Plurilingualism and Intercultural Pedagogy Revisited: Integrating Decolonial Perspectives in Tertiary English Curricula

Joy Christine Lwanga-Lumu

Department of English, Soweto Campus, University of Johannesburg, South Africa

Abstract The 21st global era of massive migration and rapid change is characterised by social, cultural, scientific, political and economic upheavals hence highlighting the need for intercultural education as intervention to improve student performance, social*cohesion, economic development and peaceful coexistence. In South Africa (henceforth SA), English second language (EL2) educators are debating a transformation model of the humanities curricula to reduce intercultural incompetence and education inequality. This article uses the qualitative in-depth critical analysis method of the affordances and controversies of plurilingualism, as well as multilingualism. Specifically, it assesses the feasibility of adopting the intercultural communicative language teaching (iCLT) and language learning (ILL) framework to integrate intercultural perspectives, decolonise the EL2 curricula and promote multilingualism for higher education transformation. Educators are encouraged to shift perspectives by being eclectic in incorporating intercultural perspectives, the philosophy of Ubuntu, as well as understanding the crucial role of using SA indigenous languages/inter-cultures in scaffolding EL2 curricula for effective development of students' plurilingual and intercultural competence (IC). Finally, implications are outlined for using pedagogical strategies such as translanguation, technical computer-mediated support, instructional and research design, to innovatively develop students' academic proficiency, intercultural competence, socio-cultural identity construction, and democracy in multilingual SA and the cosmopolitan global village.

1. Introduction: Purpose and Focus

Due to the explosive global migrations, associated with linguistic diversity, mobility and socio-economic changes, there is need to analyse the major obstacles and trends of blended language learning oriented towards plurilingualism, so as to help language educators teach for multicultural diversity, equality and global communication at university level. Within the new plurilingual context is, as postulated by the Council of Europe's Common European Framework of Reference for languages (2001, henceforth CEFR), plurilingualism, which is a complex notion to define. In this context, it is the speakers' ability to use linguistic hybridity and diverse repertoire to acquire intercultural communicative competence and develop intercultural awareness (cf. Piccardo, 2013; Lwanga-Lumu, 2020). Such a definition of pluringualism suggests that, language educators have to grapple with the major barriers

to understand ambivalent plurilingual perspectives, and develop students' plurilingual competence to become active global citizens.

Specifically, lecturers have to teach in a complex university and fluid linguistic system, in which students, competent in more than one language can switch between languages and vice versa, depending on the context, to communicate effectively within the social context. The purpose of this article is to help language educators unpack the theoretical intercultural perspectives to facilitate the development of students' integrated and individualised plurilingual competences, as well as promote the multilingualism language policy in SA. The new Multilingual policy was adopted in 1997 to promote additive bilingualism/multilingualism and offer guidelines for promoting the teaching of the nine official, African indigenous languages, namely: isiXhosa, isZulu, Nothern Sotho (Sepedi), Southern Sotho (Sesotho), Setswana, Tshivenda, Xitsonga, isiNdebele (Southern Ndebele) Siswati (Swati); to advance social cohesion, cultural and linguistic awareness, as well as tolerance (Department of education, henceforth DoE, 1997).

The analysis may contribute to the discourse for an ideal model for the incorporation intercultural perspectives into the (EL2) courses, with specific reference to understanding the key concepts of plurilingualism, comprising multiple, contextualized and dynamic competences in higher education. Specifically, the main objective of the article is to assess the extent to which the core theoretical underpinnings and practical pedagogy implications of plurilingualism are consistent with global trends for the development of the students' holistic linguistic and cultural repertoire in SA. The main goal of the higher education transformation process in SA is to reduce ignorance of cultural/linguistic diversity, communicative failure, and high attrition rates in EL2 learning, as well as promote academic achievement at tertiary level.

Additionally, the article reinforces the need for language educators to understand the framework and know how to use it to develop students' intercultural competence (henceforth IC) perspectives; pertaining to the implementation of a comprehensive EL2 language pedagogy. Such a framework is crucial for effective development of critical cultural awareness (CCA) and IC, as well as maintaining the multilingual language policy, and promoting indigenous languages/intercultures for students to be socially adaptable in the global world (cf. Lwanga-Lumu, 2020).

While the oppressive and racist apartheid system in SA ended in 1994, the movement to radically transform and decolonise the higher education curricula is faced with some challenges, pertaining to the development of students' intercultural/plurilingual competence and effective implementation of the ambivalent multilingual perspectives in a superdiverse pluri-lingual university contexts.

To improve students' throughput rates and global IC, educators need to understand the competences of the plurilingual individual speaker as outlined by the Council of Europe, comprising outstanding researchers, who identified language goals according to: Communication, cultures, connections, comparisons, and communities (cf. (CERF, 2001). These goals are used to maintain the dialogue that promotes reaching a common ground with the objective of developing students' plurilingual competence (ICC) and IC. Within this framework, the instruction incorporates IC perspectives, such as plurilingualism and multilingualism, and the concepts are viewed through a broader and complex iCLT lens. However, how effective IC teaching and learning occurs is ignored.

Significantly, the immense challenge of how educators should facilitate the acquisition of ICC and development of IC within a super-diverse multilingual context is scarcely addressed in the abound current literature. This new multilingual challenge is influenced by changing immigration patterns of modern technological developments, made via computer assisted language learning (CALL), social media available to the masses such as blogs; phones and internet, to improve learning and global communication (cf. Lumu, 1998).

According to Liddicoat et al. 2003 * cited in Newton (2015), the intercultural language learning (ILL) framework was initiated as a dialogue to help language educators understand the new IC perspectives. This dialogue allows educators to reach a common ground for negotiating how learning and teaching IC perspectives should take place. However, most of the language educators are excluded from the ILL dialogue and are not inter-culturally competent to facilitate the development of students' CCA, ICC and IC.

Furthermore, some language lecturers are ignorant of the need to shift traditional pedagogic practices to blended learning and are incompetent to integrate IC perspectives, such as indigenous languages. Significantly, plurilingualism is defined against the backdrop of multilingualism, which refers to ''knowledge of a number of languages or the co-existence of different languages in a given society'' (CEFR, 2001). Although some language educators are willing to integrate IC perspectives, they are unaware of the precise definitions of the main concepts such as plurilingualism/multilingualism, and ICC/IC. Due to academic ignorance, they only use concepts loosely and interchangeably, while facilitating mainly the acquisition of students' linguistic competence.

Consequently, the main challenge facing educators is that culture remains 'the marginalized sister of language'' by educators and students (Lopez-Rocha, 2016). Specifically, as Lwanga-Lumu (2020) states, educators need to understand the distinction between plurilingualism and multilingualism, the relationship between language and culture, the distinction between IC and ICC, as well as the teaching strategies to promote effective transformation

of the EL2 curricula. The assumption is that intercultural language teaching and learning entails focus more on plurilingual/ICC as a more complex and holistic goal than linguistic/communicative competence (CC).

To address the main challenge of developing students' plurilingual competence, this article aims to critically analyse the obstacles curricula transformation language educators encounter. First, it examines academic ignorance of the pedagogical practices of plurilingualism which is brought about by globalisation and modern technology/super-diversity. Secondly, it explores the feasibility of implementing plurilingualism in the EL2 curricula; *with a view to help educators with the traditional narrow mindset to bridge the gap between theory, policy and practice, as well as to promote the multilingual language policy and improve students' linguistic competence.

With globalisation and accelerating migratory immigrants, educators need to understand that IC and ICC concepts are different, although often used interchangeably, they are key concepts to incorporating inter-culturality in the EL2 curriculum, as prescribed in the CEFR (2001). In addition, some scholars support a more inclusive role of culture in the EL2 curricula that emphasises the significance of exploring authentic cultural representations, as opposed to superficial elements (cf. Lopez-Rocha, 2016; Lwanga-Lumu 2020). This article highlights the need for educators to promote the complex plurilingualism and IC, as well as the understanding of cultural differences for global citizenship, instead of focusing on language.

The goal of promoting plurilingualism is to develop students into competent intercultural speakers, who can use their linguistic/cultural competences to mediate/interpret the values, beliefs and behaviour differently (Byram, 2006b cited in Newton et al. 2015). However, people from different cultures use language differently: according to norms, values and attitudes (cf. Jacobs, 1998). Owing partly to academic ignorance of differences in linguistic and cultural norms, EL2 learners tend to transfer negatively their mother tongue communication styles to English causing miscommunication and inadvertent conflicts.

Consequently, educators tend to use monolingual norms, based on native speaker proficiency to evaluate students as suffering from deficient competence. Additionally, the notion of culture remains a contentious issue in scientific and anthropological usage hence stereotypes continue to be, indeed reinforced. It is therefore imperative that educators understand the complex nature of culture to integrate it in the EL2 curriculum.

Significantly, this article argues for effective transformation of EL2 curricula by integrating plurilingualism in the lecture hall through promotion of multicultural experiences, intercultural awareness, as well as fostering of ICC. This may help educators to embrace all knowledge related to academic multilingualism and cultural experiences, paralinguistic features and strategies to decode, as well as code texts as crucial elements for the development of academic literacy and IC.

Furthermore, whereas research indicated educators' willingness to incorporate IC in EL2/English foreign (henceforth EFL) teaching, there are scarce descriptions of understanding of the complex and multifold approaches to IC teaching process. Specifically, studies indicate a discrepancy between theoretical plurilingualism/multilingual policy understandings, and teaching practice, as well as the understanding of IC concepts (cf. Sercu, 2006; Kohler, 2015; cited in Xue, 2019). The available literature indicates that partly owing to academic ignorance of the comparative study of primary and secondary linguistic systems at all levels namely: phonetic, lexical, grammatical, syntactic, and stylistic, language educators and students encounter challenges in the pedagogic process (cf. Epimakhova, Declinkima and Tarasova, 2019).

Specifically, Lwanga-Lumu (2020) highlights lack of cultural knowledge, as one of the major challenges regarding the implementation of multilingualism/plurilingualism as a model into EL2 curricula. To fill some of the void, this article analyses the pedagogical strategies of how to promote IC through using transcultural and translingual competences of SA indigenous languages, as a resource, instead of as a problem in the EL2 curricula at university level.

First, it highlights the educators' academic ignorance of key theoretical concepts and the complexity of the notions about culture, as well as the functional interrelation between language and culture. Next, it reviews the pertinent literature of two distinct iCLT approaches to facilitate the refocusing of teaching and learning from communicative competence as a goal for multilingualism to the broader plurilingual holistic approach that allows integration of intercultural perspectives in the EL2 curricula. Finally, it provides pedagogic suggestions and implications for the promotion of the multilingual language policy and the use of indigenous African languages to decolonise the EL2 curricula by addressing the following questions:

Q1. How can language educators incorporate intercultural perspectives (multilingual indigenous languages/ culture) in the EL2 to facilitate learners' acquisition of plurilingual competence?

2.a. What strategies should language educators adopt to decolonise the EL2 language curricula, facilitate the development of multilingualism, as well as the students' intercultural competence (IC) to be active mediators in the global world?

b. What are the pedagogical implications of using the iCLT model linked to the ILL framework to implement Plurilingualism at university level?

2. Background: Literature Review Global Trends: Plurilingualism / Multilingualism / Indigenous African Languages

To address the questions above, a comprehensive analysis qualitative research method was adopted, based on the traditional literature review approach. The main argument developed is that traditional language teaching approaches should embrace a plurilingualism shift perspective. This could enable facilitate intercultural understanding to better suit contemporary society and education needs. Globally, as Piccardo, (2013) states, the ignorance of the new plurilingual stance has partly hindered the educators from acknowledging and promoting plurilingualism defined as "the ability of an individual to master more than one linguistic variety" (Henriksen, 2016). This suggests that speakers have to use linguistic repertoire strategically, to communicate effectively in multilingual and multicultural contexts. Partly, owing to academic ignorance of theoretical frameworks, concepts and pedagogical tools of plurilingual and IC, educators have followed the monolithic multilingual approach to promoting academic language, as opposed to plurilingualism.

As approaches to culture in language learning are diverse and varied, to help educators fill the theoretical chasm, reference is made to Liddicoat and Scarino's (2013) view of language as a social practice, as well as the cultural understanding outlined in an evidence-based framework of principles for effective intercultural teaching and learning (cf. Byram's, 2003; 2006b and Kramsch's 1993 and 2006) cited by Newton et al. 15). These scholars observed that language learning was a complex social interaction and that although it was perceived as communication, some lecturers continued to marginalise the learner as a passive meaning maker. Such educators often trivialized what was communicated and communicable as they continued to rely on a simplistic framework.

Furthermore, in the contemporary global world, IC plays a significant role, yet some language educators still use traditional approaches and focus on language skills such as listening, vocabulary, speaking, reading and writing and often under represent culture. As language and culture are interlinked, this analysis begins with the global recent political developments in the practice of intercultural language learning (ILL) and teaching.

Locally, in South Africa, owing to partial academic ignorance, some language educators have been battling with the distinction between multilingualism and plurilingualism, as there are different descriptors denoting pedagogical approaches. However, with reference to the CEFR, Lwanga-Lumu (2020) makes the distinction clear to language educators to facilitate implementation. To address Q1, regarding helping language educators to incorporate IC perspectives in the EL2 curricula, and

facilitate learners' acquisition of plurilingual competence, this article through in-depth critical analyses, highlights how a shift in perspective, from the monolithic multilingual approach towards an integrative plurilingual and collaborative stance to language teaching and learning, can facilitate the transformation of students' plurilingual repertoire into plurilingual competence.

Significantly, educators should have mutual perception, influence, as well as understanding of the methods of teaching and refuting stereotypes to address learners' difficulties and influence change. First off, educators need to understand the distinction between the plurilingualism/multilingualism theoretical concepts, to facilitate students' development into interculturally competent speakers, by appropriately preparing them to be active participants in the global world (cf. Lwanga-Lumu-2020). According to (Canagarajah and Liynage, 2012:50, cited in Piccardo 2013) plurilingualism differs from multilingualism in the following ways:

- Plurilingualism tolerates ICC as the goal for El2 learning
- Promotes individual linguistic plurality, language and intercultural awareness in interaction, as well as mutual interconnection and influence of all languages in a more dynamic way than multilingualism.
- Provides a broader and more strategic framework for language educators and students than multilingualism (cf. Marshall & Moore, 2018 cited in Xue, 2019).
- Helps educators address monolingual bias and challenges in language education settings, as it draws attention to the interconnectedness and intertwined relationship, within the plurilingual's linguistic and cultural repertoire (Yue:2019).
- Leads a new focus on the individual's linguistic repertoire as it changes flexibly, according to the context, instead of mere focus on language
- Within the plurilingual framework, all languages at different proficiencies are acknowledged and transferred of previous linguistic skills/resources tolerated.
- Facilitates the development of a student into an active social participant, learning in engagements, using plural repertoire as mediational tools for various task completion,
- Develops a holistic, instead of a segmented view on language, culture and linguistic skills (cf. Yue, 2019).
- Supports and even valorizes uneven, as well as partial competence by acknowledging potential connections, as opposed to separation of components.
- Encourages participants to develop various partial competences by building up their plurilingual / intercultural repertoire during their entire lifetime.

From these plurilingual characteristics, educators have to integrate the new objective, which entails building a plurilingual repertoire comprising partial competence, that can be developed into plurilingual competence.

Understanding partial competence may require knowledge of how to actualize the theory of language transfer and EL2 as a complex multifold process, based on a comparative study of primary and second language systems. Educators may need knowledge of geographical and historical factors to prepare classroom tasks and interviews to facilitate learners' acquisition of multi competences in El2 learning.

Additionally, language educators need to be aware that using students' indigenous languages for translation, code-switching and cross-linguistic analysis may contribute to learners' overall academic success and effective IC. Specifically, according to Xu and Shuang cited in Epimahova et al., (2019), when learners without knowledge of the target language rules (TL) use sentence patterns and communicative strategies of their L1 to decipher information of the TL during the learning process, positive/negative transfer could occur.

Educators need to know how to distinguish between positive transfer (when the mother tongue is similar or consistent with the TL) and negative transfer (when the original language is quite different from the TL) based on the range of factors influencing the transfer, such as phonetic, lexical, grammatical and cultural factors (Epimahova, et al., 2019). Language lecturers may use awareness of influencing factors for transfer, as a comparative analysis tool for preparing learning tasks with didactic potential. They can use EL2 as a benchmark to identify peculiarities and similarities between the first language (henceforth L1) and second language (L2) features.

Furthermore, awareness of the similarities and differences may help the language lecturers to pinpoint differences and similarities. Where differences occur, they could be identified and used as teaching/reference points to reduce students' linguistic interference with mother tongue and EL2 features. This could help students cope with the learning challenges in the acquisition process. Another strategy (according to (Epimahova et al., 2019) could be using the principle of conscious learning, whereby language educators facilitate student awareness of the significance of understanding formal and semantic characteristics of EL2 by making students recognize borrowed words from L1 structures, such as possessive, thematic-rhematic articulation verb and verb difficulties.

Regarding understanding theoretical concepts, language educators need to know that multilingualism refers to "the knowledge of a number of languages; the co-existence of different languages in a given society'' (Council of Europe, 2001:4). This implies that multilingualism is developed by globalizing processes. It entails diversifying the academic language, as well as encouraging students to learn foreign languages based on the separation of language approach that is dominated by monolingual assumptions (cf.* Lui, 2019). Thus, multilingualism can be used to prepare students to develop linguistic sensitiveness, and awareness that each language is a system with common and specific

features that some languages have no precise equivalents and that the context is important when checking words up in dictionaries.

Specifically, the advantage of multilingualism is that a person speaking more than one language possesses cognitive advantages, reflected in his/her modality and capacity to acquire different cognitive strategies. Although the context of multilingualism contributes to efficiency of EL2 and facilitates acquisition of the linguistic structures, it is based on a narrower view than plurilingualism, which promotes a more holistic vision for acquiring ICC.

Additionally, plurilingualism is categorized into four types: Individual, territorial, political and institutional. At the individual level, the student's knowledge of various languages/cultures (repertoire) is dynamically blended together to constitute plurilingual competence. With reference to Q1, by helping educators to understand the explicit distinction between multilingualism and plurilingualism, it is assumed that educators may profoundly shift their perspective to adaptation of multilingual education to reduce social injustice.

Significantly, as the language learners' resources/repertoire may fundamentally differ in nature from one language/culture to another, the individual's development of linguistic/cultural competence is unpredictable and unbalanced. According to the (CER 2009), cited in Xue (2019) this perspective is called *partial competence*. This notion refers to the imperfect, often very limited language mastery that may be a functional ability connected to a specific goal. To develop such competence, the language educator may tailor activities based on reading /written comprehension or vocabulary, and summarizing, which have complementary functions and various partial competences, which are part of an individual's plurilingual competence.

Above all, internationally, higher education demands effective transformation of the EL2 curricula in tertiary institutions through the implementation of multilingualism. This entails recognition and use of indigenous languages separately at individual and societal levels, as media of instruction to promote advanced mastery of each language. As Nelde (1992) observes, the majority of the world's population is multilingual, therefore language educators require deep understanding of multilingualism and its different manifestations in social, political, educational and cultural sectors, since it is crucial in developing plurilingual competence/ICC, and IC by promoting intercultural harmony, reducing conflict, stereotypes, misunderstanding and miscommunication.

Whereas plurilingualism and multiculturalism are encouraged in South African schools, and the Language policy for higher education recommended multilingualism, to address issues of academic and democratic injustice (DoE, 2002), some language lecturers are hesitant and incompetent to foster the policy. Xue's (2019:2) in depth analysis of the characteristics and advantages of

plurilingualism indicate that it is an action-oriented, student-centred pedagogical approach. It also has a broad and strategic framework to provide high quality language education in an era of superdiversity. Although there are some challenges in the promotion of plurilingualism as a theory of language in mainstream language education, it has the potential to cultivate students' plurilingual and intercultural ability.

However, Xue (2019) and Lwanga-Lumu (2020) indicate that, some language educators are still ignorant of the implications of plurilingualism. As this approach is incomprehensible to some lecturers, they are reluctant to promote the use of indigenous languages at tertiary level. To address this challenge, this article emphasises the need for language educators to understand the key concepts of plurilingualism and the South African government's policy for higher education. Such understanding may contribute to a shift from the narrow traditional linguistic practices; it may help educators adopt a plurilingual pedagogical approach that promotes multilingualism for formal communication, instruction and assessment, as well as global intercultural communication.

In addition, regarding Q1 pertaining to the facilitation of learners' plurilingual competence, as effective communication is realised in appropriate language contexts, language educators need to understand that language learning is interlinked with culture learning. According to Brown (2000:177)*, "A language is a part of culture and a culture is a part of language…" This implies that language and culture are interconnected and educators need to use this interrelationship as a basis to facilitate learners' development of plurilingual/ICC and intercultural awareness by integrating culture learning as a fifth skill.

3. Conceptual Background: Language, Culture, Learning

In this review, the focus is mainly on the intercultural language learning (henceforth ILL) literature, which involves the integrating of language, culture, and learning in one pedagogic framework to decolonise the curricula. As Lwanga-Lumu (2020) observes, despite the available literature to promote multilingualism and individual plurilingualism, some language lecturers due to academic incompetence, still ignore the seamless interrelationship between language and culture, as well as the significance of African indigenous languages in scaffolding EL2 learning.

This ILL framework is linked to intercultural communicative teaching and could be an ideal model to explore the notion of intercultures. It uses learning processes such as interacting, exploring, comparing and experiencing, as a tool for facilitation of learners' development of CCA, ICC and IC (cf. Lwanga-Lumu (2020). Newton et al. (2015:3-4) described the term "intercultural communicative language teaching"

henceforth "iCLT" as the framework of principles of the curriculum that focuses on communication as the goal for language learning and incorporates cultural knowledge. On the basis of this framework, Liddicoat et al. (2013) considered language learning as a complex social practice.

To reflect a social and cultural perspective pedagogically, Dellit (2005) outlined five principles of language learning for language educators to develop students' intercultural competence. Learners could explore the following cultural practices by:

- **Active construction.** Actively being involved in constructing knowledge through exploring cultural practices
- **Making connections.** Making connections between cultures, existing knowledge of culture and language, and new learning
- **Social interaction.** Involving in social interactions that entail communicating across cultural boundaries
- **Reflection.** Reflecting 'critically and constructively on linguistic and cultural differences, as well as similarities'
- **Responsibility.** Taking responsibility for their intercultural growth assisted by educators who, for example, foster engagement with difference and awareness of stereotypes (cf. Dellit (2005:26-28, cited in Newton et al.: 4).

The five principles in the iCLT framework may not directly indicate intercultural understanding, however they show that iCLT is much broader than an approach and situated within a broader research niche on multicultural and intercultural issues. As Liddicoat et al. (2013) observed, it could be seen as a new intercultural perspective comprising learning processes more than prerequisites or a method.

According to (Byram, 2006a, 2006b) cited in Newton et al.15), iCLT is mainly linked to democracy and global citizenship. However, to facilitate common ground, some researchers have linked the literature to multicultural, as well as diversity literatures and the principles developed into instrumental design (cf. Alton-Lee, 2004, cited in Newton et al. 2015). Considering the framework's feasibility for use in the instructional design of some studies, it could be a useful model for the presentation of core principles of intercultural language learning and understanding global multicultural, as well as intercultural perspectives (cf. Newton et al.,2015). Language educators are therefore advised to use the iCLT model to facilitate the incorporation of culture teaching and African indigenous languages into the EL2 curricula to promote academic language proficiency and multilingualism, which are being neglected in South African higher institutions.

This could involve developing with learners understanding of their own language(s) and culture(s) in relation to an additional language and culture (Liddicoat et al. 2003). The implication is that before language educators can understand how to facilitate the development of

academic language proficiency and promote multilingualism in higher education, they need to first, reflect on their knowledge of language and culture, which is considered dynamic in nature.

Regarding Q 2.a. pertaining to the strategies language educators need to adopt to decolonise the EL2 language curricula, facilitate the development of multilingualism, as well as the students' intercultural competence, to be active mediators in the global world; intercultural communicative language teaching and learning is one of the appropriate frameworks recommended here.

Specifically, the plurilingualism approach adopted by the language educators is guided by the way the 'cultural cake is cut' (Liddicoat et al. 2003 cited in Newton, 2015), which requires understanding the different perspectives of culture relevant to the views expressed by significant intercultural language teaching researchers such as (Kramsch, 1993 and Bryam, 1997). Their views include the static view of culture (which refers to content stereotypes/generalizations of nation states) and the dynamic one, which subtly, links culture dynamically to language and intercultural communication (cf. Lwanga-Lumu, 2020 for further details).

The definition of culture as an integral component of intercultural communication is complex and broad, therefore this article aims to explain it with reference to plurilingualism to help educators in facilitating the development of student' IC and cultural awareness, as well as promote functional multilingualism. The following section highlights the seamless interrelationship between language and culture, which language educators need to consider to systematize and integrate intercultural characteristics in the EL2 curricula. Specifically, language educators should understand that culture:

- Informs understandings of the world, knowledge types and sources of genre within a particular cultural context.
- Constructs pragmatic and instructional norms, particularly, the various means of politeness and speech act realisation via the choice of appropriate strategies.
- Is also realized pragmalinguistically through body language (non-verbal signs) and linguistic signs, as well as language via the words, grammar and expressions to realise speech acts and also communication strategies (cf. Crozet & Liddcoat, 1999, cited in Newton, 2015).

These cultural functions indicate that for language educators to teach for effective IC, they need to understand the cultural concepts, and perceive culture as "a content and dynamic process that should be linked to knowledge of discourse'' (cf. Kramsch, 2013) and the translingual and transcultural competences as recommended by the modern language association.

Considering that Africa hosts a third of the world's languages, but in most African universities no single African indigenous language is used as a medium of instruction, beyond the specific language courses, structural imbalances, inequalities and injustices persist as stumbling blocks. In South Africa, researchers attribute this lack of linguistic curricula decolonisation, as the main cause of high failure and drop-out rate at tertiary level (* Heugh, 2002; Alexander, 2003, Heleta, 2016). While the multilingual government policies advocate the promotion of the nine African indigenous languages in education for instruction, communication and assessment, English remains, still the dominant medium of instruction. Specifically, as Statics South Africa (2012) indicates, the rates for passing and graduation remain dismal.

In this article, it is argued that despite South African government's ambivalence in the academic use of indigenous African languages as media of instruction, language educators need awareness of the significance for using indigenous languages in scaffolding EL2 learning and to adopt a practical pedagogic approach to implement plurilingualism for effective curricula decolonisation (cf. Lwanga-Lumu, 2020; Ngcobo Ngcobo, S., Ndaba, N., Nyangwe, B., Mpungose, N., Jamal, R. 2016). Partly, due to the increasing number of student dropout, poor academic English literacy and increasing linguistic super-diversity in higher institutions of learning, language educators need to understand the different approaches to language planning and teaching, so as to select the right language model.

The term "academic language" refers to the medium of instruction used in education settings to facilitate students' acquisition and use of knowledge (cf. Snow & Uccelli, 2009; Zweirs, 2008; cited in Madiba, 2012). To develop students' academic language effectively, language educators need to understand the broader terms of reference, which are functional. They also need to know the narrower linguistic definition, which describes academic language as a group of grammatical words and organizational strategies describing structural high-order thinking processes and abstract concepts, such as phonological, lexical, grammatical, and discourse aspects (cf. Scarcella, 2003, cited in Madiba, 2012). Some language educators, however, consider the term academic language as too broad, complex and ambivalent to understand it precisely. Although the proposed complementary language use model challenges standard languages as purist and separate entities taught in isolation, some educators are still reluctant to promote it due to academic ambivalence.

The assumption (as indicated earlier) is that some educators are ignorant of the significant role of using indigenous languages to complement EL2 learning. As the new emphasis is on intercultural academic language, some lecturers do not know how to distinguish between language as a problem, resource or a right. According to Carsten (2019), in some former colonial countries, multilingualism is the norm, former colonial language, the medium of instruction and the indigenous languages are considered as

inferior. There is therefore an urgent need for more strategies to be formulated to help educators value the use of the mother tongue language as a resource.

Within certain complementary models of EL2 teaching, some linguists have weaker interpretations of the language view as a resource. They may find this plurilingual approach complex and challenging, as it entails consideration of shared knowledge built on emergent common ground, which is a dynamic construct of the communication process. As these educators lack deeper understanding of the ILL approach and the transformative potential process of integrating indigenous language use in higher institutions, they encounter problems about what should be taught and how culture could be taught effectively (cf. Genc & Bada, 2005). Such educators use English as the medium of instruction, allow mother tongues use as auxiliary means of learning, while encouraging concept formulation, albeit not as part of formal instruction (cf. Madiba, 2013 cited in Carsten, 2019).

On the contrary, certain linguists (e.g. Joseph and Ramani, 2004* cited in Carsten, 2019), with a stronger orientation to language argue that using the mother tongue is a significant strategy for attaining higher levels of academic cognition. Above all, some researchers recommend the integration of students' L1 with the EL2 as a teaching and learning resource to bring about equity and justice in similar situations. Specifically, as (Paxton, 2009 cited in Engcobo et al.) stated, the development of African translations for academic register has become an urgent matter, state, in South Africa. This article hence highlights the need for identifying some of the pedagogic strategies educators need to facilitate the enhancement of students' plurilingual/IC Competence. In addition, it promotes educators' awareness of what cultural aspects require teaching and how to facilitate the development of students' intellectual and intercultural competence at university level.

4. Contextual Background: Global Trends: CLLT /Implications

The current trend globally, is the recognition and blending of the sociocultural constructionist theory together with other major theories, such as Universal Grammar, cognition and L2 learning, interlanguage, input, constructivism and functionalist/pragmatic approaches (Mitchell and Myles 2004, cited in Moloney and Harbon 2013). This entails the adoption of the plurilingualism approach, which is based on the analysis of the benefits of understanding the inter-link between language and culture to motivate students in second language learning. Underpinning this approach is the pedagogy of communicative intercultural language learning (ILL).

Within this pedagogy, goals to develop ICC and IC of students in EL2 and foreign language (henceforth FL) learning have become central to language instruction and have been extensively researched. (e.g. Byram, 1997; Kramsch, 2013). Findings from such studies indicate that language educators are shifting away from communicative language teaching and learning to ICC/IC. A case in point is the Multilingualism Education Project at the University of Cape Town (cf. Madiba et al., Dec. 12.2019 download), as well as Lwanga-Lumu's SANPAD funded English research project on speech acts and politeness realisation patterns (cf. Luanga-Kasanga and Lwanga-Lumu 2007). The latter aimed at promoting African indigenous languages/cultures by bringing students' linguistic repertoire in the lecture hall and allowing them to analyse concepts and speech act realisation patterns in their mother tongues, while drawing on English as the medium of instruction.

Recent trends indicate that an apparent shift and growing interest in multilingualism, and some holistic and incorporated views are partially overlapping with plurilingualism, such as "multi-competence'' as well as "translanguaging''. According to Xue (2019), Cook (1992) pioneered the emergence of multi-competence; to challenge the idea of language disconnection in the brain and the view of an ideal native speaker. This concept focuses on language competence as a unique system to bilinguals, with knowledge of a separate language. This implies that a single separate language is used for communication by the 'ideal' native speaker, and the L2 user is deficient. Later, with a view to refer to the cross-linguistic practices of students, in Wales and English L2 learning, (Williams 1992, cited in Xue, 2019) coined translanguaging, in Wales, as a notion to refer to learners' real bilingual practices in context. Translanguaging is a strategy popularly, used in pedagogical practices by bi/multilingual speakers. It is based on integrated repertoire mediated in a dynamic functional manner, to organise and mediate understanding socially, cognitively and affectively, in literacy and academic language learning (cf. Baker, 2013). The CEFR (2019) considers it as a constructive form of pedagogical practice within the plurilingualism framework, however, despite the overlaps, translanguaging and plurilingualism are epistemologically different in educational goals.

From the 1990's, traditional bilingual terms such as code-switching and code-mixing have been questioned for monolingual orientation and found insufficient to understand the creative bi/multilingual interactions. Since then translanguaging has become popular and scholars highlight its benefits as follows:

- Translanguaging is significant for mediating cognitively academically challenging study material in EL2 learning,
- Formulation of subject field terminology in the mother tongues,

- Authenticating students' multilingual identities and enhancing social cohesion (cf. Makalela, 2014, 2015; Madiba, 2010 cited in Carstens, 2019).

The benefits outlined above indicate a renewed focus at the University of Pretoria, in the cross-disciplinary commitment of the department of post-school education and training to use translanguaging as an alternative strategy with potential for developing the use of indigenous languages at tertiary level. Overall the research findings indicated that translanguaging is a useful strategy for the incorporation of African languages into formal programmes curricula for higher education to promote the bi/multilingual SA language policy. On the contrary, one single strategy is inadequate for the development of effective IC and intercultural awareness. As Lwanga-Lumu (2020) suggests, effective transformation of EL2 curricula entails dynamic development of student tasks, such as tutorial activities based on different partial competences, which continuously enrich the learners' whole linguistic repertoire, according to the context and improve the strategies for learning.

According to Garcia (2009: 45, cited by Yue, 2019), translanguaging describes: ''Multiple discursive practices in which learners engage in order to make sense of their bilingual world.'' This implies that lecturers need to understand the significance of IC intercultural competence, which was re-introduced as ICC in the last two decades to help students foster critical communication skills/IC, develop an appreciation of the language and culture studied, as well as their own, and develop skills to enable them to be competent, adaptable speakers.

Significantly, the (CERF's) social shift globally highlights the educator's necessity to embrace social language learning and use developments, such as the educators' need to understand mother tongue language as a mediational tool for solving linguistic problems; (a means, a resource and product of meaning making process) as opposed to seeing it as a problem. Furthermore, within the linguistic shift, the educators have to deal with the increasing awareness of linguistic/cultural diversity, as well as the seamless multilingual practices of individual learners.

In short, from a plurilingual perspective, lecturers need to understand that language ability is not acquired, but it is a continuous lifetime process (cf). From this holistic and ecological plurilingual perspective, educators need to be aware that numerous discourse studies indicate that plurilingual speakers adopt a wide range of strategies to deal with the gap between the interactants to negotiate meaning. (Piccardo, 2017(a), cited in Xue 2019). Regarding Q.2b, the implication is that language educators have to develop a plurilingual speaker, who has the capacity to speak one language and this capacity cannot be analysed from the other languages spoken, as the integrated ability is unbalanced.

As the academic debate on curricula decolonisation continues, more challenging demands for the dismantling of the Eurocentric EL2 curricula are continuing. Horsthemke (2004) remarks that demand to Africanise educational institutions, curricula, syllibi and criteria of excellence may imply a false sense of belonging, create more derogation and marginalisation.

This article suggests the of ILL framework and the integration of the philosophy of Ubuntu with its basic values of humanism and basic human rights as a possible intervention to respond to relevant decolonisation challenges of EL2 curricula (cf. Lwanga-Lumu, 2020; Horsthemke, 2004). Despite certain limitations pertaining to assessment, the Ubuntu philosophy may provide an ideal framework for language educators to deconstruct cultural stereotypes, reinforce students' self- identities, and develop their IC and CCA. In sum, more research is needed to assess the extent to which language educators understand the new plurilingual perspectives and their attitude towards plurilingualism, as well as the core philosophical values of Ubuntu such as collaboration, cooperation and respect. The implications are that:

- Students are not expected to acquire the ideal native-like monolingual competence and educators will no longer use it as the goal to measure success.
- The strategy of meshing and blending languages is no longer an error, but a natural positive strategy, for effective development of plurilingual competence. (Cf. Xue 2019).
- Students in a plurilingual lecture hall should be encouraged to strategically use their whole linguistic repertoire; their discourse knowledge forms, mixed with their daily experiences should be considered significant and relevant; they should not be stored in separate knowledge compartment.

This implies that educators are encouraged to dispel the misconception regarding native-like communication as the only pure form of communication. Therefore, it is recommended that plurilingualism be considered as a worthy model with positive effect on pluralism that enhances linguistic creativity and mutual understanding. (Picardo, 2017a cited in Xue 2019). Finally, once educators shift from purism and stop considering students' using other languages as contamination, that is a barrier for improving language proficiency, lecturers will begin to accept linguistic diversity, normality and significance. As the CERF (20 18) suggests, educational institutions need to provide pluralistic intercultural linguistic cultural teaching and learning to facilitate students' development of ICC/plurilingual competence and IC.

Additionally, the implication is that to decolonise the EL2 curricula, lecturers have to embrace education transformation at undergraduate level by understanding the need to develop theoretical premises of plurilingualism with reference to the Framework of Reference for Pluralistic Approaches to Languages and Cultures (henceforth, FREPA) and the philosophical core values of

Ubuntu (cf. Lwangu-Lumu, 2000, 2005, 2020; de Kadt (2015). According to Xue (2019), in addition, lecturers need to acknowledge the core concepts in the CERF provided in the detailed guidance and classification of pedagogical approaches to plurilingualism and the fact that the latter represents curricula transformation with reference to language education, by integrating both the social and multilingual perspectives. Within the South African context, de Kadt (2015:38) outlines the major implications for curricula decolonisation as follows:

- Enrolments are expected to increase from the current 17.3 percent to 25 percent in 2030.
- Educators will have the challenge of promoting the proposal for Undergraduate Curriculum reform which recommends that for substantial improvements of graduate output and outcomes, a flexible curriculum structure was necessary for SA's core undergraduate programmes.
- These core courses will operate amidst a context focusing on real world skills appropriate for global communication and in response to recommendation of blended learning components within the existing contact programmes (cf. De Kadt 2015).

The overall assumption in this article is that adopting iCLT and learning is a major challenge. It entails focusing more on ICC/ plurilingual competence as a more holistic goal that uses blended language learning to accomplish students' tasks, as well as a practice of engaging meaning within a particular social context such as a blog, than linguistic/communicative competence, which is a static and linear method of input (cf. Xue 2019). According to Byram (1997:7) ICC 'is the ability to communicate and interact across boundaries' . This implies that ICC is used interchangeably with plurilingual competence and entails using linguistic and non-verbal resources with people from another country in a foreign language. It requires integration of a broad EL2 curriculum with indigenous languages/cultures by building relations effectively and appropriately in the target language and incorporating a variety of indigenous languages/ cultural contexts (cf. Lwanga-Lumu, 2020).

In a nutshell, as no single intercultural model is ideal for effective integration of the IC perspectives in EL2 curricula, to be interculturally competent lecturers the following implications are outlined:

- Lecturers must be willing to shift their monolingual practices.
- Attend workshops to learn continuously,
- Transform into sophisticated mediators of learning who embrace culture as practice in teaching.
- Adopt the ILL framework which is linked to iCLT and may provide a broader education context.

The model is recommended to:

- Assist language educators with integrating intercultural perspectives, class tasks instructional

and research designs for decolonising the EL2 curricula.
- Facilitate preparing suitable class tasks needed for tutorial system intervention,
- Facilitate learners' development of interlingual and intercultural competence,
- Improve student throughput rates and encourage academic success by facilitating the development of instrumental, as well as integrative motivational teaching materials based on Ubuntu cultural values, to confront poor academic performance and stereotyping.

Educators need to understand that curricula decolonisation is a multi-faceted and challenging process that entails the use of different pedagogical strategies to develop students' intercultural competence. In sum, EL2 educators need to be innovative and eclectic in their practices.

5. Concluding Remarks

This article has highlighted the need to adopt a broader socio-cognitive collaborative approach that integrates the IC perspectives in the EL2 Humanities curricula and for decolonisation to comprise additive and inclusive indigenous knowledge. Due to certain limitations pertaining to research design, the integration of an iCLT model is a life-long complex process.

Specifically, to maintain local and global standards, and effectively decolonise the EL2 curricula, collaborative effort of stake holders may be required. A coalition with politicians, staff and the community, as well as incorporation of students' voices, pertinent indigenous knowledge systems and diverse pedagogic strategies are essential. Significantly, educators need to understand the main barriers of effective plurilingualism/multilingualism implemenation, as well as the pertinent IC pedagogical perspectives in EL2 curricula for SA universities. These barriers should be embraced as opportunities for better creative teaching and research practices. In short, to promote effective transformation in the 4th industrial revolution, in EL2 teaching and improve academic success, amidst the unprecedented global challenges, educators may have to first be interculturally competent. Secondly, lecturers should have appreciation of and respect for students' cultures/indigenous languages for reorientation and genuine CCA openness to be developed.

Thirdly, as the goal of IC teaching is paradoxical and ambivalent, further research is needed for numerous innovative and more concise EL2 models; to integrate IC/computer-mediated communication into EL2, as well as assess learners in their development of the virtual fifth skill of culture learning for multicultural diversity, equality, and global communication. Overall, to reduce education inequalities, promote IC perspectives and global

democracy require an integrated interdisciplinary framework that comprises rethinking pedagogic research and embracing intercultural/plurilingual practices through critical, innovative and concerted effort.

REFERENCES

[1] Alexander, N. (2003). Language education and policy, national and sub-national identities in South Africa. Council i of Europe. Strasbourg.

[2] Baker, C. (2013). Reflecting on translanguaging in multilingual classrooms. Online document: Htt:ww. Sciel.org. za.

[3] Baranovskaja, I., & Skorupa, P. (2011). Some aspects of culture teaching in foreign language teaching and ESP classes: Cultural scripts and small talk. SANTALKA: Filologija, Edukologija, 19(2), 1822-430X.

[4] Beets, P. & van Loux, T. Accessed 15 December 2016. African (a) Philosophy of Education: Reconstruction and Deconstructions (eds. Wagid, Y., van Wyk B; Adams, F. & November, I.)

[5] Boxer, D., & Pickering, L. (1995). Problems in the presentation of speech acts in ELT materials: the case of complaints. ELT Journal, 49(1), 44-58.

[6] Brown, H.D. 2000. Principles of language learning and teaching. Singleton: 49-58

[7] Brown, H. D. (1987). Principles of language learning and teaching. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs.

[8] Byram, M. (1997). Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

[9] Byram, M., Gribkova, B., & Starkey, H. (2002). Developing the intercultural dimension in language teaching. A practical introduction for teachers.

[10] Canale, M. & Swain, M. 1980. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. Applied Linguistic1:1-47.

[11] Carstens, A. (2019). Bridging the divide: Collaborative Learning and Translanguaging in Multilingual Classrooms. July 31.2019. Download 2020.04.01.

[12] Cruz, M. P. (2015). Pragmatic markers in academic discourse. Retrieved August 12, 2015.

[13] De Kadt, E. (2015, September). The challenges of undergraduate education: looking back and ahead. The Journal of the Helen Suzman Foundation, 1(76), 38-43.

[14] Epimakhoza, A., Declinkima, O. and Tarasova, N. 2019. Difficulties in Teaching Russia as a Foreign Language for Beginners.

[15] Genc, B., & Bada, E. (2005, April). Culture in language learning and teaching. The Reading Matrix, 5(1), 73-84.

[16] Gomez Parra, E. (Retrieved May 2016). Improving Students' ICC through email activities. International Conference: ICT for Language Learning. 3rd edition.

[17] Heleta, S. 2016. Decolonisation of higher education: Dismantling epistemic violence and Eurocentricism in South Africa. Transformation in higher education 1(1), a 9.http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/the.v1i1.9

[18] Henriksen, S.M. 2016. Identity and Plurilingualism: The Case of Mozambique. Retrieved 10. 10. 2019.

[19] Heugh, K. 2002. The case against bilingual and multilingual education in South Africa. *PRAESA*. Occasional Papers. 6.

[20] Hibbert, L. (2011). Language development in higher education: Suggested paradigms and their applications in South Africa. Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, 29(1), 31-42.

[21] Horsthemeke, K. 2004. Knowledge, education and the limits of Africanisation. Journal of Philosophy of Education, 38(4)571-587

[22] Jacobs, G. M. (1998). Book Reviews. System, 26, 427-441.

[23] Kasper, R. G. (1997). Can pragmatic competence be taught? Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Centre: National Curriculum Foreign Language Centre.

[24] Kaschuala, R.H. and Mostert, A. 2008. South African HThigher Education Report: Transformation. Accessed 28.03.2016. Http://goo.gl forms.vz/zu.

[25] Kecskes, I. (2015). Intracultural communication and intercultural communication: Are they different? International Review of Pragmatics, 7, 171-194.

[26] Kecskes, I., & Zhang, F. (2009). Activating, seeking, and creating common ground: A socio-cognitive approach. Pragmatics & Cognition, 17(2), 331-355.

[27] Kramsch, C. (2013, January). Culture in foreign language teaching. Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 1(1), 57-78.

[28] * Luanga Kasanga, L. (2006). Requests in a South African variety of English. World Englishes, 25(1), 65-89.

[29] Liddicoat, J.A. and Scarino, A. 2013. Intercurural Language Teaching and Learning.Doi:10.1002/97811184820770

[30] Lopez-Rocha-Rocha, S. 2016. Intercultural communicative competence: creating awareness and presenting skills in the language classroom. In C. Goria. O. Speicher, & S. Stollhans (Eds), *Innovative language teaching and learning at university: embracing participation and collaboration* (pp.105-111). Dublin Research Publishing.net.

[31] Luanga Kasanga, L. A., & Lwanga-Lumu, J. (2007, March). Cross-cultural linguistic realization of politeness: A study of apologies in English and Setswana. Journal of Politeness Research, 3(1), 65-92.

[32] Lumu, J.C. (1998) Computer-based education and adult English second language learning. In Limage L. (ed.) Comparative Perspectives on Language and Literacy. Selected papers from the work of Language and Literacy commission of the 10th World Congress of Comparative Education Societies - Cape Town. UNESCO-BREDA.

[33] Lwanga-Lumu, J. C. (2000). Requests and Apologies in Luganda and English. University of the Witwatersrand: Unpublished Ph.D Thesis.

[34] Lwanga-Lumu, J. C. (2002). Requests modification by first and second language speakers. Journal for Language Teaching (SAALT), 36(3-4), 289-304.

[35] Lwanga-Lumu, J. C. (2005). A cross-cultural investigation of apology realisation patterns in Luganda and English. Journal for Language Teaching (SAALT), 39(2), 227-242.

[36] Lwanga-Lumu, J.C. (2020, March). Intercultural communicative component (ICC) in the English second language curricula. Trends and challenges of transformation in South Africa and the global world. Journal of intercultural communication, 20(1) 52. *Lwanga-Lum

[37] Madiba, M. 2012. Language: and academic achievement: Perspectives on the potential role of indigenous African languages as Lingua Academae. Per Linguam.

[38] Nelde, P.H. 1992. Multilingualism and contact linguistics. Accessed online December 2019: doi.org/.1075/z.61.31nel

[39] Newton, J. Shearn, S. & Nowitzki, W. 2015. An evidence-based framework of principles for effective intercultural teaching and learning. Retrieved 15 December 2017:https://www.researchgate.net/pub 282694720.

[40] Ngcobo, S., Ndaba, N., Nyangwe, B., Mpungose, N., Jamal, R. 2016.Translanguaging as an approach to address language inequality in South African higher education: summary writing skills development. Cri STaL Critical Studies in Teaching and Learning, 4(2), 10-27.

[41] Ntuli, C. D. (2012). Intercultural Misunderstanding in South Africa: An Analysis of Nonverbal Communication Behavior in Context. Intercultural Communication Studies XXI, 2.

[42] Piccardo, E. (2013). Plurilingualism and Curriculum Design: Toward a Synergic Vision. *TESOL Quaterly.*47 (3), 600-613.

[43] Ramluchman, N., & Veerasamy, D. (2013). Intercultural communication and work integrated learning: A South African perspective. Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies, 5(3), 148-156.

[44] Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. Applied Linguistics, 4(1), 91-112.

[45] Thome-Williams, A. 2016. Developing intercultural communicative competence in Portuguese. Accessed December 2017: Https://web.uri.edu/files Intercultural Communication xxv.

[46] Uso-Juan, E. & Martinez-Flor. 2008. Teaching learners to appropriately mitigate requests. ELT Journal 62(4) October; doi:10.1093/elt/ccmo92.

[47] Waghid, Y. & Davids, N. (2016). The History of South African student protests. Accessed June 2017: Http:/ww. the conversation.com./history of South Africa...

[48] Wierzbicka, A. (1991). Cross-cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

[49] Xue, L. 2019. A New Vision of Language Education, From Monolingualism to Plurilingualsim. In-depth analysis of Plurilingualism and its theories of Language Education. A dissertation submitted to Auckland University of Technology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Education (MED).