Knowledge beyond colour lines

Towards repurposing
knowledge generation in
South African Higher Education

EDITORS

Monwabisi K. Ralarala

Lorraine S. Hassan

Rajani Naidoo

STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES OF HOW MULTILINGUALISM HELPS OR HINDERS EPISTEMIC ACCESS IN JOURNALISM EDUCATION

Sisanda Nkoala

Introduction

The 2015-2017 #FeesMustFall student protests were a watershed moment in higher education in South Africa. Even though the issue that gave impetus to the nationwide closure of universities was a demand for a zero fee increment, the students involved were unambiguous that the problems they were raising went beyond the exclusionary nature of the cost of South African higher education. Their calls also spoke to issues of epistemic access, based on a view that the pedagogy used in higher education in South Africa emphasised perspectives from the West at the expense of students from other contexts. This was why calls for a free, quality, decolonised education came to be the overarching mantra that accompanied the placards and chants on campuses across the country. One of the main ways students averred that this epistemic access could be achieved was to move away from using English and Afrikaans as the primary languages in higher education to a more multilingual approach. The underpinning view was that this move would make it easier for students to understand what was communicated. In time, this approach could also prove to be one of the most important strategies for creating a more transformed higher education sector in post-apartheid South Africa. It would help elevate the previously marginalised indigenous languages' academic esteem and create enabling environments where the speakers of these languages could access universities' main commodity: disciplinary knowledge.

In the past, higher education policies were deliberately devised to exclude students based on the colour of their skin. Today, policymakers have adopted a more inclusive view that acknowledges the existence of an intricate relationship between multilingualism and epistemic access. From the 1996 South African Constitution (RSA, 1996) to the more recent 2018 Draft Language Policy Framework in Higher education (RSA DHET, 2018), there is a recognition that the diversification of language use in higher education

is one of the critical ways of promoting access to the system and the subsequent upward mobility that comes with tertiary education for millions of students previously designated 'disadvantaged.' The revised policy framework draft states that it "seeks to promote multilingualism as a strategy to facilitate meaningful access and participation by everyone in the various university activities and in cognition and intellectual development" (RSA DHET, 2018:2). In the section on the values that guide it, the policy framework further notes that constitutional and legislative imperatives for creating an environment where multilingualism is seen as "a resource to facilitate cognitive development, epistemic access, inclusiveness, transformation, social cohesion and respect for all languages" (RSA DHET, 2018:15).

For journalism education, centred on teaching students how to be professional communicators and language practitioners in a multilingual context like South Africa, this access goes beyond access to the disciplinary knowledge learned at universities. It also has implications for access to professional opportunities vested in their ability to use language as a communication tool in their jobs. While the scholarship on multilingualism and epistemic access in the South African higher education context is a growing field, it is yet to consider students' perspective in fields like journalism. This is significant, considering that the pedagogical use of language does not serve simply to communicate knowledge about the field but also functions epistemologically by signifying to students how journalists use language as a tool when generating knowledge in their role as professional communicators in a multilingual society.

Using Morrow's (2009) concept of epistemic access, this paper examines journalism students' perspectives at a university in South Africa, focusing on how multilingualism helps or hinders epistemic access in this field.

Epistemic access: A review of the literature on this framework and its relation to multilingualism

The concept of epistemic access has become an important area of interest, especially for those studying higher education in South Africa. Perhaps its importance has grown because the paper that first coined the term 'epistemic access' addressed the longstanding issues unique to this context about affording students meaningful access to education (Muller, 2014). Morrow (1994) did not provide a concrete definition of the term but spoke about it as different from 'formal access', which refers to students gaining physical access to a tertiary institution. He juxtaposes this with epistemic access, referring to a student's ability to access disciplinary knowledge as a result of being able to make sense of what is taught once they are at university.

The concept of epistemic access falls under the broad category of 'access to education', the exact meaning of which is a topic of ongoing debate (Du Plooy & Zilindile, 2014; Muller, 2014). Du Plooy and Zilindile (2014:189) note that,

For some authors, it is defined in terms of physical access, or entry (enrolment) into schools ... For others, it is more than mere physical access, since it is reflected in ... 'expanded access' (post-enrolment experiences).

The 2017 Draft Language Policy for Higher Education (RSA DHET, 2017:6) defines it as "the successful process of knowledge acquisition and dissemination through enabling teaching and learning pedagogies".

In writing about this concept, Morrow (2009:78) notes that epistemic access is "learning how to be a successful participant in academic practice". Morrow first coined the term 'epistemic access' in 1992, just as South Africa was about to transition into a democratic dispensation. The view was that, in the post-apartheid era, it would not suffice to assume that, merely by opening up enrolments at all tertiary institutions to students from all walks of life, those who had been previously excluded because of colour would suddenly gain access. Additional measures would need to be put in place to ensure that this system, which had previously been the preserve of the white minority, would be conducive for students from epistemic backgrounds that had been excluded from the higher education sector. Morrow's (1994) first use of the coined term appeared in his work that examined what he deemed to be the two broad elements that facilitate access to education, namely institutional access (referred to as 'formal access', often equated to physical access through enrolments), and 'epistemic access'.

In recent years, using 'epistemic access' concerning the 2015-2017 #FeesMustFall protests is fitting because it distinguishes between the two critical aspects of student demands. The first aspect that they raised focused on the institutional access barriers they face, with issues such as tuition fees preventing them from accessing higher education spaces. Additionally, they called for redress in relation to barriers students face once admitted to these institutions, mainly due to epistemic barriers within their chosen fields. Southwood, Samson and Sewry (2012:7) describe the latter as having to do with "engaging students with the practices and specialised discourses of the discipline".

The concept has not been without critique, both in 'what' it alludes to and 'how' it is conceptualised. Muller (2014), for example, notes that in Morrow's initial conceptualisation, epistemic access was about "[l]earning what is meant to be a teacher" rather than "general student learning" (Muller, 2014:257). So, for Muller, applying this term to these different aspects of higher education is notable. Another criticism of Morrow's work is that it fails to account for other issues that prevent students from attaining knowledge in the university, such as equity issues (Muller, 2014). Gamede (2006) notes further how this concept does

not address critical issues that prevent students from thriving within higher education, such as the hidden curriculum.

As this concept continues to grow in popularity, what has become evident is the lack of scholarship that has sought to narrow down and neatly outline what epistemic access is and what aspects of higher education it aims to encapsulate. Antia and Dyers (2016:526) say that the issues that one can explore when looking at this concept include “issues of curriculum delivery, the student’s understanding of the content, his/her participation in creating and negotiating knowledge, and use of knowledge, to expert-like behaviour”. It includes the role of language as a tool for communicating disciplinary knowledge.

To date, several scholars have examined how epistemic access is facilitated through multilingualism in higher education. These studies have looked at how these two concepts’ interplay influences engineering, education, science and language studies (Dyers & Antia, 2019; Mgqwashu, 2011; Nomlomo & Katiya, 2018). Southwood, Sewry and Samson (2012:7) highlight the importance of language in facilitating epistemic access when they note that an essential way of ensuring epistemic access for students from diverse backgrounds – the case in South Africa – is based on pedagogical strategies that acknowledge and embrace diversity. They mention how language is used, and cultures are expressed as examples of diversity strategies. This growing body of research into how these two concepts influence each other recognises the need to understand, from theoretical and empirical research perspectives, how the language of teaching and learning in higher education helps or hinders the development of students’ disciplinary knowledge.

Multilingualism is a “fact of the existence of, or the ability to use, more than one language” (Kaschula, Maseko & Wolff, 2017:xiv). Based on this definition and statistics from the Department of Higher Education and Training (RSA DHET, 2016), it can be accepted that most tertiary students in South Africa are multilingual because they can communicate in more than one language. The most widely used approach to teaching and learning in higher education is monolingual and English (RSA DHET, 2016). This poses many challenges for these students, mainly to acquire the knowledge they need to understand their field of study and succeed. The scholarship of multilingualism and its influence on epistemic access has tried to map out the different ways in which multilingual teaching and learning strategies can be used as instruments to address this chief challenge; and, in so doing, increase the inclusiveness and representativity in this sector.

This study is concerned with adding to this body of research by asking the question:

In what ways do students perceive multilingualism as helping or hindering epistemic access in journalism studies at a South African university?

This question was broken down into the following two sub-questions:

- What are students' perspectives on the presence of multilingualism in their journalism education?
- To the extent that they perceive it as being present, in what ways do students deem the presence of multilingualism as helping or hindering epistemic access in journalism education?

For journalism education, centred on teaching students how to be professional communicators and language practitioners in a multilingual context like South Africa, how this disciplinary knowledge is communicated through language is particularly significant. In this field, the language of teaching and learning is not solely a means of conveying disciplinary knowledge; it also acts as a signifier to students of how language is used in the profession. One of the central features of journalism education is teaching students how to use language to communicate information. As such, how they see this modelled during their studies influences how they use language as a tool professionally (Fosu, 2011). It is essential to understand how multilingualism helps or hinder students' access to disciplinary knowledge in this context.

Research methodology

Context

The study took place at a South African university classified as previously disadvantaged. It is one of several higher learning institutions created to serve populations considered non-white under apartheid (Green, 2004) and thus largely excluded from higher education. Most of this university's students are not first language English or Afrikaans speakers, but most of the teaching and learning occurs through English. The university's language policy names isiXhosa and Afrikaans as official communication languages, but English is preferred in practice. The journalism programme offers a compulsory English course for all first-year students. It also provides Afrikaans and isiXhosa tuition as mandatory subjects. However, students can choose which of these languages they want to study; the language they studied in high school or the language they speak at home usually informs the choice.

Beyond these language subjects, students are also permitted to submit assignments, such as audio-visual pieces, and do PowerPoint presentations that include languages other than English. Further, while lectures are predominantly delivered in English, there are instances where other languages are used. Verbal in-class feedback and one-to-one consultations are sometimes conducted using English and other languages, depending on the lecturer concerned. The programme adheres to the university's policies on how language is to be used in teaching and learning contexts but does not have specific guidelines on what strategies should be employed by lecturers and students and in what ways this should be done.

Research design

This is an explorative study rooted in an interpretivist research orientation (Schwandt, 1994). Firstly, it relies on how the participants, namely the journalism students, interpret their observations of their language-use experiences in teaching and learning. Secondly, the researcher uses interviews as an instrument for evaluation and then draws on relevant theories to interpret them (Schwandt, 1994).

The study employs a mixed-methods sequential design (Ivankova, Creswell & Stick, 2006). It begins with an online survey to quantify the extent to which the student sample was exposed to multilingual teaching and learning strategies, followed by focus group discussions that explore students' views on these strategies and probe the findings emanating from the survey. The mixed-methods approach allows one to quantify some aspects related to the presence of multilingual teaching and learning strategies in the programme under consideration while also using qualitative techniques to ascertain students' perspectives.

Data collection

Data were generated in two phases to answer the two sub-questions of the research. The first was an anonymous online survey distributed to first-, second-, and third-year students in the journalism programme. Given that the students in the study are those taught by the researcher, specific measures were put in place to mitigate bias. Firstly, the researcher ensured that the survey had inputs from the institution's language unit and the student feedback unit. Both units provided feedback on the survey questions. The student feedback unit was further scrutinising the data collected from the survey, writing a report and running the focus group discussions so that the students had a third party asking them questions based on some of the survey findings. The language unit guided the types of questions to be asked in the survey and during focus group discussions, based on its ongoing research on multilingualism and its expertise in this regard.

The involvement of these two units was also an important way of ensuring validity and reliability (Leung, 2015). The survey used a template designed by the student feedback unit and used quite extensively at the institution. As such, it was deemed to have gone through the checks and balances needed to ensure its validity and reliability. Further, the student feedback unit processed the survey results, and thus, this report was compiled by an independent third party to remove any perception of bias. In terms of the focus group discussion, a more qualitative means of data collection, the study tried to ensure that the data collected were valid by certifying that employing focus groups was an appropriate way of getting insights to answer the research question (Leung, 2015). A facilitator unknown to the students ran the focus group discussion, and this method was deemed appropriate because students would be able to share their views freely.

Of the 70 registered and active students in the programme at the time of the survey, 30 students took part in the survey. This means that this survey's response rate was 43%, markedly higher than the 32.6% rate that Watt, Simpson, McKillop and Nunn (2002) stipulate as average for these kinds of surveys. The group included students who commenced their studies between 2011 and 2019.

The survey sought to ascertain the types of multilingual teaching and learning strategies the students had been exposed to and how they perceived these strategies. The students were required to indicate their year of study and the languages they spoke outside the lecture room context. The survey employed multiple-choice questions to determine students' exposure to specific multilingual strategies and to what extent exposure to each of these strategies had happened. It also included multiple-choice questions used to gauge their views on whether the multilingual strategies they had been exposed to had been adequate and effective. There were also open-ended (long-form) questions where students had to explain what they understood by the term 'multilingualism' and how they perceived the advantages and disadvantages of a multilingual pedagogical approach in their education.

At the end of the survey, students were asked to indicate if they would be willing to participate in a follow-up focus group session. Those who were willing were asked to email the researcher to confirm their participation. Those who subsequently took part in the two focus group discussions were selected from those who had indicated their willingness. These students were from the first- and third-year classes. The focus group questions sought to probe their perspectives on the multilingual strategies they had mentioned in the survey and ascertain their personal experiences of these. Discussions were semi-structured, with a set of preliminary questions based on what had emerged from the survey. The focus groups were audio-recorded, and the recordings transcribed for analysis.

Data analysis

A thematic analysis was performed on the transcriptions of the focus group discussions, using Braun and Clarke's (2006) semantic thematic analysis to find and describe themes that emerge, particularly from qualitative data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). A deductive approach was used to guide research analyses data by the theoretical framework that informs the study (Braun & Clarke 2006). In this study, the decision to adopt this approach was driven by a focus on understanding students' views of how the multilingual strategies employed had helped or hindered them in gaining disciplinary knowledge, based on Morrow's (1994) epistemic access concept. Braun and Clarke (2006) distinguish between a deductive and an inductive approach to thematic analysis. The deductive approach ('top-down approach') involves analysis based on looking at how the data answer the researcher's questions (Braun & Clarke, 2006). An inductive approach is also known as a 'bottom-up approach'

and, according to Braun and Clarke, bears some similarities to grounded theory because the analysis is not directed by an overarching theory but by what the data reveals (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Drawing on the areas highlighted by Antia and Dyers (2016) as possible aspects to be considered, issues of epistemic access are curriculum delivery issues, students understanding of the content, their participation in creating, negotiating and using knowledge to “expert-like behaviour” (Antia & Dyers, 2016:526). The analysis focused on three main themes: Firstly, the analysis explored students’ perspectives on multilingualism and how multilingualism in the teaching and learning context helped or hindered them in understanding their courses’ content. Secondly, the researcher examined students’ perspectives on multilingualism and how these helped or hindered their participation in negotiating knowledge in the classroom context. Finally, the analysis focused on students’ perspectives on how multilingualism helped or hindered epistemic access to journalism education.

Ethical considerations

Participation in the online survey was voluntary, anonymous and occurred with the student’s written consent (Webster, Lewis & Brown, 2013). Further, focus group discussions participants gave verbal and written permission for the discussion to be recorded and transcribed (Webster, Lewis & Brown, 2013). Participation was anonymised in the transcripts. Ethical clearance was obtained as per the institution’s guidelines.

Findings and discussion

In the survey, a central issue that the study sought to quantify was the extent to which multilingualism was something that students were familiar with and already practiced. Given that English is the medium of instruction at the university where this study was based, students were asked what languages they spoke at home. Almost three-quarters of them indicated that they spoke at least one language in addition to English (Figure 6.1), meaning they fall into the category of being multilingual.

FIGURE 6.1 What language(s) do you speak at home? (%)

This result confirms a 2016 finding by the Department of Higher Education and Training (RSA DHET, 2016) which showed that most of the students who enter higher education in South Africa are multilingual (RSA DHET, 2016). They are accustomed to using several languages.

The other set of findings relates to questions around specific multilingual teaching and learning strategies. These strategies are:

- multilingual
 - glossaries;
 - assessment briefs;
 - lectures;
 - assessment submissions;
 - feedback from the lecturer;
 - resources, such as readings, video and course outlines;
- language courses, such as isiXhosa and Afrikaans; and
- the use of multilingualism in student interactions with lecturers.

In terms of language courses, the programme only offers English, isiXhosa and Afrikaans as subjects. The reasons for this are not clear, but it is worth noting that these languages are the three mentioned in the institution's language policy.

For each of these multilingual teaching and learning strategies, students were asked a multiple-choice question to indicate the extent to which they had had exposure to the strategy in the course of their studies. The answer options were the following:

- ‘Not at all’ indicated that they had never been exposed to this particular strategy during their journalism studies.
- ‘Heard it mentioned’ referred to instances where they might have heard someone talking about multilingualism in relation to the particular strategy.
- ‘Once or twice’ indicated their exposure to the particular strategy as more of a once-off experience.
- ‘Frequently’ indicated their exposure to the particular strategy frequently.
- ‘Directly involved’ indicated their involvement in the creation of a particular strategy.

Based on the results represented in Table 6.1, it would seem that, for the most part, students had not been frequently exposed to multilingual strategies. The two aspects where the majority perceived multilingual interactions to have been used most frequently, and where they felt they had had direct input, were in their interactions with lecturers outside of formal lecture venues and during their language courses studied as credit-bearing subjects, such as isiXhosa and Afrikaans. Table 6.1 illustrates the results:

TABLE 6.1 Teaching and learning strategies where exposure to multilingualism has occurred.

Using Braun and Clarke’s (2006) six-step framework for thematic analysis, three themes were identified from the focus group discussions transcripts:

- The first theme was student perspectives on multilingualism and how they perceived multilingualism as helpful or a hindrance to understanding their courses’ content.

- The second theme related to student perspectives on multilingualism and how it helped or hindered their participation in negotiating knowledge in the classroom context.
- The third theme focused on how students articulated their views on how they perceived multilingualism as helping or hindering epistemic access in journalism education.

Student perspectives of multilingualism and how it helps or hinders them when engaging with the content of their courses

Students had different responses when asked how they perceived multilingualism as helping or hindering epistemic access to course content. On the one hand, multilingualism helped them overcome cognitive barriers caused by their inability to access the knowledge communicated through resources such as assigned readings, assessment briefs and the feedback given in marked assessments. There was a recognition that access to journalism concepts in different languages creates a better chance for previously disadvantaged students to gain access. Access is also enhanced through multilingual glossaries, lecture presentations and assessments. One student used multilingual tests as an example. The student noted that, at times, it is not that students do not understand the content of their courses; instead, what may be a hindrance is interpreting the language used to assess that understanding in a test context and some of the teaching resources such as videos and audio recordings. One of the students provided this explanation:

In most cases, you don't get to answer a question right because you didn't understand the way it was asked, but if it had been asked in your language, you would know.

If they're teaching a certain module and a certain chapter, they can maybe facilitate like finding audio or even videos of people speaking these languages with the titles underneath. So what that means, you don't need to sit down and explain the language, but subconsciously I'm being exposed to it.

The student's position is supported by existing research that has found that when students are encouraged to use multiple languages to understand the same content, they tend to grasp it better (Makalela, 2015).

The students recommend that they be presented with a variety of languages, not just English, isiXhosa and Afrikaans, currently the languages used at this institution. Students noted that, to help more students overcome the barriers to understanding caused by their not adequately grasping these recognised languages of teaching and learning, a method needs to be found to accommodate those students who do not speak the three languages:

I feel like we are limited in terms of the languages that they teach us here because I'm Tswana ... When I get here, it's just isiXhosa and Afrikaans ... I'm eager to learn, but then I feel like we should also be accommodated in a way.

Student perspectives of multilingualism and how it helps or hinders their participation in negotiating knowledge in the classroom context

The idea of negotiating knowledge is rooted in social constructivism: in a teaching and learning context, there is a situation where students are yet to construct or establish knowledge within a particular discipline (Hung & Chen, 2000). They (2000:31) note that the objective of negotiating knowledge is “to create new knowledge through which learners cultivate dispositions and metacognitive abilities for operating in the community of learners”. They argue that it occurs best when students are “querying, clarifying, hypothesising, elaborating, and synthesising” with their peers (Hung & Chen, 2000:31). Because this is one of the most critical ways students construct disciplinary knowledge, the classroom context is important for epistemic access, thus, essential to ascertain how students perceived how multilingualism helped or hindered them from doing this.

With journalism being a communications-based discipline, the kind of epistemic access that multilingualism can facilitate occurs on two levels regarding students’ negotiation of knowledge in the classroom context: On the first level, multilingualism can promote students’ knowledge of the discourse of the discipline. This occurs as students query, clarify, hypothesise, elaborate and synthesise concepts and terminology in class engagements. The second level is somewhat specific to communications-based fields like journalism which focus on sharing information through words. Here, language use is not just about the discourse of the discipline; it is also the primary ‘tool’ used in the practice of the craft since journalism is about communicating information using language. For example, this relates to how students perceive language to be used when negotiating knowledge; and what they come to assume about meaning conveyed by how journalists speak and write.

The sentiments expressed by students spoke to both of these levels. In terms of the first level, which focuses on how a multilingual approach helps students negotiate knowledge by exposing them to the discipline’s discourse, students noted that using translation in class as a multilingual strategy helps facilitate epistemic access. A student suggested that, in the classroom context, if a lecturer explains something in English, there ought to be a way of translating that into another language for students who may not have grasped what was being said, based on the language of communication:

Sometimes the lecturer will say something in English, and we don’t catch that based, maybe on the words that she’s using But then perhaps explaining it in someone’s home language just makes you able to understand better.

Some students believed that because of the emphasis on grammar and pronunciation, they had to master them in relation to English if they were to be deemed ‘good’ journalism students. The suggestion was that it would help them to witness multilingual exchanges

more frequently in their classroom contexts. A student said that the current approach made her apprehensive about speaking out in class for fear of judgement as she did not feel confident when speaking English. The view expressed suggests that when students feel that their class participation will be judged on their fluency in English, it keeps them from engaging aloud in class:

Sometimes there are words that I can't pronounce properly and some, and I can't even write them properly. I feel like with English I will be told like your grammar here was this and this and that, and I would be like, maybe I don't have the same understanding.

If we have different languages that we know and we are taught, it would be very beneficial – it would be a platform of developing our confidence so that I can be a journalist because in fact, to be able to write, you need to have a language.

Students raised the fact that according to their understanding of how a multilingual classroom context would function, certain aspects could hinder epistemic access. These related primarily to the view that a multilingual classroom context could marginalise some students, particularly those monolingual in English because they would not follow what was discussed. One student's view was that, even though the use of different languages might enable more students to feel that they can speak up and answer questions in class, this multilingual context might exclude English speakers. The student averred that it meant that English speakers would struggle to follow the discussion, thus hindering epistemic access for them in the classroom:

Maybe you ask a question in class, and 'X' wants to answer you, but 'X' can answer you better in Xhosa but now answering you in Xhosa is going to exclude your English speakers because you also want them to be involved into class participation and what-not. So now, that brings everything to be English must be the medium of instruction afforded to accommodate everyone.

Student perspectives of how multilingualism helps or hinders epistemic access in journalism education

When asked about how and why, as a journalism student, multilingual teaching and learning was essential for them, students linked the issue of language-use for teaching and learning to their future career prospects as professional communicators:

It is important that we do engage with multilingualism because if you check on SABC, the public broadcaster if you want to be employed there, you need to speak many languages.

I think in the industry of journalists being the educator of the society and community, they are supposed to be ... the watchdogs of the community. As a watchdog of the community, it's important that you cover every language and understand everyone's culture. Then that way, you can educate them by understanding them.

When read together, the survey results show that students were exposed to multilingual teaching and learning strategies to differing extents, while quotes from the focus group discussions provide insights into how these students regard these strategies as helping or hindering epistemic access.

Conclusion

From these findings, three conclusions can be drawn: Firstly, students perceived multilingualism as being present in their journalism studies through various multilingual teaching and learning strategies. They noted that multilingualism was most present in their interaction with lecturers and in the language courses that they selected to study. It was least present in teaching and learning resources such as readings, lectures, assignment briefs, assessment feedback and multilingual glossaries. Secondly, multilingualism is regarded as helping and hindering epistemic access, depending on how it is used. If used to encourage more students to negotiate knowledge in the classroom, making these contexts feel like safer spaces, multilingualism facilitates epistemic access. However, where it is seen as a means of marginalising monolingual students, it is perceived as a hindrance. Finally, because journalism education is centred on teaching students how to be professional communicators and language practitioners, students believe that how language is used to teach disciplinary knowledge will influence how they use language as a tool in their practice. It also has implications for access to professional opportunities that are vested in their ability to use language as a communication tool in their professions.

Recommendations

Studies need to be undertaken to compare the extent to which different multilingual teaching and learning strategies facilitate epistemic access. The existing body of work seems to look at specific strategies in isolation. For example, some studies have looked at multilingual glossaries as a teaching and learning strategy (Nomlomo & Katiya, 2018). Others have looked at the inclusion of language courses, such as isiXhosa and isiZulu, as part of the traditionally monolingual journalism curriculum (Du Toit & Maseko, 2017). Each of these studies has only considered the strategy of interest. This gap in scholarship means that we are yet to get a sense of,

- firstly, which strategies are beneficial, and
- secondly, how to combine different strategies so that they are effective.

Studies also need to be undertaken from educators' perspective to determine how they use multilingualism strategies to facilitate epistemic access and whether their intentions in conceptualising such approaches have translated in the ways they envisaged.

References

- Antia, B.E. & Dyers, C. 2016. Epistemic access through lecture materials in multiple modes and language varieties: The role of ideologies and multilingual literacy practices in student evaluations of such materials at a South African university. *Language Policy*, 15(4):525-545. <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s10993-015-9389-4.pdf> [Accessed 17 April 2020]. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-015-9389-4>
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2):77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Du Plooy, L. & Zilindile, M. 2014. Problematising the concept 'epistemological access' with regard to foundation phase education towards quality schooling. *South African Journal of Childhood Education*, 4(1):187-201. <http://www.scielo.org.za/pdf/sajce/v4n1/12.pdf> [Accessed 14 April 2020]. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajce.v4i1.51>
- Du Toit, J. & Maseko, P. 2017. Language and media: isiXhosa in journalism and media studies at a South African university. In: R.H. Kaschula, P. Maseko, H.E. Wolff, C. Anthonissen & B.E. Antia (eds). *Multilingualism and intercultural communication: A South African perspective*. New York: New York University Press. 223-246. <https://doi.org/10.18772/22017050268.20>
- Dyers, C. & Antia, B.E. 2019. Multilingual and multimodal mediation in one university module: The people and processes involved. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 37(1):62-76. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.2989/16073614.2019.1609365> [Accessed 17 April 2020].
- Fosu, M. 2011. Situating language at the centre of journalism training: The case for broadening the spheres of English teaching and learning in Journalism training institutions in Ghana. *Global Media Journal - African Edition*, 5(1):52-80. https://journals.co.za/docserver/fulltext/glomed_africa/5/1/glomed_africa_v5_n1_a3.pdf [Accessed 17 April 2020]. <https://doi.org/10.5789/5-1-57>
- Gamede, T. 2006. The biography of "access" as an expression of human rights in South African education policies. Doctoral dissertation. Pretoria: University of Pretoria. <https://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/23596/Complete.pdf?sequence=4> [Accessed 14 April 2020].
- Green, P.E. 2004. A comparative examination of historically disadvantaged institutions in the Republic of South Africa and historically black colleges and universities in the United States. *Race, Gender & Class*, 11(3):153-176. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/41675143.pdf> [Accessed 17 April 2020].
- Hung, D.W.L. & Chen, V.D.T. 2000. Appropriating and negotiating knowledge: Technologies for a community of learners. *Educational Technology*, 40(3):29-32. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/44428599.pdf> [Accessed 17 April 2020].
- Ivankova, N.V., Creswell, J.W. & Stick, S.L., 2006. Using mixed-methods sequential explanatory design: From theory to practice. *Field Methods*, 18(1):3-20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05282260>
- Kaschula, R., Maseko, P. & Wolff, H. 2017. Central terms and concepts. In: R.H. Kaschula, P. Maseko, H.E. Wolff, C. Anthonissen & B.E. Antia (eds). *Multilingualism and intercultural communication: A South African perspective*. New York: New York University Press. xiii-xv. <https://doi.org/10.18772/22017050268>
- Leung, L. 2015. Validity, reliability, and generalizability in qualitative research. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, 4(3):324-327. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/Pmc4535087/> [Accessed 17 April 2020]. <https://doi.org/10.4103/2249-4863.161306>
- Makalela, L. 2015. Translanguaging as a vehicle for epistemic access: Cases for reading comprehension and multilingual interactions. *Per Linguam: A Journal of Language Learning*, 31(1):15-29. <https://doi.org/10.5785/31-1-628>

- Mgqwashu, E.M. 2011. Academic literacy in the mother tongue: A pre-requisite for epistemological access. *Alternation*, 18(2):159-178. <http://alternation.ukzn.ac.za/Files/docs/18.2/23%20Bin.pdf#page=163> [Accessed 17 April 2020]
- Morrow, W. 1994. Entitlement and achievement in education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 13(i):33-47. <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/BF01074084.pdf> [Accessed 17 April 2020]. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01074084>
- Morrow, W.E. 2009. *Bounds of democracy: Epistemic access in higher education*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Muller, J. 2014. Every picture tells a story: Epistemic access and knowledge. *Education as Change*, 18(2):255-269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16823206.2014.932256>
- Nomlomo, V. & Katiya, M. 2018. Multilingualism and (bi)literacy development for epistemic access: Exploring students experience in the use of multilingual glossaries at a South African university. *Educational Research for Social Change*, 7(1):77-93. <https://doi.org/10.17159/2221-4070/2018/v7i1a6>
- RSA (Republic of South Africa). 1996. *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printing Works. <http://www.wipo.int/edocs/lexdocs/laws/en/za/za107en.pdf> [Accessed 15 June 2018].
- RSA DHET (Republic of South Africa. Department of Higher Education and Training). 2016. *Statistics on post-school education and training in South Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printing Works. http://www.dhet.gov.za/Research%20Coordination%20Monitoring%20and%20Evaluation/6_DHET%20Stats%20Report_04%20April%202018.pdf [Accessed 14 April 2020].
- RSA DHET (Republic of South Africa. Department of Higher Education and Training). 2018. *Draft language policy for higher education*. Government Gazette no. 632(41463):2-3, February 23. <https://www.litnet.co.za/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/2018-Government-Notice-Revised-Language-Policy-for-HE-002.pdf> [Accessed 16 August 2019].
- Schwandt, T.A., 1994. Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (eds). *Handbook of qualitative research*, 1. London: Sage Publications. 118-137. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Thomas_Schwandt/publication/232477264_Constructivist_Interpretivist_Approaches_to_Human_Inquiry/links/557048d908aeab777228bfef/Constructivist-Interpretivist-Approaches-to-Human-Inquiry.pdf [Accessed 7 May 2020].
- Southwood, S., Sewry, J. & Samson, D. 2012. Investigating the nature of epistemic access afforded by a first-year chemistry intervention programme: Towards a pedagogy of possibility! *The Independent Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 7(1):5-13.
- Watt, S., Simpson, C., McKillop, C. & Nunn, V. 2002. Electronic course surveys: Does automating feedback and reporting give better results? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27(4):325-337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293022000001346>
- Webster, S., Lewis, J. & Brown, A. 2013. Ethical Considerations in Qualitative Research. In: J. Ritchie, J. Lewis, C.M. Nicholls & R. Ormston (eds). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. London: Sage Publications. 77-107.