

**Assessing teachers' attitudes towards multilingualism:
A study with teachers working in different schools
in Frankfurt**

A Thesis as Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in

Moving Cultures – Transcultural Encounters

Johann Wolfgang Goethe-University Frankfurt am Main



by

Hyaе-Yeon Won

First supervisor: Prof. Dr. Jacopo Torregrossa

Second supervisor: Dr. Irene Caloi

September 25, 2020

Statutory Declaration

I herewith declare that I have composed the present thesis myself and without use of any other than the cited sources and aids. Sentences or parts of sentences quoted literally are marked as such; other references with regard to the statement and scope are indicated by full details of the publications concerned. The thesis in the same or similar form has not been submitted to any examination body and has not been published. This thesis was not yet, even in part, used in another examination or as a course performance. Furthermore I declare that the submitted written (bound) copies of the present thesis and the version submitted on a data carrier are consistent with each other in contents.

Place, Date: Frankfurt, September 25, 2020

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Won', is written above a horizontal line.

Signature

Table of Contents

Statutory Declaration	2
Table of Contents	3
List of Tables	6
Abstract	7
1. Introduction	8
1.1 The context of Frankfurt, a multilingual global city	8
1.2 Issues around migration in Frankfurt, then and now	9
1.3 The aim of this study	13
1.4 Structure of the study	14
2. Theoretical Background	15
2.1 Language and language ideologies	15
2.2 Monolingual standard language ideologies	16
2.3 Linguistic repertoire and identity	18
2.4 Separate and flexible bilingualism	21
2.5 Translanguaging in Education	25
2.6 Teachers' attitudes towards multilingualism	28
3. Methodology	31
3.1 Research Questions	31
3.2 Research Method	34
3.3 Selecting Respondents	36
3.3.1 Aylin, English and French teacher in a Gymnasium	38
3.3.2 Michael who teachers in an international school	39
3.3.3 Sarah, a Spanish and sports teacher at a Gesamtschule	41
3.3.4 Lee, head teacher in a Korean complementary school	42

3.4 Hypotheses	42
4. Development of questionnaire	47
4.1 Understanding of language	47
4.2 Awareness of the importance of multilingualism	49
4.3 Teachers' perceived role	54
4.4 Teachers' teaching practices	55
4.5 Factors of influence	60
5. Analysis of results	61
5.1 Reverse scoring questions	61
5.2 Comparing responses according to separate and flexible bilingualism	61
5.2.1 Knowledge and Perception	62
5.2.2 Teaching Practice	65
5.2.3 Factors of influence	67
5.3 Correlation between knowledge and practice	67
5.3.1 High correlation	68
5.3.2 Mixed correlation	69
5.3.3 Gap between theory and practice	70
5.4 Individual content analysis	72
5.4.1 The case of Aylin: "My head teacher does not agree with me"	73
5.4.2 The case of Michael: "I am a monolingual English speaking teacher"	74
5.4.3 The case of Sarah: "Multilingualism helps but German is more important"	75
5.4.4 The case of Lee: "There are almost no students who struggle with Korean"	78
6. Discussion	81
6.1 Summary of key findings in relation to hypotheses	81

6.2 Implications	83
6.3 Limitations	85
7. Conclusion	86
References.....	90
Appendix	98

List of Tables

Table 1 Teachers' profile	44
Table 2 Danielson's (1996) framework for teaching	56
Table 3 Quality criteria for language-sensitive teaching	56
Table 4 Respondents' scores for parts (1) ~ (4)	61
Table 5 Understanding of language	62
Table 6 Awareness of the importance of multilingualism	63
Table 7 Perceived teachers' role	64
Table 8 Teaching practices	65
Table 9 Factors of influence	67
Table 10 Benefits of maintaining the home language	68
Table 11 Use of home language among students	68
Table 12 Standard school language	69
Table 13 Use of a different language than the school language during pair or group work	70
Table 14 Teachers' own language practice	70
Table 15 Use of a language different from the school language in whole class work	71

Abstract

Frankfurt as a global international city is home to transcultural people with diverse linguistic biographies and migration backgrounds. As teachers exert significant influence on the language practice of their students and their awareness of self and others, it is crucial to examine the language ideologies and attitudes on multilingualism of teachers who work in different schools in Frankfurt. The online questionnaire was selected as the data collection method for the combination of qualitative and quantitative analysis where teachers were asked to select their opinion on statements that were designed to represent concurring viewpoints of separate bilingualism and flexible bilingualism. The study builds on existing evidence that multiple factors dynamically shape teachers' attitudes towards multilingualism. School-level support and cooperation between educational institutions seems to be necessary to establish horizontal continuity and help students benefit from language-sensitive didactic methods, such as translanguaging.

Keywords: language ideologies; attitudes; teachers; multilingualism; translanguaging; linguistic repertoire; transculturality; separate and flexible bilingualism

Zusammenfassung

Frankfurt als internationale Weltstadt ist Heimat transkultureller Menschen mit unterschiedlichen Sprachbiographien und Migrationshintergründen. Da Lehrerinnen und Lehrer erheblichen Einfluss auf die Sprachpraxis ihrer Schülerinnen und Schüler und deren Selbst- und Fremdwahrnehmung ausüben, ist es von entscheidender Bedeutung, die Sprachideologien und Einstellungen zur Mehrsprachigkeit von Lehrerinnen und Lehrern, die an verschiedenen Schulen in Frankfurt arbeiten, zu untersuchen. Der Online-Fragebogen wurde als Datenerhebungsmethode für die Kombination von qualitativer und quantitativer Analyse ausgewählt, zu der die Lehrerinnen und Lehrer ihre Meinung zu Aussagen auszuwählen, die konkurrierende Standpunkte der separaten Zweisprachigkeit und der flexiblen Zweisprachigkeit darstellen sollten. Die Studie baut auf vorhandenen Befunden auf, dass mehrere Faktoren die Einstellung der Lehrkräfte zur Mehrsprachigkeit dynamisch beeinflussen. Die Unterstützung auf schulischer Ebene und die Zusammenarbeit zwischen Bildungseinrichtungen scheint notwendig zu sein, um horizontale Kontinuität herzustellen und Schülerinnen und Schülern zu helfen von sprachsensitiven didaktischen Methoden wie z.B. Translanguaging zu profitieren.

1. Introduction

1.1 The context of Frankfurt, a multilingual global city

Frankfurt am Main, a city characterized by economic prosperity, social dynamics, mobility, immigration, heterogeneity and continuous changes, is the only city recognized as the 'Global City' in Germany (Magistrat der Stadt Frankfurt, 2010, p. 2). From 2000 the number of inhabitants in Frankfurt grew about 100.000 and reached 708.543 in 2014. The population projection by the civil office in Frankfurt predicted a population of 840.000 until 2040 (Magistrat der Stadt Frankfurt, 2017, p. 28). This growth is largely due to immigrants mostly from countries of the European Union. Up until now Frankfurt has grown in its demographic diversity so much that more than 90% of the world's 194 nationalities are represented in this international city, and that it became the city with the biggest proportion of foreigners in Germany. (Magistrat der Stadt Frankfurt, 2017, p. 184). In fact, the percentage of Frankfurters with a foreign passport increased 28% within 6 years from 2009 to 2015. According to calculations from the residents' register, the percentage of Frankfurt's inhabitants with a migration background took up 51.2% in 2015. For children younger than 6 years, more than three fourth have a migration background and more than 30 per cent of the new residents have a foreign passport (Magistrat der Stadt Frankfurt, 2015, p. 10). In some of the city's elementary schools, 80% of the children come from families where another language than German is spoken at home. Under these conditions, individual plurilingualism has become a widespread reality. Although there is no systematic documentation of Frankfurt's language diversity, its dynamics can be assumed in correlation to the diversification of the immigrants' countries of origin, where "there is hardly any country of the world that is *not* represented by immigrants in Germany" (Gogolin et al., 2013, p. 5). Concerning this, Erfurt (2016) remarked that

linguistic diversity in cities, schools, families is not really a new phenomenon and, from a historical point of view, it is linked to the nature of urbanization processes, rural exodus and immigration, often also to the consequences of internal and external colonialism. However, the novelty of these processes lies in the dynamics and variety within which the linguistic landscape and cultural practices have evolved over the last twenty years. Anthropologist Steven Vertovec developed the concept of superdiversity in 2007, which is also applicable, as of 2010, to the politics of language

and culture of integration of the city of Frankfurt (see Integrationskonzept, 2010). (p. 592-593, my translation)

The term 'superdiversity' denotes the new dimensions of migratory, social, cultural and linguistic diversity that emerged with globalization after the Cold war in the early 1990s. As noted, the officials of Frankfurt adopted this term to describe the city in their 'Integrations- und Diversitätskonzept', an official document released by the Frankfurter commission of multicultural issues ("Amt für multikulturelle Angelegenheiten") to express its acknowledgement of the city's recent changes and to present 55 goals and 60 action plans across diverse social sectors to cope with the superdiverse reality.

1.2 Issues around migration in Frankfurt, then and now

According to Karpf (2013), Frankfurt has experienced diverse forms of immigration since the 12th and 13th century until now. In the early centuries, foreigners came together around the market in Frankfurt to exchange goods. As the German nation-state was established and young migrant workers joined the wave of industrialization in the 19th century, awareness of the German national identity began to be fostered by the state. After the Second World War, people who fled from former East Germany (DDR) constituted a significant part in the Frankfurter population. From 1960 on, massive migration groups settled in Frankfurt as 'guest workers' and their families sought reunion and a long-term stay in the city. As a consequence, providing equal chances of education for children from migrant families started to present an urgent social problem, whereas additional groups of migrants continued to settle down in the city: global poverty migration mostly from Asian countries in the 1970s and asylum seeking migration in the 1980s. In the 1990s Germany was reunified and exchanges between European countries became livelier than ever along with globalization. Politicians in Frankfurt played a leading role to consider migration as a social chance and to establish institutions in the city council to cope with cross-sectional tasks related to migration. In particular, the foundation of 'Amt für multikulturelle Angelegenheiten' in a separate department in 1989 is evaluated as the paradigm shift in the politics of integration (Cohn-Bendit & Schmid 1992, p. 286; in Magistrat der Stadt Frankfurt, 2015, p. 13). Since then, new groups of migrants appeared from A8 countries (Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia), and people from Bulgaria and Rumania

making use of the unrestricted mobility since 2011. It is since the same year, 2011, that there is a clear growth in the Frankfurter population of foreign nationalities like Rumania, Hungary, Korea, Spain and Bulgaria (in order of highest growth rate of migrants from 2012 to 2013) (Magistrat der Stadt Frankfurt, 2015, p. 24). These diverse migration patterns have formed the history of the city Frankfurt in the last decades.

Meanwhile, the number of people with a 'foreign' nationality has decreased. Instead, children or grandchildren born in Germany under immigrant parents are referred to as "Germans with a migration background" (Karpf, 2013, p. 258). Experts are still trying to find the "appropriate word which is still missing to describe this development" of the city (Magistrat der Stadt Frankfurt, p. 3) in the face of the complex individual migration histories. However, experts report that there are things that stayed the same throughout history: the economic need for new employees and workers, dominant political representation of elderly local inhabitants and the skeptical perspective on new immigrants (Karpf, 2013, p. 258). According to a public survey conducted from 2011 to 2012, both groups of people with the German and foreign citizenship think that what is most important to live together in Frankfurt are: the competence in the German language, improvement of educational opportunities and improvement of job and vocational training opportunities (Magistrat der Stadt Frankfurt, 2015, pp. 25-27). Meanwhile, competence in foreign languages and multilingualism was considered relatively less important (pp. 25-27). The survey results confirm that the public is well-aware of the importance of equal educational opportunities and academic achievement to participate in the socioeconomic realm. Indeed, a successful high school graduation is directly related to an individual's career and social mobility in Germany. However, privileging the competence in German over other languages, without taking into account individual needs of people still prevails even though it has been criticized for being based on the assimilationist belief for the last decade (cf. Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2017, p. 42).

In fact, the increase in the number of students with a migration background has been continuously mentioned as a major challenge to the German educational system since the 1970s. Moreover, there still exists the negative connotation of students with a migration background with broken German and inferior academic skills. Numerous studies since in the middle of the 1990s up until now continuously highlight the academic failure of migrant students compared to their German peers and have contributed to foster a deficit view on migrant students. These studies speak for lower school scores (Dirim & Mecheril, 2010, p.

122), higher rate of school dropouts and fall into academically lower school branches (Stadt Frankfurt am Main – Amt für multikulturelle Angelegenheiten, 2012, pp. 86-92; Stadt Frankfurt am Main – Dezernat für Bildung und Frauen, 2012: p. 7f.; p. 129; in Stadt Frankfurt am Main, 2015, p.103). Statistics in 2013 revealed that among the students who fail to complete their high school, the number of students with a foreign nationality or migration background is more than double the number of students who do not have a migration background (cf. Statistisches Jahrbuch Frankfurt am Main 2013, p. 57; in Stadt Frankfurt am Main, 2015, p. 102). The report describes that in percentage, this makes up 68.9% of 196 students who did not qualify for graduation in a 'Hauptschule' which is academically the lowest school branch in Germany (p 102). The study mentions that although there was a slight increase in the number of high school graduates with a migration background from 2000 to 2011, when compared to those without a migration background, it does not even reach half of the number of their German peers. Such a comparison between students with and without a migration background is a typical discourse in magazines, newspapers and other media in Germany. Politically, several action plans to improve students' competence in German have been developed to cope with this issue, for instance in the form of extra German lessons for pre-school children or 'intensive classes' for newly arrived migrant students. However, researchers have continued to suggest that the problem does not lie in the academic failure or lack of German language knowledge of migrant students but instead on the deficit view on them. For example, Gomolla and Radtke (2010) suggested that the German school system practices an 'indirect discrimination' towards students with a migration background by setting the same linguistic preconditions for them as they do for German students. Dirim and Mecheril (2010) referred to this institutional discrimination as "Illusion der Chancengleichheit" and criticized schools' presumption that all students can speak German like native speakers, the exclusive monolingual instruction in German schools, and the instructional method that ignores the linguistic reality surrounding the students (p. 131). The report by the European Commission (Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2017) confirmed that migrant students' home languages are strictly rejected because they are "seen as a barrier and a deficit across schools in Europe" (p. 42). Especially in Frankfurt, the insistence on monolingual German instruction by educational institutions does not reflect Frankfurt's reality of linguistic heterogeneity, where many companies operate solely in English and multilingual community networks and services (e.g. in Russian, Turkish, etc.) are widely developed (Erfurt, 2016). Additionally, researchers criticize that equaling the proficiency in

German with social integration is based on the assimilationist and monolingual language ideology which dates back to the nation-state building process in the 19th century (Gogolin et al., 2019). In fact, success in school depends on various other factors than students' migration history or first languages. Students' socioeconomic background and familial resources in education as well as the school type, instruction methods, the combination of students within one class, teacher education and institutional discrimination are all relevant factors that are intertwined in a dynamic manner (Magistrat der Stadt Frankfurt, 2015, p. 108). For this reason, social science studies strongly refute the attribution of migration background with low academic performance and criticize such an act as a discriminatory and extremely reductionist approach (p. 108). To exemplify, a class consisting of German students can equally perform academically poorly, given the 'right' combination of conditions in socioeconomic background, the combination of the spoken languages in the classroom, the overall language proficiency, prior subject knowledge etc. (cf. Stanat et al., 2010; Kristen 2008; Baumert et al., 2006; in Magistrat der Stadt Frankfurt, 2015, p. 108).

In the political rhetoric of the European Union, multilingualism is described as an asset and countries are recommended to support individual plurilingualism from early childhood on. The official homepage of the city of Frankfurt states as well, that it offers students a wide variety of educational opportunities in terms of integration and language learning in its 800 institutions for early childhood education and 200 public and private schools (website 'Arbeit, Bildung, Wissenschaft'). Furthermore, in 2016, Amka published a brochure titled 'Mehrsprachigkeit in Kindertagesstätte und Schule' in which multilingualism is stated as "ein Gewinn für alle" (p. 3) and the incorporation of students' prior language knowledge in the classroom is recommended. In the research field, numerous studies have proven the role of students' home language knowledge in their cognitive and academic development and the benefits of bi- and multilingualism have been thematized a lot (Cummins, 2019; García & Li, 2014; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; etc.). Regarding teacher qualification, research continues to point out that teacher training in 'Deutsch als Zweitsprache' (German as second language) should be included in the basic teacher education competences (Köker et al., 2015, p. 104).

Unfortunately, most teachers are not aware of the benefits of transferring previous language learning strategies and cross-linguistic collaboration (Haukås, 2015) which causes students' resources to be wasted and seen as a problem. In this respect, countering the deficit view on multilingual students and raising awareness of the benefits of students' home languages is essential in order to implement multilingual pedagogy in educational institutions. In this respect, many researchers focus on assessing the language ideologies and attitudes of teachers on multilingualism as teachers exert a significant influence on students' language practices in the classroom as the mediators of classroom language policy and the first point of contact for many migrant families (Lundberg, 2019; Young, 2014; De Angelis, 2011; Cummins, 2019; Haukås, 2015; Henderson, 2017).

1.3 The aim of this study

The present study focuses on the development of a research method that explores teachers' language ideologies and attitudes towards multilingualism who work in different schools in Frankfurt, Germany. Following research questions will be addressed:

- (1) What is the teachers' understanding of 'language'?
- (2) To what extent are teachers aware of the importance of multilingualism academically (cognitively) and socially?
- (3) How do teachers perceive their role in the multilingual classroom?
- (4) How are teachers' beliefs and attitudes reflected in their teaching practices?
- (5) What are possible factors that affect teaching practices?

Henderson (2017) stated that in order "[t]o explore language ideologies and language policy in practice, it is equally important to clarify how language and bilingualism are theoretically framed" (p. 2). Therefore, teachers' understanding of language (RQ 1) and their perception of multilingualism (RQ 2) will provide important insights into which theoretical ideas have shaped their belief of multilingual students. How teachers perceive their roles in the multilingual classroom (RQ 3) and other outward factors of influence (RQ 5) will help a multifaceted observation and analysis of teachers' actual teaching practices (RQ 4). These questions will be addressed in the questionnaire developed for teachers and the answers interpreted in relation to teachers' biographical information and their school's context to find out how to support teachers to cope with the multilingual classroom situation.

1.4 Structure of the study

Chapter 2 introduces the theoretical background based on previous researches: the concept history of language ideologies, linguistic repertoire, multilingualism, translanguaging and teachers' attitudes towards translanguaging. The following chapter 3 presents the methodology of the study. Theoretical background of the research questions, research method and the main idea of the questionnaire will be introduced. Examining both teachers' knowledge (perception) and their teaching practice is key to the study since the study aims to find out not only the attitudes of teachers towards multilingualism but which factors influence them. The online questionnaire is given to four respondents who are teachers in different school types in Frankfurt: German public schools (Gymnasium and Gesamtschule¹), English international school and Korean complementary school. All of the schools have different percentages of students with and without a migration background. The context of the school and students are considered influential and important in interpreting teachers' behavior since their actions and shown attitudes don't exist apart from the actual teaching context. Chapter 4 describes the development of the questionnaire items for each research question. Chapter 5 discusses the results based on reverse scoring, in comparison of separate and flexible bilingualism, correlation between teachers' knowledge and practice, and individual content analysis. Chapter 6 presents the summary of the key findings, implications and the limitations of the research, and is followed by the last concluding chapter.

¹ In Germany, "once children complete their primary education, usually around age 10, there are various options for secondary schooling which are decided in the so-called orientation phase (*Orientierungsstufe*) in grades 5 and 6" (Gogolin et al., 2019, p. 564; italics in original). The common types of secondary schools are Hauptschule (secondary general school for grades 5 through 9 or 10), Realschule (more practical secondary school for grades 5 through 10), Gymnasium (more academic secondary school for grades 5 through 12 or 13) and Gesamtschule (comprehensive school for grades 5 through 12 or 13, which combines the Hauptschule, Realschule and Gymnasium). "Young people who have successfully completed the Hauptschule or Realschule are eligible for vocational training, or can transfer to senior high at a Gymnasium or Gesamtschule" (The Federal Government website). Only the "attendance at a *Gymnasium* leads to the *Abitur* certificate which is a requirement for enrollment at a university. Typically, the school certificate is one's 'admission ticket' to a future career: The lower the certificate, the lower the chance of gaining access to vocational training in the 'dual vocational training system' or to other types of upper secondary education" (Gogolin et al., 2019, pp. 564-565; italics in original).

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Language and language ideologies

According to Ricento (2013), “[i]t is virtually impossible to talk about language, and languages, apart from the worlds they inhabit. Although languages can be studied, analyzed, taught, and even cease to be spoken, they are never not embedded in all aspects of social life” (p. 540). Given this, beliefs and feelings about a particular language and its speakers exist in all societies. This holds true regardless of the arbitrariness of these beliefs. Piller (2015) illustrated that commonly held judgements or feelings that are associated with particular dialects or their speakers neither confirm nor reflect any linguistic reality: Still, images about language speakers do not stop to be reproduced by media as if they were facts. Fictitious boundaries between dialects are constructed, while internal homogeneity and external heterogeneity are believed to be true. Piller (2015) came to the conclusion that all named languages are, therefore, “invented label[s] that create[] a particular way of seeing language. The concept of [a particular dialect] – like all language names – is ideologically generated and does not refer to any objectively constituted linguistic reality” (p. 2). The term ‘ideology’ as “the shared framework(s) of social beliefs that organize and coordinate the social interpretations and practices of groups and their members” (Dijk, 1998, p. 8; in Ricento, 2013, p. 528) encompasses the fact that “when frameworks of social beliefs are widely shared in societies, or by groups in society, they tend to be viewed as natural, normal, and commonsense, while alternative frameworks that run counter to widely shared beliefs tend to be viewed as deviant, abnormal, and irrational” (p. 528). Furthermore, “there is no possible absolutely pre-ideological, i.e., zero-order, social semiotic” (Silverstein 1992: 315, in Ricento, 2013, p. 528). In fact, research on the ideological nature of language dates back to the Marxist tradition in Europe. However, in the English speaking tradition, the concept of language ideology was dismissed as “irrational” and “irrelevant to a principled understanding of language and social interaction” until the linguistic anthropologist Michael Silverstein published an essay entitled “Language structure and linguistic ideology” in 1979 (Piller, 2015, p. 2). Silverstein (1979) defined language ideologies as “any sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (p. 193), and highlighted the impact of language ideologies on language structure change and social organization (Piller, 2015, p.3). Following Silverstein’s publication, the

study of language ideologies grew fast as a research field in linguistic anthropology, and began to be considered as the “bridge between linguistic and social theory” that served “not really linguistic but social” purposes (p. 4). As the relation between language and politics gained growing interest in the 1980s, light was shed on the question of how political and social action might be embedded in language structures. Several linguistic anthropologists including Irvine (1989) took up the idea and gave a more sociocultural emphasis to the concept. Irvine defined language ideology as “the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests”. Similarly, Gal (1989) noted that there are both explicit and implicit, often tacit assumptions about language use, which are affected by subject positioning in the political economy, following the Marxist approach to ideology. Kroskrity (2004) defined language ideologies as “beliefs or feelings about languages as used in their social worlds”, taking into account the multiple and contradictory nature of language ideologies (in Henderson, 2017, p .2).

What distinguishes language ideologies from the study of language attitude is that while the latter puts more emphasis on the objective quantitative measurements of people’s reactions to language, the former examines the political, socioeconomic, or personal motivations behind constructed ideologies; in other words, “how speakers’ beliefs and feelings about language are constructed from their experience as social actors in political economic system” (Irvine, 2016, n.p.). Furthermore, Henderson (2017) mentioned the connection between language ideologies and identity: Identities “are imposed on individuals, including students, based on their language performances (Bunyi, 2001; Makoe, 2014)” and language ideologies “mediate how a person can use language to perform a certain identity” (Henderson, 2017, p. 2). In this research, the term ‘attitude’ will be used to encompass teachers’ language ideologies and their practice based on them, or to borrow Henderson’s (2017) word, teachers’ articulated and embodied language ideologies

2.2 Monolingual standard language ideologies

Bourdieu (1991) argued that a political relationship between the official language and nation-state was constructed both in the process of state formation and social reproduction. Especially in the course of development of nation-states in Europe in the eighteenth century,

an official language became an indispensable tool to foster a common national identity in people. Kremnitz (2004) noted:

Der moderne europäische Staat organisiert sich im zunehmenden Maße als Nationalstaat, der in einer einzigen Sprache und Kultur funktioniert (funktionieren will) und versucht, die beiden Kriterien der Kommunikationsgemeinschaft und der staatlichen Zugehörigkeit unauflöslich zu verknüpfen und sie zu den ausschlaggebenden für die kollektiven Identitäten zu machen. (p. 91)

In this process, language, territory and identity were taken “isomorphic” while “the diversity and variety of the language(s) spoken within many states” was ignored (Creese & Blackledge, 2010, p. 26). This constructed idea of a national language gave rise to the belief that the use of one common language is crucial to promote national harmony and unity, also called ‘one-nation-one-language ideology’ which became the dominant discourse in recent Western history (Hornberger, 2007). According to Ricento (2013), the

quasi mythological notion that a common, named language is a necessary, if not sufficient, requirement for national identity gained traction, and this has continued to influence how people think and talk about language/s [...] as “things,” “possessed by “native speakers” who had “mother tongues” and who might speak “other (named) languages. (p. 528).

The bond of one unified language and national identity has been reproduced mainly through institutions that are in charge of citizenship testing or language instruction for immigrants according to language planning and standardization policies. Gal (2006) critiqued that in this political discourse, monolingualism was often considered to be the “natural state of human life” (Creese & Blackledge, 2010, p. 27) while all named languages were assumed to be intrinsically homogeneous. He also pointed out that the empowerment of named European languages happened at the sake of minority language speakers against whom symbolic violence was carried out. To be specific, one particular variety of a named language that was spoken by a socially dominant group was elevated to a high status as the ‘standard’ language, while all other varieties were diminished as “nonstandard,” “illegitimate,” “ignorant,” or just plain “bad” (Ricento, 2013, p. 530). Piller (2015) described the standard language ideology as

the belief that a particular variety – usually the variety that has its roots in the speech of the most powerful group in society, that is often based on the written language, that is highly homogeneous, and that is acquired through long years of formal education – is aesthetically, morally, and intellectually superior to other ways of speaking the

language. While only relatively few members of a society can speak that particular variety, its recognition as superior is universal and thus serves to justify social inequalities [...] – both to those who benefit from it and to those who are disadvantaged by it – that speakers of that variety should occupy privileged positions in society, while nonspeakers should be excluded from such positions. (p. 4)

Clearly, the question of which language gains recognition as the ‘standard’ language, is idealized in dictionaries and grammar books and is taught through schooling is an “important political question[] that may affect the social and economic position of the social groups of a given territory” (Pujolar 2007, p.144, in Creese & Blackledge, 2010, p. 26). Ricento (2013) remarked that the political construction of named languages forms one end of the continuum in the understanding of what language is. The other end is the mentalist understanding of language, represented by the linguist Noam Chomsky. Chomsky’s theory of language as an autonomous system was highly influential in the study of linguistics since the 1960s. Since Chomsky assumed all speakers to be in-born monolinguals, his theory “tended to reify monolingualism and monoculturalism” for decades (Ricento, 2013, p. 527). However, Chomsky’s mentalist conception was critiqued and discarded for ignoring the fact that “speech communities are more typically heterogeneous (culturally) and heteroglossic (linguistically), and growing up with more than one language is far from uncommon” (p. 527). Alternative models of understanding language were devised to reflect “the reality of linguistic diversity, a historical fact that has been further enhanced by the globalization of contemporary society” (García & Li, 2014, p. 7).

2.3 Linguistic repertoire and identity

The term ‘linguistic repertoire,’ originating from Gumperz and Hymes (1972) is “the totality of linguistic resources (i.e. including both invariant forms and variables) available to members of particular communities” (in Blommaert & Backus, 2013, p.11). This notion of ‘repertoire’ was taken up by Blommaert and Backus (2013) and expanded to include all the ‘means of speaking’ ranging from “linguistic ones (language varieties) over cultural ones (genres, styles) and social ones (norms for the production and understanding of language)” (p. 11). The authors also challenged the original remark by Gumperz and Hymes that “repertoires were tied to particular speech communities” (p. 11) because the present society is characterized by an “extremely low degree of presupposability in terms of identities, patterns

of social and cultural behavior, social and cultural structure, norms and expectations,” excluding the possibility of a homogeneous speech community (p. 13). To elaborate, since the early 1990s, the downfall of the colonial powers and the Soviet Union along with the increased circulation of goods and services led to an accelerated process of globalization worldwide. Vertovec (2007) referred to the new dimensions of social, cultural and linguistic diversity emerging out of post-Cold War migration and mobility patterns ‘superdiversity’. Spaces that were up until recently relatively homogeneous have transformed into ones marked by multilingual contacts both online and offline. According to Blommaert and Rampton (2012), superdiversity is

characterized by a tremendous increase in the categories of migrants, not only in terms of nationality, ethnicity, language, and religion, but also in terms of motives, patterns and itineraries of migration, processes of insertion into the labour and housing markets of the host societies, and so on [...] The predictability of the category of ‘migrant’ and his/her sociocultural features has disappeared. (p. 7)

In line with this, Erfurt (2016) observed that “the concept of superdiversity, which refers to these cultural transformations [...] [is] of considerable significance for the emergence of new cultural and linguistic forms and practices that have been the focus of research on transculturality for some recent time.” (pp. 593-601; my translation). Like superdiversity, the concept of transculturality evolved from different places as a response to the postmodern society: The Cuban anthropologist Fernando Ortiz used this term to describe the characteristics of a postcolonial society in the 1940s that were opposite to those in the process of acculturation. In Quebec, transculturality was at the center of a heated debate during the founding of the trilingual magazine *Vice Versa* with the subtitle “magazine transculturel” in the 1980s (Erfurt, 2016, pp. 593-594). In the German-speaking region, Wolfgang Welsch (1992) introduced the concept as the new perspective to understand ‘culture’ in the 21st century. He rejected the traditional notion of culture by Herder as spheres, homogeneous in its inside formed around a center that exist in strictly separate demarcations to other cultures. According to Welsch, transculturality captures the internally hybrid and the externally permeable characteristics (*Verflechtungen*) of today’s cultures. According to Erfurt (2016), the transcultural perspective takes into account the diversified dimensions of social agents as ‘unpredictable’ individual subjects that cannot be defined by or directly associated with a particular membership or identity, be it national, ethnic or sociocultural (p. 604). According to Welsch (2010), transculturality on the micro level describes people who are transcultural

from within, also referred to as “kulturelle Mischlinge” that possess a patchwork identity (p. 5) which entails that a person’s cultural identity is formed through diverse sources and connections. Sommer (2001) described the transcultural identity as follows:

Identität ist demnach weder homogen noch statisch, weder kollektiv bestimmt noch objektiv zu beschreiben, sondern ergibt sich aus der Vielzahl von Möglichkeiten, aus denen das Individuum weitgehend ohne Vorgaben, lediglich in Abhängigkeit von Situation und Kontext, frei und selbstbestimmt auswählt. (p. 53)

Subsequently, the notion of language and linguistic repertoire can be redefined as “biographically organized complexes of resources” rather than homogeneously shared resources within one speech community, and they follow the rhythms of human lives” (Blommaert & Backus, 2013, p. 15). To specify, different life trajectories and modes of learning result in individually differing linguistic repertoires. Subjects choose the formality different modes of learning, which Blommaert and Backus (2013) named “learning by degree” (p. 16). Ranging from maximally formal to extremely informal, languages can be learned and used in distinct registers. Lüdi and Py (2009) agreed with the complex characteristic of language within an individual speaker by stating:

A language competence will never be ‘reached’: it develops throughout life. Its development is characterized by the diversity and complexity of the contexts in which it is mobilized by the specialization of the resources used, and by the increasingly demanding expectations it engenders. [...] This term resources [...] presupposes the existence of a free and active subject who has amassed a repertoire of resources and who activates this repertoire according to his/her need, knowledge or whims, modifying or combining them where necessary. (p. 157)

In this regard, it is no longer possible to assume direct links between an individual’s linguistic repertoire and his or her national or cultural identity. Also when regarding the actual language use of multilingual speakers, many researchers concluded that multilingual speakers use their linguistic repertoire in such a flexible and fluid manner, that it was difficult to identify which language is “use[d] *most often* at home, at work, at play, in public interactions” (Lamarre, 2013, p. 52). Furthermore, others documented ‘new ways’ in which individuals use their linguistic skills to “negotiate new subject positions” (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2001; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004; in Martin-Jones et al., 2012, p. 9)”. Thus, the belief that each individual has *one* linguistic identity connected to a culture or nation, that they feel most attached to, no longer reflects the reality in the transcultural society and should be avoided to

be applied as a overgeneralizing assumption (Dagenais & Lamarre, 2005; Lamarre, 2013, Lamarre, Lamarre & Lefranc, 2015). Furthermore, more and more people associate 'culture' with "local identity performance and practice" (Creese & Blackledge, 2010, p. 108) so that "language practices associated with immigrant groups no longer represent backward-looking traditions, but may be linked to global youth culture [...] not necessarily equated to national identity [...] [nor] dominated by the standardized variety" (in Martin-Jones et al., 2012, p. 9).

2.4 Separate and flexible bilingualism

"Traditionally, research in the field of multilingualism has taken as its focus bilingual language acquisition, language acquisition, cognition and code-switching" (Creese & Blackledge, 2010, p.28) which implies that pedagogic implications in second language teaching are always rooted in a certain belief about language (which can be referred to as language ideology) and multilingualism. There are two competing viewpoints regarding multilingualism in relation to language acquisition: One is called 'separate bilingualism' (Creese & Blackledge, 2010), 'parallel monolingualism' (Heller, 1999), 'bilingualism with diglossia' (Baker, 2003 and Fishman, 1967) and so on (in Creese & Blackledge, 2010, p. 28) and the other 'heteroglossia' (Bakhtin, 1986, 1884 & Bailey, 2007), 'codemeshing' (Canagarajah, 2011, 2013), 'translingual practice' (Jorgensen et al., 2011), 'polylingual languaging' (Madsen, 2011), 'contemporary urban vernaculars' (Rampton, 2011), 'metrolingualism' (Otsuji & Penncook, 2011) or 'translanguaging' (García, 2007) (in Creese and Blackledge, 2015, p. 21). The former is based on the traditionally dominant political discourse of viewing "culture as a large national and geographic entity" and language as discrete entities that are "tied to nation and culture in simplified and coherent ways" (Creese & Blackledge, 2010, p. 109) and "reflect the monolingual ideologies" (Warren, 2017, p. 3). This monolingual ideology was supported mainly by (1) Stephen Krashen's (1985, 1989) hypothesis of 'comprehensible input' hypothesis, (2) the behaviorist hypothesis of language acquisition in the 1940s to 1970s and (3) the competition model between languages. (1) Krashen's hypothesis suggested that the most effective second language teaching method is exposing learners to as much as input in the target language as possible. "Keeping languages separate, the pedagogic argument goes, allows for maximum exposure to the target language" (Creese & Blackledge, 2011, p. 1200). This is why only the target language is used as the language of instruction in the classroom while all other languages are excluded and. (2) The

behaviorist hypothesis of language acquisition compared the process of learning a second language to that of 'habit formation' (Lightbown & Spada, 2006), thus assigning to each newly acquired language a separate time and space was believed to be essential to prevent confusion and interference when learners were 'forming a new habit'. For example, when learning a new language, learners should be guarded from the influence of their first language because they would wrongly apply grammatical principles of their first language when learning the second language. (3) Related to this idea, "the notions of competition between languages and time on task (Leseman, 2000)" argued that particularly for newly immigrated children who speak a minority language as their first language, "there is a *competitive relation* between minority language and instruction language concerning learning time and children's cognitive resources in the acquisition process" (Agirdag & Vanlaar, 2018, p. 125-126; italics in original). Because language as a system was at the center of this ideological view, emphasis was placed on "linguistic and social classifications" of languages and speakers (Creese & Blackledge, 2010, p. 109). The consequent belief that development in one language comes at the cost of another language generated the misconception that children's first languages were nothing but "a barrier to academic instructional language learning and school achievement" (p. 126).

De Jong (2013) grouped this monolingual and one nation, one language ideology together with the standard language ideology and the hegemonic belief that the common (international) language is more important than minority languages under 'assimilationist language ideologies' (in Henderson, 2017). The traditional view is also referred to as the subtractive approach because students' home language is, as the term suggests, 'subtracted' as the school language takes on the dominant role. As the acquisition of languages are believed to happen in a "separate [manner] and following each other", "two languages [should] [...] not be used in the same context" (García & Torres-Guevara, 2010, p. 189). "[T]he singular goal is to increase competence in Standard [common language], with little or no value placed on the linguistic practices that students from language-minoritized backgrounds bring with them (Cummins, 2000)" (Flores and Rosa, 2015, p. 153). For example, "dual language education" programs in the U.S. are aimed at helping students' transition from speaking their home language (mostly Spanish) to English as their dominant language (p. 153).

Among sociolinguistic scholars, a paradigm shift of viewing 'language' and 'bilingualism' began to take place since the 1990s: In contrast to viewing languages as "decontextualized formal system [...] that stay[s] the same over time" and bilingual speakers as double monolinguals who perfectly master two separate languages in a balanced manner (Henderson, 2017, p. 4), the new paradigm took a more functional stance and identified individuals who use two or more languages in their everyday life, regardless of the proficiency level, as bi- or multilingual speakers (Grosjean, 1982; Lüdi & Py, 2009). Recent studies show that multilingual speakers do not use languages 'separately' but employ their whole resource of linguistic varieties, encompassing all registers, dialects, styles, accents etc. (Lamarre, 2013, p. 52). Clearly, the focus has shifted from discrete named languages to language speakers who use linguistic features across named languages for communication. Within this context, the latter model of 'flexible bilingualism' gained affirmation in the academic field as many scholars directed their focus towards the "fluid nature of actual and local language practices of all speakers (Flores, 2013; Flores & García, 2013)" while monolingual language ideologies were criticized for "keep[ing] power in the hands of the few" (García & Li, 2014, p. 9). In other words, researchers started to advocate "an approach to researching multilingualism which moves away from a highly ideologized view of coexisting linguistic systems, to a more critical approach that situates language practices in social and political contexts and 'privileges language as social practice, speakers as social actors and boundaries as products of social action'" (Heller, 2007; in Creese & Blackledge, 2010, p. 25). The 'interdependence hypothesis' by Cummins (1979) which suggests that skills and concepts learned in one language can be transferred to another language through a 'common underlying proficiency' that is inherent in all speakers (cf. Agirdag & Vanlaar, 2018) supported that the linguistic knowledge exists in an interconnected manner and not separated according to 'named languages' in a speaker's minds. Furthermore, Bakhtin posited that "language is inextricably bound to the context in which it exists and is incapable of neutrality because it emerges from the actions of speakers with certain perspective and ideological positioning", and presented the concept of 'heteroglossia' to denote the coexistence of multiple varieties within one language (García & Li, 2014, p. 7). This belief that language is a set of practice that is context-dependent, situationally governed, mutually influential and ever changing (Henderson, 2017) challenged the traditional view of separate bilingualism. Furthermore, among others, Lydia White (1991) and Lightbown and Spada (2006) proved that the amount and quality of input are not alone sufficient effective second language

learning to occur (cf. Lightbown & Spada, 2006, p. 150), countering the input hypothesis by Krashen. What is more, the simultaneous use of multiple languages was claimed to develop children's cognitive metalinguistic skills (Bialystok, 1999; Bialystok, Martin, & Viswanathan, 2005; in Agirdag & Vanlaar, 2018). This additive view of multiple languages highlights the communicative functions of language variation and language mixing based on the pluralist language ideologies (de Jong, 2013; in Henderson, 2017). Contrary to the subtractive model, the additive model “valorize[s] students’ diverse linguistic repertoires by positioning their skills in languages other than standard [common language] as valuable classroom assets to be built on rather than handicaps to be overcome” (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p.153). Nonstandard varieties of languages and the ability to code-switch are affirmed, as well.

Recently, dynamic bilingualism (García, 2009) was suggested as the better alternative to subtractive and additive approaches to deal with the ever-increasing linguistic diversity in the educational context (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 153). This is because the underlying assumption of the previous two models was that languages exist apart from each other and can be ‘subtracted’ or ‘added’ in the speakers’ mind. García and Torres-Guevara (2010) criticized this belief for being based on ‘double monolingualism’ and “monoglossic ideology [...] with bilingual individuals expected to be and do with each of their languages the same thing as monolinguals” (p. 189). Researchers claimed to shift the “goals of language education away from the creation of proficient native-like speakers, towards resourceful speakers, who can draw on ‘multiple linguistic and semiotic resources’ (Pennycook, 2012, p. 13) to serve multilingual students” (Warren, 2017, p. 4). The dynamic bilingualism model reflects the “language *practices* of bilinguals [that] are complex and interrelated” and “do not emerge in a linear way or function separately” (García & Li, 2014, p. 14; italics in original). The authors claimed that the dynamic model takes into account the single linguistic system within a speaker with features that are integrated and combined differently according to the context; and thus goes beyond the linguistic interdependence by Cummins (1979) that presupposes separate mental storages for each language. García and Li (2014) also mentioned that the dynamic model is also closely related to the concept of plurilingualism as “the ability to use several languages to varying degrees and for distinct purposes” as well as “an educational value that is the basis of linguistic tolerance” (Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe, 2000; in García & Torres-Guevara, 2010, p. 190).

In this paper, we use the terms separate and flexible bilingualism by Creese and Blackledge (2010) in order to highlight the two contrasting beliefs of how the actual language practice and acquisition take place: Do speakers use separate named languages? Or do they use their whole linguistic repertoire flexibly? In the case of the latter, children's first languages and/or other language knowledge is viewed as a resource rather than a problem (Heller, 2007; Ricento, 2013).

2.5 Translanguaging in Education

“Translanguaging refers to the *language practices* of bilingual people” (García, 2012, p. 103; italics in original). The concept ‘translanguaging’ was developed “in response to changing linguistic phenomena in schools and communities (Baker, 2001, 2006)” and gained “currency in discussions of multilingualism, especially in educational contexts (Baker, 2011; Blackledge & Creese 2010, Creese & Blackledge 2011; García, 2009; Li, 2011)” (in Creese & Blackledge, 2015, p. 26). The term was initially coined in the 1980s (Williams, 1994) to describe a pedagogical practice for which the teacher asked students to use different languages for the receptive and productive language skills. The term was translated into English to denote “the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two [or more] languages” (Baker, 2011, p. 288; in Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012, p. 665). The gist lies in “draw[ing] on all the linguistic resources of the child to maximize understanding and achievement. Thus, both [or more] languages are used in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner to organise and mediate mental processes in understanding, speaking, literacy, and, not least, learning” (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012, p. 665). “Ofelia García’s (2009) book *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century* served as the catalyst for this ongoing practice/ theory dialogue” of translanguaging (Cummins, 2019, p. 22; italics in original). According to Cummins (2019), García elaborated the pedagogical potential of translanguaging practices and stimulated a guideline for educators to implement translanguaging instructional practices (cf. Celic & Seltzer, 2011). In her book, García (2009) recognized flexible language practices of multilinguals as a natural and normal communicative method. In fact, students with different language backgrounds often mix their languages – often against the classroom language rules – to facilitate communication and proceed in their group work more effectively. Allowing and encouraging

translanguaging in the classroom is praised as a powerful tool to empower language-minoritized students in schools.

The benefits that translanguaging brings inside and outside the classroom are manifold: (1) It support cognitive and academic development of students, (2) facilitate home-school cooperation and affirms students' identity formation, and (3) raises students' creativity and criticality. (1) As described by Baker (2001), the benefits of translanguaging encompass cognitive and academic areas. A deeper understanding of the subject content is promoted, while linguistically the weaker language can be developed more effectively. This is why Haukås (2015) defined multilingual pedagogy after Neuner (2004) as "a learner-centered approach that aims to develop students' language awareness and language learning awareness across the languages that students know" (p. 12). For example, classroom observations by Lucas and Katz (1994) demonstrated how using students' first language in an English as a Second Language (ESL) class was more effective for students of all levels (Auerbach, 1993, 2016) (in Cummins, 2019). Students were asked to actively use their first language for pair/group work, and were put into groups with classmates who have the same first language in order to help each other. Auerbach as well as Lucas and Katz agreed on the point that translanguaging instructional methods were helpful for learners, regardless of the teachers' competence in students' first languages. A few years later, DeFazio (1997) reported that at an international high school in New York that integrated students' first languages into all phases of assessment and learning, the overall academic achievement of the students was impressively high. If students' first languages were not known by any of the teachers, community members outside of the school were asked for cooperation and assistance in translation (in Cummins, 2019). (2) Furthermore, embracing multilingualism through translanguaging can positively affect and facilitate home-school cooperation, and also help the integration of learners across different linguistic competence levels (García & Li, 2014, p. 64). For instance, in the research project 'L'AltRoparlante', Carbonara and Scibetta (2018) implemented in several multilingual schools in Italy different translanguaging-based activities that involved multilingual students' parents as linguistic resource and documented the positive impact they had on the parents, students and teachers. Cummins (2019) quoted Barlett and García (2011, p. 4) that "translanguaging, more than any other practice or pedagogy, sustains home language practices" (p.22) while "learning the 'heritage' language 'plays a critical role in the process of children's identity formation'" (Cummins, 2007, p.

535), thus the “implementation of bilingual instructional strategies in the classroom can promote identities of competence among language learners from socially marginalized groups, thereby enabling them to engage more confidently with literacy and other academic work in both languages” (p. 238). Creese and Blackledge (2015) documented several researches where translanguaging and identity practices are closely linked, the former becoming “an integral part of identity and belonging” (Nogeuron-Liu & Warriner, 2014, p. 183; in p. 27). They also quoted García and Li (2014) that translanguaging activities “enable students to construct and constantly modify their sociocultural identities and values, as they respond to their historical and present conditions critically and creatively” (p.28). In other words, when translanguaging space is allowed in classrooms, students combine different modes and media to negotiate their social identities. For instance, Creese and Blackledge (2010) observed that students established new creative identity positions while engaging in translanguaging activities. As described, translanguaging as an action of respecting individual agency and providing students with the space to create, interpret and negotiate subject positions became central in the pedagogic discourse in the last decades (Creese & Blackledge, 2010, p.109). Important to this discourse is that students are given free space to experiment with their linguistic repertoire because they are viewed upon as ‘emergent bilinguals’ and competent multilinguals (García & Leiva, 2014). (3) García and Leiva (2014) also stressed the transformative nature of translanguaging, going beyond normalizing multilingual students’ language practices. When teachers encourage students to use their repertoire in the classroom, students naturally receive the message that their language and culture is beneficial for the learning process, which in turn, boosts students’ self-esteem and motivation in learning. Naturally, existing hierarchical orders of languages, for example, the belief that only internationally spoken languages are worthy of recognition because they bring socioeconomic benefits, are challenged. While “the agency of the individuals engaged in using, creating, and interpreting signs for communication” is in the center (Creese & Blackledge, 2015, p.26), translanguaging “underscores multilinguals’ creativity—their abilities to push and break boundaries between named language and between language varieties, and to flout norms of behaviour including linguistic behaviour and, and criticality—the ability to use evidence to question, problematize, and articulate views” (Li, 2011; Li & Zhu, 2013; in Li, 2018, p. 23).

2.6 Teachers' attitudes towards multilingualism

Teachers “play an essential role in fostering multilingual behavior in the language classroom and their actions can exert great influence on their students” (Lasagabser & Huguet, 2007; in De Angelis, 2011, p. 217). In fact, teachers “have much policy power as they can choose whether to integrate minority languages into their teaching turning students’ multilingualism into a useful resource for the entire classroom, or can choose to ignore minority languages closing a source of linguistic knowledge for their students” (Hornberger & Cassels, 2007; in De Angelis, 2011, p. 217). This is why the written language policy, also referred to as language management, exists “in an interconnected process” with the teachers’ language beliefs and language practices of the classroom (Spolsky, 2004; in Young, 2014, p. 159) and teachers are referred to as “important mediators of classroom-level language policy” (Henderson, 2017, p. 11). Indeed, the practiced language policy by teachers “is the most influential of policies, given the repetitive nature of practice or language choice patterns, which leads speakers to deduce which language choice acts are appropriate or not within which contexts and so to construct implicit interactional rules” (Bonacina-Pugh, 2012; in Young, 2014, p. 159). This indicates that teachers’ beliefs about multilingualism may remain implicit but are powerful enough to condition students’ “participation, self-esteem, and ultimately their learning. If a teacher values a child’s competences, whichever language they are encoded, and believes in his/her capacity to achieve, the child will respond to this acknowledgement and these expectations” (Young, 2014, p. 166). In this respect, teachers are “the key facilitator of learners’ multilingualism” (Haukås, 2015, p. 2) and at the same time a social figure in the sense of representing the surrounding society, particularly in the eyes of a migrated family since teachers are “frequently approached and asked for advice on language maintenance issues as they are perceived to be well-informed and are also the first point of contact at school” for newly-arrived families and parents (De Angelis, 2011, pp. 216-217). Because “teachers’ recognition of the importance of heritage languages in the lives of their linguistic minority students is critical to the development and empowerment of the whole child” (Lee & Oxelson, 2006, p. 468; in De Angelis, 2011, p. 229), “researchers in the field argue that insight into teachers’ beliefs is necessary to understand and improve language teaching and students’ learning” (Borg, 2006; in Haukås, 2015, p. 3).

However, several studies revealed that most of the teachers have misconceptions about multilingualism based on monolingual ideologies (Lundberg, 2019). The majority of teachers have “little awareness of the usefulness and benefits of children’s first languages” according to the report initiated by the European Commissions’s Directorate-General for Education and Culture (Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2017, p. 42). Likewise, in another study, the majority of the surveyed teachers in Italy, Austria and Great Britain showed little awareness of cross-linguistic interaction and believed that language interaction brought about confusion and delay when learning the school language (De Angelis, 2011). Young (2014) identified monolingual myths and one-nation-one-language ideology in teachers’ personal beliefs on multilingualism. Under these conditions, children’s first languages “continue to be seen as a barrier and a deficit across schools in Europe” and even “harmful for [students’] academic achievement” (Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2017, p. 42). As a consequence, “many teachers tend to discourage the use of non-dominant languages in schools and recommend that families speak the dominant language at home” which is a clear sign of devaluing and rejecting their first languages (p. 42). Teachers’ tendency towards separate bilingualism seems to exist in complementary schools as well. Warren (2017) interviewed different actors in a Vietnamese community language school in Australia, including students, parents, teachers, the principal and administrators and found that both the separate and the flexible multilingual narrative co-existed. Teachers were more inclined to favor the strict separation of Vietnamese and English, while the simultaneous use of both languages was part of the bilingual students’ daily language practice. With this absence of sufficient awareness on the side of teachers, it is not surprising that most students do not have the impression that their home language is valued by teachers (Schnuch, 2015). Unfortunately, without due recognition of students’ multilingualism, the long existed ‘monolingual habitus’ (cf. Gogolin, 1994) continues to exist and waste valuable resources because learners’ awareness of the benefits of multilingualism is the pre-condition for any positive transfer to occur (Haukås, 2015). On the affective emotional level, as well, language awareness is the key to reflect on prior language learning experiences and motivation to learn a new language (Schnuch, 2015). In this sense, the National Ministry of Education in France (2012) critiqued that “the major obstacle [for immigrant children] is not the [...] child’s culture, but rather its normative negation within the school” (in Young, 2014, p. 166) for “a child who is made to feel uncomfortable at school, because he/she is obliged to leave a significant part of his/her

identity and prior learning encoded in the home language at the door of the school is not placed in ideal learning conditions” (p. 166).

Researchers argue that these problems lie, on the one hand, on the lack of relevant teacher education and, on the other hand, on the lack of resources on the societal and national level. Since “most studies on multilingualism [...] are relatively recent, teachers across Europe are unlikely to have received any type of specialized training on this topic, particularly if they have been in the teaching profession for several years already” (De Angelis, 2011, p. 226). In the context of Germany, even though educational research and evidence on the necessity of language-sensitive education of migrant students are plenty, what is missing is teacher training and teachers’ competence (Köker et al., 2015). Haukås (2015) confirmed that previous studies on teachers’ attitudes towards multilingual pedagogy had in common that the hindrance in fostering multilingualism in their classes was teachers’ feeling of incompetence and fear of disrupting students’ language learning. In this regard, it is argued that “an intensified pre- and in-service teacher education about benefits and challenges of current multilingualism” are needed (Lundberg, 2019, p. 280). What is more, teachers “are expected to rely on their own resources regarding multilingualism,” while “simply relying on the accumulation of experience does not help to improve the situation” (Herzog-Punzenberger, 2017, p. 9). For instance, if district- or school-level language policies do not favor multilingual sensitive teaching method, teachers are likely to undergo an ideological struggle between their own beliefs and those of the school and administration. As a result, even if teachers have sufficient knowledge on the benefits of multilingualism and translanguaging, their agency may be restricted due to contextual factors (Henderson, 2017).

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Questions

Teachers are among the professionals who can exert great influence on multilingual students' learning in the classroom as well as their lives outside of the classroom. This raises the question of whether teachers are sufficiently aware of the interconnectedness between languages in the mind, the benefits of implementing multilingual pedagogy in the classroom, and how they perceive their role as teachers in the multilingual classroom and whether they act in correspondence to what they think should be done. In addition, other factors will be revealed that might influence or restrict their practices. To assess teachers' attitudes towards multilingualism, the following research questions will be addressed:

- (1) How do teachers understand 'language'?
- (2) To what extent are teachers aware of the importance of multilingualism?
- (3) How do teachers perceive their role in the multilingual classroom?
- (4) How are teachers' beliefs reflected in their teaching practices?
- (5) What are possible factors that affect teaching practices?

Research questions (1) ~ (3) are intended to cover teachers' knowledge and question (4) teachers' actual teaching practices. Addressing both domains, teachers' 'understanding' and 'pedagogies' (Lundberg, 2019) or teachers' 'articulated' and 'embodied' language ideologies (Henderson, 2017) is, first of all, crucial since "teachers are not always aware that their stated beliefs do not correspond to their actual behavior (Lee, 2009)" (Haukås, 2015, p. 14).

Furthermore, the degree of consistency between teachers' knowledge and teaching practice can serve as a clue for the degree of reliability and assurance of their selected responses. For instance, we know that a teacher who demonstrates awareness of the benefits of translanguaging and also encourages students' translanguaging in practice, is likely to be confident enough of their knowledge to put it into practice. On the contrary, teachers might also be affected by outward factors. Research question (5) is intended to find out why teachers may show a gap in their knowledge and actual practice when dealing with multilingual students. What follows is the theoretical basis of each of the research questions (RQ).

(1) RQ 1: How do teachers understand 'language'?

As mentioned, RQ 1~3 address teachers' knowledge and underlying perception, "*why* they do what they do which ultimately underpins their professional practices" (Young, 2014, p. 157). A teacher's understanding of language is the basis on which other perceptions around language interaction, language learning and language policies are built upon. Henderson (2017) stated that in order "to explore language ideologies and language policy in practice, it is equally important to clarify how language and bilingualism are theoretically framed" (p. 2). Young (2014) quoted Castellotti and Moore (2002, p. 7) that "the information an individual possesses about a particular subject consequently shapes his or her set of beliefs on that subject" (p. 158). Since "previous research already found that teachers' actions in the classroom are informed by their knowledge of foreign languages (Ellis, 2004)" (De Angelis, 2011, p. 217), "it would appear that knowledge is an important factor in the construction of language ideologies" (Young, 2014, p. 158).

(2) RQ 2: To what extent are teachers aware of the importance of multilingualism?

Knowledge and awareness about multilingualism, in other words, "knowledge of migration, linguistic diversity in schools and how to deal with heterogeneity" is one of the three dimensions that constitute the necessary teacher competence in a multilingual classroom (Köker et al., 2015, p. 181). This is because "the more well-informed the teachers are about multilingualism, the more fitting their proposed course of action at a pedagogical level becomes" (Lundberg, 2019, p. 280). What is more, "multilingualism does not automatically enhance further language learning [...] In fact, the general view within the field seems to be that learning multiple languages is best enhanced when learners are encouraged to become aware of and use their pre-existing linguistic and language learning knowledge" (Haukås, 2015, pp. 1-2). On the contrary,

When a pupil's prior knowledge, encoded in her/his home language is ignored or considered as of no or little value by the school and attention is directed uniquely towards her/his difficulties in acquiring knowledge of and through the language of the school, staff adopt what is known as a deficit vision (Cummins, 2000) of the pupil's capabilities. Such deficit visions of emergent bilinguals have been documented in a variety of contexts (Gkaintartzi & Tsokalidou, 2011; Moons, 2010; Thomaske, 2011; Young, 2011) and are associated with low academic expectations on the part of

teachers (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2010) and low levels of self-esteem for children (Couetoux-Jungman et al., 2010). Grosjean (2008) describes such a vision as a monolingual or fractional view of bilingualism and suggests that a more wholistic, bilingual view of these speakers would be more appropriate and constructive. (Young, 2014, p. 158)

The problem is that,

for example, when learners are not literate in their home language, when learners are not aware of the benefits of multilingualism and 'when children are not encouraged in the school situation to rely on their different languages and language knowledge as positive resources' (Moore, 2006, p. 136), multilingualism may not provide an advantage. (Haukås, 2015, p. 1)

This is why it is all the more important that teachers are informed about the importance and benefits of multilingualism and transmit their knowledge to their students. In the worst case, a teacher's deficit view on multilingualism is likely to be even strengthened as she or he accumulates more experience with multilingual students who are not made aware of the hidden potential of their prior language knowledge.

(3) RQ 3: How do teachers perceive their role in the multilingual classroom?

This question aims to explore teachers' "policy as discourse, 'what people think should be done' (Spolsky, 2004, p. 14), for which Bonacina-Pugh proposes the term *perceived language policy*" (Young, 2014, p. 159; italics in original). To elaborate, do teachers perceive themselves as responsible to support the development of students' multilingualism and influential enough to impact students' awareness of their home language and culture (Henderson, 2017; Cummins, 2019; Haukås, 2015)?

(4) RQ 4: How are teachers' beliefs and attitudes reflected in their teaching practices?

Research question 4 focuses on exploring the actual teaching practice of teachers, also referred to as 'pedagogies' (Lundberg, 2019), 'embodied language ideologies' (Henderson, 2017), or 'practiced language policy' (Young, 2014). Examining the correlation between teachers' knowledge and teaching practices is essential to verify results from previous results that teachers experience a gap in their theoretical understanding and practice (Gogolin et al., 2019; Flores & Bale, 2017, p. 31).

(5) RQ5: What are possible factors that affect teaching practices?

Research question 5 aims at exploring which factors might influence or restrict teachers' actual practices. Haukås (2015) pointed out that

it is naïve to believe that a teacher's reported beliefs accurately reflect what occurs in the classroom [...] [because] contextual factors such as economics, group size, expectations from students and/or parents, the curriculum, or time pressure may influence or even force teachers not to act according to their own beliefs (Johnson, 1996; Lee, 2009). (p.14)

For instance, Henderson (2017) reported the "ideological struggle of each teacher within their own contexts" and presented how their "agency was constrained by the pressure of standardized assessments and other "different levels of language policy (i.e. district, program, school)" (p. 1).

3.2 Research Method

According to Chigbu (2019), the phenomenological qualitative research employs as its data collection methods "interview, surveys and observations" and serves to "understand or explain experiences". The data analysis methods are, according to Chigbu, "descriptions of experiences, examination of meanings and theme" (p. 6). This study can be described as a phenomenological qualitative research as its purpose is to assess teachers' attitudes by exploring their experiences with multilingualism and uses the online questionnaire as its data collection method. The results will be analyzed both quantitatively with the reverse scoring method and qualitatively, where teachers' personal background and information on their schools will be used to interpret their responses to the online questionnaire. Although methodologically a questionnaire is usually used for large-scale data collection and lends itself for quantitative analysis and comparative analysis, this research aims to exemplify how the developed questionnaire can be used to reveal complex teachers' attitudes towards multilingualism, hoping that it might be further developed in the future to collect data of a larger number of respondents.

The participants for the survey were contacted via email. After explaining the purpose of the questionnaire and introducing myself, participants were asked ahead which language they prefer for the questionnaire. Accordingly, three versions of English, German and Korean

questionnaires were developed with the online platform 'Google Forms' and the access links were sent to the teachers via email. Some of the questions need to be adjusted according to the school's language of instruction. The English version of the questionnaire is attributed in Appendix 1.

The online questionnaire to explore teachers' attitudes consists of three parts: knowledge, practice and teacher's profile. The first two parts consist of closed-ended items, which are, compared to open-ended questions, easier to answer and facilitate the quantitative analysis of the results. Teachers are asked to rate their opinion on 49 statements on a 4-point Likert scale of 'Strongly Disagree', 'Somewhat Disagree', 'Somewhat Agree' and 'Strongly Agree'. For a few questions, they were asked to check the frequency with options of 'Almost Never', 'Sometimes', 'Often' and 'Almost every time'. The Likert scale is often used to measure individual's attitude towards certain people, groups or ideas. Using 1-4 Likert scale is advantageous "to encourage teachers to take a position with respect to agreeing or disagreeing with the statements they were asked to rate" (De Angelis, 2011, p. 221). The third part consists of both open-ended and closed-ended items that ask for the teachers' profile (age, gender, teaching subject, teaching experience, institution, language biography, migration background etc.) that will be taken into consideration when analyzing teachers' attitudes towards multilingualism.

The major challenge in selecting the online questionnaire as the research method is that methodologically, "research about teachers' beliefs is considered especially challenging, due to the fact that different teachers' beliefs and their interrelationship are not observable and may not be entirely consciously accessible (Rokeach, 1968)" (Lundberg, 2019, p. 267). For this reason, many researches combine two or more methods with questionnaires, like classroom observations or interviews in order to obtain more reliable results. However, as the current pandemic state of COVID-19 does not allow classroom visits from outsiders, and teachers have a heavier workload than before (with preparing online classes, wearing masks and keeping extra rules), neither classroom observation nor in-person interviews were considered desirable. Instead, a lot of effort was put into avoiding potential misinterpretation of questionnaire items, since the study relies solely on the online questionnaire to gather data. To be specific, in order to minimize the possibility that respondents easily notice any preferred direction of the research, contradicting viewpoints of separate and flexible

bilingualism are equally represented in pairs for all possible questions. This is because “when asked, teachers may respond with what is culturally and socially desirable” (Lundberg, 2019, p. 267) or what the researcher considers favorable (Haukås, 2015, p. 14). To exemplify, teachers are always given two statements for each construct or idea. For instance, statement 24 is ‘I intervene when my students speak in their home language among themselves during class.’ and statement 36 is ‘I allow students to communicate in any language when they do pair/group-work.’ The former is based on separate bilingualism while the latter is based on flexible bilingualism. These two statements form a pair for the construct ‘Classroom Environment’. In this way, respondents can get a more neutral impression and express their viewpoints without any distraction. The order of the questions was mixed to prevent the item-order effect to elicit as natural and impromptu reactions as possible. Questions about teachers’ personal information were placed in the last section, so that teachers would not feel obliged to answer in congruence with their school policy, school image or their students’ and parents’ expectations.

3.3 Selecting Respondents

Exploring the attitudes of teachers who work in *different* schools in Frankfurt is one of the central ideas of this research since Frankfurt is home to diverse multilingual communities and many students visit complementary schools on the weekends next to mandatory schools. Besides the public German school, a certain number of students visit private international schools. These are children from parents who came to Frankfurt for a stay of about a few years for business purposes. I believe it is indispensable to direct the question to the context of the school and the classroom when dealing with teachers’ perception and reaction to students’ multilingual practices, since students’ behavior might carry different meanings according to the school context.

First of all, whether or not and to what degree teachers exert influence on students’ multilingualism and self-awareness will vary depending on the school context. When studying previous researches on multilingualism, it is of great significance to keep in mind the specific context of researches and not to overgeneralize the results to other contexts. This is because the context of the school has certainly more implications than just the difference in the language of instruction. In fact, young multilingual speakers select their language, register

or style according to the interlocutor and the context as exemplified in the ethnographic study by Patricia Lamarre (2006-2009) 'Montréal français, Montréal multilingue'.

Additionally, school success for multilingual children can "be expected only when applying a consistent approach throughout the classroom, school and system. [...] As with other goals that potentially involve multiple actors, the most benefit comes when all actors in a given environment pull in the same direction" (Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2017, pp. 36-37). Therefore, it is crucial to secure a vertical (from birth to adulthood) continuity as well as a horizontal continuity across different educational institutions (Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2017). However, most of the previous researches on teachers' attitudes on multilingualism are centered on one single school types: either public, international or complementary. This study involves several school types in order to address the horizontal continuity among educational institutions, "a quality feature of a well-functioning education system, which is beneficial for all learners" (Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2017, p. 36). Previous studies stated that "complementary schools often appear to argue for a static, reified version of 'culture' and 'heritage'" to resist the "impetus towards the erasure of minority immigrant languages" because they "exist in relation to, in response to, and perhaps even in spite of, a strongly felt public discourse of monolingualism and homogeneity in the multilingual, heterogeneous state" (Creese & Blackledge, 2011, p. 1197). In order to check whether schools and/ or teachers in different schools assert competing language ideologies, four teachers were selected as survey participants that each work in a Gymnasium, a Gesamtschule, a private international school and a Korean community language school. The two German public schools belong to different school branches and also have a different percentage of students with a migration background (Gesamtschule higher than Gymnasium). Except for the teacher the Korean community language school, I contacted teachers (that I did not know in person) through my acquaintances. This was done so that the teachers would feel free to express their ideas without being self-conscious. In the following subchapters I will describe each of the teachers' profile based on the answers in the third part of the questionnaire and information retrieved from each school's website. All names of the respondents are pseudonyms to protect anonymity.

3.3.1 Aylin, English and French teacher in a Gymnasium

Aylin is a teacher, between 23 to 30 years old, who completed her teacher's degree in Frankfurt in 2017 and teaches English and French to 5th to 13th graders at a Gymnasium in Frankfurt. She has been in this school for 1 year and 6 months and worked before in another Gymnasium for half a year. Her personal goal as a teacher is to “help students enjoy learning and make them learn for life and not for a test.” Aylin thinks that her teaching practices are influenced most by her own experiences as a student and in-service teacher education. As a bilingual speaker of Turkish and German with a Turkish migration background, Aylin specified in the questionnaire that Turkish and German were her “native languages”, and that she learned “English, French and Spanish at school”. Concerning her everyday language use, she wrote that “English is for movies, music and books[;] Turkish is for my relatives and family, German for anything else in Germany”.

Aylin's school has about 1100 students and 100 teachers and is characterized by a variety of international contacts and extra-curricular cooperative projects. The school indicates as one of its goals “to create an open room in which foreign cultures can be introduced and experienced; open spaces in which linguistic diversity and knowledge about other cultures can be developed into intercultural competence” (school homepage, translated by author). In subject areas, the school focuses on languages and MINT subjects (mathematics, information technology, natural sciences and technical disciplines). There are individualized learning opportunities, which means that classes are divided according to students' competences and specialized extra classes are organized for both gifted students and students who struggle with literacy (reading and writing skills). In addition, students have the opportunity to participate in ‘full-day activities’ (*Ganztagsangebot*) in different subject areas like languages, sport, music, art, theater, mathematics, science and computer. For instance, language courses include ‘business English’, ‘German language workshop’, ‘English circle’ and ‘French and Spanish’ (school homepage). Another special characteristic of the school is its German-French bilingual classes that qualify students to obtain either the German or French high school graduation. In order to participate in this bilingual program which has a tradition of over 40 years, students have to choose French as their first foreign language and from the fifth grade on, take geography and history classes that are lectured in both German and French but with time transition into monolingual French lectures. Next to the bilingual

classes, student exchange programs offer additional language learning opportunities. Students who select French as their major subject (*Leistungskurs*) in the senior grade can apply for a 3-week practicum in France. Such a close international cooperation is possible because Aylin's school is one of the 34 'Hessische Europaschulen' (HES) that are public schools that prioritize convincing students of the benefits of the European unity and supporting their international academic and professional orientation (Kultusministerium Hessen website). These schools follow as basic principles, promoting the identity as a European citizen and raising tolerance, political maturity, and responsibility in their students.

3.4.2 Michael who teaches in an international school

Michael is a young teacher from Australia, between 23 to 30 years old, who completed his teacher's degree in Melbourne, Australia in 2015 and has worked as a teacher for 6 years. During initial email exchanges he mentioned his experience as a teacher "in a wide variety of educational contexts, from schools serving low socioeconomic regions, regular middle class school, schools for students who have extreme or challenging behaviours and [his] current school (for upper class international students)" where he has been teaching mathematics, science and design to students aged from 13 to 18 for one year. Michael thinks that his experiences as a teacher and exchanges with colleagues have influenced his teaching practice the most. Michael's personal goal as a teacher is "to encourage young people to become self-reflective individuals who can 1) pursue their goals[,] 2) have a positive impact on the world, and 3) develop and maintain positive relationships. Michael described himself as a "monolingual English speaker" and "monolingual English teacher".

Michael's school is a private international school which follows the International Baccalaureate (IB) curriculum whose completion is known to offer the most widely accepted entrance qualification to universities worldwide. The school website advertises for its internationally recognized high academic standards, qualified teaching staff, small class sizes according to students' academic level, and well-organized after school activities. Students pay high tuition fees to visit this school. Another characteristic that stands out on the school website is its advertisement as a multilingual school. The school website presents the world map with colors on the students' countries of origin, introduces the nationality and languages spoken for all of the teaching staff and explicitly advocates additive bilingualism as its major

aim: According to the school's 'philosophy of language' page, the school acknowledges that the school language is different from most students' first language and specifies that their aim is to achieve additive bilingualism, which means that acquiring a new language does not affect our mother tongue negatively or impact learning unfavourably. We are passionate about assisting our students to be excellent communicators in all the languages they use and to embrace the similarities and differences in each other's speech and writing. At [this] International School we endeavour to provide each language student with the school and classroom atmosphere that nurtures his/her appreciation of language and inspires our students to express themselves. (school homepage)

What follows this statement is an explanation about the different roles each language plays at school: English is "the language of instruction" except for foreign language lessons in order to "develop students' academic and social competence in English, as well as their understanding and appreciation of English language cultures" and so "to master the English language" (school homepage). For this, all teachers "participate in training to teach English as an Additional Language (EAL) in the inclusive classroom" and a learning support team assists students with weaker English skills. Next, German as the "host language" is taught as a required course 5 times a week from primary to middle years as "the IB philosophy emphasizes the respect and acknowledgment of local culture, and the best way to do so is through the language" (school homepage). Other foreign languages like French and Spanish are offered in the middle year program "for three periods each week to students who do not need English support" and also in the high school grades as a second language. High school students can study their first language as a "self-taught literature course" with support from the English Department, if their first language is among the list of "Japanese, Mandarin, Urdu, Georgian, Hebrew, Farsi or Swedish" (school homepage). According to Michael, the school has about 400 students from kindergarten until graduation from which about "60 per cent" are students with a migration background. However, it can be inferred that all students will be at least emergent bilinguals of English and German (as the school uses English as the main instruction language) and students who use another language than English or German at home are tri- or multilinguals.

3.4.3 Sarah, a Spanish and sports teacher at a Gesamtschule

After completing her teacher's degree in a nearby city in Germany, Sarah taught for about three years at a German language school in Frankfurt which is well-known for its certificate-preparing courses for foreign students. Courses in this language institute range from regular to intensive courses that take place every day or twice a week according to student's proficiency level. At the present time, Sarah has been teaching Spanish and sports for two years at a 'Kooperative Gesamtschule' in Frankfurt that incorporates three different types of German public schools: Gymnasium, Realschule and Hauptschule. Each school form can be completed by a different final assessment whereas students can move to a higher level school branch when they pass the qualification test. With more than 13000 students, Sarah's school is one of the biggest schools in Frankfurt and is characterized by its student exchange programs and the focus on mathematics and natural sciences. Regarding foreign language classes, English is learned as the first foreign language from the 5th grade on and students can choose between French or Latin as the second foreign language in the upper grade. Sarah teaches Spanish to middle class students in the Gymnasium and Realschule branch and to 11th graders in the Gymnasium. Sarah's second subject, sports, is also mentioned as one of the school's strength, next to its focus on MINT subjects, job orientation courses and various programs that assist students' development. According to Sarah, "in some courses 100% of the students have a migration background". This indicates that a diverse range of students come together at this school, concerning their social, economic backgrounds and academic achievements. It can be inferred that interpersonal skills and sympathy towards students would be a crucial qualification for teachers to build a healthy relationship with them. Considering that Sarah answered that academic knowledge from university studies and her previous teaching experiences have influenced her teaching method the most, her experience of teaching students from different countries at the language school might have helped her to develop teaching strategies for students of diverse academic competences. Sarah's personal goal as a teacher is "that students have fun learning and actually learn something from her classes".

Concerning the language policy of Sarah's school, I referred to a presentation file on the school website, which was developed to help parents and students get an overview when choosing between Latin and French for their second foreign language. According to it, the

major difference between French and Latin courses would be the language of instruction: French is instructed in the French language in order to accelerate students' proficiency in everyday conversation skills or to prepare them to participate in student exchange programs in France. The proficiency in the French language is denoted as a crucial qualification for vocational education and profession. Latin is instructed in German and will serve as a bridge to a better English and German language competence.

3.4.3 Lee, head teacher in a Korean complementary school

Lee is the head teacher of a Korean complementary school in Frankfurt. Before becoming head teacher, Lee taught Korean language and literature to 5th and 6th grade students at the same school. Lee completed her teacher's degree in Korea in 1985. Now she is between 51 to 60 years old and the complementary school in Frankfurt is the only school where she has worked at for the past 28 years. Lee moved to Germany as a graduate student, obtained her master's degree in education and has lived in Frankfurt since then. She sees her competence in Korean and German as a privilege that enabled her to work as a Korean teacher in Germany. Her goal as a teacher is to "help students who grow up in a foreign country speak their mother tongue fluently and thereby develop self-esteem and identity as a Korean". Lee says that her teaching practice has been most influenced by knowledge acquired in university and her own experiences as a teacher.

Lee's school is most probably the biggest Korean complementary school in Germany with about 600 students from kindergarten to the high school program which is due to the fact that Frankfurt has the biggest Korean community in Germany. The community language school offers a whole day program from morning until afternoon on Saturdays. Starting from the 1st grade of elementary school, students have three periods of Korean classes in the morning, following the same curriculum as their peers in Korea. Lee indicates that "because the school uses government-authorized textbooks from Korea, that are used as regular textbooks in Korean public schools, there are almost no students who have difficulties communicating in Korean". With a one-time admission fee, monthly fees are to be paid for each the morning and the afternoon program while all textbooks are distributed for free. The regular curriculum of the Korean subject covers diverse areas of Korean grammar, reading and writing skills, literature, etc. which means that prior language knowledge is a

precondition in order to participate in the morning classes. The afternoon courses are comprised of two hours of mathematics and one hour of a subject like natural science or Korean history depending on the students' grades. Afternoon courses can be left out entirely or substituted with extracurricular activities like Taekwondo, Korean traditional sports or traditional dances. Besides regular classes there are also separate 'Korean language' classes for students whose mother tongue is not Korean. Last year, there were two classes for elementary students and one for middle and high school students. About 20 students in total participate in these Korean language courses. In general, school admission is only allowed for students with a Korean nationality, either the student or at least one of their parents or grandparents should have a Korean migration background. The school homepage specifies that children (from parents) with other nationalities cannot attend the school.

3.4 Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are formulated before conducting the survey as "a proposition at the outset about what [I] suspect is the situation for [my] exploratory work (a tentative answer), which can be either proven, refuted, verified or confirmed at the end of [my] study" (Chigbu, 2019, p. 8). The following hypotheses are to be considered "as ingredients of the preconceptions and as reflections, rather than applying procedures for testing them qualitatively" (Malterud, 2001, p. 484; in p. 8). My hypothesis is that teachers who received pre-service or in-service teacher education on multilingualism are likely to be equipped with sufficient knowledge and awareness of language and multilingualism as many researchers stress the importance of teacher education on multilingualism. I think that there will be a gap between what teachers know and actually do, due to complex outward factors like students' and parents' expectations, working conditions, time constraints, school types etc.

To elaborate, because it is easier for teachers and school administrators to conform to the socially more dominant monolingual language ideologies of separate bilingualism, the gap "between typical instructional practice in second language (L2) and bilingual teaching and the perspectives of researchers regarding optimal instructional practice" (Cummins, 2017, p. 104) will continue to exist unless teachers receive sufficient teacher education. According to previous studies on teachers' attitudes towards multilingualism, teacher training about multilingualism is quite recent which means that teachers who have

Table 1. Teachers' profile

Name	Subjects (grades)	School type	Students with migration background	Teaching experience at present school (in total)	Teacher's degree	Languages	Migration background ²
Aylin	English, French (5 th ~ 13 th)	Gymnasium (HES)	30~40%	1.5 years (in total 2 years)	2017 in Germany	Turkish, German, English, French, Spanish	Turkish
Michael	mathematics, science, design (5 th ~ 12 th)	International school	60%	1 year (in total 7 years)	2015 in Australia	English	Australian
Sarah	Spanish, sports (5 th ~ 13 th)	Kooperative Gesamtschule	In some courses 100%	2 years (in total 5 years)	2016 in Germany	German, Spanish, English, French, Latin, Italian	No
Lee	Korean (5 th ~ 6 th)	Korean community language school	100%	28 years (in total 28 years)	1985 in Korea	German, Korean	Korean

² Teachers' answers to the question: 'Do you have a migration background?'

been in their profession for a long time, are likely to be uninformed about the benefits unless they received in-service teacher training (Young, 2014). Although young teachers tend to be better aware of the benefits of multilingualism on the theoretical level, they might follow the educational philosophy of the head teacher or their colleagues who have more teaching experiences and a louder saying in making influential decisions.

Thus, how teachers' attitudes are reflected on the practical level will appear differently according to the attitude of the head teacher, time constraints or students' and parents' expectations. Concerning the expectations from parents, even though Frankfurt offers many vocational opportunities for multilingual speakers, the majority of newly immigrated families are likely to value the school language more than their home language. This is due to the consequences of the competence in the school language in their children's academic achievement and career, while the home language only seems useful for communication within the family in the first place. Besides, for those who have little contact to home language communities, diverse socioeconomic opportunities connected to minority languages may remain invisible. In the case of the international school, the fact that private international schools require high tuition fees from students, can act as a pressure on teaching staff and school administrators to meet their students' and parents' expectations. The financial investment on the part of the parents can be an indicator of their high socioeconomic background but also their dedication to their children's academic achievement. Most likely, competence in English will be of a high value for them as many students opt for studying in a college in an English-speaking country or elsewhere where competence in English is of high social value. Reflecting on my experience as a teacher in Korea, higher interest and dedication to their children's academic achievement on the part of parents means for the teacher that frequent communication, negotiation with parents or sometimes living up to their expectations is a 'must'. As the majority of parents will not have been informed about the benefits of translanguaging, teachers who have language ideologies of flexible bilingualism might have to give up their beliefs unless the school board or principal agrees with them. For example, some parents might think that teachers who conduct classes solely in the target language are more competent teachers than those who use different languages. Even though this is not necessarily so, teachers might feel compelled to prove their competence by conducting the class monolingually in the target language. In the case of complementary schools, these schools are voluntarily visited, and mean extra class hours besides the

obligatory school for children, only parents who feel the need and value of home language education and have succeeded in convincing their children will be able to send their children to this Saturday-school. Some parents might want to pass on the home language to their children while others might want the school to help their children keep up with their Korean peers since they opt for returning to Korea after a few years. The working environment and conditions of each school type can influence teachers' teaching practices as well. For instance, teaching in a mainstream school involves more responsibility on the part of teachers in terms of following the curriculum, student assessment, students' academic achievement because these factors may directly impact students' prospective career, while teaching in a complementary school has totally different implications. Not only do these educational institutions require different qualifications in the recruitment of teachers, but also different working hours.

Last but not least, the percentage of students with a migration background might affect whether multilingualism is normalized in the school climate. It can be inferred that in international schools where the majority of students have a high socioeconomic background, more students are likely to have literacy skills in their home language. Students in the international school as well as in the complementary schools will be, to a differing degree, at least bilinguals. Particularly, in the upper grades of the complementary school, most of the students are likely to be trilingual speakers (with Korean, English, and German) which makes translanguaging among students a daily communication method.

4. Development of questionnaire

4.1 Understanding of language

For the first research topic ‘understanding of language’, teachers will be asked to rate their opinion on three constructs: (1) static or dynamic nature of language, (2) connectedness between languages and (3) linguistic repertoire. As described in the previous chapter, each construct contains two “contradictory positionings of languages as separate and countable or flexible mixtures” (Warren, 2017, p. 4). Throughout Chapter 4 the statement with the viewpoint of separate bilingualism will be represented with a grey highlight, in contrast to the counterpart viewpoint of flexible bilingualism (in the electronic version, also in colors: red for separate bilingualism and blue for flexible bilingualism). The theoretical relevance based on previous researches follows as the argumentation for the pair of statements.

1) Static or dynamic nature of language

No.	Statements
49	The standard language should be protected from language change. (separate biling)
2	Languages influence one another in a dynamic way. (flexible bilingualism)

The argument in statement 49 is based on the belief of separate bilingualism and one native language—one nation ideology that the standard “language should be preserved and kept free from the contamination of other sets of linguistic resources” (Blackledge & Creese, 2008, p. 552). The opposite view described in statement 2 addresses the belief that languages constantly change through mutual influences and that places the speaker and the functional use of the language at the center.

(2) Connectedness between languages

No.	Statements
1	Individual strategies are needed in learning each language.
4	The more languages you know, the easier it is to learn new languages.

Statements 1 and 4, adopted from Haukås (2015), address teachers' beliefs of whether languages exist in a separate or an interlinked manner in a speaker's minds. As statement 4 suggests, according to

insights from research on multilingualism [...] languages are not stored separately in the brain; they are connected in multiple ways and influence one another in a dynamic system (Bialystok, 2001; Cook, 1992; Herdina & Jessner, 2002). Thus, rather than attempting to maintain learners' languages in isolation, teachers should help learners to become aware and draw on their existing knowledge [and] [...] experiences from previous language learning when learning a new language. Learners should become aware of which learning strategies they have used previously as well as reflect on, test, and evaluate the extent to which those strategies can be transferred to a new language learning context (Neuner, 2004). (Haukås, 2015, p. 2)

Likewise, Cummins (2007) observed “transfer of concepts and strategies across languages” in classrooms and criticized the “monolingual instructional assumptions that essentially deny students' access to their L1 as a resource for learning” (p. 236). However, the majority of teachers considered students' learning processes of different languages as “completely different” although the teachers had experienced that previously learned languages helped them learn another language (Haukås, 2015, p. 10). None of the teachers in the study considered “learners' language learning strategies as a competence that they wished their learners could bring to the L3 classroom” (p. 11).

3) Linguistic repertoire

No.	Statements
41	Native-like fluency is the highest attainable proficiency level.
44	Languages are learned and used in specific contexts.

Statements 41 and 44 inquire teachers' knowledge about the concept of linguistic repertoire. According to the concept of linguistic repertoire perceiving the mother tongue as a “finished-state language” is a myth (Blommaert & Backus, 2013, p. 29). Also, native-like fluency cannot be used as a general criterion to indicate the highest proficiency level because globally, the majority of speakers are not literate in their mother tongue. Rather, language competence is always in the process of development throughout the speaker's life and according to the communicative functions (Lüdi & Py, 2009). In other words, speakers'

linguistic repertoires “change all the time, because they follow and document the biographies of the ones who use them” (Blommaert & Backus, 2013, p. 29).

4.2 Awareness of the importance of multilingualism

(1) Interference and translation

No.	Statements
31	Frequent use of the home language delays the learning of German (English).
11	Students with migration background often have highly developed translation skills.

Statement no. 31, adopted from De Angelis (2011), addresses teachers' beliefs about the role of prior language knowledge in language learning: Is it a source of confusion and interference for students? Or is it a positive resource that raises students' metacognitive skills? The former question conforms to the “language competition model” (Lamarre, 2013, p. 51) under which languages are believed to compete against each other, in relation to the assimilationist belief that children have to cut down on the use of their home language in order to enhance the learning of the school language. For the complementary school teacher, statement 31 was reformulated into ‘Frequent use of the German language delays the learning of Korean’. In contrast, statement no. 11 suggests that multiple languages coexist within a speaker with positive outcomes. For example, in Wales translation is an instructional strategy that is predominantly used in bilingual classrooms (Lewis et al., 2012, p. 659). Also, outside of the classroom, translating for parents or family members in various situations is a daily task for multilingual children, thus it was documented that bilinguals often possess highly developed translation skills (Cummins, 2007). Contrary to the fear of interference, expressed by many teachers across Europe (De Angelis, 2011), translation promotes not only the acquisition of the target language, but also the biliteracy development and students' identities of competence (Manyak, 2004). For this reason, Cummins (2007) noted that prohibiting translation in a language classroom is a monolingual instructional method (p. 222). He claimed that in the context of second language teaching, translation is often associated with the grammar translation method, and teachers worry that students will overly rely on their first language rather than trying to express themselves in the second language.

(2) Multilingualism in language learning

No.	Statements
27	Students benefit more from learning to think in the new language rather than constantly comparing it to previously learned languages.
33	Students can benefit cognitively from using their home language in the classroom.

In the research field of second language acquisition, the 'direct method' was designed based on the principle how children learn their first language and emphasized the direct use of the target language for every classroom situation. As statement 27 advocates, the goal is to enable "learners to think in the target language with minimal interference from [the first language]" (Cummins, 2007, p. 223). However, the direct method was criticized for assuming the same cognitive and linguistic skills for an infant and a child who already knows one or more languages. Naturally, when learning a foreign language, using a bilingual dictionary or comparing new grammatical structures to those of the first language is an effective strategy that boosts not only learners' motivation but also raises their metalinguistic awareness as they process two languages simultaneously (Cummins, 2007, p. 229). For the complementary school teacher, statement 33 was reformulated into 'Students can benefit from using different languages than Korean in the classroom'.

(3) Code switching (or translanguaging)

No.	Statements
3	When completing a task, using one language instead of two leads to a more efficient communication.
22	Code-switching has many communicative functions.

Statements 3 and 22 examine whether teachers are familiar with the linguistic practice of multilinguals which involves translanguaging (formulated as 'code switching' to help teachers' understanding³). Traditionally, mixing languages was judged to be "a sign of semilingualism, a lack of mastery of any language", for example, to borrow words from another language to make up for missing words (Lamarre, 2013, p. 48). Instead, solving a

³ García prefers the term 'translanguaging' over code switching. According to her, the latter suggests that speakers possess separate codes and switch from one to another (García & Li, 2014). In the questionnaire I used the more familiar word 'code switching' since some teachers might not be familiar with the term translanguaging.

task in one language instead of two was interpreted as having a higher language proficiency (as statement 3 suggests) since bilingual speakers were viewed as double monolingual speakers that need to reach the level of monolingual speakers in each language and have balanced competence in the two languages. However, recent research showed that bilinguals' linguistic practice is different from that of monolinguals. This was called 'bilingual mode' (Grojean, 1985), 'bilingual speech' (Lüdi and Py, 2003) "in which the entire repertoire is activated" (Lüdi & Py, 2009, p. 161), or "another form of linguistic resource, beyond the ability to perform 'unilingually'" (Lamarre, 2013, p. 48). Multilingual speakers locally negotiate the appropriateness of translanguaging, and translanguage typically in interactions among close friends or family members (Lamarre et al., 2015, p. 72). Statement 22 refers to deictic functions of the bilingual speech (Lüdi and Py, 2009), also called as strategic functions by Coste et al. (2009), for instance to negotiate meaning, convey a message more effectively, indicate the speaker's sociocultural identity and position in the conversation, or characterize the conversation, etc. (pp. 18-19).

(4) Benefits of learning the home language

No.	Statements
13	The purpose of learning the heritage language lies in forming students' ethnic identity.
15	Home language literacy has many cognitive and linguistic benefits.

Statements 13 and 15 aim at examining how teachers perceive the cognitive and social benefits of multilingualism (García & Li, 2014). 'Promoting students' identity' (statement 13) is one of the benefits that come with learning the home language, however, should not be seen as the only benefit. According to Blackledge and Creese (2008) "it is certainly an oversimplification to treat certain languages as 'symbols' or 'carriers' or 'identity'" (p. 535). However, if teachers have little knowledge on the existence of multilingual networks or communities, the socioeconomic benefits of speaking minority languages might remain invisible to teachers. Bourdieu referred to this as teachers' "linguistic habitus". In other words, a teacher's "understanding of the social order and one's own position in it" determines his or her perspective on diverse areas (Gogolin et al., 2019, p. 285).

(5) Bias towards international languages

No.	Statements
29	In our society it is more important to know German perfectly than other foreign languages.
5	Students who are familiar with several languages will have more opportunities to succeed in their professional life.

Statements 29 and 5 ask whether teachers have any “bias toward major international languages” (De Angelis, 2011, p. 229). Affirming the idea of ‘knowing German perfectly’ in statement no. 29 indicates that the respondent believes that there is such a thing as ‘perfect mastery’ of a language. This does not correspond to the linguistic reality where one’s language competence constantly develops and changes according to its linguistic functions and the context in which the language is used. Statement 5, adopted from De Angelis (2011), examines whether teachers are aware of the benefits of multilingualism since devaluing students’ home languages might lead to language loss or students “miss[ing] out on some work opportunities in the future” (De Angelis, 2011, p. 229).

(6) Assimilationist vs. pluralist language ideologies

No.	Statements
9	Speaking German at home promotes migrant students’ integration.
8	Valuing students’ home language enhances their engagement in learning.

Although learning the language of the school is crucial for integration, many teachers take up the assimilationist position and claim that students “should forfeit their home language and culture in order to learn successfully” (Young, 2014, p. 163). Young judged this thought as “perplexing from both a linguistic and an educational perspective” as research proved that learning occurs by building on existing knowledge (p. 164). At the core of the problem lies the misconception that integration is

a one-way street, the burden of responsibility to integrate, to learn [the school language], being placed firmly on the foreign pupil’s shoulders, whilst the school makes scant effort to adapt to the multilingual society which it is supposed to serve. [...] The opposition of plurilingualism with integration also reveals an either/or attitude, characteristic of a monolingual/cultural vision. Either you renounce your

home language and culture and exclusively adopt those of your country of residence or you choose to maintain your linguistic and cultural identity and in so doing reject those of the host country. The idea of simultaneously developing both languages and multiple identities is viewed as inconceivable. (p. 162)

What may be more important for students' integration is 'valuing their home language' (statement 8) since students' engagement in learning "is fueled as much by affect as by cognition" (Cummins, 2005, n.p.). An environment that affirms students' home language and identity "increas[es] the confidence with which these students engage in language and literacy activities" (Cummins, 2005, n.p.). Particularly for students who have limited competence in the school language, using their home language at school can facilitate sharing their experiences with teachers and building a good relationship with them.

(7) Students' identity

No.	Statements
12	Students with a migration background mostly feel 'torn' between two cultures.
6	Students with a migration background cannot be clearly categorized according to their countries of origin.

Statements 12 and 6 ask, whether teachers think that the category of nationality and culture is the main indicator for students' identity. Do they believe that all students with a migration background inevitably feel 'torn' between two or more cultures? This view depicts multilingual children as lacking something monolingual 'native speakers' who possess a whole identity because they suffer from identity crisis and need support (Dirim et al., 2013, pp. 123-124). This thought connects to the one-nation-one-language ideology which perceives language as inextricable factor to the sense of national or cultural belonging. Teachers need to acknowledge that "people can no longer be straightforwardly associated with particular (national, ethnic, sociocultural) groups and identities" (Blommaert & Backus, 2013, p. 13) due to their unpredictability and transculturality.

4.3 Teachers' perceived role

(1) Cross-linguistic transfer and teachers' perceived role

No.	Statements
43	Students with a migration background have to learn subject contents "from the beginning" because they have learnt it in a different language.
26	Teachers need to encourage multilingual students to rely on their knowledge learned in their home language (or a different language than the school language)

Statements 43 and 26 aim to explore what teachers think they should do in a multilingual classroom. Cummins (2007) stated that one of the "three major conditions for effective learning [is] engaging prior understandings" (p. 231). Statement 43 is based on the belief that subject-related knowledge cannot be transferred across languages. Statement 26 suggests the opposite viewpoint that positive transfer is possible if teachers encourage learners to resort to previously learned knowledge in their home language. The respondents' answers to the two statements will reveal whether they are informed about positive transfer of knowledge across languages and whether they perceive it as the role of the teacher to support multilingual students to benefit from it.

(2) Teachers' influence on home language practice

No.	Statements
32	Teachers usually do not influence students' home language practice.
14	Students' awareness of their first language and culture is affected by their teachers' attitudes.

Statements 32 and 14 each assert opposite ideas of whether or not teachers influence students in their awareness of their first language and culture and the home language practice.

3) Direction of professional development

No.	Statements
47	I think that teachers should focus more on the effective teaching of the common language.
10	I think that teacher training about multilingualism is important.

Statements 47 and 10 inquire about what teachers think is more needed for the professional development of teachers: Do they feel a necessity that their colleagues should be educated more about multilingualism (no. 10)? Or is it more urgent to devise effective methods to teach the common language (no. 47)? Even though the responses to these statements are not mutually exclusive, they may reveal teachers' priorities and what they perceive of as more urgent.

4.4 Teachers' teaching practices

In order to address all domains of teaching practices, I adopted as my guideline Charlotte Danielson's (1996) 'Framework for teaching' that documented through research and empirical studies aspects of teachers' responsibilities that positively affect students' learning. In this framework, the complex activity of teaching is divided into 22 elements that are grouped into 4 domains: (1) Planning and Preparation, (2) The Classroom Environment, (3) Instruction, and (4) Professional Responsibilities (table 2). I selected one or two components from each domain that I considered relevant when dealing with multilingual students in the classroom. Another tool of reference I used, are the '6 quality criteria' that constitute language-sensitive teaching in a multilingual classroom setting (Gogolin et al., 2011) (table 3) (in Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2017, p. 54). According to Gay (2010), educators need to focus on 'culturally responsive pedagogy' which activates students' cultural knowledge and prior experiences in order to render a more effective teaching and learning. "In other words, culturally and linguistically responsive teaching validates and treats as an asset all languages and cultures of pupils through the use of responsive instructional strategies" (Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2017, p. 53).

Table 2. Danielson's (1996) framework for teaching

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation	Domain 2: Classroom Environment
1a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport
1b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning
1c. Setting Instructional Outcomes	2c. Managing Classroom Procedures
1d. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resource	2d. Managing Student Behavior
1e. Designing Coherent Instruction	2e. Organizing Physical Space
1f. Designing Student Assessments	
Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities	Domain 3: Instruction
4a. Reflecting on Teaching	3a. Communication With Students
4b. Maintaining Accurate Records	3b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques
4c. Communicating with Families	3c. Engaging Students in Learning
4d. Participating in the Professional Community	3d. Using Assessment in Instruction
4e. Growing and Developing Professionality	3e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness
4f. Demonstrating Professionalism	

Table 3. Quality criteria for language-sensitive teaching

Quality criteria	Instructional processes
QC 1	Teachers plan and implement instruction considering different registers and explicitly connect everyday language and academic language, e.g. by micro- and macro-scaffolding.
QC 2	Teachers diagnose individual linguistic preconditions and developmental processes.
QC 3	Teachers provide material for learning different linguistic registers from vocabulary to specific content-related tasks.
QC 4	Pupils experience many opportunities to learn, activate and develop academic language competences.
QC 5	Teachers support pupils in their individual language development processes.
QC 6	Teachers and pupils monitor and evaluate the results of their actual language development.

(1) Domain 1: Planning and Preparation

No.	Statements
30	I usually don't ask about students' first language (languages other than the school language) or their migration background.
20	I ask and talk about students' home languages (languages other than the school language) openly.
16	I treat every student the same regardless of their linguistic proficiency.
23	I prepare supplementary material for linguistically weaker students.

No. 30 and 20 are directed towards teachers' demonstration of their knowledge about students (framework component 1b) which overlaps with the quality criteria (QC) 2 'Teachers diagnose individual linguistic preconditions and developmental processes'. These statements are intended to examine indirectly how teachers perceive a student's first language or migration background. Do teachers consider them as relevant factors for individualized teaching? Do they *show* their interest to multilingual students? These questions are significant because knowing which languages students can speak is the first step to implementing a language-sensitive classroom instruction. Some teachers might respond that they recognize the assets of multilingualism but have "never spoken with [their] minority students about their home languages and what they know" in practice (Haukås, 2015, p. 9). Others might not know how to address these issues or perceive mentioning these topics as labelling students. The responses to statements 16 and 23 will provide clues whether teachers incorporate students' linguistic knowledge and proficiency level in the planning and preparation stage, for example by preparing supplementary material for linguistically weaker students.

(2) Domain 2: Classroom Environment

No.	Statements
24	I intervene when my students speak in their home language (languages other than the school language) among themselves during class.
36	I allow students to communicate in any language when they do pair/group-work.
28	I try to stick to the standard German (or another school) language to set an example for the students.
38	I use different languages to build rapport with multilingual students.

The two pairs of statements are designed to check on teaching framework components (2a) 'Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport' and (2b) 'Establishing a Culture for Learning': Do teachers create an environment that welcomes and respects students' languages and allows them to communicate in different languages during pair/group work (no. 36)? Or is the use of home languages in the classroom inappropriate and needs to be stopped by the teacher (no. 24)? According to Li (2011), translanguaging space "embraces two concepts, namely creativity and criticality, which, in [his] view, are fundamental but hitherto under-explored dimensions of multilingual practices" (p. 2). Canagarajah (2011) referred to "the realization of translanguaging in texts [that] accommodates the possibility of mixing communicative modes and diverse symbol systems"

as 'codemeshing' (p.403). Canagarajah observed that translanguaging space, or codemeshing allowed his students to employ several essential critical writing strategies.

Statements 28 and 38 are developed to explore how teachers express their beliefs on the standard variety of the school language (German/ English/ Korean) and multilingualism. Sticking to the standard variety to set an example (no. 28) certainly reveals standard language ideologies, valuing the standard variety more than other varieties. Teaching about different registers and their functions rather than eliminating all other varieties from the classroom discourse will be an approach that better reflects the linguistic reality. No. 38 'I use different languages to build rapport with multilingual students' clearly is a sign of respect and willingness to build a rapport with multilingual students.

(3) Domain 3: Instruction

No.	Statements
17	Subject-related vocabulary or academic expressions are learned naturally with time.
34	I ask if students have understood subject jargons or subject-specific vocabulary.
19	I correct students when they use slang or words from other languages.
18	I encourage my students to express their ideas in any language.

The instruction domain includes how teachers communicate with students (3a), engage students in learning (3c) and demonstrate flexibility and responsiveness (3e). Using effective questioning and discussion techniques (3b) and assessment in instruction (3d) can be the means to enhancing the effectiveness of instruction. Statements 17 and 24 address teaching "subject register" which accounts as one of the three dimensions that build necessary teacher competences (Köker et al., 2015, p. 181; in Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2017, p. 43). This is because academic register is the key to a successful instruction since

knowledge about subject register (or linguistic varieties) means gaining an intimate understanding of morphology, lexical semantics, syntax and text linguistics in the realm of grammatical structures and vocabulary of the teacher's subject. Within the dimension of the subject register there are also semiotic systems to be clear about: orality versus literality, representation format, and linguistic references between different formats. (Köker et al., 2015, p. 181; in Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2017, p. 43)

In this respect, checking on students' understanding of subject register (no. 34) is indispensable for effective and flexible instruction. Gogolin et al. (2011) also indicated that

providing material for learning different linguistic registers from vocabulary to specific content-related tasks is one of the six quality criteria (QC 3) for language-sensitive teaching. However, many teachers unconsciously believe that the register of academic knowledge is acquired in the family, outside of school, or develop naturally as a result of more exposure (no. 17) (Gogolin et al., 2019). The problem lies in the fact that “multilingual students, but also monolinguals who have less access to literacy activities in the language of schooling in their family environment, can thus gradually be excluded from successful learning due to the linguistic presentation of contents and tasks” (Gogolin et al., 2019, p. 587). Considering that bilingual students typically “require at least five years to catch up” with their monolingual peers to acquire the academic register, explicit instruction on subject register seems to be crucial (Cummins et al., 2005, p. 22).

Allowing students to express their ideas in any language (no. 18) can be an opportunity for students to ‘learn, activate and develop academic language competences’ (QC 4) in a safe space by establishing links to previously learned subject knowledge. Cummins et al. (2005) noted that “instruction that builds on students’ home language (L1) proficiency represents a potential lifeline that enables students to participate academically and express their intelligence and identities within the classroom” (p. 22). On the contrary, correcting students’ slang or foreign words for every utterance lets infer that teachers focus more on the correct use of the language when communicating with students.

(4) Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities

No.	Statements
7	I give practical advice to students how to learn correct German (the school language).
25	I encourage migrant students or parents to maintain their home language.
39	The competence in English (German or Korean) of multilingual students’ parents is crucial for any successful collaboration between the school and the parents.
48	I provide material or translation in other languages (in addition to German or English or Korean) for immigrant parents if needed.

Statements 7 and 25 cover what message teachers communicate to students and families (4c) about multilingualism. No. 25, adopted from De Angelis (2011), asks whether teachers encourage families to maintain their home language. Considering that teachers might exert great influence on families’ perception of the home language, whether they support students’

individual linguistic development (QC 5) in regard of their multilingual repertoire and their home language or just focus on the correct use of the school language (no. 7) is of great meaning.

Statements 39 and 48 can be grouped into the category of communication with parents. According to Lundberg (2019), teachers who emphasized the school language competence of multilingual students' parents as a precondition for successful collaboration with the school (no. 39) also believed that parents carry the sole responsibility to learn the school language, and that speaking the first language at home did not present any benefits for students. On the contrary, teachers who provide material to facilitate communication with migrant families (no. 48) demonstrate their engagement and support for newly arrived families.

4.5 Factors of influence

No.	Statements
35	Implementing a multilingual didactic method bears the risk of excluding monolingual students.
21	Students' and parents' expectations are important factors in designing my instruction method.
45	Preparing multilingual didactic material is difficult because of time constraints.
46	My principal (teachers) share(s) my ideas about multilingualism.
37	Working together with colleagues means that I often have to give up my beliefs and make compromises.
42	I think that public schools and heritage language schools have different educational goals.
40	I would be interested to receive information about students' engagement or academic performance in other schools/ institutions (i.e. heritage school or public school).

Some possible factors that may affect teachers' practice were identified in this part: fear of excluding monolingual students (no. 35), students' and parents' expectations (no. 21), time constraints (45), disagreement with school principle (no. 46) or colleagues (no. 37) or the lack of institutional support and cooperation between schools (no. 42 and 40). Contrary to some teachers' fears, "bilingual instructional strategies can also promote identity investment among both majority and minority students in bilingual/ immersion programs by encouraging them to express *themselves* through both of their languages" (Cummins, 2007, p. 238).

5. Analysis of Results

5.1 Reverse scoring questions

Reverse scoring means that the score coded for each response in the Likert scale is reversed for negatively worded sentences. In the present questionnaire, except for the last part of exploring the influential factors, all statements exist in pairs, each representing the view of separate and flexible bilingualism. Therefore, responses for flexible bilingualism will be scored from 0 to 3 (strongly disagree=0, somewhat disagree=1, somewhat agree=2, and strongly agree=3) and for separate bilingualism 3 to 0 (strongly disagree=3, somewhat disagree=2, somewhat disagree=1, strongly agree=0). The same is applied to responses of describing frequency for statements on teaching practice: 'almost never', 'sometimes', 'often', 'almost every time'. For example, if a respondent strongly agrees with a statement of flexible bilingualism (=3) and strongly disagrees with the concurring statement of separate bilingualism (=3) the scores will add up to 6 while the lowest possible score will be 0.

Table 4. Respondents' scores for parts (1) ~ (4)

Respondents	(1) Understanding of language (0~18)		(2) Perceived importance of multilingualism (0~42)		(3) Perceived teachers' roles (0~18)		(4) Teaching Practice (0~48)		Total (0~126)	
	(sep.)	(flex.)								
Aylin	2	8	9	16	5	7	14	8	30	39
	10 (total)		25		12		22		69	
Michael	5	6	10	12	6	6	18	7	39	31
	11		22		12		25		70	
Sarah	6	7	7	16	4	7	14	10	31	37
	13		23		11		24		71	
Lee	1	6	4	15	3	7	5	9	14	37
	7		19		10		14		50	

5.2 Comparing responses according to separate and flexible bilingualism

In order to explore whether teachers' attitudes are more inclined to separate or flexible bilingualism, scores for each construct were added and presented according to their

parts. Scores between 0 and 2 represent an inclination towards separate bilingualism. The smaller the number, the stronger the belief is. When teachers' responses sum up to 3, their viewpoint is mixed (and sometimes contradictory, for example, they would agree with both contradicting opinions). Scores between 4 and 6 demonstrate the tendency towards flexible bilingualism. What follows is a detailed description of the responses. The darkness of the grey color indicates the degree of inclination towards flexible bilingualism.

5.2.1 Knowledge and Perception

(1) Understanding of language

Table 5. Understanding of language

No.	Construct	Aylin	Michael	Sarah	Lee
1	Static or dynamic nature of language	5	4	5	2
2	Connectedness of languages	3	3	5	3
3	Linguistic repertoire	2	4	3	2
	Sum	10	11	13	7

Aylin's answers represent mixed viewpoints of flexible and separate bilingualism. On the one hand, she strongly confirms that languages influence one another in a dynamic way and thinks that standard languages can change over time (construct 1:5). On the other hand, she strongly believes that native-like fluency is the highest attainable goal of language learning, confirming the existence of the 'mythical' competence of 'native speakers'. At the same time, she agrees with the concept of linguistic repertoire that all languages are learned and used in specific contexts, which contradicts with the idea of a native-like fluency to be the highest level of proficiency (construct 3:2). Regarding the connectedness of languages (construct 2:3), Aylin strongly agrees that the more languages you know the easier it is to learn other languages; but at the same time strongly advocates individual strategies for learning different languages.

Michael and Sarah display a tendency towards flexible bilingualism, while Sarah shows a stronger inclination. Both of them agree that languages mutually influence each other

in a dynamic way while for the counterpart statement advocating standard language protection, Sarah shows a stronger dissent. Michael is more convinced of the idea of the linguistic repertoire (construct 3:4) while Sarah believes that students can benefit from drawing connections between languages and transferring learning strategies from one language to another (construct 2:5)

Lee is convinced of the necessity to protect the standard language from language changes (construct 1:2) while the connectedness of languages and the need for individual strategies to learn different languages are both agreed with. Also strongly advocated is the belief that native-like fluency is the highest attainable proficiency level (construct 3:2).

(2) Awareness of the importance of multilingualism

Table 6. Awareness of the importance of multilingualism

No.	Construct	Aylin	Michael	Sarah	Lee
1	Interference and translation	3	2	3	3
2	Multilingualism in language learning	4	4	3	0
3	Code switching (or translanguaging)	6	4	4	2
4	Benefits of home language learning (literacy)	3	3	2	2
5	Bias towards international languages	3	4	5	3
6	Assimilationist vs. pluralist language ideologies	3	3	3	6
7	Students' identity	3	2	3	3
	Sum	25	23	23	19

Concerning the awareness of multilingualism, Aylin, Michael and Sarah display a viewpoint of flexible bilingualism and Lee that of separate bilingualism. Interestingly, each teacher expresses the strongest opinion for different statements: The idea that Aylin feels most confident about is the communicative functions of code-switching. She strongly disagrees with the countering idea that using one language instead of two leads to a more effective communication. Sarah and Michael both disagree with the statement that perfect mastery of German is more important than other foreign languages in our society. Then again,

they are inclined to the assimilationist view, as they agree with the use of German at home to promote migrant students' integration, which is based on the idea that frequent use of the home language is likely to delay German. It can be inferred that both Michael and Sarah position major international languages like English over minority languages. Lee agrees with the language competition model that the frequent use of one language delays the learning of another. Lee thinks that languages should be used and learned separately conforming to double monolingual language ideologies. Despite the fact that she emphasizes the importance of the German language in the society, she expresses firm dissent against enhancing German language proficiency at the sake of the home language (construct 6:6). Except for Michael, all agree that categorizing students according to their country of origin is difficult and students with a migration background mostly experience conflicts between two cultures.

(3) Perceived teachers' role

Table 7. Perceived teachers' role

No.	Construct	Aylin	Michael	Sarah	Lee
1	Cross-linguistic transfer and teachers' perceive role	5	5	4	4
2	Teachers' influence on home language practice	4	4	3	3
3	Direction of professional development	3	3	4	3

Regarding how teachers perceive their role in the multilingual classroom, all respondents share similar viewpoints. For the first construct all three teachers except for Lee agree that positive transfer of subject knowledge occurs across languages. For the second construct Aylin, Michael and Lee think that teachers have influence on their students' home language practice whereas Sarah does not. However, Sarah thinks that students' awareness of their home language or culture can be affected by teachers and so do Aylin and Michael. Lee, however, thinks that teachers cannot affect students' awareness of their home language or culture. For construct 4 Aylin and Lee judge both teacher training on multilingualism and common language instruction as very important and Sarah thinks that the latter is more important than the former.

5.2.2 Teaching Practice

Table 8. Teaching practice

No.	Construct	Aylin	Michael	Sarah	Lee
1	Talking about students' multilingualism	4	3	4	4
2	Individualized instruction	2	3	1	2
3	Creating translanguaging space	2	4	3	0
4	Teachers' language practice	3	3	2	0
5	Instruction of academic register	3	4	5	5
6	Translanguaging instruction	0	4	4	0
7	Expressing opinion on multilingualism	5	4*	4	2
8	Communication with migrant families	3*	0*	1*	1
Sum		22	25	21	14

* Formulation of question contains error which lowers the reliability of the result.

(1) Planning and preparation

For construct 1 'talking about students' multilingualism', all teachers ask about students' first languages or their migration background while only Aylin talks about it openly in class and other teachers only sometimes. Regarding construct 2 'individualized instruction', all three teachers except for Michael strongly advocate that they treat students the same regardless of their linguistic proficiency level. Aylin and Lee often prepare supplementary material for linguistically weaker students, whereas Michael and Sarah only do so sometimes.

(2) Classroom Environment

In regard to creating translanguaging space, communicating in any language during pair or group work is strictly forbidden in Aylin and Lee's classroom. On the contrary, Michael often allows multilingual communication among students while Sarah does so sometimes. However, except for Lee who always intervenes when students speak in a language different than the school language (Korean) the other three teachers answered that they do so only sometimes. Concerning teachers' own language practice, Aylin and Michael never stick to the standard language while Sarah does so often and Lee always. In contrast,

using different languages to build a better relationship with students is only practiced by Sarah occasionally while the other three teachers never do so.

(3) Instruction

Sarah and Lee almost always check on students' understanding of academic register while for Aylin and Michael this seems only occasionally necessary. Still, all teachers disagree with the statement that subject register is acquired naturally with time. The responses to construct 6 'translanguaging instruction' vary mostly. Aylin and Lee uphold an instructional method that excludes translanguaging. They always correct students when they use slang or foreign words and never encourage them to express their ideas in other languages than the target language. Michael and Sarah have in common that they almost never correct students when they use a different register and sometimes encourage them to participate in any language.

(4) Professional Development

Giving students advice on how to learn correct school language is for Lee a daily task, for Aylin and Sarah an occasional one and for Michael something he never does. (However, Michael's response to this question will not be considered meaningful for the analysis, since he was asked to choose his answer to the statement "I give practical advice to students on how to learn correct German" instead of English, his school's language.) Teachers answered differently to the question whether they encourage migrant students to maintain their home language: Aylin chose 'almost every time', Sarah and Lee 'often', and Michael 'sometimes'. In regard to communication with multilingual parents, none of the teachers provide extra material or translation for them. Parents' competence in the school language is considered indispensable for Michael and Lee. Aylin and Sarah's answers are not meaningful since the statement they were given was 'The competence in English of multilingual students' parents is crucial for any successful collaboration between the school and the parents' where 'English' was by mistake not changed into 'German' to match the school language.

5.2.3 Factors of influence

Table 9. Factors of influence

No.	Construct	Aylin	Michael	Sarah	Lee
35	Excluding monolingual students	1	2	1	0
21	Students' and parents' expectations	3	2	2	2
45	Time constraints	3	2	2	3
46	Agreement with principal on multilingualism	0	1	2	2
37	Making compromises with colleagues	3	1	1	1
42	Different educational goals for public and heritage language schools	3	2	2	3
40	Interest in receiving information about students' engagement/ academic performance in other schools	3	1	2	0

Strongly disagree=0, somewhat disagree=1, somewhat agree=2, and strongly agree=3

(For no. 5: almost never=0, sometimes=1, often=2, almost every time=3)

Factors that influence or restrict teachers' behavior are marked with a grey background and the intensity is shown by the darkness of the color. Aylin seems to be highly influenced by students' and parents' expectations (21:3), time constraint (45:3), disagreement with the principal (46:0) and compromising with colleagues (37:3). Michael, Sarah and Lee are also influenced by students' and parents' expectations and time constraints while Michael is the only one to express his fear of excluding monolingual students (35:2). Concerning statements 42 and 40, all four teachers think that public and heritage language schools have different educational goals. Aylin showed interest in receiving information about students' engagement or academic performance in other schools while Sarah and Michael showed less interest and Lee did not at all.

5.3 Correlation between knowledge and practice

For this part of the analysis, statements of knowledge and practice with the same topic were grouped together to see whether teachers answered consistently across what they know and what they actually do. The topics are presented in the order of the degree of correlation or consistency between knowledge and practice. The responses with a higher correlation are framed with bold lines, while those with lower correlation are colored in grey. The statements for teaching practices are marked in italics.

5.3.1 High correlation

(1) Benefits and maintaining the home language

Table 10. Benefits and maintaining the home language

No.	Statement	Aylin	Mich.	Sarah	Lee
13	Home language literacy has many cognitive and linguistic benefits.	3	2	2	2
29	Students who are familiar with several languages will have more opportunities to succeed in their professional life.	3	2	2	3
25	<i>I encourage migrant students or parents to maintain their home language.</i>	3	1	2	2

In *italics*: statement about teaching practice

All four teachers are more or less convinced of the benefits of home language and knowledge of foreign languages in the society. Except for Michael, this seems to lead them to the action of encouraging migrant students or parents to main their home language.

(2) Use of home language among students

Table 11. Use of home language among students

No.	Statement	Aylin	Mich.	Sarah	Lee
27	Students can benefit cognitively from using their home language in the classroom.	2	2	3	0
24	<i>I intervene when my students speak in their home language among themselves during class.*</i>	2	2	2	0

In *italics*: statement about teaching practice

The responses from Aylin, Michael and Lee (with bold box frames) are consistent through knowledge and practice concerning students' use of their home language. They believe that using home languages in the classroom is beneficial for students' cognitive development and also show a relatively tolerant attitude towards communication in the home language among students.

5.3.2 Mixed correlation

(1) Standard school language

Table 12. Standard school language

No.	Statement	Aylin	Mich.	Sarah	Lee
2	The standard language should be protected from language change.*	2	2	3	0
28	<i>I try to stick to the standard German language to set an example for the students.*</i>	3	3	1	0
10	I think that teachers should focus more on the effective teaching of the common language.*	0	1	1	0
7	<i>I give practical advice to students on how to learn correct German.*</i>	2	3	2	0

* reverse score; in *italics*: statement about teaching practice

For Aylin, Michael and Sarah, their teaching practice concerning the standard language is not consistent with their knowledge. For instance, Sarah strongly disagrees with the need to protect standard languages but sometimes tries to stick to the standard German language. Aylin strongly believes that teachers should focus more on the effective teaching of the common language, but does not give practical advice on how to learn correct German. Unlike the other three teachers, Lee's responses remain consistent across knowledge and practice.

(2) Use of a different language than the school language during pair or group work

Table 13. Use of a different language than the school language during pair or group work

No.	Statement	Aylin	Mich.	Sarah	Lee
22	When completing a task, using one language instead of two leads to a more efficient communication.	3	2	2	0
36	<i>I allow students to communicate in any language when they do pair/group-work.</i>	0	2	1	0

In *italics*: statement about teaching practice

Columns are colored in grey where teachers' attitude of flexible bilingualism in knowledge becomes weaker in practice

Michael and Lee show a rather consistent attitude between their belief and practice while Aylin and Sarah, show a reaction that deviates from what they believe about using multiple languages for communication. Although both Aylin and Sarah think that translanguaging does not interrupt effective communication and task completion, they prefer their students to use the target or school language during pair work or group work. For both teachers, the score decreases from knowledge to practice which means that their attitude towards flexible bilingualism is represented stronger in their perception than in their actual teaching practice.

5.3.3 Gap between theory and practice**(1) Teachers' own language practice**

Table 14. Teachers' own language practice

No.	Statement	Aylin	Mich.	Sarah	Lee
9	Valuing students' home language enhances their engagement in learning.	2	2	3	3
38	<i>I use different languages to establish a relationship with multilingual students.</i>	0	0	1	0

In *italics*: statement about teaching practice

All four teachers react in a passive manner when it comes to employing their full linguistic repertoire and bringing it into expression, even though all of them have a favorable attitude towards the effects of valuing students' home languages or other languages that they know besides the school language. Again, the scores of all teachers decrease from knowledge to practice which means that their attitude towards flexible bilingualism cannot be represented through actual teaching practices.

(2) Use of a language different from the school language in whole class work

Table 15. Use of a language different from the school language in whole class work

No.	Statement	Aylin	Mich.	Sarah	Lee
1	The more languages you know, the easier it is to learn new languages.	3	2	3	2
19	<i>I correct students when they use slang or words from other languages.*</i>	0	3	3	0
26	Students with a migration background have to learn subject contents "from the beginning" because they have learnt it in a different language.*	3	3	2	1
43	Teachers need to encourage multilingual students to rely on their knowledge learned in their home language.	2	2	2	3
18	<i>I encourage my students to express their ideas in any language.</i>	0	1	1	0

* reverse score; in *italics*: statement about teaching practice

For statements no. 1 and 19, all teachers more or less acknowledge that previously learned language knowledge or language learning strategies are helpful when learning another language. Only Sarah and Michael let students combine slang or foreign words to

express themselves. Aylin and Lee tend to focus on the monolingual development of the target language which becomes evident in that they correct students' translanguaging. For statements 26, 43 and 18, interestingly, all four teachers react negatively towards encouraging students to express their ideas in any language: Aylin and Lee chose 'almost never' whereas Sarah and Michael chose 'sometimes'. Their theoretical knowledge that subject content is transferred across languages does not seem to result in classroom interactions during whole class work. Even though all four teachers agree, to differing degrees, with the idea that it would be helpful for students if teachers encouraged them to rely on their knowledge learned in their home language, they seem to be strictly maintaining the monolingual language policy.

It is noteworthy that the attitude of all four teachers towards students' translanguaging practice changes according to the type of interaction; whether students speak in their home language among themselves, during pair work and group work, or during whole class activities. It is noticeable that there are two differences that mark these three types of interaction: the interlocutor, to whom the students speak and the formality of students' participation. Generally, students' participation during whole class work is considered to be a more formal contribution in the procedure of the lesson while small talk is more informal and 'acceptable' as long as it remains in the background, for example to ask a peer for clarification of an unknown word. Also, students often imitate their peers when it comes to interacting with the teacher. It can be inferred that on the one hand, the teachers might want to prevent the situation where single exceptions of their classroom language policy might lead to an overall disorder while on the other hand, they feel compelled to represent a certain position when it comes to interacting with the whole class.

5.4 Individual content analysis

The following chapters suggest possible explanations based on qualitative analysis of teachers' profiles, information of their schools and their responses on their articulated and embodied language ideologies in the questionnaire. I am aware that alternative interpretations are possible. My intention lies in demonstrating how given qualitative and quantitative data can be synthesized to interpret teachers' attitudes and to explore what kind of support is helpful for the development of teachers' profession in the multilingual reality.

5.4.1 The case of Aylin: “My head teacher does not agree with me”

While on the theoretical level Aylin conforms to some aspects of flexible bilingualism, her teaching practices reflect the position of separate bilingualism. Aylin's contradictory responses in knowledge and practice exemplify the typically found gap in the theoretical understanding of multilingualism and practice that several researchers observed (Gogolin et al., 2019; Flores & Bale, 2017, p. 31) or as Cummins (2017) put it, the gap “between typical instructional practice in second language (L2) and bilingual teaching and the perspectives of researchers regarding optimal instructional practice” (p. 104). Aylin's responses in the knowledge part reflect her awareness of the benefits of the multilingual didactic method for both monolingual and multilingual students and her favorable attitude towards students' multilingualism. She openly discusses students' home languages and cultures with them and advises them to maintain their home language. Furthermore, her interest and willingness to receive information about students' engagement or academic performance in heritage language schools underline that she would like to engage more actively in helping students to see and apply their multilingualism as a resource. Her recently completed teacher's degree and profile are indicators for sufficient theoretical and practical knowledge about multilingualism and translanguaging, which indicates that teacher training and knowledge alone may not suffice to implement a multilingual pedagogical teaching method. Aylin's gap in knowledge and practice may be explained by her responses in the part ‘factors of influence’: Her principle does not at all share her ideas about multilingualism and almost every time she has to give up her own beliefs in order to cooperate with colleague teachers. Besides, she lacks resource in time while students' and parents' expectations play a decisive role when designing her teaching method. It can be inferred that what her school takes pride in and her students and parents expect from English and French classes are conflicting with Aylin's educational philosophy to “teach for life and not for a test”, and teach students how they can use these languages are in real life as multilingual speakers.

Her school takes pride in organizing French bilingual program as a Europaschule. Additionally, the description of the bilingual program in the school homepage indicates that the language of instruction transitions from bilingual (German and French) to monolingual (French only) once students attain higher a proficiency level. This bilingual program is based on “transitional language ideology in which the goal to achieve proficiency in [the target

language] rather than bilingualism and biliteracy (Palmer, 2011)” (Henderson, 2017, p. 11) and parallel monolingualisms (cf. Heller, 1999), viewing bilingual students as double monolinguals.

As a competent multilingual speaker of German, Turkish, English and French, Aylin activates her linguistic repertoire according to the context, interlocutors and purpose of the communication. She is able to indicate specific contexts when and with whom she uses *which* language: “English is for movies, music and books[;] Turkish is for my relatives and family, German for anything else in Germany”. It is for sure that her translanguaging is not a sign of semilingualism since teaching English and French to students of diverse proficiency levels ranging from classes 5 to 13 at a Gymnasium requires a high professional language proficiency. However, Aylin’s responses show a gap between her own language learning process and that of her students. Even though she agrees with the idea that previous language knowledge is helpful for further language learning, she advocates individual strategies for learning different languages for her students. This attitude was also present in many foreign language teachers in Norway (Haukås, 2015). The reason why teachers believed that students were not able to apply their strategies when learning a new language was that, unlike “teachers [who] were aware of how to use their previous knowledge in further language learning” students were not (Haukås, 2015, p. 12). The fact that Aylin acknowledges the cognitive and linguistic benefits of multilingualism, but does not agree that multilingual students who have good translation skills might indicate that she did not have the chance to observe multilingual students translate or use their whole linguistic repertoire in the classroom in general.

5.4.2 The case of Michael: “I am a monolingual English speaking teacher”

Michael shows a slight tendency towards the pluralist viewpoint of flexible language ideology, compared to his school’s articulated language policy which insists on the separation of languages. Michael mainly shows a tolerant and respectful attitude towards multilingual students and their home language use. Rather than focusing on students’ correct use of the English language, his attention is drawn to students’ comprehension of subject contents. However, we also need to keep in mind that this might be due to the fact that Michael teaches mathematics, science and design unlike the other three teachers who teach at least one

(foreign) language as their subjects. Michael does not display sufficient awareness of the benefits of multilingualism, evident in his belief that ‘implementing a multilingual didactic method has the risk of excluding monolingual students’ which is one of the major misconceptions based on monolingual ideologies due to the lack of pre- and in-service teacher education on multilingualism (Lundberg, 2019). He shows little interest in ‘receiving information about students’ engagement or academic performances from heritage language schools as well. One factor that might influence Michael’s teaching practice is parents’ and students’ expectations since he indicates that meeting their expectations is important in designing his teaching method. This is likely to be related to his school’s characteristic that has to promise something more compared to public schools in order to sustain its organization. Particularly international schools are visited by many students who plan to study in universities that are most desirably in an English-speaking country after graduation and naturally, parents would like to have their children get prepared for this apparently monolingual English-speaking environment. The school seems to be well aware of this fact and specifies which languages each teacher can speak and at the same time attracts parents with English native-speaking teachers from different countries. Without explicit explanation, it cannot be expected from parents that they support translanguaging activities instead of following the common belief that monolingual instruction is more helpful for students since it ‘forces’ them to practice English rather than resorting to their stronger languages like German. From this information, it can be inferred that for the school board, being a monolingual speaker might as have been a positive criteria when recruiting Michael.

The advocated language philosophy on the official website of Michael’s school is noteworthy. The school board mentions that they are “passionate about assisting [their] students to be excellent communicators in all languages” and state additive bilingualism as their “aim” (school homepage). Also, it is the only school in this study that offers home language lessons to students. However, when examined more closely, the school language policy is entrenched with the “view of sequential language acquisition and [considers] language as a decontextualized system” (Henderson, 2017, p. 7). This is because only students who have ‘sufficient’ English skills so that they do not need any more assistance in it are qualified to learn a third language, unlike in other public schools learning a third foreign language is an open option for every student. It is made clear that English comes first, German second and whatever follows can follow, but not necessarily. This view that the

acquisition of languages has to take place sequentially since the interaction between them might confuse students or distract English is based on the monolingual ideology of separate bilingualism, contrary to the additive bilingualism that the school advocates on its homepage. English is foreseen as the only instruction language while it is doubtful how many students benefit from home language classes since these classes are only available for high school students who are older than 15 years old and considered qualified by the school. This indicates that the school does not consider home language literacy or education central in the cognitive academic development of students but as an option that can be chosen upon individual wishes.

5.4.3 The case of Sarah: “Multilingualism helps but German is more important”

Sarah's answers reflect knowledge about multilingualism and awareness of its importance in the classroom as well as in the society although she does not agree with all aspects of flexible bilingualism. To elaborate, Sarah is convinced of the benefits of the direct method that thinking in the new language is more effective than comparing it to previously learned languages. Many teachers across Italy, Austria and Great Britain agree with this opinion since in their perspective, activating the knowledge of previously learned languages bring about confusion and delay the learning of the school language (De Angelis, 2011). Secondly, Sarah thinks that speaking German at home helps students' integration into the German society like many teachers in Europe. This belief ignores the risk of depriving students of the emotional and affective links that come from communicating in their home language and sustaining relationship with their relatives in the 'home country' (Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2017). Although Sarah shows a respectful and favorable attitude towards multilingual students and their language use, her teaching practices do not actively incorporate translanguaging activities or other pluralist flexible instructional methods. She seems to 'go with the situation' which implies that it lies in the hands of the students whether they use their prior language knowledge or not. Interestingly, Sarah is the only respondent in this study who uses different languages in the classroom to build a rapport with her students. A possibility that needs to be taken into account is that compared to her colleagues, her actions might be received more positively by students or parents as an expression of tolerance and not associated with deficit reasons like lack of German competence, due to her social agenda as a white native speaker of German (Henderson, 2017). What is more interesting to

our analysis is that Sarah does not seem to connect her knowledge on multilingualism to her own language biography or practice. As the only respondent who does not have a migration background, when asked which languages she can speak and how she learned them, she answered “Spanisch im Ausland, English und Französisch in der Schule, Latein und Italienisch Grundkenntnisse in der Uni”, whereby she left out German (her first language) unlike the other three respondents who indicated their first language in the list. Also when asked about her daily language practice Sarah did not mention German but instead indicated that “Spanisch ist mein Unterrichtsfach, ansonsten [haben andere Sprachen] leider keine Funktion”. From this, it can be inferred that Sarah considers her German knowledge as ‘default’ that is more or less taken for granted for a ‘native speaker’ and separates it from other foreign language skills. Furthermore, even though she uses different languages in the classroom to build a better relationship with students, she does not count this to her daily language use, nor does she seem to practice translanguaging in her everyday life, at least on her conscious level. From the given information on her profile, it can be speculated that her previous experiences as a German language teacher partly shaped these thoughts. Sarah taught multilingual students at the private language school for three years, which is mostly organized monolingually by ‘native speaking’ German teachers. Students are often adults with specific short-term goals like attaining a German CEFR certificate in order to get qualified for studying or working in Germany. This learning purpose tends to legitimize monolingual instruction because in test situations these multilingual students are treated as monolinguals and are assessed by their German knowledge alone (García & Li, 2014). Additionally, Sarah’s response that students would benefit from using German at home represents an assimilationist viewpoint that is a widespread discourse in German media: In order to integrate, you have to learn German. Along similar lines, Sarah’s school advertises for its foreign language courses that are instructed monolingually in the target language. According to the school homepage, the monolingual classes will give students more opportunities to practice foreign languages more authentically. However, particularly in a city like Frankfurt, such a thought based on ‘double monolingualism’ does not reflect the “lebensweltliche Mehrsprachigkeit” (Schnuch, 2015, p. 130).

5.4.4 The case of Lee: “There are almost no students who struggle with Korean”

As the only respondent who argues for standard language protection, Lee reveals “anxiety about language shift and loss of the community language and heritage identities in the face of the dominance of [the local language]” (Creese & Blackledge, 2011, p. 1201). On the personal level, Lee’s monolingual language ideology of separate bilingualism seems to be based partly on the lack of received teacher training on multilingualism and, on the institutional level, insufficient resource for recruiting qualified teachers and training them. As an argument for monolingual instruction in Korean, Lee states that “there are almost no students who struggles with Korean” in her school. According to Lee, students’ proficiency of the Korean language varies drastically from city to city. In fact, the Korean community network in Frankfurt is known to be the most dynamic and biggest one in Germany because most of the overseas branches from big Korean companies are settled in Frankfurt, so that new expat employees come to Germany with their family every few years and young Koreans come to work in these Korean companies in Frankfurt for short-term internship programs. The largest network of Korean community is formed around Korean restaurants, supermarkets, cafes, shops and several Korean evangelical churches that have Sunday services and extracurricular activities for each age group. In no other city in Germany is there such a close network among newly arrived Koreans and second or third generation Korean-Germans. For children and parents, these environments boost their motivation to maintain their Korean language and keep up with the trends through the internet to communicate with newly arrived Koreans. From my own experience as a student from grade 5 to 10 at the Korean complementary school, many parents from second or third generation Korean children send their children to the Korean school for their Korean language, while others who come from Korea to Germany for a few years due to their profession want their children to receive extra classes to keep up with their peers in Korea. The strongest motivation for the children is to meet up with their friends on Saturdays who have similar linguistic or cultural backgrounds. However, the number of students in the high school program generally decreases because students either return to Korea or focus on studying for the Abitur since their academic performance in the complementary school are considered relatively unimportant and irrelevant for their graduation and career.

While most complementary schools inevitably face the destiny to counter the “strongly felt public discourse of monolingualism and homogeneity in the multilingual, heterogeneous state” and the “impetus towards the erasure of minority immigrant languages” (Creese & Blackledge, 2011, p. 1197), the situation in Frankfurt is different in that the overall proficiency of students’ home language is high. However, as Creese and Blackledge (2011) stated, “underlying any discussion of linguistic practices in complementary schools is the fact that the teachers are generally more proficient in the community language than in [the local language], whereas students are generally more proficient in [the local language]” (p. 1202). What needs to be questioned is *which* of the students’ register Lee referred to when she said that students do not have difficulty with the Korean language. Cummins (1981) distinguished between ‘basic interpersonal communication skills’ (BICS) and ‘cognitive academic language proficiency’ (CALP) when discussing language skills. Applying this to the Korean complementary school, the majority of the students would not have difficulties with BICS as they communicate in Korean with their family on a daily basis, but might struggle with CALP, since they mainly study in the German or English language. In this sense, connecting the subject knowledge learned at the mainstream school to what they learn at the complementary school seems meaningful. Allowing translanguaging space will not only boost students’ motivation for learning but also open up spaces for creativity and criticality (Li, 2018). Creese and Blackledge (2015) observed in a Punjabi complementary classroom how students translanguage for “terms emblematic of certain cultural values and traditions” to negotiate their identities. Especially in Frankfurt, where German, English and Korean are shared in the repertoire of the majority of students with a Korean migration background, translanguaging practices “are typical, everyday, unremarkable examples of [...] adopting, imposing, and negotiating their identity positions [...] moving across and between mobile sets of linguistic resources within their communicative repertoires” (p. 32). Since “translanguaging takes as its starting point the *language practices of bilingual people as the norm*, and not the language of monolinguals” (García & Li, 2014, p. 22; italics in original) translanguaging in classrooms will help students to make sense of their multilingual worlds and build a healthy identity as competent multilingual speakers (Creese & Blackledge, 2015).

Concerning the school’s admission policy, the fact that only students who themselves or one of their parents or grandparents possess a Korean nationality are allowed to visit the school defines the educational purpose of the school as promoting the Korean identity in

students who have a Korean migration background and/or plan to return to Korea one day. The specification that children with parents who have other nationalities are not eligible for admission signals that the administration board wants to limit the overall number of students (and for this reason prioritize students with a Korean nationality). It might be unable to cope with potential challenges that come with teaching students or communicating with families who are not Korean. These factors are directly linked to the school's resources on funding and the qualification of teachers. It needs to be mentioned that implementing multilingual didactic methods requires teacher training, that cost teachers additional hours. Many complementary schools are funded by local communities and cannot offer the best working conditions and high income for teachers. Asking teachers to invest extra time and effort to develop their professional skills might be difficult in a school where recruitment alone is already a challenging task. Leave alone teacher training, preparing creative multilingual didactic material can be time-consuming and burdensome for most teachers.

6. Discussion

6.1 Summary of key findings in relation to hypotheses

The results together with the analysis imply that three of the four teachers who work in German public schools and an English international private school have a slight tendency towards flexible bilingualism on their understanding of language, awareness of the importance of multilingualism and partly their teaching practices. One teacher who teaches in the Korean complementary school displayed a clearer tendency towards separate bilingualism in all of the above mentioned areas.

The findings conform to my hypothesis for the part that pre-service or in-service teacher education on multilingualism is likely to equip teachers with sufficient knowledge and awareness of language and multilingualism. However, Sarah's case shows that this knowledge is not necessarily applied to teachers' personal language practice and their teaching practices. Three teachers (Aylin, Michael and Lee) indicated that they have a migration background and Michael was the only respondent who answered that he is a monolingual speaker. Sarah does not have a migration background but identifies herself as a multilingual speaker. Concerning their daily language practice, Aylin is the only respondent that employs her linguistic repertoire contextually and translanguages in her daily life. She was also the only one to be convinced of the communicative functions of translanguageing. This lets infer that teachers' multilingualism or their migration background (even whether they have received relevant teacher training) do not automatically lead to having a viewpoint of flexible bilingualism. Despite of this, pre-service teacher education plays a significant part in enhancing teachers' understanding of language and multilingualism. As De Angelis (2011) stated, teacher training on multilingualism has started to be emphasized and visited more recently. Two of the four teachers (Aylin and Sarah) who completed their teacher's degree within the last five years in Germany, displayed knowledge and awareness of flexible bilingualism and multilinguals' language practices. Michael who completed his teacher's degree six years ago in Australia showed a favorable attitude towards flexible language use but did not respond in agreement with the results from recent researches on multilingualism. Except for him, all teachers considered teacher training on multilingualism very important. However, theoretical knowledge alone might not suffice to counter the dominant social belief

of separate bilingualism. Rather, sufficient knowledge on multilingualism combined with teachers' own linguistic practices (as seen in the case of Aylin) provides a clearer index of their attitudes towards multilingualism.

The prevalent assumptions in schools were, as hypothesized, standard language ideologies, assimilationist, one nation–one language ideologies and monolingual beliefs around separate bilingualism that inevitably leads to a deficit view on multilingual students. Also, international languages tend to be valued more than minority languages for students' academic and economic success. What was different from expected was that schools seem to advocate separate language ideologies regardless of the percentage of students with a migration background. Despite speaking in favor of interculturalism and multilingualism or even additive bilingualism, the schools' language policy embedded in the official curriculum and instructional method, are mostly based on the monolingual habitus (Gogolin, 1994) and exclude the use of minority languages in the classroom. Even the 'home language lessons' for high school students in the international school seem to be "not comprehensive enough, and such teaching [of students' home languages] is considered secondary and unimportant, which can result in low quality" (Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2017, p. 40).

The hypothesis that there will be a gap between what teachers know and actually do, due to complex outward factors like students' and parents' expectations, working conditions, time constraints, school types etc. was confirmed by the results. To describe, what is known does not seem to be necessarily put into practice by teachers due to reasons based on teacher's own social positioning, lack of experience, concurring social beliefs or diverse contextual factors such as disagreement with the head teacher, cooperation with colleagues, administrative issues and meeting the expectation of students and parents of which the last factor was commonly mentioned as an important factor by all four respondents. On the one hand, teachers who support the viewpoint of flexible bilingualism tend to show a relatively passive attitude in their own teaching practice. On the other hand, the teacher with a clear viewpoint of separate bilingualism seems to experience less conflict to act according to her belief while this may also be due to her position as head teacher. This observation is consistent with the claim that there is an "increasing gap between rhetoric and practice in the fields of interculturalism and bilingual education" (Lopez & Sichra, 2017, p. 382).

6.2 Implications

The results of this study agree with previous researches that there is an increasing gap “between typical instructional practice in second language (L2) and bilingual teaching and the perspectives of researchers regarding optimal instructional practice” (Cummins, 2017, p. 104). All of the four schools officially advertise for their monolingual instruction of foreign language classes or bilingual program which connects to the commonly shared belief that the separation of named languages leads to an effective learning. From such a perspective, multilingualism is a barrier or a deficit for students’ academic development and integration rather than being a resource or an asset (Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2017). This “normative negation within the school” is in fact the major obstacle for immigrant children to integrate in the new society (Young, 2014, p. 166). For, if students are deprived of due recognition for their languages, chances are low that they embrace their own multilingual identities and use their home language as a resource for further academic and linguistic development. In this respect, it is doubtful how effective schools’ monolingual strategies are for students’ long-term development.

Unfortunately, even teachers, who have a viewpoint of flexible bilingualism may find it difficult to react according to their beliefs in the classroom. The results in this study indicate that teachers may show a tendency away from flexible bilingualism, towards separate bilingualism as the form of interaction with students becomes more ‘formal’ and directed to the whole class. This may be based on teachers’ uncertainty of the benefits of students’ flexible language practices but also of potential negative consequences in relation to students’ or parents’ reaction and that of the school board or colleagues. For example, when teachers translanguage to communicate with students, this might be misinterpreted as a sign of semilingualism by students which may impact their respect towards the teacher and their learning motivation. Particularly younger teachers tend to conform to typically practiced teaching methods by their colleagues or the principal and become more susceptible to prevalent language ideologies and expectations of students and parents. Support from the head teacher and parents seems to be a crucial factor to ignite positive changes in the classroom since teachers’ feeling of incompetence and fear of disrupting students’ language learning due to lack of information and experience are definitely a hindrance in fostering multilingualism in the classroom (Haukås, 2015). Additionally, convincing students and

parents (and even colleagues or the head teacher) of the benefits of activating prior language knowledge and translanguaging activities should not be solely the responsibility of teachers who received education on multilingualism. Without school-level support, teachers are likely to feel that they are expected to rely on their own resources (Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2017).

These results build on existing evidence that structural preconditions through systematic national-level commitment and school-level support are crucial factors next to qualification of teachers to implement language-sensitive instructions (Köker et al., 2015). The present study confirms the statement that “support from school heads and boards is just as important as the communication to the school community about the concept, and pupils have to be persuaded just the same as teachers and parents” (Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2017, p. 46). Across the European Union, active collaboration among political authorities, community organizations, parents and school educators have been mentioned as one of the key facilitators for the successful implementations of multilingual models (p. 40). Schools in Germany were traditionally “rather isolated structures with little to no cooperation with their neighbourhoods” (p. 37). However, recently some schools in Germany started to change and cooperate with local community networks. For example, in Hamburg, a mentoring initiative ‘Young Role Models’ connects university students with migrant backgrounds with students in lower secondary schools. In Cologne, a large network of schools developed a platform for students to work with an external organization on projects that enable them to use their first languages within the curriculum of their subjects.

In line with this, my suggestion is that mainstream schools and complementary schools in Frankfurt could find ways to work together to maximize the academic potential and learning motivation of students who attend both of these institutions. When students’ learning process and outcomes in complementary schools are recognized and incorporated (for instance as an extra-curricular activity) in the mainstream school, students will not only attribute more meaning to developing their home language across different academic areas but also will be empowered and motivated in the mainstream school. In this way, individual educators do not have to carry the burden to contact and devise projects with regional educational stakeholders on their own initiative. Even though cooperating with regional institutions is meaningful, for the present time, building connections with already established

educational institutions like complementary schools can be effective as well as time and energy-saving, as time is one of the essential elements for successful implementation of regional language education networks in Germany (Gogolin et al., 2011; in Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2017, p. 50). Particularly, the context of Frankfurt provides an excellent setting as the majority of children and teenagers are bi- or trilingual.

6.3 Limitations

The primary purpose of this study is to develop a questionnaire to explore teachers' attitudes towards multilingualism who work in different schools in Frankfurt. Therefore, the process of data collection and response analysis serves an exemplary purpose to demonstrate how the questionnaire can be used to elicit meaningful results. This is why results from this study cannot be used to compare different schools nor to generalize the attitudes of teachers in Frankfurt.

The process of developing questionnaire items with alternating viewpoints of separate and flexible bilingualism is an innovative approach, however, the process of designing these items was difficult in that they should ask teachers about the same construct without them noticing it, because teachers should not get the impression that they are being asked the same question twice and feel compelled to remain consistent. For this reason, the statements were rephrased accordingly which carries the danger of changing the meaning of the construct. While it remains unclear whether out of internal consistency, inaccurate phrasing or misinterpretation of the statements, respondents agreed to contradicting statements for many items. Because of this, the analysis based on the reverse scoring method should be considered as an exemplary suggestion of a quantitative analysis while the qualitative phenomenal analysis and content analysis form the main parts. For future surveys, the re-test method may be used to measure the internal consistency reliability.

7. Conclusion

Frankfurt as a global international city became home to transcultural people with diverse linguistic biographies and migration backgrounds for whom mutual acceptance and integration have become highly demanded skills for a harmonious living. According to Herzog-Punzenberger et al. (2017), there are two prevailing conceptions of linguistic diversity within the current education policy in European countries: “One gives positive connotations to multiculturalism, multilingualism and inclusion, and the other is preoccupied with deficit-based ‘disparity’, in which diverse characteristics are associated with different outcomes and differential treatment” (Zimenkova, 2011; EADSNE, 2010; in p. 40). These beliefs are shaped by language ideologies, defined as “any sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (Silverstein, 1979). The former is based on the monolingual habitus (Gogolin, 1994) of the nation-state in the early nineteenth century and is inherent in the beliefs of the majority of educational institutions and educators. As a consequence, languages are regarded as discrete entities bound to a certain nationality that should be kept separate for efficient acquisition. These language ideologies of separate bilingualism (Creese & Blackledge, 2010) have in common that they tend to regard multilingualism as a hindrance to acquiring the new target language and, within language competition models, migrant students’ home language and culture as something to be set aside for assimilation and integration into the society. When adopting such an attitude, teachers are likely to look at multilingual students with a deficit view. The counterpart attitude towards multilingualism what Creese and Blackledge (2010) called ‘flexible bilingualism’ is based on acknowledging the dynamic interconnectedness of languages within the mind of speakers. Prior language knowledge is seen as a resource from which multilingual students can profit from. Accordingly, the benefits of employing multilingual practices within the classroom setting were stressed. García (2010) referred to the language practices of bilingual people as translinguaging and elaborated the pedagogical potential of translinguaging in relation to dynamic bilingualism (García & Li, 2014). The focus on the speaker and his or her linguistic repertoire instead of separate named languages goes in line with recent development of the term ‘linguistic repertoire’ (Gumperz & Hymes, 1972; Blommaert & Backus, 2013) to denote the unpredictable and “biographically organized complexes of resources” of individual actors in the transcultural superdiverse society. (Blommaert & Backus, 2013, p. 15).

As classroom language policy mediators and the first point of contact for many migrant families, teachers exert considerable influence on the language practice of their students and their awareness of self and others. In this respect, in order to support teachers' professional development in the multilingual reality, it is crucial to examine in detail teachers' knowledge on multilingualism and experiences inside and outside the classroom and factors that affect their behavior. Since several aspects interplay to shape and influence teachers' attitudes towards multilingualism, following research questions were addressed to assess their attitudes:

- (1) What are teachers' beliefs about languages?
- (2) To what extent are teachers aware of the importance of multilingualism?
- (3) How do teachers perceive their role as teachers in the multilingual classroom?
- (4) How are teachers' beliefs and attitudes reflected in their teaching practices?
- (5) What are possible factors that affect teaching practices?

These research questions were designed to cover both teachers' knowledge (RQ 1-3) and teaching practices (RQ 4-5) as did Lundberg (2019), Henderson (2017), Young (2014) etc. The online questionnaire was selected as the data collection method to assess teachers' attitudes towards multilingualism in light of the current restrictions of visiting schools due to COVID-19. For the analysis, both the qualitative phenomenal type and the content analysis together with the quantitative reverse scoring method were used (Chigbu, 2019). The questionnaire consists of 49 statements to rate on a 4-point Likert scale and additional open-ended questions about teachers' profile. To prevent respondents from choosing a socially more desirable answer which may bring about misleading interpretation (Haukås, 2015; Lundberg, 2019), a pair of concurring statements was developed for each construct, one in favor of the language ideologies of separate bilingualism and another representing the viewpoints of flexible bilingualism. Four teachers who work in a different school type in Frankfurt were contacted: Aylin from a Gymnasium, Sarah from a Gesamtschule with a high percentage of migrant students, Michael from an English international private school and Lee from a Korean complementary school. The choice of these different school types was based on the idea that the linguistic landscape and other school-specific contexts are relevant and influential to teachers' practices.

For the first part of the questionnaire 'Understanding of language' teachers were asked to express their opinion to statements concerning the nature of language, connectedness

between languages and linguistic repertoire. The second part, 'Awareness of the importance of multilingualism' deals with language practices of multilinguals, the role of prior language knowledge in language learning, benefits of home language learning, bias towards international languages, assimilationist or pluralist language ideologies and multilingual students' identity. The third part, 'Teachers' perceived role' covers what teachers think is important and should be done by teachers in a multilingual classroom. The fourth part about teaching practices was designed according to the framework for teaching (Danielson, 1996) and the quality criteria for language-sensitive teaching (Gogolin et al., 2011). The last part inquiring the 'factors that influence teachers' behavior' is the only part that consists of single statements that do not form pairs. The analysis of the results followed the reverse scoring method for statements that advocated separate bilingualism. Teachers' responses revealed that for both knowledge and practice parts, three teachers that work in mainstream schools setting have a slight tendency towards flexible bilingualism while the teacher from the complementary school upholds an attitude of separate bilingualism. Next, teachers' answers for statements that deal with the same issue in both knowledge and practice parts were grouped together to examine the correlation between them, whether teachers act according to their beliefs. Last but not least, I tried to interpret teacher's attitudes with a holistic view on their profiles, their school's articulated language philosophy or possible issues related to administration, and connected these contexts to their responses through individual content analysis.

The results build on existing evidence that multiple factors dynamically shape teachers' attitudes towards multilingualism. To name a few, teachers who recently completed their teacher's degree are likely to have received education on the role of prior language knowledge and how to practice multilingual didactic methods because research on the benefits of multilingualism is relatively recent (De Angelis, 2011). Also, some teachers were restricted by their school's language policy or students' and parents' expectations which are based on monolingual beliefs (Henderson, 2017). Surprisingly, although all four schools of the respondents have different linguistic landscapes and percentages of multilingual students they share attitudes of separate bilingualism. In this respect, being equipped with sufficient theoretical knowledge alone is not sufficient for teachers to create a translanguaging space for students in the classroom. The analysis of their responses shows that, on the individual level, teachers need to combine their theoretical knowledge with their everyday language practice

while school-level support and cooperation with parents and communities are necessary as well. Furthermore, efficient national-level support and cooperation between educational institutions could establish horizontal continuity (Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2017) and thus, serve to maximize the benefits of implementing language-sensitive and multilingual didactic methods and close the gap between the political rhetoric and the actual resources provided for teachers. In this way, teachers can be supported to become competent facilitators of multilingualism, to encourage multilingual students to wisely use their resources and establish a society that is open and tolerant towards its multilingual reality.

References

- Agirdag, O. & Vanlaar, G. (2018). Does more exposure to the language of instruction lead to higher academic achievement? A cross-national examination. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 22(1), 123-137, DOI: 10.1177/1367006916658711
- Arbeit, Bildung, Wissenschaft*. Stadt Frankfurt am Main. <https://frankfurt.de/themen/arbeit-bildung-und-wissenschaft>
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (3rd ed.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD.
- Blackledge, A. & Creese, A. (2008). Contesting 'Language' as 'Heritage': Negotiation of Identities in Late Modernity. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(4), 533-554.
- Blommaert, J. & Backus, A. (2013). Superdiverse Repertoires and the Individual. In I. de Saint-Georges & J.-J. Weber (Eds), *Multilingualism and Multimodality. Current challenges for Educational Studies* (pp. 11-32). Rotterdam: Sense.
- Blommaert, J. & Rampton, B. (2012). Language and Superdiversity, *Diversities*, 13(2), 1-22. <https://d-nb.info/1030403368/34>.
- Bourdieu P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*, Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the Classroom: Emerging Issues for Research and Pedagogy. In Li Wei (ed.) *Applied Linguistics Review*, Volume 2, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 1-27.
- Carbonara, V. & Scibetta, A. (2018). Il translanguaging come strumento efficace per la gestione delle classi plurilingui: il progetto "L'AltRoparlante". *Rassegna Italiana Di Linguistica Applicata*, Vol.1, 65-82.
- Celic, C., & Seltzer, K. (2011). *Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB guide for educators*. CUNY-NYSIEB. New York: CUNY.
- Chigbu, U. E. (2019). Visually Hypothesising in Scientific Paper Writing: Confirming and Refuting Qualitative Research Hypotheses Using Diagrams. *Publications*, 7 (22). DOI: 10.3390/publications7010022
- Coste, D. et al. (2009). *Compétence plurilingue et pluriculturelle. Version révisée et enrichie d'un avant-propos et d'une bibliographie complémentaire*. Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe. Division des Politiques linguistiques. Disponible en ligne : <https://rm.coe.int/168069d29c>
- Creese, A. & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 20-35.

- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94, 103-115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x>
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2011). Separate and flexible bilingualism in complementary schools: Multiple language practices in interrelationship. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 119601208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.006>
- Cummins J. (1979). Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency, Linguistic Interdependence, the Optimum Age Question, and Some Other Matters, *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 19, 121-129.
- Cummins, J. (1981). The Role of Primary Language Development in Promoting Educational Success for Language Minority Students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Rationale* (pp. 3-49). Los Angeles, CA: California State University.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters
- Cummins, J. (2005, September). *Teaching for cross-language transfer in dual language education: Possibilities and pitfalls*. Paper presented at the TESOL Symposium on Dual Language Education: Teaching and Learning in Two Languages in the EFL Setting, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 221-240.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 221-240
- Cummins, J., Bismilla, V., Chow, P., Cohen, S., Giampapa, F., Leoni, L., Sandhu, P., & Sastri, P. (2005). Affirming identity in multilingual classrooms. *Educational Leadership*, 63(1), 38-43.
- Cummins, J., Bismilla, V., Cohen, S., Giampapa, F., & Leoni, L. (2005). Timelines and lifelines: Rethinking literacy instruction in multilingual classrooms. *Orbit*, 36(1), 22-26.
- Cummins, Jim (2019) "The Emergence of Translanguaging Pedagogy: A Dialogue between Theory and Practice," *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*: Vol. 9 , Article 13. Available at: <https://fordham.bepress.com/jmer/vol9/iss1/13>.
- Cummins, J. (2017). Teaching for transfer in multilingual school contexts. In García, O., Lin, A. & May, S. (eds.), *Bilingual education. Encyclopedia of language and education*. Berlin: Springer, 103-115.

- Danielson, C. (2009). *Implementing the framework for teaching in enhancing professional practice*. Alexandria, VA :ASCD.
- 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, DOI: 10.1080/14790718.2011.560669
- Dirim, I., Eder, U. & Springsits , B. (2013). Subjektivierungskritischer Umgang mit Literatur in migrationsbedingt multilingual-multikulturellen Klassen der Sekundarstufe. In : B. Kümmerling-Meibauer & I. Gawlitzek (Eds.), *Mehrsprachigkeit und Kinderliteratur*. Freiburg i. Breisgau : Filibach, 121-141.
- Erfurt, J. (2016). Le concept de transculturalité : un atout pour le débat sur l'éducation bilingue? In J. Erfurt & C. Hélot (eds), *L'éducation bilingue en France : Politiques linguistiques, modèles et pratiques*. Limoges: Lambert-Lucas, 592-609.
- Flores, N. & Bale, J. (2017). Sociopolitical Issues in Bilingual Education. In O. García, A. Lin, S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and Multilingual Education. Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (3rd ed.) (pp. 22-34). Springer, Cham. http://doi-org-443.webvpn.fjmu.edu.cn/10.1007/978-3-319-02258-1_5.
- Flores, N. & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing Appropriateness: Raciolinguistic Ideologies and Language Diversity in Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149-171.
- Gal, S. (1989). Language and political economy. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 18, 345–367. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.an.18.100189.002021
- García, O. & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- García, O. & Torres-Guevara, R. (2010). Monoglossic ideologies and language policies in the education of U.S. Latinas/os. In E. Murillo, S. Villenas, R. T. Galván, J. S. Muñoz, C. Martínez & M. Machado-Casas (eds.). *Handbook of Latinos and Education: Research, theory and practice* (pp. 182-194). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O. (2012). Theorizing Translanguaging for Educators. In C. Celic & K. Seltzer (Eds.), *Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching?* *Modern Language Journal*, 94, 103-115.
- García, O., & Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and Enacting Translanguaging for Social Justice. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (eds.), *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy* (pp. 199-216). Dordrecht: Springer.

- Germany's school system*. The Federal Government. <https://www.make-it-in-germany.com/en/living-in-germany/family-reunification/school-system/>.
- Gogolin, I. (1994). *Der monolinguale Habitus der multilingualen Schule*. Münster u.a.: Waxmann.
- Gogolin, I., McMonagle, S., & Salem, T. (2019). Germany: Systemic, sociocultural and linguistic perspectives on educational inequality. In P.A.J. Stevens & A.G. Dworkin (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Race and Ethnic Inequalities in Education*. 2nd Edition. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 557-602.
- Gogolin, I., Siemund, P., Schulz, M. & Davydova, J. (2013). Multilingualism, language contact, and urban areas. An introduction. In P. Siemund, I. Gogolin, M. Schulz & J. Davydova (Eds.), *Multilingualism and Language Contact in Urban Areas* (pp. 1–15). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gomolla, M. & Radtke, F.-O., 2010, Mechanismen institutionalisierter Diskriminierung in der Schule. In: I. Gogolin & B. Nauck (eds.), *Migration, gesellschaftliche Differenzierung. Resultate des Forschungsschwerpunkt-programms FABER*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 321-341
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. & Hymes, D. (1972). *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Haukås, Å. (2015): Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach, *International Journal of Multilingualism*. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 13(1), 1-18. DOI:10.1080/14790718
- Heller, M. (Ed.) (2007). *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 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. <https://isiarticles.com/bundles/Article/pre/pdf/134023.pdf>.
- Herzog-Punzenberger, B., Le Pichon-Vorstman, E. & Siarova, H. (2017). *Multilingual Education in the Light of Diversity: Lessons Learned, NESET II report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. DOI: 10.2766/824918.
- Hessische Europaschulen*. Kultusministerium Hessen. <https://kultusministerium.hessen.de/foerderangebote/zertifizierte-schulen/hessische-europaschulen>.
- Hessisches Kultusministerium. (2017). *Hessische Europaschulen*. Kassel: Hessisches Kultusministerium. https://kultusministerium.hessen.de/sites/default/files/media/hkm/hessische_europaschulen_0.pdf.

- Hornberger, N. (2007). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. In O. García & C. Baker (Eds.), *Bilingual education. An introductory reader* (pp. 177-194). Clevedon, UK : Multilingual Matters.
- Irvine, J. T. (1989). When talk isn't cheap: Language and political economy. *American Ethnologist*, 16, 248–267. DOI: 10.1525/ae.1989.16.2.02a00040
- Irvine, J. T. (2016). *Language Ideology*. Oxford Bibliographies. New York: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/OBO/9780199766567-0012
- Karpf, E. (2013). Eine Stadt und ihre Einwanderer. 700 Jahre Migrationsgeschichte in Frankfurt am Main. Frankfurt a. M./New York: Campus. (Hrsg. vom Magistrat der Stadt Frankfurt am Main, Amt für multikulturelle Angelegenheiten), Frankfurt a. M. / New York: Campus.
- Köker, A., Rosenbrock-Agyei, S., Ohm, U., Carlson, S. A., Ehmke, T., Hammer, S., & Koch-Priewe, B. (2015). DaZKom – Ein Modell von Lehrerkompetenz im Bereich Deutsch als Zweitsprache. In B. Koch-Priewe, A. Köker, J. Seifried & E. Wuttke (Eds.), *Kompetenzerwerb an Hochschulen: Modellierung und Messung. Zur Professionalisierung angehender Lehrerinnen und Lehrer sowie frühpädagogischer Fachkräfte* (pp. 177-206). Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman.
- Krashen, S. (1989). We acquire vocabulary and spelling by reading: Additional evidence for the input hypothesis. *Modern Language Journal*, 73(4), 440–464. <https://doi.org/10.2307/326879>
- Kremnitz, G. (2004). *Mehrsprachigkeit in der Literatur. Wie Autoren ihre Sprache wählen* (pp. 83-103). Wien: Edition Praesens.
- Lamarre, P. & Lamarre, S. (2009). Montréal „on the move“ : pour une approche ethnographique non-statique. De l'étude des pratiques langagières de jeunes multilingue. In T. Bulot (ed.) *Ségrégations et discriminations urbaines (Formes et normes sociolinguistiques)* (pp. 105-134). Paris: L'Harmattan (Collection Espaces Discursifs).
- Lamarre, P. (2013). Catching "Montréal on the move" and challenging the discourse of unilingualism in Québec. *Anthropologica*, 55(1), 41–56. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24467373>.
- Lamarre, P., Lamarre, S. & Lefranc M. (2015). *La socialisation langagière comme processus dynamique. Suivi d'une cohorte de jeunes plurilingues intégrant le marché du travail*. Québec : Conseil supérieur de la langue française. <http://www.cslf.gouv.qc.ca/publications/pubf329/f329.pdf>.

- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice*, 18(7), 37-41.
- Li, W. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1222-1235. DOI:10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035
- Li, W. (2018). Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9-30. DOI: 10.1093/applin/amx039
- Lightbown, P. M. & Spada, N. (2006). *How Languages are Learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University.
- López, L. E., & Sichra I. (2017). Indigenous intercultural bilingual education in Latin America. In O. García, et al. (Eds.) *Bilingual and Multilingual Education. Vol. V: Encyclopedia of language and education* (3rd ed.) (pp. 381–394). New York: Springer.
- Lüdi, G. & Py, B. (2009). To Be or Not to Be ... a Plurilingual Speaker, *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 6(2), 154-167, DOI: 10.1080/14790710902846715.
- Lüdi, G. & Py, B. (2013). *Être bilingue*. Berne: Peter Lang, 4e éd.
- Lundberg, A. (2019). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism: findings from Q method research, *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 20(3), 266-283, DOI: 10.1080/14664208.2018.1495373 Lydia
- Magistrat der Stadt Frankfurt. (2010). *Vielfalt bewegt Frankfurt. Integrations- und Diversitätskonzept für Stadt, Politik und Verwaltung*. Frankfurt/M.: Magistrat der Stadt Frankfurt/M. https://www.vielfalt-bewegt-frankfurt.de/sites/default/files/medien/downloads/integrationskonzept_ffm.pdf.
- Magistrat der Stadt Frankfurt. (2015). *Frankfurter Integrations- und Diversitätsbericht 2011 - 2014*. Frankfurt/M., Magistrat der Stadt Frankfurt/M.. https://amka.de/sites/default/files/2018-05/Frankfurter%20Integrations-%20und%20Diversit%C3%A4tsbericht%202011-2014_2015.pdf.
- Magistrat der Stadt Frankfurt. (2016). *Mehrsprachigkeit in Kindertagesstätte und Schule*. Frankfurt/M.: Amt für multikulturelle Angelegenheiten. https://www.vielfalt-bewegt-frankfurt.de/sites/default/files/medien/downloads/broschuere_mehrsprachigkeit_web_ges_2_0.pdf.
- Magistrat der Stadt Frankfurt. (2017). *Frankfurter Integrations- und Diversitätsmonitoring*. Frankfurt/M., Magistrat der Stadt Frankfurt/M.. https://amka.de/sites/default/files/2018-05/Frankfurter%20Integrations-%20und%20Diversit%C3%A4tsmonitoring_2017_0.pdf.

- Manyak, P. (2004). Literacy Instruction, Disciplinary Practice, and Diverse Learners: A Case Study. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 4(1), 129-149.
- Martin-Jones, M., Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2012). Introduction: a sociolinguistics of multilingualism for our times. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge, & A. Creese (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism* (pp. 1-26). New York: Routledge.
- Piller, I. (2015). Language ideologies. In K. Tracy, C. Ilie, & T. Sandel (Eds.), *The International encyclopedia of language and social interaction*, 2, 917-927. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, Wiley.
- Ricento, T. (2013). Language Policy, Ideology, and Attitudes in English-Dominant Countries. In R. Bayley, R. Cameron & C. Lucas (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (pp. 526-545). Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199744084.013.0026
- Schnuch, J. (2015). Inklusion und Mehrsprachigkeit: Die Rolle von Sprachbewusstheit im multilingualen Spracherwerb. In C. M. Bongartz & A. Rohde (Eds.), *Inklusion im Englischunterricht* (pp. 117-143). Inquiries in Language Learning Bd. 17. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang.
- Silverstein, M. (1979) "language structure and linguistic ideology." In R. Clyne, W. Hanks & C. Hofbauer (Eds.), *The Elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels* (pp. 193-247). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Sommer, R. (2001). *Fictions of Migration: Ein Beitrag zur Theorie und Gattungstypologie des zeitgenössischen interkulturellen Romans in Großbritannien* (pp. 48-56). Trier: WVT.
- Vygotski, L. S. (1997). *Pensée et langage*. Paris : La Dispute.
- Warren, A. R. (2017). Monoglossic echoes in multilingual spaces: language narratives from a Vietnamese community language school in Australia, *Current Issues in Language Planning*, DOI: 10.1080/14664208.2017.1337831
- Weirich, A.-C. (2018). Lecture : Restrukturierung sprachlicher Repertoires und transnationale Mobilität [Powerpoint slides]. Goethe University Frankfurt, Moving Cultuers Einführungsvorlesung. Blackboard: www.olat.uni-frankfurt.de.
- Welsch, W. (1992). Transkulturalität – Lebensformen nach der Auflösung der Kulturen. *Information Philosophie*, n° 2, 5-20.
- Welsch, W. (2010). Was ist eigentlich Transkulturalität? In L. Darowska, T. Lüttenberg & C. Machold (Eds.), *Hochschule als transkultureller Raum? Kultur, Bildung und Differenz in der Universität* (39-66). Bielefeld: Transcript.

- White, L. (1991). Adverb placement in second language acquisition: Some effects of positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *Second Language Research*, 7, 133-161.
- Williams C. (1994). Arfarniad o Ddulliau Dysgu ac Addysgu yng Nghyd-destun Addysg Uwchradd Ddwyieithog, [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education], Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, Bangor.
- 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. DOI: 10.1080/09658416.2013.863902

Appendix: The questionnaire⁴

Study: "Teachers' attitude towards multilingualism: A study with teachers working in different schools in Frankfurt"

Dear teachers,

I would like to thank you once again for participating in this survey.

By participating in this survey, you will help me to better understand how teachers, who work in different schools in Frankfurt, experience the multilingual situation in the classroom, why they make certain decisions, and what helps them to successfully practice their profession. The questionnaire will take about 20 minutes of your time.

All answers will remain anonymous and will be only used for research purposes as part of my master thesis of 'Moving Cultures-Transcultural Encounters' at Goethe University Frankfurt.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or technical difficulties:

Hyaе-Yeon Won

E-Mail: hywon711@gmail.com

Telefon: +49 163 7160 994

By clicking "next", I consent to the processing of my personal data for study purposes.

* Required

Please check the answer that best matches your opinion on the scale.

1. The more languages you know, the easier it is to learn new languages. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. The standard language should be protected from language change. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[s://docs.google.com/forms/d/1p5JZ9PH0BnseJcd0Ms5juB_HGhM1YW20JeREck_TZJY/edit](https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1p5JZ9PH0BnseJcd0Ms5juB_HGhM1YW20JeREck_TZJY/edit)

⁴ Access link: <https://forms.gle/EAPwMS8PUKeLQh31A>

3. Code-switching has many communicative functions. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. Individual strategies are needed in learning each language. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. In our society it is more important to know German perfectly than other foreign languages. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. Students with a migration background mostly feel 'torn' between two cultures. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. I give practical advice to students on how to learn correct German. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Almost never	Sometimes	Often	Almost every time
.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. Speaking German at home promotes migrant students' integration. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. Valuing students' home language enhances their engagement in learning. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10. I think that teachers should focus more on the effective teaching of the common language. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

11. Frequent use of the home language delays the learning of English. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12. Students with a migration background cannot be clearly categorized according to their countries of origin. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. Home language literacy has many cognitive and linguistic benefits. *

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

14. Teachers usually do not influence students' home language practice. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

15. The purpose of learning the heritage language lies in forming students' ethnic identity. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please check the answer that best matches your opinion on the scale.

16. I treat every student the same regardless of their linguistic proficiency. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

17. Subject-related vocabulary or academic expressions are learned naturally with time. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

18. I encourage my students to express their ideas in any language. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Almost never	Sometimes	Often	Almost every time
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

19. I correct students when they use slang or words from other languages. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Almost never	Sometimes	Often	Almost every time
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

20. I ask and talk about students' home languages openly. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Almost never	Sometimes	Often	Almost every time
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

21. Students' and parents' expectations are important factors in designing my instruction method. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

22. When completing a task, using one language instead of two leads to a more efficient communication. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

23. I prepare supplementary material for linguistically weaker students. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Almost never	Sometimes	Often	Almost every time
.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

24. I intervene when my students speak in their home language among themselves during class. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Almost never	Sometimes	Often	Almost every time
.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

25. I encourage migrant students or parents to maintain their home language. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Almost never	Sometimes	Often	Almost every time
.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

26. Students with a migration background have to learn subject contents "from the beginning" because they have learnt it in a different language. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

27. Students can benefit cognitively from using their home language in the classroom. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

28. I try to stick to the standard German language to set an example for the students. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Almost never	Sometimes	Often	Almost every time
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

29. Students who are familiar with several languages will have more opportunities to succeed in their professional life. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

30. I usually don't ask about students' first language or their migration background. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

31. Students with a migration background often have highly developed translation skills. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

32. Students' awareness of their first language and culture is affected by their teachers' attitudes. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please check the answer that best matches your opinion on the scale.

33. Students benefit more from learning to think in the new language rather than constantly comparing it to previously learned languages. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

34. I ask if students have understood subject jargons - subject-specific vocabulary. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Almost never	Sometimes	Often	Almost every time
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

35. Implementing a multilingual didactic method has the risk of excluding monolingual students. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

36. I allow students to communicate in any language when they do pair/group-work. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Almost never	Sometimes	Often	Almost every time
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

37. Working together with colleagues means that I often have to give up my beliefs and make compromises. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Almost never	Sometimes	Often	Almost every time
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

38. I use different languages to establish a relationship with multilingual students. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Almost never	Sometimes	Often	Almost every time
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

39. The competence in English of multilingual students' parents is crucial for any successful collaboration between the school and the parents. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

40. I would be interested to receive information about students' engagement or academic performance in other schools or institutions (e.g. heritage language school). *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

41. Languages are learned and used in specific contexts. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

42. I think that public schools and heritage language schools have different educational goals. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

43. Teachers need to encourage multilingual students to rely on their knowledge learned in their home language. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

44. Native-like fluency is the highest attainable proficiency level. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

45. Preparing multilingual didactic material is difficult because of time constraints. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

46. My principal shares my ideas about multilingualism. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

47. I think that teacher training in multilingualism is important. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

48. I provide material or translation in other languages (in addition to English) for immigrant parents if needed. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Almost never	Sometimes	Often	Almost every time
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

49. Languages influence one another in a dynamic way. *

Mark only one oval per row.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please answer the following questions in detail.

(In case you are not working at a school at the moment, please answer the questions according to your experience at the school, where you have taught lately.)

1. Which subject(s) and grade(s) do you teach? *

2. What is the percentage of students with a migrant background in the classes you teach? *

3. What is the name of the school you are working in right now? (The name of the institution will not be mentioned in the research.) *

4. What is the percentage of students with a migrant background in your school? *

5. How long have you worked in this school? *

6. Have you worked in other schools or educational institutions before? If yes, where and for how long? *

7. When and where did you complete your degree as a teacher? *

8. What do you think has influenced your teaching practice most? *

Check all that apply.

- Your own experiences as a student
- Academic knowledge acquired at the university
- Your teaching experiences
- Exchange with colleagues
- Teacher training that you have received

Other: _____

9. What is your goal as a teacher? *

10. Which languages can you speak and how did you learn them (as a school subject, through acquaintances etc.)? *

11. Of those languages, which functions do they have in your everyday life? *

12. Do you have a migration background? If yes, specify. *

13. What is your gender? *

Mark only one oval.

female

male

14. How old are you? *

Mark only one oval.

23-30 years

31-40 years

41-50 years

51-60 years