BOĞAZİÇİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ EĞİTİM DERGİSİ
2022, VOL. 39-1, SPECIAL ISSUE
https://doi.org/10.52597/buje.1227214

Language Teachers' Responses to Multilingual Classrooms: A Linguistic Ideological Perspective

Işıl Erduyan[a], Sezen Bektaş[b] and Hakan Şentürk[c]

Abstract

The present study aims to explore English language teachers' (ELTs) responses to a set of activities regarding multilingualism on an online Continuous Professional Development (CPD) course platform. The CPD was developed in the framework of the Erasmus+ Project, ENRICH (English as a Lingua Franca Practices for Inclusive Multilingual Classrooms) designed to cater for in-service ELTs across five countries and composed of various online modules. Our focus in this paper is on the Multilingualism module of the course that was completed by 15 ELTs working in state schools in Turkey. Taking a linguistic ideological perspective on discourse, we analyzed responses given to two questions embedded in one of the activities in the Multilingualism in the Classroom section of the module regarding teachers' observations of students' awareness of multilingualism in their classrooms. As our findings suggest, Turkish ELTs' responses can be analyzed in three groups each of which suggests a different understanding of multilingualism: a) immigrant minority multilingualism, b) regional minority multilingualism, and c) multilingualism as a result of foreign language instruction at school. We depict in our analyses how each of these categories are intertwined with teachers' linguistic ideologies.

Keywords: multilingualism, language ideologies, teacher education

Article info

Received: 28.06.2021
Revised: 15.10.2021
Accepted: 20.12.2021
Published online: 31.12.2022

Introduction

English language classrooms across the globe have become increasingly multilingual in the past few decades in line with accelerated migration flows due to globalization. In the context of Europe, this changing demographic profile has resulted in the addition of migrant and refugee languages to the already existing groups of regional and minority languages[d] that are spoken by students and/or their parents. Extra and Gorter (2001; 2008) and Extra and Yağmur (2013) analyze the first group as *immigrant minority* (IM) languages and the second group as *regional minority* (RM) languages, a distinction that we will adopt in this paper. Besides these languages, students in European schools also learn a range of additional languages at school that are mostly spoken in Europe. While European schools have had a long tradition of foreign language instruction, the 'mother

[a] *Boğaziçi University, Department of Foreign Language Education, isil.erduyan@boun.edu.tr*
ORCID: 0000-0002-0542-3788
[b] *Boğaziçi University, Department of Foreign Language Education, sezen.bektas@boun.edu.tr*
ORCID: 0000-0003-4686-232X
[c] *Yeditepe University, Department of Foreign Language Education, hakan.sentrk@boun.edu.tr*
ORCID: 0000-0003-3951-2305
[d] https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2016/589794/EPRS_BRI(2016)589794_EN.pdf

tongue plus two languages' principle with the incentive of the European Council in 2002 has been reflected in curricula widely across the continent. In this picture, English has become the most widely offered foreign language in European schools and thus an indispensable part of students' multilingual repertoires.

The present paper analyzes linguistic ideologies that English language teachers (ELTs) in Turkey hold about these three types of multilingualism in their increasingly diverse classrooms in state schools. Drawing on data collected within the framework of the Continuous Professional Development (CPD) component of the Erasmus+ project, ENRICH (English as a Lingua Franca Practices for Inclusive Multilingual Classrooms), we investigate how ELTs describe their take on multilingualism in response to two questions on the "Multilingualism in the Classroom" section of the online module "Multilingualism." Below, we first present a brief review of literature on linguistic ideologies and on multilingual classroom pedagogies respectively. We will then move onto reporting on the study and its findings.

Literature Review

Language Ideologies

Since its inception as a field of study in applied linguistics, language ideologies have been defined and studied in a variety of ways (e.g. Silverstein, 1998; Woolard, 1998). As Kroskrity's (2010) definition suggests, language ideologies are "beliefs, feelings, and conceptions about language structure and use which often index the political economic interests of individual speakers, ethnic and other groups, and nation states" (p. 192). Based on this definition, Kroskrity (2010, pp. 195-201) identifies four layers that shape our understanding of language ideologies. In the first place, language ideologies are productions of societies and they serve to confirm what is believed to be good, ethical or aesthetic about language or discourse in each society. Secondly, language ideologies are plural. Each society can be divided into smaller communities along socioeconomic, ethnic, political, gender lines, among others, and each can create its own set of norms and values about languages. Thirdly, Kroskrity (2010) argues, local language ideologies are not known by all members in a community. Some ideologies need to be identified in practice based on members' identities and relationships. Finally, language ideologies are diverse in a community in line with the diversity in sociocultural practices, but the community members tend to work together to produce these ideologies.

Against this background, research focusing on language classrooms have depicted numerous findings related to the workings of language ideologies. One important finding is the mediating role of the teacher in the dissemination of language ideologies in the classroom. Teachers' role in this context can involve the mediation of larger discourses in the classroom such as monolingual ideologies. For instance, Razfar (2005) demonstrates how language ideologies in multilingual ELL classrooms permeate the teacher-student talk through the simple conversational strategy of repair. Likewise,

Showstack (2017) depicts how stance-taking in interaction can illuminate the language ideologies in play in heritage language classrooms. Language ideologies in these studies are shown to be brought into the classroom through teachers' role in mediating the classroom pedagogies. At the policy level, Henderson (2017) depicts how teachers' ideologies are affected by local policies, and the hegemonic and counter-hegemonic discourses that come with them. Spotti (2011), for instance, focuses on modernist linguistic ideologies in play in immigrant minority classrooms in the Netherlands and depicts the complexity of multilingualism through looking at it as polycentric semiotic performances.

In sum, language ideologies in classrooms are entrenched within multiplicity of factors that include language policies and societal discourses. In the case of multilingual classroom realities, the pedagogies designed and implemented by schools and teachers play an important role in these factors, which we will turn to next.

Multilingual Classroom Pedagogies

Faced with the unprecedented diversity particularly brought by IM students into their classrooms, ELTs today are required to adopt and implement new pedagogies in their teaching. As Alisaari et al. (2019) state, far from being sufficient in meeting modern classrooms' multilingual realities, traditional pedagogies "strengthen monolingual ideologies and tend to identify acceptable and unacceptable languages for multilingualism" (p. 49). To this end, the European Commission calls for the development of multilingual pedagogies to be employed in schools (EC, 2018). The need for multilingual pedagogies has long been acknowledged by multilingualism scholars. It is widely suggested that the entire linguistic repertoire of a multilingual learner should be taken into consideration as a resource for more effective teaching (e.g., Cenoz & Gorter, 2015; Cummins, 2019; Garcia & Wei, 2014). Of particular importance, equipped with English, an international lingua franca, ELTs are considered to have an advantage in incorporating their students' multilingualism in teaching. That is, they can utilize English as a mediation tool to narrow the gap between their learners' different languages, thus enhancing the appreciation of multilingual practices in their classes (Hufeisen & Neuner, 2004).

Teachers play a crucial role in fostering multilingualism and implementing multilingual pedagogies in their classrooms (De Angelis, 2011; Haukas, 2016); and their decisions and actions exert a strong influence on their learners (Lasagabaster & Huguet, 2007). As Henderson (2017) puts it, despite being closely related to numerous factors, what is happening in the classroom depends on the teachers who "are at the methodological heart of language policy implementation" (p. 21). Since the pedagogical decisions and actions of teachers are largely shaped by their awareness, beliefs, and attitudes (Borg, 2006), it is essential to uncover their understanding of and beliefs about multilingualism and multilingual pedagogies in order to study it more comprehensively.

Indeed, there has been a growing interest in exploring the views of teachers, working in either ELT or other disciplines, on their learners' multilingualism and/or the use of multilingual pedagogies in the classroom. A number of studies in this realm have been conducted with teachers working in various European countries, like Italy, UK, and Austria (De Angelis, 2011), France (Young, 2014), Poland (Otwinowska, 2014), Norway (Burner & Carlsen, 2019; Haukas, 2016), Finland (Illman & Pietila, 2018), Sweden (Lundberg, 2019), and Spain (Portoles & Marti, 2020). These studies reveal that teachers' beliefs and practices are still rooted in traditional pedagogies; even if they acknowledge the potential of multilingualism for their learners, they still believe that languages should be kept and taught separately. They also illuminate the prevalence of English-only policies in the teachers' practices (cf. Otwinowska, 2017). In Inbar-Lourie's (2010) words, embracing monolingual pedagogies "equates 'good teaching' with exclusive or nearly exclusive target language use" (p. 351). Thus, it seems to be clear that students' linguistic repertoires mostly represent a silent entity against the linguistic diversity in today's classrooms. In addition, these findings point to a gap between policy- and research-based recommendations and their implementation in teaching. That is, although findings obtained from recent research on multilingualism suggest numerous benefits of the incorporation of learners' whole linguistic repertoire in teaching, they have been only partially transferred into real classrooms.

Despite yielding common findings, the studies cited above put forth different explanations while discussing their results, thus highlighting the uniqueness of each country's sociolinguistic context. Each country has different education systems, different constellations of languages, and different policies regarding the use of these languages in teaching. The ENRICH project provides insights into the uniqueness of local contexts by focusing on ELTs from five different countries. In this particular paper, we aim to explore ELTs' language ideologies and their pedagogical thinking about their students' multilingualism in the Turkish educational context. In the next section, we continue with detailing our methodology.

Methodology

The data analyzed in this paper were obtained from Turkish ELTs who participated in an Erasmus+ project, ENRICH (English as a Lingua Franca Practices for Inclusive Multilingual Classrooms), between February 2020 and June 2020. The main objective of ENRICH was to train English language teachers (ELTs) across 5 European countries (Greece, Italy, Norway, Portugal, and Turkey) on how to integrate ELF practices into multilingual classrooms. One component of the project is an online Continuous Professional Development (CPD) course that partners developed and implemented. The course employed competence-oriented, collaborative, reflective and Internet-based learning tasks as well as mentoring support. This Moodle-based course consists of the following sections: (1) Introduction (2) Learning English (3) Using English (4) Teaching English (5) Final Assignment and (6) Course Evaluation. Sections 2, 3, and 4 are further divided into topics that the teachers access separately. For instance, section 3, Using English, is further divided as Key issues, English as a Lingua Franca, Defining

ELF, ELF Discourse, Communication Strategies, Multilingualism, Linguistic Diversity, Migration, and Translanguaging.

Each of these topics starts with a short instructional video on theoretical and practical matters related to developing an ELF-aware pedagogy. A series of activities and links to other videos and websites are integrated into the videos. Participants are required to watch these videos and complete the activities on the Moodle platform where the videos are embedded. Participants are also free to navigate across the activities and complete them on their own time without following a certain order. Video lectures consist of multiple activities and the participants are not required to complete all the activities in one topic. However, to complete a module successfully, one activity in each topic is compulsory. At the end of the course, the participating teachers are expected to complete a final assignment where they are asked to plan and execute an ELF-aware lesson.

In the present study, we focus solely on Turkish ELTs as course participants and analyze their responses to a single topic within the section Using English, Multilingualism. This topic, as well, required the participants to watch an instructional video and complete four activities integrated into it. We provide a list of these activities in the Appendix. As there was no order in completing the course components, participants' submission of responses to the activities in this section spanned two months (March 7, 2020 - May 8, 2020). The Turkish ELTs completed all four activities integrated in the topic of Multilingualism. For the purposes of this paper, we have analyzed the responses given to the fourth activity in the Multilingualism section of our CPD, titled "Multilingualism in the Classroom." This activity poses two open-ended questions to the teachers:

1. Can you find some real-life examples from your own classes that are evidence of students' awareness of their own multilingualism?

2. How can these examples be understood with reference to the way that you teach?

15 out of 31 participants completed this activity by answering both of these questions. The answers ranged between 45 to 215 words in length, after discarding one with a one-sentence response. Table 1 presents information on participant demographics.

Table 1

Participant Demographic Information (n = 31)

Gender	#	Age	#	Qualification	#	Years of Teaching Experience	#	Type of School	#
Female	25	26-35	20	BA	22	2-5	3	Secondary	14
Male	5	36-45	10	MA	8	6-10	16	High School	15
Other	1	46-55	1	Other	1	11-20	7	Adult Education Center	1
						21 or more	5	Science and Art	1

After compiling the entries in response to the two questions from the teachers, we took a grounded approach in coding our data (cf. Saldaña, 2015). However, as we particularly aimed to inquire three types of multilingualism as constructs, we employed initial coding that would help us with beginning analytic decisions with respect to these categories in the data set. Based on these initial codes, we further coded the themes and categories in the accounts that showed recurring patterns and that "are more abstract, general, and simultaneously analytically incisive than many initial codes that they subsume" (Charmaz & Belgrave, 2012, p. 356). To this end, for instance, we coded specific references to languages separately (e.g. Kurdish) and constructed the theme RM based on these codes. Below in the analyses, we depict the three categories that we set out to investigate and that emerged in our data set.

Findings

Regional Minority (RM) Multilingualism in the Classroom

As in the case of Europe, where the designation of some languages as RM languages and the national languages as official languages dates back to the nation-state formation of the 19th century (Extra & Gorter, 2001), in Turkey, too, this hierarchy started with the foundation of the Turkish Republic as a nation-state in 1923. Since then, all non-Turkish languages spoken by minorities have been kept outside the mainstream education system. Yağmur (2001) estimates the number of these languages to be 42 based on the Ethnologue website. Although minority languages in Turkey cannot be regionally compartmentalized today due to internal migration and rapid urbanization, the regional distinction in their origins is retained.

To this end, some responses that we gathered from the teachers with respect to the multilingualism in their classrooms focused on the RM languages in Turkey as spoken by students in the ELF classrooms. As most of the teachers teach in urban schools in big cities, they randomly have students from non-Turkish speaking home environments in their classrooms. In this respect, some of the teachers have occasionally referred to the second most-widely spoken language in Turkey, Kurdish. As in other large cities, İstanbul, too has a large Kurdish population who have continuously migrated from the southeast of Turkey since the 1950s.

Mr. Mehmet's[e] account below[f] indicates the natural role that Kurdish plays in the social interactions involving multilingual Kurdish students in his English classroom. It also emphasizes the mediator role that students play in his interactions with the parents:

> A couple of times, when I greeted my classes in English/Turkish, some of my Kurdish students greeted me in Kurdish in return. Also, some of the parents

[e] All teacher names used in this paper are pseudonyms.
[f] The original content and format of the posts are retained as they are.

> don't speak Turkish well and in parents' meeting, my students becomes a mediator between the teachers and their parents. (Mehmet, March 8, 2020)

Remarkably, Mr. Mehmet's account positions Kurdish as a neutral language against the background of the polarized history of this largest minority language in Turkey. The example that he gives reveals how his students seem to find a discursive space in his classroom and comfortably use Kurdish in greetings.

In some responses, meanwhile, Kurdish as a minority language is juxtaposed against the immigrant languages in Turkey in terms of their representation in the classroom. An interesting account that we have obtained here comes from a teacher who compared the case of Kurdish students with that of Russian or Syrian students:

> After the earthquake in Van in 2011, I had Kurdish students. The parents didn't know Turkish so the students help us to communicate. Now, I have multilingual students. Their mothers are usually from Russia or sometimes both parents are from Syria or Iraq but the parents can speak Turkish as well. In classes, they teach us some simple words especially greetings and numbers. (Merve, April 18, 2020)

In her account, as in the case of Mehmet above, Ms. Merve takes a neutral stance against her Kurdish-speaking students and their parents, and contrasts her Kurdish speaking students with the IM students. Remarkably, she uses the term 'multilinguals' for the IM students in her class, but not for Kurdish speaking English learners. Her account further reveals a welcoming attitude towards IM students' languages in her class.

The accounts we have retrieved with respect to the regional minority languages of Turkey as represented in the classroom do not indicate a strong ideological stance. While this might be related to the context and the question that is posed, it might also be because the teachers refrained from being vocal in a highly stigmatized language like Kurdish. What is more remarkable in these accounts is the comparison of a regional minority language with an immigrant minority language. Despite excluding the former from the multilingualism definition, the teachers seem to use multilingualism for the latter.

Immigrant Multilingualism in the Classroom

The IM languages in the case of Turkey refer to languages spoken by immigrants of the last four decades. As İçduygu and Aksel (2012) describe, irregular migration from neighboring countries to Turkey started in the late 1970s with Iranian immigrants escaping the 1979 revolution in Iran. This was followed by the massive migration of the 1980s in the form of asylum seekers from Iraq and Bulgaria, and concurrently, economically motivated migration from the Soviet Republics. In the last ten years, Syrians have become an indispensable part of the IM profile in Turkey. Therefore, the RM multilingualism and IM multilingualism in Turkey show distinct characteristics.

As their responses to the forum questions suggest, most of the teachers in this study use multilingualism to describe students with immigrant backgrounds. When they need to state the lack of IM students in their classrooms, they can comfortably use the designation monolingual:

> My students are monolingual. We don't have any immigrant students in our school. So I won't be able to give an example (...) But if it can be an example, apart from English, my students have German classes, and they rarely use German words speaking English. I stop and ask them to continue in English. (Aslı, March 17, 2020)

Ms. Aslı's account points to a few lines of thought that are connected to discourses on multilingualism in Turkey. In the first place, she clearly equates multilingualism with immigrant students and because there are not any immigrants in her school, she designates her students as monolinguals. The inherent multilingualism of the Turkish society is not a factor in Ms. Aslı's rationalization. Besides, Ms. Aslı seems to exclude foreign languages taught in her school, English and German, from her understanding of multilingualism, as well. Although, like all other participants, she has been teaching at later grade levels to students with at least six years of experience of learning English or other foreign languages at school, she seems to designate EFL students clearly as monolinguals. Her final statement further depicts how she subscribes to monolingual ideologies by separating these two languages.

While saving the designation 'multilingual' for IM students, the teachers often refer to the most recent migrant groups to Turkey: Syrian, Iraqis, and Arabs. Drawing on some real-life examples, teachers appear to be welcoming to the multilinguality of these students in their classes. Following is what Ms. Nisa has to say in response to the two questions posed in Activity 4:

> I work at the science and art center. There are two immigrant students in our institution (one from Iraq and one from Syria). My students are in the 4th and 5th grades. Their level of English is basic. My Iraqi student is in 5th grade and has a lot of interest foreign language. She is willing to communicate with her friends and attend the lesson. In one of the English activities, she first finished and said in her own language "hooray, I succeeded, I was the first to finish" then she looked at us and said in English "look at me, I one," Of course the English sentence was not correct, but she could easily tell us the situation with her screaming, body language and facial expression. Such examples show that I positively welcome multilingualism in a foreign language. Although the number of multilanguage students in a foreign language is low, we do not fool as a class when they use it and try to understand what it means. He sees this as a source of motivation for other students in the class. Because they see they can communicate with the foreigner without having to use the correct language in English. (Nisa, March 25, 2020)

As she also writes, Ms. Nisa's account reveals her positive attitude towards multilingualism in her classes, again using the term exclusively for IM students. She seems to embrace the multilingualism of these students by providing space for them to express themselves not only multilingually but multimodally, as well. In addition, she sees this as an opportunity for her Turkish students to communicate in English without feeling the need to speak correctly. Her use of the descriptor "foreigner" further attests to her egalitarian perspective on the immigrant students in her class, putting them all in the same category with other foreign people in Turkey. Her perspective on the embracing role of English is also similar to Ms. Ayşe's account above.

Adopting a similarly positive attitude, Ms. Yasemin explains how she is open to their code-mixing in her classes, and gives the following example:

> I am from Turkey and some of my students are from Syria and their mother tongue is Arabic and religion is Islam. When they speak in English, they often prefer saying the word 'İnşallah' in the middle of the conversation which is used in both Arabic and Turkish instead of using alternative similar expressions in English. I do not interrupt their conversation as long as they feel comfortable during their speech. (Yasemin, March 7, 2020)

Contrary to Ms. Aslı's perspective in the first excerpt above, Ms. Yasemin seems to be comfortable with students' code-mixing in the classroom. Framing it as a matter of students' cultural background, she exemplifies the Turkish/Arabic *inşallah* that is inserted in Syrian students' discourse in English. She seems to see this cognate use as a natural part of classroom interaction.

Teachers further commented on the shared culture between Turkish and Arabic students in the EFL classes. Here, too, language enters the picture:

> In multilingual classrooms students especially Arabs tend to talk about their culture, food and cities. As Turkey borrowed a lot of Arabic words in the past they build positive attitude towards culture and the language. In break time I see students form a group and speak their own language which is very new thing in our school. (Burcu, March 27, 2020)

Ms. Burcu takes a positive view on Arab students' bringing their cultural background into the classroom. Referring to her Turkish students by third person plural, she recounts on providing a space for them in class to discover their Arab peers' cultures and language. Remarkably, as a state-school employee who has been used to monolingual interactions among students at her school, Ms. Burcu also writes about her observation of Arabic-speaking students speaking Arabic among themselves in the break times as a new scene at school.

Ms. Burcu further writes about a Karaoke Contest that she organized to raise awareness about the multilingualism in her class:

> As I see that different countries students like to be respected, known by others, I organized a 'Karaoke Contest' and Arab students joined with their own language not English. Besides there were groups formed by half Turkish half Arab singing Arabic. I sometimes see that students wrote Turkish names and mottos in Arabic alphabet on white board which makes a positive transition between cultures. Thus I believe that in multilingual classes including all and blending them makes a positive effect. (Burcu, March 27, 2020)

Ms. Burcu's account of the Karaoke contest, in which Arab students sang in Arabic and some Turkish students joined them, and her observation of Turkish students practicing Arabic script on the board all attest to her positive attitude towards immigrant students' multilingualism in the classroom as much as the space she provides for the transition between cultures, as she names it. In her final evaluative statement, she summarizes this all as "including all and blending them," which she believes has a positive effect on the students.

The linguistic ideologies toward immigrant multilingualism in the EFL classrooms as participants' accounts reveal pose a contrast to the stigmatization of recently arrived immigrants in Turkey. The participating teachers all seem to be accommodating immigrant students' multilingual repertoires in their lessons and they seem to be aware of the construction of multilingualism in classroom discourse. Their flexible attitude to code-mixing that their Arabic- speaking students commit in the lessons is likely to be a part of their approach to code-mixing in general that they allow in their classes heavily populated by Turkish students, as well. Their references to the commonalities between Arabic and Turkish further attest to their positive attitudes towards Arabic as spoken by their students.

As these accounts also suggest, teachers designate multilingualism as a separate category from what they experience in their EFL classrooms. Although their Turkish students are learning two foreign languages at school, they still consider these students as monolinguals. They seem to save the term multilingual for immigrant students who are raised as multilinguals and contrast them with their students raised as monolingual Turkish speakers. These accounts indicate how the teachers subscribe to the traditional discourses of monolingualism and separation of languages. But they also indicate teachers' subscription to the traditional discourses of multilingualism that are based on the premise of equal competence across the languages in one's multilingual repertoire.

Multilingualism as a Result of Foreign Language Instruction at School

Finally, we analyze multilingualism as a result of foreign language instruction in Turkish schools as emerged in our data with respect to ELTs' understanding of ML, as well. In this case, the multilingual repertoires usually include foreign languages such as German and French as taught regularly in some state schools in Turkey. Multilingualism for the teachers in our study concerns the multiple foreign languages that students are

taught at school. In Turkey, alongside English, German and French, -recently Spanish, as well- have been traditionally taught in state schools. In this quote, Mr. Emre directly draws on this variety:

> Well in my case, most teenagers are also interested in many languages and take courses like German, French and Spanish as additional languages. This helps me to make comparisons among them, which adds up to their metalinguistic awareness. Thus, they are able to be easily familiar with various linguistic and cultural contexts. I find multilingualism motivating for my lessons as I can give examples from their third or fourth languages, depending on the grades. Also, they use English as a means to bridge the gap when their French or German fails at naturalistic interactions. (Emre, April 23, 2020)

Different than the rest of the answers, Mr. Emre's take on multilingualism centers on the metalinguistic awareness that it might raise among his students, which he thinks will ease students' familiarity with other "linguistic and cultural contexts." Mr. Emre further suggests a role that English plays that has not been remarked by any other participant: that of bridging the gap in students' interactions in the other foreign languages that they use.

Mr. Emre's accounts subscribe to linguistic ideologies that place Western/European languages at an equal footing, without assuming any hierarchical relationship among them. Influential in this perspective is the fact that all of these languages are known to be taught at schools in Turkey as foreign languages. Remarkably, ELF, for Mr. Emre does not seem to have a special or more powerful status than the other foreign languages.

Discussion

The multilingualism module of the ENRICH CPD course makes a distinction between RM and IM languages while designating English as an indispensable part of the ML repertoires. Still, our findings suggest that Turkish ELTs approach multilingualism in conventional ways, saving it for immigrant minorities' depictions exclusively. Remarkably, they also exclude RMs from this picture, and do not consider RM students in their English classes as multilinguals, either. This suggests, despite participating in a CPD module, teachers' conceptualizations of multilingualism are still bound by traditional ideologies about languages and speakers that have longstanding political motivations. While excluding RM multilingualism from the picture, they seem to subscribe to monolingual ideologies in Turkey in which RM languages have not been depicted as part of the multilingual repertoires at all. Their focus being on IM languages as spoken by their immigrant students further depicts how they save this definition exclusively for the more recently arrived migrants in their classrooms. Against this background, the only exception to this dichotomy seems to be about multilingualism as induced by foreign language instruction at schools. A possible interpretation of this finding might be the relatively more neutral assignment of the term multilingualism in

English to a construct that has not been named in Turkish at all, the multilingualism as induced by the foreign language instruction at schools.

Teaching much more linguistically diverse classrooms today than in the past, ELTs show heightened awareness of multilingualism. This study has showcased how this awareness makes itself visible in the case of responses to a CPD program. However, further research from the actual classrooms can enlighten how teachers shape multilingual pedagogies in their classrooms. In the case of countries like Turkey where RM and IM students can be found in the same classrooms, ELTs' pedagogical differences might be very informative for further research and policy making.

References

Alisaari, J., Heikkola, L. M., Commins, N., & Acquah, E. O. (2019). Monolingual ideologies confronting multilingual realities. Finnish teachers' beliefs about linguistic diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 80*, 48-58.

Borg, S. (2006). The distinctive characteristics of foreign language teachers. *LanguageTeaching Research, 10*(1), 3-31.

Burner, T. & Carlsen, C. (2019). Teacher qualifications, perceptions and practices concerning multilingualism at a school for newly arrived students in Norway. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1-15.

Cenoz, J. & Gorter, D. (Eds.). (2015). *Multilingual education*. Cambridge University Press.

Charmaz, K., & Belgrave, L. L. (2012). Qualitative interviewing and grounded theory analysis. In J. F. Gubrium, J. A. Holstein, A. B. Marvasti, & K. D. McKinney (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft* (pp. 347-365).

Cummins, J. (2019). The emergence of translanguaging pedagogy: A dialogue between theory and practice. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research, 9*(1), 19-35.

De Angelis, G. (2011). Teachers' beliefs about the role of prior language knowledge in learning and how these influence teaching practices. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 8*(3), 216-234.

European Commission. (2018). *Rethinking language education in schools*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Extra. G. & Gorter, D. (2001). *The other languages of Europe*. Multilingual Matters.

Extra, G. & Gorter, D. (2008). *Multilingual Europe: Facts and Policies*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Extra, G., & Yağmur, K. (2013). Language-rich Europe: Key findings and discussion. *European Journal of Language Policy, 5*, 116-127.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave MacMillan.

Haukås, Å. (2016). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 13*(1), 1-18.

Henderson, K. I. (2017). Teacher language ideologies mediating classroom-level language policy in the implementation of dual language bilingual education. *Linguistics and Education, 42*, 21-33.

Hornberger, N. (2007). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. In G. Ofelia & C. Baker (Eds). *Bilingual education. An introductory reader* (pp. 177–194). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Hufeisen, B. & Neuner, G. (2004). *The plurilingualism project: Tertiary language learning: German after English*. Council of Europe.

İçduygu, A. & Aksel, D. B. (2012). *Türkiye'de düzensiz göç*. Uluslararası Göç Örgütü Türkiye.

Illman, V. & Pietilä, P. (2018). Multilingualism as a resource in the foreign language classroom. *ELT Journal, 72*(3), 237-248.

Inbar-Lourie, O. (2010). English only? The linguistic choices of teachers of young EFL learners. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 14*(3), 351-367.

Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 157-181.

Kroskrity, P. V. (2010). Language ideologies–Evolving perspectives. *Society and Language Use, 7*(3), 192-205.

Lasagabaster, D. & Huguet, Á. (2007). *Multilingualism in European bilingual contexts. Language use and attitudes*. Multilingual Matters.

Lundberg, A. (2019). Teachers' viewpoints about an educational reform concerning multilingualism in German-speaking Switzerland. *Learning and Instruction, 64*, 101-244.

Otwinowska, A. (2014). Does multilingualism influence plurilingual awareness of Polish teachers of English?. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 11*(1), 97-119.

Otwinowska, A. (2017). English teachers' language awareness: Away with the monolingual bias?. *Language Awareness, 26*(4), 304-324.

Portolés, L. & Martí, O. (2020). Teachers' beliefs about multilingual pedagogies and the role of initial training. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 17*(2), 248-264.

Razfar, A. (2005). Language ideologies in practice: Repair and classroom discourse. *Linguistics and Education*, *16*(4), 404-424.

Saldaña, J. (2015). *The Coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage Publications.

Showstack, R. E. (2017). Stancetaking and language ideologies in heritage language learner classroom discourse. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *16*(5), 271-284.

Silverstein, M. (1998). Contemporary transformations of local linguistic communities. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *27*, 401-26.

Spotti, M. (2011). Modernist language ideologies, indexicalities and identities: Looking at the multilingual classroom through a post-Fishmanian lens. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *2*, 29-50.

Woolard, K.A. (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B.B. Schieffelin, K.A. Woolard, & P.V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 317–332). Oxford University Press.

Yağmur, K. (2001). Turkish and other languages in Turkey. In G. Extra & D. Gorter (Eds.), *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Young, A. S. (2014). Unpacking teachers' language ideologies: Attitudes, beliefs, and practiced language policies in schools in Alsace, France. *Language Awareness*, *23*(1-2), 157-171.

Dil Öğretmenlerinin Çokdilli Sınıflara Yaklaşımları: Dilsel İdeolojik Bir Perspektif

Öz

Bu çalışma, çevrimiçi bir Sürekli Mesleki Gelişim (SMG) kurs platformunda çok dillilik ile ilgili bir dizi etkinliğe İngilizce öğretmenlerinin verdiği yanıtları araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Sözkonusu SMG, beş ülkede hizmet içi İngilizce öğretmenlerine hitap etmek üzere tasarlanan ve çeşitli çevrimiçi modüllerden oluşan ENRICH (Ortak Dil Olarak İngilizce'nin Kapsayıcı Çokdilli Sınıflarda Kullanım Pratikleri) adlı Erasmus+ Projesi çerçevesinde geliştirilmiştir. Bu makalenin odak noktası, Türkiye'deki devlet okullarında çalışan 15 İngilizce öğretmeni tarafından tamamlanan kursun Çokdillilik modülünün Sınıfta Çokdillilik bölümündeki etkinliklerden biri içinde yer alan iki soruya öğretmenlerin verdikleri yanıtlardır. Söylem analizi uygulanarak ele alınan bu yanıtlarda öğretmenlerin öğrencilerinin çok dillilik farkındalığına ilişkin gözlemleri dilbilimsel-ideolojik bir bakış açısıyla incelenmiştir. Ortaya çıkan bulgular, Türk İngilizce öğretmenlerinin yanıtlarını her biri farklı birer çokdillilik anlayışını öneren üç gruba ayırmayı işaret eder: a) göçmen azınlık çokdilliliği, b) bölgesel azınlık çokdilliliği, c) İngilizce dışındaki çokdillilik ve d) okuldaki yabancı dil eğitimin bir sonucu olarak çok dillilik. Analizlerde bu kategorilerin her birinin öğretmenlerin dilsel ideolojileriyle nasıl iç içe geçtiğini gösterilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çokdillilik, dil ideolojileri, öğretmen eğitimi

Appendix

FACULTY INVENTORY (Chickering & Gamson, 1987)	**STUDENT INVENTORY** (Oberst, 1995)
Student-Faculty Contact	
tSFC1 I encourage students to ask questions.	sSFC3 I question my professor when I disagree with what is said.
tSFC2 I share my past experiences, attitudes, and values with students.	sSFC5 I find out about my professors- what else they teach, areas of expertise, and other areas of interest.
tSFC4 I serve as a mentor or informal advisor to students.	sSFC1 I look for opportunities to develop informal relationships with one or more of my professors.
Cooperation among Students	
tCAS1 I ask students to tell each other about their interests and backgrounds.	sCAS1 I try to get to know my classmates.
tCAS2 I encourage my students to prepare together for classes or exams.	sCAS2 I study with other students in my courses.
tCAS4 I ask my students to explain difficult ideas to each other.	sCAS4 I assist other students when I they ask me for help.
tCAS5 I encourage my students to praise each other for their accomplishments.	sCAS5 I tell other students when they have done good work.
Active Learning	
tAL2 I ask my students to summarize similarities and differences among different mathematical methods.	sAL2 I question the assumptions of the materials in my courses.
tAL3 I ask my students to relate outside events or activities to the topics covered in my courses.	sAL3 I try to relate outside events or activities to the subject covered in my courses.
tAL4 I give my students concrete, real-life situations to analyze.	sAL4 I seek real world experiences to supplement my courses.
Prompt Feedback	
tPF5 I give my students written comments on their strengths and weaknesses on exams and papers.	sPF1 When I get feedback from my professors on exams, papers, or other class work, I review their responses to assess my strengths and weaknesses.
tPF4 I ask my students to schedule conferences with me to discuss their progress.	sPF2 I talk over feedback with my professors as soon as possible if anything is not clear.
Time Management	
tTM1 I expect my students to complete their assignments promptly.	sTM1 I complete my assignments promptly.
tTM2 I underscore the importance of regular work, steady application, sound self-pacing, and scheduling.	sTM4 I maintain a regular study schedule to keep up with my classes.
tTM3 I explain to my students the consequences of non-attendance.	sTM5 I attend class on a regular basis.
tTM5 I meet with students who fall behind to discuss their study habits, schedules, and other commitments.	sTM6 I confer with my professor if I am concerned about keeping up with a particular class.
High Expectations	
tHE2 I emphasize the importance of holding high standards for academic achievement.	sHE5 I consciously think about the trade-offs between the things I do to learn and the things I do to achieve a grade.
tHE3 I make clear my expectations orally and in writing at the beginning of each course.	sHE2 I try to get clear information about my instructors' goals.
Respect Diversity	
tRD2 I discourage snide remarks, sarcasm, kidding, and other behaviors that embarrass other students.	sRD1 I try not to embarrass other students
tRD3 I use diverse teaching activities to address a broad spectrum of students.	sRD2 I consciously adjust my learning habits to accommodate the teaching practices of my professors.
tRD4 I integrate new knowledge about underrepresented populations into my courses.	sRD5 I support my professors when they include the content of their courses the contributions or interests of underrepresened populations.

Note. Oberst provided permission to reprint.