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Abstract
The purpose of this case study is to examine if and how working with homework in general and translanguaging homework (TLH) in particular can support collaboration between home and school. Our aim is also to find out if TLH provides the ground for teachers and parents of migrant background to feel and act as epistemic subjects, i.e., as participants whose knowledge is given credibility. Prior research has shown the importance of collaboration between home and school. However, for migrant parents, collaboration has often proved to be problematic and unequal, due to for example language barriers. Research has shown that translanguaging bridges such problems. How the implementation of translanguaging is appreciated by parents and teachers has scarcely been researched. Neither has collaboration through TLH been studied regarding how they perceive each other as epistemic subjects. In this study, thematic content analysis has been applied on interview data with parents and teachers. The epistemic (in)justice framework has then been used to discuss the found themes in their answers. The findings show that teachers’ and parents’ perceptions of working with TLH differs. Some parents perceive that TLH enhances their chances to collaborate with school as epistemic subjects. Conversely, TLH may obscure other parents’ possibilities to collaborate, thus creating epistemic injustice. Lastly, TLH might be ignored altogether by some parents, thus neither enhancing collaboration nor creating epistemic justice. Concludingly, in order for TLH to work, reciprocal sensitive listening to each other, from both the teachers’ and the parents’ side, is important, and teachers need to be aware of the students’ family situation regarding their language choices and language use.

1 Introduction
This article highlights teachers’ and migrant parents’ perceptions of parental collaboration when homework in general, and translanguaging

1 By the concept of ‘migrant parents’ or ‘parents of migrant background’, we mean parents who have children in compulsory school and have moved to Sweden for one reason or the other, and therefore talk a first language other than Swedish, or parents of children in compulsory school who were themselves born in Sweden to parents who had migrated there. In this article, we focus on the first group.
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homework (TLH) in particular, is used in their children’s school context. Our study departs from the concept of pedagogical translanguaging, which refers to “the teaching approaches that involve the intentional and planned use of student multilingual resources in language and content subjects” (Juvonen & Källkvist 2021: 1). As previous research has indicated, this approach takes into account the students’ entire linguistic repertoire to enable their learning processes (see e.g., Cummins 2021; García 2009; Svensson 2017). However, how the implementation of translanguaging in school in Swedish contexts is appreciated as a means for collaboration by parents and teachers has been subjected to little research (for an exception, see Svensson & Khalid 2017). Our study builds on a prior article by Svensson and Svensson (2022), which pertains to the perceptions of four migrant parents, but the current article also involves another parent and two teachers. Besides translanguaging, we also use the framework of epistemic injustice (Fricker 2007). This concept refers to injustice related to one’s knowledge and one not being seen as an epistemic subject. The framework is used to study the perceptions of homework in general and TLH in particular with regard to teachers and to parents of migrant background. TLH is of special interest in this study, but as perceptions of homework in general and TLH are sometimes intertwined and are often difficult to distinguish in the interviews, we include both types of homework. The concepts of translanguaging and epistemic (in)justice will be further described in the theoretical background section.

According to the Swedish National Agency of Education (SNAE) and its compulsory school curriculum, Lgr11, schools must collaborate with parents in their children's schooling: “The school shall, in collaboration with the homes, promote students’ all-round personal development into active, creative, competent, and responsible individuals and citizens” (SNAE 2018: 7, English in original). It also states that “the teacher must collaborate with and continuously inform the parents about the student’s school situation, well-being, and knowledge development, and stay informed about the individual student's personal situation” (SNAE 2018: 14, English in original). Nevertheless, collaboration from the parents’ side is not explicitly highlighted in the national curriculum, but the shared responsibility of raising children is expressed (SNAE 2018: 7). In this article, we use ‘parental collaboration’ to mean co-responsibility for the educational development of children.

Prior research has shown that collaboration between home and school, for example parents helping their children with their homework and attending school meetings, can promote the children’s school performances (see e.g., Epstein 2001; Erikson 2004; Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler 1995; Jeynes 2012). Nonetheless, for parents of migrant backgrounds, collaboration has often proved to be problematic and unequal, due to, for example, language barriers and different approaches to school and
collaboration on the part of teachers and parents (Bouakaz & Persson 2007; Bunar 2015; Dahlstedt 2018; Månsson & Osman 2017). Researchers on multilingualism, such as Cummins (2017), García (2009) and Svensson (2017), emphasize that the use of translanguaging in teaching bridges such problems. Work with translanguaging activities may include TLH, which can involve activities such as translation into the languages spoken at home or discussions between children and their parents or other relatives in those languages (Svensson 2017; Svensson & Khalid 2017). A recent Swedish case study showed that parents experienced working with translanguaging positively, but their explicitly expressed opinions about participating in their children's schooling through TLH were not further examined in the study (Svensson & Khalid 2017). The overall aim of this study is to examine whether homework in general and TLH can support collaboration between the home and the school, as well as in particular create epistemic justice for the migrant parents, and how. Our research questions are:

1. What perceptions do teachers have about homework in general and TLH in particular as a means of supporting parental collaboration in their students’ schoolwork?
2. What perceptions do migrant parents have about homework in general and TLH in particular as a means of supporting their collaboration in their children’s schooling?
3. How do parents’ life experiences and teachers’ expectations inform us about how homework in general and TLH in particular are perceived?
4. How do TLH seem to promote epistemic justice for migrant parents in the context of their children’s schooling?

2 Theoretical background
In this section, we outline the theoretical frameworks of translanguaging and epistemic (in)justice that our study is built on. In connection with the framework of translanguaging, we highlight examples of TLH, which are implemented by the participating teachers.

2.1 Translanguaging framework
The concept translanguaging stems from schools in Wales (Baker 2001; Williams 1996) where emerging bilinguals alternated between two learning languages, the Welsh mother tongue and the English school language. Over time, the term has come to designate a concept with a variety of perspectives on the use of multilingual resources. Baker (2011: 288), for example, characterizes it as “the process of making meaning, shaping experiences,
gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages”, while García (2009: 44) defines translinguaging as “engaging in bilingual or multilingual discourse”. The application of translinguaging practice in classrooms of all levels has proved to empower students and support their linguistic, academic, social and cultural potential in several countries, such as in the U.S. (CUNY-NYSIEB n/d), Ireland (Little & Kirwin 2019), Sweden (Rosén & Wedin 2015; Svensson 2017; Svensson & Khalid 2017) and many other countries, such as Canada, Italy, Pakistan, Mexico, Burkina Faso, Uganda and China (Cummins & Early 2011).

In this study, we focus on translinguaging homework which is a strategy that relates to the pedagogical translinguaging approach. As previously stated, by pedagogical translinguaging we mean the teachers’ planned, deliberate, purposeful and intentional education that enables the students to use all their linguistic resources for learning (see, Cenoz & Gorter 2020; Gauza & Hedman 2017). Pedagogical translinguaging aims to increase the inclusion, social justice and learning of students (Juvonen & Källkvist 2021). In this study, we also investigate the inclusion and justice of parents. Even though pedagogical translinguaging has a significant dominance in the translinguaging research field (Axelsson 2015; Creese & Blackledge 2010; Cummins & Early 2011; Paulsrud et al. 2018; Svensson 2017; Svensson & Khalid 2017), there is a scant amount of research focusing on the perspective of pedagogical translinguaging and parents.

Translanguaging homework
TLH can be shaped in different ways depending on the purpose. One overarching purpose, however, is to create talk between parents and the students in the language or languages spoken in the homes. One example of such homework can be seen below in Figure 1. It aims to create talk in the homes around responsibilities and duties, and revolves around words and concepts to be used as the starting point of a discussion about values, such as arriving at school on time and back to the lessons after the break on time.

---

2 The City University of New York (CUNY) New York State Initiative on Emergent Bilinguals.
Figure 1. Translanguaging homework on values

Figure 1 shows that the parents are invited to collaborate not only on language use when applying the concept of translanguaging, but also to discuss different values with their children. Another example of TLH can be what the teachers of this study call “aesthetic homework”. The students are asked to write poems in school and at home, assisted by their parents. They are supposed to write them in as many languages as they would like, which can be seen below in Figure 2, where a girl in year four has written the same poem in four languages.

Figure 2. Example of aesthetic translanguaging homework
Apart from the two types displayed above, TLH can also consist of short texts or words, as well as concepts to translate into the language or languages used at home, as shown below in Figure 3.

![Figure 3. Example of translanguaging homework with translation of words](image)

Homework concerning translations of texts and words can exist in any school subject. In Figure 3 above, the homework consists of concepts concerning ethics, empathy, bullying, etc., in the subject of social science, which are translated into Somali.

### 2.2 Epistemic injustice

The concept of epistemic injustice is defined by Fricker as an injustice done against someone “specifically in their capacity as a knower” (2007: 1). Consequently, the concept relates to how someone is (mis)interpreted in the scope of a hearer. Epistemic injustice “includes exclusion and silencing; systematic distortion or misrepresentation of one’s meanings or contributions; undervaluing of one's status or standing in communicative practices; unfair distinctions in authority; and unwarranted distrust” (Kidd et al. 2017: 1).

Fricker (2007, 2008) distinguishes between two types of epistemic injustices, the first being *testimonial injustice* and the second *hermeneutical injustice*. According to the author, testimonial injustice occurs when someone is wronged “in his capacity as a giver of knowledge” by a hearer (2008:
The wronging implies that the speaker suffers a diminished degree of credibility out of prejudice. An example might be that a jury disbelieves someone solely because of the color of his skin. Hermeneutical injustice takes place at a prior stage, “when someone is trying to make sense of a social experience but is handicapped in this by a certain sort of gap in collective understanding – a hermeneutical lacuna whose existence is owing to the relative powerlessness of a social group to which the subject belongs” (Fricker 2008: 69).

Both concepts – testimonial and hermeneutical injustice – can take place in different kinds of transactions, both interpersonal and between individuals and systems of institutions (Andersson 2012). In order to account for how teachers and parents perceive TLH, both testimonial and hermeneutical injustice are relevant to this study and are placed in the context of education. Nevertheless, the two concepts are not applied to direct transactions between the teachers and the parents involved in the study. Instead, it is their perceptions towards TLH as a means of enhancing parent–teacher collaboration that are in focus. These perceptions are discussed in order to investigate how epistemic (in)justice takes place when TLH is implemented as a way of improving collaboration between home and school. In this study, we also assume the concept of *epistemic subject*, which, in Fricker’s (2007) words, is a human being functioning as an enquirer, knower, testifier and giver of evidence.

### 3 Prior research on translanguaging: teachers’ and parents’ views

Prior research on teachers’ perceptions of and attitudes toward students’ use of translanguaging in compulsory school has been conducted by, for example, Cunningham (2017, 2019), who found that primary school teachers in the United Kingdom displayed negative attitudes in this area. Likewise, teachers in compulsory school in Greece displayed beliefs that the use of heritage languages at home serves as an obstacle to learning and developing the school language (Gkaintarzi et al. 2015).

In a study by Svensson (2020), four teachers in a Swedish compulsory school were interviewed with regard to their perceptions of working with pedagogical translanguaging. The interviews were performed at the time of the first implementation of translanguaging in the school and five years later. During this period, the teachers found that translanguaging cooperative homework increased parents’ collaboration with the homework, especially when the focus of the homework was on bilingual terminology and translation. However, the study focuses on the teachers’ perceptions of TLH, rather than the parents’.

Regarding translanguaging within families of migrant backgrounds, parental views on the language policy implemented in the homes of French and English-speaking families in the United Kingdom were investigated by Wilson (2020). Additionally, in Singapore, Curdt-Christiansen (2013)
investigated the language ideologies that guided English- and Chinese-speaking families’ language choices while doing homework. Both studies relate to our own in the sense that translanguaging practices at home are scrutinized, but Wilson and Curdt-Christiansen do not immerse themselves in parental perceptions about TLH. In the work by Svensson and Svensson (2022), parental perceptions of and attitudes toward TLH are studied, however. The findings show that TLH can be perceived both as an affordance and as a challenge for parental collaboration with school by the parents of migrant backgrounds.

4 Data collection, the school, the participants and ethical considerations

The data of the study was collected through interviews at a Swedish compulsory school, chosen through a convenience sample (Denscombe 2010). The school has a majority of students living in families with migrant backgrounds, many of which speak a language other than Swedish at home. Since 2016, the school has implemented an official multilingual policy when translanguaging was manifested in the school’s activity plan, which states that: “Translanguaging shall permeate all teaching regardless of subject and the age of the students”. At the start of the autumn term in 2016, the principal appointed a teacher as lead teacher in translanguaging, i.e., as a pedagogical coach in translanguaging at the school. This teacher is one of our interviewees. An emphasis on translanguaging and interculturality is also visible in the school’s presentation of itself on the website, where the translanguaging policy is presented in a video and the written text says that the school educates citizens of the world. This policy is implemented by the teachers’ use of pedagogical translanguaging in both the teaching in the school and in homework assignments.

Five parents of grade four students (age 10–11) at the same school participated in the study. Semi-structured and audio-recorded interviews of 40–60 minutes were conducted in Swedish with each parent in the school one at a time by one researcher. Two middle school teachers, teaching the same class of grade four students, participated in semi-structured interviews separately and twice together as a pair via Zoom. The interview questions revolved around three topics: the meeting with the Swedish school, homework and TLH, and collaboration between home and school. The teacher interviews were altogether approximately two hours long and were carried out by one researcher. These interviews were all videotaped, but based on recommendations from the teachers, the interviews with the parents were only audio recorded. The data also consists of homework material.

Transcriptions were made loosely based on Jefferson’s (2004) transcription conventions. The following symbols were used: (.) for short pauses; ((( ))) for meta comments; ___ for emphasis; and - for interrupted
words or broken sentences. Question intonation is marked by ?, and omitted words or phrases are marked by […]. Moreover, [*] was used when the transcriber added an explanation of a word that was implied by the context of the transcript but not displayed in the example. All analyses were made on the Swedish transcripts, and the analyzed extracts of the transcripts were translated into English thereafter. Parts of the transcripts are presented in chapter 6 as examples of our findings. They are displayed in two languages side by side: in English to the left, and in the original Swedish to the right. We have not glossed the transcripts, as our focus is on the content as a whole, not on the specific use of grammar or the choice of words.

For ethical considerations, the participating teachers in this study were informed orally about the study by us, and they informed the parents orally about the study in a parent meeting in school. All participants signed a consent form prior to the interviews. In order to grant them anonymity, in accordance with the Swedish National Scientific Council (Vetenskapsrådet 2017), they were given pseudonyms: Gladys, Hadya, Isabell, Kajal and Zahra for the parents, and for the teachers, Teacher 1 (T1), the lead teacher, and Teacher 2 (T2). Consequently, we do not identify the participants’ ethnicities, home countries or first languages in this article. Prior to the interviews, all the participants were also informed about their rights to interrupt their participation at any time without having to explain why, which none of them did. All the collected data (audio- and video files) and the transcriptions of the recorded interviews were saved on an external hard drive and stored in a safe at Linnaeus University.

With respect to Swedish as a second language, the participating parents spoke it more or less fluently. Regardless of this, all the interviews were conducted without interpreters, since we did not want the parents to refrain from speaking frankly due to the presence of an interpreter. Parents whom the teachers regarded as being unable to conduct an interview in Swedish were not invited, despite some of them expressing a desire to collaborate in the study.

5 Methods of analysis
The research method applied in this study is Qualitative Content Analysis, which is used to analyze qualitative descriptive studies in order to comprehend human perceptions in various circumstances (Bengtsson 2016; Berg 2001). Additionally, the theory of epistemic (in)justice (Anderson 2012; Fricker 2007) is used to explain the content that emerges through the qualitative content analysis.

The data in this investigation is explored according to a latent perspective, which means that it is analyzed in an interpretative way to try to find the deep structure of intention and the underlying meaning in the verbal expressions (Bengtsson 2016) of parents and teachers. While the interviews with the parents were admittedly only audio recorded, we were
also able to observe during the interviews the parents’ nonverbal actions, such as gestures, facial expressions, intonations and occasional laughter, which helped us to interpret the data as well. The interviews with the teachers departed from questions of their perceptions of translanguaging as an educational strategy and how they managed to perform the strategy with respect to the parents’ diverse backgrounds and to homework in practice. As we used a latent perspective with interpretations, the codes in the content analysis were created inductively by us during the development of the process of analysis (cf., Bengtsson 2016).

The examination process started by examining the transcribed data as a whole to understand ‘what is going on’ (Bengtsson 2016). The next step was to extract ‘meaning units’ that were then condensed (‘what is said’) in order to find codes and generate categories, which were grouped as a collection of similar data (Bengtsson 2016; Graneheim et al. 2017; Morse 2008). The categories were in turn interrelated by themes that were a unifying red thread that could answer the question ‘why’ (Graneheim et al. 2017).

Table 1 illustrates how such an analysis is performed concerning one of the parents. An interviewee, Isabel, is answering a question about TLH, and her statement is quoted as a whole under the heading Meaning unit. The table shows how the analysis begins by extracting the text unit and condensed meaning units in order to code, generate a category and, finally, create a theme. According to the latent analysis, all codes, categories and themes are interpreted. The original Swedish text is placed below the English in the table.
Table 1. Analysis of Isabel’s answer regarding her perceptions of translanguaging homework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning unit</th>
<th>Condensed meaning unit</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[<em>the children</em>] do not need mother tongue (.)\ they need not (.)\ what do parents at home then? they [<em>the children</em>] born here in this country</td>
<td>not need mother tongue what do parents do at home then? born in this country</td>
<td>The mother tongue is not needed</td>
<td>Significance of translanguaging as unnecessary</td>
<td>Parental perception that TLH is not needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[<em>barnen</em>] behöver inte modersmålspråk (.)\ de behöver inte (.)\ vad gör föräldrar hemma då? de [<em>barnen</em>] född här i den här landet</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modersmålet behövs inte</td>
<td>Vikten av transspråkande som onödigt</td>
<td>Föräldrarnas uppfattning att transspråkande läxor inte behövs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Isabel’s statement shows that she finds it unnecessary for her children to work with TLH. By saying that her children do not need the mother tongue, she shows her negativity for TLH with the motivation being that her children were born in Sweden. She does not seem to be interested in participating in this kind of homework.

After having analyzed the interviews with the parents and the teachers according to Qualitative Content Analysis, the results from the two groups were compared by focusing on the themes that turned out to be the same from the interviews with the teachers and the parents. The contents of these themes were in turn analyzed through the framework of epistemic (in)justice (Anderson 2012; Fricker 2007) to see whether, when, how, why, by whom and for whom justice or injustice as a knower was rendered, and whether someone was being positioned as or positioning herself as an epistemic subject or not. This was done from an individual perspective, which appears in the findings section. In the discussion section, we will raise the focus and discuss epistemic justice in the context of school as a social institution.

6 Findings

Our findings are presented following our four research questions: the perceptions of teachers and parents regarding homework in general and TLH in particular (RQ 1 and RQ 2), how the parents’ life experiences and the teachers’ expectations inform us about their perceptions regarding TLH
(RQ 3), and how TLH seems to promote epistemic justice or not for migrant parents in the context of their children’s schooling (RQ 4). The first two RQs are answered in section 6.1. RQ 3 is answered in section 6.2, and RQ 4 is answered throughout the chapter.

6.1 Teachers’ and parents’ perceptions regarding homework in general and TLH in particular

In the following quote, T1 explains that the overall purpose of TLH is to perform schoolwork at home in a way that engages both parents and children using common linguistic resources.

The parents should have insight on what we do in school (.) when they sit with their children and speak first language then it is not so that I should assess the students’ knowledge but I should just get the parents to e also take part in what we do (.) they get insight into the school’s e yes what we do

Föräldrarna ska få insyn på vad vi gör i skolan (.) när de sitter med sina barn och pratar förstaspråk då är det inte så att jag ska bedöma elevernas kunskap utan jag ska bara jag får med föräldrarna till att e också få ta del av det vi gör (.) de får insyn i skolans e ja vad vi gör

T1 emphasizes the integration of the parents in the schoolwork with expressions such as take part and get insights when the parents and children talk together in their first language. As a way of incorporating parents in the education of their children, they are given the opportunity to engage in various sorts of TLH with them. In the following paragraphs, we revise the various types of homework teachers send home from the different angles they may be intended to cover. T1 points to the fact that the children learn better when they have talked to their parents about their homework.

[*Translanguaging homework] makes the child come back and remember it or has a better understanding by having heard it from its parents (.) then without thinking they still talk about these concepts at home so then one comes to school and […] my goal and purpose is that they should be able to [...]use these concepts in some context and in school

[*Transspråkande läxa] gör att barnet kommer tillbaka och kommer ihåg det eller har bättre förståelse genom att fått höra det från sina föräldrar (.) då utan att tänka så pratar de ändå om de här begreppen hemma så e då kommer man till skolan och […] mitt mål och syfte är ju att de ska kunna […] använda de här begreppen i något sammanhang och i skolan
In the quote above, T1 declares that the children return to school, remember and understand better if they have talked about the homework with their parents. Then the students can use the concepts in various contexts, which is T1’s intention. By giving this kind of TLH, whereby students and parents have the opportunity to use their linguistic resources, translate into and discuss concepts in a language that is well known to the parents, we see an epistemic injustice that might be avoided by those parents who do not speak the dominating language of schooling, i.e., Swedish. One of the parents, Hadya, explains in her interview that she enjoys doing TLH, because her son can learn words in the mother tongue.

Sometimes they get text from here [*from school] and then teachers they said it is parents homework so they want me to sit with my son and translate the language from X-language to Swedish or vice versa […] I think it’s a lot of fun so students can also know a few words about home language.

It is clear from the quote that Hadya appreciates this kind of homework very much, as it allows her to work together with her son, and he can learn words in her mother tongue. Seen from the theory of epistemic (in)justice (Fricker 2007), she can be said to be given the role as an epistemic subject. However, all parents do not understand the words that are asked to be translated into their mother tongues and thus have to find some kind of solution on their own. Gladys, for instance, explains in the example below that this can be remedied through the help of digital tools, when the interviewer asked her if she could help her children with homework in both the mother tongue and in Swedish.

Yes in Swedish too (.)
although I do not understand sometimes but I also ([(laughing)]) sometimes I do not understand so I google Google translate so I understand what they say (.) I find from Google

Ja på svenska också (.) även om jag inte förstår ibland men jag också ((skrattar)) ibland jag förstår inte så jag googlar Google translate så jag fattar vad dom säger(.) hittar jag från Google

Gladys shows that she is interested in helping her children with TLH when she says “we use all languages we know” during the interview. The quote shows that digital tools can then be helpful for her and construct her as an epistemic subject. Gladys finds it to be crucial for her daughter to maintain
her first language, as the language is important for keeping in touch with her relatives.

My daughter (.) before she comes [to Sweden] good x-language but now sometimes she does not understand much (.) she also do not talk much (.) I have to force her (.) before she talks (.) even if she understands when I talk but not at all (.) she just English [...] but they understand for instance when we went to X-country (.) last year we went (.) last summer we go home (.) but mom nor understands I cannot speak English so she must speak X-language with them we stayed for a month (.) they mix together (.) if I was not at home they had to dare to talk to mom

Min dotter (.) innan hon kommer [till Sverige] bra x-språk men nu ibland hon förstår inte mycket (.) hon pratar också inte mycket (.) jag måste tvinga henne (.) innan hon pratar även om hon förstår när jag pratar men inte alls (.) hon bara engelska [...] men de förstår till exempel när vi gick till X-land förra år (.) förra sommaren vi åkt (.) vi åka hem (.) men mamma förstår också inte det (.) kan inte prata engelska så hon måste prata x-språk med dom vi stanna en månad (.) dom blandar tillsammans (.) om jag var inte hemma då måste våga prata med min mamma

During her interview, Gladys thus shows that she does not feel obligated only to Swedish and the mother tongue when working with TLH, a fact that is highlighted by T1 in an interview where she reports that parents sometimes ask her what to do, as they do not use the mother tongue at home.

So usually I answer all languages are welcome (.) what language do you want to choose

Så brukar jag svara alla språk är välkomna (.) vad vill ni välja för språk

However, it is generally known that some migrant parents have not attended school at all, or for just a few years in their home countries (cf., Månsson & Osman 2017). Neither have they attended Swedish compulsory school and are thus not acquainted with the curriculum and the contents of all of the subjects in the Swedish school. This fact can lead to epistemic injustice for the migrant parents. Being aware of this complex scenario, T1 describes how she tackles this issue by giving the parents information with pictures and explanations in relation to the homework.

The parents should not have read a lot of books (.) just bring their experiences explain to the children what is the difference between [*for

Föräldrarna ska inte ha läst på en massa böcker (.) bara komma med sina erfarenheter förklara för barnen vad som är skillnaden mellan [*till exempel] en kanal
The quote shows that the teacher strives to give the parents the opportunity to help their children with the homework without specific prior knowledge. The teacher does this by evening out the circumstances for doing homework together in all families and, in our view, by trying to construct all the parents as epistemic subjects in front of their children. Despite the teachers’ attempts to facilitate the situation, all parents may not be able to help their children with the homework, as in the case of Kajal, who finds even these explanations too hard to understand and asks a sibling for help with the homework.

Int: When they have homework (.) do you help them with homework? […]
Kaj: I can speak (.) I cannot write
Int: when you do homework?
Kaj: yes
Int: do you explain in the mother tongue?
Kaj: mean you say mother tongue and Swedish?
Int: yes mother tongue and Swedish
Kaj: no (.) if it is that difficult say to his sister you come help her (.) my son helps his sister (.) so so say to him so come help her
Int: yes […] but can you explain?
Kaj: no it is not like that

Int: När dom har läxor (.) hjälper du dom med läxor? […]
Kaj: jag kan tala (.) jag kan inte skriva
Int: när du gör läxor?
Kaj: ja
Int: förklarar du på moderstålet?
Kaj: menar du säger moderstålet och svenska?
Int: ja moderstålet och svenska
Kaj: nej (.) om det är så svårt säger till hans syster du komma och hjälpa henne (.) min son hjälper sin syster (.) så så säger till honom så kom och hjälp henne
Int: ja […] men kan du förklara?
Kaj: nej det är inte så ((skrattar))
While talking about TLH, Kajal tells the interviewer that she cannot read or write in her mother tongue, a language that has a writing system different from that of Swedish. Therefore, she cannot get help from digital tools, like Gladys. Instead, Kajal hands the homework to her son so he can help his sister.

Int: What do you think about homework that your daughter gets?
Zah: my daughter much better if she has homework […]
Int: does she need any help with the homework?
Zah: no she goes to eh (.)
House of roses go the Red Cross

Zahra thus tells that she finds help for her daughter at a place called The House of roses or at the Red Cross, where volunteers help students of migrant backgrounds with their homework. The fact that not all migrant parents can help their children with their homework, not even homework of a translanguaging nature, may be seen as epistemic injustice, but since the parents play a role in finding the best solutions for their children, they may also be regarded as epistemic subjects.

In the account above, we have focused on TLH in relation to the parents’ writing and reading abilities. Some homework demands such abilities, but the teachers also consider having parents of different backgrounds and with different language skills to be a complex situation. According to T1, she always tries to get to know the parents before starting to give her students TLH. She also has to deal with students referring to their parents’ lack of writing ability. In the quote below, T1 describes how she tackles such instances by placing responsibility on the students.

Some [*students] say that they [*the parents] cannot write in the first language (.)
but [*I say] write in Swedish then (. ) you can speak Swedish (. ) they can say it in their first language (. ) so there is nothing (. ) tell the parents what you have done and then it is you who write (. ) it is your task not theirs

Vissa [*elever] säger att dom [*föräldrarna] kan inte skriva på förstaspråket (. ) men [*jag säger] skriv på svenska då (. ) du kan svenska (. ) dom kan säga det på sitt förstaspråk (. ) så det är ingenting (. ) berätta för föräldrarna vad du gjort och så är det du som skriver (. ) det är din uppgift inte deras
The quote shows that T1 does not consider parents not being able to read or write as a problem, and she tells the students that it is their responsibility to find solutions, and their task to do the writing.

Even though language barriers may be an obstacle for homework, according to the teachers, TLH can highlight parents’ experiences and results in talk in the mother tongue at home. T1 says:

And then the parents do not need to have read a lot of books (.) just bring their experiences when the child hears it from his own parents or like this at home, it becomes a context that makes the child consolidate theory as well […] as when they come home, it becomes a well word from mother a word from the child like this (.) so together they sit and discuss (.) okay so I send it in Swedish (.) explained and but I still want them to sit and talk about it (.) in their first language

Och då behöver föräldrarna inte ha läst på en massa böcker (.) bara komma med sina erfarenheter när barnet får höra det från sina egna föräldrar eller liksom så här hemma så blir det ett sammanhang som gör att barnet befäster teori också […] som så när de kommer hem så blir det ett jamen ord från mamma ett ord från barnet så här (.) så tillsammans sitter dom och diskuterar (.) okej så skickar jag det på svenska (.) förklarat och men jag vill ändå att de sitter och pratar om det (.) på sitt förstaspråk

Both teachers highlight that TLH raises the parents up as knowledgeable persons in the eyes of themselves and in the eyes of their children.

[* TLH] lift them (.) I mean towards the child (.) then they are knowledgeable […] they sit with their parents (.) where parents have this parenting role also in Sweden also in Swedish school (T1)

[* Transspråkande läxor] lyfter dom (.) asså gentemot barnet (.) så är dom kunniga […] dom sitter med sina föräldrar (.) där föräldrar har den här föräldraskapsrollen även i Sverige även i svensk skola (T1)

[…] so that they feel that they are competent homeworkers as well even if they cannot help them with the theoretical (T2)

[...] så att dom känner att dom är kompetenta läxläsare liksom även om dom inte kan hjälpa dom med det teoretiska (T2)
According to the quotes above, the parents can be viewed as epistemic subjects by the teachers’ work with TLH, when they are using all their linguistic resources.

Hadya provides an example of TLH in her interview as she discusses the parents’ experiences.

Sometimes it is about well for example what your mother has worked in your home country or it consists (a) a thing

Ibland det handlar om alltså till exempel vad din mamma har jobbat i ditt hemland eller det handlar (en) en sak

This kind of homework provides Hadya with the opportunity to share her experiences from her home country and from prior work with her son, rendering her as an epistemic subject in front of him.

As stated before, the teachers in the interviews enable migrant parents to work in their mother tongues with TLH. Four of the interviewed parents did not express objections to this type of homework, though it sometimes resulted in difficulty. For the fifth interviewed parent, Isabel, it might not always be helpful that the homework can be performed in a common mother tongue. She reported in her interview that when she talks to her children in her own mother tongue, they answer back in English, since the family has a history of prior migration through an English-speaking country.

At home try to speak X-language (.) they understand but they don’t speak in it that much (.) here they speak Swedish very well (.) but for the most speak English

Hemma försöker att prata x-språk (.) de förstår men de pratar inte så mycket (.) här pratar de jätte bra svenska (.) men pratar mest engelska

The quote shows that Isabel believes that all of her children have the ability to understand her mother tongue, but that they mainly talk in English and Swedish. Therefore, in those cases in which parents and children do not systematically use the same language at home, TLH may instead lead to epistemic injustice for the parents. As Isabel recalls her own time in school, she goes on to explain how her own mother encouraged her to not limit herself to only one language:

If we needed (.) we could get help with our languages (.) but I did not get (.) because of my mother was a teacher in the same school (.) that is why she pushed I and my siblings to learn various languages (.) we would not

Om vi behövde (.) vi skulle få hjälp med våra språk (.) men jag fick inte (.) för att min mamma var lärare i samma skola (.) därför hon pushade jag och mina syskon för att vi skulle lära oss olika språk (.) vi skulle inte stanna bara på vårt språk för att
Isabel’s quote shows that she was raised as a multilingual person with no obligation to stick to her mother tongue. As her children do not answer back in her mother tongue, she does not appreciate working with TLH. Besides, she considers that the use of the mother tongue is unnecessary for her children, as they are being raised and educated in Sweden (see Table 1). If the teacher assumes that all parents are willing to use their mother tongues when helping their children with their schoolwork and ignore that some parents might prefer using other languages, epistemic injustice might occur. However, the teachers explain in their interview that their aim is for the parents and children to use any language of their choice while doing TLH, which Isabel does not seem to have been informed of.

In sum, the findings show that RQ1 – What perceptions do teachers have about TLH as a means to support parental collaboration in their children's schoolwork – is answered in the interviews by evidence of the teachers’ perceptions of TLH. They see it as a good means for supporting parental collaboration in their children’s schoolwork and that the children learn better by collaborating with their parents, using all their linguistic resources while doing TLH.

The findings of RQ2 – What perceptions do migrant parents have about TLH as a means to support their collaboration in their children's schoolwork – present different perceptions among the participating parents. One of them seems to appreciate TLH, which provides an opportunity to collaborate with her son and for him to learn more words in their mother tongue. Other parents seem to perceive TLH as important too, but they have to use digital tools for translation, or must arrange for help with the TLH from siblings or voluntary organizations if they cannot help their children themselves. However, as we have seen in one case, not all parents seem to appreciate TLH. In such cases, TLH appears to not lead to increased collaboration between home and school.

The findings of RQ4 – How does TLH seem to promote epistemic justice for migrant parents in the context of their children’s schooling – show that the teachers seem to have the ambition to construct the parents as important knowers in front of their children, which would mean epistemic justice for them. Nevertheless, those who cannot help their children with their TLH themselves might suffer from epistemic injustice if they are unable to seek help by other means. In the case of the teachers, the findings show that they try to even out the possibilities for all parents to help their children with the homework, thus aiming to create epistemic justice, but some parents seem to not be helped regardless. However, these parents avoid suffering from epistemic injustice and instead position themselves as epistemic subjects by taking control over the situation and finding the best solutions for
themselves and their children. The teachers also tell the children that TLH can be done using any linguistic resources, which would entail epistemic justice for all the multilingual parents. This information does not seem to reach all parents, however, thus rendering epistemic injustice instead.

6.2 How do parents’ life experiences and the teachers’ expectations inform us about their perceptions regarding homework in general and translanguaging homework?

When parents are asked about their experiences with Swedish schooling and their own time in school in their home country, their answers revolve around common responsibilities, the time between the homework being assigned and when it is due, school demands and homework load.

Regarding common responsibilities, when working around TLH on values (see Figure 1), the teachers stress that the children’s behavior in school and in relation to school is also a matter for the parents. In the interview, Gladys tells of her own obligations, which she also regards as rights, according to her words. The quote below is in English, since the interview was flexible in terms of switching between English and Swedish to make the questions and discussion comprehensible to the parent.

Int: What rights do you have as a parent?
Gla: as I say (.) I guess the rights to help them to come to school (.) to do their läxa [*homework] (.) to obey the teachers (.) not to do anything herself
Int: yes (.) what are your duties towards the school (.) something you think?
Gla: my greatest duty is to bring my children to school and makes you also be ready to help the teachers
Int: mm
Gla: because if you bring your children to school and they are not cooperating it’s bad

Gladys highlights that her responsibility in collaboration with the school is to ensure that her children obey the teachers and do their homework, an activity that she participates in with all her language resources, according to other discussions in the interview. This can be seen as the teachers giving her the opportunity to collaborate as an epistemic subject.

Another type of common responsibility that is implemented through TLH has to do with, on the one hand, the time of onset for sending home homework and, on the other hand, the time at which the results of these activities must be submitted.

Concerning the onset for sending homework, T1 explains how she waits for some time to assign homework when she has a new class:

I do not send homework directly at the beginning of
Jag skickar inte läxa direkt i början av läsåret (.) är det ny
the school year (.) is it a new class I usually wait so that I have really created that relationship with both the children and parents so that I have a little (.) amen a little (.) so I know a little about the parents’ situation (.) how long they have been in Sweden (.) if they have a little (.) what they have with them

T1’s action is thus to wait on assigning homework until she has formed relations with both the students and the parents and knows a little about their situation. We interpret this as the teacher aiming to create an equal starting point and, possibly, to enable the necessary conditions for epistemic justice to occur. The moratorium for giving homework is visible in the perceptions of two of the interviewed parents. Hadya, for example, seems a little bit worried by this:

This thing that they do not come with homework every day (.) I was a little worried (.) why do not you have homework as our homeland

Hadya is a trained teacher of language in her former home country, and she worked there for one year before having her own children. It is clear from the interview with her that she has a positive perception of TLH. She says that she used to worry when her son did not bring homework in general home from the Swedish school. In her home country, she reports having had to sit with her other child and help her with her homework for three to four hours every day. In this sense, the homework load she experienced in her home country seems to have functioned as an indicator of things performing normally. That is why she was worried when the homework from her son’s class in Sweden did not materialize. However, when her son finally did begin bringing TLH home, she reports enjoying the collaboration between her and her son.

Sometimes they get text from here [*from school] and then teachers they said it is parents’ homework so they want me to sit with my son and translate the language from X-language to Swedish or vice versa I think it’s a lot

Den här saken att dom kommer inte med läxa varje dag (.) jag var lite orolig (.) varför har ni inte läxa som vårat hemland

Ibland de hämtar text härfrån [*från skolan] och så lärare de sa att det är föräldrar läxa så de vill att jag ska sitta med min son och översätta språket från x-språk jag tycker det är jätteroligt så elever kan också veta lite ord
of fun so students can also know a few words about home language

The example above shows that Hadya became an epistemic subject in her son’s eyes when she could teach him words in the mother tongue.

Another parent, Isabell, expresses a concern similar to that of Hadya regarding homework load. In her case, the problem is not related to her children not having gotten any homework, but to her children not getting enough homework. She seems to think that the workload that her children get in school is too low compared to the demands she was used to from previous schools outside of Sweden.

All homework the children need to work on every day (.) when they come from school home (.) it was really tough

A relatively high workload seems to be well appreciated by Isabell. In her view, doing homework and delivering it on time creates a sense of responsibility among students. As a result, and according to her, homework generates actions on the part of the parents and the students that eventually lead students to obtain good results. Thus, when reflecting about the sense of responsibility that the school could push students to develop, she starts talking about school qualifications. She appears to perceive students not being pushed enough by the school to improve their results.

It doesn’t matter [*for the children] it is an A or an E (.) the most important [*for them] is to pass (.) they don’t think of getting A (.) I will fight to get A (.) in our time we fought for an A (.) in our time it should be an A because we get a present at the end of the year

In Isabell’s view, it is important that the educational system encourage children to improve their qualifications. Not getting enough boost might be interpreted in Isabell’s case as a circumstance leading to epistemic injustice for her, since she thinks that her children would not get the necessary positive results to succeed in school, and later on in life, if not prompted to make the effort and work harder.

With regard to the deadlines for the homework, the teachers in this study find it hard to get back homework in general and TLH at all. Sometimes just one or two students hand it in on time. T1 describes how she calls some
parents to remind them, but also how she uses lists to check on and remind the pupils. She tries to engage children and parents to get them to see the importance of the homework coming back to school ready and done, by displaying TLH on a bulletin board in the classroom. This can also be seen by parents when visiting school at parent meetings or thematic evenings that are held at the school every term (see Figure 2).

Even though some parents may find that the way the teachers handle deadlines to be positive, others seem to find it difficult arguing that the teachers do not send a clear message about the importance of obeying deadlines. In Isabell’s words:

I cannot push xxx at home (.) here they do not push her (.) the same homework will come again next week on Tuesday (.) plus another homework and it will continue like this

Jag kan inte trycka hemma på xxx (.) här de trycker inte på henne (.) samma läxa ska komma igen nästa vecka på tisdag (.) plus en läxa till och det ska fortsätta så

In Isabell’s view, the teachers should be more demanding, as this would give the parents the chance to exert more control over their own children at home. Unclear goals and loose homework deadlines seem to disempower her in her parental role. We interpret this as her thinking that she is prevented from displaying her entire potentiality, which can be regarded as epistemic injustice.

In sum, the findings of RQ3 – What do the parents’ life experiences and the teachers’ expectations inform us about how homework in general and TLH in particular are perceived – show that some of the difficulties that can arise when working with TLH are closely related to the different expectations of both parents and teachers.

Even though almost all parents in this study do appreciate TLH, some parents express concerns about homework in general. These concerns seem to stem from what they report as life and school experiences, and revolve around the current time of onset that teachers send home homework, the school demands and the homework load. Their thoughts about these aspects seem to affect how they currently perceive more specific types of homework, such as TLH. In the case of the teachers, they express concerns about not getting back the homework on time, even though they constantly remind both parents and children. The aforementioned action of the teacher to wait on assigning homework in order to give an equal starting point is not always creating epistemic justice, according to the heterogeneous expectations parents bring with them.

To sum up the findings of RQ4 – How does TLH seem to promote epistemic justice for migrant parents in the context of their children’s schooling – they are quite heterogeneous and vary according to the parents’
current expectations and earlier life and school experiences. In general, and even though the number of parents interviewed is quite limited, their answers point in three directions. TLH might either be perceived as a positive strategy that supports their chances to collaborate as epistemic subjects, or it may be perceived as an act that obscures parents’ opportunities to feel to be a part of collaboration between home and school. Moreover, TLH might be ignored altogether by the parents who do not use their mother tongue at home.

7 Discussion
The aim of this study was to examine if and how working with homework in general and TLH can support collaboration between home and school and create epistemic justice, i.e., for the migrant parents to be regarded as knowers. The outcomes of the study show that the participating teachers regard translanguaging pedagogy to contribute to the linguistic and knowledge development of children, which has also been shown in prior research by García (2009) and Svensson (2017). This counteracts the findings of Cunningham (2017, 2019), who found the opposite among primary teachers in Great Britain. For the teachers in our study, working with translanguaging pedagogy also includes working with TLH, which is seen as a means for the teachers to support parental collaboration. Some parents in the study seem to perceive this positively, as do the teachers in Svensson’s study (2020). However, in those cases in which the mother tongues of the parents are not systematically used by their children, TLH is perceived as an obstacle, which is in line with prior research by Ckaintarzi et al. (2015).

According to our results, TLH does not always seem to facilitate the collaboration between home and school, even though the teachers’ intention to overcome linguistic barriers seems to be behind this type of homework. Linguistic obstacles in the collaboration between migrant parents and Swedish school have also been witnessed of by, e.g., Bouakaz and Persson (2007), Bunar (2015), Dahlstedt (2018), and Månsson and Osman (2017). Their results point in the same direction as ours, in the sense that a mismatch between the parents’ and the teachers’ expectations serve as an obstacle to their collaboration. However, as Curdt-Christiansen (2013), Svensson and Svensson (2022) and Wilson (2020) stress, TLH might not only be perceived as a challenge, but also as an opportunity to enhance collaboration between the home and the school. Besides, the life and school experiences of the parents seem, according to our results, to be of importance when considering working with homework in general, but especially, when working with TLH. It is well known that many migrant parents have a history of forced migration, war and trauma, which may keep them from helping their children with their homework through their mother tongues. This could lead to epistemic injustice, but to avoid that, some parents
arrange for help with their children’s homework, and thus position themselves as epistemic subjects instead, not in the sense of being knowers of specific disciplinary school contents, but in the sense of having the knowledge to solve situations in a new country.

Implications for teaching that can be drawn from our study show that for the collaboration between parents of migrant background and school to work as an appropriate strategy to improve the students’ school performances and enhance home-school collaboration, cautions must be taken. Both sides need to listen sensitively to each other. In our study, the decision by the teachers to work with TLH for such reasons seems to mean well but can become both an opportunity and an obstacle for the participating parents, especially if the parents are not acquainted with the Swedish school or disprefer using their mother tongues.

A conclusion that we draw from this study is that it is important that the school inform the migrant parents early and thoroughly about the Swedish school system. Interpreters are needed in parent-teacher meetings and in parent-teacher-student conferences. It could also be of help if written information about the school and the Swedish school system were offered in different languages, both physically and on the web, for migrant parents to be able to support their children’s schooling in the best possible way. These types of measures have been pointed out by other researchers recently (see, e.g., Piller 2021).

Our method of analysis in this study was Qualitative Content Analyses (Graneheim et al. 2017), which was applied on the participants’ interview answers to find salient themes in the contents. The method helped us to systematically go through significant meaning units, condense them, code them, categorize them, and converge them into themes. Then, these themes were put under the lens of the theoretical framework of epistemic (in)justice (Fricker 2007). This framework enabled us to analyze the data to find out what might lie behind the answers of both parents and teachers. Through the epistemic (in)justice framework, we were able to uncover who was seen as an epistemic subject and who was able to act as one. The framework also enabled us to evaluate those strategies that position different individuals as epistemic subjects, which can be of help to anticipate how to plan and implement TLH and thus avoid epistemic injustice. These gained insights would not have been possible to reach without applying concepts such as epistemic (in)justice or epistemic subject in this study. However, in order to find out whether epistemic justice is actually at place, it would be necessary to conduct a study of observational nature. This framework has not, to the best of our knowledge, been used previously to analyze teachers’ and parents’ work with TLH, a gap which we have now contributed to fill.

While the focus of this study was on the perceptions of the teachers and parents, who turned out to be females only, a suggestion for further research would be to expand the group of participating parents to include male
parents as well. Prior research by, for instance, Kramvig (2007) has pointed out how important fathers are to their children’s school success. Furthermore, the students’ perceptions on homework, TLH and the collaboration between school and their homes could also be subjects of further research.

As a conclusion, stemming from our results, it can be said that TLH is of value for supporting collaboration between school and migrant parents. However, reciprocal sensitive listening to each other from both parts is important, especially from the teachers’ side, since they have the obligation to collaborate with parents, according to the Swedish National Curriculum (SNAE 2018). Thus, the teachers are the ones to open channels for communication between home and school in their role as gatekeepers, which can be done if pedagogical translanguaging is used in the classrooms. TLH gives migrant parents chances to see what is done in their children’s school. In doing so, they gain insights into the Swedish school system, which in the long run may enhance their opportunities to be considered as and to act as epistemic subjects.
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