Multilingual Practices from Multilingual Perspective in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa

Mujahid Shah*, Shaista Malik**, Wajid Riaz***

ABSTRACT*: Pakistan is a multilingual country and in a multilingual environment, the emergence of bi-multilingual practices such as Code switching (CS) and Translanguaging (TL) are natural and not something new. This rich linguistic backdrop has been studied widely from the perspective of CS which yielded negative perceptions among teachers and students regarding the use of multilingual resources in learning and teaching context. However, the exploration of these practices from the perspective of TL, which takes the use of multilingual resources as something positive, is neglected. In view of the said discussion, the current research attempted to explore the teacher' interactive practices in institutional settings in Pakistan from the perspective of TL. Data collected through observations, audio-taping and semi-structured interviews were analysed. The findings revealed that the teachers have given a free expression to their linguistic repertoires. Moreover, the study showed that the participants can engage in TL both unconsciously and unconsciously. Moreover, the emergence of TL in the current context could be attributed to the socialisation of the speakers in a multilingual environment. The study is important in the sense that it will help to understand the use of bi-multilingual practices in the pedagogic context in particular and communication in general, as something positive enhancing and adding to the communicative potential of the speakers.*

Keywords: Translanguaging; code switching; multilingual practices; linguistic repertoire, linguistic heritage

Introduction

Pakistan is a multilingual country with more than 70 languages used in different domains (Mahboob, 2016). English is the medium of instruction and official language, mainly used in academic settings and in offices for official correspondence. Urdu is the national language, used across the country by different ethnic communities, serving as lingua franca which helps to keep all the ethnic groups as one nation united. Then there are over sixty local languages, spoken in different regions of the country. In such scenario CS and TL are likely to happen and so did in this context. But unfortunately this b-multilingual backdrop has been

---

*   *Assistant Professor, Department of English, AWKUM (Corresponding author email: mujahidshah@awkum.edu.pk)*

**   *Associate Professor, Department of English, Hazara University Khyber Pakhtoonkhwa.*

*** *Associate Professor, University of Lahore.*

studied extensively from the perspective of CS, while the study of these practices from the perspective of TL stays neglected. Further, even most of the CS studies lack in certain ways. In Pakistan context most of these studies are "survey-based" and lacking in "credible classroom-based research" (Mahboob & Jain, 2016). They have mainly explored CS either from micro sociolinguistic perspective (Bashir & Naveed, 2015; Gulzar, 2014) or macro sociolinguistic perspective (Gulzar & Qadir, 2010) but there is lack of studies that have explored CS from a micro-macro integrated perspective.

This lack of classroom-based research, also leads to the fact that the teachers and students have very little understanding of CS, considering it as a negative practice, emerging due to the lack of proficiency on the part of the speakers (Khan, 2014; Raja, 2014). This is one of the main reason which has motivated the current research. Being a university teacher, it is usually the routine to go to different universities in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa to observe students, and noted that despite the strict instructions from educational authorities and keenness and consciousness of the lecturers and students about the use and status of English, they quite often code switch between English and Pashto both inside and outside the classrooms. However, when you ask them about CS or the reason for CS most of them would reply that this happens due to lack of proficiency and nothing more. On the other hand, when we look at other countries of the world, the monolingual pedagogic scenario is changing fast into bi-multilingual approaches but traditionally, we still adhere to the old and outdated ideas and practices of "English only" policy in the classrooms, considering the use of CS and other bi-multilingual practices counter-productive for language learning in particular and learning in general. These thinkings and situations have aroused the interest to unpack the in-depth multilingual environment in the context of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa from the perspective of TL. The study is important in the sense as it will help to create awareness among teachers and students that using multilingual resources not only enhance the communicative potential of the speakers but give them an edge to make the teaching and learning process easier and more comprehensible.

This study addresses the following questions:

1. How do the college teachers use their linguistic repertoires in their interactions in an institutional setting in Pakistan?

2. Why do the college teachers give expression to their linguistic repertoires in an institutional setting in Pakistan?

Literature Review

Multilingual practices have been mostly investigated from the perspective of either CS or TL. There exist similarities and differences between CS and TL. Both, CS and TL concern with bi-multilingual practices, dealing with the same phenomenon. The proponents of TL, in order to justify and establish it as a distinct approach, have mainly focused on the differences between CS and TL. Highlighting the difference between CS and TL, Garcia and Lin (2017) argue that CS and TL are two distinct paradigms. In the first place, the purposes of both practices stand pole apart. The goal of CS is somewhat to teach an additional language or teaching itself, while TL focuses on the development or sustenance of bilingualism. In other words, CS mainly deals with the product of bi- multilingual practices whereas TL practitioners engage with the source and process of such practices. Moreover, CS takes a monoglossic view of languages, considering that bilinguals have two separate linguistic systems which govern and regulate their speech/ interactive practices. TL on the contrary views bilingual practices as heteroglossic assuming to be controlled not by two but one unitary linguistic system. Further, TL takes an insider view of language, paying attention to the process of using different languages, while CS approaching language from an outsider perspective. To put it simply the exponents of TL, it emphasis on the idiolect/ the individual linguistic repertoire. On the other hand, CS supporters look at the bilingual practices from the stand point of the languages (named languages) (Garcia, 2009).

The concepts of named languages such as English, Urdu and so on are labelled by the proponents of CS as different codes while TL approaches and perceives it as political and social entities; shaped and substantiated by political and social forces. They considered idiolect as something linguistic that the grammarians and Linguists are engaged with. Speaking generally about languages, TL presumes the shuttling of languages to be fluid and dynamic while CS mostly assumes bi-multilingual practices as static and separate. Finally, CS investigations mainly focus on the content and purpose of multilingual practices whereas TL practitioners engage with the source and process of such practices.

In fact, the emergence and rise of TL can be termed as a kind of reaction against "the English only policy which emphasizes the use of English for

instructional purposes in the classrooms and create a kind of embarrassment among the teachers when they switch to use native language in the classroom" (Moore, 2013). But there are studies which support the speaker use of "dominant or native language" and its structure available to the speakers to be utilised for development of another language and thus L1 provided solid foundations for enactment of L2 (Cook, 2001). To avoid L1 in learning English, is also in a way depriving the speakers to activate their previous linguistic knowledge and structure and pushing them to the blind corner (Cummins, 2009). The use of L1 in classroom facilitates understanding and helps the students in developing communicative competence more effectively than just to expose them to target language. Bilingual cantered approaches such as TL are also justifiable from the stand point of "monolingual bias". If you are allowing a monolingual, particularly English speakers to use their language freely in the classroom and setting as it is standard for the bilingual to achieve the same level of proficiency then it is something unfair and biased evaluation. Because in this context the proficiency of the monolingual is not only the touch stone criteria for the bilingual to achieve but the monolingual has full liberty to use their L1 while on the other hand, the bilinguals are restricted to use only one of their two languages. So from this perspective the evaluation system based on "only English" policy is biased and unjustified to be used for bilingual and multilinguals alike (Garcia & Flores, 2014; Cummins, 2009).

No doubts, TL has great utility and facilitate the process of communication and learning but there does appear certain challenges that the researchers and scholars have to handle and come up with amicable solutions. The first thing is that TL being student centered, would be highly challenging for the teachers. It is dependent on student's motivation and comprehension, and there are chances that the students may go off track in the process, then in such situations, it is the responsibility of the teachers to bring them back to the track (White et al., 2013). In addition, there emerges the question of teacher's proficiency in the students' native language, which is considered important for the process of translanguaging without that it would not be possible for the teachers to allow the students to get engaged in translanguaging (McMillan & Rivers, 2011). Moreover, another important issue which is expected to arise in situations where the students have diverse linguistic backgrounds. In such situation it would be quite difficult to allow each and every student to use their L1 freely, which in way would be advantaging for some students at the cost of other (Hornberger & Link, 2012). Besides, there are some other

pedagogic, linguistic and cultural issues that the researchers have to take up seriously. MacSwan (2017) criticizes the current TL approach and argues that it would be quite hard for TL exponents to prove and justify on empirical grounds the "undifferentiated unitary linguistic system", presented by Otheguy et al., (2015, p. 282), which they believe to govern the linguistic repertoire of the speakers. Because the undifferentiated unitary linguistic system lacks explanation for structural differences, exist between certain languages. For instance, there exists a structural difference between Farsi and English, more evident at word order level. Now, these differences could not be explained with the help of an "undifferentiated unitary linguistic system". Therefore, the integrated linguistic model which takes into consideration both similarities and differences, arising between certain languages, seems to be more plausible.

Moreover, they also agreed with TL that in most of the cases "named languages" are created on political and social basis, and those idiolects are real and languages in general are abstractions. However, calling "named languages" as only political entities and accordingly, presuming the differences between them to be political in nature, are not absolute and true in all cases. There also exists some structural differences between certain languages, which necessitate it to be named separately. Moreover, when "named languages" are out rightly dismissed as political entities, then concepts such as "speech community" "multilingualism", "code switching" and "native language" will stand nowhere. Therefore, the "multilingual perspective on translanguaging" is not only logical but flexible as well. This approach will not only accommodates concepts such as CS, multilingualism, speech community and native language but will also strengthen the position of TL and reduce the distance between CS and TL. On the whole TL both as communicative strategy and pedagogic approach has great potential which needs to be properly explored.

In the last few years, a number of studies have investigated bi-multilingual practices from the perspective of TL in different contexts and settings. In fact, the scholars have been involved in mixing and applying TL with other approaches which in the process have very much expanded the concept of TL. For instance, Creese and Blackledge (2010) investigated the interactive practices of teachers, students and administrators in complementary schools in the context of English and heritage language in UK. Data were collected by means of recording the interactive practices

and interviewing the participants. The findings showed that the boundaries between the languages remained "permeable "and fluid. The students were freely allowed to draw on their linguistic repertoire which helped in creation of a learner friendly environment, proving equally profitable for development of multilingual communicative competence. Moreover, the results revealed that the participants used languages in a complimentary manner wherein the existence of one language is essential for the completion of other. The study recommends that multilingual practices in the classrooms need to be encouraged that would help in enhancing the proficiency of the students in both the languages. The findings of Creese and Blackledge (2010) were further cemented by Lewis et al., (2013) who explored TL in the interactive practices of teachers and students at school level in the same Welsh context. They found TL "pedagogically effective" and reported that the participants have used both the languages "dynamically and in an integrated manner" for meaning making. Similar kind of findings were reported by Mendoza and Parba (2018). They investigated the use of TL for the development of academic writing skill in English and Filipino context in Hawaii State University. Though the study showed that TL did not improve the academic writing skill of the students significantly but it did help the students in understanding the difficult content easily. Similarly, some of the researchers moved to Spanish context and explored TL in the interactive practices of teachers and students in US. They found that the teachers and students used both the languages in a dynamic and free fashion for creation of a bilingual space for meaning making and getting their views across. They strongly advocated the use of TL in bilingual and multilingual contexts not only in the classrooms but going beyond to the outside social world. They emphasised that the speakers' use of stronger language effectively help in developing proficiency in their weaker language. In other words, they believed that the speakers L1 provide stronger foundations for the development of L2 and other languages (Lasagabaster & Garcia, 2014).

So, it can be stated that TL has gained great popularity during the last decade of the current century. The researchers tried to make new and new experiments by looking at TL from diverse perspectives and approaches.

Research Methodology

In view of the nature of research in general (exploratory) and research questions of the study in particular, it was deemed appropriate to rely on qualitative

paradigm. In qualitative paradigm, as the current study was approaching human activities/ behaviors in a particular socio-cultural setting from the perspective of the participants therefore, ethnography as research method was opted.

Data Collection and Selection of the Participants

Before proceeding with data collection, all ethical obligations including consent of the participants; their reservations and anonymity were fulfilled. As per desired of the participants, they were given pseudo codes. They were labelled as "T1 to T5". A total of 5 participants, comprising 5 college teachers; teaching at post graduate level in government colleges located in Mardan, were selected. The selection was made based on their availability and their native language being Pashto. They were all teaching English. The age range of the college teachers was between 28 to 35 years.

Audio or video taping and note taking are the two important tools in any type of qualitative research which can help the researchers in quote, requote with play and replay for descriptions and interpretations of results and findings (Eisner, 1991). Audio is important because it is considered to be a useful tool for capturing precise utterances and naturalistic interactive data/interactions. In view of the importance of recording as a data collection tool for capturing interactive practices, the current research study has opted to audio-taped teachers interactions (See appendix c). A total of 5 hours interactions of the college teachers among themselves in the faculty room, in five sessions were recorded.

One of the most important aspect of qualitative research in the context of the classroom interaction in general and ethnographic research in particular is observations and note taking. Because here at the research site, the researchers observe the activities in progress and document the important points as field notes (see appendix A). These field notes help to recalling certain points and interactional moves/ behaviours, which at later stage facilitate them in the analysis and interpretation of the data from other sources (Creswell, 2013).

Interview is another important data collection tool which is commonly used in qualitative research in general and ethnographic research in particular. It would not be wrong to state that qualitative research in social sciences heavily rely on interviews which link the researcher with the participants (Eisner, 1991). Keeping in view the nature of the current study (ethnographic) and the importance and utility of interview in the current context, a structured interview was opted (See appendix B).

Data Analysis

In order to answer questions, 1 and 2, an observational analysis of the interactive data, informed by the insight gained during the interview sessions and guided by Creese and Blackledge (2010) was conducted. The findings revealed that the participants have given a free expression to their linguistic repertoires in a dynamic and diverse manner having no regards for the status, time and place of the languages concerned, which confirm the existence and use of the teachers' conscious and unconscious TL. Moreover, the emergence of multilingual strains and its uses could be due to the fact that the speakers are brought up in a multilingual environment which led to the emergence of multilingual practice in their interactions.

Use and Expression of Linguistic Repertoire

One of the main points that is the exponent of TL, emphasis is the expression of individual linguistic repertoire. They believe that each individual should be given the choice to use their linguistic repertoire for creation of translanguaging space, which can be used for meaning making in a creative and critical manner (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Garcia & Lin, 2017). Now in the current study, the speaker's linguistic repertoire comprises three languages (confirmed by the participants in their interviews as well) and the data bear instances all three of them, which is indicative of TL.

In extract 1, L1 begins with Pashto and states **ta chi da da shpy khoob k habary kavi nu** *doctor* **saib warta waye k** (The doctor advised him on the issue of talking in sleep) then he turns to Urdu and says **ap asy raat ko asay moqa na da daina tu raat ma ye na boly ga** (The doctor said do not give them opportunity to talk) **ap jaty hoye asy moqa da da** *(laughing)* **wo bechari os ko moqa nahi da rahi te** (Consequently, the lady did not give any chance to her husband to talk). This shows that the speaker being multilingual has given fullest expression to his linguistic repertoire.

Interactive Extract (1)

T1. ta chi da da shpy khoob k habary kavi nu (You were talking while sleeping) doctor **sain warta waye k ap asy raat ko asay moqa na da daina tu raat ma ye na boly ga** (The doctor said do not give them opportunity to

talk) **ap jaty hoye asy moqa da da** (laughing) **wo bechari os ko moqa nahi da rahi te** (So the lady was not giving any chance to her husband to talk).

Based on the interview with T1 (as mentioned in Interview Extract 1), he speaks three languages. He felt that speakers are not aware of mixing of three languages when they speak. Here the speaker being conscious of the mixing phenomenon, tried to use English language deliberately:

Interview Extract 1

T1. I speak three languages, Pashto, English and Urdu. Pashto is my native language, English is the medium of instruction and Urdu is our national language. Now these   languages are mixed up every. Even we do not know what is happening

In extract 3, T3 starts the sentence with Pashto and then turns to English and hence the interplay between Pashto and English continues till the end. Interesting T3 utters the subject part of the sentence in Pashto ***aow taso b*** (You will have to be) and then for the verb code switches to English "face". In the next sentence the pattern changes and instead of English a Pashto verb can be seen **"warkave"** (to give) and so the process goes on. All this done in free and fluent manner which is indicative of the unconscious TL, disregarding the status, time and place of these languages. Each of the above mentioned languages has a specific status and domain of its use. For instance, Pashto is the native language of the speakers, commonly used within families and mostly for informal purposes, while English is the official languages. But the speaker disregards this distinction and gives a free and fluid expression to his linguistic repertoire.

Interactive Extract 2.

 T3. …aow taso b behaviour **hum** face **kavay haghvi ta b** time **hum warkave** (And you   have to bear them and give them time too) **haghvi b** face **kave hum (.)** (You have to face   them) at least **kor k da** tension **na v**

In the interview when T3 was asked, why she used those three languages in the classroom, T3 replied that she does so habitually. She just utters whatever comes to her without thinking about it or being aware that she is using different languages. In the following extract T3 has integrated three different languages, Pashto, English and Urdu. All these languages are integrated in and interwoven in such a manner that one cannot make sense without the other.

Interview Extract 2

T3. **waim chi** (I am saying) *we change naturally* **mung ta** (we) **MALOOM** (do not know) **nave LASHAWORI** (unconsciously) **kegi** (happens) *we are unaware of this mixture* (I say that we mix these languages naturally and unconsciously and we are unaware of this mixture.)

The analysis shows that the college teachers have freely used their linguistic repertoire in a diverse manner having no regards for the status and place of these languages**.** Though officially all the three languages have its specific domains. Pashto is the native language of the speakers, generally use in the family and social circles. Similarly, Urdu is their national language partially used as medium of instruction and generally used to connect with people belonging to different regions. And finally English is the official language and medium of instruction particularly at university level. But here it can be observed that the speakers quite freely used all these languages in a single speech event. In summary, the participants have used their linguistic repertoire, both conscious and unconsciously.

Why Do the College Teachers Give Expression to their Linguistic Repertoires?

As mentioned earlier that the participants both consciously and unconsciously used different languages for different purposes. The dynamic and fluent alternation of languages at times made it difficult to determine the immediate micro function or purpose of moving from one language to other. All the participants confirmed and agreed that the conscious and unconscious use of different languages may be attributed to their socialisation in a bilingual environment. The following extracts will make the point clear.

In extract 4, T4 while discussing the reason for multilingual resources gives a comprehensive and an in-depth reply. He goes to the very heart of the matter and explains that they are socialised in an environment where both, Pashto and English are commonly used on routine basis, which is likely to reflect in their interactive practices unconsciously. In other words, the multilingual environment results into the multilingual spaces for multilingual practices.

Interactive Extract 4.

T4. So this is sometime it happens not using it intentionally but it happens unconsciously as well and it should be done. I think it's useful for the teachers as

well as for the students. We are used to this practice. As we use Pashto and English on daily basis and now this has made a place in our lives and sometime we unconsciously change from one language to another without knowing it.

Finally, in Extract 5, T3 attributes the speaker use of their linguistic repertoire to their socio cultural background. She further adds, that they do so naturally /unconsciously. It has now become a state of mind and the speaker finds it difficult to avoid. She elaborates that at times they are unaware of the flow of different languages in their interactive practices. So, here the speaker talks not only about unconscious TL but highlights its main reason, multilingual background.

Interactive Extract 5

T3. One of the important reason for the prevalence of multilingual practices is our social background. We live in multilingual society. We use Pashto, English and Urdu on daily basis. This situation has led to the rise of mixing of these languages in our speeches which we mostly habitual and unconsciously. Even if we want sometime we cannot stop as it is not in our control but unconscious.

T3 while commenting on the reason for TL, has given an in depth reply. T3 elaborates and touches the very crux of the matter. He explained that the participants' unconscious use of TL could be ascribed to their socialisation in a multilingual environment. They are brought up in an environment where these languages are used on daily basis which led to their habitual development of TL.

The analysis shows that the teachers use their linguistic repertoires both, conscious and unconsciously, more predominant unconsciously. This unconscious or habitual use of linguistic repertoire could be attributed to their socialisation in a multilingual environment.

Findings

The analysis shows that the college teachers have given a free expression to their linguistic repertoire in a diverse manner. Despite the fact that changing language at word and sentence level is considered to be one of the most difficult types of language alternation which requires a high level of competency/proficiency in both the languages, the speakers have made a free use of their linguistic repertoire which cannot be limited to some specific patterns, parts of speech, or a particular syntactical or morphological order. The same dynamism and fluidity has also been highlighted as one of the main feature of TL. Lewis et al., (2012, p.1) "both

languages are used in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner to organise and mediate mental processes in understanding, speaking, literacy, and, not least, learning".

The findings show that at times there seems to be no conscious efforts on the part of the speakers while moving from one language to another in a fluent and natural manner in both directions i.e. Pashto to English and English to Pashto. Canagarajah (2011) endorses the same situation as translanguaging. He showed that the learners involved in translanguaging which were not elicited by the teachers but in most of the cases they did so unconsciously. Otheguy et al. (2015) also endorses TL as the use of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire having no regard for the norms and boundaries of socially and politically defined usually national and state named languages. At times they don't care about the specific domain or status of a language, whatever come to them they just speak it out. In addition to Pashto and English, the data also contain stretches from Urdu but that is very limited. The teachers and students in their interview have confirmed that they are multilingual, can speak three languages but mostly use Pashto and English. In other words, their linguistic repertoire comprises three languages and if the data bears instances of all of them then it can be said that here the data takes us close to translanguaging. Creese and Blackledge (2010, p.109) highlights "translanguaging in which the speaker uses his languages in a pedagogic context to make meaning, transmit information, and perform identities using the linguistic signs at her disposal to connect with her audience in community engagement".

Now the question is what enable them in the first place to develop and then to use their linguistic repertoire. The analysis shows that one of the main reasons is the speakers' socialisation in a multilingual environment. In the current study, the speakers are brought up in an environment where they are using different languages in the disposal of their routine business of life. At home mostly they are using their native languages, in school they are officially bound to use English and then with friends, they are at their own to deploy any one of the language. So, in such situation translanguaging will be the natural outcome and so they did so.

Conclusion

The study shows that TL is a positive practice, which challenges those who considers language alternation to be a negative practice resulted from the lack of proficiency in target language on the part of the speakers. Because here the speakers

move not only in the direction from English to Pashto but mostly from Pashto to English. The question of lacking proficiency makes sense when one moves from target to native language but what about the flow from native to target language. Seeing it from the perspective of CS, the findings also showed that language alternation in the current case is not only bi-directional but highly diverse, at both, Intra and Inter CS level. The frequent use of Intra CS and the high diversity in its use, is indicative of the speakers' high level of proficiency in both the languages. Therefore, CS and TL are positive practices, which facilitate teachers, students and the speakers in general, in their communication and it should be allowed in academic and non-academic settings. The study also revealed that the social environment around the speakers has strong impact on the communication of the speakers. In the current context the speakers are brought up in a multilingual environment, which get reflected both conscious and unconsciously in their interactive behaviours and activities. This suggests that social environment plays a key role in guiding and mentoring the activities and attitudes of the speakers.

Finally, the study showed unconscious translanguaging in Pakistani context in the making which needs to be rigorously investigated. This will benefit the leaners, teachers and all other stakeholders and thus the overall learning process will be facilitated.

References

Bashir, A., & Naveed, A. (2015). The functions of code switching in ESL classroom discourse. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics, 6*, 1-4.

Mahboob, A & Jain, R. (Eds.). (2016). *Bilingual Education in Pakistan and India*. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied linguistics review, 2*(1), 1-28.

Canagarajah, S., & Ashraf, H. (2013). Multilingualism and education in South Asia: Resolving policy/practice dilemmas. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *33*, 258-285.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian modern language review, 57*(3), 402-423.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(1), 103-115.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*: Los Angles: Sage publications.

Cummins, J. (2009). Multilingualism in the English-language classroom: Pedagogical considerations. *TESOL quarterly, 43*(2), 317-321.

Eisner, E. W. (1991). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*: New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Gulzar, M. A., & Qadir, S. A. (2010). Issues of language (s) choice and use: A Pakistani perspective. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences 30*(2), 413-424.

Gulzar, M. S. (2014). Teachers' code switching in a content focused English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom: Patterns and functions. *International Journal of Linguistics, 6(*4), 130-153.

Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International Journal of bilingual education and bilingualism, 15*(3), 261-278.

Lasagabaster, D., & García, O. (2014). Translanguaging: towards a dynamic model of bilingualism at school/Translanguaging: hacia un modelo dinámico de bilingüismo en la escuela. *Cultura y Educación, 26*(3), 557-572.

Kaleem, K. (2004). Sociolinguistic analysis of code switching in classroom discourse. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 53*(1), 553-564.

Lewis, G., Jones, B. and Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its Conceptualisation and Contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18*(7), 655-670.

MacSwan, J. (2017). A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal, 54*(1), 167-201.

McMillan, B. A., & Rivers, D. J. (2011). The practice of policy: Teacher attitudes toward "English only". *System, 39*(2), 251-263.

Mendoza, A., & Parba, J. (2018). Thwarted: relinquishing educator beliefs to understand translanguaging from learners' point of view. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1-16.

Moore, P. J. (2013). An emergent perspective on the use of the first language in the English as a foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 97*(1), 239-253.

Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied linguistics review, 6*(3), 281-307.

Raja, F. U. (2014). Bilingual Education System at Primary Schools of Pakistan. *Journal of Research (Humanities), L*, 77-89.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective. *Language learning, 54*, 1-289.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston

Wei, L. (2017). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics, 39*(1), 9-30.

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.

White, G., Hailemariam, C., & Ogbay, S. (2013). Towards the Development of a Plurilingual Pedagogy: Making Use of Children's Informal Learning Practices. *TESOL quarterly, 47*(3), 638-643.

Appendices

Appendix A: Observation note taking Guide

No.	Physical Setting	Participant	Nature of Event	Interactive Patterns
1	Faculty room	Teachers	General discussion	Fluid and discursive
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				

As mentioned earlier, the study is ethnographic in nature, therefore, it was thought highly important to approach each and everything from the perspective of the participants. In this vein a four grid based observational template guided by Spradley (1980) was designed. The first column of the template is related to the setting where the actual interaction takes place. For instance, it may be classroom, café, hostel or public place or as given in the template faculty room. In the second column, it was noted down that who are talking to whom/the relation of the participants which could impact the interpretation of the discussion. The 3rd column deals with nature of event. It was also deemed important to know the speech event/the nature of discussion. Then finally the nature of interaction, its delivery and interactive pattern were also given special attention, so to determine, the conscious and unconscious integration of components of different languages. In short, all these four dimension helped to pick and note what actually was going on.

Appendix B: Semi structured Interview.

As the study was ethnographic in nature wherein it is mandatory to approach the interactive practices from perspective of the participants, for this purpose, a semi structured interview was designed and conducted. All the participants were briefed about the function and purpose of the interview. The interview comprised 5 questions which are mainly guided by the two main research questions of the study. The average time period for each interview was from 7 to 10 minutes. The interview of each participants was audio-taped and then transcribed. A transcribed sample interview is given below.

Name: --------T4

Gender: M

Designation: Lecturer

Qualification: MPhil.

Questions	Responses
How many languages do you speak?	I speak three languages,Pashto English and Urdu. Pashto is our first language urdu national and English medium of instruction and official language. Out of the three , we frequently use two languages i.e. Pashto and English. Mostly we use pashto at home and on informal occasion and english in the university and other formal place. But being multilingual we quite frequently see these languages in different domains even at home sometime we see english and pashto in academic settings
How frequently do you use these	I used these languages particularly Pashto

languages?	and English quite often on daily basis.
Why do you change or integrate different languages in your interactions?	There are micro and macro reasons for this . Macro are broader and micro limited to specific situation (micro). Macro are those which can be traced back the socio-cultural structure of the societies like we can say that the main reason for integration of different languages in our society is it multilingual nature we are using different languages (.) for different purposes consequently the mixing of these languages are natural and unconscious. In other words we are brought up in such environment, so obviously this background will be reflected in interacions.
How do you view the use of these languages in the classroom?	I believe that everybody should have the liberty to use the languages he or she likes. Multilingualism is a gift of God. The use of native language rather than negatively affecting the proficiency of the speaker actually add to their communicative potential.
How do you view the relation between translanguaging and code switching and culture?	Actually multilingual practices such as translanguaging and code switching are socio-cultural phenomenon. If a society is monolingual there won't be any use of multilingual practices but if society is bi-multilingual, conscious or unconsciously there would be mixing and integration of different languages.

Appendix C: Sample of transcribed data

A total of 5 hours teachers' interaction in the faculty room were recorded and accordingly transcribed guided by seedhouse (2004). Keeping in view the huge volume of the data, a short transcribed extract from the data is attached here as a sample.

?	rising intonation
(.)	represent pause
(..)	short untimed pause
___	(underlining) emphasis of part underlined
=	(latching) no gap between turns
:	stretching the sound
::	longer stretch
( )	word/expression from another language
( )	translation of the word
S	student
T	Teacher
Bold	Expression for Pashto (Seedhouse, 2004)

Analysis

Name Interaction (General Discussion among teachers)

T1 **ya alaka T2 ta senga ye**

   (T2 , how do you do?)

   khair di taso senga ye khariat

   (I am fine . How you doing sir?)

hagha bala wruz za bakhshali ta raghaly wuma

(The other day, I visited Bakhshali)

T2.   ok

chi hagha za na wapas ratlu kana pa bazar ki dira hala gola hum wa

(On our way back, there was a great rush in the bazzar)

 aow yaw kus sara me saag oledu

(The spinach was giving an impressive look, which aroused my appetite)

aow zama chi kom malgarai wu kana haghvi hum va chi zaan sara ba wapasay k saag akhlu khu yara (..)wapasay ke zamung kheer shu

(My friends who were accompanied me also said that on our way back we will take spinach with us but then we forgot about)

T1   **k staso kwakh ve khair da rawo ba ru kana**

(If you like, I will bring it for you)

T2   **nu rojo k chi da da dir** <u>delicious meal</u> **ve ( ) saray pokh kri pa dagha**

(In Ramzan, spinach is considered to be a favorable vegetable)

(conscious)

T1   **da saag** <u>taste</u> **chi kom da khaas kar da kadu saag da,**

(The taste of spinach specifically the cabbage spinach is really amazing)

Gap filling/ common

Unconscious/ habitual

	yw khu da chi <u>soft</u> **ve aow bala da chi kala pokh shi kana aow** <u>meat</u> s**a paky wachavi nu** taste **ye sewa shi** (It is either cooked separately nor mixed with other food)	Fluid and running
T2	**Ziayat tur paky** <u>rich vitamins</u> **achavi** (Mostly, the people mixed it with food having rich vitamins)	
T1	**nu hghay sara da di** <u>taste</u> **nur hum sewa shi** (This increases its taste and the people like it too much) hum da dalta pa dagha e:: local patoo k b kegi kana( ) (It is locally produced by the farmers)	
T2	**hu biya hagha kus taso o na drolu pakar da chi taso warta wailay va** *chi lug shan mong ta rakay chi pokh ye kru* (You should have stopped that man and requested him to give you some spinach for cooking)	
T1	**alta chi hagha** <u>grocery shop</u> chi km **wo hagha k wo** (No, it was available there in the grocery store)	Fluid and running
	zamung biya wapasay ke kheer shu, chonky ma <u>driving</u> **kaoo aow** <u>attention</u> **chi wo hagha bul tarafata wo kana** (But on our way back, as I was driving could not remember to purchase it from the store)	Unconscious/ habitual
	chi kala dagha ta rawaoredu bakhshalay <u>cross</u> **shu nu hagha malgary rata o va tana khu saag kheer shu za** next time (When we crossed the store then the friends told me that	Ease/common

you did not purchase the spinach)

T2	T2 shta kana **(**T2 is belonging to the sane area. He will bring it for you)	
	aow chi taso kala va raoba ru *(*Yes sir, whenever you like I would bring it for you)	
T1	T2 d**a da saag da** gift **b rata ralegy (** T2 you have to send me spinach as gift)	Gap filling
T2	**staso hpal patu ki dasy kegi k na taso b dasy:: da bul cha na ya** <u>farmers</u> **(**Is it grown/cultivated in your own farm houses or you bring it from farmers?)	Education/co nscious
T1	**staso alaka nr da hagha za dasy** <u>dishes</u> **shta da** **(Any other special meal of your area?)** **alta khu** sir **daagha saag da tolu na kha shay da paky aow da kachalanu saag da** **(** I think the only thing for which this area is famous is spinach)	Education/co nscious
T2	roja matay k ziyat tur e:: **<u>cooking</u>** sa ve **(What do you cook in your aftari?)**	Gap filling /common Unconscious/ habitual
T1	**chawal ve** (rice)	
T2	aow chawal (Rice)	
T1	**aow da saag khum ve warsara kala kala laka da saag**	

pakay dira maza kavi

(Sometime we also use spinach as major Aftari meal.)

T2	**( ) na da pa hapla khuri mong la na rawori** <u>i will be waiting tomorrow</u> **kha** (**He is just taking spinach alone and not bringing it for us. I will be waiting tomorrow ok.**)	(showing authority/social influence directive)
T2	Inshallah taso la ba raworo (**If God wishes will bring it for you**)	
T1	saba la ba saag raworay kha	
T2	<u>**shopper**</u> k raowra duna ve chi sirf hagha **(You can bring spinach in a bag)**	Gap filling/ common Unconscious/ habitual
T1	**ma paroon laka za odredum ma saag waghishto pokh mu ku khu khwand** (Yesterday, I bought spinach in the market but was not that much tasty) **ye dir ziyat na wu <u>even chicken</u> mu paky wachao aow khwari ye warsara** **dira okra khu pata na lagi khwand ye na wo (Noise)** (We mixed spinach with meat and took a great pain in its cooking but I do not know why it wasn't that much tasty)	Common word familiarity Unconscious/ habitual
T2	**na dvi sara dir waht shavay ve pa dukanuno k khu dir zoor maal ve** (Actually the spinach available in stores are not that much fresh)	

T1	**noor taso za razay senga laka taso** <u>travelling</u> **senga kavi chi unisty ta razay** (How do you manage to come to university?)	Common Unconscious/ habitual
	chutyny di vacations di kana (As its off that is why I asked)	Reiteration
T2	**chutyanu k sa kavay taso** (What do you do in vacations?) **kali v aow bus di pato mato k naast u** (Nothing but mostly stay in village)	
T1	**na na laka cho os unvsty ta razay kana da khu** <u>vacations</u> **di chutyany di**	Reiteration
	kana nu taso university <u>transport</u> **use kavay ka na** (No, what I want to ask is that when you are coming to university in vacations are you still availing university transport facility?)	Ease/common Unconscious/ habitual
T2	**aow** <u>employee</u> **zee razi aow hagha use kaoo()** (Yes, we are using the university employees' bus)	
T1	**aow hagha hum biya** <u>number</u> **ta gori chi sun da hgahy** <u>tadad</u> **sewa ve**	Message qualification