in this case, English). Concurring with this view, Fuster (2022) writes that translanguaging allows learners to access their entire communicative repertoire, including both their first language (L1) and second language (L2), in the classroom. By implication, utilising both languages in harmony helps learners make connections between words and concepts, thus enhancing their vocabulary acquisition. Thus, as learners use their familiar language in conjunction with the target language, they can make connections and relate new information to their existing knowledge. This helps learners retain new vocabulary and grammar more effectively as they can associate it with their prior knowledge (Barragan & Vazquez, 2016). In other words, teachers recognise that learners' L1 can help them understand and make connections between concepts and new vocabulary in the L2. This understanding aligns with

the heteroglossic ideology, which acknowledges that languages are not static entities, but rather, they are in constant dialogue with each other.

In addition, teachers' viewpoints acknowledged that translanguaging helps learners develop a more extensive vocabulary by providing opportunities for word expansion and enrichment. They believed that when learners are allowed to use their L1 in the classroom, they can share and discuss words that may not exist in the L2. This exchange of vocabulary between peers fosters a collaborative learning environment where learners can learn from one another's linguistic resources. As a result, learners are exposed to a wider range of words and expressions and are afforded additional opportunities to practice and reinforce newly acquired words, which contributes to their vocabulary growth and enhances their language learning experience. This was evident in the Wawire & Barnes-Story (2022) study that showed that translanguaging had positive effects on academic vocabulary compared to a traditional monolingual approach, and learners in the translanguaging group had higher scores in academic vocabulary at the end of the program compared to learners in the monolingual group. The findings of this study also align with Galante (2020), who found that learners in the translanguaging group engaged in meaning-making across languages and took an active role in language learning, suggesting that translanguaging may provide engagement in vocabulary learning in ways that monolingual practices may not. According to Nation (2022), using the first language to explain the meanings of foreign or second-language words is highly effective and comprehensible. This means that translanguaging pedagogy, when used effectively, can expand the vocabulary knowledge and memory of grade 4 ESL learners (Hodgson, 2023). In this study, the participants explain that the use of translanguaging helps them enhance their vocabulary skills in English. Thus, the present study argues that integrating the practice of translanguaging during the learning process of L2 learning will be a huge help for the learners for additional clarity and assistance.

6.3.1.3 Translanguaging Bridges the Linguistic Gaps between Home and School

The findings have indicated that translanguaging serves as a critical bridge between home and school environments. The teachers believed that when they incorporate learners' home languages into the classroom, they validate learners' identities and experiences, fostering a sense of belonging. The findings indicate that translanguaging practices facilitate better communication between schools and families, particularly for those who may be limited in their proficiency in the school's dominant language. Teachers noted that when schools adopt a translanguaging approach, families feel more empowered to participate in their children's

education, fostering stronger home-school connections and support systems. Phiri, Chanda, & Mwanapabu (2024) affirm that translanguaging not only facilitates a better understanding of the subject matter but also fosters a sense of cultural identity and pride among learners. They further note that it helps bridge the gap between home and school environments, leading to increased parental involvement in education. In their study (cf. Phiri, Chanda, & Mwanapabu, 2024), they noted the excitement of some parents who were happy that they would be able to help their children with homework since it was in their home language (Kiikaonde) was a sign that a bridge had been created between school and home, thereby enhancing the learners' education. By utilising local languages, teachers can create a supportive learning environment where learners feel empowered to express themselves confidently, ultimately enhancing their overall academic achievement and promoting inclusive education practices.

A study by DeLong (2024) found that when teachers encouraged learners to engage in translanguaging practices, learners reported feeling more confident and engaged in their learning. They experienced less anxiety and were better able to relate classroom instruction to their home lives, creating a more coherent and connected educational experience. Makalela (2019) affirms that setting a translingual tone at the beginning of the lesson opens up a space for learners to relive their home experiences in the classroom, providing a fertile ground for effective learning and teaching. Mabena (2023) notes that when teachers accommodate the learners' home languages, they create a comfortable learning space and set up an appropriate tone for the multilingual learners, a space to see themselves mirrored in the lesson. This means translanguaging embraces their linguistic resources, integrating home languages into classroom instruction. This practice not only nurtures learners' self-esteem but also cultivates a classroom atmosphere where diverse backgrounds are recognised and celebrated. This also implies that teachers create a more inclusive learning environment. This not only facilitated comprehension but also validated learners' linguistic identities, leading to increased participation and engagement in academic activities.

6.3.1.4 Translanguaging Enhance Performance in Assessment Tasks

Further, teachers believed that translanguaging improves learners' performance in assessment tasks. They said that it helped learners to understand the content of the task and its requirements more deeply. The teachers believed that when learners can use their languages to process information, they can make more connections to their prior knowledge and experiences. In addition, they stated that translanguaging allowed learners to express their ideas more clearly,

elaborate their responses, and demonstrate their understanding of complex concepts. Therefore, the teachers believed that by incorporating translanguaging, learners could establish connections between the new information and their pre-existing knowledge, thereby surmounting any language obstacles that may impede their comprehension. Consequently, this empowers them to exhibit their comprehension with greater precision in the context of assessment tasks, ultimately resulting in improved performance. The findings suggest that translanguaging can be a positive pedagogical approach that can help learners learn more effectively. The findings align with Macawile & Plata (2022), who also reported a positive ideology toward translanguaging to help their learners in meaning-making and knowledge construction. They noted that translanguaging is fundamental in supporting the critical thinking and higher-order thinking skills of the learners, particularly in answering “how” and “why” questions in class. According to Macawile & Plata (2022), teachers allowed translanguaging in assessment for learning (formative), but not for assessment of learning (summative assessment). They noted participants were hesitant to allow the use of TL, most especially in reading, writing, and listening activities.

These results agree with those of Li & Zhu (2020) and Gomez & Liang (2021), whose studies showed that learners who were encouraged to use translanguaging in their assessments demonstrated higher academic performance compared to those who were not given this opportunity. The data also revealed that the use of translanguaging helped learners engage in critical thinking and develop a deeper understanding of the subject matter. Additionally, the learners reported feeling more confident and motivated to participate in class activities when translanguaging was utilised. This finding can be compared to the study of Fang and Liu (2020), as it also reveals that translanguaging acts as an instruction reinforcement. Thus, the strategy helps to further clarify any academic instruction through the use of two or more languages. As shared by the participants in the interview, translanguaging is beneficial in classroom activities such as small group discussions, brainstorming activities, generating examples through translation, recitations, and in-class interactions during a graded discussion. It implies that translanguaging encourages learners to participate in various classroom activities because they do not feel obliged to speak the target language only. Instead, they are allowed to use their entire linguistic repertoire, setting aside the defined boundaries of the languages that are being utilised and vice versa (Otheguy et al., 2015).

The findings of this study thus provide evidence for the benefits of translanguaging in improving learners' academic performance and promoting a more inclusive and equitable classroom environment. Therefore, by allowing learners to draw upon their full linguistic repertoires, translanguaging provides them with a more authentic and meaningful learning experience. In assessment contexts, translanguaging empowers learners to demonstrate their knowledge and skills in ways that are both linguistically and cognitively accessible. It reduces the cognitive load associated with translating and allows learners to focus on the content and tasks at hand.

6.3.1.5 Translanguaging Engenders Inclusive Learning

The teachers acknowledged the significance of translanguaging integration in multilingual classrooms in fostering an inclusive learning and supportive classroom environment. Teachers emphasised that translanguaging promotes greater inclusivity in language classrooms by improving comprehension, engagement, and cultural connections. They highlighted that allowing learners to utilise their home languages creates a more supportive and dynamic learning environment where learners' identity is respected and valued as a part of the teaching-learning process. Thus, by incorporating translanguaging into the teaching and learning process, classrooms evolve into more inclusive spaces where every learner feels esteemed and included, leading to higher engagement and motivation. Mahmoud and Galante (2020) echo that providing learners with the chance to share their existing language knowledge and compare it with English transforms the ESL classroom into an inclusive and equitable environment where all learners actively participate in the learning process. They underscored that English can only be successfully learnt when learners' identities are deeply involved in the learning process, and their communicative repertoire is respected and recognised as a fundamental aspect of their identity.

Furthermore, Banda and Mwanza (2020) established that translanguaging promoted a sense of belonging and inclusivity among learners, which led to increased confidence and motivation to learn. According to Deniega & Neri (2024), the impact of translanguaging in creating an inclusive ESL classroom is also rooted in the deep respect for their cultures. The teachers acknowledged the diversity present in their classroom and the varied languages that learners speak, which are generally Silozi, Sifwe, Subia, Yeyi, Totela, Mbalangwe, and Thimbukushu; however, other dialects were also present, such as San languages, Oshiwambo, and Khoekhoegowab. Poza (2019) noted that learners from diverse ethnic backgrounds utilised

translanguaging to navigate cultural differences, effectively bridging their native and host cultures. Macawile and Plata (2022) added that recognising this diversity and differences among learners positively influences their comprehension of broader and varied realities. This acknowledgement can aid learners in grasping concepts and perceiving their learning from a relatable perspective. They also revealed how translanguaging can bridge the gap between multiple languages in the classroom and promote the identity of Namibian culture.

Deniega & Neri (2024) point out that strategies that utilise L1, such as translanguaging and code-switching, are particularly effective in reducing anxiety and enhancing motivation to engage with the material. Thus, by offering learners a sense of security and familiarity, teachers can foster a more relaxed and positive learning environment that encourages active participation and engagement. In that regard, Wei (2023) alluded to the fact that translanguaging pedagogy requires not only a change in practice but also a shift in mindset, challenging teachers and learners to re-examine their roles and identities within the classroom. He reiterated that this approach is critical for fostering inclusion and social justice in linguistically diverse educational settings. Thus, when teachers aim to develop both learners' home language and ESL through translanguaging, learners can enhance their professional and personal growth by recognising their cultural background. This approach offers meaningful opportunities to learn ESL by linking it to their home language and culture. In conclusion, Deniega & Neri (2024) emphasise that employing other languages in the classroom through a translanguaging approach can be highly beneficial as it helps to change the mindsets of both learners and teachers towards achieving inclusivity not only within the classroom but also in broader contexts. This approach is strengths-based, allowing learners to develop deeper knowledge and understanding of the world around them (Deniega & Neri, 2024).

6.3.1.6 Translanguaging Builds Stronger Teacher-Learner Relationship

The study's findings revealed that teachers held a positive view of translanguaging and believed that it fostered strong relationships between themselves and their learners. Teachers stated that incorporating learners' languages into interactions helped them to build rapport with learners and gain a better understanding of their individual needs and experiences. By demonstrating a genuine interest in learners' linguistic backgrounds and cultures, teachers created a sense of belonging and fostered a positive teacher-learner relationship. The findings align with those of Garcia, Sylvan, and Curran (2017), who reported that using translanguaging in their classrooms had a positive impact on teachers' relationships with their learners, and they were able to

establish trust and respect, which, in turn, improved communication and participation in the classroom. Thus, language is not just a tool for communication in the classroom but also a medium for building relationships and creating a sense of belonging. This means that translanguaging allows teachers to connect with learners on a personal level, building trust and rapport. This strong teacher-learner relationship is essential for effective teaching and learning.

Further, teachers in this study mentioned that translanguaging motivated learners to participate more actively in lessons. They said that by allowing learners to use their languages, they empowered them to engage meaningfully in classroom discussions and activities. Thus, learners felt more confident and engaged when they were able to connect their learning to their own linguistic experiences. They believed that integrating translanguaging in the lessons helped their learners feel more confident in their abilities and reduced their anxiety about learning a new language. This finding is in line with the sociocultural theory, which suggests that learners' motivation is influenced by their sense of belonging and identity in the classroom (Vygotsky, 1978). This finding is also consistent with Al Sharaeai (2012), who found that learners who were encouraged to use their L1 in the classroom exhibited higher levels of confidence and were more willing to take risks in using the target language. As pointed out by Andleeb, Salahuddin, & Ajmal (2024), the use of translanguaging positively impacts learner learning and engagement, improves learner-teacher relationships, and promotes a sense of belonging for multilingual learners. This means translanguaging is an effective approach in promoting equitable and inclusive education for multilingual learners and fostering a positive learning environment for all learners. The findings of this study demonstrate the transformative power of translanguaging in the classroom. By valuing and utilising the linguistic repertoires of multilingual learners, teachers can foster positive relationships, enhance motivation, and build confidence. Therefore, embracing translanguaging as a pedagogical approach is an essential step toward creating inclusive and equitable learning environments that support the academic and social-emotional development of all learners.

6.3.1.7 Translanguaging Familiarises Learners with the Target Language

The teachers saw translanguaging as a means to familiarise grade 4 learners with the target language (English) and nurture the acquisition and development of both first and second languages. Teachers said that when learners are allowed to utilise their mother tongue in conjunction with the target language, they can understand and internalise the new language more easily. This familiarity helps learners feel more confident and motivated to continue

learning the language. This finding is in tandem with Wei (2010), who suggested that when translanguaging is integrated into teaching English as a second language, learners can make connections between the structures, vocabulary, and grammar of their familiar language and the target language. It allows them to better understand the target language and acquire new knowledge more quickly. Thus, translanguaging not only familiarises learners with the target language but also enables them to make meaningful connections between their native and target languages. In addition, teachers acknowledged that translanguaging nurtures both first language (L1) and second language (L2) acquisition and development. Thus, it creates a space where diverse languages are viewed as resources, promoting linguistic and cultural diversity (Tai & Wong, 2022). The findings suggest that translanguaging can be an effective strategy for familiarising learners with the target language. By creating a bridge between their existing linguistic knowledge and the target language, translanguaging helps learners to make connections, internalise new concepts, and develop a deeper understanding. It also reduces anxiety, increases confidence, and facilitates communication, creating a more supportive and inclusive learning environment.

Teachers' positive ideologies about translanguaging are aligned with the language orientation theory, specifically the perspective that language is a resource and a right. This viewpoint rejects the prevailing monolingual ideology and asserts that every individual has the right to use and maintain their native language(s) in all aspects of their lives, including education (Ruiz, 1984). As a result, teachers who embrace the translanguaging pedagogic approach consider language to be a fundamental human right and advocate for the inclusion and acknowledgement of all languages in the educational environment (Garcia & Li, 2014). These teachers recognise that language is not merely a tool for learning but rather a vital component of one's identity, culture, and community. They understood that denying learners the opportunity to utilise their native language in the classroom was a violation of their right to education and that it undermined the principles of equity, inclusion, and quality education. Therefore, learners should have the freedom to use their familiar languages without fear of discrimination, and it is the responsibility of the teacher to acknowledge and promote this right. This ideology holds particular importance in the Namibian education context, where some learners' home languages are often stigmatised as inferior to the dominant language of instruction, English. By embracing translanguaging, teachers challenge this discriminatory mindset and create an inclusive learning environment that values and respects all languages. In doing so, teachers play a crucial role in empowering learners and ensuring equal access to education for all.

Furthermore, teachers' positive ideologies about translanguageing mean that learners' familiar language(s) are not impediments to their target language learning and academic progress but rather valuable resources that can be harnessed to support their learning experiences. This perspective aligns with Ruiz's (1984) language as a resource orientation, which underscores the significance and potential of leveraging multiple languages in educational settings. Thus, teachers' positive ideologies about translanguageing acknowledge that learners' multilingualism is an asset, not a deficit, and that it can contribute to their academic success.

This ideology also aligns with the idea of multilingualism as a valuable resource in today's globalized world (Garcia & Wei, 2014). Therefore, the findings of this study contradict the claims made by Arafin (2016) that the presence of multiple languages in a classroom leads to confusion and hinders learners' academic progress due to cognitive overload. The study's findings demonstrate that these notions, influenced by linguistic imperialism and coloniality, do not accurately represent the reality of multilingual classrooms in Africa, specifically in Namibia. Therefore, translanguageing can be utilized to decolonize curricula and foster epistemic justice by encouraging negotiations among different knowledge systems and constructing decoloniality-informed learning ecologies (Song, 2022). The notions of language as bound entities are not only outdated but unrealistic. Instead, languages should be regarded as valuable resources (Ruiz, 1984) that collaborate in constructing meaning during classroom interactions.

Additionally, teachers who embrace translanguageing also recognise the importance of power dynamics in language use within the classroom. They understand that certain languages may hold more social significance than others, and they strive to establish a fair and balanced language hierarchy. This aligns with the heteroglossic ideology, which challenges the dominance of particular languages and promotes linguistic equality. By valuing all languages and language varieties equally, these teachers create an environment that fosters inclusivity and respect for diverse linguistic backgrounds.

6.3.2 Negative Ideologies about Translanguageing

On the contrary, the study established that teachers also held negative ideologies about translanguageing that may hinder its successful implementation in the grade 4 classroom. Negative ideologies encompass the beliefs and attitudes of teachers that hinder the implementation of translanguageing in their classrooms. This section discusses the negative

ideologies held by teachers about translanguaging. These ideologies are based on concerns about the potential drawbacks and challenges associated with translanguaging. The following are some of the key negative ideologies identified in the study:

6.3.2.1 Translanguaging Lowers Target Language Proficiency

One main concern noted by the participants about the implementation of translanguaging was that it limits learners' exposure to the target language (L2). The teachers believe that reduced exposure can hinder the development of fluency, as consistent immersion in the target language is essential for mastering skills in English. Moreover, for the teachers, the frequent use of native language in the classroom as a safety net can lower the confidence and motivation to engage fully and independently with English, impeding the development of necessary language skills for effective communication. As stated by the teachers, learners become reliant on their native language, knowing that teachers will translate for them, which limits their exposure and practice in English. According to Canagarajah (2013) and Ren et al. (2016), translingual practices like code-switching and translation may become a "crutch" for language production, hindering L2 development. Further, agreeing with the teachers' views, Deiga & Neri (2024) highlight that when learners frequently revert to their native language, they miss out on the immersive experience necessary for language acquisition. This limited exposure can slow their progress in developing essential language skills, undermining their overall communicative competence. This reliance on translation can create a comfort zone that impedes learners from pushing their linguistic boundaries and actively improving their English vocabulary and grammar (Thongwicht & Ulla, 2024).

The efficacy of translanguaging is further interrogated when considering its impact on developing communicative competence, allowing learners to gain proficiency. According to Chan and Chou (2022), unconscious switching between languages in class reduces exposure to the target language. Galante (2020) and Makalela (2015) noted that participants expressed concerns that learners would neglect their target language when they used translingual strategies. Thus, when translanguaging is overused, it can prevent learners from being pushed to their limits and fully engaging with the target language (Deniega & Neri, 2024). As far as implementation is concerned, the limitations of translanguaging in ESL classrooms are also evident during activities that require active language use. The teachers explained that mixing languages in writing leads to grammar, punctuation, and style errors, affecting clarity and readability. For the teachers, it was more harmful to the grade 4 learners acquiring their second

language by causing confusion and slowing their progress. The teachers noted that limited use of English results in a restricted vocabulary, as learners are not encouraged to use and practice new words in context. Cenoz & Gorter (2011) pointed out that using L1 resources in L2 writing can interfere with grammatical structures. Constantino (2017) also found that translanguaging hinders writing skill development, as learners rely on literal translations from their L1 instead of expressing their thoughts in the target language. These observations underline the importance of maximising English exposure to enhance vocabulary acquisition and overall language proficiency. Balancing the benefits of translanguaging with the need for English language exposure remains a critical challenge for teachers (Deniega & Neri, 2024).

Nevertheless, the argument is inconsistent because studies have shown that when implemented strategically and appropriately, translanguaging can significantly enhance the second language (L2). Thus, by using elements from both languages, multilingual learners can draw on their existing knowledge and skills to make new connections and learn new concepts. Kiramba (2017) suggests that translanguaging in writing disrupts unequal voices and language hierarchies by transgressing standard ideologies in academic writing. Equally, Akbar and Taqi (2020) noted that learners who practice translanguaging can cultivate confidence and reduce their anxiety, which subsequently activates their ability to process information using all of their language resources. Thus, translanguaging helps bilingual learners to develop their L2 skills more efficiently. However, Thongwicht and Ulla (2024) emphasise the importance of finding a harmonious balance that upholds the benefits of target language exposure while accommodating the linguistic diversity of learners. This balance is crucial for ensuring that learners receive adequate practice in English, essential for their academic and professional success. The goal is to integrate translanguaging strategically, allowing it to facilitate comprehension without compromising the immersive experience necessary for mastering English (Deniega & Neri, 2024).

6.3.2.2 Translanguaging is Time Consuming and Causes Confusion in the Classroom

Teachers in this study expressed negative views about translanguaging, considering it time-consuming and confusing for learners. They believed that it slowed down communication, especially in limited-time instructional settings. Teachers argued that this inefficiency resulted in repeated instructions and explanations, reducing the amount of content covered in class. They indicated that the time spent clarifying contents, communicating, and learning L1 and L2 was lengthier and time-constraining. The teachers believed that the English language classroom was

one environment where learners could have a more absurd opportunity to use and practice English regularly. Thus, exposure to other languages will deter learners from practicing and engaging with the target language. The process of learner engagement is regarded as time-demanding by most teachers, even though it is the standard practice of educating learners (Galante, 2020; Mishra, 2020). Thus, the use of multiple languages in the classroom not only impacts the pace of learning but also causes frustration and fatigue for both teachers and learners. The current challenge links to Galante's (2020) claim that realising the learner's language in class is stressful since the teacher provides learners more time to engage in the lesson, which causes uncertainty. Furthermore, teachers raised concerns that translanguaging, particularly among grade 4 learners, may lead to confusion and misunderstandings. They mentioned that the multilingual nature of the Zambezi region makes it difficult for learners to track the language used and its meaning, which can result in a communication breakdown. Li (2015) highlights that the mixing of languages can make it hard for listeners to understand, while Ismael (2024) notes that constant language switching can lead to disengagement and decreased learning and retention of information. Nyimbili and Mwanza (2020) also found that translanguaging was time-consuming according to the views of the teachers. In this study, teachers considered the integration of translanguaging time-intensive, confusing, and unrealistic in a language learning context like the multilingual grade 4 classrooms.

However, the teachers' views about time constraints and confusion and Galante's (2020) beliefs are based on the monolingual ideology of English language teaching. With monoglossic ideology being promoted, monolingualism is the preferred language teaching method via translanguaging (Galante, 2020; Mishra, 2020; Hungwe, 2019; Jaspers, 2018). I argue in this study that the teachers' beliefs result from a lack of familiarity with translanguaging (cf. 6.2), leading to uncertainty in its use. As a result, they perceive it as a problem and avoid using it altogether or use it in a haphazard and unstructured way, which could lead to confusion and time-wasting in the classroom. Consequently, Hungwe (2019) suggests that addressing the current issue, adapting the curriculum, and teachers' conceptions should be the first step in enhancing English language classes and the effective implementation of translanguaging. The current challenge shows that teachers who view multilingualism as complex will favour monolingualism and perceive translanguaging as a distraction to English language learning.

6.3.2.3 Local Languages have no Educational and Professional value

Furthermore, some teachers believed that local languages had no educational and professional value. They perceived local languages as being limited in scope and lacking relevance to the modern world. They believed that focusing on local languages would distract learners from acquiring English, which they viewed as essential for academic and professional success. Khumalo & Moodley (2023) found that while teachers recognised the importance of African languages, a majority perceived them as lacking relevance in the 21st century, viewing their integration into digital platforms as a "nice-to-have" rather than essential for preparing learners. Consequently, in this study, other teachers emphasised the importance of using English as the main language in education for global success, as the mother tongue may not adequately prepare learners for higher education or the job market. They argued that not all first languages have well-developed terminologies, making it difficult for learners to understand complex concepts and communicate effectively. This lack of precise language could lead to misconceptions, misunderstandings, and shallow knowledge. DeTemple and Kim (2010) pointed out that some languages lack scientific terminology, hindering learners' progress in higher education and limiting their opportunities for academic and career advancement. Therefore, teachers in this study believed that English, as a neutral language, allows for better understanding among learners from diverse backgrounds, fostering unity and national identity. Hence, they supposed that exposing learners to English as the language of instruction from an early age would ensure their success in higher education and future careers.

According to Kadodo & Muzira (2012), local languages are not viewed as useful in fostering the teaching and learning of the English language in Namibia, a belief based on subtractive bilingualism. This notion shows that teachers often prioritise teaching dominant languages like English for academic success, viewing learners' first languages as hindrances rather than valuable resources. This means that teachers view language as a fixed, separate entity, which aligns with the language as a problem orientation. This ideology marginalises home languages and ignores the benefits of translanguaging. Embracing translanguaging can enhance cognitive development, promote cross-cultural understanding, and empower learners by valuing their languages and cultures. This calls for a paradigm shift in language education towards inclusion rather than marginalisation.

6.3.2.4 Translanguaging is Ineffective in Learners' Assessment and Evaluation

Teachers in the study expressed concerns about the potential challenges that translanguaging practices can pose to conventional assessment methods. Teachers mentioned that the use of multiple languages during teaching can make it difficult to effectively evaluate learners' comprehension and mastery of the subject matter. They noted a lack of training in how to effectively assess learners who utilise translanguaging in their responses. Without adequate professional development, teachers may struggle to create assessment practices that genuinely reflect learners' diverse linguistic capabilities. According to Saleem *et al.* (2023), traditional methods, such as written exams and standardised assignments, proved insufficient for capturing the depth of learners' understanding, particularly when multiple languages were involved. Grading a written assignment in English, for instance, often failed to fully encompass the insights shared by learners during discussions conducted in their mother tongues. This experience serves to underscore the potential hurdles presented by the incorporation of translanguaging into standard assessment methods.

According to Deniega & Neri (2024), the integration of home languages into the learning process, while beneficial for oral skills, appears to be less effective when applied to writing. Teachers often refrain from allowing learners to use their native languages in written outputs, focusing instead on English for such tasks. The teachers in this study noted that they do not usually apply translanguaging in written outputs, highlighting the perceived incompatibility of translanguaging with the rigorous demands of written English. Thus, although educational policies require teachers to integrate translanguaging, the school systems and policies often reinforce conventional assessment practices. The institutional resistance to adopting more flexible assessment strategies poses a barrier to the successful implementation of translanguaging in the classroom. Teachers in this study highlighted that although translanguaging is used in verbal interactions and classroom deliberations, learners often struggle to translate these skills into their writing as teachers observed that learners have not achieved proficiency in terms of vocabulary and grammar. This suggests that while translanguaging can aid in immediate comprehension and verbal expression, it does not necessarily translate into long-term improvements in written language proficiency.

Furthermore, the limitations of translanguaging in assessment are evident in classroom practices where teachers often forbid the use of home languages for written assignments. According to Yusri, Huzaimi, and Sulaiman (2022), most participants discourage the use of L1

in group presentations or written tasks, emphasising the necessity of using the target language: English. This stems from a belief that writing in English demands strict adherence to grammatical rules, proper syntax, and accurate orthography (Fang & Liu, 2020) in areas where translanguaging offers little support. Anderson (2022) found that in India, English is predominantly used monolingually in written forms, while spoken interactions often involve a blend of languages. Similarly, Atta and Naqvi (2021) highlighted the difficulties Pakistani learners face in reading and writing, including complex vocabulary, syntax, and grammar. In addition, Yusri, Huzaimi, and Sulaiman (2022) also revealed that translanguaging is suitable for tasks such as group discussion to build up knowledge on the topic discussed, but in terms of language production, such as in writing, the use of English is highly preferred. These findings align with the concerns expressed by ESL teachers about the limitations of translanguaging in enhancing learners' assessment and evaluation.

6.3.3.5 Translanguaging is too Complex to Apply Effectively in the Classroom

Participants in this study perceived translanguaging strategies to be too complex to apply in the classroom. One major concern expressed by teachers was a lack of understanding of what translanguaging entails. This study established that teachers are not sufficiently trained in this pedagogical approach, leading to uncertainty and hesitation when considering its implementation. As a result, teachers felt overwhelmed by the complexities of designing lessons that encourage flexible language use while ensuring that all learners can participate effectively. Teachers expressed frustrations over the absence of guidance within the syllabi for implementing translanguaging. They noted that the syllabi do not explicitly address how to incorporate translanguaging in practical terms. They felt that educational policies often favoured language separation models, which conflicted with their pedagogical intent. Therefore, teachers are left to navigate uncharted waters, often with limited professional development opportunities related to translanguaging. Constantine (2023) noted teachers lack full support from the syllabus to implement translanguaging effectively; they perceive the term translanguaging to be a vague concept, resulting in a vague implementation in the classroom and a preference for primarily adopting an English-only approach. The absence of a clear roadmap can result in uncertainty regarding best practices and effective application in the classroom.

The concern regarding how to use it, the fear of misusing it, or the risk of overusing it can be explained by the fact that neither the 2011 syllabus nor the current syllabus explicitly addresses

the concept of translanguageing in English language classrooms (Constantine, 2023). Despite the Namibian language policy and curriculum document acknowledging the use of translanguageing in grade 4 classrooms, specific guidelines on its implementation or extent are not explicitly mentioned. For example, it is mentioned that translanguageing should not serve as a replacement for English instructions; instead, it should be used in a supportive role to improve English proficiency (MEAC, 2015, 2016). Therefore, it is up to the teachers' judgement to decide to which degree it should be used in the classroom (Constantine, 2023). This raises questions for the teachers trying to follow the syllabus, such as what quantity qualifies as a replacement and what degree constitutes a balanced use. This leads us back to the understanding of translanguageing being perceived as a vague concept.

Furthermore, teachers expressed concerns about misusing translanguageing as a classroom strategy. Teachers feared that incorporating translanguageing may conflict with standardised assessment objectives or curricular mandates, hindering their ability to support learners' linguistic development in line with prescribed outcomes. This concern was compounded by the pressure to produce measurable results, leading teachers to prioritise traditional language teaching over innovative practices like translanguageing. Moreover, teachers were concerned that inappropriate integration of translanguageing may lead to confusion among learners, particularly for those who are still developing their language skills. Misuse of translanguageing can result in dilution of language proficiency and academic language skills, which are fundamental for success in mainstream educational settings. Teachers fear that learners may not receive sufficient explicit instruction in either language if they are permitted to switch between languages freely. This corresponds with Garcia's (2009) observation that multilingual learners often challenge the language norms in the classroom. It also corresponds with the criticism raised by Cenoz and Gorter (2017). If teachers allow learners to use spontaneous translanguageing freely, the majority language would be used more extensively than the target language in the classroom.

The findings of this study suggest that teachers' negative ideologies about translanguageing may be a barrier to its implementation in classrooms. These ideologies are based on misconceptions about the nature of language and the learning process. Translanguageing is a purposeful use of multiple languages to aid communication, not a random mixing of languages. It supports learners in utilising their linguistic knowledge to comprehend new languages and express themselves, while also promoting a deeper grasp of the target language through meaningful

practice opportunities. The findings suggest that teachers need to be provided with professional development opportunities to better understand multilingual teaching practices such as translanguaging in the case of this study. Sang-Hwan and Shu-Wen (2020) suggest that when teachers are not equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills to implement translanguaging effectively, they may view it as a challenge. This lack of understanding can lead to language as a problem orientation, where teachers see the learners' language diversity as a barrier to learning rather than an asset. In the context of this study, teachers perceived translanguaging as a disruptive practice rather than a valuable tool for language learning. These negative ideologies also contribute to the deficit view of multilingual learners, viewing their linguistic background and skills as insufficient and in need of remediation. These ideologies may hinder the integration of translanguaging into teaching, depriving multilingual learners of the benefits of this approach.

The study demonstrated that they held diverse stances toward the implementation of translanguaging. Some teachers expressed a positive view towards translanguaging, considering it an effective tool for bridging the linguistic gaps, aiding comprehension, and enhancing Grade 4 learners' language acquisition and content learning processes. They recognise that translanguaging enables learners to make connections between their languages and concepts, thereby enhancing comprehension and retention. Thus, teachers adopted a heteroglossic ideology, viewing translanguaging as a valuable resource that enriches the learning experiences of Grade 4 learners. By implication, they might actively integrate translanguaging strategies into their instruction by employing code-switching, allowing the use of home language resources, and encouraging peer collaboration in learners' familiar languages. However, the study also reveals contrasting viewpoints among teachers. Some teachers expressed concerns that translanguaging could hinder language acquisition, leading to confusion and lack of fluency in the target language. They may perceive the use of multiple languages in the classroom as a deviation from established norms, which could result in a lack of clarity in communication and academic understanding. Thus, they held a monoglossic ideology, viewing translanguaging as problematic, seeing it as a potential source of confusion that undermines language acquisition and proficiency. This means that they might discourage the use of learners' home languages, viewing their integration as a hindrance to the mastery of the target language.

The findings demonstrate that teachers' language ideologies play a critical role in shaping attitudes toward translinguaging and, consequently, the educational experiences of their learners. The findings suggest that teachers' beliefs about translinguaging can either facilitate or hinder its implementation, with positive ideologies promoting the use of learners' full linguistic repertoire as a resource, while negative ideologies emphasise language purity and standardisation. The implications of these findings suggest the need for professional development programs that address and challenge monolingual ideologies among educators. As education systems continue to grapple with increasing linguistic diversity, it is essential to equip teachers with the knowledge and skills to embrace translinguaging and recognise it as a vital component of effective language education.

6.4 Application of Translinguaging in Grade 4 English Language Classrooms

This theme discusses data on the application of translinguaging in multilingual grade English language classrooms. The data was collected through a combination of document analysis and classroom observations. Lesson plans from grade 4 English language teachers were analysed to determine whether translinguaging was intentionally planned and integrated into the teaching and learning process. Classroom observations were conducted to observe the actual implementation of translinguaging in the classroom to witness how it was enacted, supported, or hindered. This set of data is discussed in two separate subthemes, starting with a discussion of the analysis of lesson plans and later the actual application of translinguaging in multilingual grade 4 English language classrooms.

6.4.1 Interview Results

Interview data revealed that some teachers felt unprepared to incorporate local languages into their lesson plans due to a lack of resources, training, or confidence. This omission reinforces the notion that English is the only language of value in the classroom and that Namibian languages and cultures are less important or relevant. However, the findings also indicate that teachers often shift between Silozi and English during teaching and learning not as a planned strategy but as an instinctive response to learners' language proficiency and comprehension challenges. Teachers expressed that they resorted to Silozi to clarify complex concepts, illustrating the fluid nature of language use and the necessity of making content accessible. Teachers cited instances where learners struggled with specific vocabulary or grammatical structures in English. In these instances, they would intentionally switch to Silozi to provide explanations, thereby enhancing learners' comprehension and mitigating feelings of frustration. The use of Silozi often helped to create a more inclusive atmosphere. Teachers noted learners

were more willing to contribute to discussions when they could express themselves in both languages, highlighting the importance of linguistic flexibility in fostering a supportive learning environment. Furthermore, teachers described translanguaging as a strategy for simplifying the complex subject matter. They noted that by breaking down difficult concepts into Silozi, they could scaffold learning and ensure learners grasped essential ideas before transitioning back to English for formal assessment. The teachers reported that this teaching practice helped to bridge the gap between learners' prior knowledge and new content.

These results suggest that while teachers may not explicitly plan for translanguaging, they can support spontaneous translanguaging exchanges by creating meaningful learning spaces. This approach encourages learners to draw from their hybrid language practices during language activities (Lemmi & Pérez, 2023). This means teachers will utilise various semiotic resources available, including spontaneous translanguaging, to foster understanding and facilitate learner participation. This highlights the dynamic nature of the translanguaging space, adapting to the needs of the classroom environment (Tian J., 2024). The findings led the researcher to believe that even though the use of the target language is indeed important, to ensure comprehension, the teachers will always turn to translanguaging as the most fitting and natural approach to reach the majority of learners. This directly aligns with statements made by Celce-Murcia et al. (2014), regarding the dilemma of using the target language while also attempting to prioritise the learners' understanding of a new language. Timrin & Lexros (2024) contend that utilisation of spontaneous translanguaging is not detrimental, as Dougherty (2021) noted that translanguaging can be a successful approach when subject to either planned and/or spontaneous usage. Dougherty (2021) continues by stating that the increase in learner participation and understanding of the subject is what matters most.

6.4.2 Document Analysis of Lesson Planning

Lesson planning is indisputably crucial in language teaching, and it continues to be considered as part of the teacher's daily task. This process of planning, predicting, and preparing solutions is the core of any lesson. Regardless of whether one is typically more prepared or has more experience than a colleague, at the beginning of anyone's professional career, there is always the need to sequence each stage of the lesson (Ferreira, 2019).

The analysis of the lesson plans confirms the teacher's views expressed during interviews that teachers did not plan for translanguaging in their lesson plans (cf. Lesson 1, 2, 3, and 4). The

findings showed that lesson plans are predominantly written in English. Moreover, the instructional strategies and activities used in the lesson plans did not promote translanguaging. Most of the activities were conducted solely in English, with no opportunities for learners to use their home languages or other languages to support their learning. This suggests that the lesson plans did not consider the linguistic repertoires of the multilingual learners in the grade 4 classrooms. The use of English as the primary language for lesson plan design perpetuates the colonial legacy of linguistic dominance. This implicitly positions English as the language of authority, knowledge, and professional competence, while marginalizing indigenous languages as being less relevant to the formal education system. Therefore, this preference for English is not merely a pedagogical decision but a reflection of the power dynamics that pervade the education system. By choosing English as the medium of instruction, teachers are reinforcing the dominance of English and perpetuating the unequal power relations that exist in Namibian society. The consistent use of English in lesson plans, without explicit recognition of the value of other languages, contributes to the symbolic violence against speakers of indigenous languages, implicitly reinforcing the notion that their languages are less valuable or less suitable for formal education. Nevertheless, considering that teachers resort to Silozi to make meaning in the grade 4 classes, it implies that translanguaging happens spontaneously in the grade 4 classrooms.

However, as with everything in a lesson, translanguaging must also be planned. Hamman, Beck & Donalson (2018), thus, advise that translanguaging should be used if previously planned. Even though learners and teachers often engage in the flexible use of both languages without regard to the aims or purpose for it, “translanguaging pedagogies should be purposeful and strategic, designed to support [learner] learning and metalinguistic awareness” (Hamman, Beck & Doanlson, 2018: n.d.). To help learners use their linguistic knowledge and repertoire to their full potential, translanguaging must be previously planned by the teachers and not appear without warning (Ferreira, 2019). Yuvayapan (2019) states that translanguaging needs to be carefully and systematically scaffolded when being implemented, and teachers must scaffold their learners in what they already know together with what they will learn. Creating a translanguaging teaching environment leads to the learners developing their critical thinking skills and comprehension strategies as well as deepening their understanding of content, creating a bilingual identity, and making sense of their bilingual world (Yuvayapan, 2019).

Several factors emerged from the interviews as potential explanations for the absence of translanguaging in the teachers' lesson plans. Most teachers reported a lack of awareness and understanding of the concept of translanguaging and its benefits. They mentioned that they lacked the necessary training and professional development to effectively implement translanguaging strategies. Others were concerned about using learners' native languages in the classroom. Still, some felt that they did not have the time or resources to plan for translanguaging. García & Kleifgen (2010) noted that there is a widespread misconception that translanguaging is synonymous with code-switching, which is often viewed as a negative practice that hinders language acquisition. Also, Creese & Blackledge (2010) highlighted that standardised testing, and curricular requirements may pressure teachers to prioritise monolingual English instruction over translanguaging strategies, resulting in reluctance to consider it when planning.

The findings suggest that translanguaging is not yet widely recognised or incorporated into lesson-planning practices. This may be due to several factors, including a lack of awareness about translanguaging, misconceptions about its role in language learning, or institutional barriers that limit its implementation. According to Ding (2023), teachers face challenges integrating translanguaging into lesson planning, despite recognising its importance for effective language teaching. Burton and Rajendram (2019) found that translanguaging is not fully embraced in English second language lesson planning practices due to prevailing English-only ideologies and teachers' language orientations. Therefore, most teachers in Nguyen (2022) expressed a need for training in planning and implementing translanguaging practices, indicating a recognition gap in lesson planning incorporating translanguaging.

Hornberger & Link (2012) argue that translanguaging is not a spontaneous practice or random mixing of languages, but a purposeful and strategic use of multiple languages to achieve specific goals. This means that translanguaging is not an accidental pedagogic practice, but rather it should be a deliberate part of the teachers' lesson planning. Thus, it requires careful planning and intentional design to effectively implement it in the classroom. As García (2009:169) states, "Translanguaging is not a haphazard, impromptu use of different languages, but a strategic and purposeful use of multiple languages for specific communicative and social purposes." This means that teachers must plan for translanguaging just as they plan for each lesson. Translanguaging must be intentional and purposeful, with specific objectives and outcomes in mind. It cannot be left to chance or used spontaneously in the classroom. In the

context of this study, therefore, translanguageing is not purposive. The absence of planning for translanguageing implies that even if they incorporated it in their lessons, it was not purposive but coincidental.

As indicated earlier, the planning of flexible language practices is an essential component in second language teaching. Teachers must examine the lessons' objectives and how the sociolinguistic atmosphere would promote learner English language learning (Ojong, 2022). While teachers in this study often participate in natural language practices in the classroom, pedagogical translanguageing should be purposeful and planned to support learner learning and metalinguistic awareness. Nonetheless, the use of the target language (English) should not be minimised. Teachers should create spaces to balance two or more languages in the same English language classroom where learners interact in the target language and L1s. Ojong (2022) also illustrates that flexible language spaces are important, provided they are appropriately constructed and integrated into English classrooms to assist learners.

Therefore, successful implementation of translanguageing requires careful planning, appropriate preparation and support for teachers, and a supportive environment (Alessia, 2023). Gutiérrez (2021) and Ojong (2022) contend by stating that pedagogical translanguageing requires adequate planning by teachers to be conducted successfully and develop learners' language competencies. As Dougherty (2021) claims, purposeful planning of translanguageing allows a teacher to create a comprehensible subject area lesson while also factoring in anticipated language demands before the instruction to foster language development alongside content area teaching. Thus, planning for translanguageing allows teachers to strategically incorporate learners' first language in their lessons, ensuring that it is purposeful and enhances learning outcomes. This is to say, when teachers strategically integrate translanguageing into their plans, bi/multilingual learners benefit from their whole linguistic repertoire (Cenoz, 2017). Thus, learners gain access to "academic content through the linguistic resources and communicative repertoires they bring to the classroom while simultaneously acquiring new ones" (Hornberger & Link, 2012).

The absence of planning for translanguageing can have significant implications for translanguageing implementation and multilingual education in Namibia, affecting both teachers and learners. Without proper preparation, teachers may struggle to integrate translanguageing strategies in the classroom, leading to inconsistency and confusion. They may just have no plan to integrate it. Thus, if they do not plan for it, they do not implement it. Translanguageing is not

code-switching, which is often thought of as random and chaotic language mixing; it requires specific rules and strategies to be implemented successfully. This means that lesson planning plays a crucial role in ensuring the effective use of translanguaging activities, allowing teachers to create organised and clear learning experiences for learners. Without proper planning, learners may become disengaged and struggle to follow the lesson, ultimately affecting their academic success (García and Kleifgen 2010). Therefore, careful planning and scaffolding are necessary to guide learners on when and how to use different languages in the classroom, emphasising the importance of consistent and purposeful translanguaging practices for language development and academic achievement.

Nevertheless, the study also showed that while teachers did not plan for translanguaging, some regularly planned for their lessons and had lesson plans, while others did not plan at all and had no lesson plans. Those who did plan believed it was essential for effective teaching and helped them reflect and make improvements. However, it was established in this study that having a lesson plan did not always translate into actual classroom practice when it comes to translanguaging. This suggests that the decision of whether teachers will implement it in their lessons does not lie in the lesson plan because, according to the data, teachers with and without lesson plans all did not have it, indicating a potential lack of intention to include it in teaching practices. Lesson planning is essential, as Ferreira (2019) noted; the process of planning, predicting, and preparing solutions is the core of any lesson. Therefore, irrespective of whether one is typically more prepared or has more experience than a colleague, at the beginning of anyone's professional career, there is always the need to sequence each stage of the lesson (Ferreira, 2019). However, the findings of this study demonstrate that teachers do not plan for translanguaging in their lesson plans. This is a major barrier to the implementation of translanguaging in the classroom. To overcome this barrier, teachers need to be better informed about the benefits of translanguaging, given opportunities to learn how to plan for and implement translanguaging, and provided with the resources and support they need to use translanguaging effectively.

6.4.3 Classroom Implementation of Translanguaging in Multilingual Grade 4 Classrooms

The study revealed that most of the teachers implemented unplanned translanguaging practices in their lessons. As established earlier, teachers did not deliberately plan to use multiple languages in their teaching, but rather it happened spontaneously in response to learners'

linguistic needs or situations that arose during the lesson. The unplanned nature of translanguaging practices was further supported by the classroom observations, which documented instances of teachers switching between English and Silozi languages to clarify instructions, explain complex concepts, or facilitate communication between learners with different linguistic backgrounds. The flexible strategies that the teachers use in classrooms and the practical solutions they provide in different situations reflect the multilingual reality in society and demonstrate their competence to act purposefully in different communicative situations (Norro, 2024). The spontaneous translanguaging practices in the classrooms form a resource as pedagogical practices, though according to the analysis, these practices tend to be spontaneous adaptations to the multilingual context rather than strategically planned pedagogical practices.

Observations from Grade 4 lessons (cf. 5.4. Lessons 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 indicate that teachers predominantly utilised English and Silozi during lessons, often neglecting other potentially valuable languages present in the classroom. This aligns with the interview data where teachers reported that Silozi and English were the only recognised school languages by the policy. This pattern reflects a clear preference for the languages perceived as 'official' or 'academic' within the context of schooling. Furthermore, they mentioned that Silozi was the only local language with an established orthography and a common language that everyone in the class would understand compared to other locally familiar languages. Teachers' adherence to English and Silozi highlighted a conscious, albeit constrained, choice aligned with institutional expectations. Such a code-switching paradigm reflects the concern among teachers regarding compliance with school policies, which may prioritise certain languages based on perceived prestige or appropriateness. However, this exclusive focus on a limited linguistic repertoire contradicts the essence of translanguaging, which seeks to capitalise on the full linguistic resources of learners. This directly aligns with Bernstein's notion of restricted codes, wherein teachers feel constrained by policy structures that hinder their pedagogic choices. Furthermore, the findings reveal a CDA perspective that the dominant language choices perpetuated hierarchies in the classroom. Consequently, learners who are more proficient in languages other than English and Silozi struggled to connect with the material and contribute meaningfully to discussions. Nevertheless, the observed hesitancy to embrace translanguaging likely stems from a lack of professional development and support in navigating multilingual pedagogies.

In Namibia, the use of English and Silozi is aimed at promoting national unity and identity. Harris (2018:71) writes that the government chose Silozi as the official lingua franca to address tribal tensions and unify the Zambezi region. Therefore, English and Silozi serve as unifying languages among different tribes. In the context of this study, teachers stuck to these languages with the belief that they would unite and make learners understand one another as compared to using other local languages in their classrooms. This ideology implied that language was a problem (Ruiz 1984, 2010). Therefore, translanguaging through English and Silozi would foster linguistic harmony and unity in grade 4 classrooms. This means that teachers believed that using multiple languages was a deviation from the norm. Ultimately, they misinterpreted translanguaging as the use of only approved school languages. Thus, teachers' linguistic choices appear to be influenced by a desire to conform to school policies aimed at maintaining certain linguistic standards. This aligns with Code and Pedagogic Discourse Theory, suggesting that teachers' language choices are mediated by broader institutional norms. The pressure to conform to these policies restricts their ability to fully integrate learners' linguistic resources, potentially hindering their engagement and understanding. However, this adherence often results in missed opportunities to leverage learners' linguistic resources. When teachers fear repercussions for deviating from prescribed codes, their pedagogic discourse becomes rigid, undermining the potential richness of a translanguaging approach.

In this context, translanguaging is controlled and restricted to certain approved languages, typically official ones associated with power and status. Teachers limited themselves to these languages, believing they offered learners a competitive edge in society, leading to neglect of local familiar languages seen as inferior. In this case, teachers suggest through their language choices that non-dominant languages lack academic value, creating a hierarchy where learners must conform to the dominant languages. This reinforces the notion that only officially recognised languages are suitable for academic learning, while others are deemed inferior. Therefore, translanguaging in this study was used to assimilate learners into dominant languages, with teachers often praising the use of sanctioned languages and discouraging home languages during lessons. This reinforced the message that home languages were less valuable than officially recognised ones. Mwambula (2021) noted that when teachers face multiple languages in the classroom, they consider their linguistic ideologies. The scholar stated that the value placed on a language affects how it is received and used. Higher language value results in warmer reception and more patronage, while lower value leads to colder reception and less patronage. In this case, teachers prioritised English and Silozi due to their instrumental and

integrative value, affecting their attitudes towards learners' linguistic resources. This highlights the importance of language ideologies in shaping language reception and usage in educational settings. In this context, teachers enforced top-down directives by restricting translanguaging to officially recognised languages, denying learners from using their full linguistic rights. This limits learners' linguistic development and perpetuates disparities in the education system by favouring certain languages over others. The finding reveals how the existing discourse shapes language use and ideologies in the classroom, ultimately impacting learners' linguistic repertoires and educational experiences.

Regarding teachers' stance, the findings revealed that the instances of translanguaging that occurred in the classrooms were mostly the result of teachers' conscious choices related to their epistemic stance toward translanguaging during interviews. This epistemic stance toward translanguaging is a good indicator that these teachers can later promote translanguaging as a formal pedagogical Grade 4 practice because, as García et al. (2016) note, the first component involved in building a translanguaging classroom is stance. The findings of this study also noted how effective stance-taking among some teachers' spontaneous use of different languages is indicative of everyday translanguaging in Namibia, in which teachers can move back and forth from one language to another language easily. However, in classroom practice, translanguaging needs to be planned, as proposed by Halim et al. (2023), who discovered that unplanned or spontaneous translanguaging could not produce the maximum benefits of translanguaging. García et al. (2016) also proposed that translanguaging pedagogy is formed by design in which teachers prepare tasks that provide learners with opportunities to use their full linguistic repertoire. In this way, not only will learners value their languages, but they will also develop the metalinguistic awareness that helps them shape and strengthen their bilingual/multilingual identities.

The findings regarding translanguaging practices are in contrast to those of Mashinja and Mwanza (2020), who revealed that teachers used English, Silozi, and other local languages in teaching. The reason for using these languages in their study was that learners were experiencing both English and Silozi for the first time, and thus local languages helped learners make sense of what was taught. However, in the current study, teachers believed that Silozi and English were the only recognised school languages and recommended translanguaging in grade 4. Therefore, the functions of translanguaging in this study included explaining concepts, engaging learners in the lesson, managing the classroom and maintaining discipline, building

personal connections with learners, establishing trust, providing clear instructions, and supporting language learning. The findings are consistent with those of Sapitri, Batan, & Myartawan (2018), who found that teachers used translanguaging to facilitate learners' understanding, to provide L1 and target language comparison, to elicit learners' responses, to attract learners' attention, to manage learners, to promote discipline, to develop deeper personal relationships, to create a secure classroom atmosphere, and to make the class more interesting.

Contrary to the prevailing practices of other teachers who solely prioritised officially approved languages (English and Silozi), one teacher (cf. 5.4. Lesson 4) recognised the potential of using learners' familiar language (Subia). The teacher mentioned that her learners struggled to fully comprehend concepts in English and Silozi, as most of them only used these languages at school, potentially hindering their learning. Therefore, this teacher actively incorporated Subia into her teaching, recognising it as a valuable resource for her learners. This approach was grounded in the understanding that learners' linguistic knowledge is not compartmentalised but rather interconnected. Therefore, by explaining complex concepts in Silozi and Subia, the teacher made the learning process more accessible to learners, bridging the gap between their native language and the curriculum taught in English. Moreover, engaging learners in their familiar language created a more comfortable and inclusive learning environment. This in turn boosted their confidence and participation, leading to higher engagement in the classroom as observed in the lesson. The teacher's heteroglossic practice implied that "...pedagogically learners should not be discriminated against from participating in classroom interaction simply because they cannot speak the target language" (Mwanza, 2017: 104). This finding provides that translanguaging is taking place, though not necessarily recognised as a conscious pedagogical strategy, and it happens mostly spontaneously (Norro, 2024).

The teacher's classroom language practices in this case are what Peirce (1989) cited in Martínez (2017) noted a pedagogy of possibilities, which means pedagogies that encourage teachers to reconsider which language discourse practices are possible. Also, it is what Bernstein (1990) referred to as recontextualization, the appropriation of other discourses and bringing them into special relation with each other for their selective transmission and acquisition. Bourne (2006) equated recontextualization to a teacher's interpretation and application of the policy and methods of teaching for the policy and method to be relevant and appropriate to the specific learning and teaching situation. In the case of this teacher, recontextualization included her reinterpretation and reapplication of the language in education

policy to ensure epistemic access. Therefore, the teacher's language adoption here implied making use of the pedagogical language practices and choices to adapt the lesson to the linguistic context of the learners to best achieve teaching and learning in the multilingual grade 4 classrooms.

Apart from recontextualization, the teacher's language practices (cf. 5.4. Lesson 4) also revealed the power relation that existed between government and teachers in the classroom in terms of language choices; the relationship between the dominant and the dominated controlled the weak group (Mwanza, 2016). Haugen (2009:12) observed that "power relations are exercised and negotiated in discourse" in classrooms. The implication is that both teachers and learners have the power to resist, negotiate, or accept policy and teachers' directives. In this case, the teacher re-negotiated top-down directives by involving language choices and practices that were not recommended but were responsive to the linguistic abilities of the learners in ensuring epistemic access, enhancing effective instruction, and facilitating second language learning and development. As observed in this case, when in the classroom, teachers have the power to choose language practices according to their judgement of the classroom. The practice by the teachers also implied that she recognised and implemented the linguistic rights of learners to learn in their familiar language (Subia) and the target language (English). Further, the teacher's heteroglossic choices meant that teachers should negotiate changes that would not only be beneficial to the system but also enhance and mediate learners learning. As noted by Paradowski (2020: 26), "Instructions should always be a reasoned and strategic response to the local circumstances and ecology of the classroom, tailored to the situation and the needs and abilities of the learners; pedagogical decisions ought to be more a critical and judicious choice than a reflexive use of trend solutions." Thus, a change from monolingual towards multilingual ideologies about mother tongues in education would be more successful when initiated by teachers at the school and classroom levels.

However, the findings of this study highlight the prevalence of unplanned translanguaging practices in teaching. While the unplanned nature of these practices may be seen as a limitation, it also suggests that teachers are responsive to the needs of their learners and are willing to adapt their teaching strategies to promote learning. The use of translanguaging as a spontaneous strategy to facilitate communication and understanding is particularly noteworthy, as it underscores the importance of language as a tool for learning. However, the study also raises questions about the effectiveness of unplanned partial translanguaging practices. While the

teachers in this study reported positive outcomes, such as improved understanding and increased learner engagement, it is unclear whether these benefits would be sustained over time or whether they would translate into long-term learning gains. Furthermore, the unplanned nature of translanguaging practices may lead to inconsistencies in the use of multiple languages, which could potentially hinder language acquisition and development (Aung, 2021).

The findings of this study also suggest that while teachers may not explicitly incorporate translanguaging in their pre-planning of lessons, they are willing to implement it when they perceive it to be beneficial for their learners' learning. The findings of this study correlate with Liu, Lo, & Lin's (2020:8) study, where one teacher stated that "[e]ven if we don't plan the use of translanguaging, I would use it when talking about things that are different from their everyday life, things that are very academic..." By implication, teachers may still implement translanguaging practices even if they were not reflected in their pre-planning. Hence, this study argues that the decision to implement translanguaging is not a simple pedagogical choice that can be made solely based on a lesson plan. Rather, it is influenced by a complex web of factors, including teachers' ideologies, classroom dynamics, and the realities of the educational system. The study found that teachers' willingness to implement translanguaging was influenced by their ideologies about language learning and their understanding of their learners' linguistic needs. This means that teachers who believed that language learning was a social process and that learners' home languages were valuable resources for learning were more likely to use translanguaging in their classrooms.

In this study, it was also observed in one lesson (cf. 5.4. Lesson 3) that despite recognising the benefits of translanguaging during the interviews, the teacher did not implement it in the classroom, insisted on using English exclusively, and discouraged the use of other languages, even Silozi. This approach differed from other teachers in the study who encouraged the use of Silozi within the classroom. When learners attempted to use these languages, she would reprimand and remind them to speak English in an English lesson. For instance, one learner attempted to use Silozi to explain why she went late to class; the teacher reprimanded the learner, and she kept silent. The teacher's reluctance was based on the belief that rural school learners needed more exposure to English to become proficient. She argued that an English-only environment would help learners learn faster, lead to faster language acquisition, and improve performance. She was concerned that using familiar languages in the classroom could hinder language development and cause confusion. She viewed language as a barrier to

learning, not a resource, a mindset that is common among teachers unfamiliar with translanguaging. She saw incorporating familiar languages as a hindrance to English development. Thus, learners were expected to leave their languages and cultures outside the classroom, limiting their linguistic and cultural identities. This demonstrates a lack of understanding of translanguaging as a teaching approach and its advantages for language learners.

There is a mismatch between what teachers said in the interviews about explaining concepts in home languages and what was observed. However, it is possible that the presence of the observer in the classroom influenced this. Similarly, Simasiku (2014) found that teachers used English in the presence of a mistrial official, but as soon as s/he left the classroom, they reverted to using their mother tongue. Thus, the instances when teachers forbade learners to speak their home language during the lesson reflected a monoglossic ideology (García et al., 2017), the assumption of maximum exposure leading to maximum learning of the target language (cf. Cummins & Swain, 2014), or both. The findings of Burton and Rajendram (2019), Pantalleresco (2021), Rodríguez-Izquierdo (2021), and Yusri et al. (2022) all suggest that despite the benefits of translanguaging, teachers tend to adopt a monolingual approach in the classroom. Teachers often believe that using only the target language, such as English, is the best way for learners to practice in realistic situations. This mindset can have negative consequences, as learners may struggle to understand lessons and lack confidence in expressing themselves in both their native language and English. Thus, teachers' lack of support for familiar languages in the classroom further disconnects learners, hindering their language development. De Angelis (2011) emphasised the importance of teachers incorporating minority languages into their teaching to enhance learners' multilingualism as a valuable resource. Therefore, teachers need to recognise the importance of learners' home languages and utilise them to enhance the language acquisition process for learners.

Further, findings from various scholars in Namibia, such as Simasiku, Kasanda, and Smit (2015a, b) and Simasiku (2016a, b), highlight a resistance among teachers to incorporate familiar languages into the classroom, even when learners struggle to understand the language of instruction. Katukula, Set, and Nyambe (2023) reported that both parents and teachers held monolingual beliefs favouring English-only education, leading to the exclusion of mother tongue languages from school premises. Principals and teachers believed that success was tied to English proficiency, punishing any violations of this ideology. Simasiku, Kasanda, and Simit

(2015a) noted a prevalent belief among Namibian teachers and politicians that African languages should not be used as primary teaching languages. Additionally, Denuga, Abah, and Michael (2017) found resistance against translanguageing due to English-focused examinations and language policies. Similarly, Ipinge and Banda (2020) found that teachers hesitated to utilise learners' linguistic resources in classrooms, fearing that mother tongue usage would hinder English mastery and conflict with language policies.

However, while the teacher's (cf. 5.4. Lesson 3) intention to increase English exposure for learners was commendable, her failure to utilise translanguageing impeded its efficacy. This means that by enforcing exclusive English usage, she unintentionally created barriers for non-proficient learners, leading to difficulties in comprehension and reduced participation in class. As observed in the lesson, when the teacher attempted to engage learners with questions, they remained silent, indicating their difficulty in understanding or expressing themselves in English due to language barriers. By restricting home language use, the teacher missed opportunities to enhance learner learning with existing knowledge and experiences. Incorporating translanguageing could have fostered a more supportive and engaging learning environment, benefiting learners' language development. Translanguageing involves utilising both native and target languages strategically, with native language use gradually decreasing as proficiency in the target language improves.

This study's findings revealed a gap between theory and practice in education, where teachers' pedagogical ideologies often do not align with their actual implementation in the classroom, specifically regarding translanguageing. As indicated earlier, despite this teacher expressing support for translanguageing, she did not incorporate it into her classroom instruction, highlighting the gap between theory and practice in education. Costa (2021) reported that there was a clash between teachers' actual practices and their beliefs, which were affected by a strong tradition of foreign language use only. His study noted that some teachers often felt guilt about applying translanguageing in the classroom, as they thought that it deprived learners of necessary exposure to foreign languages despite their support of it. This means that positive ideologies do not guarantee positive application of pedagogical strategy, as also seen in Yuvayapan's (2019) findings.

Further, the study findings support the notion that individuals within a society may hold conflicting ideologies about pedagogical practice (Kesevan, 2016), as seen among teachers with varied beliefs on translanguageing. Moreover, the study findings are in line with Huckin et

al. (2012), Mwanza (2016), and Pacheco, Kang, & Hurd (2019) in suggesting that the classroom is a site where power dynamics are influenced by institutional policies, teacher decisions, and practices. Teachers can negotiate and challenge dominant ideologies through various forms of mediation in multilingual classrooms. However, the study observed that the teacher upheld dominant monolingual ideology and power dynamics by adhering strictly to using English only, thus marginalising alternative perspectives and perpetuating inequalities. The teacher's language use reflects her own biases and ideologies, with pressure to conform to sanctioned ideologies to maintain power within the education system. This resistance to change and reluctance to challenge the status quo hindered the full implementation of translanguaging. Commenting on the importance of teacher attitudes toward teaching and learning, Mwanza (2017) advised that there is a need for teachers to hold positive attitudes towards languages, including local, zonal (predominant), or familiar languages, to ensure epistemic access among learners of different language backgrounds and abilities.

Consequently, I argue that for effective teaching and learning to take place, teachers should integrate translanguaging in their lessons to facilitate teaching and learning of the English language in grade 4 classrooms. As Iipinge and Banda (2020) argue, depending on psychological, linguistic, and cultural factors, learners' first language can powerfully influence second language development. Banda (2018) has argued that denying learners the opportunity to use their familiar languages limits their capacity to engage with teaching and learning, as they are unable to take advantage of their multilingual repertoire. The teacher's classroom practices were teacher-centred by default, and learners were muted as they found themselves with no voice to express themselves efficiently and efficaciously and were deaf to the classroom content delivered in a monolingual language, English. As argued in the previous section, learners should not be discriminated against from participating in classroom interaction because they cannot speak the target language. There is a need for teachers to perceive language as a resource and accept multilingual discursive practices as legitimate and part of the classroom; a normal mode of effective communication and a strategic sense and meaning-making in the educational setting, validating learners' linguistic resources.

In this study, I argue that the teacher's monolingual and exclusionary practices in Namibian multilingual grade 4 classrooms contradict the inclusive values of Ubuntu, limiting the potential for learner learning and development. Ubuntu, meaning 'I am because we are,' emphasises community (classroom) interconnectedness and equality (Makalela, 2017). Translanguaging,

working with Ubuntu logic, stresses the importance of all languages in promoting inclusivity and respecting diversity (Makalela, 2019). As Nyimbili & Mwanza (2020:79) put it, the teacher is because learners are, and learners are because the teacher is. This means that the teacher-learner relationship is crucial for effective learning, as both parties must actively engage in classroom interactions. Therefore, the teacher is ineffective in facilitating learning, as teaching and learning occur only when both the teacher and the learner are actively engaged in a mutually engaging classroom interaction. Makalela (2019:240) suggests that no language is complete without others, highlighting the interconnectedness of languages in African communities and highlighting the necessity of allowing multilingual learners to use their full linguistic repertoires in the classroom. The exclusive focus on official languages leads to a disconnect between languages and between teachers and learners, hindering learning. To facilitate significant learning, teachers must adopt pedagogical practices that value and support multilingualism, aligning with Ubuntu principles.

Nyimbili & Mwanza (2020) and Makalela (2019) agree that for children in multilingual grade 4 classrooms to acquire necessary literacy skills, there is a need for what Makalela calls discontinuation continuation. This notion suggests that teachers should use learners' first languages as resources for teaching literacy, instead of solely focusing on sanctioned languages. The study found that the teacher's practices mainly led to linguistic assimilation and marginalised Indigenous languages. The study argues that teachers, influenced by coloniality, maintain orderliness through a monolingual/monoglot approach to language in the curriculum. Decolonising the curriculum calls for a learner-centred approach and recontextualization of educational knowledge. This study argues for the need to implement a decolonised curriculum for a more inclusive and effective education system. Hence, discontinuation is a call for the decolonisation of the curriculum in which learner-centred pedagogy will be practiced through the recontextualization of education knowledge context by context (Nyimbili & Mwanza, 2020:80). This study argues for the need to implement a decolonised curriculum for a more inclusive and effective education system.

Teachers play a crucial role in implementing translinguaging practices to empower learners through epistemic access. Nyimbili & Mwanza (2020) emphasise teachers' agency in negotiating curriculum within dual language education settings, highlighting the importance of questioning and advocating for beneficial changes. This means that teachers should not passively accept government policies but actively create spaces for dynamic bilingualism in the

classroom, as suggested by Pacheco et al. (2019). Makalela (2019) argues that in Africa, where most people grow up speaking more than one language, “input and output alternation is the only way to become, gain epistemic access, and develop a higher sense of self in education.”. This is particularly crucial in the context of the Zambezi region's urban and rural areas, where translocal mobility has resulted in linguistic mobility and language contact. As Nyimbili & Mwanza (2020:80) suggest, this provision of education in such environments requires a context-sensitive pedagogy that recognises rather than imposes identities on the learners. Thus, effective language use in multilingual classrooms requires culturally relevant, socially responsive pedagogy and well-trained teachers who understand their learners' sociocultural reality. Language use in the classroom must not only mirror the community's language use (officially sanctioned languages only) but must also provide an effective model and learning environment for bilingual learners (Riegelhaupt, 2000: 213).

The findings of this study point to important conclusions. The results point to multilingual practices in the classroom. However, a monolingual classroom language ideology seems to prevent some teachers from using multilingual practices in teaching, as well as the strategic leveraging of translanguaging practices. Key, the translanguaging practices that teachers reported using and that were observed in lessons were mostly used spontaneously, adapting the teaching to the situations that arose in the classroom. They were neither planned beforehand nor intentionally leveraged as pedagogical strategies. Using translanguaging practices should be recognised as a legitimate pedagogical approach to enhance their strategic use when planning and implementing classroom activities. The multilingual practices that teachers use spontaneously and that are common in multilingual communities offer a good starting point for developing multilingual education (Norro, 2024). Therefore, teachers need to be better informed about the benefits of translanguaging. Moreover, they need to be given opportunities to learn how to plan for and implement translanguaging in their classrooms. Further, schools need to provide teachers with the resources and support they need to use translanguaging effectively.

6.5 Factors Affecting Teachers' Implementation of Translanguaging in Multilingual Grade 4 Classrooms

The study findings established that numerous factors promote and constrain the implementation of translanguaging in the multilingual Grade 4 classrooms in the Zambezi region of Namibia. Therefore, this theme discusses these findings, and the first set of data discusses the factors that

promote its implementation. The second set of data will be a discussion of factors that constrain or limit the successful implementation of translanguaging. Below is the data discussed under two separate subheadings, starting with factors promoting translanguaging implementation and later factors limiting successful translanguaging implementation:

6.5.1 Factors Promoting Translanguaging Implementation

The first set of data collected from the study revealed several factors that promote the implementation of translanguaging in the multilingual Grade 4 classrooms in the Zambezi region of Namibia. These factors include:

6.5.1.1 Learners' Low Mastery of the English Language

The study findings revealed that learners' limited English proficiency was a key factor that led to the introduction of translanguaging in classrooms. The teachers mentioned that learners often struggled to understand concepts and express themselves solely in English as they were transitioning to the English medium for the first time. Teachers believed that using multiple languages was necessary to support learners in grasping content effectively by leveraging their existing language abilities. Consequently, this influenced the integration of translanguaging practices in the educational setting. This means that learning involves building on what the learner knows so that the learner brings it to the current situation, restructures it, and creates new knowledge (Zano, 2022). This is what he meant when Mwanza (2016) argued that it is impossible to effectively teach formal language without recognising and utilising learners' linguistic resources. It also aligns with Bernstein (1990:169), who cited that "segments of horizontal discourse become resources to facilitate access to vertical discourse," supporting the idea that one might utilise horizontal discourse as a resource to access vertical discourse. This suggests that the interaction of both the horizontal (unofficial and illegitimised language) and vertical discourse (official and legitimised language) was crucial for assuring learners' access to knowledge and their ability to make sense of it as they began to build their literacy (Bernstein, 1975). This means one cannot ignore the linguistic resources and knowledge that learners bring with them to the classroom. Further, it means that no language is complete without others, highlighting the importance of integrating translanguaging.

6.5.1.2 Teachers' Judgement of their Learners as being of 'Poor Quality'

The study also found that teachers saw the need for translanguaging implementation due to the perceived lack of learner preparedness from the junior primary level. The teachers were

concerned that learners in the junior primary were not adequately equipped with the necessary language skills to cope with the demands of the senior primary curriculum. Uugwanga's (2023) study in Namibia reported on learners' unpreparedness and revealed that Grade 3 teachers did not prepare learners well for the transitional grade. This lack of preparation was attributed to various factors, including overcrowded classrooms, inexperienced teachers, and inadequate resources. One of the main consequences of inadequate preparation in the junior primary is the widening success gap in later grades. The teacher expressed concern that learners who are not adequately equipped with the necessary skills and knowledge in the early years struggle to catch up with their peers in the senior primary, and this gap only widens as they progress to higher grades. Therefore, translanguaging emerged as a potential solution to support these learners at the senior primary level. Thus, teachers believed that by using their L1, they could bridge the gap and provide a more inclusive and personalised learning experience for their learners.

6.5.1.3 Overcrowded Classrooms

The study findings indicated that overcrowding in grade 4 classrooms significantly impacted teachers' use of translanguaging strategies. The study found that due to the limited infrastructure and space, the classrooms were overcrowded, with an average of 50 learners per class. Teachers mentioned that they often struggled to provide individual attention and support to each learner in those classrooms, leading to difficulties in managing the diverse linguistic needs of learners. Consequently, translanguaging emerged as a practical solution to ensure that all learners could participate in classroom activities and engage with the curriculum. Thus, translanguaging provided a way for teachers to manage the diverse linguistic needs of their learners in an overcrowded classroom setting. By allowing learners to use their native languages, teachers were able to create a more inclusive and supportive learning environment that catered to the needs of all learners.

Omidire (2019) repeats this concern, expressing that teachers do not have sufficient training to deal with L2 learning, and they cannot adjust the curriculum in support of their teaching due to time constraints, especially in overcrowded classrooms. The study's findings suggest that overcrowding, while often seen as a challenge, could create opportunities for translanguaging in classrooms. This finding highlights the importance of considering classroom context when implementing translanguaging practices, as overcrowded classrooms may necessitate the use of multiple languages to ensure effective communication and learning. This implies that when

teachers are unable to provide individual attention and support to all their learners, they may turn to translanguaging as a way to meet the diverse linguistic needs of their learners. Translanguaging could help to create a more inclusive and supportive learning environment, and it could also facilitate communication, understanding, and engagement among learners. This means that more knowledge is needed about how to prepare teachers to best serve multilingual learner populations (Zano, 2022), including how to effectively incorporate translanguaging in overcrowded classrooms.

6.5.1.4 Implementation of the Double Shift School System (Platoon System)

The implementation of the double shift school system also promoted the utilisation of translanguaging in the grade 4 classrooms. In this system, schools operate on two separate schedules, with one group of learners attending classes in the morning and another group attending in the afternoon. This arrangement often created a unique set of challenges for teachers and learners, as they had limited time to cover the curriculum and engage in meaningful learning experiences, making it necessary for teachers to employ strategies that maximise learner engagement and understanding. Teachers mentioned that due to the strict time constraints, they were unable to spend additional time with learners who needed extra support or attention as they had to cover the curriculum in a shorter time. This was particularly challenging for learners who required assistance in understanding concepts due to language barriers or learning disabilities. Translanguaging, in this context, provided a way for teachers to maximise learning opportunities within the limited time frame by allowing learners to use their native languages to support their understanding of English. Thus, in the absence of sufficient time for English instruction, teachers often relied on translanguaging to convey content and facilitate understanding.

This finding demonstrates translanguaging to be an effective strategy in the double-shift school system, where time is limited, and learners come from diverse linguistic backgrounds with diverse learning needs and abilities. The finding highlights that translanguaging not only saves time but also helps teachers reach out to their learners' support quickly and build a stronger connection with them. Furthermore, it can also enhance learners' language acquisition in the target language. Therefore, schools need to encourage and support teachers in implementing translanguaging in their classrooms.

6.5.2 Factors Constraining Translanguaging Implementing

Although on the one hand, the findings have demonstrated that it may be useful for grade 4 learners, the study has also shown numerous factors preventing the full implementation of translanguaging. The proceeding section examines and presents the various constraints presenting the integration of translanguaging pedagogy in the multilingual Grade 4 classrooms in the Zambezi region of Namibia. These factors include:

6.5.2.1 Lack of Teacher Training, Support and Knowledge of Translanguaging Practice

The study found that inadequate teacher training constrained the implementation of translanguaging in multilingual grade 4 classrooms. The findings have shown that many teachers lack adequate training in translanguaging techniques. While they acknowledge the potential benefits of using learners' first languages alongside English, they often lack the necessary skills and strategies to implement them effectively. Teachers felt unprepared to use translanguaging in class due to a lack of focus on it in teacher training programs. They cited a lack of knowledge about translanguaging, limited understanding of the linguistic repertoires of their learners, and insufficient training on how to effectively use translanguaging in the classroom. This lack of training can result in uncertainty and inefficiency when attempting to incorporate translanguaging into their teaching practices (Saleem *et al.*, 2023).

Probyn (2015) highlighted how inadequate teacher training hampers the use of translanguaging to support multilingual learners. This means that teachers' lack of training may lead teachers to resist integrating translanguaging to support learning and multilingualism in classrooms, as observed in this study that teachers were hesitant to employ it. The teachers explained that they needed appropriate training to fit in multilingual settings. The lack of well-trained teachers to implement the translanguaging pedagogy by the teacher and school administrators is also reported in multiple studies (Chan, 2021). The teacher noted that the teachers' education does not include multilingual pedagogical training. Consequently, teachers may take a longer time to adjust and adapt to the translanguaging teaching approach. The current issue clarifies why even though teachers acknowledge pedagogical translanguaging for learners' learning as essential, their practices are minimal. This means that teachers need to acquire a high level of training and be cognisant of their learners' linguistic needs and abilities before incorporating translanguaging pedagogy in the classroom (Choi, 2020).

To address this constraint, it is essential to provide teachers with comprehensive training on translanguaging pedagogy. This training should cover not only the theoretical foundations of translanguaging but also practical strategies for implementing it in the classroom. Additionally, ongoing professional development opportunities should be made available to ensure that teachers can continue to refine their skills and stay up to date with the latest research and best practices in translanguaging education. Choi (2020) emphasises the importance of teachers being well-trained and informed about their learners' language needs before using translanguaging in teaching. Providing teachers with the necessary training will help them plan and implement translanguaging effectively. Omidire (2013) suggests teachers require more support and preparation for multilingual classrooms, supporting Ojong's (2022) idea of annual workshops for teachers' professional development in bilingual settings for successful translanguaging implementation. This study suggests that teacher education institutions in Namibia should explicitly incorporate multilingual practices into their curriculum to enhance the acceptance of translanguaging in multilingual L2 classrooms.

6.5.2.2 Monolingual-Based Assessment Practices

The study findings also found that the dominance of monolingual assessment practices constrained the implementation of translanguaging in multilingual grade 4 classrooms. The study revealed that assessment practices in these classrooms mainly focused on evaluating learners' English proficiency. Teachers acknowledged their lack of training in incorporating translanguaging in assessments, resulting in a monolingual teaching approach where learners were required to use English exclusively for learning and assessment. The study found that despite advocating for translanguaging, the Namibian education system heavily favours monolingual assessment methods and teaching materials that are purely monolingual, neglecting the heteroglossic nature of language (Set, 2023). In Zambia, Nyimbili & Mwanza (2021) observed that current school assessments often overlook multilingual learners, assuming they are monolingual. Similarly, in this study, monolingual assessment methods, influenced by teaching materials in English only, did not accommodate linguistic diversity among learners. As a result, assessments solely focused on testing proficiency in one language, failing to cater to multilingual learners. In Namibia, English is seen as a language of power and success, leading to a push for English-medium instruction and assessment, posing challenges for multilingual learners in the country. This means that teachers need professional development

to understand the benefits of translanguaging and incorporate it effectively in teaching and assessment.

To overcome this constraint, it is crucial to develop and implement assessments that are sensitive to the multilingual realities of learners' lives. This may involve designing assessments that allow learners to draw on their full linguistic repertoire or adapting existing assessments to better accommodate the use of multiple languages. Moreover, teachers and policymakers should work together to ensure that assessment policies and practices reflect the diverse linguistic backgrounds of learners in multilingual classrooms. Campbell & Rosenhan (2023) pointed out the need for holistic and inclusive assessment practices in language education that recognise diverse linguistic backgrounds. It advocates for collaboration between teachers and policymakers to foster tolerance, diversity, and translingual practices while resisting neoliberal mandates. Assessment policies must be designed to reflect the diverse linguistic backgrounds of multilingual learners. Mensah (2014) suggests that the Namibian school's language policy should be revised to support dynamic bilingualism, emphasising ensuring assessment practices reflect the diverse linguistic backgrounds of its multilingual learners.

6.5.2.3 Learners' Resistance of the Target Language due to Lack of Proficiency in the Target Language

Another factor identified was the learners' resistance to the target language, which in this case was English. The study found that many learners in these grade 4 classrooms had a limited proficiency in English, which hindered their ability and willingness to use the language in their learning. This was particularly evident in the learners' written work, where they struggled with basic grammar and vocabulary, making it difficult for them to fully engage with the target language. This resistance to the target language can be attributed to several reasons. For grade 4, English is a third language after Silozi for many of these learners, and they may not have had much exposure to the language outside of the classroom. This lack of exposure resulted in a lack of confidence and a fear of making mistakes when using the language. In many classroom cultures, making mistakes is seen as a sign of incompetence and can lead to embarrassment and loss of face. This fear of making mistakes in front of their peers and teachers made learners hesitant to use the target language, English, in the classroom (Mashinja & Mwanza, 2020), preferring to stick to their mother tongue or other languages that they are more comfortable with, further hindering the implementation of translanguaging.

6.5.2.4 Lack of Translanguaging-Based Instructional Materials and Resources

Another factor reported by the teachers is the lack of multilingual teaching and learning resources that support the integration of translanguaging. The study found that teachers were reluctant to integrate translanguaging due to the unavailability of resources and curriculum. The materials available to them are all monolingual. This constrains teachers from adopting translanguaging, particularly since they are not trained to employ multilingual approaches and prepare teaching resources by themselves. This finding is consistent with Driouch (2022), who highlighted that the absence of translanguaging-based instructional materials and resources limits the effectiveness of translanguaging implementation. According to Nyimbili & Mwanza (2021), the absence of materials affected the integration of translanguaging because there was no reference for correct language instruction. Consistent with the findings, Sayer (2013) acknowledged numerous shortages of translanguaging teaching and learning resources in most bilingual educational contexts, which hinders the implementation of translanguaging pedagogy. Kirsch (2020) also revealed a dearth of translanguaging teaching and learning resources for successful English language teaching employing learner-centred practices. Further, Cenoz and Gorter (2017) and Gorter and Arocena (2020) likewise argue that the lack of translanguaging curriculums and learning materials is one of the core reasons translanguaging is not widely incorporated in the monolingual and multilingual context.

In agreement with Ojong (2022), this study suggests that the government must offer adequate and linguistically suitable teaching and learning resources to institutions to facilitate the effective integration of translanguaging in their English language classrooms. Similarly, Chaika (2023) emphasises that policymakers should provide adequate linguistic resources and materials to support the implementation of translanguaging practices in educational settings, ensuring equitable access to language learning opportunities and fostering inclusive environments for multilingual learners. Nevertheless, contextual sensitivity and ideological impartiality should be ensured in recontextualising textbooks for translanguaging practices in Namibia. In theory, the current issues are policy-related and can only be resolved via policy realignment.

6.5.2.5 Translanguaging Perceived to be Time Consuming

The study revealed that teachers find translanguaging time-consuming because they must cater to varying language proficiency levels among learners, leading to extra time spent explaining

concepts in multiple languages and providing additional support. The teachers reported that translanguaging required them to spend more time on planning and preparation and that it also required more time during class time. The teacher felt that creating bilingual or multilingual materials, designing activities that cater to diverse linguistic backgrounds, and adapting their teaching methods to accommodate translanguaging practices were time-consuming tasks. This aligns with Galante's assertion that accommodating learners' languages in class demands more time, leading to ambiguity. Childs (2016) states that teachers may not support multilingual teaching models due to time constraints in the curriculum. They believe languages should be taught separately to avoid added strain and time consumption. The teachers' views align with Driouch (2022), who found difficulty in managing well their time as they did not know about the proper amount of time that should be allocated for the use of other languages in their classes. The findings also agree with Arocena et al. (2015), who argued that the teachers in their study viewed learners' participation in their local languages as time-consuming. Similarly, Nyimbili and Mwanza (2021) noticed that the teacher did not manage time very effectively, and the lessons were not concluded early enough. In that regard, I agree with Driouch's (2022) suggestion that there is a need for studies that could clarify when it can work best.

However, the teachers' ideologies about time limitations and Galante's (2020) views were based on the monocultural and monolingual ideology of English language teaching, as Nyimbili & Mwanza (2021) argue that this mindset supported the silencing of learners and marginalisation of the native language. Here, the monomodal methodology is the desired pedagogical practice compared to translanguaging. Given these ideologies, the study proposes the decolonisation of the curriculum and the mindsets of the teachers as the first step into democratising the grade 4 English language classrooms in Namibia (Nyimbili & Mwanza, 2020). The current ideologies suggest that scholars who perceive multilingualism as a problem will continuously advocate for monolingualism and view translanguaging as interference with English language learning. Therefore, for English language learning to occur seamlessly in the context of a multilingual grade 4 classroom in Namibia, the learner must interact with the language they understand best, which can only happen in a translanguaging classroom.

6.5.2.6 Teachers' Unfamiliarity with all Learners' First Languages

Another factor constraining the integration of translanguaging in the classroom is the teachers' inability to understand learners' first language (L1). The study found that the teachers' lack of knowledge of learners' home language is an additional barrier to incorporating pedagogical

translanguaging in the multilingual grade 4 classroom. Some teachers reported that they were not comfortable using learners' L1s in their teaching because they were not fluent in the language and therefore were unable to use them to provide clear and comprehensible explanations or to scaffold their learning. This, according to teachers, risks their control of the classroom and makes them feel less secure (Driouch, 2022). They were worried about making mistakes when using L1, which could undermine their credibility or confuse learners. The same was reported by Ticheloven et al. (2021: 500), who found that teachers felt motivated not to use other languages during their classes because they experienced “organisational stress and risk of losing control as more significant than the principle of linguistic inclusion.”.

According to Jenks & Lee (2020), teachers' privation of knowledge of learners' native language is an additional barrier to incorporating pedagogical translanguaging in the classroom. This finding highlights a significant challenge in implementing L1 in English language teaching classrooms. Without familiarity with the learners' L1, teachers may be reluctant or unable to use it effectively as a pedagogical tool. Teachers with a lower command of language learners' L1 can be more unwilling to encourage learners to swap between languages or use their L1 (Ojong, 2022). However, although teachers' low proficiency restricts teachers from using the learners' home language, learners must not be denied the right to their L1, as low proficiency drawbacks are for teachers and not learners (Vogel and García, 2017). The teacher's lack of learners' L1 has resulted in the teachers using the English language instead of creating a space for translanguaging practices.

According to Ojong (2022), teachers believe that using translanguaging pedagogy requires them to be proficient in their learners' L1 or have a classroom where all learners share the same L1. However, being proficient in learners' home languages is not necessary, as noted by Hansen-Thomas et al. (2021) and García, Johnson, & Seltzer (2017). Flóres and García (2013) suggest that teachers do not need to be fully bilingual to implement translanguaging techniques with multilingual learners. Furthermore, Stewart et al. (2020:153) maintain that “Teachers do not need to be fully bilingual to engage in learning with their learners and become equal participants in the educational enterprise to equalise power relations between learners and teachers.”. Instead, teachers should be willing to learn alongside learners to equalise power dynamics. Thus, teachers don't have to be bi/multilingual for translanguaging; they should be co-learners. This shift in perspective allows teachers to recognise the valuable skills that learners bring to the learning environment, even as they continue to acquire English. According

to Desmond (2024), they should be ready to co-learn with learners, explicitly demonstrating that they are not the sole keepers of expertise.

Co-learning is seen as essential in knowledge construction, shifting traditional teacher and learner roles to collaborative partners in the learning process (Hansen-Thomas et al., 2021:153). Wei (2014:169) emphasises the importance of mutual adaptation in co-learning, where both teacher and learner continuously adjust their actions to learn from each other. Through sharing, learning, and mutual adaptation, co-learning becomes a valuable experience for both parties. This concept is particularly relevant in Namibian educational settings, especially in multilingual classrooms with diverse learners encountering a new language. To address challenges of lack of familiarity in L1 and promote inclusive translinguaging, pedagogical implementation of co-learning is essential for collaborative teacher-learner learning interactions. To address this constraint, it is essential to provide teachers with opportunities to develop their language skills, either through formal language courses or through informal language learning activities.

Training and development can precipitate ideology shifts and changes in perspective about the traditional role of teachers and instruction. Seltzer (2020) worked with a teacher who began learning about different translingual approaches. After reflecting on her privilege and educational posture, she created a new pedagogy infused with the “destabilisation of her role as ‘linguistic expert’ in the classroom” (ibid., 2020: 302). This enabled the teacher to become a co-learner instead of the traditional sole steward of knowledge and linguistic proficiency (Seltzer, 2020). As teachers build a practice of investing in the lives of learners while learning and growing with them, they have the unique opportunity to become a new kind of listener, one who monitors and adjusts their thinking, practices, and ideologies informed by learners’ lives, skills, and experiences (Desmond, 2024).

6.5.2.7 Some Learners Lack of Proficiency in the Regional Official Language (Silozi)

The findings of the study further revealed that translinguaging was constrained by the learners’ lack of proficiency in the regional official language, Silozi. The study found that many grade 4 learners in multilingual classrooms were not proficient enough in the Silozi language to use it as a medium of instruction, which limited their ability to engage in translinguaging practices. Teachers reported that most learners were not fluent in the language as they did not use it at home but only encountered it at school. During group discussions, learners were observed

frequently using their familiar languages, such as Subia, Sifwe, and Totela, instead of Silozi. This indicated a lack of confidence and fluency in using the medium of instruction, which limited their ability to express their ideas clearly and engage in meaningful communication with their peers. Harris (2018:74) found that “[l]earners in the region struggle to understand Silozi as a medium of instruction in the classroom. Learners further struggle to speak and read Silozi's vocabulary. This is partly because most Zambezi residents use Silozi as a second language and use their mother tongue in their communities.” According to Nzwala (2022), both teachers and learners are not comfortable with Silozi being the medium of instruction in pre-primary, as they both struggled to express themselves in Silozi, consequently making it difficult for teachers to assist learners (in the selected schools) to develop basic literacy skills through the said language medium.

Literature shows that teachers implement translanguaging in the Silozi lessons to mediate learners' understanding due to unfamiliarity with Silozi, the officially designated language of instruction. This reflects Mashinja & Mwanza's (2020) argument that the classroom is not a site of monolingual epistemic violence but a democratic space for literacy and epistemic development. Therefore, it is argued in this study that while teachers implemented translanguaging through English and the Silozi language, the classroom became a site of official monolingual/monomodal epistemic violence. Thus, although teaching took place, no learning took place, as the study found that some learners resorted to keeping quiet when English and the Silozi language were used exclusively. Thus, this phenomenon of the official monoglossic approach had a profound effect on deterring learners from active classroom participation and eventually denying them access to quality education. Hence, the study argues that the exclusive use of English and Silozi in Namibian classrooms is not appropriate and calls for the legitimisation of dynamic heteroglossic practices in the education system to promote equitable and accessible quality education for all. It is time for Namibia to embrace its linguistic and cultural diversity and create an inclusive and culturally responsive education system that prepares learners for a globalised world. Creating spaces for such translanguaging to support learning is therefore an act of transformative education in which the teachers “challenge the operation of coercive relations of power in the wider society” (García 2009; 318) to apply more equitable education practices for all learners. To address this constraint, it is essential to provide learners with opportunities to develop their language skills, either through formal language courses or through informal language learning activities.

6.5.2.8 Teachers' Negative Attitudes Towards Indigenous Languages

Teachers' negative attitudes towards indigenous languages played a crucial role in the failure of translanguaging in the classroom. The study found that many teachers viewed indigenous languages as inferior to the dominant language of instruction. Some teachers even believed that learners who spoke indigenous languages were less intelligent and incapable of learning in the classroom. This negative attitude towards indigenous languages was also reflected in the way teachers interacted with their learners. Some teachers often discouraged the use of indigenous languages in the classroom and even punished learners who spoke their native languages. Thus, English was considered by some teachers and school principals as the only language that could lead to success, and its violation was punishable in a derogatory manner (Shifidi, 2014; Katukula, Set, & Nyambe, 2023). This created a sense of fear and reluctance among teachers to experiment with translanguaging. Supporting this finding, Mwanza (2017) showed that teachers held monolingual purist language ideologies in which their negative attitudes towards unofficial languages resulted in symbolic violence. In Namibia, Katukula, Set, & Nyambe (2023) reported that both parents and teachers harboured monolingual ideological belief systems that did not only construct and perpetuate an "English-only" language zone but also banished all mother tongue languages from the school premises.

Teachers' beliefs were shaped by their experiences as learners, including being reprimanded for using their mother tongue in the classroom and being taught to only use English. Many teachers themselves were educated in a system promoting monolingualism, viewing indigenous languages as a barrier to learning. Consequently, they avoided using local languages in their teaching, hindering translanguaging implementation. These findings align with Pantalleresco (2021), indicating that teachers' language ideologies were heavily influenced by their personal histories and experiences, impacting their teaching practices. Some teachers felt less educated and incompetent when using local languages. Teachers were afraid of being seen as unprofessional or incompetent if they used local language in English lessons, due to the belief that it showed poor English proficiency. This pressure to conform to dominant beliefs led to a lack of translanguaging in the classroom. Teachers avoided using local languages to protect their image, despite missing out on potential benefits. These biases are influenced by the language positions held by most teachers, restricting their language practices. Commenting on the importance of teacher attitudes toward teaching and learning, Mwanza (2017) advised that there is a need for teachers to hold positive attitudes toward languages, including local, zonal

(predominant), or familiar languages, to ensure epistemic access among learners of different language backgrounds and abilities.

6.6 Support Needed to Successfully Implement Translanguaging in Multilingual Classrooms

The findings of the study have revealed some challenges encountered by the teacher hindering the employment of translanguaging in the grade 4 classrooms. Therefore, this study outlines four major areas aimed at addressing these challenges, centring on teacher training, adjusting curriculum and assessment, fostering collaboration, and developing language policies.

6.6.1 Teacher training

Desmond (2024) noted that theory alone is not enough. Hence, Stewart et al. (2020:160) established that translanguaging can, at times, feel “uneven and ambiguous” to teachers without training in theory and specific practices. Lang (2019:13) advocates that “teachers need additional preparation to effectively leverage learners’ bilingualism, considering both the complex instructional context and learners’ perspectives.” Dougherty (2021) established that teachers must be exposed to professional development and training directly related to translanguaging and its planning and implementation. Thus, effective implementation of translanguaging entails the reconstruction of teachers’ knowledge about language instruction and the adoption of practical models in contextualised classrooms, rather than leaving teachers and learners to trial and error (Wang et al., 2024). However, many teachers remain sceptical about breaking the boundaries of named languages to normalise the approach, viewing themselves as unprepared to act as representatives of translanguaging (Aung, 2021). Therefore, Champlin (2016), Yasar Yuzlu & Dikilitas (2022), Karabulut & Kesli Dollar (2022), and Desmond (2024) all recommend that teachers should be educated or trained about the benefits of translanguaging so that they could be able to promote comprehensive use of languages. Exposure to translanguaging forums, activities, and online resources is recommended to enhance teachers’ proficiency (Wang et al., 2024).

Empirical evidence from studies such as Cavazos and Musanti (2022) emphasises the transformative impact of teacher training. Involvement in teaching training programs could encourage teachers to adopt learner-centred translanguaging pedagogies and engage in critical self-reflection. These programs serve as valuable platforms for teachers to share insights and challenge entrenched language ideologies and therefore revise their instructional practices

(Wang et al., 2024). For example, despite initial reservations, when teachers completed courses like the ‘ESL (English as a Second Language) Endorsement Practicum,’ they gradually recognised the benefits of translanguaging in learner comfort and identity development (Barro et al., 2021). Similarly, teachers in a Stewart et al. (2020) study initially struggled with translanguaging, thinking some of its practices were questionable, but found that after training their perspectives changed. They began to see translanguaging as a “key to help unlock meaning through negotiating with our learners” (158). Equally, Gorter and Arocena (2020) revealed that professional development interventions led to a shift in teachers’ attitudes towards language separation. After the training, the teachers gradually embraced the concept of leveraging multiple languages.

According to Desmond (2024), not all training needs to be formal. In a study by Van Viegen Stille et al. (2016), participating teachers created their learning and development designed to leverage translanguaging principles, and as they became learners of their learners and cultures, they added multilingual resources to the school and classrooms. The school staff concluded that “professional learning was significant in generating change at the school” (492). For these teachers, training, development, and preparation were vital in the deployment of successful translanguaging methods. Teacher training catalyses promoting the successful adoption and integration of translanguaging practices in educational contexts. It can challenge and reshape teachers’ existing attitudes and beliefs about language teaching and learning. By exposing teachers to the benefits of translanguaging and providing evidence of its efficacy, teacher training fosters a positive shift in their perspectives, encouraging greater openness to embrace multilingual approaches.

6.6.2 Adapting Curriculum and Assessment

Implementing translanguaging pedagogy is not merely a matter of adopting a set of practices; it requires a mindful adaptation to the specific context in which teachers operate. Thus, schools vary in terms of language policies, community demographics, institutional culture, and available resources, making it essential to tailor translanguaging practices accordingly. Therefore, it is crucial to tailor pedagogical translanguaging to fit within existing school curricula while considering the specific education context (Gorter & Arocena, 2020; Ou et al., 2023). Adapting the curriculum ensures that instructional materials and activities align with the goal of translanguaging by incorporating opportunities for learners to use and develop proficiency in multiple languages and optimise their learning outcomes (Wang et al., 2024).

In addition to curriculum design, assessment methods need to be reformed to support and embrace learners' multilingual practices to better actualise translanguaging in educational contexts. Traditional assessment methods may not accurately measure learners' knowledge and skills if they are limited to a single language. As suggested by teachers in Mbirimi-Hungwe (2019), teachers should allow learners to be assessed in two languages, enabling learners to respond to questions in their preferred language. This approach empowers learners to demonstrate their understanding and skills using a translanguaging approach, even if their proficiency in the target language is not fully developed. According to Wang et al. (2024:414), regular review and adjustment of the curriculum and assessment practices allow teachers to identify areas for improvement and make necessary changes to better support translanguaging implementation. This iterative process helps ensure that teachers' instructional practices remain responsive to the evolving needs of learners and diverse educational contexts.

6.6.3 Fostering Collaboration

The study findings emphasise the need for engaging all stakeholders in discussions on multilingual education. Collaboration among teachers, learners, administrators, policymakers, and other stakeholders promotes a shared understanding of translanguaging goals, strategies, and opportunities. Wang et al. (2024:414) claim that establishing a culture of collaboration amongst diverse parties involved in the learning process would increase the feasibility of translanguaging applications. In their studies, Fang and Liu (2020) and Wang (2020) both advise that teachers and learners should establish agreements concerning the ratio of home language usage at the beginning of the subject.

Additionally, the partnership of teachers is essential for fostering interactions in translanguaging that facilitate the incorporation of language and content. Collaboration permits teachers to leverage their expertise and insights and enables managers to provide support and resources to facilitate translanguaging initiatives. By combining their expertise, stakeholders can develop more effective strategies for integrating multiple languages into the learning environment. Collaborative interactions would create a supportive environment, and teachers may be more willing to try translanguaging strategies when they have the support of colleagues and managers.

6.6.4 Adjusting Language Policy

Teachers often turn to language policies to shape their curriculum and instructional practices. Teachers' ideologies are complexly shaped by language policies, underlining the significance of aligning these policies with the actual needs, experiences, and challenges encountered in their professional environments. (Alhasnawi, 2021). Evidence from studies such as Fang and Liu (2020), Yasar Yuzlu and Dikilitas (2022), and Ou et al. (2023) highlights the major challenges posed by monolingual policies to the effective implementation of translanguaging in practice. The findings of this study established that despite the current language policy's recognition of multilingualism and recommendation for translanguaging integration in Grade 4, it is not explicit on how it should be applied. As also echoed by Wang et al. (2024), despite evolving perspectives, many policies and language teachers continue to prioritise full immersion in an English-only situation for language learning. Therefore, to effectively implement translanguaging, significant adjustments to current language policies are essential. Moreover, language policies could ensure consistency and coherence across educational institutions or systems. They help maintain uniformity in translanguaging practices and prevent confusion or discrepancies among teachers, learners, and other stakeholders.

6.6.5 Releasing Linguistic Control

Releasing linguistic control in the classroom is a challenging but attainable goal, profoundly influenced by the teacher's level of preparation and introspection. Through thoughtful planning and self-reflection, teachers can create classroom environments that celebrate learner voices and promote collaborative learning. In a study by Gonzalez & Machado (2022), teachers developed their theory and practice through training; they found themselves relaxing language dominance in the classroom. They developed a "willingness to step beyond their comfort zones regarding language—to speak, write, and understand in languages in which they did not consider themselves fluent" (Gonzalez & Machado, 2022:691). They made the shift from always being a teacher to sometimes being a learner and then used their novel knowledge about learners to guide instruction. Stewart et al. (2020:153) uphold that "Teachers do not need to be fully bilingual to engage in learning with their learners and become equal participants in the educational enterprise to equalise power relations between learners and teachers." This standpoint is realised in their 2020 study in which teachers, after training, established themselves as mediators of language even though they had very limited abilities within the languages represented in the classroom.

6.7 Chapter Summary

The chapter examined teacher familiarity with and ideologies about translanguaging and its implementation in grade 4 classrooms in the Zambezi region. Factors that support or hinder translanguaging were also analysed. The next chapter presents the conclusions and recommendations of the study

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Overview

This chapter presents the conclusions and recommendations on the teachers' ideologies about the implementation of translanguageing in multilingual grade 4 classrooms in Namibia. The chapter further provides the study's contribution to the body of knowledge. Lastly, the study presents suggestions regarding the areas for future research and academic debate.

7.2 Conclusions

In the study under consideration, the researcher set out four objectives that provided a clear roadmap for the research. 1. Teachers' Familiarity with the Language Policy about Translanguageing: This objective aimed to assess the awareness and understanding of the language policy related to translanguageing among Grade 4 teachers. 2. Teachers' Ideologies about Translanguageing Pedagogical Practice: This objective sought to explore the beliefs and attitudes of Grade 4 teachers towards the use of translanguageing in their classrooms. 3. Application of Translanguageing in Multilingual Grade 4 Language Classrooms: This objective aimed to examine the extent to which Grade 4 teachers applied translanguageing in their English language classrooms. 4. Factors Affecting Teachers' Implementation of Translanguageing in Multilingual Grade 4 Classrooms: This objective aimed to identify the factors that influenced the implementation of translanguageing in multilingual Grade 4 classrooms. By concluding the line with each objective, the study was able to provide valuable insights into the relationships between variables. Thus, the conclusions were drawn in line with each objective.

7.3 Teachers' Familiarity with the Language Policy in Relation to Translanguageing

This research objective sought to establish the grade 4 English language teachers' awareness of the language policy about translanguageing. The study findings revealed that most teachers were familiar with the language policy about translanguageing, while a few were not. Teachers who were familiar with the policy expressed positive attitudes towards translanguageing, citing its potential to enhance language learning and promote multilingualism in the classroom. They also reported incorporating translanguageing strategies into their classroom practice, practicing new concepts, and better understanding the subject matter. In contrast, teachers who were unfamiliar with the language policy expressed concerns about the potential challenges of implementing translanguageing in their classrooms. They were worried that using multiple

languages in the classroom might confuse learners and hinder their learning. This suggests that providing teachers with adequate training and resources on translanguaging may not only improve their familiarity with the policy but also enhance their attitudes toward it. The findings demonstrate the need for teacher education institutions to revise their curriculum and explicitly incorporate multilingual practices into their curriculum to increase the acceptance of using translanguaging in multilingual second language classrooms. Similarly, there is a need for teacher education institutions to expose teachers to the curriculum and syllabi during training so that when they are deployed, they are aware and implement the curriculum without problems.

7.4 Teachers' Ideologies About Translanguaging Pedagogical Practice

The findings of the study demonstrated that teachers hold diverse ideologies about the implementation of translanguaging in multilingual grade 4 classrooms. These ideologies range from positive perspectives that emphasise the benefits of translanguaging for language learning to negative perspectives that highlight potential challenges. Some teachers held positive ideologies about translanguaging, emphasising its potential benefits for language learning. These teachers embraced translanguaging as a valuable tool for language learning. They believed that translanguaging allowed learners to leverage their linguistic strengths, promote understanding, and develop cognitive flexibility. They said that translanguaging could enhance learner comprehension and L2 learning by allowing the use of learners' full linguistic repertoire, developing learners' vocabulary, improving learners' performance in assessment tasks, familiarising learners with the target language (English), and creating a more inclusive and equitable classroom environment. Further, teachers believed that by embracing and incorporating learners' multiple languages into the classroom, teachers can foster positive relationships, encourage active participation, and boost learners' confidence.

On the other hand, other teachers held negative ideologies about translanguaging, highlighting potential challenges associated with its implementation. These teachers expressed concerns about translanguaging, particularly its potential to hinder learners' development of standard English proficiency. They feared that translanguaging could lead to confusion and interfere with learners' ability to learn new concepts in the classroom. Their concerns were that translanguaging has a detrimental effect on L2 oral and written skills, is time-consuming and causes confusion, impedes learners' familiarisation with the target language, and that local languages have educational and professional values. The study highlights that teachers'

ideologies can significantly influence the implementation of translanguaging. To ensure the successful implementation of translanguaging, it is crucial to provide teachers with the necessary support and resources to navigate the complexities of this approach. Teachers should be provided with professional development opportunities that focus on the effective implementation of translanguaging, including strategies for scaffolding learners' language use and promoting the development of standard academic language.

7.5 Application of Translanguaging in Grade 4 English Language Classrooms

This research objective sought to examine the actual classroom application of translanguaging. Lesson plans were analysed to establish whether teachers deliberately planned for translanguaging and purposefully used it as a pedagogic practice. The study found that while some teachers regularly planned for their lessons, others did not. However, the study also found that although teachers regularly planned for their lessons, they often did not include translanguaging in their daily lesson plans. Thus, teachers did not plan for translanguaging in their lesson plans. Most of the teachers reported that they never or rarely considered translanguaging when planning their lessons. This raises important questions about the role of translanguaging in the classroom and the barriers that may prevent its incorporation into lesson planning. The lack of awareness and understanding of the concept of translanguaging arising from a lack of training and resources, coupled with the pressure to prioritise English, were crucial factors that contributed to this phenomenon. The study highlights a critical gap in teacher preparation and professional development when it comes to planning for translanguaging. The findings suggest a need for increased awareness and training for teachers on the benefits of translanguaging and strategies for incorporating it into their lesson plans.

Regarding classroom implementation, the findings of the study revealed that most of the teachers implemented unplanned translanguaging practices in their lessons. This finding suggests that teachers did not intentionally plan to use multiple languages in their teaching, but rather it happened spontaneously in response to learners' needs or situations that arose during the lesson. The unplanned nature of translanguaging practices was further supported by the classroom observations, which documented instances of teachers switching between languages to clarify instructions, explain complex concepts, and facilitate communication between learners with different linguistic backgrounds. Some teachers spontaneously switched between officially sanctioned languages (English and Silozi). While others integrated learners' familiar languages (Subia) as well, apart from the officially approved ones. The unexpected use of

multiple languages emerged in response to addressing situational demands that arose during the lesson. However, while these practices may be seen as a spontaneous response to the needs of their learners, further research is needed to determine their long-term effectiveness and to explore the potential benefits and drawbacks of using translanguaging as a deliberate teaching strategy. On the other hand, other teachers stuck to English exclusively, despite supporting its benefits, demonstrating a gap between actual practice and their beliefs.

7.6 Factors Affecting Teachers' Implementation of Translanguaging in Multilingual Grade 4 Classrooms

This research objective was aimed at establishing factors affecting the implementation of translanguaging in multilingual grade 4 classrooms of the Zambezi region of Namibia when teaching English. The findings of this study pointed to several factors that both engendered and constrained the full integration of translanguaging in multilingual grade 4 classroom settings. The study identified four main factors that promoted the use of translanguaging: learners' inadequate proficiency in English, teachers' judgement of their learners being of inadequate quality, overcrowded classrooms, and the implementation of the double shift school system. On the other hand, the implementation of translanguaging in multilingual classrooms also faces multiple constraints, including inadequate teacher training and support, monolingual assessments, teachers' lack of familiarity with translanguaging pedagogic practices, teachers' inadequate proficiency with learners' L1, the perception of translanguaging as time-consuming, learners' lack of proficiency in the regional language, and teachers' negative attitudes about indigenous languages. These factors hinder the effective use of translanguaging and limit its potential to support multilingual learners' linguistic development and academic achievement. To overcome these constraints, it is essential to provide teachers with comprehensive training and support on translanguaging pedagogy, including its theoretical foundations, practical strategies, and assessment practices. Additionally, schools need to shift their assessment paradigms away from monolingualism towards recognising and valuing translanguaging practices. Teacher education programs should also prioritise developing teachers' proficiency in the L1s of their learners. By addressing these constraints, teachers can create more supportive and inclusive learning environments where translanguaging is valued and effectively implemented to enhance the educational experiences of multilingual learners.

7.7 The Contribution of this Research

The study examined the teachers' ideologies about translanguaging in multilingual grade 4 classrooms in Namibia. Through the research objectives, the study's findings have contributed to the body of knowledge in the field of language teaching, particularly the implementation of translanguaging in pedagogic practice in the teaching of the English language in Namibian multilingual classrooms. The findings from this study offer contributions to theory and practice, as discussed in the following sections.

7.7.1 Contributions to the Theory

By applying the language orientation theory to the context of Namibia, this study provides a critical examination of the assumptions underpinning language policy and ideology. This study contributes to the theoretical framework surrounding language orientation and translanguaging by demonstrating how teachers' ideologies can influence pedagogical practices in multilingual contexts. It draws attention to the transformative potential of translanguaging as a mechanism for engaging with the complexities of multilingual classrooms. Furthermore, it underscores the necessity of recognising teachers as key agents in the translanguaging process, advocating for policies that empower both teachers and learners to leverage their beliefs in support of multilingual education. The bridging of the language orientation theory and translanguaging practices demonstrates how a shift in teachers' language ideologies can lead to transformative educational experiences. Thus, it argues for a shift towards a multilingual orientation that appreciates the complexities of language use in educational settings. The Code and Pedagogic Discourse Theory, unpacks the complexities of pedagogical discourse, revealing how certain language codes marginalize learners who use minority languages. It clarifies relationships by revealing how teachers' linguistic codes reflect their social backgrounds and educational philosophies, influencing their pedagogical choices in the classroom. In this regard, it underscores the necessity of balanced language inclusion that fosters an equitable learning environment. CDA broadens the scope of language analysis by foregrounding the interconnections between discourse and power relations. It posits that teachers' ideologies are not simply personal beliefs but are influenced by larger societal discourses. Consequently, it has revealed how institutional narratives prioritise certain language varieties over others, constraining teachers' capacities to adopt translanguaging effectively in Namibia.

The current study contributes to the current debates surrounding language education policies. If classrooms continue to silence learners' native languages, the ambition of achieving a truly

multilingual educational framework is unlikely to materialise. This study advocates for a paradigm shift towards recognising and valuing learners' linguistic diversity as a resource rather than a hindrance. Teachers wielding shared linguistic power can construct curricula that celebrate multilingualism and facilitate the incorporation of translanguaging practices. Thus, to genuinely embrace translanguaging as an effective pedagogical approach in the Namibian multilingual classrooms, stakeholders in language education—policymakers, curriculum designers, and teachers—must advocate for policies that recognise and celebrate linguistic diversity. By doing so, we can move closer to realising a truly multilingual education system that serves all learners effectively.

7.7.2 Contribution to Practice

The study of teachers' ideologies about translanguaging also contributes to the body of knowledge on language ideologies. Language ideologies refer to the beliefs, attitudes, and values that individuals hold about language and its use (Woolard, 1998). By examining teachers' ideologies about translanguaging, this study contributed to a better understanding of how language ideologies shape teachers' perception of language use in the classroom and how these ideologies can be nurtured or challenged through teacher education and professional development. Furthermore, the study provides insights into how teachers understand and implement translanguaging in the classroom. It adds to the existing literature on translanguaging by exploring how teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward language use influence their teaching practices. This contributes to a deeper understanding of the concept of translanguaging and its potential to enhance language learning and academic achievement. From a practical perspective, the study provides valuable insights into how teachers' ideologies influence their teaching practices and how these practices can be improved to support learners' linguistic and academic development. This is particularly relevant in the Namibian context, where the use of translanguaging is encouraged but not always understood or implemented effectively.

Furthermore, the study contributes to the body of knowledge by also challenging teachers to reflect on their language ideologies and biases. Many teachers in Namibia have been trained in a monolingual education system and therefore have been socialised to believe that English is the only language of instruction and that other languages should be excluded from the classroom. Translanguaging challenges these ideologies and encourages teachers to see the value in learners' home languages and how they can be used to support their learning. This

approach also challenges teachers to move away from a “one-size-fits-all” approach to teaching and embrace a more flexible and adaptable approach that considers learners’ individual needs and backgrounds. This not only contributes to the body of knowledge in pedagogic practice implementation but also enhances teachers' professional development by equipping them with new strategies and approaches to teaching. Moreover, the study has contributed to the understanding of the sociocultural and contextual factors that influence language use in the classroom. In Namibia, where learners come from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, the use of different languages in the classroom is not only beneficial for linguistic and academic development but also promotes a sense of inclusivity and cultural diversity. Lesson planning that incorporates translanguaging takes into consideration the learners' cultural and linguistic background and creates a more culturally responsive classroom environment, which in turn contributes to the growing body of knowledge on the importance of cultural sensitivity in language teaching.

Moreover, lesson planning for translanguaging in multilingual classrooms can contribute to the body of knowledge in the field of language teaching by providing evidence-based practices that can be replicated in other multilingual contexts. As the use of translanguaging is still a relatively new approach in education, there is a need for more research and documentation of best practices. Therefore, lesson planning for translanguaging can serve as a learning platform for teachers, researchers, and policymakers to better understand the benefits and challenges of this approach and how it can be implemented effectively. The study has made a significant contribution by showing the relationship between lesson planning and translanguaging and how that affects the potential use of translanguaging practices.

Finally, the study also sought to establish the factors that affect the implementation of translanguaging pedagogic practices in the grade 4 multilingual classes of the Zambezi Region. The study established some constraints on translanguaging practices in Namibian classrooms, preventing their application. Chief among the factors is teachers’ lack of knowledge of translanguaging, resulting from a lack of training in the pedagogic approach. Therefore, this study has suggested a training program in translanguaging as part of a continuous development program for teachers in Namibia to equip them with theoretical and practical underpinnings of the pedagogic practice (see 7.3.4).

7.8 Proposed Training Program in Translanguaging as part of CPD for Namibian Teachers

a) Importance of CPD for Teachers

Continuous professional development is essential for teachers to adapt to changing educational needs and contexts. In Namibia, a CPD program focusing on translanguaging can provide teachers with: Enhanced pedagogical skills and strategies for inclusive teaching; Opportunities to reflect on their practices and engage with new methodologies; Support for navigating the linguistic diversity present in their classrooms.

b) Objectives of the Training Program

The training program aims to achieve the following objectives:

1. **To Enhance Teachers' Understanding of Translanguaging and its Pedagogical Significance:** Provide theoretical and practical knowledge about translanguaging and its benefits in a multilingual context.
2. **Develop Practical Skills:** Equip teachers with practical strategies and activities to implement translanguaging in their classrooms.
3. **Promote Linguistic Inclusivity:** Foster an appreciation of linguistic diversity and cultural inclusivity among teachers.
4. **Facilitate Collaborative Learning:** Foster a collaborative environment where teachers can share resources, experiences, challenges, and successes related to translanguaging.

c) Target Audience

The program is designed for teachers from primary and secondary education levels in Namibia. It is intended for teachers from different language backgrounds, encouraging collaboration and exchange of knowledge.

d) Program Structure

The training program is structured into six modules, each lasting one day, and conducted over six weeks. The program employs a blend of workshops, hands-on activities, group discussions, and reflective practice.

Module 1: Introduction to Translanguaging

➤ Session 1: Understanding Translanguaging

- ❖ **Content:** Definition and principles of translanguaging.
- ❖ Theoretical foundations: Exploration of key theories underpinning and research supporting translanguaging in education.
- ❖ Significance of translanguaging in multilingual education.
- **Session 2: Translanguaging in the Namibian Context**
 - ❖ **Content:** Overview of linguistic diversity in Namibia.
 - ❖ Discussion of current language challenges faced by teachers and learners.
 - ❖ Overview of translanguaging concepts and its relevance in the Namibian context.
- **Case Studies:** Analysing successful translanguaging practices from Namibia and other multilingual contexts.
- ✓ **Activities: Identifying Translanguaging Opportunities:** Group discussions on current language practices, analysing case studies from successful translanguaging implementations.
- ✓ Participants will analyse their classroom scenarios to identify potential translanguaging practices.

Module 2: Classroom Strategies for Translanguaging

- **Session 3: Developing Linguistic Awareness**
 - ❖ **Content:** Activities to promote awareness of learners' linguistic repertoires, respect and appreciation for linguistic diversity.
 - ❖ Tools for assessing learners' language proficiencies.
- **Session 4: Designing Translanguaging Lesson Plans**
 - ❖ **Content:** Creating lesson plans that incorporate translanguaging strategies.
 - ❖ Pair work to design and present mini-lessons.
- **Session 5: Observation and Feedback**
 - ❖ Teachers will observe their peers implementing translanguaging strategies in the classroom.
 - ❖ Constructive feedback sessions to discuss observations and improvements.
- ✓ **Activities: Lesson Planning:** Participants brainstorm and develop lesson plans incorporating translanguaging techniques, followed by peer feedback sessions.
- ✓ Participants will create lesson plans that integrate translanguaging strategies in their teaching practices.
- ✓ **Role-playing:** Simulating classroom scenarios to practice translanguaging techniques.
- ✓ Reflective discussions on the implementation of translanguaging strategies

- ✓ Feedback sessions focusing on peer collaboration and improvement.

Module 3: Resources for Translanguaging

- **Session 5: Identifying and Creating Resources**
 - ❖ **Content:** Identification and creation of bilingual and multilingual resources, including bilingual texts, visual aids, and digital tools.
 - ❖ Use of bi/multilingual resources and materials.
- ✓ **Activities: Developing bilingual and multilingual resources:** Hands-on sessions to develop and curate resources, as well as sharing existing materials among participants.

Module 4: Creating a Translanguaging-Friendly Environment

- **Content:** Strategies for restructuring the classroom environment and promoting a translanguaging-friendly classroom.
- ✓ **Activities:** Room redesign activities, role-playing scenarios to foster an inclusive and supportive space.

Module 5: Assessment in Translanguaging Contexts

- **Session 7: Assessing Translanguaging**
 - ❖ **Content:** Discussing traditional and innovative assessment methods for multilingual learners.
 - ❖ Designing assessments that recognize and value language use across the curriculum.
 - ❖ Evaluating learner progress using translanguaging-friendly assessment techniques.
- ✓ **Activities:** Developing and sharing formative and summative assessment strategies that accommodate multiple languages.

Module 6: Building a Community of Practice

- **Session 9: Networking and Resource Development**
 - ❖ **Content:** Creating a collaborative platform for sharing resources, experiences, and ongoing support among teachers within and across schools.
 - ❖ Establishing a community of practice for translanguaging teachers.
- **Session 6: Reflection and Feedback**
 - ❖ **Content:** Participants reflect on their learning and discuss the application of translanguaging in their classrooms.
 - ❖ Preparing personal action plans for implementing change in the classroom.

- ✓ **Activities:** Creating a mentorship program, planning future workshops, and establishing online collaboration platforms for continuous discussion and resource sharing

Action Plan Development:

- ✓ Teachers will develop personal action plans detailing how they will implement translanguaging in their classrooms and the support they may need.

➤ **Session 10: Closing Ceremony**

- ❖ Presentation of certificates of participation.
- ❖ Encouragement of a commitment to implementing translanguaging in their teaching practices.

e) Evaluation and Follow-Up

To measure the efficacy of the training program, the following evaluation methods should be employed:

1. **Pre and Post Training Surveys:** Assessing changes in knowledge, confidence and ideologies regarding translanguaging.
2. **Lesson Plan Evaluation:** Reviewing lesson plans created during the practical application sessions to gauge the integration of translanguaging.
3. **Observation Feedback:** Utilising peer reviews and observation data to assess the effectiveness of translanguaging strategies in real classroom settings.
4. A **follow-up session** will be scheduled several months later to discuss challenges encountered, successes achieved, and opportunities for further professional development in translanguaging.

7.9 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study on teachers' ideologies towards the implementation of translanguaging in multilingual classrooms, several recommendations can be suggested to teachers, policymakers, and researchers to improve the implementation of the language policy and promote the effective use of translanguaging in the Grade 4 classroom in Namibia:

- 1) **Promote a Multilingual Mindset:** Since translanguaging is taking place using officially approved languages in multilingual schools, there is a need to promote multilingualism as an asset to increase its acceptance in the classroom. Teachers should be encouraged to reflect on their ideologies about multilingualism and language use in the classroom through guided

discussions or peer observations. Ultimately, teachers may become more open to the idea of translanguaging and be willing to implement it in their classrooms.

2) Provide appropriate training and support for teachers: Teachers need to be equipped with the knowledge and skills to effectively use translanguaging in the classroom. Professional development programs should be developed to help teachers understand the benefits and challenges of translanguaging and how to use it effectively to support learning. This may be done through workshops, seminars, and conferences organized by educational institutions and conducted by experts in the field.

3) Develop appropriate resources: Along with training, it is essential to develop accessible resources and materials that align with the language policy to support teachers in implementing translanguaging practices. Resources such as multilingual texts, visual aids, and digital tools can help support the use of translanguaging in the classroom. Teachers and policymakers should work to develop and distribute such resources to support the implementation of translanguaging.

4) Provide Recognize and value linguistic and cultural diversity: Learners' linguistic and cultural diversity should be recognized and valued in the classroom. Teachers and school managers should create a supportive learning environment that celebrates diversity and promotes inclusivity.

5) Incorporate Translanguaging in Lesson Planning: There is a need for school authorities to consider encouraging teachers to intentionally incorporate translanguaging in their lesson planning and purposely use it in their classrooms. This can be done by encouraging teachers to work together to develop lessons and activities that incorporate multiple languages.

6) Promote collaboration and peer learning: Peer learning and collaboration can be effective strategies to support the use of translanguaging in the classroom. Teachers should encourage and facilitate peer learning opportunities that allow learners to work together and support each other in their learning. Similarly, teachers may be paired with mentors who have experience in implementing translanguaging to provide ongoing support and guidance. This would equip teachers with the necessary skills and knowledge to promote multilingual education effectively.

7. Conduct further research: Further research is needed to explore the potential of translanguaging as a pedagogical tool and to address the challenges and limitations associated with its use. Researchers should conduct further studies to evaluate the effectiveness of translanguaging in different educational contexts and to develop best practices for its use in the Namibian context

7.10 Suggestions for Further Research

Based on the findings of the study, the following areas of research are being suggested:

- 1) This study was conducted in one multilingual region. Therefore, there is a need to carry out a similar study in all the regions of Namibia to cover all the multilingual classrooms.
- 2) There is a need to study the role of teacher education programs in promoting translanguaging. Teacher education programs play a crucial role in shaping teachers' ideologies and beliefs about language and education. Therefore, research can be conducted to examine the extent to which teacher education programs in Namibia prepare teachers to implement translanguaging in their classrooms. This can inform the development of more effective training programs for pre-service and in-service teachers.
- 3) There is also needed to investigate the impact of translanguaging on learners' academic achievement. One of the primary goals of implementing translanguaging is to support learners' academic achievement. Therefore, it is crucial to investigate the impact of translanguaging on learners' academic performance. This research can compare the academic achievement of learners in classrooms with and without translanguaging practices and explore the effects on learners from different linguistic backgrounds.
- 4) This study was conducted in English and at senior primary. It can also be important to conduct research on the teachers' ideologies about translanguaging in teaching sciences and Mathematics at the secondary school level since the failure rate is higher, even at higher institutions.

7.11 Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented conclusions and recommendations on the study findings, and it has further provided suggestions for future research that may help evaluate the implementation of translanguaging.

REFERENCES

- Adler, K., & Ljungdahl, R. (2022). *Teacher perception on translanguaging in grades 4-6 in Swedish Schools*. Malmo University.
- Aghai, L., Sayer, P., & Vercellotti, M. (2020). Effects of Teachers' Language Ideologies on Language Learners' Translanguaging Practices in an Intensive English Program. In Z. T. (eds.), *Envisioning TESOL through a Translanguaging Lens, Educational Linguistics* 45 (pp. 345-361). Switzerland: Springer Nature Switzerland AG.
- Ahmad, A., & Khan, S. (2011). Significance of language policy awareness in English language teaching,. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*,, 1897-1900. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.023>.
- Akbar, R., & Taqi, H. (2020). Translanguaging as an ESL Learning strategy: A case study in Kuwait. *International Journal of Higher Education*.
- Al Sharaeai, W. (2012). *Students' perspectives on the use of L1 in English classrooms*. Ames, Iowa: Master of Arts Thesis. Iowa State University .
- Aleem, U., & Irshad, S. (2021). Teaching and Learning English Language through Literacy Drive Policy in Grade 3 in Public Schools: Teachers' Perception and Challenges. *Psychology and Education* 58 (1), 4664-4676.
- Alemania, B. B., Beltran, J. M., Betancor, M. I., Eli, P. J., Escueta, M. A., Espiritu, M. J., & Mendoza, H. (2022). Examining the attitudes towards translanguaging and language positions of pre-service English language teachers. *Asian Journal of English Language Studies (AJELS) Volume 10*, 148-175.
- Alessia, B. W. (2023). *Translanguaging in World Language Higher Education*. PhD Dissertation: University of Nebraska.
- Alhasnawi, S. (2021). Teachers' beliefs and practices with respect to translanguaging university mathematics in Iraq. *Linguistics and Education*, 63, 100930.
- Ali, A. (2024). Translanguaging in multilingual university classrooms: Effects on students' language skills and perceptions. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 47:2,, 186-210. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2024.2336942

- Alstad, G. T., & Sopanen, P. (2020). Language orientations in early childhood education policy in Finland and Norway. *NORDIC JOURNAL OF STUDIES IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY*, 1-14. doi: 10.1080/20020317.2020.1862951
- Ambele, E. A. (2022). Supporting English teaching in Thailand by accepting translanguaging: Views from Thai university teachers. *Issues in Educational Research*, 32(3), 871- 886.
- Amoussou, F., & Allagbe, A. A. (2018). Principles, Theories and Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, 6 (1), 11-18.
- Anderson, J. (2022). The translanguaging practices of expert Indian teachers of English and their learners. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 45(6), 2233–2251. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2045300>
- Anderson, J., & Lightfoot, A. (2021). Translingual practices in English classrooms in India: current perceptions and future possibilities. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 24 (8), 1210-1231. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1548558>
- Andleeb, N., Salahuddin, A., & Ajmal, F. (2024). Teachers' Perceptions of Translanguaging as a Pedagogical Tool in Multilingual Education. *Annals of Human and Social Sciences*, (5)1, 48-54. Retrieved from [http://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2024\(5-1\)05](http://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2024(5-1)05)
- Antony, S., Ramnath, R., & Ellikkal, A. (2024). Examining Students' Perspectives on Pedagogical Translanguaging in the Multilingual Classroom Context. *IAFOR Journal of Education: Language Learning in Education*, Volume 12 – Issue 1, 199-223.
- Arafin, M. A. (2016). Bilingualism: The Beneficial and Contradictory Findings. *Asian EFL Journal*, 4(2), 48-59.
- Arocena, E., Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2015). Teachers' beliefs in multilingual education in the Basque Country and in Friesland. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 3, 169–93. doi:10.1075/jicb.3.2.01aro
- Ashadi, Y. S. (2024). Translanguaging as Pedagogical Practice: Insight from Indonesian EFL Classroom. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis (IJMRA)*, 7(06), 3034-3038. doi:10.47191/ijmra/v7-i06-78, Impact Factor: 8.22

- Ashikuti, S. (2019). *Implementing Namibia's Language Policy: A Case Study of Classroom Practices and Language Beliefs in Rural and Urban Namibian Schools*. Doctor of Education Thesis. University of Reading.
- Aung, S. (2021). *Perceptions of Translanguaging among English teachers in township primary schools*. ME Thesis. University of Pretoria .
- Ausiku, J. (2010). *An Evaluation of the Implementation of the Namibian Language-in-Education-Policy in the Upper Primary Phase in Oshana Region*. MA Thesis (Sociolinguistics): University of South Africa.
- Awuor, Q. (2019). Language Policy in Education: The Practicality of its Implementation and Way Forward. *Journal of Languages, Technology & Entrepreneurship in Africa*, Vol. 10 No. 1, 95-109.
- Ayob, S. (2020). *The Utilisation of Translanguaging for Learning and Teaching in Multilingual Primary schools*. Pretoria: PhD Thesis. University of Pretoria.
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism (3rd ed.)*. Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (2003). Biliteracy and transliteracy in Wales: Language planning and the Welsh National Curriculum. In N. (. Hornberger, *In Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research and practice in multilingual settings* (pp. 71 – 90). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism; 5th edition*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual matters.
- Baker, C., & Wright, W. E. (2017). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Banda, F., & Mwanza, D. (2020). Introduction. *Multilingual Margins*, 7(3), 5-13.
- Barragan, A., & Vazquez, L. (2016). Translanguaging as a form of academic literacy practice. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science*, 16(2), 20-31.
- Barros, S., Domke, L. M., Symons, C., & Ponzio, C. (2020). Challenging monolingual ways of looking at multilingualism: Insights for curriculum development in teacher preparation. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 20(4), 239-254.

- Bernstein, B. (1973). *Class, Codes and Control 3: towards a theory of educational transmissions*. London.
- Bernstein, B. (1975). *Towards a Theory of Educational Transmissions (Vol.3)*. London: Routledge & Kegan.Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (1990). *The structuring of pedagogic discourse: Class, codes & control, Volume IV*. London: Routledge.
- Bernstein, B. (1990). *The structuring of pedagogic discourse: Class, codes & control, Volume IV*. London: Routledge.
- Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control, and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique (No. 4)*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bernstein, K. A., Kilinc, S., Deeg, M. T., Marley, S. C., Farrand, K., & Kelly, M. F. (2018). Language ideologies of Arizona preschool teachers implementing dual language teaching for the first time: pro-multilingual beliefs, practical concerns. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND BILINGUALISM*, 1-25. doi:10.1080/13670050.2018.1476456
- Blackledge, A., & Pavlenko, A. (2006). "Introduction.". *Multilingua - Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication* 21, 121–140. doi:10.1515/mult.2002.006.
- Bolkvadze, L. (2023). Implementing Translanguaging as EFT Teaching Method. . *Creative Education*, 14, 1721-1736.
- Bourne, J. (2006). *Official pedagogic discourses and the construction of learners' identities*. School of Education, University of Southampton Southampton SO17 1BJ, U.K. .
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101.
- Burton, J., & Rajendram, S. (2019). Translanguaging-as-Resource: University ESL Instructors' Language Orientations and Attitudes Toward Translanguaging. *TESL CANADA JOURNAL/REVUE TESL DU CANADA, VOLUME 36, ISSUE 1*, , 21-47.
- Calvert, D. (2020). *Exploring the language orientations of third - sector ESOL teachers in London towards translanguaging*. Master's Dissertation: UCL Institute of Education.

- Campbell, M., & Rosenhan, C. (2023). Assessment and creativity through a translingual lens: transdisciplinary insights. *Applied linguistics review*. doi:10.1515/applirev-2023-0090
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 401–417. doi:[https:// doi. org/ 10. 1111/j. 1540- 4781.](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.)
- Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. New York: NY: Routledge.
- Cavazos, A. G., & Musanti, S. I. (2022). Insights from a faculty learning community on translingual community-engaged pedagogy at a Hispanic serving institution. *Language and Education*, 36(3), 211-225.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D., & Snow, A. (2014). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language (4th ed.)*. Boston, MA: Heinle ELT.
- Cenoz, J. (2017). Translanguaging in School Contexts: International Perspectives. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* 16, 193–98.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). *A dynamic approach to second language acquisition: Methods and techniques*. . New York, NY: : Multilingual Matters.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: Threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(10),, 901-912.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Translanguaging as a Pedagogical Tool in Multilingual Education. In *Language Awareness and Multilingualism* (pp. 309-321). Springer International Publishing. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02240-6_20
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020a). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes*, 39(2), 300-311. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.0.1111/weng.12462>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020b). Pedagogical translanguaging: An introduction. *System*, 92, 102269. Retrieved from [https:// doi. org/ 10. 1016/j. system. 2020. 102269](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102269)
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2022). *Pedagogical Translanguaging*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cenoz, J., & Santos, A. (2020). Implementing pedagogical translanguaging in trilingual schools. *System*, 1-9.

- Chaika, O. (2023). Translanguaging in multilingual classrooms: a case study analysis. . *Filološki časopis*,. doi:10.31499/2415-8828.1.2023.281366
- Champlin, M. J. (2016). "Translanguaging and Bilingual Learners: A Study of How Translanguaging Promotes. *Education Masters. Paper 323*. Retrieved from t https://fisherpub.sjf.edu/education_ETD_masters/323 a
- Chan, B. H., & Chou, C. I. (2022). ranslanguaging practices of Macau junior-one students in a remedial class. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*. doi:doi: 10.1186/s40862-022-00164-3
- Chan, B. H.-S. (2021). Translanguaging or code-switching? Reassessing mixing of English in Hong Kong Cantonese. *Chinese Language and Discourse. Online-first*.
- Charalambous, P., Charalambous, C., & Zembylas, M. (2016). Troubling translanguaging: Language ideologies, superdiversity and interethnic conflict. *Applied Linguistics Review*. 7. doi:10.1515/applirev-2016-0014
- Chaudhary, D. (2024). Understanding Practices of Translanguaging Pedagogy in ELT Classroom. *NELTA ELT Forum*. Retrieved from <https://neltaeltforum.wordpress.com/2024/07/01/understanding-practices-of-translanguaging-pedagogy-in-elt-classroom/>
- Childs, M. (2016). Reflecting on Translanguaging in Multilingual Classrooms: Harnessing the Power of Poetry and Photography. *Educational Research for Social Change (ERSC)*, 22-40.
- Ching, K. C. (2024). Translanguaging in Chinese as a Second Language writing Classroom. *International Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 12(5), 83-91.
- Choi, J. (2020). Multilingual learners are learning translanguaging through translanguaging. *AppliedLinguisticsReview*, 11(4), 625-648. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2018-0117>
- Christoffersen, K., & Regalado, K. (2021). Toda lengua es válida aquí en esta clase”: Translanguaging pedagogy and critical language awareness in sociolinguistics courses on the U.S.-Mexico border. *Journal of Bilingual Education Research & Instruction*, 23(1), 45-71.

- Chukwuemeka, D., Chinwe, D., & Buba, L. (2023). Christian Schools Stakeholders' Opinion on the Teachers' Competence in the Implementation of Language Policy at Lower Basic Education. *Sapientia Foundation Journal of Education, Science and Gender Studies (SFJESGS)*, (5)2, 103 – 115.
- Clark, U. (2005). Bernstein's theory of pedagogic discourse: Linguistics, educational policy and practice in the UK English/literacy classroom. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 4(3), 32-47.
doi:<http://education.waikato.ac.nz/research/files/etpc/2005v4n3art2.pdf>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research Methods in Education*. 7th ed. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Constantine, M. (2023). *Teachers' perspectives on translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Discourses around its use in Swedish upper secondary schools*. Degree Project at Undergraduate Level. Stockholms Universitet.
- Constantino, R. (2017). Translanguaging as a counter-hegemonic pedagogy: A language teacher's perspective . *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 20(6) , 739-750.
- Costa, I. C. (2021). *Use and Perception of Translanguaging and Code-switching as Foreign Language Teaching Strategies: A Case Study*. Masters Dissertation, Universitat de Vic-Universitat Central de Catalunya.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (. (2011). Separate and flexible bilingualism in complementary schools: Multiple language practices in interrelationship. *Journal of pragmatics*, 43(5), 1196-1208.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning_and_teaching? *The_Modern_Language_Journal*, 94(1), 103–115.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x>
- Creswell, J. (2013). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. London: Sage.
- Cummins, J., & Swain, M. (2014). *Bilingualism in education aspects of theory, research and practice*. Routledge.

- Daniel, S. M., Jiménez, R. T., Pray, L., & Pacheco, M. B. (2019). Scaffolding to make translanguaging a classroom norm. *TESOL Journal*, 10(1). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.361>
- De Angelis, G. (2011). Teachers' beliefs about the role of prior language knowledge in learning and how these influence teaching practices. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 8:3, 216-234. doi:10.1080/14790718.2011.560669
- DeLong, J. (2024). *Feeling at Home: Sociocultural Language Learning and its Effects on Integration and Belonging among Adult Newcomers to Victoria, Canada*. MAs Thesis: University of Victoria.
- Deng, L., & Wimpenny, K. (2022). Students' perceptions and experiences of translanguaging pedagogy in teaching English for academic purposes in China,. *Teaching in Higher Education*, pp. (In-Press), 1-35. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2022.2129961>
- Deniega, M., & Neri, S. (2024). A Case Study on Translanguaging in English as a Second Language (ESL) Class Among Public High Schools Throught the Lens of Language Teachers. *Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, Vol.4, Issue.8, 9-31.
- Denuga, D., Abah, J., & Michael, E. (2017). An Investigation Into The Prevalence of Code Switching in the Teaching of Natural Science And Health Education In Three Primary Schools At The Zambezi Region in Namibia. *International Journal of Research in Engineering and Science (IJRES)*, 5(7), 55-61.
- Deroo, M. R., & Ponzio, C. (2019). Confronting ideologies: A discourse analysis of in-service teachers' translanguaging stance through an ecological lens. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 42:2, 214-231. doi:10.1080/15235882.2019.1589604
- Desmond, W. (2024). Translanguaging and the Monolingual Teacher: Leveraging Students' Full Linguistic Competencies Within Literacy Development . *ORTESOL Journal*, Volume 41, 4-20.
- Dlamini-Nxumalo, N., & Charamba, E. (2021). Science Teachers' Practices in Relation to their Perceptions of Translanguaging: The case of Eswatini. *Solid State Technology*, (64)2.

- Doiz, A., & Lasagabaster, D. (2017). Teachers' beliefs about translanguaging practices. In C. M. Mazak, & K. S. (Eds.), *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies* (pp. 157–176). Multilingual Matters.
- Dougherty, J. (2021). Translanguaging in action: Pedagogy that elevates. *ORTESOL Journal*, 38, 19–32.
- Driouch, A. (2022). Translanguaging as an Inclusive Pedagogical Practice in Early Education Classes. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*. 4(4), 76-96. doi:<http://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v4i4.1088>
- Duma, L. P. (2021). *An Analysis of Multilingualism as an Approach to Language-in-Education Policies of the Department of Basic Education in Relation to the Promotion of Indigenous Languages as Languages of Teaching and Learning, in Accordance with Section 29(2) of the Consti*. Master of Laws Dissertaton. The University of Kwa-Zulu Natal.
- Fang, F., & Liu, Y. (2020). 'Using all English is not always meaningful': Stakeholders' perspectives on the use of and attitudes towards translanguaging at a Chinese university. *Lingua*, 247, 1-18. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2020.102959>
- Fang, F., & Liu, Y. (2020). Using all English is not always meaningful': Stakeholders' perspectives on the use of and attitudes towards translanguaging at a Chinese university. *Lingua*, 247(102959).
- Ferreira, C. A. (2019). *Planned Translanguaging as a means to improve students' working relationship in pairwork activities*. Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto.
- Fitriati, S. W. (2015). *Teachers' Language Ideologies and Classroom Practices in English Bilingual Education: An Ethnographic Case Study of a Senior High School in Central Java, Indonesia*. PhD Dissertation. University of Southern Queensland.
- Flores, N., & García, O. (2013). Linguistic third spaces in education: Teachers' translanguaging across the bilingual continuum. In C. L. Little, *Managing diversity in education: Key issues and some responses* (pp. 243-256). Multilingual Matters.
- Frydman, J. (2011). A Critical Analysis of Namibia's English-Only Language Policy. In E. Bokamba, R. Shosted, & B. Ayalew (Ed.), *Selected Proceedings of the 40th Annual*

- Conference on African Linguistics: African Languages and Linguistics Today* (pp. 178-189). Somerville, MA: Cascadia Proceedings Project.
- Fuster, C. (2022). *Lexical transfer in pedagogical translanguaging: Exploring intentionality in*. Doctoral dissertation. Stockholm University.
- Galante, A. (2020a). Translanguaging for Vocabulary Development: A Mixed Methods Study with International Students in a Canadian English for Academic Purposes Program. In Z. T. (eds.), *Envisioning TESOL through a translanguaging lens*. Switzerland AG: Educational Linguistics 45,.
- Galante, A. (2020b). Pedagogical translanguaging in a multilingual English program in Canada: Student and teacher perspectives of challenges. *System*, 92, 102274. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102274>
- Ganuza, N., & Hedman, C. (2017). Ideology Versus Practice: Is There a Space for Pedagogical Translanguaging in Mother Tongue Instruction? In J. R. B. Paulsrud, *New perspectives on translanguaging and education* (pp. 208-225). Multilingual Matters.
- Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garcia, O. (2014b). Countering the dual: Transglossia, dynamic bilingualism and translanguaging in education. In R. Rubdy, & L. A. (Eds.), *The global-local interface and hybridity: Exploring language and identity* (pp. 100–118). Multilingual Matters.
- Garcia, O., & Kano, N. (2014). Translanguaging as process and pedagogy: Developing the English writing of Japanese students in the US. In G. M. J. Conteh, & N. K. (Eds.), *The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges* (pp. 258-277). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2010). Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English language learners. *Teachers College Press*.
- García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students. Learning from Classroom Moments*. New York: Routledge.
- Garcia, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language bilingualism, and education*. Palgrave Macmillan. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765>
- García, O., Johnson, I. S., & Seltzer, K. (2016). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Philadelphia: Caslon Publishing.
- Garcia, O., Johnson, S., & Seltzer, K. (2017). Translanguaging classroom: Leveraging Student Bilingualism for Learning. *Language and Education* 3(6), 590-594.
- Garcia, O., Sylvan, C., & Curran, M. (2017). Teachers' translanguaging practices and their impact on teacher-student relationships. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 20(5), 521-536.
- Gauna, L. (2014). *Stories of Languages and Teaching First Year Bilingual Spanish/English Teachers' Narratives*. Doctor of Education Dissertation: Faculty of the College of Education: University of Houston.
- Gill, S. (2020). Qualitative Sampling Methods. *Journal of Human Lactation* 00(0), 1-3.
- Gkaintartzi, A., Kiliari, A., & Tsokalidou, A. (2015). nvisible' bilingualism – 'invisible' language ideologies: Greek teachers' attitudes towards immigrant pupils' heritage languages. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18:1, 60-72. doi:10.1080/13670050.2013.877418
- Goli, A. (2023). Translanguaging Instruction and Reading Comprehension Skills of Japanese EFL Learners: A Quasi-Experimental Study. . *Journal of language and education*. doi:10.17323/jle.2023.14069
- Gomez, K., & Liang, S. (2021). The impact of translanguaging on students' academic performance in assessment tasks. . *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 42(3), , 1-18. doi:10.1080/01434632.2021.1935012.
- Gonzales, G. C., & Machado, E. (2022). Taking the leap: Supporting multilingual writers through translanguaging. *The Reading Teacher*, 75(6), 685–692. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.2097>
- Gorter, D., & Arocena, E. (2020). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism in a course on translanguaging. *System*, 92, 102272.

- Gu, M., Kou, Z., & Guo, X. (2017). Understanding Chinese language teachers' language ideologies in teaching South Asian students in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-18. doi:10.1080/13670050.2017.1332000
- Gutiérrez, F. (2021). Translanguaging: navegando entre lenguas – pedagogical translanguaging for multilingual classrooms. In T. Beaven, & F. (. Rosell-Aguilar, *Innovative language pedagogy report* (pp. 29-33). Research-publishing. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2021.50.1232>
- Haji-Othman. (2005). *Linguistic Diversity in Negara Brunei Darussalam: An Ecological Perspective*. School of Education: University of Liecester.
- Halim, N., Mayuni, I., & Setiadi, S. (2023). A Perspective on the Practice of Spontaneous Translanguaging in Indonesia. doi:10.2991/978-2-38476-054-1_45
- Hamman, L., Beck, E., & Donalson, A. (2018). *A pedagogy of translanguaging*. Retrieved from <https://www.language magazine.com/2018/09/10/apedagogy-of-translanguaging/>.
- Harris, C. (2018). The Linguistic Dilemma in Namibia's Zambezi Region: Is the dominance of the Silozi language a curse or a blessing? *Namibian Journal for Research, Science and Technology (NJRST)*, Vol 1, 69-77.
- Harris, P. (2011). *Language in Schools in Namibia: The Missing Link in Educational Achievement?* Monograph 1. Windhoek: The Urban Trust of Namibia.
- Hashoongo, M. (2022). *An Investigation on the Effects of Translanguaging Practices in a Grade 11 Bilingual Classroom: A case of Kaupumhote Nghituwamhata Combined School*. Windhook: The Namibia Uversity of Science and Technology.
- Haugen, C. (2009). *Recontextualisations of Trainability: Learning Strategies and Social Background*. In *Contextualizations and Recontextualizations of Discourses on Equity in Education* (pp. 143–167). PhD Thesis. Trondheim: Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Heller, M., & Martin-Jones, M. (2001). *Voices of Authority Education and Linguistic Difference*. Westport, Conn: Ablex.
- Hillman, S., Graham, K. M., & Eslami, Z. R. (2018). Teachers' Translanguaging Ideologies and Practices at an International Branch Campus in Qatar. *English Teaching & Learning*.

- Hlatshwayo, Z. V. (2013). *Teaching Experiences of Language Educators in Selected Grade Ten Multilingual Classrooms*. Durban: MEd Thesis: University of Kwazulu-Natal.
- Hodgson, D. A. (2023). Translanguaging and Language Learning. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*,. doi:10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal20441
- Hopewell, S. (2017). Pedagogies to Challenge Monolingual Orientations to Bilingual . In J. R. B. Paulsru, *New perspectives on translanguaging and education* (pp. 72-89). Multilingual Matters.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. F. (2012). Translanguaging and learning in multilingual classrooms: A critical approach. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3), 261-278.
- Huckin, T., Andrus, J., & Clary-Lemon, J. (2012). Critical Discourse Analysis and Rhetoric and Composition. *National Council of Teachers of English*, 61(1), 107- 129.
- Hult, F. M., & Hornberger, N. H. (2016). Revisiting orientations in language planning: Problem, right, and resource as an analytical heuristic. *Bilingual Review/Revista Bilingüe*, 33(3), 30–49.
- Hungwe, V. (2019). *The effectiveness of using translanguaging in collaborative learning to enhance reading comprehension in first-year university students*. PhD Thesis: University of Limpopo.
- Ipinge, K. (2013). *English lingua franca as language of learning and teaching in Northern Namibia: A report on Oshiwambo teachers' experiences*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Stellenbosch.
- Ipinge, K. (2018). *Consequences of Ideology and Policy in the English Second Language Classroom: The Case of Oshiwambo-speaking Students in Namibia*. PhD Thesis. University of the Western Cape.
- Ipinge, K., & Banda, F. (2020). Language ideology, policy and classroom practices in Oshiwambo speaking areas, Northern Namibia. *Multilingual Margins*, 7(3), 14-32.
- Ismael, A. (2024). *Translanguaging Strategies in ESL Classrooms*. MA Project. California State University San Marcos.

- Iversen, J., & Mkandawire, S. (2020). Comparing language ideologies in multilingual classrooms across Norway and Zambia. *Multilingual Margins*, 7(3), 33-48.
- Jacobs, A. (2020). *An Exploratory Case Study in a Rural Municipality in the Western Cape: Local Government Skills Development*. MA Thesis: University of the Western Cape.
- Jaspers, J. (2018). The transformative limits of translanguaging. *Language & Communication*, 58, 1–10. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2017.12.001>
- Johnson, E. J., Avineri, N., & Johnson, D. C. (2017). Exposing gaps in/between discourses of linguistic deficits. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 11(1), 5–22. doi:10.1080/19313152.2016.1258185
- Juvonen, P., & Källkvist, M. (2021). Pedagogical Translanguaging: Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical Perspectives. In P. & Juvonen. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Juvonen, P., & Källkvist, M. M. (2021). Pedagogical Translanguaging: Theoretical,. *Multilingual Matters*.
- Kadodo, W., & Muzira, A. (2012). The Influence of Language Users' Attitudes towards the Learning and Teaching of English Language in three Post-Independence Namibian Schools. 120-135.
- Kamwangamalu, N. (2013). Effects of Policy on English-medium Instruction in Africa. *World Englishes*, 32 (3), 325–37. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12034>
- Karabulut, A., & Dollar, Y. (2022). The Use of Translanguaging Pedagogy in Writing Classes of Turkish EFL Learners. *Participatory Educational Research (PER)*, Vol.9(6), 41-65.
- Karabulut, A., & Kesli Dollar, Y. (2022). The use of translanguaging pedagogy in writing classes of Turkish EFL learners. *Participatory Educational Research*, 9(6), 41-65.
- Katukula, K. M., Set, B., & Nyambe, J. (2023). Language Ideologies and the Use of Mother Tongue as Medium of Instruction and Learning in Junior Primary Schools: A Case Study of Parents and Teacher in a Namibian School. *Innovare Journal of Education*, (11) 4, 70/79.
- Kavhura, J. (2018). *Indigenous Languages in Regional Education: A Case of Namibia*. MA Thesis. University of Eastern Finland.

- Kela, J. (2021). *A study of the Namibian transitional language policy in education and the role of code-switching in achieving it*. Cape Town: MA Dissertation. University of Cape Town.
- Kesevan. (2016). Classroom Ideologies and Teaching Practices of Native and Non-native English Teachers in EFL Classrooms . *International Journal of English Linguistics*; 6 (5), 146-155.
- Khairunnisa, K., & Lukmana, I. (2020). Teachers' Attitudes towards Translanguaging in Indonesian EFL Classrooms. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan, Volume 20, Nomor 2*, 254 - 266.
- Khojan, S. (2022). *Teachers' Perceptions and Practices of Translanguaging in Thai EFL Classroom*. ME Thesis. Mahasarakham University.
- Khumalo, C., & Moodley, M. (2023). Exploring Teachers' Perceptions of the Relevance of African Languages in the Digital Space. doi: doi: 10.24256/ideas.v11i2.3688
- Kiramba, L. K. (2017). Translanguaging in the Writing of Emergent Multilinguals. *n International Multilingual Research Journal*, 1-16.
- Kirsch, C. (2020). Opening minds to translanguaging pedagogies. *System*. 92. 102271. doi:10.1016/j.system.2020.102271
- Kleyn, T., & García, O. (2017). Translanguaging as an act of transformation: Restructuring teaching and learning for emergent bilingual students. In L. D. (Ed.), *The Handbook of TESOL in K-12* (pp. 69-82). John Wiley & Sons.
- Kombe, C., & Mwanza, D. (2019). The 2014 Zambian Revised Literacy Policy in Primary Schools: Were Teachers Prepared to Implement It? *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education (IJHSSE)*. 6 (8), 115-131.
- Kroskrity, P. (2004). Language Ideologies. In A. D. (Edit), *In A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 496–517). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Lang, N. W. (2019). Teachers' translanguaging practices and “safe spaces” for adolescent newcomers: Toward alternative visions. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 42(1), 73-89. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2018.1561550>

- Lara-Stephanie, K., & Prinsloo, M. .. (2016). Translanguaging in a township primary school: Policy and practice. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, vol. 34, 347-357.
- Larsson, E. (2016). *"So when can I start taking English?": A study on language ideologies at the language preparation programme*. Research Project: Stockholms universitet.
- Lehman, C. W., & Welch, B. (2020). A Quantitative Investigation of Language Policy in International Schools in East Asia. *Research in Educational Policy and Management*, (2)2, 1-18.
- Lemmi, C., & Pérez, G. (2023). Translanguaging in elementary science. *International journal of science education*,. doi:10.1080/09500693.2023.2185115
- Lenis, M. (2015). *Translanguaging and Identity in a Kindergarten Classroom: Validating Student's Home Culture and Language in an English-Only Era*. Unpublished Doctor of Education Thesis. The University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Lew, S., & Siffrinn, N. E. (2019). Exploring Language Ideologies and Preparing Preservice Teachers for Multilingual and Multicultural Classrooms. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, 68, 375-395. doi:10.1177/2381336919870281
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 641–654.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (655-670). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718490>
- Li, W., & Zhu, Y. (2020). Exploring the Effects of Translanguaging on Performance in Assessment Tasks: A Comparative Study of Multilingual Practices among Chinese College Students. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 17(4), 332-349.
- Li, Y. (2015). The Impact of Mixing Grammatical Structures and Vocabulary from Different Languages on Message Comprehension by Listeners. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 19(5), 545-562.
- Lin, A. M. (2012). Multilingual and multimodal resources in L2 English content classrooms. In C. Leung, & B. S. (Eds.), *'English'—A changing medium for Education* (pp. 79-103). Bristol, U.K: Multilingual Matters.

- Lin, A. M. (2020). *Translanguaging in a multilingual English classroom: An Asian perspective and contexts*. Springer Nature Singapore.
- Lin, A., & Lo, Y. (2016). Trans/languageing and the triadic dialogue in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classrooms. *Language and Education*, 31, 26-45.
- Liu, J. E., Lo, Y. Y., & Lin, A. M. (2020). Translanguaging pedagogy in teaching English for Academic Purposes: Researcher-teacher collaboration as a professional development model. *System*, 1-16.
- Lou, K., Xiong, T., & Peng, Y. (2022). 'I have been dreaming about Chinese becoming the number one language in the world': Chinese language educators' language ideologies in Myanmar. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 44:1, 65-77. doi:10.1080/01434632.2022.2096051
- Mabena, M. (2023). Learners' reception of translanguaging pedagogy as a strategy for reading English L2 texts. *Journal for Language Teaching*, (57)2, 1-24.
- Macaro, E. (2005). Code-switching in the L2 classroom: a communication and learning strategy. In E. (. Llurda, *Non-Native Language Teachers. Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession*. (pp. 63-84). US: Springer.
- Macawile, K. L., & Plata, S. (2022). Teachers' Perspectives on Translanguaging as a Pedagogical Resource in Senior High School English Classes. *Journal of English and Applied Linguistics, Vol. 1: Iss. 2, Article 7*, 65-89. doi:: <https://doi.org/10.59588/2961-3094.1022>
- Macawile, K. L., & Plata, S. M. (2022). Translanguaging as a Resource for Teaching and Assessment: Perceptions of Senior High School Teachers. *Modern Journal of Studies*
- Mahmoud, A. E., & Galante, A. (2020). Pedagogical translanguaging in a multilingual English program in Canada: Student and teacher perspectives of challenges. *System*, 92.
- Makalela, L. (2015). Breaking African language boundaries: Student teachers' reflections on translanguaging practices. *Language Matters*, 46(2), 275–292. Retrieved from . <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10228195.2014.986664>
- Makalela, L. (2017). Bilingualism in South Africa: Reconnecting with Ubuntu Translanguaging. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-02258-1_14

- Makalela, L. (2019). Uncovering the universals of ubuntu translanguaging in classroom discourses. *Classroom Discourse*, (10)3-4, 237-251.
- Makoe, P., & McKinney, C. (2014). Linguistic ideologies in multilingual South African suburban schools. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35:7, 658-673. doi: 10.1080/01434632.2014.908889
- Martínez, J. (2017). Realization of a Language-As-Resource Orientation in Language Immersion Mathematics Classrooms. In & J. E. Galindo, *Proceedings of the 39th annual meeting of the North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education* (pp. 1163-1169). Indianapolis, IN: Hoosier Association of Mathematics Teacher Educators.
- Mashinja, B. (2020). The Use of Silozi as Language of Initial Literacy Instruction in Multilingual Pre-Primary Classrooms of Zambezi Region: Challenges and Way Forward. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Language and Social Sciences Education*, volume 3, No. 1, 98-130.
- Mashinja, B. Z., & Mwanza, D. S. (2020a). The efficacy of translanguaging as pedagogic practice in selected Namibian multilingual primary classrooms. *Multilingual Margins*, 7(3), 49-68.
- Mazak, C., & Carroll, K. S. (2017). *Translanguaging in Higher Education: Beyond Monolingual Ideologies*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Mbaka, N., Peter, C., & Karuri, M. (2013). Implementation Status of Kenya's Language in Education Policy: A case Study of Selected Primary Schools in Chuka Division, Meru South District, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, (4)23, 97-103.
- Mbirimi-Hungwe, V. (2019). Stepping beyond linguistic boundaries in multilingual Science education: Lecturer's perceptions of the use of translanguaging. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 37(1), 15-26.
- Mensa, H. A. (2015). Managing Linguistic Diversity within and outside the Classroom in an International Multilingual High School in Namibia. *Intercultural Communication Studies XXIV*: 3, 28-49.
- Mensah, H. A. (2014). Language policy and practice in a multilingual classroom : managing linguistic diversity in a Namibian high school. .

- Merchán, R. A. (2019). *A survey of elementary teachers' language ideologies and their perceptions of biliteracy*. Huntsville, Texas: PhD Thesis: Sam Houston State University.
- Ministry of Education, Arts and Culture. (2015). *Final Draft Language Policy for Schools in Namibia*. Okahandja: National Institute for Educational Development (NIED).
- Ministry of Education, Arts and Culture. (2016). *The National Curriculum for Basic Education*. Okahandja: National Institute for Educational Development (NIED).
- Mishra, P. (2020). Translanguaging in the Indian Context. *Language and Education*, 34(2), 136-149.
- Mostert, M., Hamunyela, M., Kasanda, C., Smit, T., Kangira, J., Zimba, R., . . . Veii, U. (2012). Views and preferences of parents, teachers and principals on the implementation of the language policy in primary schools in Namibia: An explorative study in the Khomas region. *Journal for Studies in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 167-178.
- Motlhaka, H. A. (2021). Translanguaging as a Socioculturally Responsive Pedagogy for Multilingual Learners. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI)*, 12(7), 7258 - 7266.
- Mukwambo, M., Mhakure, D., & Sitwala, N. (2020). The Impact of Silozi Language on the Teaching of Numeracy in the Zambezi Region. *International Journal of Trends in Mathematics Education Research*, 3(1), , 13-19.
- Mungala, R. (2022). Benefits and Challenges in Implementing Translanguaging in Sub-Saharan Primary Schools. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, vol 10, no. 2, 39-43. doi:10.20431/2347-3134.1002005
- Mungala, R., & Mwanza, D. S. (2024). Translanguaging Practices Lecturers use when Teaching Literacy and Language in Multilingual Classrooms at a Selected University in Zambia. *International Journal of Education Humanities and Social Science*, (7)3, 781-795.
- Murray, C. (2007). Reflections on the question of mother tongue instructions in Namibia. *NAWA Journal of Language and Communication* 1(1), 10.
- Mwambula, H. (2021). Teachers' Perception on Translanguaging in Mother Tongue Based Languages as a Tool for Teaching and Learning in Lower Rural Primary Education in Tanzania: A Case Study of Rungwe District. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 9(3), 41-45.

- Mwanza, D. (2016). *A Critical Reflection on Eclecticism in the Teaching of English Grammar at Selected Zambian Secondary Schools*. PhD Thesis: University of the Western Cape.
- Mwanza, D. S. (2017). Implications of Teachers' Attitudes towards Unofficial languages on English Language Teaching in Multilingual Zambia. *Zambian Journal of Language Studies, Volume 1. Issue 1*, 101 - 124.
- Mweli, P. (2018). *Grade Four Teachers' Language Attitudes and Lived Teaching Experiences in KwaZulu-Natal Schools, South Africa*. KwaZulu-Natal: PhD Thesis, University of KwaZulu-Natal.
- Mwinda, N., & van der Walt, C. (2015). From "English =-Only" to Translanguaging Strategies: Exploring Possibilities. *Per Linguam*, 31(3), 100-108.
- Naha, D., Nkengbeza, D., & Liswaniso, C. (2018). The effect of Code Switching on English Language Teaching and Learning at Two Schools in Sibbinda Circiut. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(5), 56-68.
- Nambisan, K. (2014). *Teachers' Attitude Towards and Uses of Translanguaging in English Language Classrooms in Iowa, United States*. Iowa: (Unpublished Masters Dissertation, Iowa State University).
- Namutenya, T. I. (2022). *Code-switching in Grades 4-7 English Second Language classrooms. A study of three primary schools in Namibia*. MA Thesis: University of South Africa.
- Naqvi, S., & Atta, A. (2021). Translanguaging as a Pedagogical Strategy to Improve English Reading and Writing Skills at University Level. *Asian EFL Journal*. 25, 181-218.
- Nation, P. (2022). Translanguaging and Vocabulary Learning. . *TESL-EJ*. doi:10.55593/ej.26103a24
- Nepando, N. P. (2018). *Challenges Fourth Grade Learners Encounter in Readingenglish Second Language: Six Primary Schools in Ohangwena Region*. MEd Thesis. The University of Namibia.
- Nguyen, T. N. (2022). A Review of Studies on EFL Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of Tranglanguaging as a Pedagogical Approach. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 2(3):, 324-331. doi:10.54855/ijte.222322

- Nhongo, R., & Tshotsho, B. P. (2019). Translanguaging as an instructional method in science and mathematics education in English second language classroom contexts. *The Independent Journal of Teaching and Learning - Volume 14 (2)*, 57-71.
- Niazi, S. (2022). *Teacher' Views, Challenges, and Strategies towards Pupils' Bilingualism and Translanguaging*. MAs Dissertation. University of Liverpool, British Council.
- Norro, S. (2021). Namibian Teachers' Beliefs about Medium of Instruction and Language Education Policy Implementation. *Language Matters*, 52:3, 45-71. doi:10.1080/10228195.2021.1951334
- Norro, S. (2022). Factors affecting language policy choices in the multilingual context of Namibia: English as the official language and medium of instruction. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, (16)1, 1-20.
- Norro, S. (2023). *Namibian Primary School Teachers Believes and Practices in a Multilingual Context: Language ideologies underlying the language education policy and the its implementation*. Painosalama, Turku, Finland: PhD Thesis. University of Turku.
- Norro, S. (2023a). “You can be fluent in English but empty-headed” Language ideologies underlying Namibian primary school teachers’ beliefs. *Language and Education*, 1-22. doi: 10.1080/09500782.2022.2160645
- Norro, S. (2024). Namibian Teachers' Practices in a Multilingual Context. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, (21)1, 360-378.
- Nsele, T. P. (2015). *Translanguaging in Grade 9 Social Science Classroom in the Zululand District*. ME Thesis. University of Zululand .
- Nur, R., Namrullah, Z., Syawal, S., & Nasrullah, A. (2020). Enhancing Reading Comprehension through Translanguaging Strategy. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 11(6), 970-977. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1106.14
- Nyimbili, F., & Mwanza, D. (2021). Translanguaging Challenges faced by Teachers and Learners in First Grade Multilingual Literacy Classrooms in Zambia. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)* 9(3), 20-31.
- Nzwala, K. (2015). Challenges Faced by Student Teachers when Teaching Through the Medium of Mother Tongue during School Based Studies: A Case for Katima Mulilo Campus Bachelor of Education 4 (Pre & Lower Primary) Students. 1-11.

- Obeng, P. (2020). Some Stakeholders' Position on the Language Policy of Ghana. *International Journal of Social Science And Human Research*, (3)12, 499-458.
- Ohanga, O. K., Odeo, I. I., & Abenga, E. (2021). Lower Primary School Teachers' Attitudes Towards Educational Language Policy in Kenya. *Teacher Education and Curriculum Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 4,, 137-142.
- Ojong, A. S. (2022). *Developing English Language Learning in Cameroon through Translanguaging Pedagogy*. Unpublishe MAs Thesis: Soka University.
- Omidire, M. F. (2019). Experiencing language challenges in a rural school: Implications for learners' life aspirations. *Early Child Development and Care (ECDC)*, Special Issue, 1–19.
- Omidire, M., & Ayob, S. (2020). he utilisation of translanguaging for earning and teaching in multilingual primary classrooms. *Multilingua* 41(1), 1–25. doi::10.1515/multi-2020-0072.
- Otheguy, R., Garcia, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281-307.
- Ou, W. A., Gu, M. M., & Hult, F. M. (2023). Translanguaging for intercultural communication in international higher education: Transcending English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 20(2), 576-594.
- Öztürk, S., & Çubukçu, F. (2022). Exploring Student-directed Translanguaging in the English-centric Classroom. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, Vol 31, 159-173.
- Pacheco, M. B., Kang, H., & Hurd, E. (2019). Scaffolds, signs, and bridges: Language ideologies and translanguaging in student-teaching experiences. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 42:2, 194-213. doi:10.1080/15235882.2019.1596179
- Palmer, D. (2011). The discourse of transition: Teachers' language ideologies within transitional bilingual education programs. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 5(2), 103-122. doi:10.1080/19313152.2011.594019
- Pantalleresco, J. (2021). *The teachers' beliefs on translanguaging practices during speaking tasks in the Spanish as a foreign language classroom*. Master's Dissertation. The University of Malta.

- Paradowski, M. (2020). Transitions, translanguaging, trans-semiotising in heteroglossic school environments: Lessons from (not only) South African classrooms. In & V. C. Walt, *Multilingual Classroom Contexts: Perspectives from the Chalk Face* (pp. 1-27). Stellenbosch: African Sun Media.
- Paulsrud, B., Zilliacus, H., & Ekberg, L. (2020). Spaces for multilingual education: language orientations in the national curricula of Sweden and Finland. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 1-15. doi: 10.1080/19313152.2020.1714158
- Phiri, M., Chanda, C. T., & Mwanapabu, N. H. (2024). The Effect of Using Local Languages as A Medium of Instruction on Academic Performance of Learners: A Case of Selected Primary Schools in Solwezi District of North- Western Province, Zambia. *International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences*, (11)3, 9-26.
- Pinto, J. (2020). Chinese Teachers' Attitudes Towards Translanguaging and Its Uses in Portuguese Foreign Language Classrooms. *Theory and Practice of Second Language Acquisition*, vol. 6 (1), 11–30.
- Pomuti, H., & Weber, E. (2012). Decentralization and School Management in Namibia: The Ideologies of Education Bureaucrats in Implementing Government Policies. *International Scholarly Research Network*, 1-8.
- Poza, L. E. (2019). "Where the true power resides": Student translanguaging and supportive teacher dispositions. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 42(4), 408–431. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2019.1682717>
- Probyn, M., Murray, S., Botha, L., Botya, P., Margie, B., & Westphal, V. (2002). Minding the gaps – an investigation into language policy and practice in four Eastern Cape districts. *Perspectives in Education*, Volume 20 Number 1 , 29-46.
- Pulinx, R., & Van Avermaet, P. (2014). Linguistic diversity and education : dynamic interactions between language education policies and teachers' beliefs : a qualitative study in secondary schools in Flanders (Belgium). *EVUE FRANCAISE DE LINGUISTIQUE APPLIQUEE*, 19(2), 9–27.
- Rahimi, F., & Riasati, M. (2011). Critical Discourse Analysis: Scrutinizing Ideologically-Driven Discourses. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 107-112.

- Rahmawansyah. (2019). Translanguaging as a Pedagogical Strategy in EFL Classroom. *LT-Lectura, Vol. 5, No. 2*, 139-146.
- Raja, D. F., Suparno, S., & Ngadiso, N. (2022). Teachers' attitude towards translanguaging practice and its implication in Indonesian EFL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(3), 567-576. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v11i3.38371>
- Rajendram, S. (2021). The Affordances of Translanguaging as a Pedagogical Resource for Multilingual English Language Classrooms in Malaysia. 186-198. doi:10.4324/9781003057284-14
- Rajendram, S., Burton, J., Wong, W., & Bale, J. (2022). Examining Teacher Candidates' Pedagogical Practices and Stances towards Translanguaging and Multimodality in Writing. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*.
- Ralushai, M., Ntombela, B., & Rammala, J. (2024). English First Additional Language teachers' perceptions of translanguaging pedagogy: A case of Vhembe District, Limpopo Province. *African Perspectives of Research in Teaching and Learning Journal, Issue 3, Volume 8*, 57-72.
- Razfar, A. (2012). Narrating Beliefs: A Language Ideologies Approach to Teacher Beliefs. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 43 (1), 61–81.
- Ren, Y., Yan, X., & Chen, X. (2016). The impact of translingual practices on L2 learners and their linguistic abilities in the target language. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 20-35.
- Riegelhaupt, F. (2000). *Code switching and language use in the classroom. Northern Arizona*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Robertson, S. A. (2017). *The Place of Language in Supporting Children's Mathematical Development: Two Grade 4 Teachers' use of Classroom Talk*. Rhodes University: Unpublished PhD Thesis.
- Robertson, S.-A., & Graven, M. (2020). A mathematics teacher's response to a response to a dilemma: 'I'm supposed to teach them in English but they don't understand'. *South African Journal of Childhood Education* 10(1), , 1-11.

- Robillos, R. J. (2023). Implementing Translanguaging with Pedagogical Approach in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Listening Classroom. *International Journal of Instruction*, Vol.16, No.2, 623-642.
- Rodriguez, V. (2019). Teachers' perspectives on the implementation of translanguaging in teaching practices. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 42(2), 252-264. doi:org/10.1080/15235882.2019.1624574
- Rodríguez-Izquierdo, R. M. (2021). Monolingual ideologies of Andalusian teachers in the multilingual schools' context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-13. doi:10.1080/13670050.2021.1918627
- Romanowski, P. (2019). Translanguaging in the Polish educational context: Lessons learnt from IB schools. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature Vol. 12(1)*, 5-24.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. . *NABE Journal*, 8, , 15-34.
- Ruiz, R. (2010). Ruiz, R. (2010). Reorienting language-as-resource. In J. (. Petrovic, *nternational perspectives on bilingual education: Policy, practice, and controversy* (pp. 155-172). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Sadovnik, A. R. (2001). . Basil Bernstein (1924-2000): Sociologist, mentor and friend. In , . In P. Aggleton, J. Brannen, B. A., L. Chisholm, J. Mace, & S. (. Power, *A Tribute to Basil Bernstein: 1924-2000*. . London: Institute of Education.
- Saha, S., & Rahman, M. M. (2022). Translanguaging Pedagogy in the EAP Classroom of Private Universities in Bangladesh. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, Vol. 22(17) , 49-65.
- Saleem, T., Latif, S., Khan, A., Javaid, M., & Khan, B. S. (2023). Bridging linguistic divides in higher education: An exploration of translanguaging practices in Pakistan. *Ampersand II*, 1-8.
- Sang-Hwan, Y., & Shu-Wen, H. (2020). Understanding the Complexity of Teachers' Beliefs and Practices for Translingual Pedagogy. *System*, 92, 1-11.
- Santoso, W., & Hamied, F. (2022). Towards Multilingual Education: Pre-Service English Teachers Perceptions of Translanguaging Pedagogy. *Unika Atma Jaya*, 364-374.

- Sapitri, N. M., Batan, I. G., & Myartawan, I. P. (2018). Functions of Teachers Translanguaging in the EFL Classrooms t Two Junior High Schools in Singaraja. *Lingua Scientia*, 25(1), 29-36.
- Sato, R. (2023). Japanese EFL speakers' willingness to communicate in L2 conversations: The effects of code-switching and translanguaging. . *Teaching English as a Second Language Electronic Journal (TESL-EJ)*, 27 (3), 1-22.
- Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, TexMex, and Bilingual Pedagogy: Emergent Bilinguals Learning Through the Vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(1), 63–88. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.53>
- Schissel, J., & Reyes, M. (2020). Preparing to teach emergent bilinguals: Examining practices and shifting language ideologies of non-ESL preservice educators. *Journal of Multilingual Theories and Practices*, 290-312.
- Sefotho, M. M. (2019). *Strategies for Reading Development among Sesotho-English Bilinguals: Efficacy of Translanguaging*. Johannesburg: PhD Thesis. University of the Witwatersrand.
- Seltzer, K. (2020). Translingual writers as mentors in a high school “English” classroom. In Plurilingual pedagogies. *Springer International Publishing*, 185–204). doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-36983-5_9
- Set, B. N. (2020). *Using semiotic resources to teach and assess scientific concepts in a bilingual Namibian primary school: A socio-cultural discourse analysis*. PhD Thesis. University of Cape Town.
- Setali, M. (2008). Access to mathematics versus access to the language of power: the struggle in multilingual mathematics classrooms. *South African Journal of Education*, 103-116.
- Setyarini, M. C., & Jocuns, A. (2024). The Potential of Developing Pedagogical Translanguaging in a Private University in Indonesia: A Study of Teachers' Beliefs. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-024-00874-x>
- Shifidi, L. (2014). *Intergration of Translanguaging in Lesssons: An aproach to teaching and learning in Namibia junior secondary schools*. Masters thesis: Hedmark University College.

- Shikalepoh, P. (2016). *Learners' self-efficacy beliefs in reading comprehension in English Second Additional Language in a Namibian rural school*. Magister Thesis. : The North-West University.
- Shilamba, J. (2012). *An Investigation into the Prevalence and use of Code Switching Practices in Grade 8 Mathematics Classrooms in the Ohangwena Region of Namibia: A Case Study*. MEd Thesis: Rhodes University.
- Shinga, S. E. (2019). *Code-Switching in the English Second Language Classroom: A Case Study of Four Rural School Teachers in Umbumbulu, Kwazulu-Natal*. Kwazulu-Natal: PhD Thesis: University of Kwazulu-Natal.
- Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In W. H. R. Clyne, *The elements: A parasection on linguistic units and levels* (pp. 193–247). Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguist. Soc.
- Simasiku, L. (2014). *The perceptions of Grade 10 English Second Language teachers about the effects of Code Switching in their classrooms in the Caprivi Education Region of Namibia*. Windhoek: MA Dissertation: University of Namibia.
- Simasiku, L. (2016a). Is Code switching complementary to English as medium of instruction in Namibian English Second Language classrooms? *JULACE: Journal of University of Namibia Language Centre*, 1(1), 12-26.
- Simasiku, L. (2016b). The Impact of Code Switching on Learners' Participation during Classroom Practice. *Studies in English Language Teachin*, 4(2), 157-161.
- Simasiku, L., Kasanda, C., & Simit, T. (2015a). Barriers to Code Switching in English Second Language medium classrooms. *International Journal of English Literature and Culture*, 3(1), 7-13.
- Simasiku, L., Kasanda, C., & Simit, T. (2015b). Can Code Switching Enhance the Learning of the Target Language? *Journal of Modern Education Review*, ISSN 2155-7993, USA, 5(6), , 564–575.
- Simasiku, L., Kasanda, C., & Smit, T. (2015). Teaching Subject Mater through English as the Medium of Instruction in the Namibian English Second Language Classrooms. *European Scientific Journal*, 315-324.

- Song, Y. (2022). Translanguaging as decoloniality-informed knowledge co-construction: a nexus analysis of an English-Medium-Instruction program in China. *Applied linguistics review*,. doi:10.1515/applirev-2022-0020
- Stewart, H., Stewart, M. A., Flint, P., & Dollar, T. (2020). Co-learning in the high school English class through translanguaging: Emergent bilingual newcomers and monolingual teachers. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 20(3), 151-166. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2020.1726759>
- Steyn, G. (2017). *The transition of Grade 4 learners to English as medium of instruction*. MEd Thesis. University of Pretoria.
- Sun, B., & Tan, H. X. (2019). Exploring the potential of translanguaging for L2 writing: Insights from an EFL Chinese context. . *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 39(1), , 87-100.
- Tai, K. W., & Wong, C. (2022). Empowering Students Through the Construction of a Translanguaging Space in an English as a First Language Classroom. . *Applied Linguistics*,. doi:10.1093/applin/amac069
- Teng, M. F., & Fang, F. (2022). Translanguaging pedagogies in developing morphological awareness: the case of Japanese students learning Chinese in China. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 1-30.
- Thanh, N., & Thanh, T. (2015). The interconnection between interpretivist paradigm and qualitative methods in education. *American Journal of Educational Science*, 1(2), 24-27.
- Thomas, S. (2017). What Teachers Need To Know About Translanguaging. *School of Education and Leadership Student Capstone Projects*. 77, 1-44. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse_cp/77
- Thongwichit, N., & Ulla, M. (2024). Translanguaging pedagogy in Thailand's English medium of instruction classrooms: Teachers' perspectives and practices . *TESL-EJ*, 27(4).
- Tian, J. (2024). Co-constructing translanguaging space to facilitate participation in a novice CFL classroom: Chinese Language and Discourse. *An International and Interdisciplinary Journal*. doi:10.1075/cld.24006.tia

- Tian, Z., & Shepard-Carey, L. (2020). (Re)imagining the Future of Translanguaging Pedagogies in TESOL Through Teacher–Researcher Collaboration. *TESOL Quarterly*, 54(4), 1131–1143. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.614>
- Ticheloven, A. E., Blom, P., Leseman, & McMonagle., S. (2019). Translanguaging Challenges in Multilingual Classrooms: Scholar, Teacher and Student Perspectives. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 18 (3), 1–24. doi:1080/14790718.2019.1686002.
- Timrin, N., & Lexros, E. (2024). *The use, attitudes, and perceptions of translanguaging in Swedish primary School*. Malmo University.
- Torpsten, C. (2018). Investigated Translanguaging in a Swedish Multilingual Classroom. . *Journal of Multicultural Perspective* 20(2), 104-110.
- Tuskeyeva, A. (2022). *Perceptions on Translanguaging from EFL Teachers with Different Linguistic Backgrounds in Kazakhstan*. MA Thesis.Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education.
- UNESCO. (2016). *Global education monitoring report: policy paper, 24*. Global Education Monitoring Report.
- Uugwanga, J. (2023). *The Transition form Mother Tongue to English as a Medium of Instructions in Namibian Primary Schools*. National Institute for Educational Development (NIED).
- Vaish, V. (2019). Challenges and directions in implementing translanguaging pedagogy for low achieving students. *Classroom Discourse*, 10:3-4, 274-289. doi:10.1080/19463014.2019.1628790
- Van Viegen Stille, S., Bethke, R., Bradley-Brown, J., Giberson, J., & & Hall, G. (2016). Broadening educational practice to include translanguaging: An outcome of educator inquiry into multilingual students’ learning needs. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 72(4), 480–503.
- Vidana, V. (2020). *Language Ideologies And Identities: Beliefs And Practices Of College Level Spanish Students And An Instructor In A Spanish Heritage Language Classroom*. Open Access Theses & Dissertations. 3202. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.utep.edu/open_etd/3202

- Vikøy, A., & Haukås, A. (2021). Norwegian L1 teachers' beliefs about a multilingual approach in increasingly diverse classrooms. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1-20. doi:10.1080/14790718.2021.1961779
- Vogel, S., & García, O. (2017). Translanguaging. Publications and Research. Retrieved from https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_pubs/402
- von Wühlisch, A. (2018). *Analyzing Student Perceptions on Translanguaging: A Case Study of a Rural Namibian School*. Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wang, D. (2019). Translanguaging in Chinese foreign language classrooms: students and teachers' attitudes and practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2), 138-149.
- Wang, D. (2020). Studying Chinese language in higher education: The translanguaging reality through learners' eyes. *System*, 95, 102394.
- Wang, D., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). Code choice in the Chinese as a foreign language classroom. *Multilingual Education*, 2(1), 3.
- Wang, H. (2008). Language Policy Implementation: A Look at Teachers' Perceptions. *Asian EFL Journal*, 1-38.
- Wang, J., Hanafi Zaid, Y., Ibrahim, N. A., & Haladin, N. B. (2024). Teachers' and students' beliefs about translanguaging in higher education: A systematic review. *Journal of Nusantara Studies*, 9(2), 402-419.
- Wang, J., Zaid, Y., Ibrahim, N. A., & Haladin, N. B. (2024). Teachers' and students' beliefs about translanguaging in higher education: A systematic review. *Journal of Nusantara Studies*, Vol 9(2), 402-419.
- Wang, P. (2022). Relooking at the Roles of Translanguaging in English as a Foreign Language Classes for Multilingual Learners: Practices and Implications. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 850649.
- Wawire, B. A., & Barnes-Story, A. (2022). Translanguaging for multiliteracy development: pedagogical approaches for classroom practitioners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. doi:10.1080/13670050.2022.2094702

- Wei, L. (2010). Theory, evidence and practice: Translanguaging and the education of emergent bilinguals. In C. K. Leung, & B. V. Street, *The Routledge companion to English language studies* (pp. 385-398). Routledge.
- Wei, L. (2011). Moment Analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1222–1235. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.03>
- Wei, L. (2023). Transformative pedagogy for inclusion and social justice through translanguaging, co-learning, and transpositioning. *Language Teaching*, 1–12. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000186>
- Wei, L., & Ho, W. Y. (2018). Language learning sansfrontiers: A translanguaging view. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 38, 33–59.
- Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education]*. Bangor, UK: Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Wales.
- Williams, C. (1996). Secondary education: Teaching in the bilingual situation. In C. L. Williams, & C. Baker, *In The language policy: Taking stock* (pp. 39 – 78). Llangefni , , UK: CAI .
- Williams, C. (2021). The national immersion scheme guidance for teachers on subject language threshold: Accelerating the process of reaching the threshold. *Bangor, Wales: The Welsh Language Board*.
- Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA Is about—A Summary of Its History, Important Concepts and Its Developments. . In & M. W. R., *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 1-13)). London: Sage Publications.
- Wolfaardt, D. (2005). Namibia: A Case for a Gradual Transitional Bilingual Language Programme. *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism*, ed. James Cohen, Kara T. McAlister, Kellie Rolstad, and Jeff MacSwan (pp. 2357-2368). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Woolard, K. A. (1998). Simultaneity and Bivalency as Strategies in Bilingualism. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 8(1), 3-29. doi:10.1525/jlin.1998.8.1.3.

- Ya Nangoloh, P. (2021). *Multilingualism in the Lecture Room: A Investigation of Translanguaging by UNAM Main Campus Lecturers in Content Subject in Windhoek, Namibia*. MA in English Studies: University of Namibia.
- Yasar Yuzlu, M., & Dikilitas, K. (2022). Translanguaging in the development of EFL learners' foreign language skills in Turkish context. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 16(2), 176-190.
- Yusri, N., Huzaimi, N., & Sulaiman, N. (2022). Translanguaging in Malaysian ESL Classroom: Teachers' Perceptions. *International journal of academic research in business & social sciences*, (12) 9, 607 – 619. doi:10.6007/ijarbss/v12-i9/14542
- Yuvayapan, F. (2019). Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Dil ve Dilbilimi Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 15(2), 678-694.
- Zainuddin, N. M., & Zaki, N. N. (2023). Comparison of Translanguaging Practices and Ideologies in Secondary and Tertiary ESL Settings in Malaysia: Teachers' Perspective. *Higher Education and Oriental Studies (HEOS) – Vol 3(1)*, 4 – 23. doi:http://doi.org/10.54435/heos.v3i1.90
- Zano, K. (2022). A Multilingual Turn: Translanguaging by Design Activity in an EFL Context. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 10(2), 199-210. doi:https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v%vi%i.4826
- Zhang, R., & Chan, B. H. (2021). edagogical translanguaging in atrilingual context: the case of two EFL classrooms in a Xinjiang university. *International Journal ofBilingual Education and Bilingualism*,, 1. doi:10.1080/13670050.2021.1978383

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: ETHICAL CLEARANCE



THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA DIRECTORATE OF RESEARCH AND GRADUATE STUDIES

Great East Road Campus | P.O. Box 32379 | Lusaka10101 | Tel: +260-211-290 258/291 777 Fax: (+260)-211-290 258/253 952 | E-mail: director.drugs@unza.zm | Website: www.unza.zm

APPROVAL OF STUDY

IORG No. 0005376

HSSREC IRB No. 00006464

10th August, 20223

REF NO. HSSREC-2023-JUL.-025

Mr. Begani Mashinja
The University of Zambia
School of Education,
P.O. Box 32379
LUSAKA

Dear Mr. Mashinja,

**RE: “TEACHERS’ IDEOLOGIES TOWARDS TRANSLANGUAGING
IMPLEMENTATION IN SELECTED MULTILINGUAL GRADE 4 CLASSROOMS OF
ZAMBEZI REGION, NAMIBIA”**

Reference is made to your submission of the protocol captioned above. The HSSREC resolved to approve this study and your participation as Principal Investigator for a period of one year.

REVIEW TYPE	ORDINARY REVIEW	APPROVAL NO. HSSREC-2023-JUL-025
Approval and Expiry Date	Approval Date: 10 th August, 2023	Expiry Date: 9 th August, 2024
Protocol Version and Date	Version - Nil.	9 th August, 2024
Information Sheet, Consent Forms and Dates	☐ English.	To be provided
Consent form ID and Date	Version - Nil	To be provided
Recruitment Materials	Nil	Nil
Other Study Documents	Questionnaire.	
Number of Participants Approved for Study		

Specific conditions will apply to this approval. As Principal Investigator it is your responsibility to ensure that the contents of this letter are adhered to. If these are not adhered to, the approval may be suspended. Should the study be suspended, study sponsors and other regulatory authorities will be informed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- No participant may be involved in any study procedure prior to the study approval or after the expiration date.
- All unanticipated or Serious Adverse Events (SAEs) must be reported to HSSREC within 5 days.
- All protocol modifications must be approved by HSSREC prior to implementation unless they are intended to reduce risk (but must still be reported for approval). Modifications will include any change of investigator/s or site address.
- All protocol deviations must be reported to HSSREC within 5 working days.
- All recruitment materials must be approved by HSSREC prior to being used.
- Principal investigators are responsible for initiating Continuing Review proceedings. HSSREC will only approve a study for a period of 12 months.
- It is the responsibility of the PI to renew his/her ethics approval through a renewal application to HSSREC.
- Where the PI desires to extend the study after expiry of the study period, documents for study extension must be received by HSSREC at least 30 days before the expiry date. This is for the purpose of facilitating the review process. Documents received within 30 days after expiry will be labelled "late submissions" and will incur a penalty fee of K500.00. No study shall be renewed whose documents are submitted for renewal 30 days after expiry of the certificate.
- Every 6 (six) months a progress report form supplied by The University of Zambia Humanities and Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee as an IRB must be filled in and submitted to us. There is a penalty of K500.00 for failure to submit the report.
- When closing a project, the PI is responsible for notifying, in writing or using the Research Ethics and Management Online (REMO), both HSSREC and the National Health Research Authority (NHRA) when ethics certification is no longer required for a project.
- In order to close an approved study, a Closing Report must be submitted in writing or through the REMO system. A Closing Report should be filed when data collection has ended and the study team will no longer be using human participants or animals or secondary data or have any direct or indirect contact with the research participants or animals for the study.
- Filing a closing report (rather than just letting your approval lapse) is important as it assists HSSREC in efficiently tracking and reporting on projects. Note that some

funding agencies and sponsors require a notice of closure from the IRB which had approved the study and can only be generated after the Closing Report has been filed.

- A reprint of this letter shall be done at a fee.
- All protocol modifications must be approved by HSSREC by way of an application for an amendment prior to implementation unless they are intended to reduce risk (but must still be reported for approval). Modifications will include any change of investigator/s or site address or methodology and methods. Many modifications entail minimal risk adjustments to a protocol and/or consent form and can be made on an Expedited basis (via the IRB Chair). Some examples are: format changes, correcting spelling errors, adding key personnel, minor changes to questionnaires, recruiting and changes, and so forth. Other, more substantive changes, especially those that may alter the risk-benefit ratio, may require Full Board review. In all cases, except where noted above regarding subject safety, any changes to any protocol document or procedure must first be approved by HSSREC before they can be implemented.

Should you have any questions regarding anything indicated in this letter, please do not hesitate to get in touch with us at the above indicated address.

On behalf of HSSREC, we would like to wish you all the success as you carry out your study.

Yours faithfully,



Dr. J. I. Ziwa

DR. J. I. Ziwa

**CHAIRPERSON
THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA HUMANITIES AND
SOCIAL SCIENCES RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE - IRB**

CC: Director, Directorate of Research and Graduate Studies
Assistant Director (Research), Directorate of Research and Graduate Studies
Assistant Registrar (Research), Directorate of Research and Graduate Studies

APPENDIX 2: RESEARCH PERMISSION LETTER



**REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA
ZAMBEZI REGIONAL COUNCIL
DIRECTORATE: EDUCATION, ARTS AND CULTURE**



Tel: +26466261902/962

Fax: +26466253187

Enquiries: Adrenah Mukela

Ngoma Road

Govt Building

Our Ref: 13/2/9/1

Private Bag 5006

Katima Mulilo, Namibia

PO Box 1752
Ngweze
Katima Mulilo
Namibia

Attention: Mr Begani Ziambo Mashinja

RE: PERMISSION TO CONDUCT AN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH IN SCHOOLS IN ZAMBEZI REGION

Your letter to the office of the Regional Director: Zambezi Region dated 11th January 2022 with the caption Permission to conduct an Educational Research in Schools in Zambezi Region was received.

Kindly be informed that approval is granted to you to conduct your research at selected schools as requested, but let me draw your attention to the following aspects: **NOTE.**

- a) The granted approval should not disrupt the normal teaching and learning at those schools you intend visiting;
- b) You are requested to observe the COVID-19 protocols;
- c) You are further requested to share your findings with the Ministry of Education, Arts and Culture.

By copy of this letter Inspectors of Education concerned are notified accordingly of your presence to these schools.

I trust and hope you will find this in order.


MR JOSEPH JAKAWANA
Office of the Director
REGIONAL DIRECTOR: EDUCATION, ARTS AND CULTURE


APPENDIX 3: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TEACHERS



THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND SOCIAL SCIENCES EDUCATION

Title of research: **Teachers' Ideologies toward Implementation of Translanguaging in Selected Namibian Grade 4 Language Classrooms in Zambezi Region**

Dear Participant,

You have purposively been selected to participate in this study because you are directly involved in the teaching of Grade 4. Be as free and truthful as you can to respond to the questions in this interview.

The purpose of this guide is to elicit grade 4 English language teachers' ideologies towards the implementation of translanguaging.

Name: _____

Qualification: _____

School: _____

Date: _____

Background

1. How long have you been an English language teacher at this school?
2. Which languages do you speak?
3. Which languages would you consider to be your mother tongue?
4. How have you been working as a teacher?
5. How long have you been working as a teacher?

Familiarity with language policy

6. What is your understanding of the language policy for schools in relation to implementation of translanguaging in Grade 4? Please explain.
7. What does the policy recommend in terms of what languages should be used to teach?

8. Does the policy allow you to use all the learners' familiar languages and English languages at the same time during English lessons?

Ideologies towards translanguaging

9. What languages do your learners speak?
10. What is your understanding of translanguaging? Please explain.
11. What language (s) do you use to teach your lessons? Why?
12. How do you assist your learners understand your English lessons if they are not proficient in English?
13. What are your views about the use of translanguaging as a teaching practice in the teaching of English language in Grade 4?

Teachers' implementation of translanguaging

14. You mentioned that you use/ do not use translanguaging? Explain, how you use it/ why you do not use it.
15. What do you do to make sure that both learners who understand English and those who not understand it are able to understand what you are teaching, and they contribute in class?

Factors affecting implementation of translanguaging.

16. Tell me about some of the reasons that make you use or not to use translanguaging in your English lessons.
17. Have you been trained to teach using translanguaging? How? Was the training effective? Please explain.
18. What do you think are other factors that affect the use of translanguaging in your lessons?
19. Are you encouraged or restricted by the school authorities to use different languages in your lessons? Explain.
20. What are your final remarks?

End of interview, thanks very much for your time and cooperation.

APPENDIX 4: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION GUIDE FOR TEACHERS



THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND SOCIAL SCIENCES EDUCATION

The purpose of this guide is to obtain first hand data on teachers translanguaging practice in the classroom when teaching English language lessons (What are the teacher's and Learners' translanguaging practices?)

School category

☐ Urban ☐ Rural

School: Code _____

Teacher Code: _____

Language: _____

Date of visit: _____

Topic: _____

No. of learners: _____

Enter language code (s) in the row indicating language use as observed. Where more than one language is used enter all applicable codes.								
Teacher speaking					Learners speaking			
Teaching	Giving instructions to learners	Explaining difficult concept (s)/clarifying	Disciplining learners	Responding to learners' questions/ giving feedback	Responding to questions	Asking questions	Group per work	Requesting permission

1. What languages are represented in the classroom (languages spoken by learners)				
2. Languages teacher is familiar with				
3. Language/Languages being used/spoken in the classroom				
4. How does the teacher interact with the pupils in the classroom?				
5. How do the pupils respond to the teacher's instructions?				
6. Dose the teacher use translanguaging effectively in the English lessons?				
7. Is the teacher comfortable teaching using translanguaging?				
8. What strategies and materials does the teacher use to support the learners English learning in the classroom?				
9. What are the classroom issues that are affecting the use of translanguaging in the English lessons?				
10. Anything striking about the lesson?				

Language Codes

Afrikans=1 English= 2 German= 3 jul'hoansi=4 Khoekhoegowab= 5
Oshkwanyama=6 Oshindinga= 7 Otjiherero= 8 Rukwangali= 9 Rumanyo=10
Setswana= 11 Silozi =12 Thimbukushu= 13 Namibian Sign Language= 14 Other= 15

APPENDIX 5: DOCUMENT ANALYSIS GUIDE



THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND SOCIAL SCIENCES EDUCATION

The document will be analysed.

1. Lesson plan

The following will be some of the guiding questions for the document study:

1. Does the lesson plan include translanguaging?
2. What languages are incorporated in the lesson plan?
3. Is assessment translanguaged in the lesson plan?
4. Does the teacher have own internal policy that promote or guide on the use translanguaging in the lessons?