1 Multilingual Approaches to Additional Language Teaching: Bridging Theory and Practice

Anna Krulatz, Georgios Neokleous and Anne Dahl

The rise in students' linguistic and cultural diversity has amplified the voices in both research and professional circles supporting multilingual practices in additional language[1] education (Wang, 2019). Multilingual learning environments create opportunities for language learners' engagement with their existing linguistic repertoires as potential resources. This chapter outlines the multilingual turn in additional language education and, acknowledging teachers' role in promoting multilingualism, calls for a strengthened link between research and practice.

Introduction

Multilingualism has been declared a new linguistic dispensation in the globalized world (Aronin & Singleton, 2012; May, 2014; Singleton *et al*., 2013). While many parts of the world, for example Asia, have been characterized by multilingualism for centuries, with the increasing numbers of refugees and immigrants, Western societies are now also becoming more multilingual and diverse (May, 2014). The growing body of multilingual learners constitutes one of the current significant challenges with which education authorities are faced (King & Carson, 2016; Szubko-Sitarek, 2015). Although the exact percentage of school children whose own language[2] is different from the main language of instruction varies from country to country and region to region, multilingualism has now been recognized as a norm rather than an exception (e.g. Cenoz & Gorter, 2013; Schecter & Cummins, 2003; Ziegler, 2013).

While the educational frames and policies (e.g. textbooks, learning outcomes) remain relatively stable, students and teachers are constantly challenged to develop their language repertoires. Yet, the professional

training of language teachers still tends to be offered as monolingual education in one language. Even in contexts where teachers are trained to teach two languages, teachers often continue to identify as a teacher of one language rather than two or more, and they perpetuate teaching practices that support a strict separation of languages in the classroom. Even though there has been an increase in initiatives to introduce a focus on multilingualism into language teacher education programs (e.g. the DaZ module at various universities in Germany; a Master's degree in multilingualism and education at the University of the Basque Country; an online course on multilingualism for in-service and a Master's course on multilingualism for pre-service English teachers at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology; the addition of modules with an explicit focus on multilingualism to MA TEFL programs at institutions in the UK), language teacher training is predominantly based on the assumption that all students share at least one language, which is often considered their first language. Additionally, while learning mainstream, powerful foreign languages such as English, Spanish or German is encouraged, minority languages used by families at home have little worth and may even be banned on school premises (Busse *et al*., 2020). The lack of instructional strategies that include all languages spoken by students as a valuable resource and that meet the needs of multilingual students often culminates in lower levels of academic attainment (Canagarajah, 2007; García & Sylvan, 2011). Thus, despite abundant calls for a multilingual turn in language education (Conteh & Meier, 2014; May, 2014, 2019) and a recognition of plurilingualism as a goal for additional language education (Council of Europe, 2007), there remains a disconnect between theory and practice. In this chapter, we argue that for the multilingual turn to be enacted in the classroom it is important to recognize teachers as agents of change and open up for a dialog between school and university actors (cf. Günther-van der Meij & Duarte, this volume). This dialog opportunity would enable teacher and student voices to be heard and for grassroots approaches to promoting multilingualism to be developed.

The need for a truly multilingual turn in language education is urgent. Extensive research and numerous publications have been devoted to multilingual practices that draw on refugee and immigrant children's own languages to foster the development of the majority language and integration into the country of settlement (Minuz *et al*., 2020; Vukovic, 2019). However, these children often also learn another language (traditionally referred to as foreign language) in addition to the majority language of the school. For instance, Turkish children in Germany are expected to learn English, and Taiwanese children in the United States may be expected to develop competence in Spanish. The Council of Europe explicitly underscores that EU citizens should develop advanced proficiency in at least two new languages and stresses 'the importance of a good command of foreign

languages as a key competence essential to making one's way in the modern world and labour market' (Council of the European Union, 2014: 1). In the US, surveys among English speakers, who have traditionally been monolingual and not susceptible to learning new languages, highlight the importance of speaking a foreign language (Berman, 2011). Similarly, in traditionally multilingual countries around the globe, foreign language competence, especially in English, is important both at an individual and a societal level. For example, the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) has adopted English as its sole working language, highlighting its significance in the region, while the ASEAN charter also emphasizes 'respect for the different cultures, languages and religions of the peoples of ASEAN' (Kirkpatrick & Liddicoat, 2017: 158). Given this, it is imperative that minority language children are given the same opportunities as majority language children to develop proficiency in an additional language or languages.

Despite an increasing body of research on multilingualism and multilingual education, however, additional language national policies and classroom practices often continue to be monolingual and characterized by strict separation of languages (Cheshire, 2002). This separation is further evidenced by studies that have revealed the low value additional language instructors attribute to the students' own languages in the learning process (Busse, 2017; Liddicoat & Curnow, 2014). As Gorter and Cenoz (2011: 444) asserted, '[e]ven when multilingualism is promoted, there can be an underlying monolingual view of multilingualism that focuses on only one language at a time, and in most cases, there is an implicit preference for a national language.' Such learning environments do not enable language learners to engage with and draw on their existing linguistic repertoires as potential resources for additional language learning. Learners' previous knowledge is essentially disregarded and bi- or multilingual identities are inhibited (Hall & Cook, 2012).

While most language teachers are disinclined to adopt multilingual pedagogies, recent studies have underlined the pivotal role that students' home languages can play in the linguistic development process (García & Li, 2014; García *et al.*, 2017). The disconnect between research, policy and practice is concerning because classrooms constitute crucial localities of any change in education. Research highlights the value and importance of multilingualism, and calls have been made to abandon monolingual approaches to language education (Conteh & Meier, 2014; May, 2014, 2019), to draw on learners' full linguistic repertoires as a resource for new language learning (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020), and to replace the monolingual ideal by that of a competent multilingual speaker (Franceschini, 2011; Kramsch, 2012). Importantly, teachers are the most central agents of change, and it is therefore necessary to devote more focus to their experiences, beliefs, practices, and training.

Multilingualism and Language Education

The monolingual legacy

Additional language education has been traditionally characterized by the monolingual principle, which encompasses a strict separation of languages and the exclusive use of the target language for instruction, and which contradicts current evidence from research on language learning and multilingualism (Cook, 2007; Cummins, 2007; Flores & Aneja, 2017; Herdina & Jessner, 2002). Driven by a belief grounded in Krashen's Input Hypothesis that maximum exposure to the target language is a necessary condition for second language acquisition, approaches such as communicative language teaching and various forms of content-based instruction have perpetuated the exclusion of learners' own languages from the classroom, at least in principle (Hall & Cook, 2012). Drawing on linguistic resources other than the target language has been advised against even by national curricula in certain countries that have implemented strict guidelines in favor of an all-target language classroom setting to maximize target language acquisition and avoid interference (Gao, 2012; Sampson, 2012). While maximum exposure is undoubtedly a necessary condition in language learning, exclusion of other languages known by the learners deprives them of access to an additional valuable learning resource.

A closer look at the existing evidence reveals a picture of language teaching that is complicated and complex. Local practices and policies regarding the amount of students' own language use vary depending on factors such as whether or not teachers and learners share a language, whether teachers are themselves monolinguals or multilinguals, and whether teachers and learners have similar proficiency levels in the target language, to name just a few. Busse *et al*. (2020: 384) argue that ignoring students' linguistic resources in the classroom can prove 'detrimental' not only to learners with multilingual/multicultural backgrounds but also to their classmates who cannot turn to their advantage the linguistic resources of their peers.

Although for decades teachers have been trained to create monolingual additional language classrooms, their actual practices often contradict this ideal (Macaro, 2006). For example, in some contexts where the policy mandates a monolingual approach, teachers nonetheless rely heavily on translation or code-switching, which they deem necessary practices and which may lead them to experience a sense of guilt (Copland & Neokleous, 2011; Hall & Cook, 2012). In fact, research studies have revealed that the discrepancy between the teachers' stated behavior and actual classroom practice can be a source of the feelings of guilt, which are generated by the impossibility of complying with the monolingual approach that has been prescribed as the ideal foreign language classroom practice (Copland & Neokleous, 2011; Trent, 2013).

With recent studies exploring the teacher and the student perspective underlining the benefits associated with the integration of the students' home languages, current classroom practices are characterized by a quest to specify the judicious or optimal amount of students' own language use in new language instruction. Suggestions have been made regarding different functions that learners' own languages can fulfill to support acquisition of the new language (Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009; Crawford, 2004; Macaro, 2006). However, as findings from research are inconclusive, teachers continue to be left to their own devices when determining what amount and function of own language use should be considered 'optimal.'

The multilingual turn in language education

Recently, the hegemony of monolingual ideals has been challenged with the realization that multilingualism is in fact the norm, whether in a traditionally acknowledged multilingual country such as Indonesia (cf. Rasman & Margana, this volume), in the case of minority languages or large dialectal variation such as in Italy (cf. Mayr, this volume), or with recent demographic changes due to migration, such as in Germany (cf. Kopečková & Poarch, this volume).

As linguistic and cultural diversity in communities and classrooms around the globe is becoming increasingly acknowledged, language separation ideals have been heavily criticized and multilingualism has increasingly been recognized as the norm (Aronin & Singleton, 2012; García & Lin, 2016; Singleton *et al*., 2013). The multilingual perspective identifies language learners as emergent multilingual speakers who make recourse to their entire linguistic repertoires, which can play a catalyst role in the additional language learning process (Cummins, 2017). Language awareness and metalinguistic awareness are two of the advantages that have been associated with the attributes of multilingual learners (Cenoz, 2019; Haukås *et al*., 2018).

In an attempt to close the gap between research on language learning, multilingualism, and language teaching practices, there have been numerous calls for a major paradigm shift in language education that would legitimize the use of learners' own languages in additional language instruction. This multilingual turn (Conteh & Meier, 2014; May, 2014, 2019) is characterized by replacing the notion of an ideal, monolingual native speaker with that of a competent, multilingual user, and by softening the boundaries between languages instead of strict language separation (Blommaert, 2010; Cenoz & Gorter, 2013). Learners' cultural and linguistic resources are legitimized as valuable bridges to new learning, and instructional practices such as translation and translanguaging are encouraged (Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009; Cenoz & Gorter, 2020). Recent intervention studies that investigated translingual scaffolding

strategies (e.g. Arteagoitia & Howard, 2015; Lyster *et al*., 2013) revealed a positive impact on the participants' acquisition process where multilingual teaching approaches facilitated students' development of metalinguistic awareness.

Newer additional language teaching approaches promote multilingual proficiency, embrace the equality and visibility of all languages, and foster positive attitudes towards multilingualism. Importantly, there has been a strong push from research and higher education institutions to soften the boundaries between languages in schools and to instead promote pedagogies that encourage learners to draw on all linguistic resources available to them (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020; García & Lin, 2016). This paradigm shift echoes the findings reported in neurolinguistics and psycholinguistics about the strong interlinkage between the languages employed by multilingual speakers (Singleton, 2003).

Fostering multilingualism in foreign language classrooms

In recent years, the push for a multilingual education has seen the emergence of teaching practices that emphasize the interaction between languages and are, therefore, responsive to the needs of today's classrooms. It has been argued that students' own languages should no longer be excluded from the teaching process. Recent research has explored the teacher and student perspective and revealed a positive stance towards the integration of learners' full linguistic repertoires (Cenoz & Gorter, 2015; Neokleous, 2017). For instance, translanguaging is a teaching approach that incorporates students' entire linguistic resources and that acknowledges that languages cannot be separated as they constitute a part of a person's fluid and dynamic repertoire (García & Kleyn, 2016). Students draw on their holistic language resources 'from which they select features strategically to communicate effectively' (García, 2012: 1). In a similar vein, Cenoz and Gorter's (2011) Focus on Multilingualism perceives all languages as a whole and investigates their similarities. It establishes connections between the languages that students learn at school through the implementation of translanguaging as a pedagogy and attempts to underline the connections between them by conducting different activities to improve students' metalinguistic awareness. Although translanguaging pedagogies are not uniformly recognized as applicable to all language learning contexts (Lyster, 2019), and although local language policies can constrain translingual practices initiated by teachers and students (cf. Rasman & Margana, this volume), the value of multilingualism and minority language maintenance and development remains a solid facet of multilingual orientation in language education. EDQ1

Culture also plays a pivotal role in multilingual education. Fostering a culturally inclusive learning environment prompts students to create genuine and effective relationships across differences. For instance, Culturally

Responsive Teaching is a pedagogy that incorporates elements from the cultures (e.g. stories, food, celebrations) represented in each classroom, thus ensuring that the learning experience is relevant to all students (Gay, 2018). Along with making learning contextual, research has also concluded that Culturally Responsive Teaching can have a positive impact on achievement among minority populations (Gay, 2018). However, the spread of such teaching approaches requires that teachers are appropriately trained, prepared, and supported to implement them.

Teacher Preparedness to Work with Multilingual Learners

Teacher knowledge about multilingualism

At the same time as researchers and academics have embraced the multilingual turn in language education, research has repeatedly found that teachers working in multilingual settings continue to perpetuate monolingual ideologies and do not feel sufficiently prepared to implement pedagogies that are appropriate for linguistically and culturally diverse learners (De Angelis, 2011; Faez, 2012; Flores & Aneja, 2017). De Angelis (2011) concluded that teachers in Italy, Austria and the UK have little awareness of the role of learners' own languages in the acquisition of additional languages. In fact, many teachers in this study displayed the view that bilingualism can cause confusion and delays in development of a new language system. Faez's (2012) study conducted with teachers of English language learners in Canada revealed that although the participating teachers displayed empathy towards their students, they did not necessarily aspire to implement inclusive pedagogies and foster multilingualism. Another study conducted in Canada found that pre-service teachers were dissatisfied with the extent to which they were prepared to work with multilingual learners of English, including insufficient training in linguistics and language acquisition, lack of knowledge of teaching strategies, and inadequate or too short practicum placements (Webster & Valeo, 2011). In a study by Krulatz and Dahl (2016), Norwegian teachers of English reported a need for additional training in areas such as basic knowledge about multilingualism and language acquisition, approaches to language teaching in multilingual contexts, and knowledge about learners' linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Alisaari *et al*. (2019) discovered that in Finland, children's own languages continue to be banned at some schools and teachers recommend that Finnish be used by multilingual children and their families at home. Similarly, Rodríguez-Izquierdo *et al*. (2020) found that teachers in Spain tended to display assimilationist ideologies and deficit views of multilingualism. All studies summarized here concluded with a call for changes in teacher education programs, including an expanded explicit focus on multilingualism and helping teachers 'to critically negotiate, challenge, and deconstruct' their

views of multilingualism and multilingual learners (Rodríguez-Izquierdo *et al*., 2020: 9).

To amend the gap between research and teacher training, proposals have been put forward regarding the skills and knowledge that teachers need to possess to work with multilingual learners. For instance, García and Kleyn (2016) argued that teacher education programs should provide training in language acquisition processes, multilingual approaches to education, and working with multilingual learners and their families. Siwatu (2007) claimed that teachers need to possess knowledge about linguistic and cultural diversity, while Lucas and Villegas (2011, 2013) proposed that teachers have to be prepared to scaffold learning and be familiar with multilingual learners' linguistic backgrounds. Haukås (2016) concluded that language teachers need to be able to serve as model multilinguals, possess advanced cross-linguistic and metalinguistic awareness, and be familiar with current research on multilingualism. They should also know how to promote multilingualism in the classroom, be sensitive to students' cognitive and affective differences, and be willing to collaborate with others in an effort to promote multilingualism.

However, given the recent findings from research on teacher beliefs about multilingualism and preparedness to work with linguistically diverse learners, it seems that, to date, teacher training programs have failed to address the call to better prepare teachers for the multilingual reality of their classrooms (Alisaari *et al*., 2019; De Angelis, 2011; Faez, 2012; Krulatz & Dahl, 2016; Otwinowska, 2014; Rodríguez-Izquierdo *et al*., 2020). Although some teacher training and professional development programs have boasted positive outcomes (e.g. Fischer & Lahmann, 2020; Gorter & Arocena, 2020), and although increasing numbers of teacher education programs include some coursework with a focus on multilingualism (e.g. Angelovska *et al*., 2020; Uro & Barrio, 2013), we are far from fulfilling the goal to provide all teachers with 'appropriate preparation and targeted instruction to supporting students of diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds' (Faez, 2012: 78). While from the research and theory perspective, the multilingual turn in language education is underway, from the teacher perspective, there exist factors that limit or prevent the implementation of multilingual practices in the classroom. To say that change takes time is of course a truism, so one possibility is that the outcomes of the recent improvements in teacher training are not yet visible. Yet another possibility to consider is whether the instruction on multilingualism and the role of own language in additional language learning has been delivered in a way that is conducive to teacher uptake. Perhaps we need to make a leap from *the what* and *the how* in teacher education and focus on mobilizing the resources, knowledge and beliefs teachers already possess to enable the multilingual turn. We debate this issue further in the next section.

Teachers as agents of change

If the transition that will enable teachers to fully embrace multilingual approaches to education is to occur in language classrooms, it is essential to recognize teachers as central agents of change. Teacher actions exert influence on language practices both in and outside of school (Lasagabaster & Huguet, 2007). For example, teachers are often consulted by immigrant parents on whether they should or should not raise their children bilingually. As De Angelis (2011: 217) argues, 'Teachers may choose to encourage or discourage the use and/or maintenance of the home language on the basis of personal beliefs, individual interests or personal experience, and the advice they offer will inevitably influence parents' decisions.' Inside the classroom, it is often teachers who decide to what degree they want to implement existing language policies and, as a result, their actions can either support or suppress the multilingual practices of their students (Hornberger & Cassels Johnson, 2007).

All aspects of teachers' work, including their pedagogical practices and language use and ideologies about the languages present in the classroom (Barcelos, 2003; Fitch, 2003), are shaped by teacher cognition, defined as 'what teachers know, believe, and think' (Borg, 2003: 81). Teacher cognitions are affected by a range of internal and external factors including former schooling and professional training, teaching experience and own experiences as language learners (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Borg, 2006; Lortie, 1975; Phillips & Borg, 2009). Likewise, teacher identity is characterized by complexities which may lead to 'the tension between the kind of … [educator] they aspire to become and the kind they believe others expect them to become' (Yazan, 2018: 145). Teacher cognition and identity are not easily altered (Parajes, 1992), but both teacher education programs and teacher professional learning have a potential to stimulate change (Cenoz & Santos, 2020; Gorter & Arocena, 2020; Peacock, 2001). For instance, participation in in-service professional development can help teachers embrace positive views of multilingualism in general and multilingual practices such as translanguaging as it may legitimize teacher actions that 'they already practice but [are] afraid to admit to others' (Gorter & Arocena, 2020: 9).

Working with pre- and in-service teachers to help them examine and potentially alter their cognitions and identities to forge multilingual teacher ideologies is a crucial element of the multilingual turn in language education. A new, emergent sub-field of teacher education that utilizes teacher identity work and reflection to approach the development of teacher cognition is one promising development in this area (Liou, 2001; Yazan & Lindahl, 2020). Such a paradigm shift would allow teacher education to move forward, from knowledge and skills-based programs to facilitating teachers' professional journeys through a curriculum that

promotes self-reflection. As a result, teachers may not only become more aware of their own beliefs and the factors that shape them, but also become more receptive to innovation and willing to embrace and perpetuate change.

The Way Ahead: Educational Research, Teacher Education and Professional Learning

To bridge the gap between theory and practice and pave the way for an effective implementation of the paradigm shift, the goal of educational research should not only be to examine what language teachers do and why they do it. An important objective should be to actively involve teachers as well as students in classroom research so that they are not only the objects of study but also have a say in the aspects of their practice that undergo investigation. Likewise, teacher training programs and professional learning should place more explicit emphasis on the development of teacher identity, focusing on working with multilingual learners as one of its central elements.

The concept of teacher identity allows us to examine and understand 'the complex ways in which teachers learn to be and become teachers, grow as teachers, and exercise their practices situated in sociohistorical, cultural, and political contexts' (Yazan & Lindahl, 2020: 1). Teacher identity development is an ongoing and multifaceted process in which personal and professional factors interplay. In linguistically and culturally diverse educational contexts, it entails a negotiation of viewpoints on multilingualism (e.g. benefits versus challenges), a position on the role of learners' own languages in additional language learning, an awareness of the current sociocultural context, and an understanding of what it means to be a teacher of multilingual learners. Identity work should be built into language teacher education programs as an integral and explicit pedagogical tool. For instance, research suggests that language teachers who identify as multilinguals are more likely to value their students' linguistic resources than monolingual teachers (Alisaari *et al*., 2019). Teacher education programs could therefore take it as a point of departure to foster teachers' self-recognition as (emergent) multilingual speakers. An overreaching goal should be to implement identity work as pedagogy in teacher education in order to help (pre- and in-service) teachers 'critically negotiate, challenge and deconstruct' monolingual views and approaches to language education (Rodríguez-Izquierdo *et al*., 2020: 9).

Likewise, it is important to engage language teachers working in multilingual contexts in action research, thus empowering them to enact the multilingual turn as they 'make instructional decisions, execute these decisions, interact with students and colleagues, and reflect on teaching practice' (Yazan & Lindahl, 2020: 2). To date, the focus on multilingual education has largely been theoretical as the majority of research studies

have placed emphasis on what teachers should know and should be able to do in the diverse classroom (de Jong, 2013; Lucas & Villegas, 2013). Researchers and scholars try to familiarize teachers with pedagogies that teachers should be equipped with as these pedagogies are believed to promote language acquisition. However, some studies that address multilingual classroom practices present and discuss conceptual perceptions about language acquisition in diverse settings without considering the intrinsic link between theory and classroom practice. Studies that have ventured to materialize this link have culminated in significant changes to teaching content, syllabi and materials (Gort *et al*., 2011; Lucas, 2011) in an attempt to address the issues that have emerged. If effective multilingual approaches are to be implemented in the classroom, this should be the result of a collaboration between researchers and school and university partners, and both teacher and learner voices need to be heard. This mission is carried out by the remaining chapters in this edited volume.

Notes

(1) We choose to use the term *additional language* to denote all those contexts where learners who may already be fluent in other languages or dialects are learning a new language.
(2) In this chapter, we use Hall and Cook's (2012) term *own language* to denote what has traditionally been labeled as mother tongue/first language/home language.

References

Alisaari, J., Heikkola, L.M., Commins, N. and Acquah, E.O. (2019) Monolingual ideologies confronting multilingual realities: Finnish teachers' beliefs about linguistic diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 80 (1), 48–58.

Angelovska, T., Krulatz, A. and Šurkalović, D. (2020) Predicting EFL teacher candidates' preparedness to work with multilingual learners: Snapshots from three European universities. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics and TEFL* 9 (1), 193–208.

Aronin, L. and Singleton, D. (2012) *Multilingualism*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Arteagoitia, I. and Howard, L. (2015) The role of the native language in the literacy development of Latino students in the U.S. In J. Cenoz and D. Gorter (eds) *Multilingual Education: Between Language Learning and Translanguaging* (pp. 61–83). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barcelos, A.M.F. (2003) Teachers' and students' beliefs within a Deweyan framework: Conflict and influence. In P. Kalaja and A.M.F. Barcelos (eds) *Beliefs about SLA: New Research Approaches* (pp. 171–199). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Beauchamp, C. and Thomas, L. (2009) Understanding teacher identity: An overview of issues in the literature and implications for teacher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 39 (2), 175–189.

Berman, R.A. (2011) The real language crisis. *Academe* 97 (5). See https://www.aaup.org/article/real-language-crisis#.WrIjQudrzb0

Blommaert, J. (2010) *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Borg, S. (2003) Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching* 36 (2), 81–109.

Borg, S. (2006) *Teacher Cognition and Language Education: Research and Practice*. London: Continuum.

Busse, V. (2017) Zur Förderung positiver Einstellungen gegenüber sprachlicher Diversität als europäisches Bildungsziel: Status quo und Desiderate. [Promoting positive attitudes towards linguistic diversity as a European educational objective: Status quo and desiderata]. *Zeitschrift fur Fremdsprachenforschung* 28 (1), 53–75.

Busse, V., Cenoz, J., Dalmann, N. and Rogge, F. (2020) Addressing linguistic diversity in the language classroom in a resource-oriented way: An intervention study with primary school children. *Language Learning* 70 (2), 382–419.

Butzkamm, W. and Caldwell, J. (2009) *The Bilingual Reform: A Paradigm Shift in Foreign Language Teaching*. Tubingen: Narr Studienbücher.

Canagarajah, S. (2007) Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal* 91 (1), 923–939.

Cenoz, J. (2019) Translanguaging pedagogies and English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching* 52, 71–85.

Cenoz, J. and Gorter, D. (2011) Focus on multilingualism: A study of trilingual writing. *The Modern Language Journal* 95 (3), 356–369.

Cenoz, J. and Gorter, D. (2013) Towards a plurilingual approach in English language teaching: Softening the boundaries between languages. *TESOL Quarterly* 47 (3), 591–599.

Cenoz, J. and Gorter, D. (eds) (2015) *Multilingual Education: Between Language Learning and Translanguaging*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cenoz, J. and Gorter, D. (2020) Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes* 39, 300–311.

Cenoz, J. and Santos, A. (2020) Implementing pedagogical translanguaging in trilingual schools. *System* 92, 102273. doi:10.1016/j.system.2020.102273

Cheshire, J. (2002) Who we are and where we're going: Language and identities in the new Europe. In P. Gubbins and M. Holt (eds) *Beyond Boundaries: Language and Identity in Contemporary Europe* (pp. 19–34). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Conteh, J. and Meier, G. (eds) (2014) *The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Cook, V. (2007) The goals of ELT: Reproducing native-speakers or promoting multicompetence among second language users? In J. Cummins and C. Davison (eds) *International Handbook of English Language Education, Vol. 1* (pp. 237–248). Norwell, MA: Springer.

Copland, F. and Neokleous, G. (2011) L1 to teach L2: Complexities and contradictions. *ELT Journal* 65 (3), 270–280.

Council of Europe (2007) *From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education: Guide for the Development of Language Policies in Europe*. Strasbourg: Language Policy Division.

Council of the European Union (2014) Conclusions on multilingualism and the development of language competence. Education, Youth, and Sport Council Meeting, Brussels, 20 May. See http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/educ/142692.pdf

Crawford, J. (2004) Language choices in the foreign language classroom: Target language or the learners' first language? *RELC Journal* 33 (1), 5–20.

Cummins, J. (2007) Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics (CJAL)* 10 (2), 221–240.

Cummins, J. (2017) Teaching for transfer in multilingual school contexts. In O. García, A. Lin and S. May (eds) *Bilingual Education: Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (pp. 103–115). Berlin: Springer.

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.

de Jong, E. (2013) Preparing mainstream teachers for multilingual classrooms. *Association of Mexican American Educators Journal* 7 (2), 40–49.
Faez, F. (2012) Diverse teachers for diverse students: Internationally educated and Canadian-born teachers' preparedness to teach English language learners. *Canadian Journal of Education* 35 (3), 64–84.
Fischer, N. and Lahmann, C. (2020) Pre-service teachers' beliefs about multilingualism in school: An evaluation of a course concept for introducing linguistically responsive teaching. *Language Awareness* 29 (2), 114–133.
Fitch, F. (2003) Inclusion, exclusion, and ideology. Special education students' changing sense of self. *The Urban Review* 35 (3), 233–252.
Flores, N. and Aneja, G. (2017) 'Why needs hiding?': Translingual (re)orientations in TESOL teacher education. *Research in the Teaching of English* 51 (4), 441–463.
Franceschini, R. (2011) Multilingualism and multicompetence: A conceptual review. *The Modern Language Journal* 95 (3), 344–355.
Gao, X. (2012) 'Cantonese is not a dialect': Chinese netizens' defence of Cantonese as a regional lingua franca. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 33 (5), 449–464.
García, O. (2012) Theorizing translanguaging for educators. In C. Celic and K. Seltzer (eds) *Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB Guide for Educators* (pp. 1–6). New York: CUNY-NYSIEB.
García, O. and Kleyn, T. (eds) (2016) *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students*. New York: Routledge.
García, O. and Li, W. (2014) *Translanguaging. Language, Bilingualism and Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
García, O. and Lin, A. (2016) Translanguaging and bilingual education. In O. García, A. Lin and S. May (eds) *Bilingual and Multilingual Education* (pp. 117–130). Dordrecht: Springer.
García, O. and Sylvan, C.E. (2011) Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *The Modern Language Journal* 95 (3), 385–400.
García, O., Ibarra Johnson, S. and Seltzer, K. (2017) *The Translanguaging Classroom: Leveraging Student Bilingualism for Learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
Gay, G. (2018) *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice* (3rd edn). New York: Teachers College Press.
Gort, M., Glenn, W.J. and Settlage, J. (2011) Toward culturally and linguistically responsive teacher education: The impact of a faculty learning community on two teacher educators. In T. Lucas (ed.) *Teacher Preparation for Linguistically Diverse Classrooms: A Resource for Teacher Educators* (pp. 178–194). New York: Routledge.
Gorter, D. and Arocena, E. (2020) Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism in a course on translanguaging. *System* 92, 102272.
Gorter, D. and Cenoz, J. (2011) A multilingual approach: Conclusions and future perspectives: Afterword. *The Modern Language Journal* 95 (3), 442–445.
Hall, G. and Cook, G. (2012) Own-language use in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching* 45 (3), 271–308.
Haukås, A. (2016) Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 13 (1), 1–18.
Haukås, A., Bjørke, C. and Dypedahl, M. (eds) (2018) *Metacognition in Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Routledge.
Herdina, P. and Jessner, U. (2002) *A Dynamic Model of Multilingualism: Perspectives of Change in Psycholinguistics*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Hornberger, N.H. and Cassels Johnson, D. (2007) Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly* 41 (3), 509–532.

King, L. and Carson, L. (eds) (2016) *The Multilingual City: Vitality, Conflict and Change*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Kirkpatrick, A. and Liddicoat, A. (2017) Language education policy and practice in East and Southeast Asia. *Language Teaching* 50 (2), 155–188.
Kramsch, C. (2012) Authenticity and legitimacy in multilingual SLA. *Critical Multilingualism Studies* 1 (1), 107–128.
Krulatz, A. and Dahl, A. (2016) Baseline assessment of Norwegian EFL teacher preparedness to work with multilingual students. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching* 7 (2), 199–218.
Lasagabaster, D. and Huguet, Á. (eds) (2007) *Multilingualism in European Bilingual Contexts: Language Use and Attitudes*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Liddicoat, A.J. and Curnow, T.J. (2014) Students' home languages and the struggle for space in the curriculum. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 11 (3), 273–288.
Liou, H.C. (2001) Reflective practice in a pre-service teacher education program for high school English teachers in Taiwan, ROC. *System* 29 (2), 197–208.
Lortie, D. (1975) *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study*. London: University of Chicago Press.
Lucas, T. (ed.) (2011) *Teacher Preparation for Linguistically Diverse Classrooms: A Resource for Teacher Educators*. New York: Routledge.
Lucas, T. and Villegas, A.M. (2011) A framework for preparing linguistically responsive teachers. In T. Lucas (ed.) *Teacher Preparation for Linguistically Diverse Classrooms* (pp. 35–52). New York: Routledge.
Lucas, T. and Villegas, A.M. (2013) Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: Laying the foundation in preservice teacher education. *Theory into Practice* 52 (2), 98–109.
Lyster, R. (2019) Translanguaging in immersion: Cognitive support or social prestige? *Canadian Modern Language Review* 75 (4), 340–352.
Lyster, R., Quiroga, J. and Ballinger, S. (2013) The effects of biliteracy instruction on morphological awareness. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education* 1, 169–197.
Macaro, E. (2006) Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In E. Llurda (ed.) *Non-native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession* (pp. 63–84). Amsterdam: Springer.
May, S. (ed.) (2014) *The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and Bilingual Education*. New York: Routledge.
May, S. (2019) Negotiating the multilingual turn in SLA. *The Modern Language Journal* 103 (Suppl.), 122–129.
Minuz, F., Haznedar, B., Peyton, J.K. and Young-Scholten, M. (2020) Using materials in refugee and immigrant adults' heritage languages in instruction: Challenges and guidance for teachers and tutors. In G. Neokleous, A. Krulatz and R. Farrelly (eds) *Handbook of Research on Cultivating Literacy in Diverse and Multilingual Classrooms* (pp. 422–447). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
Neokleous, G. (2017) Closing the gap: Student attitudes toward first language use in monolingual EFL classrooms. *TESOL Journal* 8 (2), 314–341.
Otwinowska, A. (2014) Does multilingualism influence plurilingual awareness of Polish teachers of English? *International Journal of Multilingualism* 11 (1), 97–119.
Parajes, M.F. (1992) Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research* 62 (3), 307–322.
Peacock, M. (2001) Pre-service teachers' beliefs about second language learning: A longitudinal study. *System* 29 (2), 177–195.
Phillips, S. and Borg, S. (2009) Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System* 27 (3), 380–390.
Rodríguez-Izquierdo, R.M., Gonzàlez Falcón, I. and Goenechea Permisán, C. (2020) Teacher beliefs and approaches to linguistic diversity: Spanish as a second language in the inclusion of immigrant students. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 90, 103035. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2020.103035

Sampson, A. (2012) Learner code-switching versus English only. *ELT Journal* 66 (3), 293–303.
Schecter, S. and Cummins, J. (2003) *Multilingual Education in Practice: Using Diversity as a Resource*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
Singleton, D. (2003) Perspectives on the multilingual lexicon: A critical synthesis. In J. Cenoz, U. Jessner and B. Hufeisen (eds) *The Multilingual Lexicon* (pp. 167–176). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Singleton, D., Fishman, J., Aronin, L. and Ó Laoire, M. (eds) (2013) *Current Multilingualism: A New Linguistic Dispensation*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Siwatu, K.O. (2007) Preservice teachers' culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 23 (7), 1086–1101.
Szubko-Sitarek, W. (2015) *Multilingual Lexical Recognition in the Mental Lexicon of Third Language Users*. Berlin: Springer.
Trent, J. (2013) Using the L1 in L2 teaching and learning: What role does teacher identity play? *Asian EFL Journal* 15 (3), 217–247.
Uro, G. and Barrio, A. (2013) *English Language Learners in America's Great City Schools: Demographics, Achievement, and Staffing*. Washington, DC: Council of Great City Schools.
Vukovic, R. (2019) Valuing multilingual students' skills. *Teacher Magazine*, 4 June. See https://www.teachermagazine.com.au/articles/valuing-multilingual-students-skills
Wang, D. (2019) *Multilingualism and Translanguaging in Chinese Language Classrooms*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
Webster, N.L. and Valeo, A. (2011) Teacher preparedness for a changing demographic of language learners. *TESL Canada Journal* 28 (2), 105–128.
Yazan, B. (2018) TESL teacher educators' professional self-development, identity, and agency. *TESL Canada Journal* 35 (2), 140–155.
Yazan, B. and Lindahl, K. (eds) (2020) *Language Teacher Identity in TESOL: Teacher Education and Practice as Identity Work*. New York: Routledge.
Ziegler, G. (2013) Multilingualism and the language education landscape: Challenges for teacher training in Europe. *Multilingual Education* 3 (1). doi:10.1186/2191-5059-3-1