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Abstract

With the internationalization of English and the increased human mobility around the globe, it is nowadays deemed more than imperative to reconsider long held views about the notion of the traditional structure of the ‘nation’ and gear towards the reassessment and reconstruction of various ideas and practices. Speaking of education, classrooms are characterized by increased diversity which can take on various forms ranging from students who are culturally or linguistically diverse, students with disabilities to even gifted students. Specifically, teaching and learning contexts consisting of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students call for meticulous planning and careful curriculum design as well as high quality English language education. Hence, given that it is unknown the degree to which Greek EFL teachers are equipped to teach English L3 learners, there is an increasing demand worldwide not only for competent English language speakers, but also for competent English language teachers and efficient English language teaching. EFL teachers can no longer aim towards monolingual English speakers acquiring a second language. The new school reality calls for educational reforms to address the needs of diverse school populations who bring both their home languages and cultures into a mainstream classroom.

In this context, this thesis first strives to describe the current situation in Primary schools in Western Greece, where English is taught as a third language to bilingual students. In particular, we seek to examine the Greek EFL teachers’ views and knowledge regarding various issues related to interculturalism and their actual approaches and practices to third language teaching in mixed classrooms. Secondly, this study aims to explore the most efficient strategies regarding the teaching of English to students who may be ethnically, racially and / or linguistically different from the mainstream students in a Greek mixed classroom. This way, weaknesses, as well as gaps in third language teaching, learning and acquisition will be identified and in relation with the examination of professional experiences, suggestions will be provided for the optimal teachers’ development opportunities addressing this unique population of learners. In this light, this study fills a gap in the present body of knowledge on L3 instruction at a Primary level in the Greek educational context and puts forward suggestions for the improvement of the current situation.
Towards these goals, a multi-method approach was applied, with the administration of a teacher questionnaire to 93 in-service English language teachers in the Western Greece and in-depth, semi-structured interviews carried out with 12 teachers. The analysis of the data was situated in a social-constructivist framework and was thus informed by according theory underpinnings in conjunction with the related literature on second and third language learning and teaching. The findings of the study gleaned from both the questionnaire and the interviews were not convergent. While it was evident from the questionnaire that the majority of the teachers had positive attitudes towards CLD students and did employ various general techniques, they failed to refer to basic strategies which -based on research- have been proven to be conducive to successful L3 teaching and learning. Also, although teachers are aware of the advantages several languages may confer to learners, the majority of them do not involve students’ first languages in learning- ignoring this way the potential benefits, but they opt for either the second (Greek) or the third (English) one, instead. They still, though, consider first languages as a kind of scaffold and use them as a stepping stone for students’ smoother learning. Moreover, the findings indicate that teachers mostly regard themselves as cultural mediators and do not perceive absolute faith in their chosen strategies, the majority of which are also culturally – bound. This implies the teachers’ great struggle to adapt to the given contextual demands and maintain order in any teaching context.

Based on the aforementioned points, the study urges for a reconsideration or even an update of the intercultural practices regarding the foreign language classroom and of the wider legal framework regarding the teaching of English to L3 learners in the Greek educational context. Moreover, the implications of the study include the great need for teacher training to replace the mere theoretical conceptions or the rare use or even omission of specific strategies with a coherent framework for Greek EFL teachers, which would contain new initiatives and guidance for actual, practical implementation of effective L3 strategies. The qualitative data, in particular, highlight the centrality of teachers in future change processes. They suggest that the desired change will come if coherent frameworks are developed and learning communities among teachers and experts are established. This professional development may have a significant impact on developing more equitable learning
environments and providing all students with equal chances of mastering a foreign or additional foreign language.

KEYWORDS
Bilingualism, trilingualism, interculturalism, multiculturalism, learning / teaching strategies.
Περίληψη

Η εξέλιξη της Αγγλικής ως διεθνούς γλώσσας και η αυξημένη κινητικότητα των λαών λόγω της παγκόσμιας παραδοσιακής κάνουν επιτακτική την ανάγκη να επαναπροσδιοριστούν οι καθιερωμένες προσεγγίσεις στην παραδοσιακή δομή του «έθνους» και να επαναξιολογηθούν και αναδειχθούν οι παραδοσιακές και πρακτικές για τη διαπολιτισμικότητα. Συγκεκριμένα στον τομέα της εκπαίδευσης, οι σχολικές τάξεις χαρακτηρίζονται από έντονη ετερότητα, η οποία μπορεί να εκθετεθεί με ποικίλες μορφές, όπως είναι οι πολιτισμικά και γλωσσικά διαφοροποιμένοι μαθητές, οι μαθητές με ειδικές εκπαιδευτικές ανάγκες, και οι χαρακτηρισμοί ταλαντούχων μαθητών. Ειδικότερα, εμπειρία και αντιλήψεις περιβάλλοντα που αποτελούνται από επαναπροσδιορισμένοι μαθητές προϋποθέτουν ενδεχόμενη στρεβλωτική και επιμελή προετοιμασία του αναλυτικού προγράμματος και, παράλληλα, αυξημένη ποιότητα διδασκαλίας της Αγγλικής γλώσσας.

Με βάση τα προαναφερθέντα, και μόλις στιγμής ο βαθμός στον οποίο οι Έλληνες εκπαιδευτικοί της Αγγλικής γλώσσας θα προσδιοριστούν καταρτισμένοι να διδάσκουν την Αγγλική γλώσσα σε τρίγλωσσους μαθητές, καταγράφεται παγκοσμίως μια αυξανόμενη ζήτηση όχι μόνο για εκμετάλλευση της Αγγλικής γλώσσας, αλλά και για εκμετάλλευση της Αγγλικής γλώσσας και για αποτελεσματική διδασκαλία της ξένης γλώσσας. Στόχο των εκπαιδευτικών πλέον δεν ισχύει η μετάδοση μιας δεύτερης γλώσσας σε μονόγλωσσο κοινό, η χρήση σχολικής πραγματικότητα απαιτεί επαναπροσδιορισμένες μεταρρυθμίσεις προκειμένου να τροφοδοτηθούν οι ανάγκες των διαφοροποιμένων μαθητικών πληθυσμών, οι οποίοι μεταφέρουν τις μητρικές τους γλώσσες και τον πολιτισμό τους στην Αγγλική γλώσσα.

Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, η παρούσα διατριβή επιδιώκει αρχικά να περιγράψει την ισχύουσα κατάσταση στις σχολικές μονάδες της Περιφέρειας Δυτικής Ελλάδας, όπου η Αγγλική διδάσκεται ως τρίτη γλώσσα σε διεθνούς κοινό. Αναλυτικότερα, διερευνάται η κατάσταση σε διεθνείς καταρτισμένους μαθητές, και στο πλαίσιο των εκπαιδευτικών προγράμματος της Αγγλικής γλώσσας και για αποτελεσματική διδασκαλία της Αγγλικής γλώσσας, και οι ανάγκες των διαφοροποιμένων μαθητικών πληθυσμών, οι οποίοι μεταφέρουν τις μητρικές τους γλώσσες και τον πολιτισμό τους στην Αγγλική γλώσσα.
τάξεις. Στη συνέχεια, η μελέτη διερευνά τις πιο αποτελεσματικές στρατηγικές για τη διδασκαλία της Αγγλικής γλώσσας σε μαθητές που μπορεί να διαφοροποιούνται εθνικά, φυλετικά και / ή γλωσσολογικά από τους μονόγλωσσους μαθητές στην μεικτή ελληνική τάξη. Με αυτόν τον τρόπο, υποθέτουμε ότι μπορούν να αναδειχθούν τυχόν αδυναμίες και κενά στη διδασκαλία, εκμάθηση και κατάκτηση της τρίτης γλώσσας. Παράλληλα, θεωρούμε ότι σε συνδυασμό με τη διερεύνηση των επαγγελματικών βιωμάτων των εκπαιδευτικών της Αγγλικής, μπορούν να καταδειχθούν προτάσεις για την βελτίωση επαγγελματικής ανάπτυξης τους με απότερο στόχο να ανταποκρίνονται εκείνοι στις ανάγκες αυτού του μοναδικού και ιδιαίτερου μαθητικού πληθυσμού. Υπό αυτό το πρίσμα, η παρούσα έρευνα φιλοδοξεί να καλύψει το κενό που παρατηρείται στην υπάρχουσα αρθρογραφία και βιβλιογραφία σχετικά με τη διδασκαλία της τρίτης γλώσσας στο ελληνικό εκπαιδευτικό πλαίσιο της πρωτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης. Στην παρούσα κατάσταση, το κενό που παρατηρείται στην υπάρχουσα αρθρογραφία και βιβλιογραφία σχετικά με τη διδασκαλία της τρίτης γλώσσας στο ελληνικό εκπαιδευτικό πλαίσιο της πρωτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης, παρέχοντας συγχρόνως προτάσεις για τη βελτίωση της παρούσας κατάστασης.

Για την επίτευξη του σκοπού και των στόχων που αναφέρθηκαν χρησιμοποιήθηκε μικτή μεθοδολογία έρευνας. Ως εργαλείο συλλογής ερευνητικών δεδομένων χρησιμοποιήθηκαν το ερωτηματολόγιο, το οποίο διανεμήθηκε σε 93 εν ενεργεία εκπαιδευτικούς Αγγλικής γλώσσας πρωτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης στην Περιφέρεια Δυτικής Ελλάδας και η ημι-δομημένη συνέντευξη, στην οποία συμμετείχαν 12 εκπαιδευτικοί Αγγλικής γλώσσας.

Η ανάλυση των δεδομένων βασίστηκε στο κοινωνικο-κονστрукτιστικό πλαίσιο και στις θεωρίες που το διέπουν, σε συνδυασμό με τη σχετική βιβλιογραφία που αφορά στην εκπαίδευση και διδασκαλία της διεύρυνσης και τρίτης γλώσσας. Τα ευρήματα της έρευνας τόσο από τα ερωτηματολόγια όσο και από τις συνεντεύξεις δεν συγκλίνουν. Ενώ κατέστη εμφανές από τα ερωτηματολόγια ότι η πλειονότητα των εκπαιδευτικών έχουν θετική στάση απέναντι στους γλωσσικά και πολιτισμικά διαφοροποιημένους μαθητές τους, και χρησιμοποιούν διάφορες γενικές μεθοδολογικές πρακτικές, εντούτοις οι συμμετέχοντες απέφυγαν να αναφέρθουν σε συγκεκριμένες βασικές στρατηγικές οι οποίες -βάσει ερευνών- αποδεδειγμένα συμβάλλουν στην επιτυχή διδασκαλία και εκμάθηση της τρίτης γλώσσας.

Επίσης, παρά το γεγονός ότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί έχουν επίγνωση των πλεονεκτημάτων της πολυγλωσσίας στους μαθητές, η πλειοψηφία αυτών δεν περιλαμβάνει την
μητρική τους γλώσσα στην διδασκαλία- παραβλέποντας με αυτόν τον τρόπο τα πιθανά οφέλη μιας τέτοιας στάσης- και αντ’ αυτού επιλέγουν είτε τη δεύτερη (Ελληνικά) είτε την τρίτη (Αγγλικά) γλώσσα. Παρ’ όλα αυτά, εκλαμβάνουν τις μητρικές γλώσσες των μαθητών ως έρεισμα και τις χρησιμοποιούν ως μέσο για την πιο ομαλή εκμάθηση της επιπρόσθετης γλώσσας. Επιπλέον, τα ευρήματα δείχνουν ότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί αντιλαμβάνονται κατά κύριο λόγο το ρόλο τους ως πολιτισμικοί διαμεσολαβητές αλλά δεν έχουν απόλυτη εμπιστοσύνη στις στρατηγικές που χρησιμοποιούν, η πλειοψηφία των οποίων επίσης συναρτάται με τους διάφορους πολιτισμούς που συνυπάρχουν στην τάξη. Αυτό υποδηλώνει την επίπονη προσπάθεια των εκπαιδευτικών να προσαρμοστούν στις απαιτήσεις του εκάστοτε σχολικού πλαισίου και να το διαχειριστούν αποτελεσματικά.

Με βάση όσα έχουν προαναφερθεί, η έρευνα προτρέπει στην αναθεώρηση ή ακόμα και στον εκσυγχρονισμό των διαπολιτισμικών πρακτικών στην ξενόγλωσση τάξη, αλλά και του ευρύτερου νομοθετικού πλαισίου που προσδιορίζει τη διδασκαλία της Αγγλικής γλώσσας σε τριγλώσσους μαθητές στο Ελληνικό εκπαιδευτικό πλαίσιο. Επιπρόσθετα, τα ευρήματα της έρευνας υποδεικνύουν την επιτακτική ανάγκη να αντικαταστήσει την απλή αναφορά σε θεωρητικές αρχές ή την σπάνια αξιοποίηση ακόμα και την παράλειψη συγκεκριμένων στρατηγικών με ένα συμπαγές επιμορφωτικό πλαίσιο ειδικά σχεδιασμένο για Έλληνες εκπαιδευτικούς της Αγγλικής γλώσσας, το οποίο θα συμπεριλαμβάνει νέες προτομίκες και κατευθύνσεις για την πρακτική εφαρμογή αποτελεσματικών στρατηγικών διδασκαλίας της τρίτης γλώσσας. Ιδιαίτερα τα ποιοτικά δεδομένα τονίζουν τον κεντρικό ρόλο των εκπαιδευτικών σε μελλοντικές μεταρρυθμιστικές διαδικασίες. Σε αυτά οι εκπαιδευτικοί υποστηρίζουν ότι η επιθυμητή αλλαγή θα έρθει μόνο εάν αναπτυχθούν επιμορφωτικών πλαισίων με συνοχή και εάν δημιουργηθούν εκπαιδευτικές κοινότητες μεταξύ εκπαιδευτικών και εμπειρογνωμόνων. Μια τέτοια μορφή επαγγελματικής ανάπτυξης ίσως έχει σημαντική επίδραση στην ανάπτυξη πιο ισότιμων μαθησιακών περιβάλλοντων καθώς επίσης και στην παροχή ίσων ευκαιριών προς όλους τους μαθητές ώστε να κατακτήσουν μια ξένη ή επιπρόσθετη γλώσσα.

Λέξεις Κλειδιά: διγλωσσία, τριγλώσσια, διαπολιτισμικότητα, πολυπολυτισμικότητα, στρατηγικές μάθησης / διδασκαλίας.
CHAPTER 1: Setting the scene

Introduction

To communicate, to convey meaning, ideas, to be understood and to understand is key to successfully making one’s way in a world that is changing, regardless of where someone finds themselves. Language teachers, through knowledge, research, experience, and planning, help create the conditions that facilitate the language learning of their culturally and linguistically diverse students. The diversity of their students is becoming the norm rather than the exception. Throughout the world, the migration and growth of various populations has radically diversified the makeup of many countries, affecting not only the racial and ethnic composition of the working populations but also of the school – aged ones. The same applies to Greece, whose demographics are continuously changing. According to the Hellenic Statistical Authority (2020), “net migration is estimated at 34,439 persons corresponding to the difference between 129,459 immigrants and 95,020 emigrants. In 2018 net migration was estimated at 16,440 persons (119,489 immigrants and 103,049 emigrants). It should be noted that immigration data also includes persons living in the country at 1.1.2020, as a result of the refugee crisis.”

With reference to the contemporary Greek student population (see Appendix A, p.231), it is becoming more and more ethnically, socially, economically, as well as linguistically and culturally diverse. It is estimated that students of a different ethnic background, coming from the Balkans, the Middle East and the ex-Soviet Union form about 10% in grades K-12 (Gkaintartzi et al., 2015, as cited in Mattheoudakis, 2017). According to the Refugee Education Project (2017, p. 30-31), what is of crucial importance regarding the refugee population is that “approximately 48% of the children who reside in UNHCR-controlled facilities are of school age (6-15) and about 12% are of pre-school age (4-5).” Thus, 60% of the children mentioned above fall within age groups of compulsory education (pre-school through the end of gymnasium). This corresponds to approximately 2,000 pre-school children (1,000 in RACs and 1,000 in UNHCR facilities). Approximately 7,700 children (equally distributed in RACs and UNHCR facilities) belong to the age groups of primary and secondary education”. More specifically, according to a fact sheet for 2018, produced by UNHCR, UNICEF and the IOM
(2019, p. 6) “by December 2018, 11,500 refugee and migrant children were enrolled in Greek schools throughout the country, an increase of 44% compared to the number of enrolled children by June 2018.” Out of these students “91% were enrolled in schools on the mainland while 9% were enrolled in schools on the Greek islands.” This unregulated nature of immigration can be attributed to the fact that Greece is, in most cases, not a final destination for the immigrants as it is considered the “gateway” to European territory, yet one not having the right infrastructure to cope with the new circumstances (Rozakis, 1997 in Dimakos & Tasiopoulou, 2003; Dimakos, Spinthourakis & Tasiopoulou, 2011; Spinthourakis & Antonopoulou, 2012).

The ramifications of this new reality have changed the homogeneity of Greek society on a social, cultural, ethnic, economic, religious as well as racial level. The education sector is considered one area which has probably been most affected and therefore should be of concern. As Sakka (2010) argues, migration alone is not to blame for this cultural diversity. Diversity does exist in the Greek educational system but since Greek society has always been seen as mainly a monocultural one, the ideology of homogeneity prevails, and diversity is therefore ignored. To reinforce this statement Dragonas et al. (1996, p. 19, as cited in Sakka, 2010) also mention “historical continuity (albeit the ahistorical use of history) and cultural homogeneity constituted the two main axes the educational system is based on for the construction and representation of an ever-lasting, unchanged and undifferentiated national self.”

This information calls for the urgent need to identify the role that foreign language instruction and learning should play in the creation of a multilingual Europe.

Language instruction, which is different from mother tongue instruction both worldwide and in Greece has a distinct and recognized special status. In particular, non-mother tongue English is taught in primary schools as a second or even a third language from a very young age, being a powerful promoter of bilingualism as well as multilingualism. Nevertheless, with the expansion of the European Union the teaching of not a single ‘lingua franca’ but an even wider variety of languages in all grades of education is deemed imperative:
“the rich heritage of diverse languages and cultures in Europe is a valuable common resource to be protected and developed, and that a major educational effort is needed to convert that diversity from a barrier to communication into a source of mutual enrichment and understanding: “…. it is only through a better knowledge of European modern languages that it will be possible to facilitate communication and interaction among Europeans of different mother tongues in order to promote European mobility, mutual understanding and co-operation, and overcome prejudice and discrimination” (CEFR 2001, p. 2).

What is more, this directive is also referred to in the European Commission Education Councils of November 2007, 2008 and 2009, along with the improvement of teacher competencies and professional attitudes being considered additional key international priorities (Caena et al., 2011). This is especially relevant when referring to teaching English to speakers of other languages. In general, teachers’ overall stance as well as awareness towards students who are taught English as an additional foreign language, has had and will have a great impact on their attitudes as well as their progress, and it is certainly deemed a phenomenon worth researching.

As such, the presence of many nationalities constitutes a challenge for educators and has resulted in many teachers not only facing considerable changes, but also recognizing the need to adapt to the new given circumstances. Smith (2009) maintained that it is the teachers who should be prepared effectively and respectfully, since the success or failure of language learning is dependent on their own teaching practices and scope. In particular, due to the rising diversity profile in the 21st century, Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) or English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers are called upon to differentiate instruction in a way through which both cultural and linguistic differences are recognized and affirmed.

In light of the above and given that cases of trilingual children appear to be an increasingly common phenomenon for English teachers in Greece, the principal concern of this study is to investigate the current situation and collect data related to
the overall awareness of teachers, as well as the prevailing instructional strategies
they use within a culturally and linguistically diverse classroom.

The present chapter provides a brief description of the contents of the
research including the background of the study, the statement of the problem, the
significance and purpose of the research as well as the research questions that frame
the study.

1.1 Background of the study
Due to globalization and the unprecedented increase of immigration over the last
years, the makeup of entire societies, countries’ workforce as well as school
populations have changed. With respect to classroom dynamics, in particular, the
advent of newcomers in schools has resulted in the emergence of multiple identities
and inequalities. This has further complicated not only the functional realities of
diversity, multilingualism and multicultural education, but also the way teachers
should address the native as well as immigrant children’s widening cultural
spectrum and smooth integration (Banks, 2004) as these realities “challenge the
traditional visions of language education” (Ziegler, 2013, p. 2).

Language learning plays a vital role for successful immigrants’ integration
in school. However, foreign as well as host language learning can at times be more
than difficult or even discouraging for immigrant students. On the one hand,
knowing the host language “usually plays an important part in the process of
integration, because it is a precondition for participation” (Krumm & Pultzer, 2008,
p. 72, as cited in Kantzou et al., 2017) and is a prerequisite for migrants and
refugees to improve their professional and socio-economic status (Androulakis et
al., 2016, as cited in Kantzou et al., 2017). On the other hand, learning a foreign
language (English, in this case) in Greek state schools from the first year onwards is
compulsory, providing immigrants with equal learning opportunities.

In particular, the spread of English in Europe, which is considered to be the ‘lingua
franca’ (Crystal, 2003; Seidlhofer, 2007), has promoted both individual and societal
bilingualism, as well as trilingualism. English can be in many cases taught and
learnt as a second or a foreign language in several European countries, but there are
also cases where it is learnt as a third (abbreviated L3) or additional language. Such
is the case of immigrants in Greece who (in addition to their mother tongue) are
taught the official language of the country along with English.
According to Christensen and Stanat (2007), these are the children who need great support to master the language of instruction at school – let alone an additional foreign one, in order to obtain a successful education, since based on research such students usually suffer academic underachievement in relation to their peers (Carpenter, 2012). In the majority of cases, immigrant students have to deal with psychosocial and learning difficulties upon arriving to the host country, which might act as a deterrent to their overall academic development and smooth social integration (Dida, 2013). Such students experience feelings of adventure and curiosity but also of sadness and fear for the loss of their culture, social and family ties (Coehlo, 1998, as cited in Dida, 2013). Moreover, their cultural values that once made them acceptable in their own country, are now questioned, marginalizing them into “immigrant minorities” in the host country (Nikolaou, 2000), who are more often than not, recipients of racist or xenophobic behavior by Greek parents, classmates or even teachers themselves (Dida, 2013). Added to that, due to their poor knowledge of the Greek language, they are usually placed in classes lower than their level or age, resulting this way, not only in the fragmentation of their education but also in their fostering feelings of low self-esteem and abilities (Skourtou et al., 2004, as cited in Dida, 2013). Regarding their school performance, these students are burdened with the task of acquiring a second language –through which they are instructed and by exhibiting different levels of proficiency in the language, it becomes even more demanding for them to understand the subject matter content fully. It is natural therefore, that such students carry a metalinguistic awareness manifested in the instances of interference (Cummins, 1984, as cited in Dida, 2013), something which is not acceptable or apparent to the monolingual Greek teachers (Dida, 2013).

In view of the above and taking into consideration that potential differences in student performance among diverse groups in Greek schools, there appears to be an increasing concern towards not only the proper education of the culturally diverse classrooms but also of the teachers of such classes. Teachers face more and more the great challenge of meeting the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students whose learning needs and skills differ from those of traditional students (Gonzalez, 1993). This, in turn, creates the need for the development of inter and multicultural competence, as well as the improvement of their instruction; both serving as prerequisites to provide all students with a well-rounded education
with equal opportunities and help them respond effectively to both their natives’ as well as immigrant students’ needs.

1.2 Statement of the problem

In the 21st century, “diversity”, which has escalated dramatically, is conceived as an inherent characteristic of the educational and socio-cultural environment. Speaking of the educational system, not only the students’, but also the teachers’ skills and competencies are all the more challenged and questioned. Despite the research on multilingual learners, little has been written about teachers and multilingual didactics that could be used for teaching third languages. The few works referring to didactics highlight the learners’ active knowledge and learning of the existing languages, as this will bring about comparisons between the various linguistic systems and will eventually enhance L3 learning (Cenoz, et al., 2001; Cummins, 2001, 2007; Hinger, et al., 2005; Jessner, 2008; Spöttl & Hinger, 2001; Wong et al., 2007, as cited in Gutierrez, 2014). Regarding teachers, besides research by Aronin & Ó Laoire, 2003; Ellis, 2006, 2010; Griva & Chostelidou (2012, as cited in Gutierrez, 2014), which refers to the teachers’ role in ‘multilingual environments’, there is no existing literature that merely refers to the strategies teachers use to help their students become multilingual individuals.

Derman-Sparks (1989) maintains that little attention has been paid to what foreign language teachers actually do and whether they are aware of multicultural issues and their implications in a realistic context, whereas Fueyo and Bechtol (1999), highlighted the need for respect for the students’ diversity and cultural differences and above all the need for the teachers to be competent and willing to incorporate the students’ cultures into their curricula. Consequently, it is the teachers’ overall ideology about bilingual students and the value of each learner’s home language that are central to the choice of every day teaching practices (Skilton – Sylvester, 2003). Therefore, given that teachers must adapt to the new values and demands, a holistic approach to meeting the diverse needs of every student must be followed. This reality should lead to the reconsideration and re-examination of the traditional pedagogical approaches to processing, teaching and learning an additional (in our case a third) language, targeting the linguistic, cultural as well as the social development of both the teachers and the students, in an effective way. Teachers, in particular, should not only teach but also be engaged in a continuous process of
reexamining both their perceptions and assessment methods, pedagogies or even counseling practices.

1.3 Purpose of the study
At the onset, I would go along with Grant and Secada’s (1990, as cited in Zeichner, 1992) and Ladson-Billing’s (1991c, as cited in Zeichner, 1992) statements that the issue of preparing teachers for diversity has a marginal status in the mainstream teacher education literature. Although their realization concerns the U.S educational contexts, it could be expanded and applied to the Greek ones, as well. Added to this, the teaching of foreign languages in the last few decades has not only been informed by Second Language Acquisition theories (although such approaches have been the bases and are considered acceptable) but also by two other factors that have contributed to third language teaching; multilingualism and Third Language Acquisition (TLA) as academic fields of study and the establishment of English as a língua franca (Gutierrez E., 2014). On the one hand, multilingualism favors the great number of researchers who are interested in various aspects of acquisition and processing of language use (Aronin & Toubkin, 2002; Jessner, 2010; Kemp, 2007; Ó Laoire & Singleton, 2009, in Gutierrez, 2014), and on the other, English is considered the first and the most studied foreign language around the world (European Commission, 2012; Survey Lang, 2012, as cited in Gutierrez, 2014).

Therefore, considering the necessary reexamination of the nature of teaching and learning a third language, the main aim of the research is to investigate educators’ awareness concerning language teaching, learning and acquisition of English as an L3 in the Greek educational context. It also examines the prevalent perceptions among Greek EFL teachers and the extent to which they can deal with the multifaceted phenomenon of multiculturalism and multilingualism within the culturally diverse classroom by shaping -or not, their instructional practices for students who are in the process of learning English as a third language. Given the current fiscal realities, the teaching corps is not likely to change substantially - in contrast to the student body which is constantly being enriched with learners with different backgrounds and experiences, the problem of what the English language teachers know, need to know, think they know or are able to do to work successfully with diverse learners, is one that has to be given special attention.
More specifically, this research will attempt to:

• Explore teachers’ general understanding of third language teaching, learning and acquisition across the curriculum within the Greek educational context.

• Explore teachers’ level– if any - of inter/multicultural competence as well as its actual implementation in the Greek mainstream classroom when it comes to students who learn English as a third language.

• Examine the extent to which teaching strategies, employed in the classroom, relate to the envisaged and desirable profile of the foreign language teacher.

• Identify Greek teachers’ professional need – regarding preparing and/or in-service training of English teachers that will help them be more culturally relevant and teach from a more culturally inclusive perspective.

• Shed light on possible gaps that may exist and need further study in light of culturally relevant teaching knowledge bases.

1.4 Research aims

Although there has been an increase of research regarding ‘bilingualism’, research concerning bilingual speakers learning English as L3, is sparse and needs to be given more scrutiny.

The goal of the study is to look into the current status of multi / intercultural education in Greece related to foreign language teaching, understand the mindset of foreign language teachers when teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students and focus on the various strategies they employ which prove to be conducive to their own teaching context. Added to this, challenges and further opportunities of adopting and using certain strategies in practice will be critically examined through the study. The results of this study, therefore, are intended to assist teachers in selecting appropriate strategies and adapt them to their teaching
context so as to enhance their teaching as well as learning processes. In this way, we will investigate whether there is a relationship between the teachers’ beliefs and practices and the latest findings in the multilingualism research and literature as well as the theoretical framework that underpins the study.

In particular, the views and mindset of teachers will be examined in relation to the use of the learners’ available languages in the process of learning an additional one (Aronin, & Ó Laoire, 2003; Herdina & Jessner, 2002; Jessner, 2008, 2010), the special learning characteristics of L3 learners (Jessner, 2008, 2010; Kemp, 2007, Aronin, & Ó Laoire, 2003) and the role of the teachers’ experience of learning foreign languages in their teaching (Aronin & Ó Laoire, 2003). Also, another research aim is to evaluate the extent to which findings regarding teachers’ use of strategies and general opinions are in line with findings concerning L3 learners, L3 teachers and the L3 didactics. This aim is particularly important considering the lack of L3 research in the Greek educational context and is intended to also act as an incentive to identify whether there is unfamiliarity of this very young field of research on the part of L3 EFL teachers who are by definition working with culturally and linguistically diverse students in this day and age. Moreover, another research aim is to examine whether teachers’ specific uses of instructional strategies relate to certain factors pivotal in the teaching of third language learners (e.g., their pedagogical training, age, professional development, teaching experience, knowledge of foreign languages or their students’ knowledge of languages) (cf. Aronin & Hufeisen, 2009; Aronin & Ó Laoire, 2003; Cenoz et al., 2001; Jessner, 2008, 2010).

1.5 Research questions
Considering the research aims for the examination of the teaching of English as a third language in the diverse Greek educational context, this study seeks to answer the following questions that frame it:

1) How do teachers’ years of professional experience and their educational attainments affect L3 learners’ ability to acquire new vocabulary?

2) To what extent do English as an Additional Language (EAL) teachers’ teaching strategies cater to L3 learners’ engagement and promotion of a collaborative learning approach?
3) What is the relationship, if any, between the cultivation of a positive learning environment that facilitates learning and the learners’ metacognitive abilities and the use of different languages in the culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) classroom?

4) To what extent are EAL teachers aware of specific strategies for teaching CLD students?

5) How do years of teaching experience, age, types of training on issues related to teaching CLD students and educational attainments in the field of Multilingual, Multicultural Education affect EAL teachers’ general beliefs and their use of strategies?

6) Do EAL teachers adapt their teaching strategies when teaching English as L3? If so, in what way?

1.6 Significance of the study

Research into trilingualism and its teaching has a shorter history than research into bilingualism. One of the most influential publications is that of Cenoz and Genesee (1998) that went beyond bilingualism and contained chapters that treated general as well as theoretical perspectives and case studies of multilingual education. Third language acquisition includes many variables that need to be further investigated. It is very important, especially for the Greek educational context, that bilingual awareness mainly of teachers, but also of parents, pupils and communities be raised, in order to open up new vistas in multilingualism, educationally, culturally and socially speaking.

By focusing on Greek EFL teachers, the proposed study constitutes an innovative research aiming to enrich the existing academic literature and studies pertaining not only to third language teaching, learning and acquisition but also to interrelated notions such as bilingualism, trilingualism, multiculturalism and intercultural education. Therefore, by examining the EFL Greek teachers’ awareness and use of strategies and their contribution to honing culturally and linguistically diverse learners’ cognitive and linguistic skills, the present study seeks to fill a gap in the present body of knowledge on L3 instruction at the primary level in the Greek context. What is more, surveying teachers is intended to shed light on culturally relevant pedagogy and interculturalism in the foreign mainstream classroom. In this way, the need for teacher preparation institutions to include
additional cultural competence components to help teachers render their lessons more appropriate for trilingual students will be stressed. In the long run, looking into what is pertinent to the cultural / linguistic backgrounds of diverse students and understanding the challenges they face when they have to navigate in the mainstream classroom and master a third consecutive language, may hopefully raise awareness on the need to improve levels of education.

**Conclusion**

It is necessary to strengthen foreign educators’ understanding and awareness of third language acquisition, its implications, advantages and deficits, since it is impossible to adopt a neutral attitude towards the cultural and linguistic heterogeneity of society. Focusing on this is not only possible but also urgent in order to understand how a third language can change the ways in which knowledge is processed. Therefore, considering the paucity of research on the strategies used in multilingual and multicultural language learning contexts, and the all the more growing importance of mixed classrooms in our day and age (Cenoz & Jessner, 2009; Jessner, 2008, in Gutierrez, 2014), it seems relevant to look into what L3 teachers really think of culturally and linguistically diverse students, the learning processes that are found to be conducive to their learning, their own practices stemming from their own experiences when teaching English as L3 and the need for specific training—if there is any— to hone their skills when teaching a third language. Hopefully, broadening educators’ views will not only result in their ability to carry out more relevant instruction but will also help them regard ‘linguistic pluralism’ as an asset and not a handicap in our era.
CHAPTER 2: Literature review

Introduction
Conducting a literature review – as is the case when carrying out any kind of research- is of utmost importance, not only because it sets the foundations upon which a specific work is based, but it also enables researchers to adopt the most appropriate methods for their work. In this light, the second chapter constitutes an overview of the main tenets underlying various dimensions of the teaching of English as an L3 in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms, which will enable the readers to understand the subject matter under discussion in greater depth.

In particular, the present chapter begins by providing readers with a comprehensive review of the literature pertaining to culturally and linguistically diversified students, internationally and in the Greek educational context. Then, it moves on to the core of the research which is tri/multilingualism, the analysis of the EFL teachers’ strategies in the Greek context when it comes to teaching diversified students, as well as the adaptation / differentiation of their teaching methods so as to gain a reasonably adequate picture available of this relatively new circumstance.

2.1. An Overview of the Foreign Language Policy in the Greek Context
Over the years, linguistic as well as cultural diversity have gained ground as Europe expanded and there appeared to be an urgent need to promote literacy in foreign language. Besides, the Union itself “is built out of many diverse nations, communities, cultures and language groups … and founded upon the mutual acceptance of peoples with different histories but a common future” (European Commission, 2003, p. 3).

More specifically, in an attempt to safeguard this diversity and implement multilingual policies, the European Commission issued a document in 2004, emphasizing the importance of promoting the linguistic and cultural diversity of its people by learning one –and ideally two– languages in addition to their mother tongue (the ‘2+1 formula’). Therefore, the aim is to promote ‘the unique set of communication skills needed by specific groups of multilingual learners as reflected in their day-to-day lives’ (Cenoz & Genesee, 1998, p. 27), since learning a lingua franca alone (i.e., English- having been established as the first foreign language in
many European countries) is no longer considered adequate. Therefore, the development of plurilingual ability is considered as the main prerequisite in a Europe of free movement and intercultural communication (Griva & Chostelidou, 2011). Moreover, language learning is also promoted through Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), which is the teaching of a school subject through a foreign language (Dida, 2013). This way students not only practice their language skills daily, but their confidence is also boosted in the subject being taught (European Commission, 2003, as cited in Dida, 2013). What is more, given that in many areas in the EU citizens successfully combine minority languages with the host language or even a foreign one, the teaching of as many languages as possible— including many national, regional, minority and migrant languages spoken in Europe, is dictated by the European Union, since this will help towards fostering dialogue and mutual respect. This broadening of the foreign language spectrum can be attributed to multilingual people who are considered “a precious asset because they act as the glue between different cultures” (European Commission, 2008, pp. 5-6).

With respect to the Greek educational system, Greece could not but align itself with the European measures and recommendations and the Greek Ministry of Education Life-long Learning and Religious Affairs, introduced English as a compulsory subject in the third grade in primary schools in 2003. However, the worldwide tendency towards early young learning of a foreign language urged the Ministry to introduce a series of changes to more than 900 12- post teaching primary schools, aiming to introduce English to very young learners in 2010, in the hope of ‘improving the mastery of basic skills from a very early age’ (Commission of Europe, 2003, as cited in Griva, & Chostelidou, 2011), which can at times be difficult or even discouraging for immigrant students. Knowing the host language “usually plays an important part in the process of integration, because it is a precondition for participation” (Krumm & Pultzer, 2008, p. 72, as cited in Kantzou et al., 2017) and is a prerequisite for migrants and refugees to improve their professional and socio-economic status (Androulakis et al., 2016, as cited in Kantzou et al., 2017). However, learning a foreign language in Greek state schools from the first year onwards is compulsory, giving immigrants the chance to open-up their prospects in Europe. More often than not, immigrant students have to deal with psychosocial and learning difficulties on arriving to the host country, which might
act as a deterrent to their overall academic development and smooth social integration (Dida, 2013). Such students experience feelings of adventure and curiosity but also of fear for the possibility of losing their social and family ties (Coehlo, 1998, as cited in Dida, 2013).

Moreover, the adoption of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR, 2001) has resulted in the Greek school system making use of specific ‘levels’ which act as targets for foreign language teaching and learning in the Greek educational context (Griva & Chostelidou, 2011). The ultimate aim of the Ministry for all learners without exception—related to foreign language learning—is to graduate from primary school with an A2 or B1 level of language proficiency certification, following the principles of the CEFR, adopted by ‘Κρατικό Πιστοποιητικό Γλωσσομάθειας’ (Κ.Π.Γ), which is the State Certificate. In line with this, the syllabus for English as a foreign language as well as all the state schoolbooks are approved by the Institute of Educational Policy (IEP) which is responsible for the design and implementation of instructional materials, training seminars as well as Cross Thematic Curriculum Framework – henceforth ‘DEPPS’ in an attempt to revise and amend the Greek educational system. The ‘DEPPS’, which is considered the cornerstone of the Greek educational system (Alachiotis & Karatzia-Stavlioti, 2006), defines the goals of language learning by emphasizing the use of linguistic, paralinguistic and extra linguistic means of communication on the part of the students in order for them to be able to act in real-life situations, giving priority to functions, speech acts, notions and the acquisition of knowledge on the form of English. The ‘DEPPS’ promotes an educational model according to which, all different cognitive fields are of equal importance and its definition of coordinated subject-specific skills allows for the design of a cross-curricular structure. Moreover, the Cross-Thematic Curriculum for Modern Foreign Languages sets as one of the main aims of teaching “to facilitate the development of language skills that will enable pupils to communicate effectively in different linguistic and cultural contexts” (Pedagogical Institute, 2003, as cited in Dida, 2013). What is of top priority though, and directly linked to this research, is the special emphasis given to foreign language literacy, multilingualism and multiculturalism within this framework which are considered guiding principles. In essence, the curriculum helps pupils develop speaking, listening, reading and writing skills in order to understand all kinds of information, in all communication.
settings. Learners acquire knowledge of the English language form and functions and they consider English as the common linguistic code. Multilingualism and multiculturalism – being the awareness of the plurality of different languages, cultures and civilizations- are also highlighted in the curriculum to help learners develop an awareness of cultural and linguistic diversity, understand religious differences, gender equality or equality of chances, achieve peaceful coexistence, develop intercultural awareness and learn to accept the ‘otherness’- with reference to all pupils including those with Special Educational Needs (SEN). In addition, the framework focuses on the maintenance of our national identity and cultural heritage on the one hand, and the development of European citizenship acknowledgment on the other. Finally, students promote autonomous learning since they can use their learning independently of teachers and they are the authority themselves (Cotterall, 2000, p. 104). In this light, ‘knowledge is not seen as a set of fixed facts but as a creative problem-solving capacity that depends upon an ability to retrieve appropriate schemata from a mental store’ (Clarke, 1987, p. 49). Even more recently, in 2016, the new national Curriculum for foreign languages, that is, the Integrated Foreign Languages Curriculum (IFLC), initiated as an ongoing project aiming at the development of the students' competences in languages other than their mother tongue - competences for which they can be certified on the six-level language proficiency scale of the CoE, specified in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. It draws on a multilingual database, which contains descriptions of the functional, grammatical, lexical, and pragmatic competences of the learners, acquired from profile books, course books and the KPG exam specifications. The ultimate aim of the curriculum is to develop a list of features for every distinct learning stage, by comparing and contrasting the acquisition of knowledge at all levels.

### 2.2 Diversity – Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) students

In the 21st century ‘diversity’ has a contested meaning, meaning different things in different contexts. While not being exceptional or unusual, it has clearly become both an inherent and ubiquitous characteristic of modern sociocultural environments (Chiner et al., 2015). Broadly speaking, diversity refers to the individual differences between and in various groups on the grounds of ethnicity, language, religion, gender, race and social class (Banks & Banks, 2007, as cited in Chiner et. al, 2015).
In other words, diversity is conceived as a general concept for acknowledging the set of those human attributes that are different from our own. In the context of this research, ‘diversity’ includes language, ethnicity and race, excluding other forms of diversity namely gender, religion, sexual orientation or residence status.

It could be argued that diversity is open to interpretation based on personal experiences and worldviews. Whereas there is the ‘visible’ diversity about what can be objectively identified such as age, gender and physical attributes, Chen (1998) also identified the ‘invisible’ or ‘non-visible’ diversity that can encompass attributes like educational background, different levels of motivation or even various opinions. Another definition of diversity places emphasis on the variety of learning styles. Therefore, it is extended to both education and schools. This is even more evident in the case of teachers who -along with stakeholders, are struggling to adapt to the new demands by giving special attention to cultural and linguistic diversity so as to avoid differences that would naturally evolve into future inequalities (Batanero 2003, as cited in Chiner et. al., 2015). Regarding the multicultural diverse classroom, it can be inferred that it is a space where teachers respond to the learning style differences and needs of various students. These students are not only from different cultural or linguistic backgrounds, but they can also be students with different styles, intelligences and abilities (Allen et al.,2002, as cited in Hoosein, 2014). Other definitions of diverse classrooms regard them as inclusive classrooms that embrace diversity and treat all students as equal members of the school community. In this sense, human diversity is valued, the curriculum is adapted, and the necessary support is provided to students with exceptional or different abilities to successfully participate in general education (Artile & Dyson, 2005, as cited in Hoosein, 2014). Culturally and linguistically diverse students (hereafter CLD) can be considered those with a migrant background –first or second- generation migrants, temporary or permanent migrants- setting their immigrant status as a proxy for factors such as ethnicity, race, duration of settlement, birthplace, language etc. The term can also apply to the repatriated Greek students, students from refugee backgrounds, the Roma or Muslim minorities or even foreigners who use or understand a language other than Greek. In the specific research, these students, who do not comprise a homogeneous group, can also be referred to as trilingual or multilingual learners, denoting school age students who can use or speak one home
language (their native—L1), the official language of the wider community they live in (L2)—which is the official language of instruction—and at least one foreign language (L3) or more (Lx) as part of their formal education (FL) program. They can be characterized as “speakers who use their resources when communicating with monolingual and multilingual interlocutors” (Cenoz & Gorter 2011, p. 367, as cited in Gorter, 2015). According to Jessner (2008), the complexity among the various language systems involved in a learner’s education is an important issue to consider, since “the spectrum of third language acquisition covers a range of multilingual acquisition and use patterns” (p. 19). This means that different languages are used for different purposes, competence in each varying according to such factors as register, occupation, and education (Kemp, 2009, p. 15, as cited in Iamroz, 2018, p. 32). Besides, Edwards (1994, p. 39) maintains that “in most instances, multilingualism arises, and is maintained, through contact and necessity.” For multilingualism to arise, some variables that will define the ‘type’ of multilingualism, should manifest. According to Anastassiou et al. (2017, p. 4), four interrelated variables that are discussed in the literature of multilingualism are: (a) the age of the speakers when they made their first important contact with the language, (b) the input they receive (type, modality and quantity) (c) the level of proficiency in each language and (d) the order that the languages were obtained.

Historically, research into multilingualism suggests that being a multilingual learner has consequences on the cognition, language and social background, which can be viewed either as an advantage or a drawback depending on certain conditions (Herdina & Jessner, 2002). Multilingual learners’ superiority in various cognitive fields has been reported in various studies (Kecskes & Papp, 2000; Cummins, 1991, as cited in Mitits, 2018). It has been found that even primary school children were able to translate, thus, they could develop their metalinguistic skills and promote their overall development (Hakuta, 1990, as cited in Mitits, 2018). Also, various studies have shown their advantage over monolinguals when it comes to cognitive flexibility, creativity and metalinguistic awareness (Bialystok, 1991; Baker, 1996, as cited in Mitits, 2018). Also, in comparison to L2 learners, multilingual learners are more autonomous and use learning strategies more often and in a more elaborate way so as to speed up their learning (e.g., Aronin & Toubkin, 2002; Ó Laoire & Singleton, 2009; Jessner, 2010; Kemp, 2007; Psaltou-Joycey & Kantaridou, 2009).
On the downside, earlier studies acknowledged limited cognitive and linguistic knowledge of a bilingual child to cross linguistic influence (Jespersen, 1922, as cited in Mitits, 2018) and underperformance in all cognitive areas compared to native speakers (Cook, 1993; Hamers & Blanc, 1989, as cited in Mitits, 2018). Thanks to these findings, it can be inferred that when it comes to learning a third language, the processes are different from those required in a second language (Cenoz, 2003; Cenoz et al., 2001).

Vouyoukas et al., (2017, pp. 3-4), note that the issue of CLD students in Greece has been in papers since the early 1990’s articles and although no research for CLD students attending primary schools in Greece has been published, there are non-empirical studies that focus mainly on the high dropout rate from secondary education, the potential difficulties at school that can be attributed to bilingualism, low parental expectation or even poverty.

In line with this, Nikolaou (2011) argues that most immigrant students encounter various problems at schools and experience school failure or low self-esteem, since the integration of linguistic minority learners is neither smooth nor balanced for them (Gogonas, 2010). What is more, while there have been several studies dealing with the teaching of Greek as a second language (Antonopoulou et al., 2007; Damanakis, 1997; Tressou & Mitakidou, 2003; Skourtou, 2000, as cited in Gogonas, 2010), minority pupils’ languages are completely absent from the existing school curricula. Yet, CLD pupils are expected to cope with English, Italian, German or French as additional languages -in addition to the official language of instruction which is Greek- on entering primary school. Also, what is of utmost importance and directly linked to the research is that –to date- there are no studies in Greece on the teaching strategies and practices for such students so that they can be engaged in the foreign language classroom successfully.

However, there has been some research on the necessity to maintain the migrant pupils’ ethnic identity and parental language for their cognitive and linguistic development of theirs (Chatzidaki 2005a, 2005b; Paleologou & Evangelou, 2003; Tsokalidou, 2005a, 2005b, as cited in Gogonas, 2010). Moreover, regarding immigrant and refugee education, several training programs focusing on language have been implemented by Universities, Ministries and local municipalities, in an attempt to make them feel productive and self-sufficient members in the Greek society (Mattheoudakis, 2005; Rodakopoulos & Lily, 2010, as cited in Kantzou et
al., 2017). Two well-known nationwide research projects put into practice by the Greek Language and Multilingualism Laboratory of the University of Thessaly, are the ELMEGO and the MATHEME, both offering second language courses (i.e., Greek) to adult immigrants. Undoubtedly, these projects extend to all age groups and aim to the teaching not only of the Greek language, but also to that of English and other foreign languages.

2.3 English as an additional (third) language/ Multilingualism

In the last couple of decades, English has spread and established as one of the most important languages, reinforcing this way the spread of both bilingualism and trilingualism. According to Graddol (2004, p. 1330) “English cannot be ignored, since it will indeed play a crucial role in shaping the new world linguistic order, but its major impact will be in creating new generations of bilingual and multilingual speakers across the world.”

This has also resulted in its being recognized as a “lingua franca” (Widdowson, 1994, 1997, 2002), meaning “a medium of communication for people that speak different first languages” (Crystal 1995, p. 454). Jessner (2006) also reveals that English as a third language can be regarded as a variant of foreign language acquisition, but it can also be seen as a lingua franca as time goes by. In this regard, she draws on various studies to describe the use of the main lexicon of English in international contexts (being a lingua franca - ELF) and indicates that “in a growing number of countries worldwide, English is learnt and taught as a third language” (Jessner, 2006, p. 2).

What is more, “The key Data on Teaching Languages at Schools in Europe” also issued a report, which attests to the fact that the English language is the most widely taught one, in almost all European countries for social, financial and political reasons (European Commission, 2012). In this light, English can be mostly taught and learnt as a second or a foreign language in several European countries with a specific foreign language methodology, but there are also instances where it is possible to be taught as a third (L3) or -using another term- as an additional language (EAL). Such is the case of immigrants in Greece who are taught the official language and the English language, as an obligatory subject in the formal school context.
Therefore, it can be inferred that “to be bilingual or multilingual is not the aberration supposed by many (particularly, perhaps, by people in Europe and North America who speak a ‘big’ language). It is rather a normal and unremarkable necessity for the majority in the world today” (Edwards, 1994, p. 1). Talking about various concepts of multicultural and intercultural education or even learning, the terms will be used interchangeably in the present thesis, since there is no consensus about whether there is a distinction or differentiation between the two. According to UNESCO (in Palaiologou & Faas, 2012, p. 569):

The term multicultural[ism] describes the culturally diverse nature of human society. It not only refers to elements of ethnic or national culture, but also includes linguistic, religious and socio-economic diversity. Intercultural[ism] is a dynamic concept and refers to evolving relations between cultural groups. It has been defined as the existence and equitable interaction of diverse cultures and the possibility of generating shared cultural expressions through dialogue and mutual respect…Multicultural education uses learning about other cultures in order to produce acceptance, or at least tolerance, of these cultures. Intercultural education aims to go beyond passive coexistence, to achieve a developing and sustainable way of living together in multicultural societies through the creation of understanding of, respect for and dialogue between different cultural groups.

In addition, while in English speaking countries (such as the US, the U.K., the Netherlands, Canada, Australia) multicultural education is the favored term, in most parts of Europe scholars speak of intercultural education when referring to policies and practices (Palaiologou & Faas, 2012). The term intercultural has been defined as “the existence and equitable interaction of diverse cultures and the possibility of generating shared cultural expressions through dialogue and mutual respect.” It conveys “a dynamic concept and resulting from ‘intercultural’ exchange and dialogue, refers to evolving relations between cultural groups” (UNESCO 2006, p. 17). Intercultural education refers to a society in which different ethnic minorities live and interact through mutual respect, dialogue and understanding, whereas multicultural education is perceived as the learning about other cultures with the
aim to produce a form of acceptance or at least tolerance (cf. UNESCO 2006, p. 18). In the present thesis the term ‘intercultural’ is used to refer to practices and policies, whereas the term ‘multicultural’ to describe the school and societal reality at large.

2.4 Third Language Acquisition (TLA) / Trilingualism

It is true that throughout the years many linguists (Mitchel & Myles, 1998 and Singh & Carroll, 1979, among others) have supported the idea that there is no difference in the way languages are acquired, since it is natural for all languages to follow the native one and also because of the fact that research about third language acquisition was initially based on studies regarding second language acquisition. Therefore, it is quite recently that researchers have started to look at the phenomenon of third language acquisition more meticulously (De Angelis 2007; Aronin & Hufeisen 2009; Cenoz, 2009) and have been researching it as a separate “domain of inquiry” (Leung, 2007, p. 95).

Moreover, despite the fact that quite a few typologies of bilingual education have emerged, they do not always apply to multilingual education given the different cognitive and linguistic variables involved in multilingualism. Therefore, the great differences between the acquisition of additional languages as well as the fact that TLA should not be considered a sub-topic of SLA, have been stressed by the researchers over the last decade.

As Hufeisen and Marx (2004, p. 142) put it: “the term TLA represents the prototypical concept of the acquisition or learning of any language after the second language, whether the L3, L4, or even L7, as there is not merely a quantitative difference between SLA and TLA, but also a qualitative one. This difference is so fundamental that it needs to be covered by a new and different theoretical framework, or a substantially extended Second Language Acquisition model.”

Moreover, Herdina and Jessner (2000, p. 92, as cited in Halimi, 2010) point out the interdependence between language systems in multilingual acquisition, by stating that: “the development of each individual language within one multilingual speaker largely depends on the behavior of previous and subsequent systems.” Therefore, it makes sense that the pedagogical approaches that have been traditionally used to teaching additional languages should be reconsidered in light of the most recent
findings in the field of multilingualism and, more specifically, third language acquisition.

Ever since the importance of multilingualism has been largely acknowledged and established, more and more research is being conducted on the teaching, acquisition and learning of a third language (L3), as an additional one. This realization has paved the way for the establishment of trilingualism as a research and academic field as well as educational topic (Griessler, 2001) drawing the attention of many scholars (De Angelis, 2007; Hammarberg, 2009, among others).

*Trilingualism* is generally treated in the relevant literature as a branch or even an extension of bilingualism (Anastassiou, Andreou, & Liakou, 2017) and theories or findings from studies of bilingualism are often assumed to be applicable to this relatively young ‘type’ of multilingualism. Therefore, with regard to terminology, the term *multilingualism* could also be interchangeably used to refer to the learning of more than two languages, always bearing in mind that while trilingualism shares common features with bilingualism and multilingualism, it still retains its own unique characteristics.

Related to this, Jessner (2006, p. 13) states: “For a long time, linguists have treated third language learning as a byproduct of research on second language learning and acquisition. But nowadays it is known that learning a second language differs in many respects from learning a third language.” Besides, research has shown that the processes involved in learning a third language are different from those underlying the learning of a second language (Gutierrez, 2014). Yet, L3 research- as a field- is so new that “it can only expand and deepen its methodology to both isolate the internal and external variables involved in L3 learning and to account for their multiple interactions” (Sanz & Lado, 2008, p. 21). Scholars will continue not only to make use of and refine methods regarding approaches to SLA, but also create their own, from scratch, so as to enhance linguistic and cultural approaches to teaching and learning. What is more, Cenoz (2000), goes along with Jessner about the different ‘nature’ of TLA and states that although it admittedly bears similarities to the second language acquisition processes, the complexity of TLA comes down to the fact that “third language learners who have more language experience at their disposal than second language learners, are influenced by the
general effects of bilingualism on cognition, and have two linguistic systems when acquiring a third language” (Cenoz & Jessner, 2000, p. 71).

According to the European Commission (European Commission, 2007, p. 6), people can be called multilingual or multi-literate in three distinct cases. In the first case, people speak an autochthonous regional or minority language in addition to the national language; in the second one people speak a migrant language in addition to the language of the host country. The third one belongs to people who grew up in other multilingual environments. Nevertheless, the majority of trilinguals are said to “straddle these categories” (Hoffmann, 2001, p. 4), since none of the languages are equally important to learners, nor are the learners equally competent in all three. Therefore, since multilinguals are capable of using various languages for different purposes, it makes sense that their competence is difficult to measure because of its fluidity (Cenoz, et al., in press, as cited in Gorter, 2015).

The second case is considered the most common one for linguistic minorities in Greece where multilingual students make use of two or even three languages in everyday life. They speak one or two languages at home (in case of two bilingual parents), they are exposed to the official school language which is Greek and they are called upon to learn one mandatory foreign language, which is English and even a second foreign language in the majority of schools. This fact describes that multilingualism exists not only on the individual and the social level, but on the school level as well. Therefore, school multilingualism is a particular kind of multilingualism that occurs in school settings where two or more foreign languages are added to the individual’s L1.

2.5 Research on Trilingualism

In the context of the thesis, research in trilingualism looks at the bilingual children’s learning and acquisition of an additional (third) language through schooling, which is quite a common phenomenon. Related to second and third language acquisition and the role the second language has on the third instructed, Thomas (1988) referred to metalinguistic awareness in the case of monolingual and bilingual performance and concluded that bilinguals had enhanced lexical knowledge and developed more sensitivity towards the language system. Moreover, she highlighted the importance of formal learning of the language, since she deemed that bilinguals who had enhanced literacy skills in both languages performed better on tests where they had
to deal with specific tasks and parts of knowledge. In contrast to Thomas (1988), Cenoz and Lindsay (1996) who carried out research that focused on the appropriate age and teaching methodologies for introducing a third language to children with limited biliteracy, found that a very good teacher, supportive parents and positive attitudes towards learning English were contributory factors in successful L3 acquisition. Finally, although Valencia and Cenoz (1992) conducted a study with secondary students, the results are worth mentioning. It was found that bilingualism has a positive effect on third language acquisition and the effect of bilingualism on the additional language is mediated by social motivation (meaning the effort made by the students in learning a third language, the overall attitude towards learning as well as English tuition after school and residence in an English-speaking country). In addition, Jessner (2006) makes clear that third language acquisition (TLA) at school can be found anywhere in the world, and multilingual schools, where several languages are taught, can be found both in Europe and Canada. Jessner (2006) also makes clear that “TLA in school context and trilingual education are not new phenomena but are becoming more widespread” (2006, p. 120), since the study of two foreign languages as school subjects, of one foreign language at an early age and a second foreign language during secondary school years, is a common phenomenon nowadays. Generally speaking, it has been found that bilingual learners learning an additional language may have a positive effect on their overall linguistic abilities, grammatical awareness, memorizing techniques, as well as communication strategies (Griessler, 2001). Added to this, although L3 learners’ receptive and productive vocabulary has been understudied and reported in a few case studies, it is critical since it is the diversity and the natural variation present in the language input of bilingual children that might impact their acquisition of the third language (Mieszkowska et al., 2017). Language input is important, especially for trilingual children for their vocabulary size. In bilingual children, the input they receive is divided between two already existing languages (heritage / minority and community / majority languages) which means less input in total and lower scores on vocabulary tasks in comparison to monolingual learners (Bialystok et al., 2010; Bohnacker et al., 2016, as cited in Mieszkowska et al, 2017; Leseman, 2000; Oller et al., 2007). Studies that refer to bilingual vocabulary development include those of Thordardottir (2011, as cited in Mieszkowska et al., 2017) who focused on receptive and expressive vocabulary and observed that bilingual children
who were exposed to receptive vocabulary test scored comparably to monolingual learners, whereas in expressive vocabulary they needed more input in the target language. Gollan et. al (2015, as cited in Mieszkowska et al., 2017), in turn, observed that when learners were exposed to native speakers of a given target language on a picture naming task, the variety and correctness of words used (irrespective of how frequently the participant used it) was evident. What is more, other researchers who focused on language development in trilingual learners yielded results, which are in tune with research on bilingual development, but there is still much need of further investigation of the topic. For instance, Oller (2010, as cited in Mieszkowska et al., 2017) – by analyzing the recordings of a trilingual toddler- showed that the number of selected words was indicative of the direct input to the child, and not by the language that she just heard. These findings match Hoffmann’s study (1985, 2001, as cited in Mieszkowska et al., 2017), in which two early trilingual children who were exposed to Spanish and German from their parents and English at school, developed sufficient competence in all three languages.

Another important component of acquiring an additional language has to do with the number of common cognate words and expressions among the various languages- being ‘the words in different languages which have descended from a common parent word’ (Schmitt, 1997, p. 209). Depending on the learners’ vocabulary strategies, the psychotypological distance among the languages and the number of languages known, the role cognates play in foreign language learning has long been recognized (Otwinowska-Kasztelanic, 2011). At least in Europe, the linguistic map is quite simpler than in other continents, since most of the languages belong to either the Germanic, Slavic or Romance group of languages. Therefore, if learners are motivated and aware of cross-linguistic similarities, the basic understanding of a language or text in that language will not be a huge problem (Hufeisen & Marx, 2007; Otwinowska-Kasztelanic, 2011), especially in the case of languages that share scripts and present orthographic as well as phonological overlap (Marian et. al, 2012, as cited in Bartolotti & Marian, 2012). Odlin (1989, p. 77, as cited in Otwinowska-Kasztelanic, 2011) who was in favor of incorporating cognates in foreign language vocabulary teaching, stated that “similarities and dissimilarities in word forms, along with similarities and dissimilarities in word meanings, play a major role in how quickly a particular foreign language may be
learned by speakers of another language.” In the same vein, Carlo et al (2004) considered it beneficial to teach students to draw on their cognate knowledge as a way to infer or figure out meanings in English words - a realization that is in accordance with Jessner (1999, as cited in Otwinowska-Kasztelanic, 2011), who recommended activation of prior linguistic knowledge for equivalent expressions in all three languages. In short, cognates are relatively easy to acquire (De Groot & Keijer, 2000; Lotto & De Groot, 1998, as cited in Bartolotti & Marian, 2012) and can provide learners with a head start in vocabulary acquisition, since various forms overlap in both meaning and form across languages and the acquisition of vocabulary that resembles the native language is thus facilitated.

2.6 Cross linguistic influence in third language acquisition

*Cross Linguistic Influence* (CLI) is a term that seeks to identify the conditions under which prior linguistic knowledge influences the production as well as the comprehension of a second language or interlanguage (De Angelis, 2007). First coined by Sharwood-Smith and Kellerman (1986, as cited in Iamroz, 2018), this psycholinguistic term was used to embrace all different types of influence such as “transfer”, “interference”, “avoidance”, “borrowing” and “language loss” when acquiring a new language. Given that CLI had traditionally focused on second Language Acquisition - discussing how a learner’s native language interferes in the acquisition of a second language, Third Language Acquisition constitutes a more appealing subject of research, since there is no specification as to which of the two already acquired languages acts as the main ‘source language’ or ‘language supplier’ (Cenoz, 2001, as cited in Halimi, 2011). In this study, the terms *cross-linguistic influence* and *transfer* are used interchangeably, as do in most studies related to third language acquisition (Cenoz 2001; De Angelis & Selinker 2001; Jessner 2003; Ringbom 2001, 2007, as cited in Anastassiou, 2014). Since it can be assumed that the possibilities of equations regarding the influence among various languages when acquiring an additional one can be multiplied, the choice of a specific source language depends on commonly accepted factors such as the language distance (or ‘typological relation’ / ‘linguistic typology’), the order of the acquisition of the languages, the formality of context and the regency of use - which is the use of the language that was learned prior to the last one and the target / source language proficiency (De Angelis, 2007). Out of these, the ‘linguistic
typology’ and ‘regency’, are considered the most influential, since bilinguals who have a language which is typologically closer to the target language, are more likely either to borrow structures from that language they may know but not use anymore or use structures from their second rather than their first language (Balke – Aurell & Lindblad, 1982, as cited in Mesaros, 2009; Swain et al, 1990). However, there might be the case where the formal similarity between the words may cause negative lexical transfer, while contributing to a higher level of learners’ metalinguistic awareness at the same time. This might happen because students are capable of understanding that though the form of the words may sound or look similar, the meanings might be different. This realization confirms once more the intricate way in which all languages previously learnt function during production in L3 (Cenoz, 2001; De Angelis, 2007; Hammarberg, 2009; Ringbom, 2001, as cited in Gevorkian, 2012).

According to Swan (1997, as cited in Hodal, 2005), ‘cross-linguistic references’ are indispensable for both L2 and L3 effective learning (although ‘negative transfer’ related to syntax, grammar or choice of words may happen when previous languages do not act positively in the target language). Also, although there are various studies that stress the lack of the use of L1 when learning a third language (Cenoz, 2003; Jessner, 2008). Swan (1997, as cited in Hodal, 2005) claims that the more languages learners possess, the more aware they are of the similarities and differences of their L1 and their target language, and therefore they are able to make more cross linguistic correspondences and employ more strategies. In the same vein, Ringbom (1986, as cited in Mesars, 2009) states that the less the learner knows about the target language, the more they are forced to draw upon others they have already learnt, whereas Bouvy (2000, as cited in Hodal, 2005) states that learners represent nothing but internal linguistic data they acquire from the environments they are exposed to. Moreover, regarding the emphasis on cross-linguistic practices in a multilingual classroom, it is worth mentioning that several studies (Clyne 1997; William & Hammarberg, 1998) have emphasized that a second language of trilingual learners can act as a source language in their L3 production, influencing its acquisition. Filatova (2010, as cited in Gevorkian, 2012), in a study on L3 acquisition, attributed the frequent use of L2 and the lack of L1 on the part of the learners to the perception of ‘correctness’ and ‘foreignness’. Students might feel that their L1 (native lexis) is not correct when they speak a foreign language, so
they tend to borrow word constructions from their L2 in an attempt to be more ‘acceptable’ or ‘understandable’.

Wang’s (2013) viewpoint on the role of languages as sources of cross-linguistic influence coincide with that of William and Hammarberg’s (1998) who, after conducting a study regarding the oral production of a trilingual learner, postulated that the first (L1) and the second (L2) language played distinct roles in the production of the third (L3) or additional one (Lx). More specifically, Hammarberg (2001) reported that L1, which the speaker identifies with, was given an ‘instrumental’ role, since words were used by the learner in a strategic way for pragmatically language shifts and asides. L2, on the other hand, was given a ‘default supplier’ role because it was conducive to formulating words in L3.

Many researchers have highlighted the positive effects already learnt languages may have on the acquisition of an additional one, since third language acquisition is not only about distinct learning styles, but also about empirical evidence which indicates that previously gained languages do have an impact on the acquisition of an additional one (Cenoz & Jessner, 2000, p. 39-50; De Angelis, 2007, p. 3-6). For instance, previous research in Sweden and Finland have indicated that both L1 and L2 influence L3 depending on some interacting factors such as the cross-linguistic influence “between non-native languages in a European context” which takes primarily place in lexis (Ringbom, 1987, p.114, as cited in Gevorkian, 2012) or the level of competence in the second language as well as the degree of similarities among all languages (Hammarberg, 2009, p.18, as cited in Gevorkian, 2012). Therefore, the fact that all languages acquired before the target language interact in a complicated and different manner can be confirmed by many researchers (Hammarberg, 2001, 2009; Falk, 2010; Filatova, 2010; Ringbom, 1987, as cited in Gevorkian, 2012) and should be used by teachers accordingly in the various contexts.

2.7 Metalinguistic Awareness - Code Switching -Translanguaging

The metalinguistic awareness of trilingual learners is also of high importance, considering that the knowledge of several language systems and the ability to actually learn how to learn, gives trilingual children an advantage over mono/bilinguals. This has been proved by various studies over the past 40 years focusing on the development of metalinguistic awareness and the according
processes that differentiate monolingual from bilingual children (Cohen, 2011). Metalinguistic awareness can be understood in terms of the development of the analysis of knowledge and the control of processing (Bialystok, 1988, 1994a; Bialystok & Ryan, 1985) which emerge as the child matures. With reference to bilingual children, previous research has shown that they typically outperform their monolingual peers of the same age on cognitive tasks that require high levels of analysis of knowledge and/or cognitive control (e.g., Bialystok, 1988). However, research on metalinguistic awareness and multilingual children is still in short supply and the grounds are quite insufficient to provide us with a full explanation. The existing research shows that trilinguals perform at higher levels, displaying additional advantages over bilinguals (Jessner, 2008). In line with this, several researchers have stressed the catalytic effect of the metalinguistic knowledge in bilingual education on trilingual acquisition and subsequently the high importance of formal instruction and exposure of children to literacy in two or more languages (Sanz, 2000; De Bot & Jaensch, 2013).

*Code switching* referring to "the subtle change, switch or mixing of languages at the word or sentence level of a conversation between bilinguals” (Baker & Jones, 1998, p. 59), can be used to help an idea be expressed more clearly in another language, interject humor into a conversation or even exclude people from it, emphasize any word pattern or even communicate friendship or family bonds while talking. Although many monolinguals regard code switching as a sign of deficiency or a lack of mastery of the two languages, research has shown that it constitutes a valuable linguistic strategy and a highly complex and sophisticated process governed by rules and constraints (Myers-Scotton, 1993, as cited in Baker & Jones, 1998, p. 61). Moreover, the ethos of the context, familiarity and the perceived linguistic skills of the listeners, which affect the nature of code switching, indicate important social and power relationships and therefore are of great importance. In line with code switching, Grosjean (2013, p. 15) referred to *language mode* as “the state of activation of the bilingual’s languages and language processing mechanism at a given point in time” that can be applied not just to bilingual but also to multilingual learners. At the beginning, all languages are inactive but when the question of which language to choose in a specific circumstance arises, then a specific language is activated. This is the “language
chosen” or using the same term as in code switching, it is the base language (also recipient or matrix language). Generally, regarding tri/multilingual speakers, while the target language is on activation mode, the “guest” languages can be partially or fully used. If the speaker is in a monolingual mode, the “guest” languages are not activated (or very rarely), so there are a few or no instances of code-switching that can actually be recorded.

In the same vein, translanguaging, which is “the ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system”, (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 401) is a relatively new and constantly developing term used interchangeably with code-switching. It can be used as an umbrella term that encompasses a variety of practical and theoretical examples, several kinds of practices, like code switching or translating but also the fluid use of languages and the mixing of structures on the process of meaning making. Moreover, what is crucial when discussing translanguaging- and in particular communities with minority languages- is the ‘social context’ because it “helps to disrupt the socially constructed language hierarchies that are responsible for the suppression of the languages of many minoritized peoples” (Otheguy et al., 2015, p. 283). However, this might prove dangerous if attention is not given to “issues of asymmetrical relations of power and inequalities” (Kubota, 2014, p. 7). If this happens, speakers of the majority language will be empowered at the expense of speakers of minority languages.

In an attempt to distinguish code-switching from translanguaging, Tsokalidou (2015) mentions: “…If code-switching refers mainly to the language level, I believe that translanguaging allows us to refer to the wider ideological issues of multilingual management and the development of languages and language varieties, which are related to our complex and changing relationship to the language and language varieties building our personal and collective identity.” Therefore, and in line with Heugh (2015, as cited in Cahyani et al., 2018), translanguaging offers learners a strategic use of code-switching that allows them to work with all languages available simultaneously, rather than separately.

Within the multilingual classroom, a translanguaging approach would allow for the use of different sources to the benefit of minoritized communities. Cenoz and Gorter (2017, as cited in Cenoz & Gorter, 2019, p. 134) propose a framework for translanguaging practices in school contexts that promotes the use of minority
languages, enhances language awareness as well as metalinguistic awareness, provides the functional ‘breathing’ spaces for using the minority language and also links translanguaging to pedagogical activities. Yet, the approach should be critical and heedful as the irrational celebration of translanguaging without considering the specific characteristics of the given social contexts, might- in all probability- lead to language attrition.

Finally, although several studies have stressed the advantages of a translanguaging pedagogy regarding school performance and minority / migrant languages, namely balancing the power- relations among the different languages (Allard, 2017), protecting and promoting minority languages (Cenoz, 2017) or raising participant confidence and motivation (Creese & Blackledge, 2010) to name some, the implementation of translanguaging approaches in mainstream education does not yet belong to the pedagogical status quo in most European schools.

2.8 The Role of the Teacher in the Multilingual Classroom

Teachers play a pivotal role in children’s views, conceptions and lives in general and exert significant power in guiding children’s behavior and learning (Ming & Dukes, 2006, as cited in Tarman & Tarman, 2011). Given the increase in student diversity and the complexity in teaching, teachers are at the forefront when it comes to supporting the integration of culturally and linguistically diverse students in the mainstream classroom. Teachers are the ones who are challenged to work not only simultaneously but also effectively with diverse learners and being proficient at multi-level, group focused teaching (Alton-Lee, 2003) and are expected to be fully prepared for a wide range of English proficiency and language diversity (Alton-Lee, 2005). However, according to the research literature in a Eurydice report (2019, p.23), teachers “often feel unprepared and insecure when confronted in the same classroom with students from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds.”

Indeed, in spite of the increasing knowledge of certain strategies and approaches that would help culturally and linguistically diverse learners in the mainstream contexts, the situation is far from ideal because teachers not only need to have access to the principles of effective teaching but should also know how to channel that knowledge to the students in the best possible way (Price, 2008). In relation to this, research has shown that teachers face challenges when it comes to supporting language learners in a mainstream classroom because they have received
–in the majority of cases- minimal training (Martin, 2004; Sharma et al., 2011; Mattheoudakis et al., 2017) and may also presume in certain cases that the use of the students’ first/home language in the classroom may prove detrimental to their learning (Mady & Garbarti, 2014; Planas & Setati-Phakeng, 2014; Winsor, 2007).

While much research has been conducted on multilingual and plurilingual language learning and teaching in Asia (Surinn et al., 2019), Canada (Surinn et al., 2019), and Europe (Surinn et al., 2019), such studies are lacking in U.S. contexts, possibly because English has always served as a lingua franca and according to Kloss (1998, in Surinn et al., 2019, p. 87) the U.S ideology “has traditionally required linguistic assimilation of all minority groups, supporting the value of English as a dominant language.”

Other than that, the studies concerning foreign language teachers around the world focus primarily on their conceptions, attitudes and views towards diverse learners and less on their practices- strategies employed in classrooms.

Other than that, the studies concerning foreign language teachers around the world focus primarily on their conceptions, attitudes, and views towards diverse learners and less on their practices- strategies employed in classrooms.

Jessner (2006) has stated that multilingual schools can be found either in Europe or in double immersion programs in Canada where foreign languages are taught as school subjects, making third language acquisition at schools a common, worldwide phenomenon. This view is also shared by Lasagabaster and Huguet (2007, as cited in Halimi, 2011), according to whom, “the teacher’s role with regards to the formation of language attitudes can be crucial to the students’ future language attitudes” (2007, p. 1), highlighting this way the crucial role teachers play in such environments. Regarding the Norwegian context, Iamroz (2018) highlighted the need for a more multilingual approach to language pedagogy as well as teachers’ practices. The results from this study revealed the teachers’ incompetency and lack of readiness when it comes to English instruction in a highly diversified classroom, as well as the need for multilingual pedagogy to be included in teacher education both in the theoretical and practical analysis of the teaching practices. Moreover, Pedersen (2016) looked into Norwegian teachers and their ability to teach English as L3. The results indicated that English teachers lack sufficient multilingual competence and are in need of teacher training programs that focus on third language acquisition and efficient practices.
In the Greek context, the majority of the research doesn’t revolve around EFL teachers, but focuses on Greek teachers in mainstream classrooms instead, who teach Greek as a second language, focusing on intercultural education in general and the primary school teachers’ practices, attitudes as well as training (Tsaliki, 2012, 2016; Kantzou et al., 2017; Sakka, 2010; Beneris, 1999, as cited in Tsaliki, 2012; Mattheoudakis et al., 2017; Mitits, 2018, among others) or even the production of teaching material in teaching Greek as a second language, in particular (Tsaliki, 2012). Other prominent studies related to teaching in the multilingual classroom include those of Nikoloudis (2004) and Spyridakis (2002, as cited in Tsaliki, 2012). The former, who studied the linguistic activities and teaching choices of teachers who taught Greek as a second language in three reception classes of three different primary schools, concluded that teachers did not incorporate foreign pupils' cultural background or native language into their teaching. In the research study undertaken by Spyridakis (2002, as cited in Tsaliki, 2012), he explored whether the generally accepted intercultural pedagogical theory coincided with its actual implementation in one intercultural school in Northern Greece. Apart from the insufficient training of the teachers and the inappropriacy of the teaching material, it was shown that the entire school organization was based on assimilation, without valuing pupils’ native language, something which was also evident in Hasapi’s (2005, as cited in Tsaliki, 2012) findings. In another study, Sismanidou (2005, as cited in Tsaliki, 2012) made reference to the practices of primary school teachers, which included whole-group discussions, individualized teaching, various rewards as well as activities for establishing good relationships between native and foreign pupils. Regarding teaching practices, the conclusions drawn from Nikolaou's (1999, as cited in Tsaliki, 2012) study are similar and they therefore agree. Teachers maintained that group activities, rewards, awards, and communicative activities were all conducive to encouraging stronger bonds between foreign and repatriate pupils. In another study, Griva and Papadopoulos (2018) examined the ways the Greek student-teachers of the Department of Primary Education in the University of Western Macedonia are trained in teaching multicultural classrooms. In this study, special emphasis is given to modern teaching methods and approaches as well as the design of appropriate educational activities that aim at developing immigrant/refugee students’ skills in the host language. Moreover, Athanasiadou (2005, as cited in Tsaliki, 2012) studied the
interdisciplinary approach to teaching and learning, which proved to encourage all pupils' participation and social integration. Finally, Lytra (2007, as cited in Tsaliki, 2012), through semi-structured interviews and ethnographic observations explored the social identities of young learners in an intercultural primary school in Athens. In this research, minority children seemed to value their home languages as well as their cultures to a great extent, denoting thus the need for both teachers and students to celebrate diversity and various social identities. It is noteworthy that the results are in agreement with those in Papalexatou’s (2013) research in which – through a case study of two bilingual children – the need to preserve both culture and native languages became evident in an attempt to raise bilingual awareness. Only Dida (2013), in her recent paper “EFL Teacher Training on Multicultural Classroom Management in Elementary and Junior High School” refers exclusively to the English language teachers with reference to intercultural education in Greece, by shedding light on their needs and making suggestions for further teacher training. Another equally prominent study worth mentioning is that of Lagou’s (2014), who investigated the practices employed by EFL teachers in multicultural junior high school classrooms in Greece. Yet, the area of EFL teaching strategies in Greek primary school context remains an undiscovered one and lags behind similar research in the field worldwide. Teaching strategies of EFL teachers might not have become a research issue yet, probably because teachers’ views on cultural diversity have been considered more important or it is considered self-evident that the strategies applied by EFL teachers coincide with the ones applied by mainstream Greek ones.

Nevertheless, the review of the literature shows that teachers in multicultural settings can use a variety of methods to contribute to the goals of the intercultural education, which actually constitute the key principles that underlie the teaching and learning of a language. These have been developed over the years through the work of various scholars worldwide and are based on the interpretation of their research when it comes to multi / intercultural education. Therefore, regardless of the teaching post or the subject taught, some general positions that are held, should be delineated. It should be noted here, however, that these tenets can be expanded in the present research both to accommodate education with three or more languages and present the current Greek education system which can be described as “a rather
weak form of multilingual education that leads to monolingualism or limited multilingualism by assimilating language minority children within the language majority society” (Mitits, 2018, p. 29).

First and foremost, cooperation and whole class teaching approaches are suggested in working towards creating an intercultural ethos in schools (Corbett, 2003; Kaldi, 1999, as cited in Tsalkiki, 2012). Also, cooperative learning is considered a basic principle when achieving a common goal (Council of Europe, 2007) -whether in group or pair work (Markou, 1999; Nikolaou, 1999, as cited in Tsalkiki, 2012), since it contributes to equal access to all learning opportunities among all students (Cowie et al., 1994; Shapon-Shevin & Schniedewind, 1999 as cited in Tsalkiki, 2012) and to the improvement of their social skills (Markou, 1999; Nikolaou, 1999 as cited in Tsalkiki, 2012). Moreover, through the interdependence and mutual help, equal participation can be ensured especially if pupils are allocated multiple-ability tasks (Cohen, 1994, 1995, 1999, as cited in Tsalkiki, 2012). Furthermore, great importance is given to communication and social interaction (i.e., dialogue), as a practice in multicultural classrooms (Tsalkiki, 2012). The interaction, negotiation and general understanding is facilitated through key visuals, ranging from drawings or flashcards to gestures, facial expressions, and body movements (Cummins, 1996; Breen et al., 2001, in Tsalkiki, 2012). Students display various learning styles and teachers should use a variety of styles to highlight the shades that various meanings have in various cultures (Simpson & Erickson, 1983; Houlton, 1986; Corbett, 2003, as cited in Tsalkiki, 2012).

Furthermore, research has shown that some teachers may encourage students to use their L1 in the classroom, as an important factor for learning, since this will boost their confidence and will make them feel emotionally balanced (Dimitroff, 1972). They should also encourage their parents to use their L1 at home or in wider social environment. Apart from that, the first language constitutes a great tool for the activation of prior linguistic knowledge and in this sense, new knowledge is better and more effectively acquired (Shapon-Shevin & Schniedewing, 1991; Ovando et al., 2003, as cited in Tsalkiki, 2012). Dimitroff (1972) was also the one to suggest that teachers should provide pupils with one difficulty at a time -a view which is in line with that of Skattebol (2003) on the provision of examples, guidance and help. Questions and items should be simple enough and if needed should be repeated or paraphrased so that they are fully understood. What is more,
great importance is also given to the comprehensible input when it comes to the organization of teaching strategies for such learners, that has to be simplified enough to match the learners’ given language proficiency (Krashen, 1981, as cited in Ellis, 2005). In the same vein, repetition also plays a major role, since it increases retention and transference of knowledge to long-term memory (Shaw & Hawes, 1998, as cited in Tsaliki, 2012). Finally, feedback can also be conducive to the learning process when given in a remedial form (Tsaliki, 2012).

In order to delve into the role of the multilingual teacher in particular, more than one perspective must be taken into account and exemplified. As Jessner (2008) states, in order to raise multilingual awareness in the classroom, teachers themselves should possess it first- by having general linguistic knowledge about language typology as well as structure and manifest it in any given aspect of the lesson. It is also important that teachers not only understand their personal stereotypes and biases, but also recognize how these influences their teaching practices and relationships with children. Ming & Dukes (2006, p. 44), perceived that process as one of self-reflection and stated that “during this time of self-reflection, teachers analyze their own feelings towards those who are culturally different, determine how it relates to the dominant culture, and think about what frame of reference influences these feelings.” Banks et al. (2001, p. 197), elaborated on this idea of teachers by claiming that “they should also acquire the skills needed to translate that knowledge into effective instruction and enriched curriculum.” What is more, there is the possibility for teachers to be unaware of the multilingual learners’ abilities and breadth of knowledge. Therefore, they fail to see them as potential resources for learning. This might happen when learners are not literate in the home language or “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).

Also, what is interesting is that although most teachers seem to be tolerant and hold positive views on a theoretical level, in practice they fail to adopt practices that promote multilingualism among their students (Ramos, 2001). As Wright (2002, p. 115, as cited in Andrews, 2003) mentions, “a linguistically aware teacher not only understands how language works but understands the students’ struggle with language and is sensitive to errors and other interlanguage features.” Thus, he highlights the role of the teacher not just as a language analyst but also as someone who perceives possible difficulties in practice during the learning process.
In sum, there is no one-size-fits-all approach to teaching language. Unfortunately, not all teachers receive proper or adequate training in how to teach a third / additional language to bilingual students in their teaching preparation programs. Teaching an L3 requires understanding of both L2 and L3 principles and theories as well as knowledge of different approaches. Research findings so far, reveal that there are two major aspects of multilingual students that teachers should focus on: (1) cross-linguistic knowledge (Cenoz, 2000) and (2) metalinguistic awareness (Jessner, 1999), which constitute two major factors that might distinguish multilingual speakers from monolingual learners. In turn, De la Fuente and Lacroix (2015) proposed some practical suggestions for teachers in multilingual contexts: teachers should encourage reactivation of prior linguistic knowledge of the students and encourage them to look for similarities and differences among the languages, using contrastive analysis and avoiding negative transfer. This way, they will project themselves as “language experts” and will therefore improve their self-image and promote motivation. In relation to this, students should reflect upon their previous language learning experience and reapply strategies they used in the past to new learning situations (De la Fuente & Lacroix, 2015, p. 52). Based on the findings cited above, it seems that the best practices for teaching bilingual students an L3 are a combination of cultural responsiveness (Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2006; Villegas & Lucas, 2002) linguistic sensitivity (Villegas & Lucas, 2002), strategy training (Oxford, 1990; Richards & Rogers, 1986) and activation of metalinguistic awareness (De Angelis, 2011; Jessner, 2008).

Surely, teachers, educators, administrators and policy makers in their attempts to find the optimal way to teach bilingual students an L3, are required to differentiate their instruction in order to meet the needs of such students and accommodate their needs in the best possible way.

2.9 Culturally Responsive Pedagogy/ Differentiated Instruction

According to Ramsey (1987) and Banks et al. (2001), teaching in a diversified context should be culturally responsive. Gay (2000, p. 29) defines culturally responsive teaching as “using the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant and effective for them.” Also, according to her, the most important elements that are critical to a culturally responsive classroom incorporate
the use of a variety of techniques along with resourceful materials, the acknowledgement of the value of the various cultures in the classroom and the connection between home and school experiences. According to culturally responsive pedagogy, “effective teachers use the knowledge of their students’ culture and ethnicity as a framework for inquiry and they organize and implement instruction” (Banks et al., 2001, p. 198). By recognizing the importance of the students’ cultural references in all aspects of learning (Ladson-Billings, 1995), they become the teachers who are sensitive and knowledgeable about other cultures and by adopting multicultural perspectives, they create a diverse environment in the classroom. An important characteristic of culturally responsive teaching is that every student has knowledge and prior experiences which are valued and incorporated in the classroom curriculum (Price, 2008) on condition that the teacher is aware of their and their parents’ knowledge, resources, strengths and expertise. This connection process has been called “a meeting of minds” by McNaughton (2002, as cited in Price, 2008). Indeed many theorists have highlighted the importance of making connections between students and teachers (Bruner, 1966; Cazden, 1988; Garcia, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1994, as cited in Price, 2008), since this would ensure that what is taught would be relevant to all students by “building on the familiar and unlocking the unfamiliar” (McNaughton, 2002, p. 118 as cited in Price, 2008), in order to help multilingual students achieve pride in their culture and experience full success in their learning at the same time. Besides, as Hollins and Oliver (1999) state, “to better serve an increasingly diverse population, it is imperative that teachers improve their competence in selecting and developing culturally responsive curricula and instructional approaches that better facilitate learning.”

In line with all the aforementioned comments, effective L3 teaching may need to be carefully “differentiated” to the needs of either each learner or a group of learners. Teachers are required to leave their comfort zone and their teacher-centered methodologies and apply differentiated instructional practices by modifying curricula and resources in order to maximize learning opportunities for all learners and address their needs, always taking into account the students’ learning styles, level of attainment and personal interests (Sougari & Mavroudi, 2019).
According to Walqui (2007), differentiated instruction is an educational framework that refers to modified instruction or activities that engage the learners without oversimplifying the content. According to Bearne (1996, p. 39), differentiation should focus on the one hand on individuals and on the other on the whole class, since “the principle of entitlement is to provide equal access to what is deemed of value and essential for all.” Differentiation is deemed necessary when a student—or some—are at a different level and cannot keep up with the rest of the class. Of course, when it comes to performance, this discrepancy does not merely have to do with the skill level of the students. In our case, bilingual or immigrant pupils might be in need for extra support or tools to assist their learning and overcome language barriers or any other deficiencies. Differentiated instruction encourages the modification of instruction to meet certain objectives in a comfortable yet demanding learning environment, based on the learners’ learning profile and preferences. The cornerstone of this framework is that it depends on teachers’ “making sure that the right students get the right learning tasks at the right time” (Earl, 2003, pp. 86-87). Once the teachers familiarize themselves with their students’ prior knowledge and needs, differentiated lessons “is no longer an option; it is an obvious response”, if the instruction is to be effective.

Some indicative differentiated strategies that can be used by teachers include the use of pair-, group- and individual work depending on the task, the learners’ readiness levels and learning preferences. Grouping enables learners to improve their social skills, learn how to cooperate and learn from one another, benefit from their classmates’ talents and become aware of their own strengths and weaknesses, whereas individual work boosts their self-confidence and gives them a sense of achievement. Moreover, children learn best in a non-threatening, relaxed environment where they can actively be involved in learning procedures when they have teachers who don’t act as controllers of activities, but as guides of their personal progress. In addition to this, the process as well as the content of the lesson can be differentiated. Regarding the first, the students may follow a different way of thinking and different methodological ways so as to make sense of the subject matter, whereas the differentiation of the content might refer to the provision of less or more complex material, less or more demanding tasks or just less or more information that they have to retain (Sougari & Mavroudi, 2019).
Research has attested to the positive effects of differentiated strategies (i.e., improved academic performance or high motivation, concerning primary school students (Reis et al., 2011; Valiandes 2015), secondary students (Rejeki 2014), as well as students with learning difficulties (McAdamis 2001; McQuarrie & McRae, 2010). However, research reveals that teachers might feel uncomfortable at the thought of modifying materials, making plans or changing instruction, possibly because they feel that such policies will attract attention to student differences and stigmatize students (Schumm & Vaughn, 1992, 1995, as cited in Nicolae, 2014). Moreover, there are other potential challenges of differentiating materials: lack of knowledge or resources, limited preparation time, large class sizes, teachers’ heavy workload or even lack of motivation on their part (Chan, et al., 2002; Scott, Vitale, & Masten, 1998; Westwood, 2002, as cited in Nicolae, 2014). Also, although additional work in the form of simple material or project work have been suggested as effective differentiated strategies to employ for early finishers in the classroom, a major challenge to modify teaching practice is time in conjunction with classroom management (Corley, 2005, as cited in Nicolae, 2014), since some teachers feel that preparing extra material is out of the teaching norm and isn’t worth, so they just plan for whole-class instruction, instead.

2.10 Research on Strategy Use and Strategy Instruction

There is an undisputable consensus that teachers should use a variety of learning strategies to help diversified learners succeed in the process of learning English as an additional language, based on their linguistic and extra-linguistic characteristics. Research has shown that irrespective of the techniques a teacher uses, many of the strategies used with English language learners are an extension of approaches that work well with all students (Gray & Fleischman, 2004/5, as cited in Kottler et al., 2008). The use of specific strategies depends on the pace of each learner which is largely determined by factors such as the instructional context, motivation, cognitive and affective factors, as well as the quality and the quantity of the target language input given. Also, the learners’ native language, age, aptitude or socioeconomic status are closely related to the learning strategies that students may employ in order to make their learning easier but also more self-directed, interesting and efficient (Oxford, 1999). On a similar line, Hall (2001, p. 92), reinforces the statement by characterizing learning strategies as “goal-directed actions that are
used by learners to mediate their own learning”. Given that the term “strategy” appears in various disciplines (i.e., applied linguistics, psychology and education), it has been defined by scholars in multiple ways and cannot therefore be given a single definition. The most prominent ones include the definition of Wenden and Rubin (1987, p. 19) who describe learning strategies as “any sets of operations, steps, plans, routines used by the learner to facilitate the obtaining, storage, retrieval and use of information”. Nevertheless, this definition lacks the ‘deep’ as well as the ‘shallow’ approaches to processing information. This gap is compensated by O’Malley and Chamot (1990, p. 1) who defined learning strategies as “the special thoughts or behaviors that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information”, highlighting this way the different learning styles and strategies that can be found. Expanding on this definition, Weinstein and Mayer (1986, p. 315) state that learning strategies aim to “affect the learner’s motivational or affective state, or the way in which the learner selects, acquires, organizes, or integrates new knowledge”.

Concerning the teaching language strategies, Rubin (1990, p. 279) probably gives the best possible definition: “… since each learner can only learn in ways that are meaningful to himself or herself and since each learns in a slightly different manner, it follows that the same approach cannot be fully effective for all students. To help learners become more effective and efficient, teachers need to actively help students help themselves learn how to learn.” At this point, the distinction between learner and teacher strategies is deemed necessary: depending on the learners’ learning style and strategy preferences, teachers should separate their preferable strategies from the ones their students might use in order to help them adopt the ones that will actually work for them. Hence, since there is no distinct field for teaching strategies per se, in the present study learning strategies will refer to those learning strategies supported by EFL teachers and it will be assumed that strategies for teaching and learning share similar characteristics (Cohen & Weaver, 2005). Besides, several researchers have generated lists of effective strategies that might differ in strategy names or description (Chamot, 1998). It is imperative that learners be instructed strategies invariably, as a way to begin to understand their own learning processes, take responsibility and eventually become good language learners (Chamot, 1998). This is because students who are good ‘strategic’ learners are more motivated to participate in the learning process (Paris, 1998, as cited in
Chamot, 1998) and are more confident and successful academically (Zimmerman, 1990; Zimmerman & Pons, 1986, as cited in Chamot, 1998). What is more, conducting tasks successfully - based on appropriate strategies, leads to better awareness of learners’ thinking processes, which are known as metacognition or meta-cognitive awareness. This, in turn, leads to reflection and helps learners proceed with tasks at hand, monitor or self-evaluate their performance and finally know “how to learn” (Paris and Winograd, 1990, as cited in Chamot, 1998). Research has shown that strategy instruction in areas such as reading comprehension, writing, and problem-solving (see, for example, Derry, 1990; El-Dinary, Brown & Van Meter, 1995; Gagne, Yekovitch, & Yekovitch, 1993; Harris & Graham, 1992; Palincsar & Brown, 1985, 1986; Pressley & Associates, 1990; Pressley & Harris, 1990; Silver & Marshall, 1990; Wood, Woloshyn, & Willoughby, 1995, as cited in Chamot, 1998) has brought about positive effects to learners. Other studies that confirm the value of teaching learning strategies (for instance those of Hosenfeld, Arnold, Kirchofer, Laciura, & Wilson, 1981; Rost & Ross, 1991; Rubin, Quinn, & Enos, 1988; Thompson & Rubin, 1993, as cited in Chamot, 1998), report that if strategy instruction is properly carried out, students increase their learning ability and confidence. Similarly designed studies have proven that apart from boosting learners’ confidence in their own ability, strategy instruction proves to be beneficial for average students (Chamot et al., 1993). Therefore, teachers should teach strategies in the target language as much as possible, by integrating strategy instruction within regular lessons and be explicit about their use in distinct language activities. Moreover, learners should be allowed to choose the preferred strategies and build on a range of new ones, which are instructed throughout the course.

One of the most important features of strategies is the new roles they assign to teachers ranging from "... instructor, director, manager, judge, leader, evaluator, and controller to facilitator, helper, guide, consultant, advisor, coordinator, idea person, diagnostician and co-communicator (Oxford, 1990, p. 10)." These multiple, varied roles assign different roles to teachers and they are presented as innovative, creative mediators in the learning procedure. Also, referring to problem orientation, learning strategies are perceived as "tools that have to be used to solve a problem, to accomplish a task or to meet an objective... (Oxford 1990, p. 11).” The next features refer to flexibility and teachability. The former denotes the necessity on the part of
learners to choose, combine and sequence strategies (Oxford 1990, p. 13), because they are not always found in fixed patterns or sequences, whereas the latter refers to the ability of teachers as ‘trainers’ to adapt and teach learning strategies in order to help learners understand strategy use in depth and become more skilled at choosing and employing the most appropriate strategies for them. In this case, the teachers’ role is to guide learners as to the "why and when specific strategies are important, how to use them, and how to transfer them to new situations" (Oxford 1990, p. 12). The final feature listed by Oxford (1990, p.11), is involvement beyond just cognition, referring to the equal value of using both functions referring to the manipulation of the target language and mental processing, along with metacognitive functions like planning, evaluating, and arranging one's own learning.

Regarding taxonomies, several scholars have proposed different - often interrelated- classifications for categorizing language-learning strategies with respect to different criteria (Bialystok, 1978; Naiman et al., 1978; O’Malley & Chamot, 1990; Rubin, 1987).

Second / Foreign language learning strategies, in particular, are generally divided into two classes: strategies for long-term learning and strategies used for using the target language in a current contact situation (Horvathova et.al., 2017). They can be classified according to the learners’ age or proficiency level, the goals set – language learning and language use strategies, the four skills – listening, speaking, reading and writing, and the particular function each time - referring to the cognitive, memory, compensation, metacognitive, social and affective learning strategies (Cohen & Weaver, 2005). Age, along with the proficiency criterion, constitute important factors in classifying strategies. Teachers should think of the most appropriate way a strategy is introduced to a learner avoiding terminology in case the learner is relatively young, whereas learners with a high proficiency level might handle more cognitively demanding tasks, using more sophisticated strategies.

Moreover, according to Cohen and Weaver (2005, pp.33-37), as well as the CEFR (2011, pp. 63-87, as cited in Horvatova et al., 2017), skill areas including receptive and productive skills can identify receptive (aural and visual reception) and productive (oral and written production) strategies accordingly, to help learners activate the appropriate schemata and mobilize various resources to deal with given
tasks. There are also other subsidiary strategies, like grammar or vocabulary learning related to all four skills, which are equally important for learners to understand the nature of the various activities. Generally, there is no agreement on how strategies should be defined or classified and this is where the essential problem in strategy research lies: there is an ambiguous concept related to strategy use and “the field reveals a non-disjunction of dimensions of strategy classifications while a generally accepted classification system for strategy description is absent” (Vlčková et al., 2013, p. 97). According to Vlčková et al. (2013), there are five broad classification types of language learning strategies: 1) classifications connected with good language learners (e.g., Rubin, 1975), 2) classifications based on psychological functions (e.g., O’Malley & Chamot, 1990), 3) classifications with a linguistic background dealing with formal and functional practice, meaning mapping, language monitoring (e.g., Bialystok, 1981), or communication strategies such as paraphrasing and loanwords (e.g., Tarone, 1983), 4) classifications connected with language skills (e.g., Cohen & Weaver, 2005), and finally 5) classifications based on the different styles or types of learners. Although there are various classifications of second/foreign language learning strategies, the most widely used ones are those of Rubin’s (1981), Oxford’s (1990) and O’Malley and Chamot’s (1990, as cited in Manitoba Education, 2006). O’Malley and Chamot’s classification proposed a taxonomy which differentiates between cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective strategies, whereas Rubin’s between direct and indirect strategies. In particular, O’Malley and Chamot’s classification distinguishes various types of strategies within: the socio-affective strategies include cooperation, self-talk and questions for clarification, whereas the cognitive strategies include repetition, resourcing, note taking, summarizing, deduction and inferencing, resourcing, translation, contextualization, recombination, imagery and auditory, keyword method, transfer and representation. As for the strategies that fall into the metacognitive section, these include directed and selective attention, self-management, functional planning, advanced organizers, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation.

Also, within the direct strategies, Rubin distinguishes among six subgroups: 1) clarification / verification, 2) memorization, 3) guessing / inductive inferencing, 4) practice, 5) deductive reasoning, 6) monitoring, while with respect to the indirect
strategies, he identifies the production tricks and the creation of opportunities for practice.

Out of all, Oxford’s (1990) model of language learning strategies is the most comprehensive strategy system, which classifies strategies into six functional groups: memory strategies (how students remember language / recall data), cognitive strategies (how students think about their learning / the processes and mental manipulations they go through), metacognitive strategies (how students organize, evaluate and plan together with analyzing and reasoning), compensation strategies (how students make up for limited knowledge), affective strategies (how students feel and manage their emotions) and social strategies (how students achieve learning by interacting with others).

To start with, cognitive strategies, which have been asserted to have a positive effect on learners’ proficiency levels (O’Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990; Oxford & Ehrman, 1995, as cited in Surin et al., 2017) involve all the processes learners go through both when learning the target language (e.g., grouping information, retaining and storing of the language material) and when using it (retrieving language material, grouping, translating, comprehending words or phrases). Repetition, inferencing and deducing, note taking, contextualization, elaboration and transfer are examples of cognitive strategies (Horvathova et al., 2017). Other cognitive strategies include instances of naturalistic settings (i.e., such as listening to music) that aim at deeper language processing, analyzing, synthesizing, and reorganizing information (Surin et al., 2019).

Memory-related strategies, such as making associations, drawing pictures, using acronyms and drawings (Surin et al., 2019), or creating mental linkages help information enter the long-memory and be retrieved at any moment, when needed in communication. In this sense, new information is linked to already existing concepts in the learners’ working memories. Memory strategies are useful primarily for novice or young learners, when trying to master new vocabulary because their vocabulary is really limited, and they rely heavily on such strategies for excellent acquisition.

Compensation strategies, such as guessing unknown words, asking for clarification, rephrasing, pausing or using gestures while reading or listening, or even circumlocutions in speaking and writing are used to make up for missing information when the task at hand is beyond the learner’s reach. Therefore, in order
not to show their incompetence, learners’ resort to compensation strategies to fill in the gaps in the L3 and continue communication (Horvathova et al., 2017). Cohen (1998) as well as Oxford and Ehrman (1995), have reported positive correlations between the use of such strategies and learners’ performance.

Meta-cognitive strategies involve planning, analyzing, organizing, reasoning, (Oxford, 2002) and empowering learners to control their learning by planning, checking and then evaluating their performance. Meta-cognitive strategies help learners to be more self-directed and autonomous and are conducive to successful language learning (Dreyer & Oxford, 1996; Oxford, 1990; Purpura, 1997). Identifying learning styles, needs and preferences as well as planning or organizing the learning process (including monitoring progress, analyzing mistakes, adjusting tasks, self-reflecting and evaluating learning) are instances of widely used metacognitive strategies (Surin et al., 2017).

Other strategies that are less attributed to language learning, concern social and affective strategies. Oxford (2002) mentions that they are undervalued by even the most skilled learners, since having attained high levels of proficiency, they don’t need such techniques. Yet, she included them in the classification system because she not only views learners as a “whole”, but she also considers them unique entities. Therefore, she had to include all senses and parameters in order to ensure that there is something for everyone so that the system is as effective as possible. Affective strategies help students control their emotions, attitudes, and feelings during the learning process. Intrinsic as well as extrinsic motivation, rewards, positive talk, and relaxation techniques are often used to reduce anxiety and provide self-encouragement (Surin et al., 2017). Finally, social strategies involve learners interacting with others, asking for and giving clarification, cooperating with others, and empathizing with others (Horvathova et al., 2017) while exploring social and cultural norms. Once more, social strategies have been found to affect language learning positively (Dreyer & Oxford, 1996; Oxford, 1990; Oxford & Ehrman, 1995) while affective strategies exert some systematic and enduring positive effect (Dornyei, 2001). Regarding motivation, which is considered a basic component in foreign language teaching, Dornyei (2001) classified four phases, (namely, creating the basic motivational conditions, generating initial motivation, maintaining and protecting motivation and encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation). These phases include several subcategories that should be applied –not necessarily
consecutively- to build students’ motivation to learn confidently and successfully. The basic *motivational conditions* include a positive learning environment and good relationships between the teacher and the students as well as between the learners themselves. Generating initial motivation encompasses the increase of learners’ goal orientation, language sense and feeling of success while the teachers try to create realistic beliefs and make the teaching material relevant to the learners’ needs. Moreover, protecting and maintaining motivation involves making learning enjoyable, stimulating, and cooperative while at the same time learners’ self-esteem, social image and confidence are either maintained or increased and their learning autonomy starts to create. Other significant factors of success in learning a second or foreign language include the promotion of motivational attributions and motivational feedback as well as the increase of learners’ satisfaction and the offering of rewards or grades in a motivating manner. Finally, and in relation to the foundations discussed earlier, the *Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach* (CALLA) is an instructional model that influenced the study. According to Chamot and Robbins (2005), this model can be used in ESL, EFL, bilingual, foreign language, and general education classrooms and constitutes an effective plan for integrating learning strategies instruction into a language curriculum. CALLA was initially developed by Chamot and O'Malley in an attempt to remedy the lack of cognitive language proficiency of students learning English as a second language (Manitoba Education, 2006) and its main objectives include focusing on learners by motivating them with content topics, developing their language skills, improving their academic language proficiency and teaching them effective learning strategies (Chamot & Robbins, 2005). The instructional model is based on three areas of theory: *constructivism*, (which focuses on the learner’s mental processes and different types of knowledge), *schema theory*, (which refers to the mind organizing information into schemata or mental structures), and *social-cognitive theory*, which explains how people interact to creating learning (Manitoba Education, 2006). Regarding the cognitive information-processing (constructivism), the model places emphasis on metacognition (thinking about one’s own thinking) as well as on cognitive strategies such as summarizing, predicting and inferencing, indicating that acquisition of new information requires mental processing (Manitoba Education, 2006).
Schema theory discusses the storage of what we already know, our prior knowledge “concept maps”, or schemata with associated concepts based on which new information is organized and understood. Chamot et al. (1999, as cited in Manitoba Education, 2006) argue that “having a schema, or relevant prior knowledge, allows us to make predictions, visualize events, draw inferences, monitor comprehension, and create summaries” (p. 158). Last, social cognitive theory refers to the learners’ sense of motivation and self-efficacy, the belief that they can succeed in tasks, given that they are taught the appropriate strategies. In terms of strategy instruction, teachers are expected to explicitly teach social-affective strategies referring to interaction or cooperation with other learners for reasons of clarification or assistance, cognitive strategies which refer to the learning of the material mentally (making mental images or elaborating on existing concepts) or physically (grouping items in categories, taking notes) as well as metacognitive strategies which involve monitoring learners’ comprehension or production and evaluation of the learning process (Manitoba Education, 2006).

The three main components of the CALLA model are realized in a five-stage instructional sequence: preparation during which the objectives are identified, motivation is provided and learners’ prior knowledge is activated; presentation, when learning strategies are explained and new information is presented in a variety of ways by discussing the connections to students’ prior knowledge; practice during which learners actually put strategies into practice, cooperate and make use of hands – on / inquiry-based activities and authentic tasks and finally self-evaluation and expansion, when students reflect on their own learning, evaluate themselves and assess their own strategies used (Chamot & Robbins, 2005). In short, the CALLA, which is based both on research and cognitive theory, aims to help students learn important academic content and language and become independent learners through their mastery over a variety of strategies for learning (Chamot & Robbins, 2005).

2.11 Adaptation of Strategies in mixed classrooms
In multicultural settings, it is highly probable that groups of learners may be empowered or disadvantaged because of various factors including their language, culture but even their socio-economic status or gender. During the course of the years, the field of education has benefited from various thoughtful teachers who have proved that teaching is both a science and an art (Davis, 2006, as cited in
Kottler et al., 2008) This realization constitutes a wonderful metaphor according to Lachat (2004, as cited in Kottler et al., 2008) and places special emphasis on the challenges teachers face when asked to provide language development for English language learners of varying language abilities and academic backgrounds as well as varied languages and different ages. Various methods can be borrowed from the work of foreign and English language teachers and can be adapted in different ways, depending on the teaching style, grade level or certain students’ needs. Therefore, instructional adaptation is, more often than not, deemed imperative to facilitate access to greater academic achievement, provision of comprehensible information and assurance- above all- of learners’ engagement in constructing or negotiating meaning and monitoring their progress (Lalas & Bustos, 2012).

According to Brooks & Thompson (2005), adaptation pedagogy reflects the virtue of equity and educational justice, openness, and unique expression. As such, teachers need to value diversity, respect, and provide all learners with equitable learning environments. Diverse students need to be cared for and respected by their peers, teachers or even administrators- (as if they are part of the whole), before they care about school itself (Valenzuela, 1999, as cited in Lalas & Bustos, 2012). It is an opinion also shared by Stanton-Salazar (2001, as cited in Lalas & Bustos, 2012), who acknowledges the career and academic assistance of the ‘institutional agents’ in guiding the learners’ progress in the challenging learning environments. Also, teaching should not be considered a matter of mere transmission of knowledge but it should engage pupils in “developing critical habits of mind, understanding and sorting out multiple perspectives, and learning to participate in and contribute to a democratic society by developing both the skill and the inclination for civic engagement” (Cochran-Smith, 2004, p. 159).

Vygotsky (1978), who focused on social interaction in cognitive development, created the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) which indicates why adaptation pedagogy facilitates learning, since it is in the zone of the learners that they understand concepts with the aid of a peer or a teacher who makes instructional adaptations as part of scaffolding (Lalas & Bustos, 2012). Similarly, Piaget, whose study is premised on intelligence and cognitive development, considered intelligence as an adaptation that requires the balance between two processes: assimilation, which is receiving stimuli and accommodation, which encompasses the ways in which people adapt their thinking to new experiences.
The process of integrating what individuals know into a unified whole (Ziegler and Alibali, 2005, as cited in Lalas & Bustos, 2012) and the “internal balancing between assimilation and accommodation” (Meadows, 2006, p. 263, as cited in Lalas & Bustos, 2012), makes human beings develop steadily.

Gunning (2010) claimed that the instructional adaptations that could be attributed to Piaget and Vygotsky could include hands-on experiences, activities through interaction with peers or teachers, use of developmental activities and recognition of individual differences.

In most recent years, instructional adaptations are considered necessary and involve several variables and frameworks that entail the influence of both social and cultural factors. First and foremost, the teacher-learner interactive relationship within a diverse classroom, referring to the academic capabilities and prior experiences that learners bring to class as well as the teachers’ backgrounds, is of utmost importance (Ruddell & Unrau, 2004, as cited in Lalas & Bustos, 2012). In the same line, the reflective process, which includes problem-solving, inferences, activation of prior knowledge and assessment of weaknesses and strengths, creates an atmosphere of openness and can be conducive to making adaptations (Tremmel, 1993; Schon, 1987, as cited in Lalas & Bustos, 2012). What is more, the cultural characteristics learners bring with them should not be ignored. Howard (2010, p.53) asserts that “culture, which is comprised of myriads of factors, influences students’ learning and teachers should learn to build resiliency and help self-identity become evident, based on relevant research.” Other researchers related the ‘social’ perspective of adaptations (except for the social networking aspect and the ethics of caring mentioned beforehand) with the funds of knowledge -i.e., the students’ existing sets of overall experiences, dispositions, abilities and practices in their homes and communities (Lalas & Valle, 2007). Teachers should take the learners’ funds of knowledge as points of reference when adapting material to acknowledge any aspect of diversity and foster positive social identities within a mixed classroom. Finally, as Trueba (1999, as cited in Lalas & Bustos, 2012) explains, there is the notion of cultural ‘resiliency’ in adaptation pedagogy, referring to the reliance of immigrant children to their closer, immediate environment (e.g., friends, family, community). It is very important for teachers to help learners maintain and
promote an image of individuals who have a strong bond with their social and cultural community within the classroom.

Consequently, adaptation pedagogy is not just a procedure of making academic content and target language relevant to culturally and linguistically diverse students. It is not a process of equipping students with thinking strategies and critical literacy to make subject matter comprehensible. It is primarily a matter of creating a ‘safety’ net for such students, promoting positive behavior, equitable learning environments of trust and mutual care in which learners should be eligible to not only understand the instructional material, but also relate it to their own lives.

Lalas and Bustos, (2012) stress the importance of teachers’ ‘reflection’ on their own experiences as well as their learners’ potential abilities, linguistic and cultural backgrounds or levels of academic and language proficiency in order to make intentional instructional decisions and adapt materials to the learners’ needs. Adaptation refers to a conscious effort of creating alternative means for learners to acquire and demonstrate content knowledge. It constitutes an ‘umbrella’ term for classroom organization adaptation, instructional presentation adaptation and activating student motivation and response adaptation (Lalas & Salomon, 2007). To the aforementioned researchers, instructional presentation adaptations include the activation of prior knowledge by relating it to personal experiences, previewing information or pre-teaching vocabulary, using questioning or recalling strategies (e.g., student “think-aloud” technique, cue cards, outlines and summaries, vocabulary glossary), simplifying abstract concepts, music, drawing, painting, dramatization, self-monitoring checklists, and many others. Some examples of classroom organization adaptations include peer/buddy partners, cooperative groups, physical room / seating arrangement, proper lighting and use of materials, suitable workspace, gesturing, and other classroom adaptive equipment and materials (such as, personal computers, enlarged printed material, maps, and many others). Some examples of activating student response and motivation adaptations relate to response procedures and include information organizers, bulletin boards, charts, posters, collages, songs, poems, extra time, more practice through exercises, use of an interpreter, shorter assessments and students’ involvement in assessments, creating more interest, free choice of doable activities, choice to cooperate with others, personally meaningful activities, and many other activities that foster trust and boost learners’ confidence.
Whitman and Borgerding, (2017) differentiate among four basic categories of strategy adaptation for making language objectives for the English language learners regarding academic vocabulary, language skills and functions, language structures and grammar and finally language learning strategies. In general, they urge teachers to use bulleted items instead of sentences, reduce the number of words in a sentence, use high-frequency words and match the language of the items to that of instruction, highlight key vocabulary, avoid complex sentences with complex structures, add visual supports to facilitate learning and use questions to make sure that everything is clear to the students.

In terms of how students are called to give answers, they suggest a modification plan which entails providing learners with word banks, simplifying the questions, limiting choices available and providing them with matching items and lots of pictures, instead of bombarding them with words. Moreover, additional time and bilingual dictionaries are suggested to support their learning effort. As far as grading or feedback are concerned, vague statements like “well done!” or “good job!”, should be avoided. According to the researchers, success is not a matter of natural talent or luck. Instead, success is the result of effort or specific strategies and the reference to their success should be individual and relevant to the task.

Further, besides the approaches that can be borrowed from the work of foreign language teachers, there are some models that have been developed by English language teachers as a separate discipline. Except for the CALLA instructional model according to which teachers identify not only academic language skills, but also specific academic content and corresponding learning strategies, Freeman and Freeman (1998, as cited in Kottler et al., 2008) developed some principles for success for teachers working with diverse students. Their guidelines include the creation of thematic units to help the learners see the whole picture, connect it with their own lives and find examples before concentrating on the details. Along with thematic units, units of study could be organized in a way that will help learners look for answers through books, journals, or web sites. This kind of research could be achieved either individually or collectively, using various resources to explore the answers to what Wiggins and Mc Tighe (2005, as cited in Kottler et al., 2008) refer to as “essential questions”. Also, lessons that develop oral and written skills simultaneously need to be introduced from the very beginning, as an initial step to develop communication skills, in conjunction with authentic
material with relevant themes that would be clear, meaningful, and engaging. Much emphasis is also given to social interaction in the form of structuring small group cooperative learning tasks and get the learners to work together, express their ideas, ask questions and improve their conversation skills provided that clear directions are given, resources are organized, and time limits for the activities and for the feedback have already been set. Teachers should also acknowledge and appreciate students’ efforts, maintain a positive attitude, encourage them and express confidence and full faith in their abilities and potential. Moreover, culture and first languages should be valued, since students in bilingual settings possess higher self-confidence and display a more positive attitude towards school (Kottler et al., 2008).

Therefore, an ideal learning environment for diverse learners would be a non-threatening one that would help learners feel safe, think creatively and exchange or reflect on ideas using various resources (Sprenger, 2010; Krashen, 1988; Haghighi, 2013, as cited in Salem, 2017). Only when teaching environments along with learning activities are compatible with a brain’s natural learning systems, will students become critical and creative and learning will be natural and successful (Smilkstein, 2003, as cited in Salem, 2017).

Conclusion
In sum, the literature review serves as a guide containing theories and ideas pertaining to the instruction of children from bilingual backgrounds. This process has helped me clarify the meaning of inter / multicultural education, realize the need for its proper implementation and become aware of the teaching strategies which could be incorporated in school life in general to the benefit of L3 learners. It therefore served as a basis for the design of the questionnaire in relation to the research questions of the study. Apart from that, it became evident that multilingual children have advantages over monolinguals when learning an additional language as far as their cognitive benefits, metalinguistic and metacognitive abilities are concerned (Jessner, 2008; Hufeisen & Marx, 2004; Hufeisen & Marx, 2007). This should make teachers not only recognize diversity, but also develop understanding and respect for different countries, by creating a diverse environment, enhancing their overall knowledge base of this subject matter and adapting their lessons to potentially assist students in the best possible way.
CHAPTER 3: THE THEORETICAL CONTEXT OF THE RESEARCH

Introduction

The development of the study was influenced by research in second / foreign language learning, which is summarized in the following sections. Also, it was influenced by theoretical and practical methodologies in various fields. The section, therefore, is divided into two sub-sections: in the first part, the language acquisition foundations that underlie the study are described and in the second part, which carries the heaviest load, teaching approaches and methodologies for culturally and linguistically diverse students are acknowledged. In particular, the educational theory of constructivism – which embraces a top-down instructional methodology - will be used as the theoretical framework to “the structure, scaffolding and framing of the dissertation” (Merriam, 2001, p. 45). Contrary to the ‘narrow’ behaviorist paradigm, the framework chosen is attentive to psychological, cognitive, and social variables and was thus considered appropriate in framing the research, analyzing and interpreting the data as well as reporting on relevant information.

3.1 Language Acquisition Foundations

There are some prominent ESL theories which have broadly influenced the study. It should be noted that the field of EAL, following the premises of constructivism, should take various ESL models as paradigms to orient itself. Therefore, using L2 learning theories as the theoretical background seems appropriate to set the foundations and provide sustainable support to shed light on the key tenets of Third Language Acquisition (TLA) theories as well as multi/plurilingualism.

One prominent theory of SLA based on the cognitive perspective, is Krashen’s (1982) Monitor Theory or The Monitor Hypothesis. Krashen’s theory, which is among the leading and most cited theories of SLA is considered relevant as differentiation constitutes the main idea of it. However, having been tested by empirical research, it has been found extremely difficult- if not impossible, so it remains a theoretical concept only (Halimi, 2011). The ‘monitoring model’ has five main hypotheses (Baker & Jones, 1998, p. 649):
(i) **The Acquisition Learning Hypothesis**: The language acquisition is a subconscious process that develops naturally in the context of social communication being a means rather than a focus or an end in itself. The theory here distinguishes between learning (the conscious learning) and acquisition (unconscious learning).

(ii) **The Monitor Hypothesis**: It refers to an editing device (a ‘monitor’) operating before or after the actual performance and can occur only when there is plenty of time and knowledge of the appropriate rules.

(iii) **The Natural Order Hypothesis**: It suggests that grammatical structures are learnt in a predictable way in order to help the learner engage in natural communication more smoothly.

(iv) **The Input Hypothesis**: ‘Input’ refers to language understandable by the learners which is slightly above their current linguistic ability (it is the $i+1$ formula where $i$ is the input and $+1$ is the next stage of language acquisition). Acquisition occurs when the input is comprehensible by the acquirer. In order for this to be achieved most of the times the input is ‘modified’ or adapted for the benefit of the learners.

(v) **Affective Filter Hypothesis**: It proposes the idea of a filter comprised by affective factors such as anxiety, motivation or even self-confidence that determines the level of language acquisition. The more favorable the affective factors are, the more efficient learning will be.

Lightbown and Spada (2019) also suggested an *information processing* model for second language acquisition according to which the learner is viewed from a more cognitive perspective, as an active organizer of incoming information. The model which is concerned with all the mental processes involved in the process of learning, includes the perception and the input of new information; the formation, organization and mental representations; and the retrieval as well as the output strategies (Halimi, 2012). Other approaches to SLA study are the *connectionist perspective*, according to which learners attribute great importance to their exposure to the environment rather than their innate knowledge and the *competition model* dealing with how language is used. Gass and Selinker (2008, p. 222, as cited in Halimi, 2011) state that various elements in a sentence contribute to different
sentence interpretations and “a major determining cue in understanding this relationship is word order.”

3.2 Schumann’s (1978) theories of language acquisition and acculturation

Other approaches to Second Language Acquisition include the following theories: Schumann proposes an acculturation model of SLA whose main element is the learner adapting to a new culture. The basic premise of the model is that “the degree to which a learner acculturates to the target language group will control the degree to which he acquires the second language” (Schumann, 1978, p. 34, as cited in Baker & Jones 1998, p. 646). Schumann believes that learners will make use of their second language to affiliate to a social group and depending on the psychological and societal factors the learner may either succeed or fail in the second language.

3.3 Brown’s (2001) principles of ‘English as a Foreign Language’ (EFL) pedagogy.

What is more, Brown’s (2001) principles of (EFL) pedagogy incorporate the principles of motivation and communicative language teaching, as well as notions developed in Krashen’s and Schumann’s theories. Through the design of twelve principles which are divided into cognitive, affective and linguistic, he gives an account of the pedagogical principles of second language learning and acquisition that can be applied to the study under discussion.

Automaticity (Brown, 2001, p. 69) refers to a spontaneous acquisition of any language in which a child is exposed, while meaningful learning (Brown, 2001, p. 57) denotes that kind of learning that is relevant to learners’ interests and lives and anticipation of rewards (Brown, 2001, p.58) indicates a learner’s expectation of an incentive or praise after having achieved a goal. Intrinsic motivation (Brown, 2001, p.59) refers to the lack of need for an externally administered reward, since the most powerful rewards are the ones that are intrinsically motivated within the learner and strategic investment (ibid) refers to the attention to specific needs, characteristics and specific styles of learners in order for the activities to be learner – centered. Communicative competence (Brown, 2001, p. 69) can be fostered if learners are exposed to real life situations, authentic materials and genuine language so as to
meet their second language needs outside the classroom. The principles of language ego (Brown, 2001, p. 60), self-confidence (Brown, 2001, p. 62) as well as risk taking (Brown, 2001, p. 63) are related. The teacher has to reassure and direct children learning a second language by paying attention to how their ‘ego’ is nurtured along with simply assuring them that they are capable of accomplishing the tasks assigned to them. In turn, if learners believe in themselves and recognize their own ‘ego’, this can automatically lay the ground for risk taking. Moreover, inter language (Brown, 2001, p. 67), deals with the gradual acquisition of the second language just like the process of their first one and the internalization of its rules and lexis. The language – culture connection (Brown, 2001, p. 64) and the native language effect (Brown, 2001, p. 65) are principles which both relate to the language itself. The first one which is linked to Schumann’s theory of acculturation, combines language with cultural customs and values whereas the latter has to do with the level of interference of the mother tongue (L1) in the acquisition of the second language (L2).

3.4 Threshold Theory/Hypothesis

According to the ‘threshold theory’ (also known as Worsham’s Cognitive Threshold Theory) “there may be levels of linguistic proficiency which bilingual children must attain in order to avoid cognitive deficits and allow for the cognitive benefits” (Ricciardelli, 1992, p. 301). This theory was first postulated by Cummins (1976) who suggested that the research on cognition and bilingualism could be best explained with the notion of two thresholds. According to Baker & Jones. (1998, p. 74), these two thresholds constitute a level of language competence, yet not clearly defined, that must be attained or surpassed in order to reach the next level. While the first threshold is the level for a child to reach in order to avoid the negative effects of bilingualism, the second threshold indicates the point where two languages are developed well enough to enable the child to cope with both languages in the classroom.

Out of the threshold theory, a succession of refined theories emerged. Cummins (1978b) developed the developmental interdependence hypothesis according to which a child’s competence in the second language is partly dependent on the level of competence developed in the first. The less competence in L1, the more difficult it will be to achieve proficiency in the second language.
Alongside this, in order to avoid hasty judgments regarding the language competence of students at schools, Cummins (1984b), made a distinction between the terms BICS (which stands for Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) and CALP (which stands for Cognitive / Academic Language Proficiency). CALP refers to academic, context reduced situations where language is extracted (meaning that it stands on its own to convey meaning) and signaled, in essence, the integration of language and content in second language instruction. On the contrary, BICS can be found in context embedded situations where cues and clues are used to support verbal language. Therefore, they are much easier to perform- that is, cues that are used when producing or interpreting messages, other than the main language used, include gestures, intonation patterns, visual supports, or facial expressions (Manitoba Education, 2006). Another attribute of context embeddedness is that participants can negotiate meaning: they can repeat, rephrase, ask for clarification or manipulate the topic as they wish, whereas in more academic language, such contextual supports are rare (Manitoba Education, 2006). What is of utmost importance for Cummins though, is that ‘minority children’ must have the Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP) well developed before entering the classroom, since academic skills, prior knowledge and cognitive proficiency are deeply connected. This way, they will be able to cope with curriculum processes- especially when they are called upon to learn an additional language, and the learning outcomes will be nothing more than positive. Cummins’s theory intersects with Krashen’s theory, since they both emphasize the role context plays in making input comprehensible. Language proficiency of EAL learners could therefore be examined, from an instructional perspective, through Cummins’s Quadrant Model (see Appendix B, p. 233) according to which quadrant A includes BICs which might refer to everyday language. Academic language, which is cognitively demanding, and context reduced is represented in quadrant D. It is therefore obvious that moving directly from quadrant A to quadrant D, which is the goal of language teachers, would be more than difficult (Manitoba Education, 2006). The preferred way is to have transitional stages for students which are represented by quadrants B and C. In quadrant B tasks are context reduced but cognitively undemanding- therefore, they are within learners’ abilities whereas in quadrant C, contextual support is provided to learners (diagrams, pictures, objects).
3.5 Approaches and methodologies that have influenced the design of the study

The design of the research was guided by a sociocultural framework, which encompasses a set of premises on the nature of knowledge and learning as well as literacy and practices related to education. In particular, constructivism, which has two major strands- the cognitive development of Piaget and the sociocultural theory of Vygotsky, constitutes the overarching theoretical framework of the research. Both strands- although slightly differentiated- are based on specific assumptions about reality, knowledge, and learning and agree on the pivotal role that interaction plays on the facilitation of learning. This means that learning is socially and culturally constructed. Apart from the cognitive development of human beings, there are meaning making processes and negotiations that are influenced by students’ active engagement and social interactions in their construction of knowledge (Kumpulainen, & Wray, 2002; Kim, 2001). This perspective is closely related to many contemporary theories, most important of which are the developmental theories of Vygotsky and Bruner, and Bandura's social cognitive theory (Shunk, 2000, as cited in Kim, 2001). More specifically, from Vygotsky, who emphasized the importance of culture and context in understanding, we can get the apprenticeship, the collaboration and group work. Piaget’s developmental theory, on the other hand, promotes a more holistic approach, according to which learning occurs through reading, listening, exploration and experience and involves the processes of assimilation, accommodation, active learning, and equilibrium (Kaufman, 2004). Both theories are based on the premise that people create their own meaning through experience (Aljohani, 2017) and learning (cognition) is the result of constructing mental images (Bada, 2015)- a view which is in sharp contrast with the passive transmission and assimilation of knowledge on the part of the learners. Piaget and Vygotsky’s theory are supported by Bruner’s cognitive theory which supported that the learning process is based on interpersonal, inter-subjective, collaborative processes and explored themes such as the role of parents’ input and the scaffolding when acquiring linguistic forms. Also, Dewey’s (1997) social constructivism theory (which touched upon students’ experiences and knowledge from their social backgrounds and surroundings) and Weimer’s (2013) learner-centered teaching theory, align with the constructivist approach. Both believed that
students are unique as far as their past and present experiences are concerned as well as their social and cultural backgrounds. Therefore, it stands to reason that educators must take into account each individual’s distinct characteristics when designing curriculum that is both meaningful and applicable. Further, Weimer (2013) posited five key teaching areas to ensure that learners are in the centre of instruction in a foreign classroom: teachers use curriculum content in such a way that will help students build metacognitive ability and focus on learning- not grading- by providing learners with various forms of feedback and using different forms of assessment. They also respect the individuality and each student’s uniqueness and try to use extrinsic motivation less in order to increase their intrinsic learning. Learners’ motivation and enthusiasm are increased when learners take control of their learning and are helped by the teacher to discover information and content on their own. Related to this, teacher-centered instruction is neither negative nor fully rejected. Teachers are to purely give students an idea of the process of the course and its content, not the material that can be used (Weimer, 2013, as cited in Itwaru, 2017). In short, the connection of the lessons created by the teachers and the learners must convey positive messages, since the learner-centered teaching encompasses an understanding of students’ languages, cultures and experiences, and supports constructivist pedagogy (Mvududu & Thiel-Burgess, 2012, as cited in Itwaru, 2017).

What is more, Driscoll (2000, as cited in Bada, 2015), asserts that knowledge is not associated with the real world, because the learners perceive the world differently and construct mental models of the real world from their own perspective. However, according to Jonassen (1994, as cited in Bada, 2015), a constructivist approach does not oblige students to “reinvent the wheel” but rather helps them become engaged in the real, practical world by hypothesizing, testing, being taught the main ideas and then deriving the detail. In short, it could be argued that the basic premises of constructivism deal with knowledge as a construction and learning as an active process and portrays learners as active creators who apply and elaborate on existing understandings and personal experiences.

3.6 Principles of Constructivist Learning / Teaching
One of the basic tenets of constructivist learning is that it is an active process. Over the years, the learners’ academic, affective and social growth as a result of
constructivism have been repeatedly documented, highlighting their individual development which is at the core of instruction (Brooks, 2002; Brooks & Brooks, 1993; Duckworth, 1987; Fosnot, 1993, 1996; Gabel, 1994; Sigel & Cocking, 1977; Tobin, 1993; Tobin et al., 1994; Wheatley, 1991, as cited in Kaufman, 2004). In this sense, learning is interactive, building on what the learner already knows or can use and knowledge is seen as dynamic and constantly changing according to these experiences. Learners’ ideas about how things work play a major role, because they try to explain what they encounter and are able to fix if they find any flaws. Instructional models based on social constructivism do not promote strict adherence to fixed curricula, textbooks, or workbooks. Instead, learning is interactive and the focus shifts from teachers to students making the latter eligible to raise questions and construct knowledge based on their personal interests (Bada, 2015). According to Kaufman (2004, p. 305), the constructivist experience allows learners to “engage in hands-on, minds-on manipulation of raw data in quest of identifying new and increasingly complex patterns, acquisition of novel concepts and construction of new understandings.”

Apart from the high interest in English language learners through the integration of various approaches that underscore their centrality, there has also been a dramatic increase in the reconceptualization of language teachers due to the growth of linguistic and ethnic diversity. In particular, greater emphasis has been placed on the sociocultural practices in preparing them as emerging professionals in both EFL and ESL contexts (Pearson Casanave, & Schecter, 1997, as cited in Kaufman, 2004). In order to understand models of instruction that are rooted in (social) constructivism, it is necessary to acknowledge the premises that underline it. Teaching cannot be viewed as a mere transmission of knowledge (Hoover, 1996). Rather, the teacher functions as a facilitator, guide or negotiator who shares its ‘authority’ with the students (Tam, 2000) and directs the students who work as a group in the process of learning. In line with this, the social context that learners bring to their learning environment can greatly affect the extent to which someone learns (Gredler, 1997; Wertch, 1991, as cited in Kim, 2001). All the symbol systems such as culture or language that have accompanied a learner throughout their life along with the learner’s social interaction with knowledgeable people in order to develop their thinking abilities can have an impact on learning. According to social constructivism, if it weren’t for a knowledgeable expert or a peer to engage in
interactions, then meaningful learning wouldn’t be facilitated. This is referred to as the zone of proximal development (ZPD) which indicates different learners’ perspectives to analyze, synthesize or regulate their own learning when interacting with peers or instructors and their readiness to learn. According to Kim (2001, p. 7), “the ZPD is the actual distance between the development level as determined by the independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under a ‘more knowledgeable other (MKO)’”. Based on Vygotskian constructivism, students who struggle and are helped (scaffolded) by a peer or a tutor will stop relying on a MKO on condition they work through ZPD levels. This way the amount of help will gradually be reduced, and the help provided will be gradually rendered unnecessary. Teachers are the ones to observe the learners’ ZPD and design the authentic, meaningful, and appropriate tasks for them. The students’ propulsion to the construction of higher levels of understanding comes from the teachers themselves who manifest the need for them to pursue diverse paths, engage actively and be externally and internally scaffolded. Internal scaffolding has students reflect and monitor themselves in order to acquire concepts more successfully, whereas external scaffolding helps learners acquire knowledge by breaking down tasks and making them more comprehensible, providing feedback, coaching, modelling and also passing on responsibility to learners for their learning (Kaufman, 2004). Oxford (1997, p. 448) also highlighted the need for guiding the student from what is formerly known to what is to be known and when “the learner requires less help, the teacher slowly removes the no longer needed scaffolding that props up the learner, and the learner becomes increasingly self-directed and self-empowered.”

What is more, if learning is based on prior knowledge, teachers are challenged to create learning environments consisting of different experiences that might entail different current levels of understandings that should be brought to the forefront for the construction of the learners’ new knowledge (Hoover, 1996). To help students compare their understandings, redirect their prior knowledge and develop it further, teachers employ the strategy of collaboration or interaction among students to encourage the contact among pupils. This way, and given ample time to deal with such procedures, current understandings will be more closely checked, revised and perceived otherwise. Also, clear communication of the concepts in the classroom is facilitated, both in writing and verbally and when the
learners are able to communicate meaningfully enough, they have truly integrated new knowledge (Aljohani, 2017). According to Aljohani (2017), another feature of a constructivist teacher is the provision of assistance to learners to help them deeply understand their own cognitive processes (metacognition) by analyzing, creating or organizing during tasks. Finally, learners’ responses are highly appreciated, incorporated in the classroom, and used in the planning of forthcoming lessons.

Hence, from a constructivist perspective, the techniques a teacher uses in a CLD classroom, might not be effective for everyone but they might be a way to make material more relevant to such students. Learners make sense of all the information they perceive, are taught to assess how they are helped, gain understanding and lastly by questioning themselves and their strategies, they learn how to learn in a conducive -to-them- learning environment. As Honebein (1996, as cited in Bada, 2015) asserts, the ideal constructivist learning environment is one in which multiple perspectives and voices thrive; one which provides experience with as well as awareness of the knowledge construction process, allowing students to determine the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of their learning by being provided with various modes of representation; one which values metacognition and reflection, social experiences, collaboration and realistic contexts. In the same line, Brooks and Brooks, 1993, as cited in Bada, 2015) define a constructivist teacher as someone who encourages thoughtful inquiries and seeks elaboration of students’ queries, assess their understanding and promotes initiative as well as learner autonomy by using open –structured tasks. Also, a successful constructivist teacher is someone who uses a plethora of materials offered to help students learn and provide them with ample time to construct meanings or create metaphors. In the constructivist classroom, although information is initially given, it is the students who own what they know, what they use and what they learn, since understanding cannot be imposed and therefore learning is a personal construction of knowledge as a result of personal explorations and quests.

3.7 Constructivism in the EFL classroom
constructivist point of view. Although there are major differences regarding the theoretical background of both approaches, they come to similar conclusions when it comes to teaching and learning practice. Generally, social constructivism emphasizes that both teachers and students play a role in facilitating knowledge, and positioning learners in the limelight. Constructivism aims to develop independent, active learners who build up on their own knowledge, characterized by their readiness to pursue knowledge. Suhendi and Purwarno (2018) conclude that constructivism pays tribute to holistic approaches to teaching and learning, learner autonomy and rich learning environments. However, when actually applying constructivism to teaching, some specific constructivist principles oriented to foreign language can be discerned. Wendt (1996, as cited in Reinfried, 2000) pinpoints the most basic ones (see Appendix C, p.234). According to the researcher, one of the main tenets in the constructivist approach to language teaching is that it is action oriented. Learner centered theories and cooperative learning, along with learning by teaching, free creations and accomplishments of projects are key features. Another essential principle is that learners are autonomous and individualized. According to Dieter Wolff (1990, 1994, 1997, 2002a, 2002b as cited in Suhendi & Purwarno, 2018), ‘construction’ is something ‘pragmatic’ and recognizing reality is something possible, although it is considered an individual process. Therefore, in this sense, knowledge is constructed in the interaction between existing, prior knowledge (schemata) and environmental influences (stimuli). Learners are the ones to opt for the materials given by the teacher having being instructed beforehand the appropriate strategies to use to their own advantage. This learning awareness- on the part of the students, will be worthwhile if it is supported by both language awareness and intercultural awareness (Aljohani, 2017). Finally, the holistic language experience referring to content- oriented foreign language teaching constitutes a core principle, especially in bilingual classes or when students are assigned projects. According to Wendt (1996, as cited in Reinfried, 2000), foreign language acquisition will be effective in complex and authentic scenarios or learning contexts. Another important notion of constructivism in foreign language teaching is that it should be actively implemented (Reinfried, 2000), in natural discourse settings where students would engage in authentic tasks and interact through group work and cooperative learning (Selinker, 1972, as cited in Gul, 2016). Gul (2016), for instance, observed several teachers in the classroom
and noticed that those who used constructivist teaching methods enhanced students’ imagination and creativity, improved English comprehension and engaged in teamwork willingly, proving this way that constructivist approaches in EFL teaching are far more prolific than traditional teaching approaches.

Other studies that prove that constructivism does provide a strong second/foreign language environment, conducive to its acquisition include those of Meredith (2003) Can (2009), Jin (2011), Kao (2010), as well as that of Yang and Wilson (2006, pp. 367-370). Meredith (2003), in her study “Current philosophy and practice in ESL/EFL reading education: An analysis”, maintained that research supported the use of constructivist methods in the acquisition of reading and writing skills in English language learners. Taking the learners’ personal experiences and background as a starting point, she proposed a constructivist approach in reading as an interactive process between the readers and the texts in a student-centered, text-rich environment that would be moderated by the teacher at the same time. She also acknowledged the lack of a single magic method for successful teaching but she urged teachers to evaluate and develop any teaching strategy “according to the considerations of a constructivist Whole Language approach to English reading instruction” (Meredith, 2003, p. 15). The proponents of the Whole Language approach assert that learning is enhanced when language instruction is holistic and used for real purposes for language users and expressing personal meanings. Also, learning is successful when students have ownership over the curriculum and when classroom projects or activities are transactional and collaborative, without of course excluding teachers, who “can draw upon a variety of instructional styles to meet their learners’ needs” (Manitoba Education, 2006, p. 23). Can (2009, p. 60) in his study ‘Learning and teaching languages online: A Constructivist approach’, studied foreign language teaching and learning through the recent advances in technology and acknowledged the constructivist approach with its assumptions about learning and knowledge, multiple perspectives, modes of learning as well as the complexity of learning environments. In particular, he explained that in such learning environments the constructivist approaches in foreign language teaching would not only enhance the learners’ language, social, interactive and communicative skills, but also their own autonomy, making them into more responsible, confident and pro-active individuals -a goal dictated by the Common European Framework for Teaching and Learning of Languages, as well (Driscoll,
Lin (2011, p. 14-16), in her article ‘Constructivism-Application in Oral English Teaching to Non-English Majors’, described the constructivist theory and its implications for oral teaching of non-English majors in China. In this study, she identified limited time allocated to the non-English language learners, limited exposure to input of western cultural background information and also lack of confidence and motivation which resulted in their negation either to express their ideas or collaborate / negotiate with their classmates. In response to these problems, she proposed student-centered classes with teachers being the guides throughout the teaching process. According to the author, teachers should help learners expand their vocabulary, arousing their interest and motivating them to be more active by giving them immediate feedback and empowering them to use affective strategies. Also, teachers should encourage learners to learn the language through self-discovery, provide them with extra, even out-of-the classroom, time and expose them to the target country’s culture so as to facilitate foreign language acquisition. She therefore postulates that constructivism helps the teachers develop various situational contexts for non-English learners and make adjustments to meet their needs successfully. The learners, through the guidance of their teachers, will not only improve their speaking skills, but will also learn and practice cooperation and improve their English proficiency. Kao (2010), in ‘Examining Second Language Learning in a Socio-cultural Stance’, uses the construct terms of mediation, ZPD, scaffolding and self-regulation to explain the relevance of sociocultural approaches to second language learning. In particular, regarding mediation, Vygotsky (1981, as cited in Kao, 2010) states that it refers to the use of certain ‘tools’, one of which is language, that help mediate children’s learning, improve their abilities and control their physical and mental behavior. Learning is mediated not only through the use of psychological tools (language, various resources, technologies), but it is also dependent on interaction, considering students as active learners who engage themselves in co-constructing experiences with others. Also, each student’s interaction with people (either adults or significant others) and their environments activates learning in the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), internalizes the learning process and then eventually constructs development (Kao, 2010, p.120). Therefore, as Mitchell and Myles (2004, as cited in Kao, 2010) emphasize, all learning is first seen as social, then individual, first inter-mental and then intra-
mental. In this sense, learners construct their own learning environment through their own personal choices and operations. In relation to ZPD, self-regulation involves learners “in a process of increasing capacity to formulate plans of action, master and control their own behavior, verbalizing their plans and goals, generalizing skills to new situations and, learning how to communicate and think” (Harvard, 1997, as cited in Kao, 2010). Finally, any kind of scaffolding obtained within a learner’s ZPD, helps construct the zone during the learning process and reach the state of self-regulation (Kao, 2010, p. 121-2). Wood et al., (1976, as cited in Kao, 2010, p. 122) suggest recruiting interest in the lesson, simplifying the tasks and maintaining the goals set. Also, marking possible discrepancies and demonstrating the idealized versions of the acts to be performed or even controlling frustration in solving problems are considered ways to help scaffolding be applied in various contexts. In line with this, Donato (as cited in Kao, 2010) supports group work, mutual assistance among learners and provision of a variety of learning tasks / environments, whereas Swain (200, as cited in Kao, 2010) favors collaborative dialogues as mediators of second/foreign language learning. Therefore, Vygotsky’s socio-cultural theories provide perspectives according to which language teachers promote learners’ meaningful learning and intrinsic motivation, considering learning as a social practice and learners themselves as active participants in constructing their learning.

Yang and Wilson (2006), who focused specifically on the teaching of reading in an EFL classroom, found that social constructivist practices could be translated into action for successful teaching. This could be achieved if teachers provided a context and purpose for reading, so as to assist the learners’ ability to read constructively, and also model the teaching practices they would want their students to adopt (use a modified version of the read-aloud technique, relating one text to another, asking questions, guessing the meaning of words, skimming or scanning). Regarding questions, text awareness rather than context awareness questions should be preferred so as to enable learners to become independent readers, without ‘imposing’ a ready-made answer on them. Also, raising awareness of the authors behind texts could help students understand the range of different purposes for writing and employ some writing techniques in their own writings. Therefore, students should be free to work independently, according to their own interests, always being scaffolded, before or during individual or group tasks, either
by the teacher or by peers “as a step to unleash them from the teacher-fronted classroom” (Yang & Wilson, 2006, p. 369). Finally, authentic macro tasks (involving a reading component) can provide a very good framework to motivate students to work independently by integrating all four macro skills and can even become more efficient if the Web comes in both as a reading material and as a publishing tool. From the aforementioned techniques, the social constructivist approach to reading, offers useful strategies for EFL teachers to have learners actively participate in text events and have them enter into interactive dialogues between the texts and their authors (Yang & Wilson, p. 370). In Lew’s (2010, as cited in Itwaru, 2017) research it was found that when teachers apply constructivist pedagogy the results for culturally and linguistically diverse learners are positive, a finding which is in line with Mvududu and Thiel-Burgess (2012, as cited in Itwaru, 2017). The latter educators contend that constructivist approaches to teaching provide diverse learners with the opportunity to be active, responsible individuals, personally involved when learning at their own pace and according to their level. To them, as to all the aforementioned researchers, constructivist strategies that create content which is engaging for and relevant to culturally and linguistically diverse learners, cannot be nothing but effective and appropriate for all students.

Generally speaking, language is seen as a means of “doing” things with words rather than a set of static rules (Canale & Swain, 1980; Widdowson, 1978, 1983, as cited in Tallowitz, 2008), and the language learner learns the language in order to become a competent member of a certain speech community (Hymes, 1972). Also, the concept of authentic texts -as an alternative to the traditional audio-lingual approach, where linguistic forms can be acquired where they typically appear, is an important characteristic of constructivist approaches in foreign language teaching. Structure practice and rote learning is not enough in a foreign classroom. The foreign language learning process should be action based and the students should be able to practice anything they are learning through real-life-based activities (Gul, 2016). Laba (2014, as cited in Gul, 2016) testified in a study on ESL learners, that students showed more interest and learned better through authentic material. Also, learner-centeredness as well as task-based language teaching are given special importance as ways to achieve individual and experiential learning accordingly (Tallowitz, 2008). Nunan, 2004; Prabhu, 1987; Skehan, 1998b, (as cited in Tallowitz, 2008), maintain that using the language in meaning-focused
and interactive tasks will eventually lead to language acquisition. Therefore, according to Tallowitz (2008) the most prevalent constructivist principles (collaborative dialogue, learner goals, scaffolding, communicative activity, learner-centeredness, authenticity, and task-based learning) had been implicitly present in communicative foreign language teaching for the last two decades and can well be subsumed under a constructivist perspective. “The value of constructivist epistemology for foreign language education lies in its explanatory, legitimizing and justificatory power” (Reagan, 1999; von Glasersfeld, 1995a, as cited in Tallowitz, 2008, p. 24).

Generally speaking, although constructivism has not played a visible role in language pedagogy over the last few years, its basic notions and premises have been integrated into language pedagogy, incorporating this way various educational approaches that highlight the diversity of learners and their active engagement in both individual and collective educational pursuits (Kaufman, 2004, as cited in Aljohani, 2017). According to Dantas (2007), situated learning experiences which are guided by socio-culturally driven theories help the social and intercultural capital as well as the deficit beliefs to be re-examined. They thus “provide a frame to make visible cultural and multiple literacy practices in and out of the classroom and across contexts, and for teachers to engage in /with rich spaces that disrupt ordinary assumptions and require the development of new repertoire of actions” (p.92).

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, the main conceptual frameworks chosen for the study were presented in detail. More analytically, the theory of constructivism, along with its underlying principles and implications for foreign language teaching constituted the cornerstone of the research. The next two chapters focus on the presentation as well as the discussion of the data collected.
CHAPTER 4: Methodology

Introduction
The previous chapter provided information regarding the theoretical foundations that permeate the whole thesis. This chapter focuses on the theoretical framework and the concepts that were useful for the implementation and analysis of this research.

Undoubtedly the key to a successful research lies in methodology. In the complex field of multicultural education in particular, “no one measure alone can sufficiently capture [its] complexity” (Ladson-Billings, 1995, p. 237). According to Nunan (1992), research is “a systematic process of inquiry consisting of three elements or components. The first one is a process of formulating questions, problems or hypotheses. The second one includes collecting data or evidence relevant to these questions/ problems/hypotheses. Finally, the last component is analyses and interpretation of data” (Nunan, 1992, pp. 2-3). Based on this definition, this chapter refers to the methodological procedures that were used to collect and analyze the data required for this thesis. First, the selected research approach and design will be presented along with the tools used. In particular, the mixed method approach will be discussed, and references will be made to the target population - sample, the quantitative and quantitative data collection tools, as well as anything related to the analysis of the research data. Furthermore, the selected process to conduct the research as well as the sequence of actions completed to ensure its reliability and validity, will be presented.

4.1 Selecting the research design: The mixed methods approach

The purpose of the study was to look into the current status of multi / intercultural education in Greece related to foreign language teaching and focus on the various strategies foreign language teachers employ which prove to be conducive to their own teaching context. For this reason, a questionnaire for the target population, which concerned English language teachers working in the public Primary schools in the Western part of Greece, was developed as well as a set of questions for semi-structured interviews.

In the research study there is a substantial element of both quantitative and qualitative data. Using two or even more combining methods of collecting data is
referred to as ‘mixed methods’ design. However, as they might not only involve combining methods but also using different research strategies, they are also referred to as multi-strategy designs (Robson, & McCartan, 2016).

Mixed methods, as a research paradigm, has emerged from the 1990’s onwards and has been given various terms, such as integrating, synthesis, quantitative and qualitative methods, multimethod, and multi-methodology, but more recent writings use the term “mixed methods” (Tashakkori & Teddlle, 2003, as cited in Creswell, 2003, p. 241).

The defining characteristics of such methodology include an explicit manner in which the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the research relate to each other and also a clear specification concerning the sequencing and priority given to the quantitative and qualitative elements of the data collection and analysis (Robson & McCartan, 2016). Also, when considering the use of mixed methods research, Guyton and Wesche (2005, p. 26) assert that one of the goals of using mixed methods is the “triangulation of measures, which is the best way to determine a person’s multicultural perspective”, indicating thus the richness and depth of data and the provided insight and stronger inferences offered by this approach, which is not clearly articulated when using either approach alone.

Another aim of multi-strategy design is to “expand an understanding from one method to another” (Creswell, 2003, p. 240) and draw from the strong points of both methods while minimizing the respective potential weaknesses. What is more, mixed methods approaches are conducive to getting research approaches together so as to produce a more thorough picture of the topic, addressing several questions or even refining the existing ones or helping researchers “deal with complex phenomena and situations” in real world settings (Bryman, 2006a, as cited in Robson & McCartan, 2016, p. 179). However, in order for that design to be successful, some factors should be taken into consideration. First, time is an issue, since the two different components require a lot of time and in most cases, time is allocated unevenly. Secondly, a researcher should ensure that the study integrates the quantitative and qualitative data and that the latter really have a significant effect on the study (Robson & McCartan, 2016).

The mixed methods approach could be defined as the approach which enables the researcher to collect and analyze data, incorporate the findings and draw conclusions, using both quantitative and qualitative approaches in an individual
study. Characteristics of this approach include a) the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data, in response to research questions, b) the combination of the two data forms and their results, c) the organization of the procedures for conducting the study in a logical sequence and finally d) the frames of these procedures within the theory and philosophy. The choice of the type of a particular mixed methods approach depends primarily on the subject under research (Creswell & Plano, 2018).

More specifically, the use of mixed methods approach is of high importance, as it offers a deeper awareness of the research problem and helps control or even complement the results collected through both the quantitative and qualitative approach. In addition, the reliability and accuracy of the research is emphasized (Robson, 2010) to a great extent. Patton (1999), comparing the use in research of mono-methodological approaches and multi-methodological approaches, states that the former make the research more exposed to errors, while the latter provide greater validity. The noticeable difference between the two lies in the fact that through the multi-methodological approaches to research, data is checked by cross-referencing it from different methods or data from different sources, within the same research.

Qualitative data provides an in-depth understanding of an issue, while quantitative data provides a more general understanding. The understanding through the qualitative approach stems from the study of some individuals exploring their perspectives in depth, whereas the understanding through the quantitative approach stems from examining many people and evaluating their responses through variables. Both qualitative and quantitative research offer different perspectives and have specific limitations. For example, when researchers study a few individuals through a qualitative approach, then it is not possible to generalize to many individuals. In order for this to happen, the deductive approach should be employed along with heightened critical thought and creativity (Maykut & Morehouse 1994; Miles & Huberman 1994, as cited in Griva & Stamou, 2014). In the event that researchers investigate a topic through the quantitative approach, then there is the possibility of generalization, but the understanding of all aspects of a particular subject is reduced significantly. Therefore, the limitations of one method can serve as an offset to the advantages of the other. Moreover, the combination of quantitative and qualitative data provides a more complete understanding of the
research problem compared to each of them separately, a feature of the mixed methods approach which constitutes one of its main advantages (Creswell, 2016; Creswell & Plano, 2018).

In the mixed methods approach, the researcher can use any data collection tool, not limited to the exclusive use of tools related to either the quantitative or the qualitative approach and it becomes way easier to find answers that might not have been possible if only one approach had been used. It also bridges the gap that has existed for several years between quantitative and qualitative approach, offering a multiple global view of the real world (Creswell & Plano, 2018). Robson and McCartan (2016) cited Mason (2006), who states that in the real world and in everyday life, it is possible to create practical, political, and economic issues, which will impose certain constraints and set other processes.

In the research under question the reason for adopting a multi-strategy design was the need to explain the data generated from a quantitative survey further, in an attempt to gain a deeper understanding of the findings obtained and elaborate on them. In particular, the sequential explanatory design was chosen for this study, which contains two phases: first, the collection and analysis of quantitative data (questionnaire) followed by the collection and analysis of the qualitative data (one-on-one interviews). First the researcher opted for “a numeric description of trends, attitudes or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population” (Creswell, 2003, p. 174) so that the researcher is allowed to make generalizations through the qualitative research, while the data from the interviews were used to build “patterns, categories and themes” (Creswell, 2007, 2010, as cited in Hardy, 2014, p. 75)

Explanatory mixed methods design (Creswell, 2009, as cited in Hardy, 2014)
The priority is typically given to the quantitative data and “the two methods are integrated during the interpretation phase of the study” (Creswell, 2014, p. 245). The main purpose of this design is to use qualitative results to assist in interpreting the findings of a primarily quantitative study, especially “when unexpected results arise” (Morse, 1991, in Creswell, 2014, p. 245). Such a design is free from ambiguity and easy to implement because it consists of two separate stages and is also easy to analyze when the data come together in the conclusion (Creswell, 2014). In the research under discussion, it was used for a more detailed understanding of the relationships among the variables regarding the preferable strategies that teachers employ in a linguistically and culturally diverse classroom. In addition to this, light was shed on the teachers’ challenges and aspirations which were combined with their initial preferences for a more complete picture of EFL strategies and practices in the Greek educational context. Consequently, for the present study it was deemed appropriate that the multi-faceted approach was ideal because we were going to deal with in-service English teachers and because of the fact that the field is characterized by special dynamics. In more detail, the use of a multi-faceted approach includes the completion of a questionnaire within the context of the quantitative approach, as well as semi-structured interviews in the context of the qualitative approach. The aim of the utilization of multiple methods is the control of the quantitative data using the qualitative data (Robson, 2010).

4.2 Selecting the instruments of data collection

The data collection methods and the specific tools used were appropriate to the general methodological stance. These data collecting techniques included a self-constructed questionnaire and semi structured interviews.

4.2.1 Questionnaire

Questionnaires are tools for collecting data and are widely used by researchers. They focus on collecting data from individuals, exploring their views on various issues, phenomena, or other subjects. The design of the tool and its implementation are necessary features for a research (Robson & McCartan, 2016).

The questions contained in the questionnaire need to be formulated in such a way that the answer to the research questions is easily extracted. A “good”
The questionnaire should not only provide a valid scale for answering the research questions, but at the same time it should promote the cooperation between the researcher and the participant. Moreover, it is important that the information be accurate, depending on the configuration of the questionnaire. It is also important for the researcher to formulate the questions in such a way that the participant can fully understand exactly what they are interested in being informed, is happy to complete it and at the same time the questions remain close to the research purpose. The language used in the questions is deemed necessary to be understandable and clear to the respondents. For the researcher, the formulation of the questions contained in the questionnaire is crucial, as they can, through the formulation, modify one of their research questions, based on perspectives that they had not seen before or had not considered useful for their research (Robson & McCartan, 2016). Therefore, self-completion questionnaires (of a self-completion format), as used in this research, require, not only the participant to understand the questions, but also need careful wording for the smooth development of the whole process. Especially in the form of self-completing questionnaires, this prerequisite is crucial given that individuals complete the questionnaire on their own and the researcher cannot provide further instructions or clarifications. Therefore, the completion process is vital not to be characterized by great difficulty. This is the reason why it is important in such questionnaires to limit open-ended questions and avoid long-term analyses. Finally, another distinctive feature of a “good” questionnaire would be the potential answers to be characterized by a) accuracy, b) analyticity, c) selectivity and d) one-dimensional approach (Robson & McCartan, 2016).

The questionnaire of this research had been designed and developed for almost a year. All the items on the questionnaire constitute “borrowing questions from already established tools” (Dörney, 2003, p. 52). In particular, the development of the questionnaire was guided by instruments previously used. First and foremost, Oxford’s (1990) Strategy Inventory for language learning (SILL) was used, which is one of the most widely used data collection instrument in second/foreign language learning research. Oxford’s SILL is organized into six strategy groups, including memory, cognitive, compensation, meta-cognitive, affective and social strategies, in conjunction with the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) instructional model. Then, a document of
High Impact Teaching Strategies by the state of Victoria (Department of Education and Training- HITS) was included. The questionnaire was also constructed by taking into account Marzano’s (2001) high yield strategies (2009) and some projects that have either been implemented or are currently in progress, including the Milton Keynes Ethnic Minority Achievement Support Service –(that works towards the Support of Pupils with English as an Additional Language), and NALDIC- (National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum, from which some principles which underpin good practice for diverse learners were retrieved). Because of the proliferation of strategies in the literature, all of the items were carefully chosen, reviewed and adapted before being distributed for the pilot study. Generally, since several strategies were repeated in more than one strategy grids, I opted for the most representative ones for diverse leaners that are more inclusive for foreign language teaching and can refer to more than one modality, incorporating all four skills.

The questionnaire includes five distinct parts: the first deals with demographic data and consists of closed- ended questions that limit the answer to the options provided on the questionnaire, followed at times by contingency questions that need to be answered on the condition that the respondents provide a particular response to a question prior to them. The other parts of the questionnaire- which make use of the scaling technique of the Likert Scale, concern 1) the organization and evaluation of teaching strategies and EAL students’ learning, 2) EAL pupils’ recalling information, 3) managing learners’ emotions along with promoting cooperative learning and finally the last part deals with 4) EAL pupils’ mental processes and missing knowledge.

Since "tests of practicability must play a crucial role in questionnaire construction" (Moser & Kalton, 1971, p. 350, as cited in Dörney, 2003), the questionnaire was piloted in a systematic way, by a pilot group that was asked to go through the items and provide feedback before being administered. Then, the items underwent an item analysis. The questionnaire (see Appendix D, p. 235) was finally administered by mail to headmasters, after selecting certain English teachers randomly through the SPSS. In particular, it was sent to headmasters, who in turn forwarded it to the English teachers. Due to the absence of a live contact person, the questionnaire was accompanied by a carefully written cover letter which
communicated the purpose and significance of the survey and provided respondents with certain important information (see Appendix E, p. 244). Moreover, respondents were provided with a contact name and telephone number in case questions or matters of clarification arose. The questionnaire was resent in the form of a kind reminder and due to the low response rate, the researcher visited several school units, providing the respondents with the questionnaire printed along with an attached stamped addressed envelope, for reasons of respecting privacy and anonymity. Yet, the response rate remained low, which might be attributed to either lack of time or interest on the part of the respondents.

The quantitative data analysis (i.e., the descriptive and inferential statistics), was computed using the statistical package for Social Sciences (SPSS 24) while the Software Microsoft Office Excel program was used for the presentation of the graphs. The nominal variables were represented using percentages and frequencies, while the scale variables were presented using the mean estimator, standard deviation, minimum and maximum value. Also, the factor analysis through the varimax method was used to extract the various components from the dimensions of the search (see Appendix F, p.246). The KMO coefficient concerning the Factor Analysis was satisfying in any case (>0,8). Multiple regression analysis has also been used to examine the effect of independent variables on a dependent. The Null hypothesis of the model is that there is no effect and the alternative is that there is. Moreover, the Normality was tested using the Shapiro Wilk test. The Null hypothesis is that the do not follow the normal distribution and the alternative is that they do. In order to test correlations between scale variables that do not follow the normal distribution, the Spearman coefficient was used; the Null coefficient is that variables are linear correlated, and the alternative is that they are not. Significance was set at 5%. Also, the Mean differences of scale variables between 2 samples was tested using the independent samples t-test. The Null hypothesis is that mean values are equal, and the alternative is that they differ. Finally, the Null hypothesis was accepted if p-value≥0,05, while rejected when p-value<0,05 (Field, 2009).

4.2.2 Semi structured interviews
Conducting interviews, which essentially helps the researcher develop a research further by formulating questions and receiving answers from the interviewees, is widely used in social inquiry. Regarding the various types of interviews, the most
usual distinction concerns structured, semi-structured and unstructured interviews. In the semi-structured interviews, which is the case here, the researcher has a guide, which serves as a checklist of topics that need to be fully addressed and contains a predefined wording as well as a set of questions. Moreover, in such interviews with a less strict structure, although the interviewee is able to answer with greater flexibility, the wording and order of the questions can be modified based on the flow of the interview. What is more, unanswered questions might be asked by the researcher in order to follow the flow of the interviewee (Robson & McCartan, 2016) and achieve coherence and smooth transition from one question to another.

Regarding the advantages of interviews, as research tools for the research data collection, they not only have the potential to provide rich and highly enlightening material, but they also allow for non-verbal elements which can communicate messages to the researcher by enlightening the verbal response. What is more, the modification of questions according to the flow of the process and the ability of the researcher to focus on important points, makes interviews highly flexible and adaptable tools (Robson & McCartan, 2016).

In light of the above, the second tool used was semi-structured interviews with twelve interviewees selected from all three prefectures at random. The interviews involved general open-ended questions that intended to elicit opinions on specific topics and although the interviews had been pre-scheduled and the subjects had been contacted much earlier, only three interviews were conducted face to face, the rest of them were actually conducted over the telephone, due to lack of time on the part of both the researcher and the interviewees.

At first, a kind of protocol was held, which included “a heading, instructions to the interviewer (opening statements), the key research questions (see Appendix G, p.249), probes to follow key questions, transition messages for the interviewer, space for recording the interviewer’s comments, and space in which the researcher records reflective notes” (Creswell, 2003, p.216), which was not needed whatsoever. The information was recorded using audio taping, transcribed (for the interview transcriptions, see Appendix H, p.250) using intelligent verbatim transcription, that is avoiding irrelevant fillers as much as possible and then “the detailed analysis began using a coding process” (Creswell, 2003, p.218). Following Tesch's (1990, as cited in Creswell, 2003, p. 219) eight steps of qualitative data
analysis, the data was analyzed in a structured manner. First, this process had the interviewer read all the transcriptions over and over again so as to grasp the general sense and jot down impromptu ideas as initial notes. At this point, sentences that answered or even touched upon the research questions were identified and determined as units of the analysis, referring to the ‘deduction of the results’, as a process of reasoning (Griva & Stamou, 2014). Then, the data were organized into “chunks”, that is a list of main topics (Rossman & Rallis, 1998, p. 171, as cited in Creswell, 2003, p. 218), based on the language of the participants. These “chunks” were actually segmented sentences or terms that were labelled as specific ‘codes’ which should be interrelated so as to fall under the same category (Papadopoulou, 2000, as cited in Griva & Stamou, 2014), addressing specific topics or sub-topics. This ‘coding’ generated a small number of themes or sub-themes for the research study, which were described and finally infused into the quantitative data to yield the result. The whole procedure is referred to as ‘thematic analysis’ (TA), which is an approach classically described by Braun and Clarke (2006). After having created the codes as a way to understand the data, the next step was creating “themes”, which consist of a set of codes, and “capture a common, recurring pattern across a dataset, clustered around a central organizing concept” (Braun and Clarke, 2019, p.2). During this step, which is actually “the systematic and comprehensive collection and classification of the data” (Miles και Huberman, 1994, p. 429, as cited in Griva & Stamou, 2014), the results are extracted cumulatively.

It should be highlighted that a primarily deductive approach to the (content) analysis was adopted, since the interview topics and the relevant theory were used as a guide in forming the initial categories. Subsequently, although the participants’ statements were coded consistent with the initial categories, some new categories that could not be fitted into the initial ones were identified and added, following an inductive approach. In the final step of the qualitative analysis, the data is interpreted and similarities as well as differences among the interviewees’ answers are exposed and highlighted (Griva & Stamou, 2014). This data along with the quantitative ones, were finally brought together to draw conclusions (Creswell, 2014).
4.3 Issues of ethical considerations in the research

Creswell (2016) reports on ethics as an idea that extends from the beginning of the research process to its completion. According to him, it is necessary for ethics to be at the highest point of the researcher’s value pyramid and characterize the researcher’s work from an ethical point of view. The researcher must respect the potential readers and at the same time the other researchers who are likely to use the findings of his own research or the ones who might use them as a starting point for the elaboration of their own research design. It is therefore necessary for the results to be presented as they are, without alteration or falsification of the data, for the sake of serving interests or confirming research hypotheses. In the same vein, it is a moral issue that the studies used should not contain plagiarism or specialized vocabulary, so that they are comprehensible to the participants. What is more, among the distinctive elements is for the research to have an impact on a practical level for both researchers and professionals of the field under study, as well as the researcher’s willingness to publish his studies and share findings of his research, so as to contribute to the well-being of the whole scientific community.

Moreover, given that conducting research in the real world lies in issues of ethical principles and ethics, mainly because the researcher comes often in contact with people, it is possible that the whole procedure might cause some traumatic experience, stress, nervousness, as well as various other negative consequences to the participants in the research. This can be exacerbated if the subject under investigation touches on sensitive social issues or if the participants are vulnerable themselves. Therefore, it is necessary for them not only not to be deceived or have any traumatic experience, but also to be entitled whenever they wish to withdraw from participating in the research process.

In this light, all researchers should be aware of what an immoral research is, what its consequences might be, and they therefore need to think carefully about the implications of research concerning sensitive questions, intervention methodology, and vulnerable populations. Thus, an important element for researchers is the responsibility and the realization of how research can be conducted, which touches on socially sensitive issues, without violating ethical principles (Robson & McCartan, 2016). In addition, researchers must also ensure the protection of the participants in their research, forge a relationship of trust with them and present the
results in an honest way. Moreover, it is necessary to avoid misunderstandings, which can cause problems to the participants and the institutions or organizations, in which they work and through the formulation of the questions, they should not express any kind of prejudice and stereotypes about gender, sexual orientation, race or nationality, any special needs or age. Also, it is important to anticipate the implications of formulating the findings, which can be used to the benefit of a potentially conflicting group (Creswell, 2009).

As far as the ethical considerations of this research study are concerned, participation in both kinds of research was voluntary, and all participants’ consent was a prerequisite for the research to commence. What is more, confidentiality, anonymity and privacy were of ultimate importance and as such, they were safeguarded as much as possible.

4.4 The data collection process: the population and the sampling method

As it has already been mentioned, the study is addressed and exclusively limited to English language teachers (part time, full time, substitute teachers as well as permanent teachers) working in the public Primary schools in the Western part of Greece. Western Greece is divided into three regional units Aetolia-Acarnania in Central Greece and Achaea and Ilia in the Peloponnese, which are further subdivided into 19 municipalities. From the 243 in-service English teachers in the public Primary schools in the Western part of Greece, the sample of this research includes 93 English teachers, in total.

The research was conducted during the period April 2019 to February 2020; more specifically, the sampling for the quantitative approach was carried out from April 2019 to June 2019 and the interviews were carried out from October 2019 to February 2020. It should be noted that before the implementation of the main research, a pilot research was implemented from February 2019 until March 2019.

Before the whole sampling procedure was carried out, the researcher contacted the directorate of the Primary Education of Western Greece, so as to provide the researcher with the appropriate data upon request, which would help in order to carry out the sampling successfully. After completing this process, the researcher sent the questionnaires electronically to the school units, where the English lesson was actively taught. There was a telephone conversation with the principals of these schools, to inform them about the purpose of the research and at
the same time to motivate them to forward the mail to the English teachers who served in their school. In the introductory note, at the beginning of the questionnaire, the purpose of the research was made clear and at the same time there was an indication that the anonymity of the participants is ensured in every way by the researcher herself.

Regarding the interviews, the researcher chose some school units at random so that the interviews with the English teachers could be conducted. It should be noted here that the interviewees are within the target population that was set from the beginning.

Generally, the researcher sought participants who had a range of experiences in both single and multiple cultural environments irrespective of the years of their working experience, since the areas these teachers work in are populated by immigrants, second generation immigrants as well as refugees or asylum seekers. This was strong proof to validate and authenticate diversity based on their responses and their testimonies on experiences, ideas and practices. Moreover, these teachers in Western Greece resemble their colleagues working in schools in other parts of Greece with respect to qualifications, social class, age, educational background, academic capability and other characteristics. They also follow the same instructions regarding the content of the curriculum, obligations, hours of instruction and course books. Therefore, the strategies they employ and their general stance towards diversified students and their instruction would not differ dramatically in relation with those of other state school teachers working throughout Greece. Given that the sample is very similar to the target population in its most important general characteristics, it was considered appropriate in order to ensure fair representation of all areas.

Therefore, a random sample of schools was chosen through random sampling (Dörney, 2003), both for the quantitative approach and for the qualitative one, which constitutes the key component of scientific sampling procedures. “It involves selecting members of the population to be included in the sample on a completely random basis” (Dörney, 2003, p. 73), so as to “minimize the possibilities of any extraneous or subjective variables that might affect the outcome of the survey study” (Dörney, 2003, p. 73). In particular, the present study constitutes an “area or cluster sampling or stratified random sampling” (Dörney, 2003, p. 73), which denotes the combination of random sampling with some form of logical
grouping, a procedure which is common in surveys “with a specific focus” (Aiken, 1997, as cited in Dörney, 2003). In this kind of sampling, the population falls into various groups, or the so-called “strata” (Dörney, 2003, p. 73) and the random sample selected from each group actually constitutes the subject matters.

### 4.5 Reliability and validity of the research

For the purposes of our research, we applied the Cronbach’s Alpha test which measures the internal consistency of the measurement scale, i.e., how closely the statements relate to each other (see Appendix I, p. 286). It is a test of the reliability of the scale as to whether there is coherence between the scale statements and the meaning we want to measure. The values obtained from the results of the Cronbach’s Alpha test are from 0 to 1 and the closer the values are to 1, the more reliable the scale. To check the validity, we applied through our pilot research the so-called content validity, that is, whether the scale actually measures the meaning (Robson, 2007). With regards to the descriptive validity of the data, the quantitative methods that were employed as well as the interviewing techniques and the method of the recording of the data, ensured it.

### Conclusion

In this chapter, the research methodology which was adopted to carry out the present study was described. In particular, the reasons for selecting the mixed methods design were expounded and the research procedures were analyzed. Further, the data collection instruments and approaches to analysis were explained, as well as all the conditions set for the present research to be characterized by reliability and validity.
CHAPTER 5: Presentation of the main findings

Introduction

In this chapter, the results of the study will be presented in detail as they were yielded from both the questionnaires and the teachers’ interviews.

5.1 The Questionnaires: The Descriptive Statistics

Below the descriptive results of a study conducted on 93 English Primary school teachers record their views on the teaching strategies they use when teaching students who may be ethnically, racially, linguistically and/or culturally different from them and their mainstream pupils. The questionnaire is divided into 5 individual sections:

1) Demographics

2) Evaluating the organization and evaluation of teaching strategies and EAL students’ learning

3) Frequency of employment of each of the specific techniques when teaching EAL students to recall information

4) Frequency of employment of specific techniques aimed to manage EAL students’ emotions and promote cooperative learning

5) Frequency of engagement of specific practices dealing with EAL pupils’ mental processes and compensation for missing knowledge

5.1.1 Demographics

Tables 1-5 as well as Figures from 1 to 19 indicate the demographic characteristics of the research. Initially, from Table 1 (Figures 1-9) and in terms of ethnicity, the overwhelming majority of the participants, i.e., 97.85% (N = 91) are Greek nationals, while only 1.08% (N = 1), i.e., 1 person has Greek-Australian ethnicity. Also, 40.86% (N = 38) are 41-50 years old, 37.63% (N = 35) 31-40 years old, and 21.51% (N = 20) 51-60 years old. Regarding the gender, 93.55% (N=87) are females and 6.45% (N=6) are males. As far as the highest level of education is concerned, 51.61% (N=48) holds a Master’s degree, 29.03% (N=27) a Bachelor degree, 11.83% (N=11) have completed some years of Master’s, 3.23% (N=3) hold a
Doctorate, 2.15% (N=2) have completed some years of Doctoral study and 1.08% (N=1) has completed some years of Post-Doctoral studies. In addition, concerning teaching experience, 4.40% (N=4) have been teaching for 6-10 years, 29.67% (N=27) have taught for 11-15 years, 26.37 (N=24) for 21-25 years, 23.08% (N=21) for 16-20 years, 9.89% (N=9) for 26-30 years and 6.59% (N=6) have taught for more than 30 years. Moreover, analyzing the employment status as teachers, 75.27% (N=70) are permanent, 23.66% (N=22) are substitute and 1.08% (N=1) are part-time teachers. Furthermore, from 1-10, 51.61% (N=48) believe that they have received low (1-3) training on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students, 43.01% (N=40) have received medium training (4-7) and 5.38% (N=5) have received very good training (8-10). Concerning the area the respondents’ schools are situated in, 39.78% (N=37) work in schools of rural/agrarian area, 33.33% (N=31) urban, 24.73% (N=23) suburban and 2.15% (N=2) in a major metropolitan area. Finally, 84.95% (N=79) state that a low (0-30) percentage of their school’s population are ethnic minority community children, 10.75% (N=10) 31-60 (average) and 4.30% (N=4) 61-100 (high).

Table 1: Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>97.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greek-Australian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Years)</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>93.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some years of Master</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some years of Doctoral study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some years of Post-Doctoral study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Doctorate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Years of teaching experience |  |
|------------------------------|---|----------------|
| 11-15                        | 27 | 29.67 |
| 21-25                        | 24 | 26.37 |
| 16-20                        | 21 | 23.08 |
| 26-30                        | 9  | 9.89  |
| 31 plus                      | 6  | 6.59  |
| 6-10                         | 4  | 4.40  |

| Employment status as a teacher |  |
|--------------------------------|---|----------------|
| Permanent                      | 70 | 75.27 |
| Substitute                     | 22 | 23.66 |
| Part-time                      | 1  | 1.08  |

| From 1-10 how much training have you received on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students? |  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|----------------|
| 1-3 (low)                                                                                                                       | 48 | 51.61 |
| 4-7 (medium)                                                                | 40 | 43.01 |
| 8-10 (very good)                                                            | 5  | 5.38  |

| Type of school's area |  |
|-----------------------|---|----------------|
| Rural/Agrarian        | 37 | 39.78 |
| Urban                 | 31 | 33.33 |
| Suburban              | 23 | 24.73 |
| Major metropolitan area | 2 | 2.15 |

| What percentage of your school's population are ethnic minority community children? |  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|----------------|
| 0-30 (low)                                                                          | 79 | 84.95 |
| 31-60 (average)                                                                    | 10 | 10.75 |
| 61-100 (high)                                                                      | 4  | 4.30  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N: Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f %: Relative Frequency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2 (Figures 10 and 11) presents the demographics as far as the educational attainments in Multilingual-Multicultural Education are concerned. The majority, actually 83.87% (N=78), answered that they haven’t got such attainments, while the remaining 16.13% (N=15) gave a positive answer. Regarding the latter, 33.33% (N=5) have attended courses/seminars and 13.33% (N=2) have taught in Roma schools. Moreover, 6.67% (N=1) has attended a trilingual translation course or Pestalozzi Program in Intercultural Competence or is currently working on their dissertation about intercultural teaching via CLIL. Finally, the same percentage, namely 1 person, holds a PhD in multilingual education and the others have
knowledge either on bilingual education, ESP, TEFL in minority education or hold a Master’s in intercultural education.

Table 2: Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>f %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainments in Multilingual-Multicultural Education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If so, please specify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses/seminars</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>33.33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Roma schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main trilingual translation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD in multilingual education and others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pestalozzi Programme in Intercultural Competence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFL in minority education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am working on my dissertation about intercultural teaching via CLIL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s in Intercultural</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: Frequency

f %: Relative Frequency
Figure 10: Educational attainments in Multilingual-Multicultural Education

As follows, Table 3 (Figures 12-17) presents the demographics related to the languages, other than English and Greek, that the participants speak as well as the level of fluency. Concerning Italian, 19.35% (N=18) speak the language at a basic level, 12.90% (N=12) at an independent level and 7.53% (N=7) at a proficient level. Similarly, 15.05% (N=14) speak German at a basic level, 6.45% (N=6) at an...
independent level and 4.30% (N=4) at a proficient level. Concerning French, 38.71% (N=36) don’t speak the language, but 30.11% (N=28) speak it at a basic level, 18.28% (N=17) at an independent level and 12.90% (N=12) at a proficient level. Regarding Spanish, 17.20% (N=16) speak the language at a basic level, 8.60% (N=8) at an independent level and 3.23% (N=3) at a proficient level.

Few teachers speak other languages. To be specific, most of them, 93.55% (N=87) don’t speak other languages, while only 3.23% (N=3) speak other foreign languages at a basic level, 2.15% (N=2) at an independent level and 1.08% (N=1) at a proficient level. As the answers show, 33.33% (N=2) of those who speak other foreign languages (different from the above), speak Russian, Portuguese or Romanian. Finally, 1 person, i.e. 1.08% (N=1) speaks Dutch, Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, Serbian, Bulgarian and Finnish.

Table 3: Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>f %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Italian</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of German</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of French</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Spanish</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Knowledge of other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>93.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: Frequency
f %: Relative Frequency

Figure 12: Knowledge of Italian
Figure 13: Knowledge of German

Figure 14: Knowledge of French
Figure 15: Knowledge of Spanish

Figure 16: Knowledge of other
Next, Tables 4-5 (Figures 18 and 19) present the demographics of the type of training teachers have received. Participants were able to answer this question by giving more than one answer. The majority, namely 68.82% (N=64) has received information through self-study (e.g. books, movies, cultural festivities, on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students), 45.16% (N=42) has received some kind of professional development through teacher training programs, seminars or workshops on such issues, 32.26% (N=30) has done undergraduate coursework and 4.30% (N=4) has received some other type of training. Analyzing those who gave the last answer, 25% (N=1) hasn’t received any training at all, whereas the other three respondents mentioned completion of a PhD thesis on relevant issues, completion of a Master's course and self-studying based on personal interest.

Table 4: Demographics - Type of Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>f %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you received self-study--not counted towards professional development</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hours (e.g. books, movies, cultural festivities) on issues related to teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culturally and linguistically diverse students?</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you received professional development (i.e. teacher training / seminars /</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workshops etc.) on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverse students?</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you received undergraduate coursework on issues related to teaching</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culturally and linguistically diverse students?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you received other type of training on issues related to teaching</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Have you received self-study—not counted towards professional development hours (e.g. books, movies, cultural festivities) on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students?

Have you received professional development (i.e. teacher training / seminars / workshops etc.) on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students?

Have you received undergraduate coursework on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students?

Have you received other type of training on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students?

Figure 18: Type of training
5.1.2 The four main axes

➢ Evaluating the organization of teaching strategies and EAL students’ learning

Table 6 and Figure 20 indicate the personal opinion of the participants regarding the organization and evaluation of teaching strategies and EAL students’ learning. The answers are given on a five-point scale ranging from 1-5, where 1 represents 'Never', 2 'Rarely', 3 'Sometimes', 4 'Often' and 5 "Always".

Participants believe that they always make encouraging statements (M=4.62) and that they almost always scan the classroom (M=4.48) and preview the language lesson (M=4.41) before they actually start teaching. Moreover, they consider that they often demonstrate value and respect (M=4.32), adopt explicit teaching practices (M=4.27), celebrate pupils' success (M=4.24), clearly identify the purpose of the activities (M=4.23), provide formal or informal feedback (M=4.12), ask pupils to reflect (M=4.09), structure the lesson (M=3.86), provide students with tokens of recognition or praise (M=3.85) as well as with meta-cognitive activities (M=3.63). Also, teachers believe that they almost often have pupils monitor their comprehension (M=3.52) and seek opportunities on their own (Mean=3.48). Furthermore, they mention that they sometimes use pupils' voice to enable feedback (M=3.35), have pupils monitor their production (M=3.34), create an inclusive environment (M=3.22) and have pupils plan for the tasks given
Finally, the participants say that they rarely have pupils keep learning logs (M=2.15). The std. Deviation of the answers in this section was between 0.65 and 1.16.

*Table 6: Evaluating the organization and teaching strategies and EAL students’ learning*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I make encouraging statements</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I scan the classroom</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I preview the language lesson</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I demonstrate value and respect</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I preview the main ideas</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I adopt explicit teaching practices</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I celebrate pupils' success</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I clearly identify the purpose of activity</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide formal or informal feedback</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask pupils to reflect</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I structure the lesson</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide students with tokens of recognition or praise</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use meta-cognitive activities</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have pupils monitor their comprehension</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have pupils seek opportunities</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use pupils’ voice to enable feedback</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have pupils monitor their production</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I create inclusive environment</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have pupils plan for the task</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have pupils keep learning logs</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 20: Evaluating the organization and teaching strategies and EAL students’ learning
Frequency of employment of each of specific techniques when teaching EAL students to recall information

Table 7 and Figure 21 indicate the personal opinion of the participants about the frequency with which they employ each of the specific techniques when teaching EAL students to recall information. The answers are given on a five-point scale from 1-5 where 1 represents 'Never', 2 'Rarely', 3 'Sometimes', 4 'Often' and 5 "Always".

Participants answer that they often put the words in context (M=4.08) and classify the newly instructed words in similar family words (M=4.01). They also often use the read aloud technique (M=3.91), combine sounds and images (M=3.82) and may also often use or transfer cognates (M=3.68). In addition, they almost often have pupils review the lesson or physically act out the words (M=3.56). Finally, the participants state that they sometimes use flashcards with new words (M=2.99). The std. Deviation of the answers in this section was between 0.85 and 1.22.

Table 7: Frequency of employment of each of the specific techniques when teaching EAL students to recall information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I put the words in context</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I put new words in similar family words</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the read aloud technique</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use combination of sounds and images</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use/transfer cognates</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often have pupils review the lesson</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I physically act out the words</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use flashcards with the new word</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 and Figure 22 indicate the personal opinion of the participants regarding the frequency with which they employ specific techniques aimed to manage EAL students’ emotions and promote cooperative learning. The answers are given on a five-point scale from 1-5 where 1 represents 'Never', 2 'Rarely', 3 'Sometimes', 4 'Often' and 5 "Always".

Participants believe that they often make use of questioning strategies (M=4.13) and techniques to relate content to students’ personal lives (M=4.12). Also, they often use (non) verbal signs (M=4.11), slow and quicken the pace of instruction (M=4.02), seek out knowledge related to personal experiences (M=3.98), have pupils work together to solve problems by applying previous knowledge (M=3.91), provide learners with opportunities to interact (M=3.84), have the pupils collaborate in negotiating roles, responsibilities and outcomes (M=3.76) and provide them with visual support (M=3.72). What is more, teachers almost often present worked examples (M=3.44). whereas they sometimes create activities for scaffolded talk using paired discussions (M=3.13). They also sometimes use academic games (M=3.11), organize pupils in dyads or triads (M=3.02), ask pupils to create mental, oral or written summaries (M=3.00) and set up buddy systems (M=2.95). Finally, teachers sometimes arrange a regular language learning partner
(M=2.42) for culturally and linguistically diverse learners. The std. deviation of the answers was between 0.76 and 1.18.

Table 8: Frequency of employment of specific techniques aimed to manage EAL students’ emotions and promote cooperative learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I make use of questioning strategies</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use techniques to relate content to students’ personal lives</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use (non)verbal signs</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I slow and quicken the pace of instruction</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I seek out knowledge related to personal experiences</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have pupils work together to solve problems by applying previous knowledge</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide learners with opportunities to interact</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the pupils collaborate in negotiating roles, responsibilities and outcomes</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide visual support</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I present worked examples</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I create activities for scaffolded talk using paired discussions</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use academic games</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I organize pupils in dyads or triads</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask pupils to create a mental, oral, written summary</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I set up a buddy system</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I arrange a regular language learning partner</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I make use of questioning strategies
I use techniques to relate content to students’ personal lives
I use (non)verbal signs
I slow and quicken the pace of instruction
I seek out knowledge related to personal experiences
I have pupils work together to solve problems by applying previous knowledge
I provide learners with opportunities to interact
I have the pupils collaborate in negotiating roles, responsibilities and outcomes
I provide visual support
I present worked examples
I create activities for scaffolded talk using paired discussions
I use academic games
I organize pupils in dyads or triads
I ask pupils to create a mental, oral, written summary
I set up a buddy system
I arrange a regular language learning partner

Mean
Std. Deviation
Table 9 and Figure 23 indicate the personal opinion of the participants about the frequency with which they use specific strategies dealing with EAL pupils' mental processes and compensation for missing knowledge. The answers are given on a five-point scale from 1-5 where 1 represents 'Never', 2 'Rarely', 3 'Sometimes', 4 'Often' and 5 "Always".

Participants believe that they often make associations to activate prior knowledge or use what their pupils already know (M=4.30), use scanning strategies (M=4.16), urge pupils to use synonymous words (M=4.09) and use skimming strategies (M=4.04). Moreover, they answered that pupils will often understand the general meaning by using any clue given (M=3.89). Also, they often engage pupils in applying or figuring out rules (M=3.74), pre-teach key-words or create glossary books or use information to have them guess meanings (M=3.72), encourage transfer among all languages (M=3.69) and practice the new language in a variety of ways in authentic situations (M=3.68). Furthermore, the respondents almost often classify group words (M=3.56), whereas they sometimes engage pupils in ways that involve making and testing hypotheses (M=3.14), engage pupils in note taking (M=2.97), use reference materials (M=2.89) and develop parents' ability to support work from home (M=3.06), The std. deviation of the answers in this section was between 0.70 and 1.21.

Table 9: Frequency of engagement of practices dealing with EAL pupils’ mental processes and compensation for missing knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I make associations to activate prior knowledge</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use what pupils already know</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use scanning strategies</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I urge pupils to use synonymous words</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use skimming strategies</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I anticipate pupils will understand the general meaning by using any clue</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I engage pupils in applying or figuring out rules</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pre-teach key - words or create glossary books</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have students use information to guess meanings</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage transfer among all languages</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I practice the new language in a variety of ways in authentic situations</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I classify group words</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I engage pupils in ways that involve making and testing hypotheses</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I develop parents' ability to support work from home</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I engage pupils in note taking</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use reference materials</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 23: Frequency of engagement of practices dealing with EAL pupils’ mental processes and compensation for missing knowledge
5.1.3 The Inferential statistics

In this section the following research questions are examined:

1. How do teachers’ years of professional experience and their educational attainments affect L3 learners’ ability to acquire new vocabulary?
2. To what extent do EAL teachers’ teaching strategies cater to L3 learners’ engagement and promotion of collaborative approach?
3. What is the relationship, if any, between the cultivation of a positive learning environment that facilitates learning and the learners’ metacognitive abilities and use of different languages in the culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) classroom?
4. To what extent are EAL teachers aware of specific strategies for teaching CLD students?
5. How do years of teaching experience, age, types of training on issues related to teaching CLD students and educational attainments in the field of Multilingual, Multicultural Education affect EAL teachers’ use of strategies?

➢ 1st Research question

*How do teachers’ years of professional experience and their educational attainments affect L3 learners’ ability to acquire new vocabulary?*

Table 10 represents the results of the factor analysis for the questions referring to the frequency of employment of each of the specific techniques when teaching EAL students to recall information. Coefficient KMO was high enough to perform factor analysis (value: 0.804>0.8) and extracted 2 components which explain the 55.96% of the total variance. In particular, the first one, which accounts for the 42.91% of the total variance, includes questions 4,5,3,6 and has 0.732 internal reliability. The second component which accounts for the 13.05% of the total variance, includes questions 2,8,1,7 and has 0.690 internal reliability. The first component was named “Facilitating the acquisition of new words”, whereas the second one “Contextualizing and mastering new vocabulary”.
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Table 10: Factor analysis using the varimax method for the frequency of the employment of each of the specific techniques when teaching EAL students to recall information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use/transfer cognates_4</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use combination of sounds and images_5</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use read aloud technique_3</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use flashcards with the new word_6</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I put new words in similar family words_2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often have pupils review the lesson_8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I put the words in context_1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I physically act out the words _7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance</strong></td>
<td>42.91%</td>
<td>13.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cronbach Alpha</strong></td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 (Figure 24) represents the descriptive statistics of the first component, which was calculated using the mean value of the questions it referred to. The mean value was 3.60 ± 0.78 (minimum=1, maximum=5) indicating that the participants often facilitate the acquisition of new words.

Table 11: Descriptive statistics of facilitating the acquisition of new words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 represents the results of the adjustment of the multiple regression analysis using ‘the facilitation of the acquisition of new words’ as the dependent variable and ‘the years of teaching experience and the educational attainments in Multilingual-Multicultural Education’ as the independent variables. The Null hypothesis is that independent variables have no effect on the dependent variable (F(3.61) =1.256, p=0.297).

Table 12: Results of adjustments of multiple regression model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>AdjR²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: Facilitating the acquisition of new words

Independent variables: Years of teaching experience, Educational attainments in Multilingual-Multicultural Education

➢ 2nd Research question

To what extent do EAL teachers’ teaching strategies cater to L3 learners’ engagement and promotion of a collaborative approach?

Table 13 represents the results of the factor analysis for the questions referring to the frequency of employment of specific techniques aiming to manage EAL students’ emotions and promote cooperative learning. Having the value 0.857>0.8,
the Coefficient KMO was high enough to perform the factor analysis. The Factor analysis extracted 4 components which account for the 68.54% of the total variance. Specifically, the first component which accounts for the 41.85% of the total variance, includes questions 2,1,3,4,5,8 and has 0.874 internal reliability. The second component which accounts for the 11.49% of the total variance, includes questions 12,15,13,16,14 and has 0.866 internal reliability. The third component which accounts for the 7.82% of the total variance, includes questions 10,11 and has 0.796 internal reliability, whereas the fourth component which accounts for the 7.38% of the total variance, includes questions 6,7,9 and has 0.618 internal reliability. The first component was named “Collaborative approach and students’ engagement”, the second component was named “Adapting instruction and using personal experiences” whereas the third and the fourth ones were named “Language buddies / Child translator” and “Supporting learning through games and visual support”, respectively.

Table 13: Factor analysis using the varimax method regarding the frequency of employment of specific techniques aimed to manage EAL students’ emotions and promote cooperative learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMO=0.857, Total Variance=68.54%</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
<th>Component 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have pupils work together to solve problems by applying previous knowledge_2</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the pupils collaborate in negotiating roles, responsibilities, and outcomes_1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide learners with opportunities to interact _3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask pupils to create a mental, oral, written summary_4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I create activities for scaffolded talk using paired discussions_5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I organize pupils in dyads or triads_8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I slow and quicken the pace of instruction_12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I seek out knowledge related to personal experiences_15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use (non)verbal signs_13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I make use of questioning strategies_16 0.677
I use techniques to relate content to personal lives_14 0.633
I set up a buddy system_10 0.863
I arrange a regular language learning partner_11 0.830
I present worked examples_6 0.776
I use academic games_7 0.638
I provide visual support_9 0.634

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>41.85%</th>
<th>11.49%</th>
<th>7.82%</th>
<th>7.38%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach Alpha</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 (Figure 25) represents the descriptive statistics of the first component, which was calculated using the sum of questions it referred to. The range of the values of the component “Collaborative / interactive approach and students’ engagement” was in the interval [6.30]. Specifically:

- Values in the interval [6.10] were labeled as “Never”
- Values in the interval [11.15] were labeled as “Rarely”
- Values in the interval [16.20] were labeled as “Sometimes”
- Values in the interval [21.25] were labeled as “Often”
- Values in the interval [26.30] were labeled as “Always”

Thirty-two respondents in total (34.41%) stated that they sometimes use the collaborative / interactive approach to engage students in the learning process, which is a quite interesting finding, given that they almost always employ the majority of the proposed strategies. In turn, 18.28% (N=17) always employ this specific strategy, 33.33% (N=31) often do so, whereas 12.90% (N=12) rarely and only 1.08% (N=1) never use it while teaching.
Table 14: Descriptive statistics of collaborative / interactive approach and students’ engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>f%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25: Descriptive statistics of collaborative / interactive approach and students’ engagement

➢ 3rd Research question

What is the relationship, if any, between the cultivation of a positive learning environment that facilitates learning and the learners’ metacognitive abilities and the use of different languages in the culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) classroom?

Table 15 represents the results of the factor analysis for the questions referring to the evaluation of the organization and teaching strategies as well as the EAL students’ learning. Coefficient KMO was high enough to perform factor analysis with value 0.873>0.8. Factor analysis extracted 4 components which account for the
64.60% of the total variance. Specifically, the first component which accounts for the 40.02% of the total variance, includes questions 18,16,6,17,7,14,8,13 and has 0.870 internal reliability. The second component which accounts for the 13.12% of the total variance, includes questions 1,3,4,2,5 and has 0.897 internal reliability. The third component which accounts for the 6.34% of the total variance, includes questions 9,11,10 and has 0.677 internal reliability. The fourth component which accounts for the 5.12% of the total variance, includes questions 15,12,20,19 and has 0.740 internal reliability. The first component was named “Promoting thinking and developing an inclusive environment”, the second component was named “Structuring and explaining the lesson” whereas the third and the fourth ones were named “Celebrate praise and respect” and “Facilitating the learning process and learning how to learn”, respectively.

Table 15: Factor analysis using varimax method for evaluating the organization and teaching strategies and EAL students’ learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMO=0.873, Total Variance=64.60%</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have pupils keep learning logs_18</td>
<td>0.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have pupils monitor their comprehension_16</td>
<td>0.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have pupils' plan for the task_6</td>
<td>0.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have pupils monitor their production_17</td>
<td>0.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have pupils seek opportunities_7</td>
<td>0.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use pupils' voice to enable feedback_14</td>
<td>0.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I create an inclusive environment_8</td>
<td>0.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide formal or informal feedback_13</td>
<td>0.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I clearly identify the purpose of activity_1</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I preview the main ideas_3</td>
<td>0.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I structure the lesson_4</td>
<td>0.751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I preview the language lesson_2 0.644
I adopt explicit teaching practices_5 0.502
I celebrate pupils' success_9 0.775
I demonstrate value and respect_11 0.637
I provide students with tokens of recognitions or praise_10 0.611
I scan the classroom_15 0.697
I make encouraging statements_12 0.627
I ask pupils to reflect_20 0.600
I use meta-cognitive activities_19 0.520

Variance

|        | 40.02% | 13.12% | 6.34% | 5.12% |

Cronbach Alpha

|        | 0.870  | 0.897  | 0.677  | 0.740  |

Table 16 (Figure 26) represents the descriptive statistics of the fourth component, which was calculated using the mean value of the questions it referred to. The Mean value was 4.15 ± 0.70 (minimum=1.50, maximum=5) indicating that the participants often cultivate a positive learning environment by teaching students how to learn and facilitating the learning process, in general.

Table 16: Descriptive statistics of cultivating a positive learning environment and facilitating the learning process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 26: Histogram of cultivating a positive learning environment and facilitating the learning process

Table 17 indicates the results of the normality for variables “Facilitating the learning process and learning how to learn” and “I encourage transfer among all languages” where normality hypothesis was rejected (p<0.001, Shapiro Wilk)

Table 17: Normality test using Shapiro Wilk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating a positive learning environment and facilitating the learning process</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage transfer among all languages</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 indicates the results of Spearman correlation between variables “Facilitating the learning process and learning how to learn” and “I encourage transfer among all languages” where no significance correlation appeared, indicating that EAL teachers might not be aware of the crucial role all languages play in a diverse classroom, in practice and how they relate to the learners’ metalinguistic awareness.

Table 18: Spearman correlation for variables “Facilitating the learning process and learn how to learn” * “I encourage transfer among all languages”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman correlation</th>
<th>I encourage transfer among all languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating a positive learning environment and rho=-0.024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
➢ 4th Research question

To what extent are EAL teachers aware of specific strategies for teaching CLD students?

Table 19 represents the reliability for all fourteen factors, using Factor analysis. In almost all cases, the reliability was greater than 0.6. In particular, the factor “Promoting thinking and developing an inclusive perspective among students” had a=0.870 reliability, “Structuring and explaining the lesson” a=0.897, “Celebrating praise and respect”, a=0.677, “Facilitating the lesson and learning how to learn” a=0.740, “Facilitating the acquisition of new words” a=0.732, “Contextualizing and mastering new vocabulary” a=0.690, “Collaborative approach and students’ engagement” a=0.874, “Adapting instruction and using personal experiences” a=0.866, “Language buddies/ Child translators” a=0.796, “Supporting learning through games and visual support” a=0.618, “Skimming / Scanning – Inductive / Deductive approach” a=0.776, “The role of parents and the use of all languages available in the classroom in various ways” a=0.803, “Processing a text, thinking and activating prior linguistic knowledge” a=0.771 and “Classification of words, pre-teaching and glossary books” a=0.499.

Table 19: Reliability analysis of factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting thinking and developing an inclusive perspective among students</td>
<td>ORG (6-8,13-16-18)</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structuring and explaining the lesson</td>
<td>ORG (1-5)</td>
<td>0.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrating praise and respect</td>
<td>ORG (9-11)</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating the lesson and learning how to learn</td>
<td>ORG (12,15,19-20)</td>
<td>0.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating the acquisition of new words</td>
<td>REC (3-6)</td>
<td>0.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualizing and mastering new vocabulary</td>
<td>REC (1-2,7-8)</td>
<td>0.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative approach and students’ engagement</td>
<td>EM (1-5,8)</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To begin with, the fourth dimension ‘Frequency of engagement of specific strategies dealing with EAL pupils’ mental processes and compensation for missing knowledge’ will be first analyzed, as it has not been touched upon so far. All the factors of the fourth dimension (No 4) were calculated as indicated in Table 20. The KMO was appropriate to perform factor analysis with value 0.803. The factor analysis using the varimax method extracted 4 components which explain for the 62.50% of the total variance. The first component was named “Skimming / Scanning – Inductive / Deductive approach”, the second component was named “The role of parents and the use of all languages available” whereas the third and the fourth ones were named “Processing a text, thinking and activating prior linguistic knowledge” and “Classification of words, pre-teaching and glossary books”, respectively.

Table 20: Factor analysis using the varimax method for “Frequency of engagement of specific strategies dealing with EAL pupils’ mental processes and compensation for missing knowledge”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KMO=0.803, Total Variance=62.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use skimming strategies_4</td>
<td>0.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use scanning strategies_5</td>
<td>0.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I engage pupils in applying or figuring out rules_6</td>
<td>0.615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I use reference materials_1 0.767
I develop parents' ability to support work from home_16 0.743
I engage pupils in ways that involve making and testing hypotheses_2 0.665
I engage pupils in note taking_7 0.63
I practice the new language in a variety of ways in authentic situations_3 0.591
I encourage transfer among all languages_10 0.438
I anticipate pupils will understand the general meaning by using any clue_9 0.796
I urge pupils to use synonymous words_14 0.648
I use what pupils already know_12 0.619
I have pupils use information to guess meanings_8 0.579
I make associations to activate prior knowledge_11 0.551
I pre-teach key-words or create glossary books_13 0.811
I classify group words_15 0.539

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>32.59%</th>
<th>11.37%</th>
<th>8.63%</th>
<th>6.91%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach Alpha</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>0.499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the satisfying reliability, the questions in each factor were grouped using the mean value.

Regarding the level of frequencies of all factors, Table 21 (Figure 27) represents the descriptive statistics of the factors referring to the first dimension (No1) named the ‘evaluation of the organization of the teaching strategies and EAL students’ learning’. High levels of frequency appeared in the factors “Structuring and explaining the lesson” (M=4.22±0.74), “Facilitating the lesson and learning how to learn (M=4.21±0.63) and “Celebrating praise and respect” (M=4.14±0.77) while
medium levels of frequency in the factor “Promoting thinking and developing an inclusive perspective among students” (M=3.27±0.73).

Table 21: Descriptive statistics of the factors referring to the evaluation of the organization and teaching strategies and EAL students’ learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structuring and explaining the lesson</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating the lesson and learning how to learn</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrating praise and respect</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting thinking and developing an inclusive perspective among students</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 27: Descriptive statistics of the factors referring to the evaluation of the organization of the teaching strategies and EAL students’ learning

Table 22 (Figure 28) represents the descriptive statistics of the factors referring to the second dimension (No 2) named: ‘the frequency of employment of each of the specific techniques when teaching EAL students to recall information’. High levels of frequency appeared in the factors “Contextualizing and mastering new vocabulary” (M=3.80±0.71) and “Facilitating the acquisition of new words” (M=3.60±0.78).
Table 22: Descriptive statistics of the factors referring to the frequency of the employment of each of the specific techniques when teaching EAL students to recall information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contextualizing and mastering new vocabulary</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating the acquisition of new words</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 28: Descriptive statistics of the factors referring to the frequency of employment of each of specific techniques when teaching EAL students to recall information.

Table 23 (Figure 29) represents the descriptive statistics of the factors referring to the third dimension (No3), named: ‘the frequency of employment of specific techniques aiming to manage EAL students’ emotions and promote cooperative learning’.

High levels of frequency appeared regarding the factor “Adapting instruction and using personal experiences” (M=4.07±0.69), medium to high levels of frequency regarding the factors “Collaborative approach and students’ engagement” (M=3.44±0.78) and “Supporting learning through games and visual support” (M=3.42±0.75) while medium to low levels appeared in the factor “Language buddies/ Child translators” (M=2.68±1.01).

Table 23: Descriptive statistics of the factors referring to the frequency of employment of the specific techniques aiming to manage EAL students’ emotions and promote cooperative learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adapting instruction and using personal experiences</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 (Figure 30) represents the descriptive statistics of the factors referring to the frequency of engagement of specific practices dealing with EAL pupils’ mental processes and compensation for missing knowledge. High levels of frequency appeared in the factors “Processing a text, thinking and activating prior linguistic knowledge” (M=4.06±0.57), “Skimming / Scanning – Inductive / Deductive approach” (M=3.98±0.66) and “Classification of words, pre-teaching and glossary books” (M=3.64±0.83), while medium levels in the factor “The role of parents and the use of all languages available in the classroom in various ways” (M=3.24±0.76).

Table 24: Descriptive statistics of the factors referring to the frequency of engagement of specific practices dealing with EAL pupils’ mental processes and compensation for missing knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processing a text, thinking and activating prior linguistic knowledge</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 29: Descriptive statistics of the factors referring to the frequency of employment of the specific techniques aiming to manage EAL students’ emotions and promote cooperative learning.
Skimming / Scanning – Inductive / Deductive approach  

Classification of words, pre-teaching and glossary books  
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Figure 30: Descriptive statistics of the factors referring to the frequency of engagement of specific practices dealing with EAL pupils’ mental processes and compensation for missing knowledge

➢ 5th Research question

How do years of teaching experience, age, types of training on issues related to teaching CLD students and educational attainments in the field of Multilingual, Multicultural Education affect EAL teachers’ general opinions and their use of strategies?

Years of teaching experience

The years of teaching experience do not follow the normal distribution according to Table 25, using the Shapiro Wilk test (p=0.008<0.05)

Table 25: Test of normality for years of teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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According to Table 26, the years of teaching experience have positive statistically significant correlation in relation with the following factors:

- Promoting thinking and developing an inclusive perspective among students (rho=0.245, p<0.05)
- Skimming / Scanning – Inductive / Deductive approach (rho=0.246, p<0.05)
- The role of parents and the use of all languages available in the classroom in various ways (rho=0.285, p<0.05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Years of teaching experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting thinking and developing an inclusive perspective among students</td>
<td>0.245*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structuring and explaining the lesson</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrating praise and respect</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating the lesson and learning how to learn</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating the acquisition of new words</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualizing and mastering new vocabulary</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative approach and students’ engagement</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting instruction and using personal experiences</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language buddies/ Child translators</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting learning through games and visual support</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skimming / Scanning – Inductive / Deductive approach</td>
<td>0.246*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of parents and the use of all languages available in the classroom in various ways</td>
<td>0.285*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Processing a text, thinking, and activating prior linguistic knowledge 0.192

Classification of words, pre-teaching, and glossary books 0.117

*p<0.05

Age

Age does not follow the normal distribution according to Table 27, using the Shapiro Wilk test (p<0.001).

Table 27: Test of normality for age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age is not statistically significant correlated with any factor, according to Table 28

Table 28: Spearman correlations between factors and age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting thinking and developing an inclusive perspective among students</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structuring and explaining the lesson</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrating praise and respect</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating the lesson and learning how to learn</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating the acquisition of new words</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualizing and mastering new vocabulary</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative approach and students’ engagement</td>
<td>0.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting instruction and using personal experiences</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language buddies/ Child translators</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting learning through games and visual support</td>
<td>0.235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Skimming / Scanning – Inductive / Deductive approach 0.145

The role of parents and the use of all languages available in the classroom in various ways 0.201

Processing a text, thinking and activating prior linguistic knowledge 0.044

Classification of words, pre-teaching, and glossary books 0.021

Training received on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students

Training received on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students does not follow the normal distribution according to Table 29, using the Shapiro Wilk test (p=0.007<0.05).

*Table 29: Test of normality for training received on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training received on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>65</td>
<td><strong>0.007</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training received on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students is statistically significant correlated with “Language buddies / Child translators” (rho=0.292, p<0.05), according to Table 30.

*Table 30: Spearman correlations between factors and training received on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Training received on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting thinking and developing an inclusive perspective among students</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structuring and explaining the lesson</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Celebrating praise and respect  
Facilitating the lesson and learning how to learn  
Facilitating the acquisition of new words  
Contextualizing and mastering new vocabulary  
Collaborative approach and students’ engagement  
Adapting instruction and using personal experiences  
Language buddies/ Child translators  
Supporting learning through games and visual support  
Skimming / Scanning – Inductive / Deductive approach  
The role of parents and the use of all languages available in the classroom in various ways  
Processing a text, thinking, and activating prior linguistic knowledge  
Classification of words, pre-teaching, and glossary books  

*p<0.05

Undergraduate coursework

Table 31 represents no statistically significant differences for mean values of factors in the cases of undergraduate coursework on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting thinking and developing an inclusive perspective among students</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structuring and explaining the lesson</td>
<td>-1.149</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrating praise and respect</td>
<td>-1.841</td>
<td>39.321</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facilitating the lesson and learning how to learn -0.162 91 0.872  
Facilitating the acquisition of new words -1.139 91 0.258  
Contextualizing and mastering new vocabulary -1.425 91 0.158  
Collaborative approach and students’ engagement -0.660 91 0.511  
Adapting instruction and using personal experiences -0.742 91 0.460  
Language buddies/ Child translators -1.769 91 0.080  
Supporting learning through games and visual support 0.384 91 0.702  
Skimming / Scanning – Inductive / Deductive approach 0.181 91 0.857  
The role of parents and the use of all languages available in the classroom in various ways -0.480 91 0.632  
Processing a text, thinking, and activating prior linguistic knowledge -0.464 91 0.644  
Classification of words, pre-teaching, and glossary books -0.451 91 0.653  

**Professional development**

Table 32 represents the results of independent samples t-test for the factors of the study in cases of professional development (i.e., teacher training / seminars / workshops etc.) on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students where there are statistically significant differences in the factors “Promoting thinking and developing an inclusive perspective among students” (t(91)=-2.503, p=0.014<0.05), “Facilitating the lesson and learning how to learn” (t(91)=-2.135, p=0.035<0.05) and “Language buddies/ Child translators t(91)=-2.276, p=0.025<0.05).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>t(91)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting thinking and developing an inclusive perspective among students</td>
<td>-2.503</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structuring and explaining the lesson</td>
<td>-0.998</td>
<td>0.321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Celebrating praise and respect  -1.345  0.182
Facilitating the lesson and learning how to learn  -2.135  **0.035**
Facilitating the acquisition of new words  -0.890  0.376
Contextualizing and mastering new vocabulary  -0.763  0.447
Collaborative approach and students’ engagement  -1.658  0.101
Adapting instruction and using personal experiences  -1.703  0.092
Language buddies/ Child translators  -2.276  **0.025**
Supporting learning through games and visual support  -1.743  0.085
Skimming / Scanning – Inductive / Deductive approach  -1.629  0.107
The role of parents and the use of all languages available in the classroom in various ways  -1.899  0.061
Processing a text, thinking and activating prior linguistic knowledge  -0.969  0.335
Classification of words, pre-teaching and glossary books  -1.039  0.302

Table 33 (and figure 31) indicates that in the factors “Promoting thinking and developing an inclusive perspective among students”, “Facilitating the lesson and learning how to learn” and “Language buddy/ Child translators” the mean value of participants who did not receive professional development on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students (M= 3.11 & M=4.08 & M=2.47) is statistically significant lower (t(91)=−2.503, p=0.014 & t(91)=−2.135, p=0.035 & t(91)=−2.276, p=0.025) than the mean value of the participants who did (M=3.48 & M=4.36 & M=2.94).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Professional development</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>t(91)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting thinking and developing an inclusive perspective among students</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>-2.503</td>
<td><strong>0.014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facilitating the lesson and learning how to learn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>4.08</th>
<th>-2.135</th>
<th>0.035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language buddies/ Child translators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>2.47</th>
<th>-2.276</th>
<th>0.025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 31: Statistically significant differences of factors in the cases of professional development

### Self-study

Table 34 represents the results of the independent samples t-test for the factors regarding the case of self-study on issues related to teaching CLD students, which is not counted towards professional development hours (e.g., books, movies, cultural festivities). It was found that there are statistically significant differences in the factors “Language buddies/ Child translators” (t (91) =-2.093, p=0.039) and “Classification of words, pre-teaching and glossary books” (t (93) =-2.077, p=0.041<0.05).
Table 34: Independent samples t-test between factors and self-study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>t(91)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting thinking and developing an inclusive perspective among students</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>0.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structuring and explaining the lesson</td>
<td>-0.370</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrating praise and respect</td>
<td>-0.082</td>
<td>0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating the lesson and learning how to learn</td>
<td>1.712</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating the acquisition of new words</td>
<td>-1.564</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualizing and mastering new vocabulary</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative approach and students’ engagement</td>
<td>-0.586</td>
<td>0.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting instruction and using personal experiences</td>
<td>-0.404</td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language buddies/ Child translators</td>
<td>-2.093</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting learning through games and visual support</td>
<td>-1.474</td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skimming / Scanning – Inductive / Deductive approach</td>
<td>-0.845</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of parents and the use of all languages available in the classroom in various ways</td>
<td>-1.508</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing a text, thinking and activating prior linguistic knowledge</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of words, pre-teaching and glossary books</td>
<td>-2.077</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35 (Figure 32) indicates that in the factor “Language buddy/ Child translators” the mean value of the participants who did not receive self-study-not counted towards professional development hours (e.g., books, movies, cultural festivities) on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students (M=2.36) is statistically significant lower [t (91) =-2.093, p=0.039] than the mean value of participants who did (M=2.83). In addition, in the factor “Classification of words, pre-teaching and glossary books” the mean value of participants who did not receive self-study-not counted towards professional development hours (e.g., books,
movies, cultural festivities) on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students (M=3.38) is statistically significant lower [t (91) =-2.077, p=0.041] than the mean value of the participants who did (M=3.76).

Table 35: Statistically significant differences of factors in cases of self-study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Self-study</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M.O.</th>
<th>t (91)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language buddies/ Child</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>-2.093</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transformers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of words</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>-2.077</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-teaching and glossary books</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 32: Statistically significant differences of factors in the cases of self-study

Other

Table 36 represents the results of the independent samples t-test for the factor regarding the case of other types of training on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students. It was found that there are statistically significant
dependences in “Facilitating the acquisition of new words” (t (91) =2.465, p=0.016), “Skimming / Scanning – Inductive / Deductive approach” (t (91) =2.056, p=0.043) and “Classification of words, pre-teaching and glossary books” (t (6.517) =6.974, p=<0.001).

Table 36: Independent samples t-test between factors and other training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting thinking and developing an inclusive perspective among students</td>
<td>1.760</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structuring and explaining the lesson</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrating praise and respect</td>
<td>-0.743</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating the lesson and learning how to learn</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating the acquisition of new words</td>
<td>2.465</td>
<td>91</td>
<td><strong>0.016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualizing and mastering new vocabulary</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative approach and students’ engagement</td>
<td>1.164</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting instruction and using personal experiences</td>
<td>-0.231</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language buddies/ Child translators</td>
<td>1.910</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting learning through games and visual support</td>
<td>1.380</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skimming / Scanning – Inductive / Deductive approach</td>
<td>2.056</td>
<td>91</td>
<td><strong>0.043</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of parents and the use of all languages available in the classroom in various ways</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing a text, thinking and activating prior linguistic knowledge</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of words, pre-teaching and glossary books</td>
<td>6.974</td>
<td>6.517</td>
<td>&lt;<strong>0.001</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37 (Figure 33) indicates that in the factors “Facilitating the acquisition of new words” the mean value of the participants who did not receive other types of training on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students (M=3.64) is statistically significant higher [t (91) =2.465, p=0.016] than the mean value of participants who did (M=2.69). In addition, in the factor “Skimming /
Scanning – Inductive / Deductive approach” the mean value of the participants who did not receive other types of training on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students (M=4.01) is statistically significant higher [t (91) =2.056, p=0.043] than the mean value of the participants who did (M=3.33). Furthermore, in the factor “Classification of words, pre-teaching and glossary books” the mean value of the participants who did not receive other types of training on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students (M=3.69) is statistically significant higher [t (6.517) =6.974, p<0.001] than the mean value of participants who did (M=2.63).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating the acquisition of new words</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.465</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skimming / Scanning – Inductive / Deductive approach</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>2.056</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of words, pre-teaching and glossary books</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>6.974</td>
<td>6.517</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Educational attainments in Multilingual-Multicultural Education

Table 38 represents the results of the independent samples t-test for the factors of the study in the case of educational attainments in Multilingual-Multicultural Education, where there are statistically significant dependences in the factors “Celebrating praise and respect” (t (91) =-2.361, p=0.020), “Adapting instruction and using personal experiences” (t (40.409) =-3.038, p=0.004) and “Supporting learning through games and visual support” (t (91) =-2.564, p=0.012).
Table 38: Independent samples t-test between factors and educational attainments in Multilingual-Multicultural Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting thinking and developing an inclusive perspective among students</td>
<td>-1.271</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structuring and explaining the lesson</td>
<td>-1.909</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrating praise and respect</td>
<td>-2.361</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating the lesson and learning how to learn</td>
<td>-1.654</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating the acquisition of new words</td>
<td>-0.545</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualizing and mastering new vocabulary</td>
<td>-1.493</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative approach and students’ engagement</td>
<td>-1.266</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting instruction and using personal experiences</td>
<td>-3.038</td>
<td>40.409</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language buddies/ Child translators</td>
<td>-0.906</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting learning through games and visual support</td>
<td>-2.564</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skimming / Scanning – Inductive / Deductive approach</td>
<td>-1.265</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of parents and the use of all languages available in the classroom in various ways</td>
<td>-1.150</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing a text, thinking and activating prior linguistic knowledge</td>
<td>-1.532</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of words, pre-teaching and glossary books</td>
<td>-0.475</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 38 (Figure 34) in the factors “Celebrating praise and respect” “Adapting instruction and using personal experiences” and “Supporting learning through games and visual support” the mean value of the participants who did not have any educational attainments in Multilingual-Multicultural Education (M= 4.06 & M=4.01 & M=3.34) is statistically significant lower (t(91)=−2.361, p=0.020 & t(40.409)=−3.038, p=0.004 & t(91)=−2.564, p=0.012) than the mean value of those participants who did (M=4.56 & M=4.39 & M=3.87).
Table 39: Statistically significant differences of the factors in the case of educational attainments in Multilingual-Multicultural Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celebrating praise and respect</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>-2.361</td>
<td>91</td>
<td><strong>0.020</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting instruction and using personal experiences</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>-3.038</td>
<td>40.409</td>
<td><strong>0.004</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting learning through games and visual support</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>-2.564</td>
<td>91</td>
<td><strong>0.012</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 34: Statistically significant differences of factors in the case of educational attainments in Multilingual-Multicultural Education
5.2 The Interviews: The Qualitative Data

The need for the qualitative phase of the study derived from some gaps in the quantitative data that emerged and therefore the qualitative results served as supplementary information for a more complete understanding of the research. In particular, although 78 out of 93 (83.87%) teachers answered that they didn’t have any educational attainments in multilingual or multicultural education and more than half of them (51.61%) have received minimum training on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students, it was found that almost all strategies conducive to successful L3 learning are quite always adopted in their lessons. This realization cannot be scientifically proven the way the discrepancies regarding findings from quantitative and qualitative can (May, 2010; Greene, 2007; Moffatt, White, Mackintosh and Howel, 2006, as cited in Robson & McCartan, 2016). However, these findings may be attributed to the fact that the respondents might have answered randomly, meaning that they might have guessed the answer as a result of not devoting time to a more careful thought or they might not have thought within the full context of the situation (Bertrand and Sendhil, 2001). Moreover, due to the fact that one’s subjectivity as well as related experience is constantly modified, the respondents might have felt or wanted their answers to match the allegedly “objective” vessel of answers given by EFL teachers most of the times, even if this is not always the case with them. All these inferences sparked the researcher’s interest to go further and look into the matter more meticulously.

Following the quantitative data, the information elicited from the teachers’ interviews will be presented and discussed. The teachers that constitute a random sample and voluntarily participated in the process, were twelve experienced teachers in total (11 women and one man), representing all three prefectures. As it has already been mentioned in the third chapter, semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions guided the data collection process. Semi-structured interviews were chosen because although they contain pre-determined questions, they allow for greater flexibility at the same time. (McDonough & McDonough, 1997). The questions which probed into personal views of 12 participants as well as their teaching strategies on the topic of teaching L3 learners, helped consider and interpret how participants made sense of their own teaching experiences. In particular, the interviews, whose average duration was about 12 to 20 minutes, were
digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim for further analysis. Then, the data was read and reread several times and analyzed based on the deductive approach to thematic content analysis so as to achieve “the subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns” (Hsieh & Shannon, p.1278, as cited in Haukås, 2016). Also, in cases where opinions could not fall under the initial broad categories, the inductive approach was used and new categories were formed. The most striking information that reinforced the connection between the teachers’ views and their strategies, was organized into categories based on personal knowledge and relevant literature, which was used as the main guide to forming the initial categories (McDonough & McDonough, 1997; Schreier, 2014, as cited in Kantzou et al., 2017). The findings provided a clear description of the general views, challenges and current strategies and resources that are employed, in an attempt to hopefully bring relevant perspectives into the discussion of bilinguals’ teaching of English as an additional language in Greece.

5.2.1 Main Findings

The seven major themes that emerged from the data analysis captured the key elements of the teachers’ perceptions and approaches in the multicultural and multilingual classrooms. Also, the extent to which teachers’ personal views are related to or influenced by the strategies they employ in their own teaching contexts became evident. The twelve participants’ responses were categorized under the following broad categories: 1) Teachers’ overall experience and intercultural awareness; 2) Teaching strategies adopted in mixed educational settings for L3 learners; 3) Active Learning; 4) Relationships among teachers and L3 learners; 5) The potential of multilingualism for learners/Use of the available languages; 6) Classroom Management / Challenges and 7) Teacher development – Future Training.

The data revealed a high degree of commonality across all twelve teachers’ interviews, that mainly had to do with their contact with such students every school year and the use of certain, widely used strategies (i.e., group work, scaffolding). Pertinent examples drawn, are provided not only to describe the commonalities, but also to verify the teachers’ overall reasoning.
5.2.1.1 Teachers’ overall experience and intercultural awareness

As already mentioned, there was a feeling of confusion when the quantitative survey data revealed that the majority of teachers had received almost no training or had few educational attainments related to intercultural education. As a result, during the interviews with the participating English teachers, the process of referring to their current teaching status as well the elaboration on their personal conceptualization of the notion of intercultural education had a two-fold purpose: first, to verify whether the high ranking of the suggested strategies reflected considerable knowledge of the field and secondly to elicit their true perceptions about issues pertaining to the teaching of third language learners, in a more impromptu way. It was revealed that, although three out of the twelve teachers mentioned – to varying degrees- some aspects of intercultural training, the suggested strategies –based on the relevant literature- which are actively employed in their diverse classrooms, are either not extensively used or cannot be fully supported or realized in the mixed classroom. It could therefore be assumed that strategies are not used invariably and in detail, on their part. In particular, all teachers (who will be referred to as T1, T2 e.t.c for the sake of anonymity), appear to have no formal education in the field, except for three teachers who seem to be somehow related to the field: T5 who completed a Master’s course in Intercultural education at a public university several years ago as a result of feeling insecure in the classrooms, so about six or seven years ago I decided to follow a master's degree course in a public university on intercultural education which was beneficial to me because it helps me realize...

“...well, to be honest sometimes I used to feel sometimes quite insecure in the classrooms, so about six or seven years ago I decided to follow a master's degree course in a public university on intercultural education which was beneficial to me because it helps me realize...”

T1 who had to study and refer to it as part of her master’s as well as PhD requirements:

“...okay... not a special kind of training but I think intercultural education was part of my... it was actually the subject or .... the topic of the module of my master's degree... so...I had to spend some time studying it as part of my master's degree and furthermore...”
and T11 who had just completed an online course in Intercultural Education offered by the University of the Aegean:

“…Yes, actually I have recently completed a course, an online course in the University of the Aegean that’s called Intercultural Education”.

The rest of the teachers reported either having no awareness whatsoever because of no previous training:

T7: “… To be honest...no, no, no... I haven’t...no... I haven’t...”, T4: “No, no, no...”, T10: “…No, unfortunately not but I would like to receive some training on that... it sounds very interesting and useful of course nowadays…”

or have sought to be educated out of personal interest:

T3 … “no, not formal training to be honest but I can recall... what I... what I try to do is...base mostly on self-directed learning like reading an article here and there... just trying to prepare myself how to deal with children that come from different backgrounds... but no… no formal training...” by participating for instance, in Erasmus projects along with other colleagues at school

T6: “…I think the training that I have assumed is not proficient of course...I don't believe I have been trained proficiently especially concerning Intercultural education...The only training that I have is through a program an Erasmus project that we have been running this year in our school”.

Others reported knowledge that can be traced back to their University years –yet, not counting towards actual useful knowledge because too many years have elapsed since then:

T6: “…okay official training to be honest, no ...I mean I have some training in my years as a student but the situation was very different because it was like 20 years ago, so as you can understand the situation is very different currently...”. Therefore, as it can be inferred, these views match perfectly well with the answers provided in the questionnaire indicating that less than half of them have a strong grasp of what intercultural education is about and what it may entail for L3 learners.
They also report to have experience working in culturally and linguistically mixed environments both at present time and in the past and also make reference to diversified learners’ communities. For them, diversity is not only confined to language or culture, but is also extended to the learners’ financial status as well as their social background:

T1: “...most students come from middle-class families with...different social educational and economic background and some of them from families with different cultural origins as I have noticed because umm there are students with parents...with fathers or mothers who come from Albania, Ukraine, Italy,... Asia or...even Nigeria and two students who come from... who... whose parents have spent several years in... in the United States only to come back 2 years before and so they enrolled in the Greek School 2 years ago.”

T2: “...These classes... have... Albanian kids... particularly one of the kids who is in the 6th class should have been in the third year of junior high school... she's old for Primary School... because she has only been in Greece for two years so they had to do that...: I also have in that particular school...I also have... a little girl... who... whose father is Pakistani... and her mother is Albanian... another little girl whose father is Greek and her mother is from Bulgaria... and I also have two or three Albanian children and that's it...”

T3: “… so, we have some people that come from Middle Eastern countries like Pakistan, Afghanistan...Irani...not that many...but it’s a possibility that their population is going to start growing.”

T4: “...well the area I work in is... I'd rather say a mosaic ...different cultures and social backgrounds as well as financial backgrounds.”

T5: “...As far as I remember, in all classrooms I have worked so far, there used to be students coming from different backgrounds.”

T6: “...I have been working in an elementary school in Patra in an area all my schools were in areas where.... kind of... you know... my students have a social and economic background which is quite low, I would say. Areas that are quite disadvantaged.”
T7: “... For the last three years I have been working in the western Achaea, So, this year I’m working in three schools. My students are immigrants...ok some of them are immigrants, so they are from Albania, Romania, Bulgaria and this year I am working with a Chinese student as well which is quite new for me to have a Chinese student and I think that the most impressive thing is that nowadays in some classes the immigrants are usually half percent of the children...of the total in the class...”

T8: “...It contains many students from other countries and many Roma students but...the majority is Greek of course.”

T9: “...The students are native Greek speakers but few of them are descendants of economic immigrants coming from countries of Europe such as Albania, Romania, Bulgaria and are bilingual.”

T10: “... I have mostly students of Albanian origin who were born in Greece though, so they are second generation immigrants. Most of them use Albanian at home and some of them are fluent speakers... it can be considered that Albanian is their L1.”

T11: “...Well, in the school I am currently working the majority of students are Greek but we’ve got minority Albanian students... of Albanian origin but in the past, I worked in a school near Patras which had classes with Indian students...I have also worked with students of Albanian origin.”

T12: “...I am working in the Prefecture of Ilia, especially in the primary school of Kentro which is a village right above Ancient Ilida. It has some special characteristics because all of the students have a specific cultural background... they are Roma students. Also, there are only a few learners from a different cultural, social and ethnic background.”

In continuation of the questions, the analysis of EFL teachers’ views on intercultural education was deemed necessary so as to contextualize the discussion, understand what it really means to them and how it is implemented in their actual teaching contexts. It is obvious that the results present us with a range of meanings associated with this concept, yet it appears that they are similar to Greek teachers’
beliefs regarding intercultural education as analyzed in Palaiologou and Faas (2012) and Tsaliki (2012). It is, however, really encouraging that more than half of the respondents (7 out of 12) have realized that intercultural education should refer not only to immigrants or foreigners (Miliou, 2011, as cited in Tsaliki, 2012), but incorporate all pupils irrespective of their language, social class, race or gender. If this is the case, the implementation of intercultural approaches will be beneficial to everyone in the classroom and promote the dynamic interaction among students (Camilleri, 1992b, as cited in Tsaliki, 2012):

“...Intercultural education focuses on the unique identity of each student in the classroom and... values, namely respect or solidarity... and... things we are supposed to foster in the classroom...and become part of our school culture...are thought to be present in any utterance... in any way we behave...well-being on the school grounds...” “...Because you know the... the...use of the preposition ‘inter’ in the word really refers to the interaction and to a pure... to a genuine...relationship... that ought to develop while in the classroom...not strictly talking about the relationship between the teacher and the student....talking about the interaction among students themselves...and this is the key point... it's not that......we as teachers are supposed to... to.... cultivate ...to make the environment appropriate for these kids... (T5)”

“... So in my opinion and as far as I know Intercultural education refers to a specific kind of pedagogy which promotes tolerance acceptance respect of ... of ... the national and cultural identities of culturally diverse people... it's a kind of Education which preaches the... the equality ...the equal opportunity to education and social prosperity umm it also I think aims at the minimization of our cultural and national stereotypes and it... it... it is also about an effort ... it...it involves or it... it promotes the effort to proceed towards a cultural convergence to come closer to the other and to establish and to develop a relationship with the culturally diverse person...” (T1)

“...Okay, theoretically first of all, Intercultural education is supposed to be as we all know the effort to assimilate and include all children from all kinds of backgrounds, cultural or ethnic, or linguistic backgrounds... the effort to assimilate all these students in a school which will offer all of them equal
opportunities to education and to eventually not only to education but also to social inclusion. I think however, that taking into consideration the theoretical framework this is not always very successful, this process of assimilation that we’re talking about and inclusion. It’s not always very successful within the framework of the Greek educational system... “(T6).

These views also echo the European guidelines on wider policies of promoting cultural and linguistic diversity in the European Union, as the latter “is founded itself upon the mutual acceptance of peoples with different histories but a common future” (European Commission, 2003, p. 3), highlighting this way the attention that should be paid to language learning when it comes to the existence of different languages.

More specifically, some teachers stated that this is necessary because of the current multilingual and multicultural state of classrooms, inferring this way that a more intercultural approach needs to be adopted to move away from the conventional European education and gear towards one which leads to the interaction of languages and cultures and promotes respect and equal participation (Tsaliki, 2012):

“... so, the notion of Intercultural education in Greece actually grew along with... the inflow of the immigrants and...for some time the... intercultural education...the...the... national policy towards... the education of the culturally diverse students was one of...promoting the assimilation...It promoted assimilation, that is the absorption into the Greek national system but then ... after the... the number of immigrants became higher and higher and this number also appeared in the Greek Schools... the Intercultural education started to... to develop...” (T1)

Of course, the remaining teachers are mostly in favor of a more ‘segregationist’ type of education targeting such students, as they exclude them from the rest of the class by focusing exclusively on their languages, cultures or identities and the effort that should be made to be accepted by the rest of the native pupils:

“...To me, intercultural education refers to any educational context that has to do with.... a diverse cultural background whether it is.... the country that my students come from.... whether they belong in a different race.... a different
religion.... anything that is... let's say.... it... it is not uniform to what we perceive as a typical Greek student...” (T3)

“...make them...give them the basic lines of the daily subjects...and give them as many...as much information as possible on specific grammar topics and vocabulary units...” (T8)

In the following quote, for instance, T4 differentiates between a general and a more personal level, indicating assimilation as a plausible effect of education nowadays:

“...In general, I think Greece does not really interfere with issues of intercultural... with intercultural issues ...it actually comes as...incorporation, as an issue of incorporating all these students into the Greek context... Personally I think that there is a slight difference between incorporating all those students rather than enabling them to be part of their own culture, of their own point of view, of their own culture and through their own point of view... through their own culture and their own lives as well...” (T4)

Also, three teachers seem to deviate from the common or recurrent definitions of ‘intercultural education’. One teacher appeared to be really doubtful about the exact meaning:

“...okay what is Intercultural education...hmm...I think it is when you try to...to integrate students from other countries in the Greek context... in the Greek classroom ...For example, to teach him the classroom rules or some things about Greek culture...I mean...It’s how you apply some methods in the classroom in order to integrate the immigrant... to make him feel at ease probably...I think that I mentioned one dimension...probably...” (T7), while another one attributed intercultural education to mere survival in the Greek society, referring to immigrants’ and refugees’ daily struggle to be incorporated into the Greek nation:

“... We live in a multicultural environment especially in these years, Greece has many people from other countries and the refugees or immigrants try to become members of the Greek community, the Greek lifestyle...they try to find work, they try to find a safe place to live, so of course schools are multicultural communities...” (T12)

The last teacher seemed to downplay the commonly accepted terms (acceptance of diversity, interaction of pupils, exploration of similarities and differences among
students), while rejecting racial backgrounds and highlighting the focus on dissimilar pupils’ levels, which actually constitute ‘intercultural’ education to her:

“... Intercultural education... it has to do level... the level of the kids and not of their background...cause if I have... let’s say for example in the 6th class... I have the specific pupil that I mentioned... who is three years older than the others...her Greek is not good...It is very good for the years she's only been in Greece...two years, but she has a lot of gaps. Her English is quite good... her English is quite good... for this specific girl... but usually that's not the case... so it depends on the level of the kids and not on their racial background...” (T2).

Finally, one teacher did not actually give a definition, but rather preferred to state that it is a common trend nowadays, by applying the notion of ‘different’ to several concepts:

“...Okay Intercultural...teaching children coming from different cultures, having... speaking foreign languages, from different racial, cultural and linguistic backgrounds in our era... it’s a common trend nowadays...” (T9)

In short, interviewees could hardly go beyond issues of unity, equity and mutual respect for all cultures within the mainstream classroom, indicating signs of equating integration of L3 learners with assimilation. What is more, their conceptualization of the term, in the majority of the cases, included the equal use of all languages and cultures present in a classroom:

“...if I had to give a definition, maybe I think it has to do with understanding different cultures and different people and maybe the teaching methods promote this diversity, this cultural diversity, so that’s what I think...(T11). Yet, this idea has not proven to be incorporated in actual, applicable strategies – as will be seen later-when teaching. This finding can also be verified from the questionnaire data, where it was found that the learning process is not facilitated through the means of equal use and transfer of all languages present in the classroom.

5.2.1.2 Teaching strategies adopted in mixed educational settings for L3 learners

The specific theme is indicative both of the duplex nature of the learning- teaching processes and the way with which they are handled and negotiated. As the results show, each teacher holds different personal beliefs about how CLD children learn more effectively, which impact the teaching strategies and methods chosen. To
begin with, all teachers unanimously agreed on adapting or at least trying to adapt driven by personal intuition- their instructional strategies when teaching English as a third language and they stressed the need for the strategies to be continuously adapted in every day practice when mixed classrooms are concerned-a view which echoes the respondents’ answer in the questionnaires:

“...Yes, they have to be differentiated because they have a different approach, foreign students have a different approach...” (T8); “...yes, they should be adapted because they have to be treated differently but the question is how we can adapt...” (T7); “...Of course, of course of course they do have...they have to be adapted... at times especially when it comes to mixed ability classes...” (T4); “...yeah...yeah...yeah... absolutely...” (T5); “...Definitely... definitely they have to be adapted yes...I totally agree with that...” (T6).

In particular, more than half of the teachers (7 out of 12) appear to be mindful of the students by improvising:

“...that's when I must invent my own techniques because I can say that not all teachers follow the same techniques in classroom especially when it comes to language... I mean a Greek language teacher and a foreign language teacher...” (T5), selecting and customizing activities tailored to their students’ needs:

“...I find tasks according to the level most of the students have...” (T6); “...maybe I assign different kinds of homework...” (T11) or even skipping selected ones from the course book as they find it inappropriate in terms of difficulty for the learners:

“...I try to differentiate my strategies because the course book is inappropriate so I have to adapt or skip activities...” (T9); “...and the book as far as possible to make them understand what I mean...” (T8); “...and not according to the needs of the book...” (T4); “...we never follow strictly the organization of the course book you know...but when we follow the... the assignments and the projects suggested by the course book I always try to adjust them because the level of difficulty is sometimes very hard for the students and I tried to make a lot of adjustments concerning the level of the difficulty of material in the course book...” (T6)
Therefore, to them all, activities require a touch of change depending on the linguistic level and the learning abilities of the learners. With respect to the task shifting, some teachers resort to oversimplifying activities (adjusting their difficulty) or extensively explain them:

“...I am trying to explain them in English as much as I can because they don't speak... neither Greek nor English perfectly so there is a basic gap...” (T8);
“...explain... explain... I mean in simpler words...” (T7); “... maybe I try to...you know...be more illustrative when I explain something... On balance, that kind... I think I become more illustrative, I become more explanatory...” (T11);
“...Interviewer: So you make activities easier for them... Interviewee: yes, so as to satisfy their needs...” (T9). It seems that the respondents give special attention to the learners’ comprehensible input - by adjusting the level of difficulty of the various tasks, and cater to the learners’ developmental levels through appropriate scaffolding, which are key tenets in the notion of successful teaching according to the constructivist theory. Along with the use of a ‘learning buddy’, it can be inferred that teachers cater to the learners’ distinct zones and help them “extend from their current level and bridge the learning to a higher level within their zone of development” (Price, 2008, p. 26). Another – central to effective teaching- notion, which seems to be aligned with the learners’ zone of proximal development, is ‘comprehensible input’, which is taken into account by teachers. By adapting the curriculum and the proposed tasks, teachers are aware of the fact that “effective teaching must be pitched at the right level for the new learner (that is the level x), but still contain an element of challenge (plus 1)” (Price, 2008, p26).

In relation to this, Cummins (2000, 2003, as cited in Mattheoudakis, et al., 2017, p. 368) points out potential risks inextricably linked “to oversimplifying and ‘watering down’ the curriculum for these students.” If students are scarcely given cognitively demanding activities, they will fail to flourish at a certain time in the future. This view is also supported by Hammond (2001, as cited in Price, 2008), who argues that teachers should provide learners with the appropriate kind of support on condition that it is gradually reduced as learners mature and take control of their learning.

Moreover, regarding the chosen teaching strategies, more than half of the teachers try to integrate the cultural elements of L3 learners in their lessons, inferring that cultural relevant pedagogy seems to be the key to third language
teaching for them. For instance, T1 demonstrates how the teaching strategy she chooses (i.e., the use of authentic material) is influenced by and dependent on culture and not only helps learners be actively integrated, but also deters them from feeling excluded from the teaching procedure:

“...I choose authentic material which relates to the cultures of some of the students.... because I have noticed that this reference to their cultural context.... background motivates them to get involved in the lesson and prevents... prevents them from feeling excluded and marginalized...”. The same is true for T4 who uses projects as a way to help children to express themselves both culturally and linguistically:

“...I try to make them feel as if they are part of the team, talking about their own background, their own real life... Especially through projects I think...”. In other instances, there is no conscious awareness of choosing specific instructional strategies related to culture, since there aren’t any explicit strategies mentioned. Yet, it is apparent that L3 students’ cultural elements exert a strong influence over the running of the mixed classroom and determine the success of these learners:

“...to talk about their cultures... to open up...” (T10); “...I try...okay the cultural background to the theme that I’m teaching...” (T11). Also, related to the emergence of cultural symbolism in the mixed classroom, two teachers (namely T1 and T5) mentioned the use of narratives and literature as ideal opportunities to free learners from inhibitions, express themselves freely in the classroom and foster constructive dialogues on the basis of a given question or topic:

“...so, these personal narratives I have noticed... are a marvelous opportunity for them to express personally....” (T1); it is recently that I discovered reading literature that... this is... an acceptable pedagogy...to make them feel comfortable (T5).

These two teachers select materials related to literacy, as a means not only to enhance their speaking, writing (in the case of narratives) and reading skills, but also to enable all learners to listen to, reflect and elaborate on another person’s point of view: “... above all I urge them to engage in reflection.... think why things happen how things happen... how things affect them...”
and understand the emerging diversity in mainstream classrooms:

“...and I encourage them also to compare and contrast to find similarities between what each of them believes...”. Also, T1 – apart from the role of the instructor-takes on the role of facilitator, as implicitly do most of the teachers, and encourages dialogues and discussion:

“...and I ask them to involve in dialogue... On the basis of a question.... on a topic.... so that they may exchange.... beliefs.... they may exchange opinions.... they may exchange values....”. This strategy will help students exchange various views, be exposed to critique by comparing and contrasting to find any similarities or differences as long as there is mutual respect and value among all learners. To her, authentic dialogues might be the key to include everyone, cooperate with each other, be receptive to other worldviews and perspectives and forge strong relationships based on diversity. Besides, students from diverse backgrounds bring different life experiences and along with them, a variety of opinions and viewpoints on several issues (Artiles & Kozleski, 2007; Bransford, 2005; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Desmond & Emirbayer, 2010; James 2001, as cited in Hoosein, 2014). This admittance of the ‘alternative’ awareness will help all students focus on critical thinking, make connections, expand their knowledge of certain situations and eventually self-reflect on all the procedures that take place in the classroom, adjusting their conception of self and their overall understanding of their identity.

5.2.1.3 Active Learning

A prevalent sub-theme of the teaching strategies that emerged revolves around active learning, referring to way’s children learn best, by being actively involved in the learning process. In contrast to being ‘passive’ recipients of knowledge, teachers maintain that “learners should take responsibility of their own learning” (Allen-Taylor-Turner, 2005, p. 258) and develop a sense of ownership and belonging. This is achieved through the adoption of the “group work” technique on the part of the teachers which proves to work well in their teaching contexts as it creates an environment in which L3 learners can be active, free to express or control themselves and eventually construct knowledge. This strategy is fortified when L3 learners are surrounded by L2 learners who take on the role of the translator or assistant when linguistic or comprehensive problems arise (‘learning buddy’):
“...So basically, it is teamwork as the main method I use in differentiated learning... of course each team has some different tasks...” (T6).

“...I have to keep in mind that there are differences, but I try not to differentiate them in terms of how I organize my... my class... I mean when I assign group work, I make sure that the groups are made of students that are taught English as L2 and as L3 as well...It's very important for me as I said that you do group work...” Also, I sometimes I ask the help of my students who are more proficient in Greek in the L2 than those students are so they may become mediators between me and the students who feel less confident to speak or to be able to produce... (T3)

“...I also try to involve my students regardless culture in... group work .... and I organize heterogeneous groups ...(T1); “...assigning these students in groups with students I know they will help them, that they will be supportive towards them...” (T10).

For T5, this sense of cooperation extends to the potential use of other tools, since she lets students incorporate anything conducive to meaning making:

“...I mean that all the children present in the classroom contribute...to the learning process...using whatever they can so as to help them make meaning....”

Along with the emphasis on group work and other strategies that promote autonomous, independent learning and in conjunction with the importance L3 leaners’ culture carries, what could be inferred from the interview data is that teachers tried to relate what is actually learned in the foreign classroom to ‘real life’ and its values. In other words, provide them with real life skills. This was apparent through some techniques, such as the analysis of differences and similarities, collective work, cooperation, reflection and problem-solving situations where all students had to intervene and help:

“...really helpful for him as well as for us... in the classroom...What was able...to... that made it clear that we could communicate one way or another...There was a way to communicate ... and the rest of the students understood that as well and they all embraced his effort to express himself...
either in Greek or in English through…mutual help and understanding…” (T4)

“…There are some rules in the classroom we make from the very beginning…” (T4) “…so… though the priority of the instructor is to cultivate their social skills…and make them realize how... how they are supposed to... behave in schools...then we move forward and... we expect from them to... to...use things…” (T5)

“…For example, to teach him the classroom rules or some things about Greek culture…” (T7).

Apart from the cognitive part referring to perception, attention, memory, learning, decision making and language abilities, teachers feel that part of their teaching should deal with providing such students with the emotional and social skills set to facilitate their integration in the society in which they are educated, as well as their life in general:

“…also encouraging them…affective strategies…” (T7)

Moreover, the active engagement of learners in the process of constructing knowledge and succeeding in additional language learning is highlighted through the adoption of other strategies, on the part of the teachers. Some teachers reported using physical resources and various visuals based on the nature of the topic taught and key ideas:

“…what I try to do...is offer the... all the kid’s visual stimuli all the time in the classroom... as well as audio resources...first of all to make them feel comfortable (T5).

Also, miming, role plays, games, pointing at objects, using songs, picture dictionaries, foreign dictionaries and images on the board were among the strategies mentioned used, by few teachers though, to promote peer interaction, socialization and self-expression firsthand:

“…teaching vocabulary probably with the use of picture dictionaries…” (T8)

“...I try to include games and role playing or whole class discussion projects…” (T9), which echoes T1’s opinion of incorporating discussions as a strong tool to forge strong relationships and help distinct cultural elements emerge:
“...we use mostly English and we point at objects, we try to mime or use songs or whatever...” (T12)

“...It was a student from Iran... that student had difficulty in talking... in speaking Greek... He knew nothing about our language he found himself as a visitor to our country, he lived here and he came to our class and he had to communicate in the foreign words, in words in English he could not understand because he was a fluent.... actually, he was a fluent speaker...but.... the level he came to was A2, so there was a foreign dictionary, a foreign vocabulary for him...” (T4)

What is more, two teachers mentioned that they make use of body or sign language in the case of immigrant students who can neither speak the host (L2) nor the target language (L3), so as to bridge the communication break-down which would have been achieved if one of the languages could be used:

“...what I am trying to do is use body language...in order to communicate with him...this can be the only way...; “... of course his peers are also very helpful...they use sign language as well and I saw that this is something that works with him so I use the same...” (T7)

“...I’m trying to explain something using images on the board, body language...” (T8).

Of course, the use of multimedia and the Internet could not be missing from the most frequently quoted strategies used by EFL teachers. However, it is not widely employed, since only two teachers mentioned using the Internet as a means to practice and supplement active, inclusive and collaborative teaching. In one case, it is used as a complementary, explanatory teaching method:

“...I am trying to give them examples using the internet whenever I have access it is not always simple...”, whereas in another case it served as an extension of the teaching process, that would ensure the active participation and interaction of a foreign student without being limited by the constraint of not knowing the host language (L2)

“...he had to use a computer in order to communicate in the Persian language... I mean he translated words he could also express himself
better when he wanted to express himself... to say something... he couldn’t through English... he always searched for... on the internet...” (L2)

In any case, active and experiential learning seems to be promoted by teachers. Using computers with such children to facilitate their learning and enable them to look up words, find the equivalent in their own language or even master vocabulary much more easily, is a way to enable CLD students to get the sense of not only belonging to the wider group, but also keeping up with the rest of the class to the greatest extent.

Also, T3 mentioned the ‘extra time’ strategy:

“...another thing I do is give them extra time...” - possibly to help them relax and work at their own pace, whereas since she was the only one to identify special characteristics that could differentiate them from monolingual learners, she acknowledged multiculturalism as an asset, placing emphasis on the fact that bilinguals do have special mechanisms and showed confidence on letting students use elements and strategies that have previously acquired in their own native languages:

“... I use the fact that English is taught as an L3 to those students as an advantage in the sense that since it is a third language they are being taught and they are learning maybe they can put emotions and mechanisms of learning the language even if it is done subconsciously... that they could use the learning process to their own benefit... like for example... if... there are some words that are phonetically similar to their own native language or to Greek or to English... they might use that as a bridge... to bridge their existing knowledge with the new one... the fact is that this can only be done for students that their native language is European-based or similar to our own... to... English or to Greek... when it comes to students that come from the Middle East or other parts of the world where the language taught is totally different then... I think... there is a problem... I cannot use that...” (T3)

In conjunction with the questionnaire data, it can be inferred that the teachers often use or transfer cognates and try to make the least use of all languages during the lesson, even scarcely. This might be due to the fact that they might want
to facilitate the learning process or to create the ‘optimal’ learning environment in which all languages are equally used. In any case, it becomes evident from the interviews that they try to find similarities among the languages and by emphasizing the typological closeness of the languages, they do not treat languages as independent or distinct, but connect and relate them because of a common underlying proficiency. These views are really important when it comes to third language teaching, since they denote the teachers’ awareness of language acquisition, which should be “measured in terms of the cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP), rather than the social English familiar to personal interactions and playground language” (Price, 2008, p. 21).

Other significant strategies include those of role-playing and reading books aloud which promote participatory learning and help learners be focused and involved. Listening to stories attentively enhances learners’ listening and receptive skills, whereas role playing actually involves students in real life simulations, therefore expose them to authentic tasks.

However, in order to help learners, it appears that some teachers resort to more traditional instructional approaches. For instance, T2 mentioned creating special worksheets:

“…worksheets which I make from home... it's usually a very, very small… little text...underline the unknown words... and I write them down and photocopy and give them to the kids and that's their work...”

or having students copy words from the board that are substantially easier than the vocabulary the rest of the class should acquire: “…so I just circle some of the very... very easy words on the blackboard but we are talking about level cat, dog, ant, work…”

The same holds true for T9 and T10:

“...or sometimes I have to produce some similar material...so that easier and more difficult exercises are included in the process…” (T9)

“...Okay, I suppose I try to differentiate them and integrate them into the mainstream classroom by writing them some differentiated material…” (T10)
In relation to the above strategies, it seems that T2 has different expectations from different students in the classroom: “...Interviewee: I put them together in a group in my... of my spare... my... my spare hours... my gaps...”

Interviewer: oh, not during the lesson!

Interviewee: No! No! during the lesson they just listen... they just listen...I don't make them do what I do with the others....

Learners will believe in their capacity to fulfill their goals and they will help themselves learn, unless they are ‘cut off’ from the rest of the students. Although the particular teacher offers individualized teaching, she does not seem to focus on these pupils’ growth and change along with the rest of the classroom. Hence, without mentioning less cognitive or linguistic ability, it is highly probable that the learners may not feel equally competent. Moreover, although she makes use of the ‘group work’ strategy to provide learners with exemplified instruction and focus on specific learning goals, she relies exclusively on language schools as a source of knowledge for these learners, degrading this way the role of the foreign language teacher in the Greek State school:

“…because they are not going to be able to do it! the level is very low... they don't they don't go to an English frontistirio...to an English language School...”

(T2)

5.2.1.4 Relationships among teachers and L3 learners

In relation to the above comments, teachers revealed that they are interested in getting to know their learners by being informed about their cultural background, showing this way they are in need of a continually developing knowledge of the learners, personalize that knowledge and apply it in all available resources:

“...what I try to do in class is to ....to get the information from their background first of all...” (T7); “...I think that the thing I strive to do is learn about the cultural environment, the cultural background of the students...” (T11)

It can be therefore assumed that the participants who aim to equity pedagogy through culturally relevant instruction, expose students to new information, new interpretations and perspectives and strive to make learning experiences more familiar to them (Gay, 2000). The majority of the respondents show unconditional
acceptance and acknowledgement that differences do exist and by being respected and welcome, effective learning might take place. As T1 commented, the materials should be varied to the extent that the classroom environment becomes inclusive and learners are valued and safe:

“...On the whole, I try to create.... (pause) with special tasks to create.... a safe and positive... climate for them to... to express themselves....” ...I mean in the case they don't feel ...We know some things about them ...they are not going to work on that... they are not going to participate...Or be willing to collaborate...” (T5)

“...then I try to be supportive and to be close to them...” (T7)

“...become a part of the larger group, but also because it is...I mean to feel safe I mean to feel included I mean an inclusive classroom, an inclusive environment is an environment of co-operation I think is the best environment for them to... to...learn for any... for any student...if they are feeling a little bit cornered...” (T3); “.... feel free and they feel safe to interact and interpret...actually to interpret...large amount of pieces of knowledge...” (T4)

“...also encouraging them... affective strategies...to talk about their cultures... to open up...” (T10)

This overt acceptance of the diversity leads to the effort of creating student-centered classrooms, in which the responsibility of learning is mostly put on the learners themselves under the vigil eye of the EFL teacher.

As testified by the various sources of related literature noted in the second chapter (Banks et. al, 2001; Ramsey, 1987; Gay, 2000), there is indeed strong support from many researchers for the need for teachers to be culturally responsive.

5.2.1.5 The potential of multilingualism for learners/ Use of the available languages

Regarding all languages available in the mixed classroom, almost all of the teachers referred to using the learners’ home languages, only as a way to value their students’ country of origin and its culture. It is therefore evident that once again teachers appreciate distinct cultures and try to follow a culturally responsive
approach to teaching that would be conducive to accepting all distinct features present in a classroom:

“...I occasionally grasp the opportunity to...to .... seek...from my students, not myself the use from the students of their own mother tongues ...they usually talk about their customs, how they express themselves in their own mother tongues and in this I have seen that.... (pause) ... somehow tingles the interest of all the other...” (T1)

“...well... I try to...in a circular way actually... they all participate to one point or another...always in a differentiating point... (T4)

“...in the previously defined delineated context I try to make them feel welcome and use their own expressions, different proverbs, greetings and in this way they open up as much as they can, they feel integrated. Yes, I’m trying to use as much -as far as I can of course- some of their linguistic elements in the everyday classroom routine...” “... to talk about their cultures... to open up... to show with the rest of the classroom linguistic elements... how we can say good morning in their own language...” (T10)

Apart from the cultural hues added to the lesson and the opening up of all students to various cultures, one teacher stated that correct and sustained use of the learners’ home languages would require research and extra load on her part. As a result, she just resorts to sparse words every now and then related to special events or celebrations that take place in L3 learners’ motherland, so as to help them integrate in the school community and raise other children’s awareness on different customs and habits:

“...I don’t...I don’t use them because it depends probably more on research from my part but from my experience, most immigrants, most children from other countries are very willing to tell me for example how we say some words in their mother tongue...this is something that I really encourage in the classroom...”

“...I am very encouraging in this part and I also encourage them to tell me their experiences and how they tell something when they go on holidays to their motherland, how they spend their time and I’m very interested in listening and... because I want all the others, all their peers to become acquainted to a different
person, to listen to something different, something out of their own context…” “I think that we call probably cultural…how we educate our students culturally…” (T7)

Moreover, T3 is restricted only to the use of the host language (L2 – Greek) as well as the target language (L3-English):

“...I don't have the knowledge of all of them... I mean for example in... with my Albanian students over the years, I may have picked up some words here and there and may have become more familiar with their cultural background... and close to their own culture but I... when it comes to other countries... I'm not... I'm not... that familiar neither with their language nor with their culture so I must say that I restrict myself to using Greek...and English...” (T3)

Other teachers attributed the lack of interest and use of learners’ native languages to their own lack of awareness of these foreign languages: a teacher for example, refers to lack of mastery of the native languages, thus absence from the teaching procedure:

“...Not always well no, no I do not because I do not speak their native language...Some students who come for example from Albania are able to understand Greek, so it's easy for us to communicate...but other students who come from China or Iran speak a language that I'm not familiar with their specific native language, so I cannot use it. Just in English or in Greek, nothing else…” (T8)

In relation to the lack of mastery, a teacher ascribed the lack of use of the native languages to limited teaching time, implying that if there were less pressure carrying out the lesson, she would probably have focused on the L3 learners’ linguistic background: No, of course I don’t... you know... make extensive use of children's languages, home languages, because I don’t have the background. Sometimes, I may try...you know... to associate the meaning of some words in their mother tongue, Albanian, but I do not make use of all of them because I don’t have time... I wish I had more time when teaching...(T11)

In the same line, T2 might use random words so as to give such learners a boost and make them feel part of the ‘gang’:
“...no, no I am not going to learn them... but sometimes I will ask the kids how's this in your language... What's this called in your language? ...To make them feel at ease, to make them feel that they blend in, that they are one of the gang, just for that...because learning wise they're not going to learn anything... my, my humble opinion is that...” (T2)

Probing into T2’s answer, a negation might be detected regarding the potential effort on the teacher’s part to deal with students’ native languages, whereas T12 gave another dimension to using the existing languages in the mixed classroom. However, based on research (De Angelis, 2011; Hufeisen, 2011 and Otwinowska, 2014, as cited in Haukås, 2016), an effective teacher is considered one that being multilingual themselves should serve as role models, by fostering their learners’ multilingualism and stressing their individual cognitive and affective differences to their own advantage.

In particular, due to the fact that her classroom consists only of first-generation immigrants who don’t speak Greek at all, she considers English as their second language. In this sense, she sets a common starting point for both monolingual and bilingual children and deems the additional language as their second one. This, in turn, goes to show that since she excludes the socially dominant language of the country (Greek) from the teaching procedure completely, as well as their native one (Albanian), the specific classroom operates only in one foreign language, which is the target language (L3).

Another teacher (T6) reported on making use of the native language of two children who were basic users of English, yet had no prior knowledge of the host language. The communication in his native language was achieved by a peer who was of the same social background and took on the role of the mediator in the event of a communication breakdown in the target language:

“...I had no choice but to focus on their native language of the child... of course I don’t speak Albanian but because we had other students of Albanian origin I always told the child of question to sit next to a classmate who is from Albanian origin and who could understand and speak a little bit of Albanian so that he could...you know...he could mediate...” “...I mean it was the only choice I had because in the beginning the two students we are
talking about... they couldn’t speak ...they could barely understand Greek but they could not speak...” “...So, I necessarily had to do that. Also, their English...Because of course in the Albanian school they also had a class of English... Their English was not in the same level as my students...It was a very different level but they could...you know sometimes because we couldn’t communicate in Greek obviously in order for me to give instructions on how to do exercises for example, I think that you know... using basic English was another choice that I had...(T6).

Yet, research has shown that it has repeatedly been the case for teachers to judge the children’s overall linguistic development in the majority language on the basis of their conversational fluency (Cummins 2000, 2003, as cited in Mattheoudakis et al., 2017), without taking into account that the development of academic language “is still lagging behind.”

Regarding another case, it was really uplifting on the part of T5 to visually acknowledge the home languages of the children, something which indicated respect at the same time:

“...there is always a place in the classroom where everybody writes their names on the board in their home languages of course...There are always posters around showing us simple everyday words are written... I repeat them in the classroom...You know, they get great satisfaction when we... when we ask them all the time to tell us the words they use at home... the equivalent... you know...word...” (T5).

In particular, the elements of cultural diversity represented in displays in the classroom surroundings are indicative of a culturally responsive teacher, which can indeed constitute a feature of an effective teacher (Gay, 2000; Parker-Jenkins et al., 2004, as cited in Price, 2004). No other teacher mentioned a particular classroom environment deviating from the norm. Moreover, the particular teacher promotes the use of all languages available as a means to make meaning and facilitate the whole process:

“...there is a tendency to use all the linguistic and semiotic repertoires...” (T5).
On the other side of the coin, only two interviewees claimed never to engage in such practices:

“...No, no... I don’t... Interviewer: You have never tried to do something related to their languages to include them in your classroom...never? Interviewer: never...” (T9)

No, because I am not educated...I don’t know any Albanian so I can’t. I try to help them using my hands, using miming, using pictures... (T12)

The latter of the two, as has already been mentioned, admitted that she has enforced an ‘English-only’ policy in her classroom, due to the fact that first generation immigrants are not aware of the Greek language (L2).

5.2.1.6 Teachers’ Challenges in the mixed classroom

The highly diverse population in the mainstream classroom posed several challenges to the teachers interviewed, considering the lack of proper training as the most frequently quoted challenge that teachers have to come to terms with. The findings indicate that the lack of knowledge about multilingual pedagogy posed challenges in finding appropriate instruction for L3 learners or corroborating that the existing strategies really worked for their students:

“...I am not sure to what extent I am prepared to meet the requirements in this teaching situation as I have not received any formal training...” (T9)

“.... Of course, it’s not easy... we have to be fully equipped and prepared...” (T12)

For instance, T4 referred to the use of soft skills such as communication so as to avoid indifference and lack of participation or equal treatment:

“... I think it’s sometimes it’s communication... okay? Especially when language is not too... when they cannot communicate in their language, I think the problem is really hard...I am already running into one such incident....and hopefully technology helps me a lot... but then again it comes also to...the rest of the classroom where... some of the students from different... social backgrounds basically... find it hard to participate...” (T4).

The specific teacher acknowledges the role of technology in helping individuals connect and construct knowledge in ways that traditional contexts would not allow. Moreover, T7 considered that it was crucial to use effective teaching methods,
tailored to the needs of the students, so as to help them acquire the target language successfully:

“...I think the main challenge is to know if the methods that I am trying to use...If they are going to have a result... for the...for the immigrants...I think this is my main concern if...if I do something right... if I help them...” (T7).

According to her, there is no official guidance and therefore the specific teachers act out of their own will and instinct:

“...Because we don't have any official guidance or some guidelines that we should use and...something to depend on or base our teaching...So, it depends on the teachers’ willingness to work with the immigrants even if they don’t have something official...something applicable probably...something that we are sure that it works with them...this is the challenge...this is the difficult part...” (T7)

This also echoes comments made by another teacher who among other challenges, mentioned lack of training and specific material that oblige teachers to become designers of relevant differentiated activities:

“...First of all, there is no differentiated material... we have no such material, so we have to become designers... of such material... But we haven't got any training in that field...” “... cause there is no efficient training... we need to get on training in that field to be more adequate...” (T10)

Moreover, it can be inferred that similar comments relevant to the inadequacy of teachers to perform well, demonstrate lack of strategy development preparation and targeted instructional methods for L3 learners:

“...For me beyond the practical... dimension the practical part of these challenges how to teach how to organize how to regulate the language activities and so on... the main challenges are several...” (T1).

In the same vein, another constraint many teachers talked about had to do with their competence regarding the management of cultural and linguistic diversity - both on an individual and a more general level, and more importantly their competence in finding the balance between monolingual and bilingual learners:
“...The challenge is to transmit the knowledge you want to transmit to the rest of the class to those students as well. It’s not always difficult...it’s not always easy to do that...Transmitting knowledge to students who do not share the same background with you most of the times challenging... This is the main challenge that I’d say...”; “...First of all, I think that it is very difficult to balance between the different learning needs that these students have and I think it’s very difficult to balance between the different cultural and linguistic backgrounds connected to these students...” (T11)

“...for example, a challenge is how to find ways of managing the students as a community... and how to manage each student as a personality...” another challenge is how to balance the cultures between students because each one is proud of each.... his or her culture... and how to inspire genuine interest to all cultures to all students....”, “...how to manage them how to persuade the other people the other, the big part of the class, of the mono-cultural mass... how to persuade them to respect their cultural diversity.... how to persuade them to come closer to them...”, “....and last... lastly another challenge is how to regulate the diverse needs of my students because each according... according to the group he belongs and according to his personal needs expect something different from me so the challenges how to regulate diverse needs of my students and how to enhance his personal properties, his personal skills, his personal qualities...” (T1)

“...I think the one that I mentioned just now being unable to be familiar with their cultural backgrounds their native language... the way they have been learning... They have just come into Greece...” (T3)

All these comments, expressed with caution, are related once more to the value and respect teachers seem to show towards L3 learners’ cultures, their foremost concern to create an inclusive environment for them:

“…we have to be open to and... ready to welcome and help them feel accepted, feel - let’s say equal- of course they are equal... they sometimes feel a little frightened when they enter an environment where they don’t share a common language... a common first language...” (T12)
“...another challenge is how to accommodate all of them emotionally first and then linguistically, how to provide this space for all of them...” (T1); “...I am trying to succeed in... when working with such kids... is to build confidence and make them feel at home...” (T5)

and their need to improve their teaching practices, at the same time.

Moreover, some ongoing difficulties in the schools are also demonstrated in the findings that concern the teachers and possibly impede them in their performance. These obstacles relate to references to prejudice and racism towards diversified learners, so the challenge for some teachers lies in balancing the various cultures coexisting in the school, establishing an intercultural and cooperative ethos and resolving potential conflicts that might arise within the student community:

“...another challenge .... which is often....shared by many teachers is how to cope with possible...arising cultural misunderstandings which sometimes turn into cultural conflicts...how to manage stereotypes how to manage prejudices...which are expressed on...on the spur of the moment ...” (T1)

Another teacher reported the case of a specific cultural group which rarely attend school, yet they tend to be disobedient and cause conflicts:

“...We have a substantial number of Roma students in our school. So, I mentioned it because it's a special cultural group that has specific habits, they have specific routines and they are not easily assimilated...usually okay?... that they don’t follow at home for example and that at school they have to follow these instructions and these guidelines and these rules in order for all kids to be ...how can I say...? To be...to be on good terms with them... (T6).

In another case, a teacher referred to the need to help children overcome possible stereotypes and prejudices before helping them accept diversity and protect the minority groups, which to her are considered ‘disadvantaged’:

“...I believe that children can be very harsh so there is a lot of prejudice in the Greek context, so we have to protect children coming from various racial and cultural backgrounds... differentiated... we have to protect them so as to avoid conflicts in the classroom... being bullied for example... There is a number of challenges...” (T10).

Other challenges experienced only by two teachers regard the limited teaching time available in the classroom, the inappropriate books, signs of indifference or negative
behavior on the part of the learners and lack of appropriate equipment conducive to accessing resources necessary for the learners’ progress:

“...The books are inappropriate to fulfill the learners’ needs... There is not much time to teach my material...”; “...sometimes I observe negative behavior...on the part of these students...towards the lesson I’m afraid because they are not motivated... I try to motivate them with the strategies and the activities I use but... there is no interest on their part...” (T9)

“...There are also problems in equipment ...The use of equipment like computers or anything that has to do... access...with the technological equipment is a bit difficult...” (T3).

It can be assumed that this negativity might stem from lack of favoritism towards these learners from school or just because they find it difficult to adjust to a new society. Also, as Nikolaou (2011) points out, these children might feel great stress or anxiety on entering a new situation, especially when they realize that their socio-cultural values that once characterized them in their country, are the main reason for being marginalized in the new one. Therefore, not only their academic progress but also their social integration may create classroom management problems and even result in conflicts.

Finally, another important aspect for teachers in choosing and applying the most effective strategies for L3 learners, relate to their rapport with the L3 learners’ parents. Several teachers believe that a relationship with the parents is critical, something which constitutes part of the resiliency on their part and the learner-centered approach that they favor: “...I do not have any contact with their family environment...which is very... sometimes these children come from a very...from families where their parents work for very long... for long hours so they are not available or they cannot communicate themselves in Greek there is no way that we can have like a teacher-parent support system for the students...” (T3)

Another teacher, referring to the cultural group of Roma pupils mentioned that: “...the children and their parents mostly are not very open to accepting new suggestions concerning life in school generally... not only concerning learning and teaching methodology...accepting some norms in the life of school...”
Regarding other cultural groups, the same teacher contended that generally cooperation between families of foreign pupils and teachers is deemed necessary, especially if they haven’t lived in Greece for long:

“...I think it has to do mostly with how much time they spent in Greece...If they spent a lot of time in Greece, I think that they are much more open to accepting things on the teacher...because if they very recently moved to Greece, then it is no very difficult for them and we can understand why...it’s easily understandable...”; Interviewer: yes, but you still think that cooperation is necessary... Interviewee: yeah...Absolutely... absolutely yeah...” (T6).

Another teacher expressed the great need to reach out to parents, which is not feasible possibly due to the language barrier or because of mere lack of interest or time:

“...And there is no cooperation in the school by parents... I would like that but...But there is no chance...” (T9).

On the downside, T2 by making quite poignant comments about the role of L3 learners in the mainstream classroom, complained that they should be cut off from the rest of the class- at least during her lesson “…because it's a waste of time in the classroom for them... because they can't follow what we are saying... they feel useless I'm sure they do...”.

To her, these learners should typically start from scratch by being taught the essentials, by an expert, another special English teacher or her if she had more time at her disposal, something which took me by surprise, since she saw no potential in such students and had really low expectations.

5.2.1.7 Teacher development – Future Training

Perhaps the most remarkable finding gleaned, is the amount of agreement found among teachers on the great need for training in the field. All teachers unanimously pointed out the need for urgent strategy training in the form of both continuing education and in-service training, except for teacher T2 who ostensibly denied being trained in the beginning but towards the end of the interview receded to possibly participating in a future workshop under certain circumstances:
“...no... because usually the people who give us the strategy developing, are usually people who have never ever worked into a classroom so he can talk to me as if he's grinning the face and I I'm going to get nothing out of it because I'm never gonna be able to apply any of this theoretical... in the class... and I'm talking about the majority not all of them of course I am sure that some of them are teachers and they know the difficulties in a classroom but usually...usually they... the people who tell you what to do are usually people who do not teach...” (T2)

The same teacher moved on by stating that she is a lot more concerned to be trained on classroom management problems, rather than helping these students thrive cognitively:

“...I'm not going to follow somebody's... which is inapplicable...in the classroom... because half of the classroom is spent usually and especially in the schools I am now... half of the classroom time is spent dealing with problems that have arisen outside during recess...because of their personal problems... we've got kids that are very poor we have children who have got enmity with each other... and they always fight I think that is more important for me to do with that first and the cognitive part later on! later on!”; “...If someone like that would like to explain to me how to have a more... a more prolific lesson, I would not be that negative...” (T2)

In this case, it is evident that the specific teacher prioritizes the more pragmatic concerns of the daily running of the lessons, namely coping with diverse learners (Sifakis, 2011) and the potential attitudinal problems that might arise. Other than that, all the other teachers acknowledged lack of competency to implement third language instruction to bilingual learners and welcomed the possibility of future focused workshops or seminars.

“...Oh yeah...Definitely... I think that training concerning strategy development is absolutely necessary and I would appreciate some opportunities for training...” (T6)
"...yes of course I would like to be trained Because I think that this would offer me not only knowledge but also new innovative ideas concerning the way I can deal with those students...” (T8)

Of course, ...of course...By all means...But I don't believe we can on our own without such strategies... We need some guidance on that... from coordinators... from the Ministry...coordinated action...” (T12)

“...You know there are some practices that are called by formal or non-formal institutions to participate and the only thing that is done is to being bombarded with theoretical approaches...” (T5).

T1 highlighted the importance of training in general in the field on condition that teachers themselves truly become multilinguals and open to the new reality which seems to establish for good. For her, it is crucial that teachers possess awareness about multilingual education and practices in addition to seeing the learners’ potential as multilingual speakers:

“...Training? yes absolutely... absolutely because all kinds of training offer the teachers a means to find answers to their to his needs and intercultural education is a really crucial area for training not only because......we all know that language is part of culture because nowadays all... most if not all classroom contexts are largely multicultural so training especially training strategy development is necessary provided that the teachers do not see just practical strategy development solutions........ but first of all are ready to receive, are ready to change their own mentality...” (T1)

Other teachers related the great need for being trained first to the lack of pre-service training and secondly to the challenging multilingual and multicultural classrooms that are being formed at an alarming rate in our era. In particular, diversity is to increase in the years to come and this realization may in all probability be intimidating to the informants, if they are not fully and effectively trained:

“...you know the truth is that... all teachers in public schools, not only English language teachers...are asked to work with culturally and linguistically diverse kids...Without having prior education...” (T5)
“...For sure...okay... I don't know if there is any plan of doing something like that in the near future, I think that we are going to need it... because... judging from the current circumstances having a more culturally diverse classroom is a reality, so we need to adapt for sure...” (T3)

“...Of course, of course I do because as things show more and more refugees or more foreigners visit Greece either from Eastern or from Europe...” (T4)

“... yes... the teachers should be trained as the challenges in the classroom... as there are many challenges in the classroom...” (T9).

The teachers’ perceptions that they would benefit from future training in the field was fortified by completely excluding the theoretical part that provides teachers with material they can find themselves and promoting hands-on, practical experience aiming to real-life situations in which the teachers could easily apply the strategies taught:

“...No, no, no not in theory not in theory!... not in theory...I'm a viewer so I think practice things are much better... Because I also believe that every single teacher can use their own theory through practice...I mean we are able to do so... This is one of the skills... we ought to have as...teachers...” (T4)

“...Not just only theory because the theoretical background is easy to find even online, I think...The most important thing is like... you know... taking part in workshops which are practical which are Interactive...you know do some work of this kind I think...this is what is lacking...in practice...” (T6)

“...the theory should be implemented in practice in order to see whether and to what extent it is effective or not...” (T9)

“...actual practice... not just theoretical information... We can read them after all... we need some actual practice and guidance...” (T10)

“... I would prefer some practical workshops... analyses of case studies...or field trips in order to see in person these strategies and no more theory...” (T12).

The practical experience becomes even more urgent and indispensable in the case of first-generation immigrants who have no knowledge of the host language and as a
result the chances of instructing them or even communicating with them plummet automatically:

“...What I would really like is to get some -apart from theoretical training- I would like to see how this works in real life... in real-time classrooms... For example, how do we teach...for example a Chinese immigrant who doesn’t speak Greek, but Chinese or English, so... how can we teach and come to a closer relationship with a student like that?” (T7)

In another case, a teacher aspires practical training in conjunction with students attending as well- a plausible plan which would undoubtedly yield fruitful results: “...I would like to attend the workshop having to do with practical issues, not theoretical...For example, I would be able to attend a workshop when... where students attend as well...” (T8)

Regarding the desired outcomes, the interviewees highlighted the need for appropriate books and curricula written according to the principles of third / additional language teaching for the mixed Greek State classrooms: “…but what we really need is practical instructions and information regarding this new situation...practical help... what kind of multilingual texts I am supposed to give them...all of that material is a great practice...a great method...to promote things...But there are things that we don’t really know...on working... so...if they want us to succeed in what we are doing...someone has to help us...understand us...” (T5)

In conjunction with appropriate teaching material, they differentiated their needs from those of Greek mainstream teachers:

“especially for us who are EFL teachers... not their mainstream teachers I mean...” (T9)

“... the whole concept... and the idea...and... the way we proceed some things in the classroom... is totally different... English language teachers think to be more sensitive towards the issue of inclusion...” (T5)

and stressed the need to be instructed on pedagogical issues, under the auspices of training teacher experts specialized in the field because
“...until now the implementation is mainly based on my personal will and my self-education and this is an obstacle that hinders this process...” (T9)

“... I would appreciate more workshops organized by people who are in charge...You know...a more specific workshop...” (T6); “...an expert and teach me how to do that in a better way because of course I cannot deal with that perfectly since I’m not familiar with that...” (T8)

Three other teachers suggested in-class modelling and attendance of a week or a month course, in the sense of simulated training, in contrast to rare seminars organized by those in charge- with collaborative perspectives among EFL participants, so as to grasp the appropriate strategies in depth and be fully prepared.

“...I would like to...participate in a week or a month course... in which... group work...would feel enhanced and I would be asked to work with other colleagues...” (T5)

“...I would like to...watch some classes...to go to some of them... actual classes, classrooms with teachers providing such differentiated training, get inspired, get some ideas... I would like to receive formal training on designing such material differentiated material...” (T10)

“... I would be expected to be educated maybe see some in-class modelling like somebody who is actually an expert on the field...to show how we can do practice...” (T3).

Finally, according to the teachers, their formal training on strategy development shouldn’t be jeopardized by marginalizing the importance of cultural awareness and skills. To them, communication skills- even on a personal level, correlate to breaking down barriers, forging stronger and more intimate relationships and improving their overall performance:

“...I reckon that intercultural education should be compulsory for all teachers, especially the EFL teachers and I think that we maybe, we could... you know receive more background information by the principal, for mixed students backgrounds so as to be prepared as to what to expect...” (T12)

“...I would...expect to be educated on cultural matters...” (T3)
“...what hasn't been done... Is that we have not given a hint of their culturally accepted forms...” (T5)

**Conclusion**

In this chapter both the quantitative and qualitative results of the study were analyzed separately, in depth. In the following – and final chapter- the findings, based on the information gathered by both research tools, will merge, and be combined as a whole in order to present a more coherent picture of the inquiries and the research itself.
Chapter 6: Implications and Conclusions

Introduction

The acquisition of English as an L3 has distinct features since it involves elements and procedures that play an important role in the processing of two linguistic systems. It might be the case though, for several teachers and educators worldwide, to perceive L3 teaching similar to second language teaching. Yet, the insights drawn from the study provided me with different pieces of information about trilingual teachers which, based on the relevant theories and frameworks presented in the previous chapters, touch upon many variables. What could be inferred with certainty, though, is that the advantages and mechanisms bilinguals have over monolinguals are distinct and require special attention by language teachers. This realization might provide useful insights that can inform the already existing teaching practices and bring change in the English language classroom.

Therefore, in this chapter, the research findings presented are assembled, analyzed and interpreted in relation to the research questions as these have been formulated along with the theoretical frameworks, providing snapshots of teaching EAL to bilingual learners. Also, given the current situation in Greece, the various teachers’ perspectives regarding the instructional strategies employed when teaching English as a third language and their implications for the overall teaching procedure as well as for the learners individually, will possibly pave the way for more efficient L3 teaching without the reported constraints or challenges. Finally, the implications as well as limitations of this study aim at portraying and interpreting the uniqueness of teaching English to culturally and linguistically diverse students in mainstream contexts and will also suggest ways forward to improve the existing quality and reality of teaching English in the primary school context.

6.1 Analysis of the main findings

Regarding the quantitative data, the current research was conducted by 93 participants, the majority of whom were Greek women, currently working in Primary Schools in Western Greece. The majority of the participants, who are aged between 31 and 50 years old, are permanent employees with 11-25 years of teaching experience. Also, the overwhelming majority of them are Greek, having received
low (1-3) to medium (4-7) training on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students. What is more, most of them stated that they mainly work in rural/agrarian or suburban areas, where a low percentage of their school's population are ethnic minority community children. Regarding their educational attainments, most of them own a Master’s degree or have attended some years of postgraduate studies and as far as the educational attainments in Multilingual-Multicultural Education are concerned in particular, the majority answered that they haven’t got such attainments. Regarding participants who have those educational attainments, approximately 1/3 of them specify that they have attended simple courses or seminars. Concerning the teachers’ knowledge about languages other than English and Greek, it was observed that several speak Italian, German, Spanish or any other language, mainly at a basic level. French is excluded, having very few (3 out of 10) participants speak it at a basic level. Finally, very few reported speaking Russian, Portuguese and Romanian at a basic level.

In terms of the type of training they have received on culturally and linguistically diverse students, the majority of the participants answered that they have devoted only self-study time on issues related to teaching CLD students, - which cannot count towards professional development hours, followed by few references of theirs to training seminars or workshops focusing on such students.

The 1st research question examined the extent to which teachers’ professional experience can affect L3 learners’ ability to acquire new vocabulary. Oral language development is especially important in third language acquisition in the development of academic competences and literacy (Genesee et al., n.d) and teachers should be aware of the commonest patterns in additional language acquisition so as to choose appropriate material conducive to the learners’ development (Fillmore & Snow, 2000). When asked about the teaching of new vocabulary, with regard to certain types of language acquisition and contextualization as well as mastery of new vocabulary, all memory strategies ranked quite high indicating that teachers pay attention to building shared knowledge before having learners navigate through deeper learning procedures. Regarding the acquisition of new words, in particular, emphasizing English cognates along with non-verbal modelling techniques are considered good teaching aids for vocabulary, etymology, and oral proficiency in the additional language. Due
to the fact that diverse students often find themselves in various stages of proficiency in the target language when entering a mainstream classroom, it is up to the teachers to expose learners to both linguistic and visual forms of knowledge. Moreover, given that students acquire language in a natural order (Krashen, 1982), various visual teaching aids along with sounds could help learners assign meaning and mental images to concepts through non-verbal means (Carrier, 2005; Curtis & Bailey, 2001). This way, they would not only stimulate, but also increase their mental activity. This is because the key idea is not to force students to learn something, but rather provide them with both meaningful and engaging language and activities so as to acquire the additional language (Hoover & Patton, 2005). Moreover, high levels of facilitating the acquisition of new words emerged and, in particular, teachers stated that they often use the read aloud technique so as to help learners model metacognitive thinking, develop their cognitive strategies, self-monitor their learning and thus, be helped to cope with more demanding learning situations. This means that teachers employ direct cognitive strategies extensively, by putting together known elements in new collective ways, and repeating sounds so as to help learners focus on the sound perception and enhance both their comprehensibility and production. Moreover, having students represent sounds in their memory in auditory forms rather than visual ones, reveals the use of direct memory strategies, as well.

What is more, the results indicated that the professional experience did not have any significant effect on the acquisition of new words in the target language. The data about the acquisition of new words in relation to the teachers’ professional experience indicate that there is no relevance possibly because they already feel very confident in the teaching of language-specific issues. It seems that teachers feel they are well prepared to deal with this area- irrespective of their teaching experience- and have a good grasp of English linguistics ever since their undergraduate studies. These findings echo Sifakis’ views (Sifakis, 2011) in a study about EFL Greek state-school teachers’ educational priorities where it was found that it might be natural for EFL teachers to consider that this is what they are actually supposed to do and they are good at teaching the new language. Therefore, experience would make no difference to the teachers. What would be interesting though, as Sifakis (2011) points out would be the examination and observation of
the actual usage of the aforementioned techniques in and outside their classrooms, which would be the case in this study, as well. Therefore, it is essential that future research be based on both stated strategies and observed behavior of teachers in the classroom. With reference to the qualitative data, there were no special references to the way the new vocabulary should be exploited and taught as a separate section, except for instances of flashcards or visual aids in a wide variety of format. The fact though, that new vocabulary is invariably taught by teachers irrespective of their experience or educational attainments using the same strategies throughout the years, constitutes a really interesting finding having two-fold repercussions in the field. First, it goes to show that either the pre-service teachers who might recently have been appointed or the teachers with long held permanent posts, have probably received minimal training on multilingual and multicultural issues. This finding is in line with previous research findings (Martin, 2004; Mattheoudakis, et al., 2017; Sharma et al., 2011), as well as with research that indicates the fact that teachers are in need of teacher training programs that focus on third language efficient strategies (Pedersen, 2016), especially when it comes to the acquisition of new vocabulary in the target language.

The 2nd research question examined the extent to which EAL teachers’ overall teaching strategies cater to L3 learners’ engagement in the lesson and aim towards the promotion of an interactive or collaborative learning environment. Interactive learning has been found to be extremely supportive of multilingual and multicultural students (Vaughn et al., 2003; Slavin, 1991). The quantitative results did not indicate high levels of collaboration and interaction approaches used for students and their engagement, with half of the participants stating that they sometimes or often use this set of strategies. In particular, they stated that they employ the direct cognitive strategy of analyzing and reasoning to have pupils work together to solve problems by applying previous knowledge or collaborate and interact in negotiating roles, responsibilities and outcomes. They also sometimes employ the indirect social strategy of grouping students in pairs or triads, using activities for scaffolded talk with another partner or the direct cognitive strategy of urging them to produce oral or written speech. According to Hill and Flynn (2006, p. 55) this collaborative kind of learning might be “… a powerful tool for fostering language acquisition”, in a more relaxed and anxiety-reduced environment, which is
in line with Nunan (2000, p. 51) who stated that “learners use considerably more language, and exploit a greater range of language functions when working in small groups”, facilitating their learning, this way. In the qualitative data, though, it was revealed that collaborative and interactive learning was of top priority. Study buddies, cooperative learning and one-to-one or teacher-student interactions seem to be an extensively used strategy to increase learners’ opportunities for actual, direct oral communication and reinforcement of their understanding. Through shared learning experiences, as research in the field has shown so far, students benefit from the cooperation and observation of learning strategies from their peers (Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec, 1994; Kagan, 1994) and they can even end up fostering strong interpersonal friendships (Snowman & Biehler, 2003).

The 3rd research question examined the relationship, between the cultivation of a positive learning environment that facilitates learning and the use of all the different languages that are manifested in the culturally and linguistically diverse classroom. Although research has shown that the inclusion of the first languages reduces the learners’ anxiety and contributes to the creation of an inclusive and welcoming learning environment (Manara, 2007), the quantitative results indicated no significant correlation. The participants indicated high levels of affective strategies use, by making encouraging statements and scanning the classroom, meaning that they always try to boost L3 learners’ self-esteem by providing help while paying close attention to the students, as the qualitative data also revealed. However, although they often ask pupils to reflect, they do not use meta-cognitive activities to raise learners’ metacognitive awareness regularly. Furthermore, they stated that they often encourage transfer among all languages that exist in the classroom, whereas in the interviews it was revealed that they make scarce use of the existing languages because of lack of actual knowledge and mastery. Although the findings regarding teachers’ use of learners’ native languages indicate that at least they are aware of the importance of using the learners’ background including their home languages, they are pretty discouraged since they believe they would need to have a firm grasp of the languages before encouraging learners to draw on them.

Most of the teachers indicated that they do not promote the use of native languages often because it is quite hard for them, since they are unaware of the various foreign languages. Therefore, they just opted for linguistic comparisons not
only to enhance the L3 learning process, but also to make L3 learners feel they are active members of the classroom.

It can be assumed here, that since they do not focus on linguistic elements in depth, they just have students pop up words for the sake of integration and social acceptance. It can also be inferred that teachers are probably unaware of the benefits using a native language can confer upon a multilingual student, since the use of native languages in classes consisting of culturally and linguistically diverse students is well established and important (Barnard, 2003b; Garcia et al. 2006; May, 2002, as cited in Price, 2004). According to Skutnabb-Kangas and Guzmán (2006, p. 23), “the issue of the plurality of languages in a classroom and whether teachers should be able to speak them does not only concern transitional or maintenance models, immersion models for dominant groups or two-way models for both groups, but it can extend to culturally and linguistically heterogeneous classes.” Without rejecting the possibility of using all languages during the lessons, the commonest question raised among the teachers in the interviews was how they can be aware of all the existing languages, maintaining that something like this is impossible in reality. The authors suggest that if teachers are not willing to undergo linguistic and pedagogical training, then they will have to offer their jobs to bilingual teachers. Although this idea is neither feasible nor practical, teacher cultural and linguistic training sounds a promising idea and quite a critical one, putting emphasis on solid knowledge of both theory and research on second language acquisition and their ability to channel this knowledge in support of the acquisition of an additional language. If there is the slightest attempt, on the part of the teachers, to use mother tongues in their lessons, they will show respect towards the learners’ cultures and their general knowledge and therefore the learners’ opportunity for native-culture experiences will facilitate their learning (Lado, 1964). This view is also supported by Lucas, Villegas, and Freedson-Gonzalez (2008, as cited in Hadjioannou, et. al., 2016), who maintain that apart from knowing how a language is structured, it is necessary for the teachers to understand the learners’ cultures and languages as parameters that influence the learners’ understanding, production and interaction (Hinkel, 1999, p. 2, as cited in Hadjioannou, et. al., 2016), if they want to build effective learning environments, something which they purport they do. Of course, as Hinkel (1999, p. 7, as cited in Hadjioannou, et. al.,
states, teachers cannot be always fully prepared to meet “the many influences of culture on language learning and teaching.” However, they can “become aware of the cultural assumptions regarding the nature of literacy, of literacy learning, and of parent involvement, and incorporate these understandings into their curriculum and instructional approaches” (de Jong & Harper, 2005, p. 114, as cited in Hadjioannou, et. al., 2016). On top of everything, it is the teachers’ responsibility- whether monolingual or multilingual learners themselves- to have the knowledge, empathy as well as the necessary skills, in contributing to the scaffolding of the learners’ learning (Gibbons, 2008) leading to their academic success.

The 4th research question examined the extent to which EAL teachers are aware of specific strategies related to teaching L3 students, referring to their more general opinions on the use of specific EAL strategies, which proved to be interpreted as being ‘often’ used. Regarding the ‘evaluation of the organization and teaching strategies as well as the EAL students’ learning’, participants stated that they more than often structure and explain the lesson, facilitate the teaching as well as the learning procedure to a great extent and try to help students learn how to learn. This way, they try to arrange and plan their students’ learning and enhance their metacognitive abilities. They also almost always celebrate praise and respect, while they sometimes promote thinking and develop an inclusive perspective among students. In particular, as far as ‘structuring and explaining the lesson’ is concerned, participants stated that in order to organize the lesson, they often preview the lesson as a whole and the main ideas, adopt explicit teaching practices in conjunction with structuring the lesson and they clearly identify the purpose of the activities. Concerning the factor ‘facilitating the lesson and learning how to learn’, teachers stated that they always make encouraging statements, often scan the classroom and ask pupils to reflect and also try to use meta-cognitive activities. As far as ‘celebrating praise and respect’ is concerned, teachers answered that they always demonstrate value and respect, celebrate pupils' success and provide students with tokens of recognition or praise. As a result, they opt for forging strong relationships by motivating, praising, encouraging and showing extra care to them.

Referring to ‘the promotion of thinking and developing an inclusive perspective among students’, teachers stated that they often provide formal or informal feedback while they rarely have pupils keep their own learning logs.
However, they sometimes have pupils monitor their comprehension or production themselves and also sometimes try to create an inclusive environment conducive to their academic success. Conducting tasks successfully leads to better awareness of learners’ thinking processes, known as metacognition or meta-cognitive awareness. This, in turn, leads to reflection and helps learners proceed with the tasks at hand, monitor or self-evaluate their performance and finally know “how to learn” (Paris & Winograd, 1990, as cited in Chamot, 1998). Moreover, teachers employ social and affective strategies extensively by empathizing with their students and encouraging them, “using some kind of affective control to assist a learning task” (Richard-Amato & Snow, 1992 as cited in Manitoba Education, 2006b, p. 28). It is evident that all the strategies used are consistent with key notions in language teaching theories. For instance, ‘thinking about thinking’ (metacognition) is supported by teachers when they explicitly explain the tasks and it seems that in order for the teachers to get the best out of the students and keep them engaged in the learning content, they try to break down information into smaller, concise chunks and be analytical and explicit when it comes to presenting information or instructions. Therefore, “scaffolding and explicit language instruction” (Rothenberg & Fischer, 2017, p.35), seem to be key strategies for Greek EFL teachers.

Analyzing the frequency of employment of each of the specific techniques when teaching EAL students to ‘recall information’, it was found that teachers help learners facilitate the mastery of new words. Concerning the contextualization and mastery of new vocabulary, participants stated that they often put the words in context and group similar family words, whereas regarding the facilitation of the acquisition of new words, although they don’t use flashcards that much, they often prefer using the read aloud technique, various combinations of sounds and images and cognates, and modelling metacognitive skills for learners while reading. It therefore seems that teachers are able to perceive the distinction between BICS and CALP (Cummins, 2000), between the contextual support and cognitive demand in certain language tasks and choose the most effective tools to help learners communicate and construct meaning.

When analyzing the ‘frequency of employment of specific techniques aimed to manage EAL students’ emotions and promote cooperative learning’, teachers presented high levels of frequency in adapting their instruction and relating to
personal experiences, medium levels in collaborative approach, students’ engagement and supporting learning through games and visual support while low levels in the use of language buddies or child translators. As far as ‘adapting instruction and using personal experiences’ is concerned, participants stated that they ask questions so as to relate content to personal lives. Also, they use (non)verbal signs to facilitate communication and often slow down and quicken the pace of instruction according to the students’ needs. Concerning the ‘collaborative approach and students’ engagement’ in the lesson, teachers said that they often have pupils work together to solve problems by applying previous knowledge, provide learners with opportunities to interact and have them collaborate in negotiating roles, responsibilities and outcomes. Moreover, they sometimes resort to organizing activities or discussions in pairs or triads and they also sometimes set up buddy systems or make use of child translators. However, they almost rarely choose a permanent language partner be seated next to a culturally and linguistically diverse learner. Regarding learning through ‘games and visual support’, teachers said they often provide visual support as a medium for making the lesson easier and more engaging. Teachers make use of direct cognitive strategies when they transfer previous knowledge to facilitate acquisition in the target language, social strategies when they promote learners’ cooperation with their peers and they less frequently use direct memory strategies when they employ action in the form of mechanical techniques such as flashcards or the use of imagery. In line with the latter strategies used, teachers employ mentally cognitive strategies when they formally focus on the perception of sounds and use formulas and patterns to enhance learners’ comprehension and production.

Analyzing the frequency of ‘the engagement of specific practices dealing with EAL pupils’ mental processes and compensation for missing knowledge’, high levels of frequency appeared in processing a text, thinking and activating prior linguistic knowledge, skimming / scanning – inductive / deductive approaches and classification of words, pre-teaching and glossary books while medium to low levels appeared in the role of parents and the use of all languages available in the classroom in various ways. As far as ‘processing a text, thinking and activating prior linguistic knowledge’ is concerned, teachers said that they more than often make associations to activate prior knowledge and use what pupils already know to
facilitate the acquisition of new knowledge. They also urge pupils to use synonymous words, guess meanings and anticipate that pupils will understand the general meaning by using any clue provided to them.

Concerning ‘skimming / scanning and the inductive / deductive approach’, teachers are in favor of using scanning and skimming strategies and engage pupils in applying or figuring out rules. Once more, direct cognitive strategies are used by teachers when they have the pupils receive and send messages in a deductive or inductive way as well as compensation strategies when they have students guess intelligently. Direct memory strategies are crucial to additional language learning, since it is the “how” of learning and its general principles, not the “what” that accelerate the acquisition of knowledge (Norman, 1980, in Manitoba Education, 2006). Regarding ‘classification of words, pre-teaching and glossary books’, teachers stated that they often teach key-words beforehand or may create glossary books, a cognitive strategy that was not frequently mentioned in the interviews. Referring to ‘the role of the parents and the use of all languages available in the classroom’ in various ways, participants – (in contrast with what was reported in the interviews), said that they often encourage transfer among all languages and practice the new language in a variety of ways in authentic situations. However, they don’t develop the parents’ ability to support work from home that much, although a few interviewees referred to the role of parents and the potential forging of a strong relationship. Regarding the role of parents, it has been proven over the last decades that the involvement of both the monolingual and bilingual children’s parents is more than supportive for their academic achievement (Simich-Dudgeon, 1986). Therefore, a concerted effort for the parents’ inclusion in their children’s education might confer additional benefits and dispel any misconceptions or mishaps during the teaching process.

The 5th research question examined cumulatively the extent to which the years of teachers’ professional experience, their age, degree and types of training on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students as well as their educational attainments in the field of Multilingual, Multicultural Education affect their general opinions and preference on using specific strategies over others. The main findings indicate that teachers who are more experienced promote more thinking strategies and develop a more inclusive perspective among students, apply
more cognitive strategies related to skimming / scanning as well as inductive and
deductive approaches and agree more both on the role the bilingual learners’ parents
should play and the use of all their languages available in the classroom in various
ways. In addition, teachers who have received higher levels of training in issues
related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students agree more about
the use of language buddies or child translators, which constitutes an important
parameter in additional language teaching. Shore (1998, p. 2, as cited in Sclafani,
2017) considers this direct strategy so indispensable that he suggests that language
buddies be constant, especially in younger ages and rotate in children of older ages.
Indeed, research has shown that interacting, sharing and conversing in pairs with the
aid of either a ‘buddy’ or a ‘tutor’ in the form of a translator, could motivate
students and promote collaboration and communication, because both parties can
act as teachers or precious resources for each other (Kline, 1995, as cited in Allison
& Rahm, 2007). Participants who have developed professionally in issues related to
teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students, try to facilitate the lessons
more, help students learn how to learn and they also agree more on the use of a
child translator, whereas participants who have preferred self-study on issues related
to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students tend to use mostly
cognitive strategies by classifying words, pre-teaching them in relation to each
lesson and using glossary books, as a resource to receive and send messages.
Moreover, they are also in favor of the strategy of having a language buddy by
bilingual learners, which connotes the use of analyzing and reasoning strategies
with reference to transferring and even translating various linguistic data. In relation
to the recurrent preference of the ‘child translator’ strategy, it could be stated that
this particular strategy could fall under the compensation strategies list, since it
constitutes a form of asking for or getting help, overcoming limitations in speaking
and writing. This realization can be proof that too many strategies have been
identified and classified in various systems and they may therefore “be implemented
in flexible orders depending on the learning context or individual preferences”
(Oxford, 1990, p. 13). Other types of training did not have any significant, positive
effect on using specific strategies. Teachers who have received other types of
training in issues related to teaching CLD students apply the skimming / scanning –
inductive / deductive approaches less, don’t classify vocabulary, pre-teach words or
create glossary books. Therefore, they facilitate the acquisition of new vocabulary
to a lesser degree. Finally, educational attainments in Multilingual-Multicultural education seem to have a positive effect. Teachers who received that kind of education, celebrate more praise and respect, apply more supporting learning through games and visual support and adapt instruction accordingly or use personal experiences to a greater degree. Therefore, they use mostly indirect, affective strategies when they aim to encourage learners and direct memory strategies when they create mental images to help learners retrieve, restore or even store information.

Regarding the 6th and final research question, teachers were queried on the potential adaptations or differentiated teaching strategies adopted during the teaching process. In 2016 in Greece, the Integrated Foreign Languages Curriculum (IFLC) became the official curriculum that outlined the guidelines of English language teaching in schools. As it is claimed in the curriculum, differentiated instruction plays a major role in successful foreign language instruction (Sougari & Mavroudi, 2019) and teachers prove both to understand and welcome this set of strategies in their teaching. “Differentiations are changes to the content of the school and classroom curriculum and expected responses to it. These changes support students to experience success”, whereas “adaptations are changes to the school and classroom environment, teaching and learning materials, and associated teaching strategies. These changes support students to access and respond to the school and classroom environment” (Ministry of Education, 2011, p. 12). As it can be inferred, ‘adaptations’ constitute a broader concept of changes referring to the ‘how’ the teaching procedure could be better by accommodating learners’ needs, whereas ‘differentiations’ mainly depend on the curriculum. Therefore, they touch upon the “what” could be modified to ensure success in third language learning. Also, differentiated or adaptive teaching strategies are guided by the constructivist approach to teaching and learning, which promotes both the learners’ autonomy, by allowing them to rely on prior knowledge to build new, and their active learning (Smith & Throne, 2007). In the particular study, instances of both differentiated teaching strategies and adaptations were detected, both in the questionnaires and particularly in the interviews in which various snapshots of teachers’ differentiated and adapted content served as a constant reminder of their desire to elicit their students’ interest, keep them engaged and provide them with equal access to
learning material and activities. Teachers identify the ‘non-visible’ diversity of students and favor all types of adaptations, ranging from instructional presentation and classroom organization adaptation to student response and motivation adaptations. It also becomes evident that the preferred instructional adaptations involve both a social and cultural perspective. Therefore, teachers seem to be resilient when it comes to the learners’ cultures, using reflective processes in an attempt to ensure a caring and equitable learning environment.

In the quantitative data it is revealed that teachers provide learners with authentic material that relate to students’ personal lives and activate prior knowledge in order to render them ready to process the new information taught. They also preview information or pre-teach vocabulary units, simplify the curriculum, use the questioning strategy, and the inductive or deductive approach in order to help learners infer or construct meaning. Moreover, they make use of cues, flashcards and task variations through the choice of specific assignments, graphic organizers or tasks based on learners’ multiple intelligences. It also seems that teachers embrace diversity and equity among students, fostering a welcoming environment for all learners to the greatest possible extent.

In the same line, in the qualitative results, all differentiated strategies ranked really high, namely individual, pair and flexible group work through teacher guiding, peer collaboration or the use of a translator and the reinforcement of the learners’ morale through praise and tokens of excellence, indicating this way that teachers strive for meaningful and equitable participation of all students. Also, it became evident that teachers pay attention to the provision of individualized or less complex material, providing learners with levelled tasks which they tier from simple to more difficult, using multiple appropriate resources for scaffolding and learning. They also cater to the classroom organization, providing such students with suitable workspace, additional personalized time spent on specific tasks and more elaborated adapted equipment –although scarcely mentioned – of bilingual dictionaries or computers. In today’s mixed classrooms it is vital to adopt the framework of differentiation instruction, since it is conducive to successful foreign language instruction and maximizes learning opportunities for all students. It is really reassuring therefore, that EFL teachers unanimously acknowledge the significance of adapting materials and work towards this direction for L3 learners.
In order to use the most effective strategies concerning differentiated instruction based on the learners’ needs, it is important to understand that not all students learn through the same types of instruction, scaffolds or tasks. The support they need depends on the stage of the language acquisition they are at. Consequently, as students acquire language in a natural order (Krashen, 2003; Peregoy & Boyle, 2012), they don’t learn English the way teachers teach it, but the way their brain can learn the language. In line with the instructional strategies that teachers mentioned in both the interviews and the questionnaires, it can be inferred that learners actually learn English not by explicitly being forced to learn specific words or grammar structures, but by being provided with rich, authentic, supportive, culturally respectful and engaging material that will help them experience meaningful tasks that foster successful additional language acquisition (Hoover & Patton, 2006).

6.2 Interpretations and Implications of the Study

From the quantitative data, some tendencies can be observed. First, it appears that the participants believe they have the pedagogical knowledge of what constitutes both effective and inclusive teaching strategies. Teachers seem to be using a great range of instructional strategies to reach all students, of which the most frequently used ones included scaffolding, activation of prior knowledge, simplification of the teaching procedures and designing activities by differentiating the existing ones according to the cultural and linguistic level of the students. In particular, in the quantitative data indirect metacognitive strategies which constitute a great way for learners to coordinate their learning ranked high. Teachers seem to arrange and plan learning, clearly identify tasks, set goals and structure the lessons, so as to scaffold learning through specific, clear steps and help learners plan, evaluate and monitor their comprehension. Also, the indirect affective strategy of making positive statements and rewarding students is employed in order to encourage learners and help them achieve their learning goal. However, the development of an inclusive perspective was not ranked as high as it appeared to be in the interviews where teachers seem to be using indirect socio-affective strategies to an extremely great extent. This might be explained by the fact that in the interviews there was a tendency, not to mention urgency, to deal with everyday problems rather than help the students flourish cognitively. Sorting out problems, empathizing with and
accepting others, cooperating and developing a sense of cultural understanding as well as an inclusive environment was of utmost importance to the interviewees. Moreover, cognitive along with memory strategies also ranked high in the questionnaires. From the data obtained it was shown that teachers help such learners manipulate the target language by practicing, analyzing and creating structure for input and output with the aid of task-based strategies such as printed material, visual cues, transfer of cognates and (non) verbal signs or sounds. Moreover, they activate familiar, background knowledge, and relate it to new information through associating, elaborating or creating meaningful contexts. This way, teachers help learners make personal, meaningful associations that can be easily reviewed. What is more, recognizing the need to adapt their teaching strategies to accommodate individual needs was ubiquitous in the majority of the teachers’ answers, without exception.

The results from the in-depth interviews indicated that the application of relevant theories as well as a solid understanding of the learners’ literacy development was only marginal in the teachers’ actual practices in the classroom. Although it seems that the participants maintained application of various instructional practices in their classrooms, which mirror the Greek mainstream teachers’ strategies for the most part, it seems that their focus is mainly limited to the acceptance of cultural diversity and inclusivity. The sparse use of and individualized reference to particular instructional strategies for L3 learners provided the researcher with a sense of bewildered awareness regarding third additional language development and literacy acquisition, which automatically underscored the quantitative data. Furthermore, the qualitative data also revealed that teachers’ understanding of their students’ ethnic and cultural backgrounds leads to positive, interactive, inclusive learning environments that respect plurality and also help students’ needs to be accommodated to the extent that this is feasible, given the teaching context and the circumstances. What was therefore evident is that emphasis is placed on social and affective strategies as well as culturally responsive teaching practices, sometimes at the expense of the cognitive development of L3 learners. Communication, cooperation of L3 learners with both their classmates and their teachers as well as the promotion of cultural awareness in the school environment seem to be top priority. In addition to the social strategies, affective strategies are shown to be used
repetitively, since teachers are primarily interested in self-encouragement, smooth relationships and control of learners’ anxiety and various other emotions or attitudes. Moreover, it could be argued that there were strong examples of culturally sensitive approaches which witnessed a kind of ‘social injustice’ and touched upon a kind of a more ‘humanitarian’ approach employed towards these students. Furthermore, teachers cited the importance and the great need to use a variety of communication and accommodation strategies in practice in order to foster a sense of equity and empowerment in CLD students. Moreover, ‘communication’ seems to be the key to negotiating meaning, intentions and preserving a peaceful learning environment in which students practice linguistic and metalinguistic skills through a social and emotional dimension. The extensively quoted strategies of group work and cooperative learning in the interviews also reveals the teachers’ effort to help learners negotiate meaning in real-life situations and promote direct communication. What is more, the teachers made reference to an increasing cognizance of the importance and impact of the various cultures on L3 learning and the classroom environment, as well as the significance of the comprehensible input and scaffolding for the learners’ language development. Drawing from Krashen’s comprehensible input and Cummins’s ‘quadrants’ as well as his theory on BICS and CALP, it is evident that teachers strive to adapt the material to their learners’ needs by using a variety of learning strategies, enhancing their cognitive, metacognitive and social-affective awareness and paying attention to both language acquisition and their academic development. Overall, it seems that it is their ultimate aim to help CLD students become independent, autonomous learners in student-centered teaching environments. In particular, while mentioning various forms of cultural teaching practices, the majority of teachers reported that they occupy students in either group or pair work / discussion. These forms of interaction among students follow either the teachers’ explanations or the students’ analyses of various phenomena, in the form of a ‘learning buddy’, or a kind of assistant that teachers obviously trust. In general, it could therefore be inferred that teachers are not in favor of drilling tasks. On the contrary, they try to promote the students’ critical thinking skills, by providing them with plentiful language input and ample opportunities to express themselves in a comfortable learning environment and use the target language in several contexts and various ways.
Research has indeed shown that positive teachers’ and students’ attitudes – which are also interrelated to motivation, should be sustained for successful additional language learning transfer (Finnocchiaro, 1982, as cited in Amjah, 2014). Once more, these views echo Krashen’s affective Filter Hypothesis according to which, a learning situation that has a “low affective filter” and therefore favorable affective factors, such a slow anxiety, high motivation and secured self-confidence helps learners thrive in a non-threatening and fun learning environment. If that is not the case, L3 learners feel uncomfortable and erect “psychological barriers” both against communication and learning (Littlewood, 1995). Explicit student empowerment is also revealed in both analyses of the interviews and the questionnaires. It seems that teachers aspire and strive to be there for these students by expressing hope, articulating high expectations, boosting their self-confidence and self-esteem and encouraging their self-expression and autonomy. In relation to this, they work towards creating relaxed, soothing learning environments that are cheerful, yet stable and safe; learning environments which value diversity and embrace ‘otherness’. When exposing their inner thoughts and strategies used during the interviews, it became evident that by applying culturally responsive strategies and practices (based on previous experience and learners’ existing schemata), teachers acknowledge and include the learners’ funds of knowledge that will in turn enable them to choose what best suits and helps them learn more efficiently.

In general, the strategies teachers mostly use align with the constructivist and learner-centered theories as well as the theoretical foundations for successful additional teaching, analyzed in previous chapters. Teachers do acknowledge that CLD students have distinct characteristics and should be considered unique based on their differentiated knowledge, experiences and social backgrounds that bring into the mainstream classrooms. In this light, instances of both internal and external scaffolding, as well as intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are evident in the data gleaned. It seems that teachers aim to meaningful learning, relevant to the learners’ interests by fostering learners’ communicative competence, boosting their ‘ego’ and associating culture with language to a great extent.

6.2.1 Learners’ home languages

Surprisingly enough, almost none of the teachers made reference to the significance of the regular use of the learners’ languages in a mixed classroom, the various
mechanisms or stages of additional language acquisition and its instructional implications, vocabulary acquisition or typological similarities / linguistic comparisons among all available languages. What should be born in mind is that diversified learners acquire a third - and in some cases, a fourth language when they learn English at school. Therefore, they have already their primary language, with which – in all probability- they communicate at home as well as in their wider community. The fact that they might be fluent in their L1 or master it with relative ease should serve as a reminder for teachers that these learners are not struggling learners overall.

Moreover, this realization might help teachers bridge the gap between what students already know and are able to do and what they need to learn. Also, it might enable them to use equitable practices and engage them in the learning process successfully, incorporating everyday concerns of their families or communities into instruction.

Based on the literature review, languages are not stored separately in the brain. Instead, they are connected in various ways and interact through a dynamic system (Herdina & Jessner, 2002; Bialystok, 2001; Cook, 1992 as cited in Haukås, 2016). In this light, teachers should be targeting the use of the learners’ various languages along with experiences from previous language learning- (a strategy widely used by teachers) and make them aware of those particular learning strategies on which they can reflect and transfer to a new language learning context (Neuner, 2004, as cited in Haukås, 2016). If L1 is scarcely used or in segments - as it is the case in our study, learners will naturally resort to modifying the input provided (repetition of words, slow pace of speaking, oversimplification of syntax) and render the whole teaching procedure dull and unrealistic (Macaro, 2005, as cited in Ismaili, 2015). Thus, it is crucial for teachers to understand that although the extensive use of native languages in the classroom might act as a deterrent, their complete omission from the teaching process, or even the mere code-switching practices that results showed they employ, will obstruct the effective acquisition of the target language. Besides, as Stern (1992, as cited in Ismaili, 2015, p. 190) mentions, “the L1-L2 connection is an undisputable fact of life, whether we like it or not the new knowledge is learnt on the basis of the previously acquired language.”
However, there seems to be a dissonance between what they considered needed to be done and what they individually mentioned are able to do. It could therefore be assumed that strategies are not used invariably and in detail, on their part. As Sifakis (2011) maintains in a study of the domain of the in-service ESOL teacher education and training in Greece, all research instruments used to gauge teachers’ beliefs, aim at finding the real, underlying views that might arise either from the mismatch between espoused, personal theories and actual teaching practices or the unconscious nature of personal theories combined with the tendency of some teachers to promote a particular self-image. This became apparent in the interviews when asked about their confidence and preparedness to teach in a mixed classroom. All twelve of them expressed anxiety about not being sure whether what they apply is actually the right thing to do or whether it will eventually prove to be beneficial for students.

It is highly probable therefore, that they might be aware of the theoretical background to a certain extent (through either official training or self-study as they mentioned), but they do not make use of all languages because they either do not know how to do it or because they lack practical training (Papas, 1998; Bereris, 1999; Nikolaou, 1999; Nikolaou, 2011; Spyridakis, 2002; Sismanidou, 2005, as cited in Tsaliki, 2012)- a view which also holds true for the Greek mainstream teachers. However, due to the fact that bilingual learners’ mechanisms differ in relation to those of monolinguals, EFL teachers should progressively become acquainted with the positive influence of other already learnt languages may have on the acquisition of a third one as well as the cognitive advantages of bilingualism, “such as a wider linguistic repertoire, enhanced learning strategies, cognitive flexibility and metalinguistic awareness and the development of enhanced linguistic processing strategies” (Mesaros, 2009, p. 7). It might also be the case that they are not aware of the theories of cross linguistic influence, code switching or translanguaging- all pertaining to the relevant benefits stemming from the interdependence among all languages, as well as “the transfer of notions and concepts between them” (Cummins, 2000; Skourto, 2005, 2011, as cited in Mattheoudakis et al., 2017, p. 361). However, instances of cross linguistic influence and code switching were mentioned in the interviews due to the learners’ freedom to scarcely use any language they want- as ‘guest’ languages, when needed. Learners are urged to draw upon any kind of prior knowledge of the languages they
possess that they deem might help. Of course, successful cross linguistic influence can be positive only in cases where there is a very good level of competence in the other languages or in cases where teachers use contrastive analysis and help learners avoid negative transfer. In any case, teachers seem to confirm Cummins’ ‘Interdependence hypothesis’, which associates academic proficiency with transfer of all languages and his ‘threshold hypothesis’ which assumes that bilingual proficiency can indeed have positive cognitive effects. Moreover, the fact that no languages are excluded from the teaching process, shows that regency factor might also play a role in the learners’ linguistic choices, borrowing mostly from languages they actively use more.

Teacher education programs, therefore, should include multicultural education theories for all levels of teachers (both prospective and in-service teachers) to build teachers’ understanding of the skills bilingual learners have developed to compensate for the missing knowledge, (e.g., language switches, word coinages or even translations (Poulisse et al., 1987). Given the wide linguistic repertoire these students already possess, only this way will they be immensely helped to succeed in acquiring the expected knowledge.

6.2.2 Professional Development

A very interesting finding that emerged from the study is that focused training is urgently needed, especially in our day and age that student populations are constantly changing. As stated, teachers do not receive sufficient training and they are at times obliged to discover their own teaching strategies in their attempt to find an optimal way to teach this specific population. It is important, therefore, that teachers go beyond mere references to theory and focus on reflective practice and a continuous dialogue and knowledge in action (Banks et al., 2001), so as to make theory-practice connections. Given the teachers’ favorable stance towards CLD students, they would benefit from the provision of materials and training as to their varied usages. In particular, and based on the relevant theory, emphasis should be given to hands-on, practical experiences, rather than lecture-discussion workshops, so as to provide teachers with the chance to observe model teaching and familiarize themselves with alternative, effective instructional methodologies. Teachers’ theoretical knowledge is not enough even to shape or change their dispositions towards diverse students and their whole communities. Although teachers’ beliefs
are built over the years and are resistant to change, multicultural research suggests that teacher education pedagogy immerse pre-service teachers in the process of acquiring knowledge about diverse learners through various schools and communities, field experiences in diverse context with culturally responsive teachers, autobiographies, narratives or life histories (Banks et al., 2001) so that they become more culturally sensitive and more responsive to the linguistic, cognitive, cultural and intellectual needs of the diverse learners (Ladson-Billings, 1995). It is vital, therefore, that teachers develop a “sociocultural consciousness”, experience their own students’ realities as third language learners and acquire experiential learning as a means of invoking a deeper understanding of culture and literacy practices.

However, in addition to the above comments, a common framework of suitable teacher education strategies might constitute a pitfall given specific national or regional environments. Hence, the design as well as the implementation of suggested syllabi in the future or suitable teacher training programs should be context sensitive, gearing towards the development of an appropriate professional vision in light of the various existing multilingual repertoires. Given that in the Greek context effective teaching of CLD learners has not been extensively recorded, the challenge is to achieve long-term and sustainable change in L3 teaching strategies either by working alongside with mainstream teachers, bilingual / expert teachers or with increasing and sustained training opportunities through the Ministry of education. L3 teachers’ professional development should occupy a current fraction of the professional development of teachers so that they are able to engage more CLD learners in the teaching procedure and provide a more challenging learning environment. Moreover, multicultural pedagogies and models of education can offer teachers a framework, providing them with continuity in their theory and practice connection and help them further explore opportunities to examine learning experiences.

6.3 Discussion

The specific study aimed at investigating the most frequently used strategies by EFL teachers when teaching diversified learners in order to acquire a more holistic picture of the teaching procedures in additional language learning. Although the research findings indicated a considerable degree of awareness of various strategies
that might help L3 students, the need to emphasize the development of all four skills and focus on such learners’ academic aspect of language development, is urgent. More specifically, one of the key findings is that teachers consider themselves mainly culturally responsive instructors. As it has been revealed, socio-affective strategies as well as culturally inclusive practices are of utmost significance to EFL Greek teachers., using ‘culture’ as a means to resolving differences. In this sense, undoubtedly teachers need to be aware of the important role culture plays on what is crucial to learn and how learning takes place in various contexts and should not make use only of school literacies that promote mainstream knowledge by excluding other diverse forms of literacy. Teachers should take on the role of effective ‘cultural workers’ (Freire, 1998) or ‘border crossers’ (Giroux, 1992) to bridge not only cultural or linguistic differences, but also differences related to social class, race or academic abilities. The same can be applied to school and family practices, since teachers are the ones to bring the diversity of the students’ families into the teaching process, in an attempt to make visible the way individual lenses differ and shape what each person is able to see or interpret (Green et al., 2007). In support of the above statements and the teachers’ views, Cummins (1996, p. 31) who maintains that children learn better when they feel appreciated and not alienated or out of place, takes interest in the cultural aspects of various languages and supports that the notion of ‘identity’ in the culturally relevant pedagogy is important for the child “to maintain his or her cultural integrity as well as succeeding academically”. Yet, all strategies should be used equally and in conjunction with all suggested factors for the learners’ whole rounded education and successful acquisition of the target language.

What is more, the teachers seem to be in harmony with the aims of intercultural schools, in which education aims to avoid discouraging behaviors and discrimination. They prioritize balancing social cohesion and diversity, ensuring equality irrespective of the students’ racial, cultural, or linguistic background and achieving mutual understanding and communication through appropriate strategies (Palaiologou- Gkikopoulou, 2005; Moodley, 1992). In addition, the high ranking of the majority of strategies in both tools proves the fact that the results are consistent with the main foundations and theoretical perspectives analysed in the previous chapters. One common characteristic of the teachers drawn from both analyses was
the emphasis on learner-centered instruction, emphasizing student autonomy and social interactions leading to construction of knowledge. This is achieved either by raising learners’ curiosity, having them be actively involved in the learning process or by “seizing” on their linguistic and cultural backgrounds and make them into teachable instances. What is more, the findings indicate that all teachers, who act as facilitators and counselors rather than traditional authoritative figures, make use of standard educational techniques by adding an element of differentiation to vary instruction, engage learners and help them interact and reflect more easily.

Another major theme that emerged from the study has to do with the teachers’ preparedness and confidence teaching such students. It is not that teachers are incapable of carrying out quality instruction, but rather the deficit ideas about what counts as appropriate instruction combined with the incapability of using what diverse learners bring in the classroom with them, as their own ‘funds’ of knowledge. As it was evident, the main problem for teachers appears to be the use of their “knowledge in action.” Whitehead (1929, as cited in Hammerness et al., 2005, p. 372) warned about the dangers of the so called ‘inert’ knowledge, which seems to be the case here. According to the researcher, this kind of knowledge can be explicitly explained by people when they are asked to do so, yet, it does not actually guide them in new educational settings. Therefore, although it is available, it cannot be put into practice. These findings can be partially explained by the fact that education for foreign language teachers seems to lack the devotion of time “to enhancing language teachers’ multilingual awareness and practices” (De Angelis, 2011; Otwinowska, 2014, as cited in Haukás, 2014, p. 13), which is clearly expressed by the teachers’ need for professional training in the field.

Therefore, it might be the case that the absence of training and development as well as the lack of appropriate textbooks, dual language books, aids and equipment –as mentioned in the constraints, constitute a preventative factor from being fully prepared to support L3 learners. Both from the rankings in the questionnaires and the topics developed in the interviews, the main weaknesses in current training, the challenges and the needs identified by the participants became apparent. This way, the participants brought up the missing element in the current teaching situations.
Professional development opportunities and focused L3 teaching strategies training that go beyond the mainstream teacher who has culturally and linguistically diversified students in their classroom, is calling for immediate attention. Undoubtedly, the expected educational development cannot be realized without concerted efforts to secure the application of classroom strategies that support additional language learning and literacy. Teachers’ ‘funds’ of knowledge, should be exploited, within a sociocultural frame, in conjunction with the aspired educational programs designed to create rich spaces for both dialogue and action in practice. This way, teachers would be able to explore the interrelatedness of the available languages and cultures and its impact on their educational practices and therefore act not only on personal, but also on instructional, professional implications.

It makes therefore sense that the problems teachers face cannot be resolved when acting alone. No single research, no single course or field experience, a few workshops or training seminars can adequately prepare teachers for mixed classrooms, unless teacher education is reformed in partnership with administrators and those in charge. To date, no teacher education program has addressed the complexity as well as the urgency of all the challenges laying before EFL teachers when it comes to using specific strategies to teach bilingual learners an additional language in a mainstream classroom in Greece.

Moreover, EFL teachers should be addressed as ‘agents of change’ in the societies in the 21st century. Whereas they had long been perceived as mere agents applying educational policies downright in the classroom, working towards a more multilingual education rather than merely facing diversity in the classrooms, may eventually take into account the various contexts and individuals as agents. In particular, EFL teachers should pay attention to those factors, which “influence how change actually occurs in language education” (Markee 1997, p. 90, as cited in Ziegler, 2013), leading to the change of the syllabi in the classroom to “who adopts what, where, when, why, and how?” (Markee 1997, p. 82, as cited in Ziegler, 2013). In short, following the findings of the study, it was evident that a language teacher “not only needs training towards the acquisition of knowledge in the specific area of multilingualism and multiculturalism or strategies to realize the importance of some values, but also willingness to engage in substantial professional development and
to learn from the learners themselves” (Ziegler et al. 2009a, as cited in Ziegler, 2013).

6.4 Study Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

6.4.1. Study limitations
Several limitations need to be acknowledged when considering the main findings of the study. At the onset, a major limitation of the study is that the scope of the thesis might be too broad. However, given that research on the pedagogical strategies employed by instructors when teaching L3 to bilingual Greek students is in its infancy, I tried not only to understand the general educational context for the culturally and linguistically diverse students in which they are instructed an additional language, but also those foreign language education policies and various theories that research has shown are conducive to successful L3 instruction. All these parameters added to an attempt to understand what really works in a mixed classroom and which instructional context can be deemed ideal.

It should also be born in mind that this study is only based on teachers’ views working in the primary education in Western Greece. Therefore, due to the fact that the study was limited to a specific sector and areas, it cannot be generalized to secondary education, since the obligatory subjects taught, the curricula as well as the general legislative framework are totally different. Also, the results from the research do not appeal to all primary English language teachers in Greece and cannot thus be generalized to a larger population regarding their teaching practices. Rather, the results were twofold: the first aim was to present some aspects that are relevant to the language and teaching pedagogy of English as an additional language to bilingual learners, in an attempt to understand what affects the choice of specific instructional strategies and second by using comparative analysis of the data, to connect theory with research and develop a thorough and rich framework, exploring how instructional strategies should be used within mixed classrooms to the benefit of both the learners and the instructors.

What is more, the respondent availability as well as the respondent subjectivity were major issues in this study. As it has already been mentioned, the questionnaires were sent via e-mails to all schools in the three prefectures of Aetolia-Acarnania, Ileia and Achaea where English is taught as a compulsory
subject. Out of the 236 teachers the questionnaire was sent to, only 93 teachers completed it, a percentage which might have had a direct impact on the validity of the data, since response refusal almost always holds the risk of bias. This can be attributed to the fact that they might not consider this area to be of high priority, importance or interest to them or it might have been so due to either lack of time or willingness on their part.

As for the respondent subjectivity, it can be very common in almost any study. Researchers can never know how truthful the respondents might be because they may read each question differently, or reply based on their own interpretation which might be totally different from the assumptions or the way the researcher perceives reality. Moreover, the respondents might want to feel socially desirable, by presenting a positive image of themselves and their services offered at schools or it might be the case that they are not always aware that the beliefs they state do not actually correspond to their classroom practices (Lee, 2009, as cited in Haukås, 2016). Finally, since the questions were fixed, the answers might not have helped them reflect either on their true feelings or on the full scope of their awareness on the topics asked.

Finally, one potential limitation of the study arises from the duration of the PhD course, during which time the educational landscape might have changed by the time the thesis is presented. However, the processes regarding the timetable and the curriculum in state schools have remained intact throughout these years. Moreover, the questionnaire had been constructed almost three years ago and the interviews were carried out quite recently. Therefore, they cannot be considered outdated empirical research methods. Added to this, references were constantly being updated and enriched based on new research evidence.

6.4.2 Suggestions for further research
Given the findings and the potential study limitations which have been identified, several issues could be addressed in further research. Having focused exclusively on teachers, the research lacks the learners’ points of view and strategies employed, which would shed light on language processing in trilingual students-communicatively, pragmatically and linguistically speaking, and lead to a more integrated understanding and coherent analysis of the topic. However, due to the
dearth of empirical studies on the implementation of specific teaching strategies tailored to multilingual students, the study aimed to focus on the teachers’ core practices as a starting point, so as to improve their teaching in mixed classrooms and enhance the development of the students progressively. If teachers don’t struggle to develop, not only their skills but also their knowledge to succeed in teaching diverse students, then they will not “continue to believe that all children can learn” (Banks et al., 2005, p.270, as cited in Dantas, 2007). Teachers’ views and realities are constantly changing and are becoming all the more challenging, so quality teacher preparation and professional development are indispensable when working with diverse student populations. In particular, apart from the exploration of cultures and the respect towards varying home languages, it is deemed imperative for teachers to delve into their students’ lives and dismiss any subtle, negative stereotypes that hinder the integration of such students in the mainstream classrooms. Rather than trying to overcome what might be perceived as ‘difficult’ and unsurpassed, teachers should opt for using students’ sociocultural and intellectual ‘funds’ by empowering them and respecting all their intrinsic characteristics in order to dismantle deficit beliefs and promote a new repertoire of actions. As a result, it is out of the question that in order to make significant progress in improving the learners’ outcomes, sweeping changes are needed to prepare foreign language teachers serve this growing population better.

Guided by previous research considerations and theoretical frameworks, a concurrent focus on teachers and L3 learners in multicultural and multilingual settings- possibly through the implementation of a hybrid instructional program, could yield significant information and insights. A longitudinal study would not only help learners understand how previously taught languages can change the ways in which additional languages can be processed and mastered, but would also broaden educators’ views, strengthen their practices and provide solid background knowledge that will enable them to teach academic content successfully. Research, therefore, should focus on a combination of various didactic strategies and theoretical aspects of trilingual teaching in order to enhance the teachers’ flexibility of the use of didactic skills in practice. Moreover, larger-scale empirical studies of similar focused provision of appropriate strategies for L3 learners or professional development programs on the best teaching practices for culturally and
linguistically diverse students in Greece, could be helpful in producing richer findings that are generalizable and applicable to various contexts in Greece.

In short, multilingualism is bound to gain greater prominence in the near future, and it is therefore advisable that any possible effort be made towards the adoption and the implementation of effective multilingual policies when it comes to additional language education. From the data in this study, the implementation of appropriate strategies should be based on long-standing, continuing development in conjunction with collaborative networks. According to Hadjioannou, et al., (2016, p. 25), instead of a short-term training program, a more “constructivist approach to development with ongoing, multiple-year support that is persistent, data driven, and reflective may be warranted to effect sustained instructional transformation”, would probably be more efficient. Furthermore, it is hoped that this emerging trend will be gradually mirrored in the improvements of our own understanding as teachers of all the processes and mechanisms involved in carrying out more relevant instruction to the benefit of diversified learners.

Conclusion
On balance, based on the plurality of strategy uses and personal philosophies permeating every teaching context, it became evident that there is no single best method of teaching diverse learners. If we wish to see improvements in culturally and linguistically diversified learners’ achievement outcomes, greater continuity in teacher training is necessary. Only by making sure that the special needs of such learners are met, based on their special characteristics and the related theory about their potential, will teachers become more competent and more importantly, will bilingual learners thrive in the acquisition of additional languages.
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APPENDICES
## APPENDIX A

### Table I: Distribution of foreign immigrant students in Greek State Schools across regions for the scholastic year 2012/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Preschool Education/Kindergarten</th>
<th>Primary Education</th>
<th>Junior and Senior Secondary Education</th>
<th>TOT AL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Macedonia/Thrace</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Macedonia</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>2,891</td>
<td>4,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Macedonia</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epirus</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thessaly</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>1,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionian Islands</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Greece</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Greece</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>2,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attica</td>
<td>5,423</td>
<td>2,965</td>
<td>8,388</td>
<td>1,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peloponnesse</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>2,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Aegean</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Aegean</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crete</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>2,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for the country</strong></td>
<td>10,086</td>
<td>8,976</td>
<td>18,862</td>
<td>35,962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table II: Distribution of Returning Ethnic Greek students in Greek State Schools across regions for the scholastic year 2012/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Preschool Education/Kindergarten</th>
<th>Primary Education</th>
<th>Junior and Senior Secondary Education</th>
<th>TOT AL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Macedonia/Thrace</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

231
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Central Macedonia</th>
<th>Western Macedonia</th>
<th>Epirus</th>
<th>Thessaly</th>
<th>Ionian Islands</th>
<th>Western Greece</th>
<th>Greece</th>
<th>Attica</th>
<th>Peloponnesus</th>
<th>Northern Aegean</th>
<th>Southern Aegean</th>
<th>Crete</th>
<th>Total for the country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Macedonia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epirus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thessaly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionian Islands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Greece</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Greece</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attica</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peloponnesus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Aegean</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Aegean</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crete</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for the country</strong></td>
<td>468</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>3,9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,23</td>
<td>1,16</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>7,2</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX B

Cummins’ Quadrant Model

![Cummins Quadrant Model Diagram](http://ed491.weebly.com/cummins-quadrants.html)

APPENDIX C

Principles of “Constructivist” Foreign/Additional Language Teaching

Principles of “Constructivist” Foreign/Additional Language Teaching (Wendt, 1996)

- Individualized Learners
- Autonomous Learners

- Learning Awareness

- Intercultural Awareness
- Process-related Awareness

- Language Awareness

- Constructivist EFL/EAL Teaching

- Learner Centeredness
- CONTENT-ORIENTED FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING

- Real/Authentic/Complex Learning Environments

- Creative/Active Participation in Classroom Work

- Cooperative Learning (team/group work)

- Active Orientedness

- Learning by developing activities (Projects)
- Learning by teaching (Talk on teacher’s role)
APPENDIX D

The Questionnaire

Dear Colleague,

My name is Evangelia Papalexatou and I am a PhD candidate in the Department of Elementary Education of the University of Patras, examining the teaching, learning and acquisition of English as a third language (L3) in a Greek Primary School educational context. As part of this endeavor, I kindly invite you to complete the following questionnaire as carefully and honestly you can, provided you are currently teaching or have in the past two years taught in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. It explores the teaching strategies you employ when teaching students who may be ethnically, racially, linguistically and / or culturally different from you and your mainstream pupils.

Your knowledge and experience are necessary for the successful completion of this study and will provide valuable insight as well as benefit the educational community at large.

Participation is voluntary and questionnaire completion should not take more than twenty minutes. All the information you provide will remain strictly confidential and will only be used for statistical analysis in conjunction with other questionnaires. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the questionnaire, please do not hesitate to contact me at evelpap@upatras.gr.

The study also has a brief, elective second phase, comprised of a few short questions. If, having completed the questionnaire, you would like to take part in the follow-up phase, please provide your email in the relevant field provided at the end of the survey.

Your email will never be divulged to third parties and will only be used to contact you for the second phase.

Your help is truly invaluable.

Thank you very much in advance.

Sincerely,

Evangelia Papalexatou
English Language and Literature Teacher / PhD Candidate
Dept. of Elementary Education
University of Patras
Questionnaire on Instructional Practices for EAL Students

● What is your ethnicity? _______________

● Age (in years) ________

● Gender
  ___ Male
  ___ Female

● What is the highest level of education you have attained:
  ___ Bachelor’s
  ___ Some years of master’s study
  ___ Master’s
  ___ Some years of Doctoral Study
  ___ Doctorate
  ___ Some years of Post-Doctoral Study
  ___ Post Doctorate
  ___ One or more completed Post-Doc(s)

● Are any of your educational attainments in the field of Multilingual, Multicultural Education?
  ___ Yes
  ___ No

If so, please specify: ____________________________________________________________
● Years of Teaching Experience: ___

● Employment status as a teacher: ____ Permanent teacher
    ____ Substitute teacher
    ____ Part – time teacher

● Which languages other than English and Greek do you speak and at what level of fluency?

(Only indicate your level of fluency for languages you speak. Select only one level of fluency for each language that you speak.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>BASIC</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT</th>
<th>PROFICIENT</th>
<th>NATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

● If you answered Other, please specify the language you were referring to:
  ____________________________

● On a scale of 1 (NONE) to 10 (A GREAT DEAL) how much training (e.g., professional development, university coursework, etc.) have you received on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students? _____

● Which, if any, of the following types of training have you received on issues related to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students? (Tick all that apply)

    _____ Undergraduate coursework
    _____ Professional development (i.e. teacher training / seminars / workshops etc.)
_____ Self-study—not counted towards professional development hours (e.g. books, movies, cultural festivities)

_____ Other

• If you answered Other, please specify the type of training:

_____________________________

• What type of area is the school where you teach located in?
(If you teach in multiple schools, please answer with respect to the school where you have the most hours.)

___ Urban ___ Suburban ___ Rural/Agrarian ___ Major Metropolitan Area

• What percentage of your school’s population are ethnic minority community children?
(If you teach in more than one school, please answer with respect to the school where you have the most hours) _____%

Evaluate each of the following statements regarding the organization and evaluation of teaching strategies and EAL students’ learning on a scale of 1 (NEVER) to 5 (ALWAYS)

Please indicate your answer by selecting the box that corresponds to the appropriate number for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I clearly identify the purpose of a learning activity (I consider the nature of the task, what they have to know and their current language skills).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I preview the language lesson (new content) to get a general idea of what it is about, how it is organized and how it relates to what my pupils already know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I preview the main ideas of a text and plan how to accomplish a task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I structure the lesson because sound lesson structures optimize time on task and classroom climate by using smooth transitions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I adopt explicit teaching practices that clearly show pupils what to do and how to do it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. I have pupils plan for the tasks; understand the task, organize it and find resources.

7. I have pupils seek opportunities that help them learn and practice.

8. I try to create an inclusive environment, conducive to learning (create labels and signs in home languages, reflect diversity in visual displays, relate to the pupils’ cultural background within the curriculum).

9. I celebrate pupils’ success (I help pupils acknowledge and celebrate current status on a learning goal as well as knowledge gain).

10. I provide students with abstract tokens of recognition or praise for their accomplishments related to the attainment of a goal.

11. I demonstrate value and respect for low-expectancy pupils.

12. I make encouraging statements to help them continue to try hard.

13. I provide formal or informal feedback so that pupils can align effort and activity with a clear outcome towards the achievement of a learning goal.

14. I use pupils’ voice to enable pupils’ feedback about teaching.

15. I ‘scan’ the classroom to monitor pupils’ engagement.

16. I have pupils monitor their comprehension as they use the language.

17. I have pupils monitor their production as they use the language.

18. I have pupils keep learning logs (journals) to check back and reflect on what they have learnt.

19. I help pupils learn how to learn. Meta-cognitive activities can include planning how to approach a task and monitor comprehension.

20. I ask pupils to reflect on what they understand and what they are still confused about.
On a scale of 1 (NEVER) to 5 (ALWAYS) how often do you employ each of the following techniques when teaching EAL students to recall information?

(Please indicate your answer by selecting the box that corresponds to the appropriate number for each statement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I put the words in sentences (in context) so as to help pupils remember them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I put the new words in a group with similar ‘family’ words (e.g. words related to clothing, cooking…).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I use the ‘read aloud’ technique to help pupils remember new words.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I use / transfer cognates to help pupils make associations between the sound of a new word with the sound of a familiar word.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I use a combination of sounds and images to help pupils learn the new material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I use flashcards with the new word on the one side and the definition or other information on the other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I physically have the pupils act out the new word or I do it myself (physical reenactments of content – use of their kinesthetic sense).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I often have the pupils review the lesson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a scale of 1 (NEVER) to 5 (ALWAYS) how often do you employ the following techniques aimed to manage EAL students’ emotions and promote cooperative learning?

(Please indicate your answer by selecting the box that corresponds to the appropriate number for each statement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I have the pupils collaborate, actively participating in negotiating roles, responsibilities and outcomes (in a non-threatening learning environment).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I have the pupils work together to solve problems by applying previously acquired knowledge and skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. I provide the learners with opportunities to interact with one another in ways that foster and enhance peer learning.

4. I ask pupils to create a mental, oral or written summary of information by using their selective attention.

5. I create activities for scaffolded talk using paired discussions (before commencing written work).

6. I present worked examples that reduce pupils’ cognitive load and help them focus on the process.

7. When pupils are not engaged, I use academic games (adaptations of popular games) to reengage them and focus their attention on academic content.

8. I organize pupils in dyads or triads to discuss small chunks of content (“digestible bites”) that are tailored to their level of understanding and elaborate on them.

9. I provide as much visual support as possible in a wide variety of formats (diagrams, photographs, T.V / computer programs, artifacts, set of picture cards, flashcards).

10. I set up a “buddy” system (pairing and mentoring) where possible, by making the appropriate arrangements.

11. I arrange for every pupil a regular language learning partner for clarification reasons.

12. I slow and quicken the pace of instruction in such a way as to either maintain a lively pace or enhance engagement.

13. I use (non)verbal signals to demonstrate intensity and enthusiasm.

14. I use techniques that allow pupils to relate content to their personal lives and interests.

15. I seek out knowledge related to pupils’ personal experiences and use it to engage in informal, friendly discussions.

16. I make use of questioning strategies to engage pupils, stimulate interest and curiosity in the learning and make links to pupils’ lives.
On a scale of 1 (NEVER) to 5 (ALWAYS) how often do you engage in the following practices dealing with EAL pupils’ mental processes and compensation for missing knowledge?

(Please indicate your answer by selecting the box that corresponds to the appropriate number for each statement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I use reference materials such as bilingual dictionaries, illustrated topic glossaries, encyclopedias.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I engage pupils in ways that involve making and testing hypotheses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I practice the new language in a variety of ways in authentic situations using all four skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I use skimming strategies to help pupils get the main idea.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I use scanning strategies to help pupils seek specific details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I engage pupils in applying or figuring out rules to understand a concept, complete a learning task or adjust their understanding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I have pupils use information in an oral or written text to guess meanings of new items or predict new information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I anticipate pupils will understand the general meaning by using any clue they may find.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I encourage regular transfer among all languages to foster self-respect and motivation, even momentarily.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I try to make associations between new material and what pupils already know so as to activate prior knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I make use of what pupils already know and make analogies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I pre-teach key words or create glossary books in both / all languages for the pupils to record new information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I urge pupils to use synonymous words, relate terms, descriptive phrases or even gestures when the exact word cannot be recalled.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I classify or group words / concepts according to their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attributes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I develop parents’ ability to support and reinforce school’s work from home and create an open dialogue for the school to become better informed about the pupil’s development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Αξιότιμη η κεδιευθυντή - ντρια,

Καλημέρα σας. Θα σας παρακαλούσα πολύ να προωθήσετε το συγκεκριμένο ηλεκτρονικό μήνυμα στα προσωπικά mails των συναδέλφων που υπηρετούν στα σχολεία σας. Αφορά αποκλειστικά σε εκπαιδευτικούς Ειδικότητας ΠΕ06 – Αγγλικής Γλώσσας. Η βοήθεια σας είναι εξαιρετικά πολύτιμη για εμένα στα πλαίσια της εκπόνησης της διδακτορικής μου έρευνας.

Σας ευχαριστώ εκ των προτέρων.

Με εκτίμηση,

Παπαλεξάτου Ευαγγελία
Εκπαιδευτικός ΠΕ06 Αγγλικής Γλώσσας
Υποψήφια Διδάκτωρ Πανεπιστημίου Πατρών

Προς εκπαιδευτικούς ΠΕ06:

Ονομάζομαι Παπαλεξάτου Ευαγγελία και εργάζομαι τα τελευταία 11 χρόνια ως αναπληρώτρια εκπαιδευτικός. Θα σας ήμουν ευγνώμων εάν απαντούσατε το ερωτηματολόγιο που ακολουθεί, το οποίο αποτελεί μέρος της διδακτορικής μου έρευνας.

Το εν λόγω ερωτηματολόγιο σχεδίαστηκε με στόχο να εξετάσει την χρήση συγκεκριμένων εκπαιδευτικών στρατηγικών (EAL STRATEGIES = English as an Additional Language Strategies), που χρησιμοποιούν οι εκπαιδευτικοί Αγγλικής γλώσσας όσον αφορά στη διδασκαλία μαθητών οι οποίοι μπορεί να διαφοροποιούνται από τον καθηγητή ή/και από τους υπόλοιπους μαθητές σε γλωσσικό, πολιτισμικό, θρησκευτικό και φιλετικό επίπεδο.

Η συμπλήρωση του ερωτηματολογίου δεν υπερβαίνει τα 15 λεπτά.

Η συμμετοχή σας είναι προαιρετική και διασφαλίζεται ότι τα στοιχεία που καλείσθε να δώσετε θα χρησιμοποιούνται αστηρά και μόνο για επιστημονικούς σκοπούς και δεν θα αποκαλυφθούν ή μεταβιβαστούν σε τρίτους.

Ευελπιστώντας στην αρωγή και στην κατανόησή σας, σας ευχαριστώ θερμά εκ των προτέρων.

Για τη συμπλήρωση του ερωτηματολογίου συνδεθείτε στον παρακάτω σύνδεσμο:
https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSd88hkTBnvpdiVtzj3CWIIRcy2OmARFJnD0moQm-L7f7L7qJQ/viewform?usp=sf_link
## APPENDIX F

### Factor Analyses

Factor analysis: Evaluating the organization and teaching strategies and EAL students’ learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have pupils keep learning logs_18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have pupils monitor their comprehension_16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have pupils plan for the task_6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have pupils monitor their production_17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have pupils seek opportunities_7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use pupils’ voice to enable feedback_14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I create an inclusive environment_8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide formal or informal feedback_13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I clearly identify the purpose of activity_1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I preview the main ideas_3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I structure the lesson_4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I preview the language lesson_2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.644</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I adopt explicit teaching practices_5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I celebrate pupils’ success_9</td>
<td></td>
<td>.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I demonstrate value and respect_11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide students with tokens of recognitions or praise_10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I scan the classroom_15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make encouraging statements_12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask pupils to reflect_20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make use of meta-cognitive activities_19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cronbach Alpha</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>0.740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Promoting thinking and developing an inclusive perspective among students
2 = Structuring and explaining the lesson
3 = Celebrating praise and respect
4 = Facilitating the lesson and learning how to learn / Cultivating a positive learning environment and facilitating the learning process
Factor analysis: **Frequency of employment of each of specific techniques when teaching EAL students to recall information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use/transfer cognates_4</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use combination of sounds and images_5</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the read aloud technique_3</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use flashcards with the new words_6</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I put new words in similar family words_2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often have pupils review the lesson_8</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I put the words in context_1</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I or the pupils physically act out the words_7</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cronbach Alpha</strong></td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1= Facilitating the acquisition of new words  
2= Contextualizing and mastering new vocabulary

Factor analysis: **Frequency of employment of specific techniques aimed to manage EAL students’ emotions and promote cooperative learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
<th>Component 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have pupils work together to solve problems by applying previous</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the pupils collaborate in negotiating roles, responsibilities and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outcomes_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide learners with opportunities to interact_3</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask pupils to create a mental, oral or written summary_4</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I create activities for scaffolded talk using paired discussions_5</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I organize pupils in dyads or triads_8</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I slow down and quicken the pace of instruction_12</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I seek out knowledge related to personal experiences_15</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use (non) verbal signs_13</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make use of questioning strategies_16</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use techniques to relate content to personal lives_14</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I set up a buddy system_10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I arrange a regular language learning partner_11
I present worked examples_6
I use academic games_7
I provide visual support_9

Cronbach Alpha 0.874 0.866 0.796 0.618

Factor analysis: Frequency of engagement of specific practices dealing with EAL pupils’ mental processes and compensation for missing knowledge

Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
<th>Component 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use skimming strategies_4</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use scanning strategies_5</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I engage pupils in applying or figuring out rules_6</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use reference materials_1</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I develop parents' ability to support work from home_16</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I engage pupils in ways that involve making and testing hypotheses_2</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I engage pupils in note taking_7</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I practice the new language in a variety of ways in authentic situations_3</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage transfer among all languages_10</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I anticipate pupils will understand the general meaning by using any clue_9</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I urge pupils to use synonymous words_14</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use what pupils already know_12</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have pupils use information to guess meanings_8</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make associations to activate prior knowledge_11</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pre-teach keywords or create glossary books_13</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I classify group words_15</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach Alpha 0.776 0.803 0.771 0.499

1=Skimming / Scanning – Inductive / Deductive approach
2= The role of parents and the use of all languages available in the classroom in various ways
3= Processing a text, thinking and activating prior linguistic knowledge
4= Classification of words, pre-teaching and glossary books.
APPENDIX G

Interview Questions

Good morning / Good evening. Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for this study. Your views will provide valuable insight and will help me analyze the topic in depth.

Over the next 10 -15 minutes I will be asking you several open-ended questions related to your experiences on the strategies/practices you make use of, when it comes to teaching English as a third language to students who may be ethnically, racially, linguistically and/or culturally different from you and your mainstream pupils.

All the information you provide will remain strictly confidential and will only be used for the qualitative analysis of the study; however, the recording and the transcription of the data is indispensable. Before we begin, do you have any questions for me? So, shall we start?

Question 1: Tell me a few things about the school and the area you are currently working in and those in the past?

What has your experience been with culturally and linguistically diverse students so far? (reference to student population) Have you got any experience with working with such students now and then?

Question 2: How do you perceive the notion of intercultural education in Greece? Have you ever received training in the field? If yes, what, when and from whom?

Question 3: As far as teaching strategies are concerned, do you differentiate them when teaching English as L2 to mainstream students VS as L3 to diverse students? If yes, how? Can you give me an example?

Do strategies have to be different / adapted?

Question 4: Do you personally make use of all the children’s existing home languages in your classroom?

Question 5: Which are the main challenges in teaching a culturally and linguistically diverse classroom?

Question 6: Do you think you could benefit from strategy development training for culturally and linguistically diverse students?

What are your main expectations in relation to possible / future workshops?

Thank you very much for your cooperation. It has been more than helpful.
APPENDIX H

Interview Transcriptions

INTERVIEW 1

Interviewer: Good morning
Interviewee: Good morning
Interviewer: Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for the study. It will provide valuable insight and help me analyze the topic in depth for my dissertation. Okay, so over the next 15 minutes I will be asking you some open-ended questions related to your experiences of the strategies you make use of when it comes to teaching English as a third language.
Interviewee: … okay
Interviewer: Okay? so all the information you will provide me with will remain strictly confidential and will only be used for the qualitative analysis of the study. So do you have any questions before we start?
Interviewee: No, I think it’s… everything is clear.
Interviewer: Okay, so shall we start?
Interviewee: Yes, please.
Interviewer: All right, tell me a few things about the school and the area you're currently working and those in the past
Interviewee: Okay. Currently I'm working in a Primary School umm located in the suburban area of Patras and populated with…about 100 students
Interviewee: Between…6 and 12 years of age….most students come from middle-class families with…different social educational and economic background and some of them from families with different cultural origins as I have noticed because umm there are students with parents…with fathers or mothers who come from Albania, Ukraine, Italy,… Asia or…even Nigeria and two students who come from… who… whose parents have spent several years in… in the United States only to come back 2 years before and so they enrolled in the Greek School 2 years ago.
Interviewer: okay so what has your experience been with….? okay
Interviewer: …something…something that I forgot is that in the past I have worked in mainly senior secondary schools.
Interviewee: so I have got very little experience with primary education but it's enough for me to… to see…to see what is going on about multiculturalism and …well there has been a break in my teaching career I used to spend… I spent 17 years teaching in various schools I stopped I had a break… because I served as a school advisor so I assumed a different role and I resumed my teaching career two years ago.
Interviewer: Very nice okay… so what has your experience been with culturally and linguistically diverse students so far? have you got any experience working with such students? now and then?
Interviewee: …okay look …the issue of multiculturalism emerged in Greece in… in the umm in the nineties… in the decade between 1990 and 2000 so …up to that time there were…there was not serious percentage of culturally diverse students in the Greek classrooms so I don't think I have such an experience teaching students because at that time…the influx of Albanian and other immigrants in Greece have
not become so big that the Schools could umm would host…culturally diverse students.

**Interviewer:** okay so…how do you perceive the notion of Intercultural education in Greece?

**Interviewee:** so the notion of Intercultural education in Greece actually grew along with… the inflow of the immigrants and…for some time the… Intercultural education the national policy towards… the education of the culturally diverse students was one of…promoting the assimilation…It promoted assimilation, that is the absorption into the Greek national system but then … after the… the number of immigrants became higher and higher and this number also appeared in the Greek Schools… the Intercultural education started to… to develop. So in my opinion and as far as I know Intercultural education refers to a specific kind of pedagogy which promotes tolerance acceptance respect of … of … the national and cultural identities of culturally diverse people… it's a kind of Education which preaches the the equality …the equal opportunity to education and social prosperity umm it also I think aims at the minimization of our cultural and national stereotypes and it it is also about an effort … it…it involves or it… it promotes the effort to proceed towards a cultural convergence to come closer to the other and to establish and to develop a relationship with the culturally diverse person

**Interviewer:** okay so have you ever received any training in the field? If yes, what, when and from whom?

**Interviewee:** Okay (pause) not a special kind of training but I think intercultural education was part of my... it was actually the subject or …. the topic of the module I…. the module of my master's degree... so…i had to spend some time studying it as part of my master's degree and furthermore I... ok… Intercultural education was also part of my PhD research because… in this framework I had to study…… the…. experiences of the teachers of English working in schools with multicultural students…. with cultural diversity.

**Interviewer:** Okay, so it was related to your... PhD’s topic... and something else?

**Interviewee:** …essentially the Greek State for many years did not organize workshops or training activities for teachers of English on the subject of multi…. intercultural education and so I chose to attend various others activities by private mostly agencies

**Interviewer:** okay very nice as far as teaching strategies are concerned do you differentiate them when teaching English as a second language to your mainstream students versus as a third one to diverse students? if yes how? Can you give me an example please?

**Interviewee:** okay…. you know it's difficult for a teacher of English to differentiate (laughing) his strategies when teaching…. a group of….an overpopulated group (laughing again) 25 to 30 students per class but nevertheless…. okay... occasionally I do.

**Interviewee:** …… for example as much as I can think of… I choose authentic material which relates to the cultures of some of the students…. because I have noticed that this reference to their cultural context…. background motivates them to get involved in the lesson and prevents… prevents them from feeling excluded and marginalized.

**Interviewee:** I also try to involve my students regardless culture in…. group work …….. and I organize heterogeneous groups ……and I ask them to involve in dialogue... On the basis of a question…. on a topic…. so that they may exchange…. beliefs…. they may exchange opinions…. they may exchange
values…. and I encourage them also to compare and contrast to find similarities between what each of them…. believes. I also encourage personal narratives because in class we need a teacher of English needs to develop the oral and written language and storytelling is a fine… provides a fine chance for me to...

**Interviewee:** to ask my students to…. Narrate…

**Interviewee:** So, these personal narratives I have noticed… are a marvelous opportunity for them to express personally…. and through these…. through these narratives I… we often see the cultural symbolism emerge. On the whole, I try to create…. (pause) with special tasks to create…. a safe and positive… climate for them to… to express themselves…. above all I urge them to engage in reflection…. think why things happen how things happen… how things affect them…So… this is how I adapt my teaching.

**Interviewee:** okay….so…. what about home languages?... do you make use of all the children's existing home languages in your classroom? That extent if you do so?

**Interviewee:** (laughing)... languages the students’ mother tongues are a serious issue because they differ more and more nowadays and…. you know…. the task of an English... teacher is actually to teach English nowadays as a lingua Franca because many culturally diverse people around the world use this common code…

**Interviewer:** Yes…

**Interviewee:** to communicate... so it’s very difficult...so my... my... my task as a teacher is to focus on that

**Interviewee:** but…. still…. depending on the topic we are working on in class…

**Interviewer:** Yes…

**Interviewee:** and depending on the specific reference to celebration... celebrations, holidays customs... I occasionally grasp the opportunity to...to …. seek...from my students, not myself thee use from the students of their own mother tongues ...they usually talk about their customs, how they express themselves in their own mother tongues and in this I have seen that…. (pause) ... somehow tingles the interest of all the other…

**Interviewer:** of all the others...yes…

**Interviewee** Yes...of all the students…

**Interviewer:** Ok I can understand it…..nice… now! What are the main challenges for you teaching in the culturally and linguistically diverse classroom?

**Interviewer:** are there any?

**Interviewee:** Yes, there are many challenges…For me beyond the practical…

**Interviewer:** Part…

**Interviewee:** Part yes… dimension the practical part of these challenges how to teach how to organize how to regulate the language activities and so on the main challenges are several. One: for example, a challenge is how to find ways of managing the students as a community

**Interviewee:** and how to manage each student as a personality

**Interviewee:** Yes

**Interviewee:** this is very difficult

**Interviewer:** another challenge is how to accommodate all of them emotionally first and then linguistically, how to provide this space for all of them.Another challenge …. which is often….shared by many teachers is how to cope with possible…arising cultural misunderstandings

**Interviewee:** ….. which sometimes turn into cultural conflicts

**Interviewer:** Yes ....
Interviewee: how to manage them how to persuade the other people the other, the big part of the class, of the mono-cultural mass... how to persuade them to respect their cultural diversity.... how to persuade them to come closer to them.

Interviewee: another challenge is how to balance the cultures between students because each one is proud of each.... his or her culture... and how to inspire genuine interest to all cultures to all students.... how to manage stereotypes how to manage prejudices...which are expressed on....

Interviewer: .... On the spur of the moment
Interviewee: ...yes on the spur of the moment...

Interviewer: .... Yes
Interviewee: ....and last... lastly another challenge is how to regulate the diverse needs of my students because each according... according to the group he belongs and according to his personal needs expect something different from me so the challenges how to regulate diverse needs of my students and how to enhance his personal properties, his personal skills, his personal qualities

Interviewer: ...Yeah...Ok, so personally do you think that you could benefit from strategy development training for such students?

Interviewee:.....Training? yes absolutely... absolutely because all kinds of training offer the teachers a means to find answers to their to his needs and intercultural education is a really crucial area for training not only because......we all know that language is part of culture because nowadays all... most if not all classroom contexts are largely multicultural so training especially training strategy development is necessary provided that the teachers do not see just practical strategy development solutions....... but first of all are ready to receive, are ready to change their own mentality...

Interviewer: .... Okay...? is that your question or...?

Interviewer: .... Yes, yes yes.... Thank you very much and related to such training what are your main expectations .... in possible workshops... future workshops...?

Interviewee: .... future workshops.... we know that up to the moment most training activities depend largely on the theoretical part....

Interviewee: ....and somehow avoid linking this part to the real, to the actual classroom practice... so in my view I would expect few training activities to be more embedded, to be more related to .... the actual classroom practice to the actual school environment. I would love, love them..... I would like them to.... not only mainly focus on.... providing teachers .... prescribed recipes...

Interviewee: .... how to do how to deal with their culturally diverse students but how to change their own mentality.... how to develop the new mindset......towards a multicultural context which would be persisting and developing in the future so I would expect the training workshops to.... to provide the teachers.... a good, a sound theoretical content to apply it in real conditions, classroom conditions.... Besides, I would expect it to be shared...this content to be shared by many teachers to inspire collaborative work between them and especially to inspire reflective... exploitation.... and practical reflective exploitation in practice and...... overall... I would expect this training activity to provide them to us teachers insights as to what intercultural education really means and allow us space to apply, to adjust this indication to our particular teaching environment.

Interviewer: ...very nice... what about the equipment is there anything missing from your classroom is there anything you would like to be provided with in the classroom?
Interviewee: ….. nowadays there is no such question about the equipment because equipment is an issue… is a very vast issue given the fact that the World Wide Web is … provides access to a lot of authentic material and all, if not almost all schools are provided waste infrastructure to the teachers, so I would not place it on this particular strand. Equipment is accessible because the teachers are capable of using… equipment….it is a matter of content is a matter of good and critical choice of the material you're going to use which will promote the idea of Intercultural education

Interviewer: …Yes…Okay, thank you very much for your help and your corporation

Interviewee: …. thank you very much I hope….it has some… a bit contributed to your research.

Interviewer: …thank you very much.

Interviewer: …me too, for the kind invitation.

INTERVIEW 2

Interviewer: Good morning

Interviewee: Good morning

Interviewer: Thank you for taking part in my dissertation, in my study, this interview. Your views will provide valuable insight for me and will help me analyze the topic in depth. So, thank you very much. Before we begin …. So over the next 15 minutes I will be asking you several open ended questions related to your experiences on the strategies / practices you make use of when it comes to teaching English as a third language to students may be ethnically, racially linguistically or culturally different from you and your mainstream pupils. Okay? So… all the information will remain strictly confidential and will only be used for the qualitative analysis of the data of this study.

Interviewer: So... before we begin do you have any questions? Is it clear? Is everything clear to you?

Interviewee: Yeah, yeah, yeah…

Interviewer: So, okay…So shall we start?

Interviewer: Yes…Alright so… tell me a few things about the school and the area you are currently working in and those in the past.

Interviewee: okay let's start with those I am working now… I am working in three schools...do I mention the areas?

Interviewer: …No, it is not necessary…

Interviewee: … three villages in Achaia.

Interviewer: Okay…

Interviewee: anyway… in three villages… the atmosphere in all three schools is wonderful.

Interviewee: in the one school I only deal with 6th class pupils... they are all Greek, so I don't have any …. any kids from other countries there…

Interviewee: and they are very, very, very well behaved. In the other schools in the two villages I have in one school….. It's …. a two-teacher school … I have three classes... all together in one go. These classes... have... Albanian kids... particularly one of the kids who is in the 6th class should have been in the third year of junior high school.

Interviewer: my goodness…! Okay...

Interviewer: she's quite old…
Interviewer: she's old for Primary School... because she has only been in Greece for two years so they had to do that...
Interviewee: I also have in that particular school...I also have... a little girl... who... whose father is Pakistani... and her mother is Albanian... another little girl whose father is Greek and her mother is from Bulgaria... and I also have two or three Albanian children and that's it...
Interviewer: So... you've got experience with working...
Interviewee: I do...I do now and in the past...yes
Interviewer: And in the past... all right... so how do you perceive the notion of intercultural education in Greece?
Interviewee: Intercultural education (pause)... it has to do level... the level of the kids and not of their background...
Interviewee: cause if I have... let's say for example in the 6th class... I have the specific pupil that I mentioned... who is three years older than the others...her Greek is not good...It is very good for the years she's only been in Greece.
Interviewee: two years, but she has a lot of gaps. Her English is quite good... her English is quite good... for this specific girl... but usually that's not the case... so it depends on the level of the kids and not on their racial background.
Interviewer: have you received any training in the field?
Interviewee: no, never
Interviewer: never? okay
Interviewee: it’s only... from my experience
Interviewer: yes... or personal intuition at times...
Interviewee: oh yes!
Interviewer: how you are going to act...
Interviewee: yes, yes
Interviewer: okay
Interviewee: now... as far as the teaching strategies are concerned do you differentiate them when teaching English as a second language to mainstream students versus as a third language to diverse students? if yes and if this happens at times how do you do that? can you give me an example?
Interviewee: ...well...
Interviewer: How do you differentiate languages?
Interviewee: how do I...?...
Interviewer: The way you use your strategies... yes... do you adapt your strategies? do you do anything... do you do anything different?
Interviewee: I always adapt my strategies... because I mentioned in the previous question that it's a matter of the level of the kids...
Interviewee: so usually let’s say... in particular in one of the schools I am now I have...let's say 5th class... I have a girl from... a girl who is... a gypsy girl...
Interviewer: ... oh yes...
Interviewee: I have an Albanian girl... and I have two Greek students whose level of English is very, very low
Interviewee: These kids the two Greek ones, the Albanian one and the...
Interviewer: and the Gypsy...?
Interviewee: and the Gypsy one...
Interviewer: okay...
Interviewee: I put them together in a group in my... of my spare... my... my spare... my spare hours...
Interviewee: my gaps...
Interviewer: oh not during the lesson!
Interviewee: No! No! during the lesson they just listen... they just listen...
Interviewer: they just listen...
Interviewee: I don't make them do what I do with the others....
Interviewer: aaaaaa okay...
Interviewee: because they are not going to be able to do it! the level is very low... they don't they don't go to an English frontistirio....
Interviewer: to an English language School...
Interviewee: an English Language School... yes...
Interviewee: ...so I just circle some of the very… very easy words
Interviewer: for them...
Interviewee: on the blackboard but we are talking about level cat, dog, ant, work.
Interviewer: Do you use flash cards for them?
Interviewee: no, no there is no time for that!
Interviewer: any other paralinguistic cues, any other … any other I don't know….
Worksheets? special worksheets or...
Interviewee: yes
Interviewer: body movements? gestures? do you use them?
Interviewee: worksheets which I make from home... it's usually a very, very small… little text...underline the unknown words... and I write them down and photocopy them and give them to the kids and that's their work... they do that as copy and try to learn the words... they don't really...but they try, they make an effort.
Interviewer: what about their languages? the existing home languages in your classroom do you make use of all of them?
Interviewee: No
Interviewer: No… not at all?
Interviewee: I am not going to learn the gypsy language… I am not going to learn the...
Interviewer: The Albanian...
Interviewee: no, no I am not going to learn them... but sometimes I will ask the kids how's this in your language... What's this called in your language?
Interviewer: Why?
Interviewee: To make them feel at ease, to make them feel that they blend in, that they are one of the gang, just for that...
Interviewer: so to motivate them?
Interviewee: yeah! because learning wise they're not going to learn anything... my, my humble opinion is that...
Interviewer: okay so which are the main challenges when teaching a culturally and linguistically diverse classroom?
Interviewee: as I said it's about... it's about the level... not about the racial, the racial thing... not at all… yes! it's a waste of time in the classroom for them...
Interviewer: yes... Interviewee: for them, because they can't follow what we are saying... they feel useless I'm sure they do
Interviewer: yes
Interviewee: ... they do their work and especially one of the Greek kids he really… really works hard... he does everything I tell him, everything! he's wonderful...he is just wonderful... that is up to the particular kid
Interviewer: yes...
Interviewee: I think it's a waste of time for them, I think they should, they should have been taken aside… for the whole duration of my lesson... and...

Interviewer: by whom?

Interviewee: by…. by someone else...

Interviewer: a specialist you mean...

Interviewee: a special teacher, another English teacher... who could start them from scratch.

Interviewer: ...okay

Interviewee: or by me if I had another, another hour to spend on them...

Interviewer: so personally do you think that you could benefit from strategy development training for such students?

Interviewee: no

Interviewer: no?

Interviewee: no... because usually the people who give us the strategy developing, are usually people who have never ever worked into a classroom so he can talk to me as if he's grinning the face and I'm going to get nothing out of it because I'm never gonna be able to apply... I will never be able to apply any of this theoretical -- in the class... a wonderful lesson for this person and I'm talking about the majority not all of them of course I am sure that some of them are teachers and they know the difficulties in a classroom but usually...usually they... the people who tell you what to do are usually people who do not teach...

Interviewer: who do not actually teach...

Interviewee: So that's --- for me... I'm not going to follow somebody's bullshit... which is inapplicable...in the classroom... because half of the classroom is spent usually and especially in the schools I am now... half of the classroom time is spent dealing with problems that have arisen outside during recess...

Interviewer: because of their personal...?

Interviewee: Because of their personal problems… we've got kids that are very poor we have children who have got enmity with each other... and they always fight I think that is more important for me to do with that first and the cognitive part later on! later on!

Interviewer: so what would you suggest... I mean...if future workshops were organized, which are your main expectations? Which would be at least? I know that you are negative....

Interviewee: yes...I am very negative… very, very negative...

Interviewer: you're very negative...ok... I can understand that...that's your personal view but if something like that happened with your expectations would actually be...

Interviewee: if something like that....

Interviewer: what would you like to have and be provided with? at least...? as a teacher....

Interviewee: if someone who has taught in primary schools and not in a private... a private college...If someone like that would like to explain to me how to have a more... a more prolific lesson, I would not be that negative...

Interviewer: so would you like to see something in practice or in theory?

Interviewee: in practice of course! Not in theory... In theory…I'm up to my eyes! Theory! no more! no more! I don't need it anymore because it can't be followed...it can't be followed!

Interviewer: so something... anything at hand? that you would feel more comfortable with? can’t you think of anything?

Interviewee: no...
Interviewer: not really...
Interviewee: Not really... it's something that I really don't care about... at the moment... I've been teaching for 25 years... over these 25 years 17 have been ... in the public school sector... in primary schools, at high schools, at senior high schools and in special schools for handicapped children...believe me none of these theories could be applied...
Interviewer: okay very nice... thank you very much for your cooperation, it has been more than helpful.
Interviewee: thank you very much, thank you.

INTERVIEW 3

Interviewer: Good morning
Interviewee: Good morning
Interviewer: First of all, thank you for taking part in my study, in my dissertation...Over the next 15 minutes I will be asking you some questions, related to the use of your personal strategies or practices you make use of when teaching English as a third language in primary schools.
Interviewee: Okay
Interviewer: Is that clear?
Interviewee: Yes
Interviewer: Okay... So... we are referring to students who may be ethnically racially linguistically and/or culturally different from you and your mainstream students, all right?
Interviewee: All right.
Interviewer: So all the information will remain strictly confidential, so don't worry about it. Are there any questions before we begin?
Interviewee: No I'm fine, everything is clear.
Interviewer: Okay, so... let's start... tell me a few things about the school and the area you're currently working in and those in the past… a few words...
Interviewer: Okay... I’ve been a teacher of English for the past 15 years...I teach in primary schools in the prefecture of Aitoloakarnania …. In my school, this current year I've been teaching English to all grades from 1st to 6th… I do have students that are from ethnic different backgrounds and...
Interviewer: okay that was my next question...
Interviewee: okay
Interviewer: do you have any experience with them... culturally and linguistically diverse students and if so, what's the relationship between then and now? Are they more... are they less?
Interviewee: well back in the day we used to have like children from more economically challenging countries whose parents were immigrants from another country for like working purposes... like students from Albania... this population has grown… I believe to tell you the truth so in a classroom we might have like... half the students being Greek and have the students being from another country…. now these last years, we are having some…. we have an influx of refugees as well...
Interviewer: ...
Interviewee: so, we have some people that come from Middle Eastern countries like Pakistan Afghanistan…. Iranis... not that many... but it is a possibility that their population is going to start growing.
**Interviewer:** ...okay, so personally how do you perceive the notion of intercultural education in Greece?

**Interviewer:** To me, intercultural education refers to any educational context that has to do with... a diverse cultural background whether it is... the country that my students come from... whether they belong in a different race... a different religion... anything that is... let's say... it... it is not uniform to what we perceive as a typical Greek student.

**Interviewer:** yes...okay... so have you received... have you ever received training in the field? If yes, what when and from whom?

**Interviewee:** regarding Intercultural education...

**Interviewer:** and foreign language teaching...

**Interviewee:** ... no, not formal training to be honest but I can recall... what I… what I try to do is... base mostly on self-directed learning like reading an article here and there... just trying to prepare myself how to deal with children that come from different backgrounds... but no... no formal training.

**Interviewer:** No formal training... all right... Let's move on to teaching strategies... all right? So, as far as they are concerned... do you actually differentiate them when teaching English as a second language to mainstream pupils versus as a third to diverse ones? if yes, how do you achieve that? Can you give me an example?

**Interviewee:** Well it is true that... I guess that... teaching English as a second language and teaching English as a third language to students is not the same... (pause) I have... I have to keep in mind that there are differences, but I try not to differentiate them in terms of how I organize my... my class... I mean when I assign group work I make sure that the groups are made of students that are taught English as L2 and as L3 as well... I sometimes... I use the fact that English is taught as an L3 to those students as an advantage in the sense that since it is a third language they are being taught and they are learning maybe they can put emotions and mechanisms of learning the language even if it is done subconsciously... that they could use or they can learn the language or they could use more... the learning process to their own benefit... like for example... if... there are some words that are phonetically similar to their own native language or to Greek or to English... they might use that as a bridge... to bridge their existing knowledge with the new one... the fact is that this can only be done for students that their native language is European-based or similar to our own... to... English or to Greek... when it comes to students that come from the Middle East or other parts of the world where the language taught is totally different then... I think...

**Interviewer:** There is a problem there

**Interviewee:** yeah... there is a problem... I cannot use that...

**Interviewer:** Okay... so you think that strategies have to be different... adapted... at times...

**Interviewer:** Yes, yes... of course... of course Another thing I do is give them extra time if I see They are feeling a little bit cornered... It's very important for me as I said that you group work not only to help them become a part of the larger group, but also because it is... Taking in mind affective factors as well I mean to feel safe I mean to feel included I mean an inclusive classroom, an inclusive environment is an environment of co-operation I think is the best environment for them to... to... learn for any... for any student
Interviewee: Also I sometimes I ask the help of my students who are more proficient in Greek in the L2 than those students are so they may become mediators between me...
Interviewer: and the students…
Interviewee: and the students who feel less confident to speak or to be able to produce
Interviewer: Yes, to produce anything... very nice… okay and what about the existing home languages in your classroom... do you make use of all of them?
Interviewee: No because I don't have the knowledge of all of them... I mean for example in… with my Albanian students over the years I may have picked up some words here and there and may have become more familiar with their cultural background... so...for example I can use a context in my learning that is culturally diverse
Interviewee: and close to their own culture but I... when it comes to other countries... I'm not... I'm not... that familiar
Interviewer: neither with their language nor with their culture so I must say that I restrict myself to using Greek...and English
Interviewer: and English... okay...which are the main challenges when teaching in such a classroom? A diverse classroom?
Interviewee: I think the one that I mentioned just now being unable to be familiar with their cultural backgrounds their native language... the way they have been learning... They have just come into Greece...
Interviewer: There are also problems in equipment ...The use of equipment like computers or anything that has to do... access...with the technological equipment is a bit difficult.
Interviewer: is a bit difficult...okay...Do you think that you could benefit from strategy development training?
Interviewer: For culturally and linguistically diverse students?
Interviewer: For sure...for sure
Interviewer: For sure...okay... I don't know if there is any plan of doing something like that in the near future I think that we are going to need it… because… judging from the current circumstances having a more culturally diverse classroom is a reality, so we need to adapt for sure.
Interviewer: To adapt…
Interviewee: For sure... so yes is it would be very welcome and would benefit greatly and I need a specific points specific tips…
Interviewer: what to do…
what to do… not just theory.
Interviewer: So…which are your expectations in relation to such future workshops? Possible, potential workshops?
Interviewee: I…I.... I would…
Interviewer: Which would your expectations be?
Interviewer: I would…expect to be educated on cultural matters…I would be expected to be educated maybe see some in-class modelling like somebody who is actually an expert on the field…to show how we can do practice…
Interviewer: in practice…
Interviewee: yeah…to demonstrate those strategies and for me to observe… maybe I could have… like… a person who is a teacher… a native speaker as well… so… maybe we can work together…
Interviewer: something like a shadow teacher… yes…
Interviewer: so as to be helped…
Interviewee: I guess there are many ideas
Hopefully these ideas will come to practice some time…
Interviewer: Hopefully! Okay… thank you very, very much for your cooperation.
Interviewer: You’ re welcome. Good luck!
Interviewer: Thank you

INTERVIEW 4

Interviewer: So, good evening!
Interviewee: ...Good evening!
Interviewer: Thank you for taking part in my study...It will provide valuable insight and help me analyze my topic in depth. So... over the next 15 minutes I will be asking you several open ended questions related to your experience strategies or practices... that you make use of when it comes to teaching English as a third language two students who may be ethnically, racially, linguistically and or culturally different from you and your mainstream pupils. Okay?
Interviewer: Okay, lovely...
Interviewer: Is that clear to you?
Interviewee: Yes, yes, yes it is.
Interviewer: okay, so all the information will remain strictly confidential so no worries about it…
Interviewee: oh, okay!
Interviewer: so shall we start?
Interviewee: yes of course
Interviewer: So first of all tell me a few things about the school and the area you are currently working in and those in the past.
Interviewee: I think... oops... oh sorry... yes? Okay?
Interviewee: Can you hear me?
Interviewer: Yes, yes, of course I can
Interviewee: All right...well the area I work in is... I’d rather say a mosaic...
Interviewee: Different cultures and social backgrounds as well as financial backgrounds
Interviewee: there are many students from foreign countries…. coming from foreign countries...We already have a ZEP class there... and…. we…. try to focus on...on adapting some methods making them equal to the rest of our students…
Interviewer: okay...
Interviewer: So you have experience working with such students
Interviewee: Yeah at least a short one but yes I do…. yeah
Interviewer: ...okay, so how do you perceive the notion of Intercultural education in Greece?
Interviewee: In general or in personal? In personal, it’s a different aspect
Interviewer: ...in general?
Interviewee: In general, I think Greece does not really interfere with issues of intercultural... with intercultural issues ...it actually comes as...incorporation, as an issue of incorporating all these students into the Greek context
Interviewee: Personally I think that there is a slight difference between incorporating all those students rather than enabling them to be part of their own culture, of their own point of view, of their own culture and through their own point of view... (pause)... through their own culture and their own lives as well...
Interviewer: ... So have you ever received any training in the field?
Interviewee: No, no, no...
Interviewer: No... no never?
Interviewer: No... just some concepts from the past...
Interviewer: .... As far as the teaching strategies are concerned, do you differentiate them when teaching English as a second language to mainstream students versus as a third one to diverse students?
Interviewee: I think that I try to... at least I try to.... especially when it comes to the third... to... to the part of those students that come from foreign countries...
Interviewee: ... I try to make them feel as if they are part of the team, talking about their own background, their own real life... Especially through projects I think...
Interviewee: ... Short projects within classroom... Well actually they behave in their own linguistic and in their own cultural background, I think...
Interviewee: according to that and not according to the needs of the book or that second language pupils... are really... have in class... At that time at least...
Interviewee: I think they they...they... they... feel free and they feel safe to interact and interpret...actually to interpret...large amount of pieces of knowledge...
Interviewee: ...yeah
Interviewee: of scraps of knowledge actually...
Interviewer: okay...
Interviewer: That's my point
Interviewer: that's your point...Create okay so you think that strategies have to be adapted at times?
Interviewee: Of course, of course of course they do have...they have to be adapted... at times especially when it comes to mixed ability classes... to that point...okay? To the point... to the extent where they are mingling...classes are mingling different cultural levels
Interviewer: yeah...
Interviewer: ... and different cultural points of view.
Interviewer: ...Okay okay... what about the children's existing-home languages? Do you make use of all of them in the classroom? while teaching?
Interviewer: well... I try to...in a circular way actually... they all participate to one point or another...always in a differentiating point... they all, they all know... There are some rules in the classroom we make from the very beginning...we all participate to the point they can...so they all know they can adapt the participation to the point they are able to... even from people with.... challenged ... knowledge or anything...after the point of the students where... which they are... really good students we assume them to be good students...
Interviewer: ...Good students okay so which are the main challenges when teaching a linguistically and culturally diverse classroom?

Interviewee: .... I think it’s sometimes it’s communication...

Interviewee: okay? Especially when language is not too… when they cannot communicate in their language, I think the problem is really hard...I am already running into one such incident....and hopefully technology helps me a lot... but then again it comes also to...the rest of the classroom where... some of the students from different... social backgrounds basically... find it hard to participate

Interviewer: to participate...

Interviewee: and then...that's when I must invent my own techniques because I can say that not all teachers follow the same techniques in classroom especially when It comes to language… I mean a Greek language teacher and a foreign language teacher

Interviewer: Yes, they are different, I agree...

Interviewee: yeah...

Interviewer: You mentioned the incident beforehand… Could you tell me what exactly do you... which strategies do you employ when it comes to such a situation?

Interviewee: yeah... It was a student from Iran... that student had difficulty in talking... in speaking Greek...

Interviewee: He knew nothing about our language he found himself as a visitor to our country, he lived here and he came to our class and he had to communicate in the foreign words, in words in English he could not understand because he was a fluent…. actually he was a fluent speaker…

Interviewee: nice…

Interviewee: but…. the level he came to was A2, so there was a foreign dictionary, a foreign vocabulary for him and he had to use a computer in order to communicate in the Persian language... I mean he translated words he could also express himself better when he wanted to express himself… to say something... he couldn’t through English...he always searched for...on the internet...

Interviewee: Yeah, but really helpful for him as well as for us… in the classroom...What was able...to… that made it clear that we could communicate one way or another...There was a way to communicate.

Interviewer: very important

Interviewer: yeah and the rest of the students understood that as well and they all embraced his effort to express himself either in Greek or in English through…

Interviewer: yeah mutual help and understanding…yeah...okay.

Interviewee: yeah, yeah...

Interviewer: okay...now...do you think that you could benefit from strategy development training?

Interviewer: of course!

Interviewer: for such students?

Interviewer: Of course, of course I do because as things show more and more refugees or more foreigners visit Greece either from Eastern or from Europe…

Interviewer: yes...

Interviewer: so I think yes... I would definitely benefit from that as long as I said before this under the prism of a common, a common target from school and from the Ministry of education, of course.

Interviewer: of education, yes...

Interviewee: yeah, yeah yeah…, IEP or all these factors…
Interviewer: yes, those who are responsible...So, which are your expectations in relation to potential, future workshops?

Interviewee: Of course I would be very positive about it because I think workshops is the only way to...to focus and actually work on the target issue, which is to follow, to communicate and help those students embrace what they are doing… in the classroom.

Interviewer: Would you like to be shown any strategies in practice or mostly in theory?

Interviewee: Of course! No, no, no not in theory not in theory!

Interviewer: not in theory

Interviewee: not in theory...I'm a viewer so I think practice things are much better...Because I also believe that every single teacher can use their own theory through practice...I mean we are able to do so… This is one of the skills… we ought to have as... teachers...

Interviewer: yes...

Interviewee: I think we can all produce the short theory after doing it...

Interviewer: ...I believe in doing things...

Interviewer: ...Doing things… yes...not just listening to them… Okay

Interviewer: Thank you very, very much for your cooperation it has been more than helpful

Interviewee: Oh you're welcome...Thank you thank you I thank you…

Interviewer: Thank you... bye…

Interviewer: Bye-bye!

INTERVIEW 5

Interviewer: Good morning!

Interviewee: Good morning, Evelyn!

Interviewer: Good morning, Evelyn! first of all, I want to thank you for taking part in my study in the survey… Your help is more than important to me...and thank you very, very, very much for accepting... So, over the next 15 minutes I will be asking some questions, some open-ended questions, related to your personal experiences on the strategies you make use of when teaching English as a third language...which means when teaching English to students who may be ethnically, racially, linguistically or culturally different from you and your mainstream pupils...So, we are talking about strategies and practices...Is that clear to you?

Interviewee: yeah, of course.

Interviewer: okay, so everything you're going to say, all the information you give me will remain strictly confidential and we only be used for the analysis of the study...So are there any questions before we start?

Interviewee: No, I'm okay... it's my pleasure to be involved to help you.

Interviewer: Thank you very much.

Interviewee: in your effort, yeah...

Interviewer: Thank you very much. So… let's start. So tell me about the school and the area you are currently working and those in the past, if you can recall anything.

Interviewee: Well… for the last 15 years I've been working as… in primary schools in Ilia and I've been working with lots of culturally and linguistically diverse students...Immigration is not a current phenomenon... we've been teaching students who come from other countries and have different backgrounds for about 30 years
now…. There is an intense situation for the last 3 years now, due to the influx of refugees

Interviewee: And this has caused a new reality in our school settings…and this has made us think of lots of innovation... innovative practices... and regard the way we teach English at schools...

Interviewer: So, you’ve got experience with working with students, right?

Interviewee: Yeah, yeah I do. I’ve been working with them for over 15 years, since my presence in Ilia is for about 15 years, but I have been having experience as an English language teacher for about 25 years

Interviewee: So I've worked in other prefectures as well.

Interviewer: yeah...

Interviewee: ... (long pause) As far as I remember, in all classrooms I have worked so far, there used to be students coming from different backgrounds.

Interviewer: …. okay, so how do you perceive the notion of Intercultural education in Greece? Generally speaking?

Interviewee: Oh, well...as regards the theoretical approach... to the concept… Intercultural education refers to... not only to ethnically diverse students... It… I think it is based on diversity... all students we have in the classroom... There is a misconception here because the majority of our colleagues here in primary schools believe that the focus is on what we call foreign students...

Interviewee: However, Intercultural education focuses on the unique identity of each student in the classroom and... values, namely respect or solidarity… and... things we are supposed to foster in the classroom...and become part of our school culture...are thought to be present in any utterance… in any way we behave...well being on the school grounds.

Interviewer: yeah...okay… have you ever received any training in the field? If yes, what, when and from whom?

Interviewer: Well, to be honest sometimes I used to feel sometimes quite insecure in the classrooms, so about six or seven years ago I decided to follow a master's degree course in a public university on intercultural education which was beneficial to me because it helps me realize...I really had to do well being in the classroom and it made me understand that some other things that I used to do were really intercultural...

Interviewee: Because you know the… the...use of the preposition ‘inter’ in the word really refers to the interaction and to a pure… to a genuine...relationship... that ought to develop while in the classroom...not strictly talking about the relationship between the teacher and the student.

Interviewee: talking about the interaction among students themselves...and this is the key point... it's not that...we as teachers are supposed to… to...cultivate …to make the environment appropriate for these kids…

Interviewer: for these kids...yes...

Interviewer: It’s the whole idea of… of…making a place for... them... to feel comfortable and secure...

Interviewee: in there...

Interviewer: As far as the teaching strategies are concerned... do you actually differentiate them when teaching English as a second language to your mainstream students versus as a third to diverse ones? And if yes how do you do that? can you give me an example?

Interviewee: Well, when teaching English as an L2

Interviewee: It's obvious that we are talking about two...only two... different...
Interviewer: languages...
Interviewee: cultures...and languages in the classroom...
Interviewee: ...talking about identities... I mean...cultures or one’s cultural background may be different in relation... in contrast to the others...
Interviewee: ...However...we are talking about...basic features...
Interviewee: If you know what I mean...
Interviewee: national identities...yeah...so, it is somehow easier to...
Interviewer: yes...
Interviewee: to...
Interviewer: instruct them...
Interviewee: to approach them...yeah... well, when teaching English as an L3...and here comes to mind my classroom... one of my classrooms now... where there are multicultural presences in there...then, things change... I mean... there is a tendency to use all the linguistic and semiotic repertoires...I mean that all the children present in the classroom contribute...
Interviewee: to the learning process...using whatever they can.so as to help them make meaning...
Interviewer: ...yes
Interviewer: it is recently that I discovered reading literature that... this is... an acceptable pedagogy...for the last twenty years called translinguaging ...
Interviewee: refers...which refers to... the equal use of all languages...in the classroom...
Interviewee: It’s an easy procedure ... what we...what I try to do...is offer the... all the kids visual stimuli all the time in the classroom... as well as audio resources...first of all to make them feel comfortable
Interviewer: yes...
Interviewee: to make them feel that...what we... what we value...is their linguistic and their cultural background...
Interviewer: cultural background...
Interviewee: it’s not...what we...what we... really want from them... is their inclusion in terms of equality...
Interviewer: yes...So, you think that the strategies have to be adapted... at times...
Interviewee: yeah...yeah...yeah... absolutely... I mean in the case they don't feel ...We know some things about them ...
Interviewer: They are not going to work on that... they are not going to participate...
Interviewee: Or be willing to collaborate...
Interviewer: yes...I understand... okay...now, what about the existing home languages in your classroom? Do you make use of them? all?
Interviewee: Yeah it's a hard job to do... I mean yeah... some... there are some words or starting at the beginning of the school year with learning...there is always a place in the classroom where everybody writes their names on the board in their home languages of course...There are always posters around showing us simple everyday words are written... I repeat them in the classroom...You know, they get great satisfaction when we... when we ask them all the time to tell us the words they use at home...
Interviewer: yes...
Interviewee: the equivalent... you know...word...
Interviewer: the equivalent word...
Interviewee: yeah… it’s a kind… that kind… it’s a kind of translating … however… this contributes to offering that at this stage they need…
Interviewee: in order to become part... of the… the… the … the whole idea...
Interviewer: the whole idea...
Interviewer: of learning… yeah...
Interviewee: so... though the priority of the instructor is to cultivate their social skills
Interviewee: and make them realize how... how they are supposed to... behave in schools...then we move forward and... we expect from them to... to...use things...
Interviewee: and if we… if we don’t… if we don’t focus on their home language and if we don’t take it for granted that...their home language is there...in order to try to… in order to scaffold...
Interviewee: then...you know… again we are gonna lose...
Interviewee: it’s a matter of confidence... Yeah… yeah
Interviewer: and trust yes, I agree with you...
Interviewee: yeah… yeah
Interviewer: okay so, which are the main challenges when teaching in such a classroom? Consisting of culturally and linguistically diverse students? Not a mainstream one. Which are the main challenges for you?
Interviewer: Well... (pause) I do set goals… but the very, very first thing… I am trying to succeed in when working with such kids is to build confidence and make them feel at home...
Interviewer: at home...
Interviewee: I mean that...even when I... even when...a song in their language...related to their culture...you know… a kind of folk or traditional...whatever...is heard at the background when they come into the classroom
Interviewer: yes… you build their confidence...yes...
Interviewee: yeah...or if and you can see it… it’s a kind of… the sparkling in their eyes and the way they smile at you… it is... yeah...we are here...we are with you...all the time
Interviewer: yes...
Interviewee: ... and then you can see that when you ask them to tell you a few things about the way they feel great...you know...an occasion in their country or even when they are talking because they do feel the need...especially refugees...to talk about their countries...
Interviewer: their countries...
Interviewee: the way they... as far as they can remember...okay?
Interviewer: ...
Interviewee: and sometimes they… they are describing some very uncomfortable, sad incidents... however, you have to... you have to show them that you are there for them...they can share their experiences
Interviewer: yes...
Interviewee: And... and it's great for the other kids as well ...because...
Interviewer: They learn...yes to embrace diversity all of them...yes...
Interviewee: the way each of the kids were brought up… the difference...
Interviewer: yeah...
Interviewee: different from the ones we are experiencing here...
Interviewer: other aspects… yes... you are right! Okay, now...regarding strategy development training in the future… do you think that you could benefit from
potential, for example, workshops in the future? regarding the strategy development training?

Interviewee: yeah...

Interviewer: for teachers...

Interviewer: You know the truth is that... all teachers in public schools, not only English language teachers...are asked to work with culturally and linguistically diverse kids...Without having prior education

Interviewer: yes, that’s true...

Interviewee: I mean that a kind of… a theoretical approach of whatever....is okay with us... but what we really need is practical instructions and information regarding this new situation...

Interviewee: Of course...what hasn’t been done... Is that we have not given a hint of their culturally accepted forms...I mean that people who come from the Middle East for example...don’t...are not used to shaking hands when meeting somebody...

Interviewer: yes...simple gestures...

Interviewee: or...looking straight in the eyes...yeah...it may... it may seem trivial but it's not trivial… It's everyday reality...these are things that ought to have been taught...

Interviewer: yeah...

Interviewee: we should have been informed ....

Interviewer: informed first... yeah... first and foremost...

Interviewer: right...

Interviewee: yeah...because it has to with social and personal everyday contact...

Interviewer: yes...

Interviewee: as regards the workshops... and the teaching strategies or practices yeah...I would really be interested in participating in workshops on condition that...the what be done... very...very specific things that I would be advised to do in the classroom...

Interviewer: yes...

Interviewee: You know there are some practices that are called by formal or non-formal institutions to participate and the only thing that is done is to being bombarded with theoretical approaches...

Interviewer: yes...

Interviewee: And things that we ourselves could as well read at home. It is not this that matters!

Interviewer: so what would you like to be offered with...be provided with...? what are your main expectations practically speaking?

Interviewee: Practically speaking I would... I would like to be at… to…work collaboratively...

Interviewer: Which means that…?

Interviewee: I mean that I would like to...participate in a week or a month course...

Interviewee: in which… group work...would feel enhanced and I ...I... would be asked to work with other colleagues...

Interviewee: you know it’s very important...

Interviewee: Greek teachers you mean... or teachers of all...

Interviewer: No...

Interviewee: Greek teachers...no? All of them?

Interviewee: No... I mean...well… due to the fact that we teach L3…

Interviewee: it’s different from teaching L2...

Interviewer: yes...
Interviewee: and ... the whole concept... and the idea...and... the way we proceed some things in the classroom... is totally different...

Interviewer: different yes...

Interviewee: different from teaching Greek as a formal...as a state language...

Interviewee: And there is... unfortunately there is a discrepancy here... I mean though everybody should be aware of the identity...of each student...some of us don't really care... I mean... We think... English language teachers think to be more sensitive towards the issue of inclusion

Interviewee: inclusion yeah... of trying to make these kids feel that this group belongs to them... we are trying to offer them this sense of belonging...

Interviewer: yes... I agree with you...

Interviewee: I don’t really...I don’t think that... it is a hundred per cent related to the fact that English is spoken by them...

Interviewer: most of them don’t...yeah...

Interviewee: most of them don’t, yeah... especially now...

Interviewer: or their level is low...yes....

Interviewee: yeah... it has to do with... teachers’ effort...

Interviewer: yes...yes...yes... personal efforts...

Interviewee: so...so... to answer your question...I mean...practical advice I mean to be the... I mean to be instructed all the time by a specialist because a specialist is supposed to do those things...

Interviewer: you mean having an expert for example...a dual language teacher in your classroom? Or not?

Interviewee: It could be...it could be...yeah! yeah! I cannot reject the idea of being aided by a person who’s an expert... because ... when you know a person...were...were there, then it would be beneficial for me as well... if this were to happen there are too many classrooms...then, okay I could participate in a course

Interviewer: yes

Interviewee: but I... I ... practical help...a person to tell me when I have a group of five students in my classroom, speaking three different languages what am I supposed to do with them?

Interviewer: yes, yes...

Interviewee: what kind of multilingual texts I am supposed to give them...

Interviewer: yes...

Interviewee: all of that material is a great practice...a great method...to promote things...

But there are things that we don’t really know...on working...

Interviewer: yes...

Interviewer: so...if they want us to succeed in what we are doing...someone has to help us...understand us

Interviewer: yes... as a starting point...yeah yeah...I agree with you...

Interviewee: yeah...

Interviewer: very nice...okay...thank you very very much for your cooperation. It has been more than enlightening for me and helpful. So thank you very much

Interviewee: It was my pleasure...

Interviewer: Thank you...let’s all hope for the best... Thank you very much

Interviewer: Me too…

Interviewer: Bye bye!...

Interviewer: Bye...
INTERVIEW 6

Interviewer: Good morning
Interviewee: Good morning
Interviewer: First of all, I want to thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for the study. Thank you very much.
Interviewee: No problem, you’re welcome
Interviewer: Ok, so over the next 10-15 minutes I will be asking you several open-ended questions related to your experiences on the strategies or the practices you make use of, when it comes to teaching English as a third language to students who may be ethnically, racially, linguistically and/or culturally different from you and your mainstream pupils. Alright? Is that clear to you?
Interviewee: Ok, yeah
Interviewer: Ok so I want to tell you that all the information you provide me with will remain strictly confidential but the recording will be transcribed. okay?
Interviewee: okay
Interviewer: So the first question, let’s start with the first question. Tell me a few things about the school and the area you are currently working in and those in the past
Interviewee: Okay for the past 5 years…about 5 years… I have been working in an elementary school in Patra in an area all my schools were in areas where…. kind of… you know… my students have a social and economic background which is quite low, I would say. Areas that are quite disadvantaged.
Interviewer: Yeah
Interviewee: So, as you can understand the majority, especially In the school I have been working in for the past 3 years, the majority of my students are ethnically diverse and they are also they come from families with disadvantaged background
Interviewer: So you have got experience working with such students
Interviewee: Yes
Interviewer: Yes, even now
Interviewee: Yeah
Interviewer: Ok so how do you perceive the notion of intercultural education in Greece?
Interviewee: Okay theoretically first of all Intercultural education is supposed to be as we all know the effort to assimilate and include all children from all kinds of backgrounds, cultural or ethnic, or linguistic backgrounds, the effort to assimilate all these students in a school which will offer all of them equal opportunities to education and to eventually not only to education but also to social inclusion. I think however that taking into consideration the theoretical framework this is not always very successful, this process of assimilation that we’re talking about and inclusion. It’s not always very successful within the framework of the Greek educational system… there are several problems. Would you like me to talk about the problems now?
Interviewer: Yes, of course tell me
Interviewee: There are several problems…One of the main issues that I have pinpointed in the school that I have been working for the past five years is that there is not enough information let’s say, there is not much information for the teachers first of all… this is one of the main problems… and secondly, there is also a problem concerning the lack of the infrastructure and the lack of multimedia or access
to...access of course for the children mainly... access to the technological equipment
that is necessary in order to apply Innovative strategies concerning their
assimilation and inclusion

Interviewer: okay.... Have you ever received any training in the field? If yes, what,
when and from whom?

Interviewee: okay official training to be honest, no ...I mean I have some training in
my years as a student but the situation was very different because it was like 20
years ago, so as you can understand the situation is very different currently. I think
the training that I have assumed is not proficient of course...I don't believe I have
been trained proficiently especially concerning Intercultural education...The only
training that I have is through a program an Erasmus project that we have been
running this year in our school. Last October we went with some colleagues of mine
to Sweden where we attended an Erasmus workshop, a seminar...and it was...I
mean the main concept we explored in this seminar was what we are talking
about...you know...assimilation and inclusion of different groups of students

Interviewer: okay very nice...now let's move on to the strategies...the teaching
strategies, okay?
do you differentiate them when teaching English as a second language to
mainstream pupils versus as a third one to diverse pupils? If yes, how? can you
give me an example?

Interviewee: Okay, I am trying to apply this differentiated teaching method but it's
not always very easy practically... okay... I do... it’s not always easy to succeed... I
sometimes make groups... I organize them in different groups Of course I try
to...you know... put in charge of every group a person who is one student who is you
know...

Interviewer: Better?

Interviewee: Yeah who is better than the rest of them let’s say...the marks are much
better...anyway...the groups don’t always work in all classes to be honest... in some
classes they work very, very successfully, they function very successfully.... In
some other classes not so much. So basically it is teamwork as the main method I
use in differentiated learning... of course each team has some different tasks and I
try to...you know...I find tasks according to the level most of the students have...

Interviewer: So you adjust the difficulty of the task
Interviewee: yeah yeah...And the other thing that I do of course is that when we
follow strictly... we never follow strictly the organization of the course book you
know...but when we follow the... the assignments and the projects suggested by the
course book I always try to adjust them because the level of difficulty is sometimes
very hard for the students and I tried to make a lot of adjustments concerning the
level of the difficulty of material in the course book

Interviewer: So you think that strategies have to be adapted? Or not concerning
these students?

Interviewee: Definitely… definitely they have to be adapted yes...I totally agree
with that

Interviewer: Very nice now what about the children’s in your classroom? Do you
personally make use of all of them? do you try at least?

Interviewee: You mean the home languages of the children?

Interviewer: yeah...yeah

Interviewee: the native languages of the children...

Interviewer: yes...yes...the first, the native one…
Interviewee: Okay... Last year and this year I had in my class in one of my classes one student... two students... actually... One last year and one this year who spoke only Albanian. Their parents came from Albania very recently the children went to the Albanian school for many years and they came to Greece to... without prior knowledge of the Greek language... In the beginning it was very very difficult for them to fit in the class with the rest of the students and of course to attend... you know... the class normally and I had no choice but to focus on their native language of the child... of course I don’t speak Albanian but because we had other students of Albanian origin I always told the child of question to sit next to a classmate who is from Albanian origin and who could understand and speak a little bit of Albanian so that he could... you know... he could mediate...

Interviewer: Yes, of course

Interviewee: I mean it was the only choice I had because in the beginning the two students we are talking about... they couldn’t speak... they could barely understand Greek but they could not speak

Interviewer: So, I necessarily had to do that. Also, their English... Because of course in the Albanian school they also had a class of English... Their English was not in the same level as my students... It was a very different level but they could... you know sometimes because we couldn’t communicate in Greek obviously in order for me to give instructions on how to do exercises for example I think that you know... using basic English was another choice that I had...

Interviewee: The third language was a kind of facilitator in this sense I mean

Interviewer: Very nice okay now... Apart from the challenges you mentioned in the very beginning, are there any challenges in teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students? to you?

Interviewee: Yeah there are definitely a lot of challenges... another group of students we have in our schools is the Roma students... We have a substantial number of Roma students in our school. So, I mentioned it because it’s a special cultural group that has specific habits, they have specific routines and they are not easily assimilated... usually okay?

Interviewer: Yes, they don't obey norms... usually... most of the times...

Interviewee: Most of the times... Yeah... there are exceptions of course... yes but as you said they are not easily assimilated... So, one of the main challenges I think that most teachers face in the schools where there are specific cultural groups such as Roma, that the children and their parents mostly are not very open to accepting new suggestions concerning life in school generally... not only concerning learning and teaching methodology

Interviewer: Yes

Interviewer: Concerning accepting some norms in the life of school... some regulations let’s say that exist in the school life every day... so you know it’s very... sometimes. it’s very difficult to make these children understand that there is a special way of doing things...

Interviewer: that they don’t follow at home for example and that at school they have to follow these instructions and these guidelines and these rules in order for all kids to be... how can I say...? To be... to be on good terms with them...

Interviewer: yeah on good terms with each other... Do you find that this disobedience is applied to other parents as well? For example, Albanian parents?

Interviewee: Mmmm... I think that not necessarily... concerning other... I mean parents of other cultural and national origin? I think it has to do mostly with how much time they spent in Greece... If they spent a lot of time in Greece, I think that
they are much more open to accepting things on the teacher...because if they very recently moved to Greece, then it is no very difficult for them and we can understand why...it’s easily understandable...

Interviewer: yes, but you still think that cooperation is necessary...
Interviewee: yeah...Absolutely... absolutely yeah...

Interviewer: Ok… now concerning strategy development training do you think that you could benefit from something like that? Personally? Training concerning strategy development?  
Interviewee: Oh yeah...Definitely... Although I think that training concerning strategy development is absolutely necessary and I would appreciate some opportunities for training...for example from ... the... how can I say that in English to be honest…? I can't find the word...

Interviewer: What are your expectations in possible workshops?  
Interviewee: ...anyway yes… I would like yes… I would appreciate more workshops organized by people who are in charge...You know...a more specific workshop...Not just only theory because the theoretical background is easy to find even online I think...

Interviewer: yes
Interviewee: You' re welcome  
Interviewer: it has been more than helpful...Thank you thank you very much
Interviewee: You' re welcome
Interviewer: Bye!

INTERVIEW 7

Interviewer: Good evening  
Interviewee: Good evening

Interviewer: First of all, I would like to thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for the study.

Interviewee: You’ re welcome

Interviewer: Thank you very much... Ok, so over the next 10 -15 minutes I will be asking you several open-ended questions related to your experiences on the strategies or the practices you make use of, in a classroom, in a mixed classroom when teaching English as a third language to students who may be ethnically, racially, linguistically or culturally different from you and your mainstream pupils. Ok?

Interviewee: Okay I would be very glad to contribute to your research

Interviewer: Thank you very much. So, I want to tell you that all the information you provide me with will remain strictly confidential but the recording has to be transcribed. Is that okay with you?

Interviewee: Ok, yes, it’s okay

Interviewer: So, shall we start?

Interviewee: yes
Interviewer: Yes, ok...so I want you to tell me a few things about the school and the area you are currently working in and those in the past… I mean do you have any experience working with culturally and linguistically diverse students?

Interviewee: Yes, I've been a substitute teacher for the last 10 years… I have worked in central areas around the Peloponnese. For the last three years I have been working in the western Achaea, So, this year I'm working in three schools. My students are immigrants...ok some of them are immigrants, so they are from Albania, Romania, Bulgaria and this year I am working with a Chinese student as well which is quite new for me to have a Chinese student and I think that the most impressive thing is that nowadays in some classes the immigrants are usually half percent of the children...of the total in the class…

Interviewer: okay

Interviewee: which is quite impressive for me...

Interviewer: yes! It is! Okay so how do you perceive the notion of Intercultural education in Greece? What is it to you?

Interviewee: okay what is Intercultural education...hmm...I think it is when you try to...to integrate students from other countries in the Greek context... in the Greek classroom ...For example to teach him the classroom rules or some things about Greek culture...I mean...It’s how you apply some methods in the classroom in order to integrate the immigrant… to make him feel at ease probably

Interviewer: yes, okay very nice

Interviewee: I think that I mentioned one dimension...probably...

Interviewer: Okay one dimension of it

Interviewee: I am not sure...yeah...

Interviewer: So what...sorry...yes...What’s your training in the field? have you ever received any training?

Interviewee: Any training...

Interviewer: in the field...

Interviewee: To be honest...no, no, no... I haven’t...no... I haven’t

Interviewer: okay now as far as teaching strategies are concerned the ones you use in the classroom...okay? Do you differentiate them when teaching English to Greek students who have English as a second language versus as a third language to diverse ones? To immigrants second generation immigrants whatever... do you differentiate the strategies?

Interviewee: To tell you the truth no… but what I try to do in class is to ….to get the information from their background first of all...and then I try to be supportive and to be close to them and explain… explain… I mean in simpler words...

Interviewer: yes

Interviewee: or for example this year I have been teaching a Chinese student...I’ve told you before who doesn’t speak Greek at all… what I am trying to do is use body language...in order to communicate with him...this can be the only way...

Interviewer: yes

Interviewee: of course his peers are also very helpful...they use sign language as well and I saw that this is something that works with him so I use the same...

Interviewer: Very nice...so do you think that strategies have to be adapted? or not when it comes to such students?

Interviewee: yes

Interviewee: yes, they should be adapted because they have to be treated differently but the question is how we can adapt...How we can adjust the methods to a different student from a different cultural background...So that is the main question...
Interviewer: Okay, so...When it comes to children's existing home languages, their native languages...do you use them in the classroom?
Interviewee: I don’t...I don’t use them because it depends probably more on research from my part but from my experience, most immigrants, most children from other countries are very willing to tell me for example how we say some words in their mother tongue...this is something that I really encourage in the classroom...I want them to tell me how to...
Interviewer: yeah, so you respect their culture and their language...both
Interviewee: yes, I am very encouraging in this part and I also encourage them to tell me their experiences and how they tell something when they go on holidays to their motherland, how they spend their time and I’m very interested in listening and... because I want all the others, all their peers to become acquainted to a different person, to listen to something different, something out of their own context
Interviewer: yes, that’s very interesting
Interviewee: yes...I think that we call probably cultural...how we educate our students culturally
Interviewer: culturally...yes from a cultural perspective...Okay What are the main challenges in teaching and culturally and linguistically diverse classroom? To you?
Interviewee: the challenges...yeah...I think the main challenge is to know if the methods that I am trying to use...If they are going to have a result... for the...for the immigrants...I think this is my main concern if...if I do something right... if I help them...Because we don't have any official guidance or some guidelines that we should use and ...something to depend on or base our teaching...So, it depends on the teachers’ willingness to work with the immigrants even if they don’t have something official...something applicable probably...something that we are sure that it works with them...this is the challenge...this is the difficult part...
Interviewer: yes...yes...you’re right...ok, so do you think we could benefit from strategy development training for such students?
Interviewee: Yes, it could be helpful of course!
Interviewer: What are your expectations in relation to possible workshops in the future?
Interviewee: What I would really like is to get some -apart from theoretical training- I would like to see how this works in real life... in real-time classrooms… For example, how do we teach...for example a Chinese immigrant who doesn’t speak Greek, but Chinese or English, so… how can we teach and come to a closer relationship with a student like that?
Interviewer: Yes, yes
Interviewee: This is something that I would like to see...how it can be like in reality
Interviewer: In reality...
Interviewee: In reality...in a real life classroom....in a real time classroom
Interviewer: Any other aspirations that you might have any other ideas that you would like to see in practice?
Interviewee: Any other ideas? Ok... I would like to see what kind of material we can use and if we should differentiate our approaches...our teaching approaches... If we should be... if we should use...if it is necessary to use something different with these children or if we should use the same methods as with the rest of the class…
Interviewer: the rest of the class
Interviewee: is it good to differentiate with these students or not? should we do that or not?
Interviewer: very nice, okay...let’s hope for the best! Thank you very much for your cooperation
Interviewee: You’re welcome, you’re welcome
Interviewer: It has been more than helpful, thank you
Interviewee: Thank you very much, thank you

INTERVIEW 8

Interviewer: Okay, so… good evening
Interviewee: Good evening
Interviewer: Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for the study. Thank you very much
Interviewee: Thank you, too
Interviewer: So over the next 15 minutes, 10m to 15 minutes I will be asking you some questions related to your experiences on the strategies you make use of when you teach English as a third language to students who may be ethnically, racially, linguistically or culturally different from you and your mainstream students. Ok?
Interviewee: Okay
Interviewer: So, all the information you provide me with will remain strictly confidential but it will only be used for the transcription of the data. Alright? Is that okay with you?
Interviewee: Ok, I can agree, okay
Interviewer: So, shall we start?
Interviewee: of course
Interviewer: ok...so tell me a few things about the school and the area you are currently working in and those in the past.
Interviewee: Well, I’m working in a school in the centre of Patras. It’s considered to be a small student...a small school in comparison with the other schools of the area...It contains many students from other countries and many Roma students but...the majority is Greek of course
Interviewee: So you have experience working with culturally and linguistically diverse students?
Interviewee: Yes, I do
Interviewer: So, how do you perceive the notion of Intercultural education? What is Intercultural education to you in Greece?
Interviewee: well, it means trying to help both Greek and students from other countries learn not to do the same things, but try to...make them...give them the basic lines of the daily subjects...and give them as many...as much information as possible on specific grammar topics and vocabulary units.
Interviewer: okay...so have you received any training in the field?
Interviewee: No, I have not received any training...just when I attended University we had a lesson concerning intercultural educational methods
Interviewer: Okay now let’s move on to the teaching strategies, okay?
Interviewee: okay
Interviewer: do you differentiate them when teaching English as a second language to Greek students versus as a third one to diverse students?
Interviewee: Well, it is different as far as I am concerned… Greek students have a different approach when they are learning...when they're trying to learn a foreign language especially English...It's easy for them to explain whatever you wish because their native language so they can easily understand what you're trying to
explain when… when English is difficult for them while foreign students find them a bit more difficult, especially when they do not understand Greek at all. What I mean is that in my school there were... there are two students this year who have come from Iran and they do not speak Greek at all.

Interviewer: wow
Interviewee: So it's really difficult for them... it's really difficult for me at first to explain them what I want to explain the rest of the class and they cannot easily understand everything, everything which is included in every lesson
Interviewer: so what do you do? can you give me an example?
Interviewee: I am trying to explain them in English as much as I can because they don't speak… neither Greek nor English perfectly so there is a basic gap.... And when this does not have success -which is common- I am trying to give them examples using the internet whenever I have access it is not always simple or I’m trying to explain something using images on the board, body language and the book as far as possible to make them understand what I mean
Interviewer: Yes… ok … now...so you think that strategies have to be differentiated...
Interviewee: Yes, they have to be differentiated because they have a different approach foreign students have a different approach...
Interviewer: So what about the of the students... the existing home languages… Do you make use of them in the classroom?
Interviewee: The students’ foreign languages? The students’ native languages?
Interviewer: Not always well no, no I do not because I do not speak their native language ...Some students who come for example from Albania are able to understand Greek, so it's easy for us to communicate...but other students who come from China or Iran speak a language that I'm not familiar with their specific native language, so I cannot use it. Just in English or in Greek, nothing else
Interviewer: Yes… yes okay… so do you think you could personally benefit from strategy development training for such students?
Interviewee: If I would like to be trained? yes of course I would like to be trained Because I think that this would offer me not only knowledge but also new innovative ideas concerning the way I can deal with those students…. I don't have the same expectations from those students unfortunately I do not have the same expectations… it’s quite difficult for them to face...to deal with the new knowledge every time...I’m trying to give them differentiated exercises in order for them to participate in the lesson as well...and when it comes to vocabulary, while the Greek students are able to write English words and translate them in Greek, those students are required to write the English word like the way they listen to it.
Interviewer: Yeah yeah...okay so what would you like to see in a workshop? What would benefit you mostly as a teacher?
Interviewee: What would benefit me as a teacher... If I... if I attended a workshop you mean?
Interviewer: In a future workshop...
Interviewee: I seem that I would like to attend the workshop having to do with practical issues, not theoretical...For example, I would be able to attend a workshop when... where students attend as well
Interviewer: yes
Interviewee: So that another colleague of mine would be able to... who knows better would be able to show me how to deal with them in practice...
Interviewer: or an expert possibly...
Interviewee: yes, an expert and teach me how to do that in a better way because of course I cannot deal with that perfectly since I’m not familiar with that...
Interviewer: yes, yes of course...ok...so very nice. Let’s hope for the best. Thank you very, very much for your cooperation.
Interviewee: Thank you very, very much... It was really nice working with you...
Interviewer: Thank you very much, goodbye
Interviewee: Goodbye

INTERVIEW 9

Interviewer: Okay, so... good morning
Interviewee: Good morning
Interviewer: First of all, I want to thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for the study.
So over the next fifteen minutes, 10m to 15 minutes I will be asking you questions related to your experiences on the strategies you make use of when teaching English as a third language...mainly to students who are ethnically, racially, linguistically or culturally different from you and your mainstream pupils. Ok?
Interviewer: All the information you provide me with will remain strictly confidential and will only be used for the analysis of the study. So, only the recording will be transcribed... Alright? Is it ok with you?
Interviewee: okay...yes, okay...
Interviewer: Tell me a few things about the school and the area that you're currently working in and those in the past... I mean have you had experience working with culturally and linguistically students so far? And if yes, just tell me your experiences on that.
Interviewee: I have been working for about 15 years and I'm currently working in two schools... Greek State primary schools in the city centre, but I worked in primary schools in the area in the past...
Interviewer: What about the student population? yes...
Interviewee: The students are native Greek speakers but few of them are descendants of economic immigrants coming from countries of Europe such as Albania Romania Bulgaria and are bilingual...
Interviewer: so you have experience working with them... you do have...
Interviewee: What did you say?
Interviewer: You do have experience working with such students...
Interviewee: Yes...yes...
Interviewer: Yes, okay so how do you receive the notion of Intercultural education in Greece? What is Intercultural education to you?
Interviewee: I think the intercultural education means to promote the students’ ability to understand and interact with students that have different cultural experiences...

Interviewee: Have you ever received any training in the field? in the field of intercultural education in particular?

Interviewer: no, no, no, no

Interviewer: As far as the teaching strategies are concerned in your classroom do you differentiate them when teaching English to these students versus your Greek natives? Or not?

Interviewee: I try to differentiate my strategies because the course book is inappropriate so I have to adapt or skip activities or sometimes I have to produce some similar material

Interviewer: ok, can you give me an example of how you adapt our strategies? What do you usually do to help them?

Interviewee: As I told you I try to produce some similar material so that easier and more difficult activities are included in the process...

Interviewer: So you make activities easier for them...

Interviewee: yes...So as to satisfy their needs… I try to include games and role playing or whole class discussion projects that involve peer interaction and promote socialization and self-expression so that students communicate and realize similarities and differences ...and...

Interviewer: this is what works in your classroom

Interviewee: yes...

Interviewer: yes...okay...regarding the children’s existing home languages… do you make use of them? I’m talking about the native languages of the students

Interviewee: No, no... I don’t...

Interviewer: You have never tried to do something related to their languages to include them in your classroom...never?

Interviewer: never...

Interviewer: Never... okay so regarding the challenges now in teaching in a culturally and linguistically diverse classroom...Which are the main challenges to you?

Interviewee: The books are inappropriate to fulfill the learners’ needs… There is not much time to teach my material… Sometimes I observe negative behavior...

Interviewer: On the part of these students...

Interviewee: of these students...

Interviewer: but why? What do you mean when saying something like that? Negative behavior towards you or towards the lesson?

Interviewee: Towards the lesson I’m afraid because they are not motivated… I try to motivate them with the strategies and the activities I use but...

Interviewer: there is no interest on their part...

Interviewee: No, there is no interest...

Interviewer: yes, yes, yes… I can understand that okay...What other challenges are there?

Interviewee: And there is no cooperation in the school by parents

Interviewer: Yes, would you like to cooperate more with their parents?

Interviewee: Yes, I would like that but...

Interviewer: But there is no chance...

Interviewee: And I am not sure to what extent I am prepared to meet the requirements in this teaching situation as I have not received any formal training
**Interviewer:** training… okay… okay now… now that you mentioned training… do you think that you could benefit from potential strategy development training in the future for such students?

**Interviewee:** yes… the teachers should be trained as the challenges in the classroom… as there are many challenges in the classroom and...

**Interviewer:** especially for us who are EFL teachers… not their mainstream teachers I mean… yes, I agree with you… so, what are your expectations in relation to possible future workshops? What would you like to see in the workshops?

**Interviewee:** I think the workshops should be carefully designed and the theory should be implemented in practice in order to see whether and to what extent it is effective or not...

**Interviewer:** yes…

**Interviewer:** So you are in favor of actual practice to see how things work in such classrooms in mixed classrooms...

**Interviewee:** yes, because until now the implementation is mainly based on my personal will and my self-education and this is an obstacle that hinders this process...

**Interviewer:** yes, you are right and I agree with you… there is much need for that… Okay thank you very very much for your cooperation… it has been more than helpful to me… and let’s hope for the best… okay? Thank you very much

**Interviewee:** Thank you very much. Goodbye...

**INTERVIEW 10**

**Interviewer:** Okay… good morning

**Interviewee:** Good morning, hello...

**Interviewer:** First of all, thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for the study.

**Interviewee:** Okay… my pleasure to help...

**Interviewer:** So over the next 10 minutes I will be asking you some questions related to your experiences on the strategies you make use of when it comes to teaching English as a third language to students who may be ethnically, racially, linguistically or culturally different from you and your mainstream students… Alright?

**Interviewee:** okay...

**Interviewer:** All the information you provide me with will remain strictly confidential but the recording will be transcribed… Do you have any problem with that?

**Interviewee:** no, not at all...

**Interviewer:** okay… not at all… so, let’s start… Can you tell me a few things about the school and the area you’re currently working in and those in the past?

**Interviewee:** okay… I have been working as an ESL teacher for the last 12 years I went all over Greece, but over the last five years I have worked in the prefecture of Achaea, mostly in Patras. I am working in a Primary, a state Primary school, in the suburb... in the suburb of Patras

**Interviewer:** So have you got experience with working with such students now and then?

**Interviewee:** I have mostly students of Albanian origin who were born in Greece though, so they are second generation immigrants. Most of them use Albanian at home and some of them are fluent speakers… it can be considered that Albanian is their L1.
Interviewer: Okay… So how do you perceive the notion of Intercultural education in Greece? What is Intercultural education to you?

Interviewee: Okay, intercultural… teaching children coming from different cultures, having… speaking foreign languages, from different racial, cultural and linguistic backgrounds in our era… it’s a common trend nowadays...

Interviewer: Have you received any training in the field?

Interviewee: No, unfortunately not but I would like to receive some training on that… it sounds very interesting and useful of course nowadays.

Interviewer: Now, as far as teaching strategies are concerned do you differentiate them when teaching English as a second language to mainstream students versus as a third one to diverse students? If yes how, can you give me an example?

Interviewee: Okay, I suppose I try to differentiate them and integrate them into the mainstream classroom by writing them some differentiated material, assigning these students in groups with students I know they will help them, that they will be supportive towards them, teaching vocabulary probably with the use of picture dictionaries… also encouraging them… affective strategies… to talk about their cultures… to open up… to show with the rest of the classroom linguistic elements… how we can say good morning in their own language… to integrate them… to assimilate them better in the classroom context...

Interviewer: and what about their home languages? The existing home languages? Do you use them?

Interviewee: In the same, in the previously defined delineated context I try to make them feel welcome and use their own expressions, different proverbs, greetings and in this way they open up as much as they can, they feel integrated. Yes, I’m trying to use as much -as far as I can of course- some of their linguistic elements in the everyday classroom routine

Interviewer: Okay now which are the main challenges in teaching in a mixed classroom?

Interviewee: Undoubtedly there is a number of challenges. First of all, there is no differentiated material… we have no such material, so we have to become designers… of such material... But we haven't got any training in that field...In addition, I believe that children can be very harsh so there is a lot of prejudice in the Greek context, so we have to protect children coming from various racial and cultural backgrounds... differentiated… we have to protect them so as to avoid conflicts in the classroom… being bullied for example… There is a number of challenges… what else? Let me think…cause there is no efficient training… we need to get on training in that field to be more adequate...

Interviewer: So you think that you could benefit from strategy development training for such students?

Interviewee: Of course...of course...By all means...But I don't believe we can on our own without such strategies… We need some guidance on that... from coordinators… from the Ministry...coordinated action...

Interviewer: yes, so which are your expectations in relation to possible future workshops? which are your main expectations?

Interviewee: My main expectations… okay… I would like to receive formal training on designing such material differentiated material. Moreover, I would like to...watch some classes… to go to some of them... actual classes, classrooms with teachers providing such differentiated training, get inspired, get some ideas

Interviewer: actual practice...
Interviewee: yes, actual practice… not just theoretical information... We can read them after all... we need some actual practice and guidance...

Interviewer: Alright...okay… let’s hope for the best, then...thank you very, very much for your cooperation…

Interviewee: Thank you… Really interesting research!

Interviewer: Thank you very much, goodbye

Interviewee: Thank you… bye

INTERVIEW 11

Interviewer: Okay… good morning

Interviewee: Good morning

Interviewer: First of all, I want to thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for the study.

Interviewee: yeah…

Interviewer: Okay, so over the next 10 minutes I will be asking you several open-ended questions related to your experiences on the strategies you make use of when it comes to teaching English as a third language, as a third language to students who are ethnically, racially, linguistically or culturally different from you and your mainstream students… Okay?

Interviewee: okay...

Interviewer: So, all the information you provide me with will remain strictly confidential and will only be used for the analysis of the study. However, the recording will be transcribed… Is that ok with you?

Interviewee: yeah, of course....

Interviewer: so, let’s start...Tell me a few things about the school and the area you're currently working in and those in the past

Interviewee: okay… So I am currently working in two primary schools, they are located in the prefecture of Iliia and more specifically they are located in two villages called Panopoulos and Simopoulos. In the past I worked in primary schools in Patras, all over Patras and Aigio. Okay, so this is my experience

Interviewer: So have you got any experience with working with diverse students?

Interviewee: Well, in the school I am currently working the majority of students are Greek but we’ve got minority Albanian students… of Albanian origin but in the past I worked in a school near Patras which had classes with Indian students...I have also worked with students of Albanian origin

Interviewer: Wow very nice…interesting… So how do you perceive the notion of Intercultural education in Greece?

Interviewee: Okay, well… Intercultural education is something a bit difficult to define in my opinion… If I had to give a definition, maybe I think it has to do with understanding different cultures and different people and maybe the teaching methods promote this diversity, this cultural diversity, so that’s what I think...

Interviewer: Have you received any training in the field?

Interviewee: Yes, actually I have recently completed a course, an online course in the University of the Aegean that’s called Intercultural Education

Interviewer: Oh...nice! So, you are familiar with the topic

Interviewee: Yeah...yeah, yeah, yeah...I’ve just completed it...yes

Interviewer: Very nice...congratulations…. Now, as far as the teaching strategies are concerned, the teaching strategies that you use… do you differentiate them
when teaching English as a second language to mainstream pupils versus as a third one to diverse students? If yes how, can you give me an example?

**Interviewee**: an example… oh...okay... it goes without saying that there is a level of differentiation when teaching English as an L3. I think that the thing I strive to do is learn about the cultural environment, the cultural background of the students, maybe I assign different kinds of homework, maybe I try to…you know...be more illustrative when I explain something... On balance, that kind… I think I become more illustrative, I become more explanatory...I try...okay the cultural background to the theme that I’m teaching…these are the things that I do... 

**Interviewer**: okay… and what about the existing home languages in your classroom? Do you use them?

**Interviewee**: No, of course I don’t… you know... make extensive use of children’s languages, home languages, because I don’t have the background. Sometimes, I may try...you know… to associate the meaning of some words in their mother tongue, Albanian, but I do not make use of all of them because I don’t have time… I wish I had more time when teaching...

**Interviewer**: Yeah...okay now which are the main challenges in teaching a culturally and linguistically diverse classroom?

**Interviewee**: We’ve got many challenges... First of all, I think that it is very difficult to balance between the different learning needs that these students have and I think it’s very difficult to balance between the different cultural and linguistic backgrounds connected to these students...Maybe some of the classes I’ve got have different learning needs...okay, this is what I find very challenging...to balance all that...

**Interviewer**: Balance...okay...So do you think that you could benefit from development, strategy development training in the future for such students?

**Interviewee**: Yeah okay so...of course I could benefit if I received such training...since I would become maybe more tolerant towards them, maybe I would become more aware of the difficulties that they say and I think that we surely have to do a lot for the people who have different feelings and backgrounds than others, so yes...overall, I think it’s a very good thing, very important...

**Interviewer**: yes, so which are your expectations in relation to potential, possible future workshops?

**Interviewee**: I reckon that intercultural education should be compulsory for all teachers, especially the EFL teachers and I think that we maybe, we could… you know receive more background information by the principal, for mixed students backgrounds so as to be prepared as to what to expect.

**Interviewer**: So, this is what you expect from workshops… okay… So, thank you very, very much for your cooperation…

**Interviewee**: Thank you... I wish you the best of luck

**Interviewer**: Thank you very much, goodbye

**INTERVIEW 12**

**Interviewer**: Okay… good evening

**Interviewee**: Good evening

**Interviewer**: I want to thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for the study. Thank you very much. Okay, so over the next 10minutes I will be asking you several open-ended questions related to your experiences on the strategies that you make use of when teaching English as a third language, to students who may be
ethnically, racially, linguistically or culturally different from you and your mainstream pupils… Alright?

Interviewee: okay...
Interviewer: Okay, so, all the information you provide me with will remain strictly confidential and will only be used for the analysis of the study but the recording has to be transcribed… Is that alright with you?
Interviewee: yes, it’s alright...
Interviewer: okay… so, let’s start…Tell me a few things about the school and the area you’re currently working in and those in the past
Interviewee: okay… I am working in the prefecture of Ilia, especially in the primary school of Kentro which is a village right above Ancient Ilida. It has some special characteristics because all of the students have a specific cultural background… they are Roma students.
Interviewer: Oh…okay they are Roma students… So, you have you got experience working with such students
Interviewee: Of course...yes… but their first language is Greek… They are raised, born and raised in this village which belongs to the municipality of Ilida, Amaliada
Interviewer: Okay, I can understand that… Any other nationalities in your school?
Interviewee: In this specific school, no but my second school is in Andravida where I only have a few hours in it and I go there only twice a week and there are only a few learners from a different cultural, social and ethnic background.
Interviewer: Ok, very nice…now...How do you perceive the notion of Intercultural education in Greece?
Interviewee: We live in a multicultural environment especially in these years, Greece has many people from other countries and the refugees or immigrants try to become members of the Greek community, the Greek lifestyle...they try to find work, they try to find a safe place to live, so of course schools are multicultural communities
Interviewer: yes, yes, okay...
Interviewee: So, over the years I have experienced this phenomenon and of course there has to be a way to help these students to feel at home as much as possible...
Interviewer: As much as possible...okay… Have you ever received any training in the field?
Interviewee: This year I am following a special course offered by the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens on this specific field...Intercultural education...
Interviewer: Okay, very nice...Now, let’s move on to the strategies, the teaching strategies that you are making use of currently… do you differentiate them when teaching English as a second language to mainstream pupils versus as a third one to diverse students? And if yes how, can you give me an example? What do you do at times?
Interviewee: My most recent example is with some students in the first grade in Andravida...these specific students experienced English and Greek as equal languages because they are both foreign to them, so it is the same for them to use either English or Greek. I opt for English, we don’t use the Greek language as a medium of communication or of mutual understanding in the class, we use mostly English and we point at objects, we try to mime or use songs or whatever… I mean I try to help them apply the language as their second language…
Interviewer: okay… as a second language, yes…and which is their first language? Their native language?
Interviewee: Albanian is the...
Interviewer: Albanian...alright
Interviewer: and what about the existing home languages- that’s my next question- do you make use of them? The native languages in your classroom?
Interviewee: You mean their native languages… for example, Albanian?
Interviewer: Hmmmm
Interviewee: No
Interviewer: No, you don’t
Interviewee: They sometimes try to ask me something they don’t know how to do in English or Greek, they may utter a few words but they…
Interviewer: in order to be helped… yes...
Interviewee: yes, yes…
Interviewer: but you don’t use it in your classroom…
Interviewee: No, because I am not educated…I don’t know any Albanian so I can’t. I try to help them using my hands, using miming, using pictures…
Interviewer: Yes...yes… okay now which are the main challenges in teaching a culturally and linguistically diverse classroom?
Interviewee: Of course it’s not easy… we have to be fully equipped and prepared… we have to be open to and… ready to welcome and help them feel accepted, feel - let’s say equal- of course they are equal… they sometimes feel a little frightened when they enter an environment where they don’t share a common language… a common first language… we try to make them… and of course I think from our point of view, it’s not so difficult… it’s not easy, but it’s not so difficult because we give them a new code of communication, a new means of communication… which is foreign also to the Greek students… So, they like it...they all learn from the same… beginning from the same point, let’s say...in this language...
Interviewer: okay...So do you think that you could benefit from strategy development training in the future for such students?
Interviewee: Yes, I could…
Interviewer: Which are your main expectations in relation to possible future workshops? As a teacher, which are your main expectations?
Interviewee: Just because I am already familiar with the theoretical framework of these strategies- more or less- I would prefer some practical workshops… analyses of case studies...or field trips in order to see in person these strategies and no more theory...we know the theory… we are very well educated...
Interviewer: Yes... you are right… I agree...So, let’s hope for the best. Okay, thank you very, very much for your cooperation… It has been more than helpful to me
Interviewee: You’re welcome
Interviewer: Thank you very much, bye-bye
Interviewee: Goodbye
APPENDIX I

Reliability analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the organization and evaluation of teaching strategies and EAL students’ learning</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of employment of each of specific techniques when teaching EAL students to recall information</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of employment of specific techniques aimed to manage EAL students’ emotions and promote cooperative learning</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of engagement of specific practices dealing with EAL pupils’ mental processes and compensation for missing knowledge</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Εκτεταμένη Περίληψη στα Ελληνικά

«Στρατηγικές για την διδασκαλία της Αγγλικής ως τρίτης γλώσσας στην πολιτισμικά και γλωσσικά διαφοροποιημένη τάξη»

Ευαγγελία Παπαλεξάτου

Εισαγωγή

Αδιαμφισβήτητα, την τελευταία δεκαετία του 20ου αιώνα η Ελλάδα έχει δεχτεί πληθώρα μεταναστών, συμπεριλαμβανομένου των επαναπατριζόμενων ή οικονομικών μεταναστών, κυρίως από Ασιατικές χώρες, την Αλβανία και την πρώην Σοβιετική Ένωση (Mattheoudakis, 2017). Αυτή η αυξανόμενη μεταναστευτική κίνηση είχε ως αποτέλεσμα την αύξηση στις εγγραφές των ξένων μαθητών στα δημόσια Ελληνικά σχολεία, κάτι το οποίο επέφερε βαθιές αλλαγές όχι μόνο στα εκπαιδευτικά ιδρύματα, αλλά και σε ολόκληρη την κοινωνία. Συνεπώς, η εισαγωγή εκμάθησης ξένων γλωσσών έχει μεταμορφώσει όχι μόνο την Ελληνική κοινωνία σε πολυπολιτισμική, αλλά πλέον το πολιτισμικό πλούσιο πολυγλώσσικο και η πολυγλωσσία είναι πραγματικότητα σε πολλά έθη και τυγχάνει ιδιαίτερης προσοχής. Συγκεκριμένα στον τομέα της εκπαίδευσης, η γλώσσα συνιστά μια από τις θεμελιώδεις αρχές της ανθρώπινης επικοινωνίας και το μέσο βάσει του οποίου οι άνθρωποι οι οποίοι μοιράζονται κοινούς κώδικες, εκφράζουν αντιλήψεις, αξίες και την προσωπική ή κοινωνική τους ταυτότητα. Τα τελευταία χρόνια, ιδιαίτερως, διακρίνεται η τάση για την εκμάθηση της Αγγλικής γλώσσας από νεαρή ηλικία στα Ελληνικά Δημοτικά σχολεία. Συνεπώς, το γεγονός ότι τα μονογλωσσικά και μονοπολιτισμικά σχολεία στην Ελλάδα έχουν πλέον μετατραπεί σε πολυπολιτισμικές μορφές, κάνει επιπλέον την ανάγκη για την κατάλληλη εκπαίδευση των ξένων μαθητών που περιλαμβάνουν τόσο μονογλώσσους, όσο και διεθνούς μαθητές. Γενικά, η πολυγλώσσια θεωρείται βασικό χαρακτηριστικό γνώρισμα της Ευρωπαϊκής ταυτότητας. Η διεύρυνση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης επιτάσσει την εκμάθηση μιας πιο πολυεθνικής γλώσσας σε όλες τις βαθμίδες της εκπαίδευσης. Γι’αυτόν τον λόγο η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση εξέδωσε έγγραφο, το οποίο τελειοποιήθηκε το 2004, σύμφωνα με το οποίο τονίζονται η ανάγκη προώθησης της γλωσσικής και πολιτισμικής ποικιλομορφίας. Μαθαίνοντας...
μία –και ιδανικά δύο- γλώσσες επιπροσθέτως της μητρικής. Παράλληλα με αυτό, έγγραφα όπως το «Κοινό Ευρωπαϊκό Πλάσιο» ή το «Ευρωπαϊκό Ντοσιέ» (Council of Europe, 2001) αντικατοπτρίζουν πολιτικές που αφορούν στην πολυγλωσσία και την Ευρωπαϊκή υπηκότητα και θέτουν διεθνείς προδιαγραφές για τη διδακτική και εκάθεση των ξένων γλώσσων. Επιπλέον, η εξάπλωση της Αγγλικής γλώσσας, ως η πιο σημαντική παγκοσμίως, προωθεί τόσο την κοινωνική όσο και την ατομική διεθνοποίηση καθώς και την αποκλίνουσα την θέση και την τριγλώσσία. Σε αναφορά που εξέδωσαν τα δίκτυα “Eurydice” / “Eurostat”, τα οποία παρέχουν πληροφορίες και αναλύσεις των Ευρωπαϊκών εκπαιδευτικών συστημάτων και πολιτικών, σε συνεργασία με την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, επιβεβαιώνεται ότι η Αγγλική γλώσσα, η οποία θεωρείται lingua franca, είναι η πιο ευρέως διασκόμενη γλώσσα σε όλες σχεδόν τις Ευρωπαϊκές χώρες. Σε αρκετές περιπτώσεις μπορεί να διδαχθεί ως δεύτερη ή ηττήτη ξένη γλώσσα, αλλά και ως τρίτη γλώσσα. Τέτοια είναι και η περιπτώση των μεταναστών που διδάσκονταν την επίσημη γλώσσα της χώρας όπου εγκαθίστανται, και την Αγγλική γλώσσα στο επίσημο σχολικό περιβάλλον. Παράλληλα, «μόνο μέσω μιας καλύτερης γνώσης των σύγχρονων Ευρωπαϊκών γλωσσών είναι πιθανό να διευκολυνθεί η επικοινωνία και η αλληλεπίδραση εντός Ευρωπαίων με διαφορετικές μητρικές γλώσσες, ώστε να προαχθεί η Ευρωπαϊκή κινητικότητα, η αμοιβαία κατανόηση και η συνεργασία και να αποφευχθεί οποιαδήποτε είδους προκατάληψη και διάκριση…» (CEFR, 2001, σελ. 2).

Ειδικά για τους μετανάστες, και την ενσωμάτωσή τους στο νέο σχολείο, αφενός η εκμάθηση της επίσημης γλώσσας της χώρας στην οποία διαμένουν είναι απαραίτητη προανάγωση για τον συμμετοχή τους (Kantzou et al., 2017) και αφ’ετέρου η εκμάθησή της επιπλέον ξένης γλώσσας είναι υποχρεωτική, δίνοντας έτσι στους μετανάστες την ευκαιρία να ανοίξουν τις προοπτικές τους στην Ευρώπη στην μετέπειτα ζωή τους. Σύμφωνα με έρευνες, αυτοί οι μαθητές συνήθως αποδίδουν λιγότερο απαραίτητη συμμετοχή οποιαδήποτε διαφορετική μεταγλωσσική ικανότητα που γίνεται ορατή μέσα από διάφορες περιπτώσεις παρεμβολών και αναμείξεων που οι Έλληνες καθηγητές μπορούν να εκλάβουν σαν περιπτώσεις διάκρισης. Επιπλέον, οι πολιτικές και πολιτισμικές τους αξίες αναφέρονται, κατατάσσοντας τους σε πολιτισμικές μειονότητες (Nikolaou, 2011) και γίνονται
αποδέκτες ρατσιστικών ή ξενοφοβικών περιστατικών, είτε από Έλληνες γονείς, συμμαθητές ή ακόμη και από τους ίδιους τους δασκάλους τους (Dida, 2013). Επίσης, λόγω της πιθανής μέτριας χρήσης της Ελληνικής γλώσσας, συνήθως τοποθετούνται σε τμήματα χαμηλότερου επιπέδου, με αποτέλεσμα να βιώνουν συναισθήματα κατοχυρώματα και μειωμένων ικανοτήτων (Dida, 2013).

Συμπερασματικά, η παρουσία τόσον εθνικοτήτων συνιστά πρόκληση όχι μόνο για τη διδασκαλία των μαθητών αυτών, αλλά και για τους εκπαιδευτικούς, οι οποίοι αντιμετωπίζουν ποικίλες διαφορετικές εργασιακές συνθήκες και αντιλαμβάνονται την ανάγκη να προσαρμοστούν στα νέα δεδομένα. Σύμφωνα με τον Smith (2009), οι εκπαιδευτικοί είναι εκείνοι που χρειάζονται να προετοιμαστούν αποτελεσματικά, δεδομένου ότι η αποτυχία ή η επιτυχία των μαθητών τους στην εκμάθηση μιας ξένης γλώσσας εξαρτάται σε μεγάλο βαθμό από τις δικές τους διδακτικές στρατηγικές και προσεγγίσεις.

Παράθεση του Προβλήματος

Η άφιξη των νεοεισαχθέντων μεταναστών μαθητών στα σχολεία έχει επηρεάσει όχι μόνο την εκπαιδευτική διαδικασία αλλά και την στάση των εκπαιδευτικών απέναντι στους γηγενείς μαθητές, καθώς και το ρόλο τους στη διεύρυνση του πολιτισμικού χώρου των μεταναστών μαθητών με σκοπό την ενδυνάμωσή τους (Banks, 2004). Αυτό συμβαίνει εξαιτίας του γεγονότος ότι η νέα πραγματικότητα «προκαλεί τις παραδοσιακές προοπτικές της γλωσσικής εκπαίδευσης (Ziegler, 2013, σελ.2)».

Παρά τις έρευνες που έχουν διεξαχθεί σε πολύγλωσσους μαθητές, λίγες έρευνες αφορούν στους ξενόγλωσους εκπαιδευτικούς και στη διδακτική μεθοδολογία που θα μπορούσε να χρησιμοποιηθεί για την εκμάθηση μιας τρίτης γλώσσας. Οι λίγες έρευνες που αναφέρονται στην διδακτική τονίζουν την πολυπολιτισμικότητα των μαθητών και την εφικτότητά τους στην εκμάθηση επιπλέον γλώσσας (Gutierrez, 2014). Σύμφωνα με την Derman-Sparks (1989), δεν έχει δοθεί αρκετή προσοχή στο πώς οι ακριβώς ενεργούν διδακτικά οι ξενόγλωσσοι εκπαιδευτικοί και εάν είναι γνώστες των πολυπολιτισμικών θεμάτων και των επιπτώσεων αυτών σε
ένα πραγματικό διδακτικό πλαίσιο. Επίσης η ίδια ερευνήτρια τονίζει την αναγκαιότητα του σεβασμού των πολιτισμικών διαφορών των μαθητών και πάνω από όλα την ανάγκη οι εκπαιδευτικοί να είναι ικανοί και πρόθυμοι να συμπεριλαμβάνουν τους πολιτισμικούς των μαθητών στη σχολική ύλη. Συνεπώς, η συνολική ιδεολογία των εκπαιδευτικών για τους δίγλωσσους μαθητές και η αξία που αποδίδουν στις μητρικές τους γλώσσες παίζουν κεντρικό ρόλο στην επιλογή των καθημερινών διδακτικών τους στρατηγικών. Δεδομένου ότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί οφείλουν να προσαρμόζονται στις νέες προκλήσεις και αξίες της σύγχρονης εποχής, μία ολιστική προσέγγιση στη διδασκαλία φαίνεται πιο ορθή. Η τορινή πραγματικότητα απαιτεί την επανεξέταση των παραδοσιακών προσεγγίσεων στη διδασκαλία και εκμάθηση μιας τρίτης γλώσσας με γνώμονα την παράλληλη πολιτισμική και κοινωνική ανάπτυξη τόσο των εκπαιδευτικών όσο και των μαθητών. Ένας τέτοιος προσανατολισμός θέτει ιδιαίτερα τους εκπαιδευτικούς σε μία συνεχή διαδικασία αναστολήματος και επανελέγχου τόσο των πεποιθήσεών τους όσο και των παιδαγωγικών πρακτικών τους.

Παράλληλα, η ανάπτυξη της διαπολιτισμικής και πολυπολιτισμικής ικανότητας των εκπαιδευτικών καθίσταται μια επιπλέον διεθνής προϋπόθεση, προκειμένου να να προσφέρουν στους μαθητές μια ολόλευκη εκπαίδευση ίση πολιτισμικών πολιτισμικών, ιδιαίτερα όταν πρόκειται για την διδασκαλία της Αγγλικής γλώσσας σε ομιλητές άλλων γλωσσών. Η γενικότερη στάση καθώς και οι αντιλήψεις των εκπαιδευτικών απέναντι στους μαθητές που διδάσκονται Αγγλικά ως επιπρόσθετη γλώσσα, είχαν και θα συνεχίσουν να έχουν τέτοιου επίπεδο στις συμπεριφορές των μαθητών και στην επίδοσή τους και συνεπώς αξίζει να διερευνηθούν περαιτέρω.

Σκοπός της έρευνας –Ερευνητικά Ερωτήματα

Ο γενικότερος σκοπός της έρευνας είναι να διερευνηθεί η ισχύουσα κατάσταση στις σχολικές μονάδες της Πρωτοβάθμιας Εκπαίδευσης στην Περιφέρεια Δυτικής Ελλάδας, όπου η Αγγλική διδάσκεται ως τρίτη γλώσσα σε δίγλωσσους μαθητές στην πολιτισμική και γλωσσική διαφοροποιημένη τάξη. Ειδικότερα, μέσω της έρευνας διευρενώνται οι βασικότερες στρατηγικές που οι καθηγητές χρησιμοποιούν και θεωρούν αποτελεσματικές στη διδασκαλία της Αγγλικής γλώσσας σε μαθητές που μπορεί να διαφοροποιούνται εθνικά, φυλετικά και ή γλωσσολογικά από τους μονόγλωσσους μαθητές στην μεικτή ελληνική τάξη.

Με βάση τα προαναφερθέντα, τα ερωτήματα που πλαισιώνουν την έρευνα, είναι τα εξής:

α) Πώς επηρεάζει η επαγγελματική εμπειρία των καθηγητών καθώς επίσης και τα ακαδημαϊκά τους επιτεύγματα την ικανότητα των μαθητών να κατακτήσουν καινούριο λεξιλόγιο;

β) Σε τι βαθμό οι διδακτικές στρατηγικές εξετάζουν στην συμμετοχή των καθηγητών στην διδασκαλία και στην προώθηση της συνεργατικής προσέγγισης;
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γ) Ποια είναι η πιθανή σχέση μεταξύ της καλλιέργειας θετικού μαθησιακού περιβάλλοντος και των μεταγνωστικών ικανοτήτων των μαθητών με την χρήση των διαθέσιμων μητρικών γλωσσών στην διαφοροποιημένη τάξη;

d) Σε τι βαθμό είναι οι ξενόγλωσσοι εκπαιδευτικοί γνώστες ιδιαίτερων στρατηγικών διδασκαλίας κατάλληλοι για διαφοροποιημένους μαθητές;

e) Με ποιο τρόπο τα χρόνια εμπειρίας, η ηλικία, τα διάφορα είδη εκπαίδευσης και τα ακαδημαϊκά επιτεύγματα στον τομέα της πολυγλωσσικής και πολυπολιτισμικής εκπαίδευσης επηρεάζουν τις αντιλήψεις των καθηγητών και την επιλογή συγκεκριμένων στρατηγικών;

στ) Διαφοροποιούν οι καθηγητές της στρατηγικές διδασκαλίας όταν διδάσκουν την Αγγλική ως τρίτη γλώσσα; Εάν ναι, με ποιόν τρόπο;

Σημαντικότητα της έρευνας

Εστιάζοντας στους εκπαιδευτικούς της Αγγλικής και στην διερεύνηση των επαγγελματικών τους βιομάτων, η παρούσα έρευνα έχει ως απώτερο στόχο τον εμπλουτισμό της ήδη υπάρχουσας αρθρογραφίας και βιβλιογραφίας, όσον αφορά όχι μόνο στη διδασκαλία και κατάκτηση μιας τρίτης γλώσσας, αλλά και στις αλληλοσυνδεόμενες έννοιες της διγλωσσίας, τριγλωσσίας, πολυπολιτισμικότητας και διαπολιτισμικής εκπαίδευσης. Συνεπώς, κρίνεται αναγκαίο να βελτιστοποιηθεί η επαγγελματική ανάπτυξη των ξενόγλωσσων εκπαιδευτικών όσον αφορά την τριγλωσσία και να αναδυθούν τυχόν επιπλέον πλεονεκτήματα ή ελλείψεις στον συγκεκριμένο τομέα. Απώτερος σκοπός είναι να ενδυναμωθούν οι εκπαιδευτικοί ώστε να καταστήσουν τα μαθήματα για αυτού τον ιδιαίτερο μαθητικό πληθυσμό πιο κατάλληλα και παράλληλα να διατυπώσουν προτάσεις για τη βελτίωση της παρούσας κατάστασης, δεδομένου ότι κανείς δεν μπορεί να παραμείνει άνετα μπροστά στην σημερινή ετερογένεια. Επιπλέον, η αποκλειστική μελέτη των εκπαιδευτικών στο ελληνικό εκπαιδευτικό πλαίσιο της πρωτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης θα αποτελέσει ένα σημαντικό για να σκιαγραφηθούν τα στοιχεία που συνδέονται με το πολιτισμικό και γλωσσικό υπόβαθρο των διγλωσσικών μαθητών και συνεπώς με την πιο επιτυχημένη κατάκτηση της τρίτης γλώσσας μέσα από μια πιο αποτελεσματική διδασκαλία.
Ο όρος διαφορετικότητα (diversity) έχει λάβει διάφορες ερμηνείες ανά τα χρόνια. Γενικά, η διαφορετικότητα αναφέρεται σε προσωπικές διαφορές μεταξύ διαφόρων ομάδων εξαιτίας της εθνικότητας, της γλώσσας, της θρησκείας, του γένους, της φυλής και της κοινωνικής τάξης. Είναι ένας γενικός όρος που αναφέρεται στο σύνολο εκείνων των ανθρώπινων χαρακτηριστικών που είναι διαφορετικά από τα δικά μας (Chiner et al., 2015). Στο πλαίσιο αυτής της έρευνας, η ποικιλότητα περιλαμβάνει την γλώσσα, την εθνικότητα και την φυλή, αποκλείοντας άλλου είδους διαφοροποιήσεων. Βάσει προσωπικών εμπειριών και απόψεων, η διαφορετικότητα μπορεί να είναι ορατή (visible) όπως π.χ. το γένος και τα εξωτερικά χαρακτηριστικά αλλά μπορεί να είναι και αόρατη (invisible) ή μή ορατή (non-visible) περιλαμβάνοντας ιδιότητες όπως τον επιδημιολογικό υπόβαθρο, οι διαφορετικές απόψεις ή ακόμα και τα διαφορετικά επίπεδα κινητοποίησης (Chen, 1998). Επίσης η διαφορετικότητα μπορεί να επεκταθεί στην εκπαίδευση και στα σχολεία, δεδομένου ότι υπάρχουν μαθητές που αναφέρονται ως πρώτης ή δεύτερης γενιάς μετανάστες, ή μέρος της εκπαιδεύτικης μιας γλώσσας άλλης από την Ελληνική. Επίσης ο όρος αναφέρεται και στους επαναπατριζόμενους Έλληνες μαθητές, στους Ρομά ή στις μουσουλμανικές μειονότητες, ακόμη και στους Ελληνες που μιλούν ή καταλαβαίνουν μία γλώσσα άλλη από την Ελληνική. Στη συγκεκριμένη έρευνα, οι μαθητές οι οποίοι δεν συνιστούν ομοιογενή ομάδα και μπορούν να αποκαλούνται ‘τρίγλωσσοι’ ή ‘πολύγλωσσοι’ μαθητές είναι όσοι μιλούν την μητρική τους γλώσσα, την επίσημη γλώσσα της κοινότητας, στην οποία κατοικούν και τουλάχιστον μια ξένη γλώσσα, ή περισσότερες, ως μέρος της επιχειρησιακής τους εκπαίδευσης. Αυτοί οι μαθητές μπορούν να χαρακτηριστούν ως ως ομιλητές οι οποίοι χρησιμοποιούν διάφορες γλωσσικές πηγές όταν επικοινωνούν με μονόγλωσσους και πολύγλωσσους συνομιλητές (Cenoz & Gorter, 2011, σελ. 367 όπ. αναφ. στο Gorter, 2015). Σύμφωνα με την Jessner (2008), η πολυλειτουργική μεταξύ των διαφόρων γλωσσικών συστημάτων που συνδέονται με την εκπαίδευση του μαθητή είναι ένα σημαντικό ζήτημα που πρέπει να ληφθεί υπ’ όψιν, δεδομένου ότι το φάσμα της κατάκτησης μιας τρίτης γλώσσας εμπίπτει στον ευρύτερο σχεδιασμό για...
την επίτευξη και χρήση της πολυγλωσσίας. Αυτό σημαίνει ότι οι διάφορες γλώσσες των οποίων η ικανότητα προσδιορίζεται από παράγοντες όπως το ύφος του λόγου, το επάγγελμα, ή την εκπαίδευση, χρησιμοποιούνται για διαφορετικό λόγο. Οι τέσσερις αλληλεξαρτώμενες μεταβλητές για την πολυγλωσσία σύμφωνα με τους Anastassiou et al. (2017, σελ.4) είναι: «η ηλικία του ομιλητή όταν είχε την πρώτη επαφή με τη γλώσσα, οι πληροφορίες που λαμβάνει (ο τύπος και η ποιότητα της πληροφορίας και η διακριτικότητα του ομιλητή), το επίπεδο τελειότητας σε κάθε γλώσσα και η σειρά με την οποία οι γλώσσες έχουν αποκτηθεί.»

Επιπροσθέτως, έρευνες για την πολυγλωσσία έχουν αποδείξει ότι το να είναι κάποιος πολύγλωσσος μαθητής ενέχει περισσότερα πλεονεκτήματα από ό,τι μειονεκτήματα για την κατανόηση διαφόρων γνωστικών πεδίων. Μέσω της πολυγλωσσίας αναπτύσσονται περισσότερες μεταγνωστικές δεξιότητες στους μαθητές και προσωπικά η πιο ολοκληρωμένη ανάπτυξη τους. Επίσης, σε σύγκριση με τους δίγλωσσους μαθητές, οι πολύγλωσσοι είναι πιο αυτόνομοι, χρησιμοποιούν πιο συχνά στρατηγικές για να επιταχυνούν την μάθησή τους, παρουσιάζουν γνωστική ευελιξία, ιδιαίτερη δημιουργικότητα και αυξημένη μεταγλωσσική αντίληψη. Οι εμπειρικές μελέτες στο ελλαδικό χώρο για τους γλωσσικούς και πολιτισμικούς μαθητές είναι ανεπαρκείς (Vouyoukas et al., 2017) και κυρίως αναφέρονται στις δυσκολίες συμμετοχής και συμμετοχικής αντίληψης των μαθητών αυτών στο σχολικό περιβάλλον. Επίσης, ενώ υπάρχουν αρκετές άφονες έρευνες οι οποίες ασχολούνται με την εκμάθηση των ελληνικών ως δεύτερης γλώσσας (Gogonas, 2010), είναι ελάχιστες οι έρευνες οι οποίες μελετούν τις στρατηγικές και τις πρακτικές που θεωρούνται κατάλληλες για τους μαθητές, ώστε εκείνοι να κινητοποιούνται αποτελεσματικά και να κατακτούν την ξένη γλώσσα με επιτυχία.

Τριγλωσσία

Παρότι γλωσσολόγοι και ερευνητές επί χρόνια έχουν υποστηρίζει την άποψη ότι οι έξενες γλώσσες μαθαίνονται με φυσιολογική σειρά μετά τη μητρική, και παρά το γεγονός ότι έχουν προκύψει αρκετές τυπολογίες της δίγλωσσης εκπαίδευσης που μπορεί να βρίσκουν εφαρμογή στη πολυγλωσσία, το φαινόμενο της εκμάθησης μιας τρίτης γλώσσας πρόσφατα αποτελεί ιδιαίτερο «τομέα έρευνας» (Leung, 2007, σελ. 95), εξαιτίας κυρίως συγκεκριμένον γλωσσολογικών και γνωστικών μεταβλητών.
Η Cenoz (2000, όπ. αναφ. στο Hodal, 2005, σελ. 6) αναγνωρίζει διάφορους τύπους εκμάθησης μιας τρίτης γλώσσας που έχουν ως κοινό σημείο την πολυπλοκότητα των γλωσσών, την εξάρτηση τους από τις άλλες γλώσσες, καθώς επίσης και παράγοντες ατομικούς και σχετιζόμενους με το περιεχόμενο μάθησης. Σύμφωνα με την ερευνήτρια, υπάρχουν οι μαθητές που μαθαίνουν τις τρεις γλώσσες ταυτόχρονα (L1+L2+L3), διαδοχικά (L1->L2->L3), αυτοί που μαθαίνουν πρώτα την μητρική και ακολουθεί η ταυτόχρονη μάθηση των άλλων δύο (L1->L2+L3) και τέλος υπάρχουν οι μαθητές που μαθαίνουν τις δύο πρώτες γλώσσες ταυτόχρονα και ακολουθεί η εκμάθηση της τρίτης (L1+L2->L3). Παράλληλα με την κατηγοριοποίηση σύμφωνα με τους τύπους κατάκτησης των γλωσσών, οι μαθητές μπορούν να χωριστούν σε 5 κατηγορίες: α) στους τρίγλωσσους που μεγαλώνουν σε διγλώσση κοινότητα και η μητρική τους γλώσσα είναι διαφορετική από τη γλώσσα που ομιλείται, β) στα παιδιά που μεγαλώνουν με δύο διαφορετικές μητρικές γλώσσες, διαφορετικές από τη γλώσσα της κοινότητας γ) στα μέλη μιας τρίγλωσσής κοινονιών δ) στους διγλώσσους που έχουν γίνει τρίγλωσσοι λόγω μεταναστευτικών λόγων και e) στους διγλώσσους μαθητές που διδάσκονται μια τρίτη γλώσσα στο τυπικό σχολικό περιβάλλον (Hoffmann, 2001b, σελ. 3). Στο πλαίσιο της συγκεκριμένης διατριβής, η έρευνα εστιάζει στην εκμάθηση της τρίτης γλώσσας στο σχολικό πλαίσιο κάτι το οποίο θεωρείται συχνό φαινόμενο.

Σύμφωνα με τους Hufeisen και Marx (2004) η διαφορά στην απόκτηση μιας τρίτης γλώσσας σε σχέση με μία δεύτερη είναι τόσο μεγάλη που θα έπρεπε είτε να δημιουργηθεί ένα καινούργιο θεωρητικό πλαίσιο, είτε να διευρυνθεί κατά πολύ το υπάρχον μοντέλο της εκμάθησης της δεύτερης γλώσσας. Επίσης οι Herdina και Jessner (2000, στο Halimi, 2010) τονίζουν ότι η αλληλεξάρτηση των διαφορετικών γλωσσικών συστημάτων είναι τέτοια, που η ανάπτυξη κάθε γλώσσας εξαρτάται σε μεγάλο βαθμό από τα προηγούμενα αλλα και τα επακόλουθα γλωσσικά συστήματα. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, η τριγλώσσια, η οποία σαν όρος μπορεί να χρησιμοποιείται εναλλάξ με την πολυγλώσσια, αναφέρεται στην σχετική βιβλιογραφία σαν προέκταση ή τμήμα της διγλώσσιας (Anastassiou et al., 2017), διατηρώντας παράλληλα αυτά έναν μοναδικό χαρακτήρα με αποκλειστικά χαρακτηριστικά. Έκρηγηται έως τις διαφορές που διέπουν την...
απόκτηση μιας δεύτερης (Gutierrez, 2014). Έτσι, οι τρίγλωσσοι μαθητές, οι οποίοι έχουν περισσότερη εμπειρία στην διάθεσή τους κατέχοντας δύο γλωσσολογικά συστήματα, υποστηρίζονται από τις επιδράσεις τις διγλωσσίας στην γνώση (Cenoz & Jessner, 2000). Αναφορικά με την επίδραση της δεύτερης ξένης γλώσσας στην τρίτη, η Thomas (1988) αναφέρθηκε στη μεταγλωσσική αντίληψη (metalinguistic awareness) και κατέληξε στη διαπίστωση ότι οι διγλωσσοί μαθητές έχουν αυξημένη λεξιλογική γνώση και αναπτύσσουν μεγαλύτερη ευαισθησία στο γλωσσικό σύστημα. Επιπλέον τόνισε τη σημασία της επίσημης διδασκαλίας/εκμάθησης της γλώσσας, με το επιχείρημα ότι οι διγλωσσοί μαθητές που είχαν αυξημένες ικανότητες στη γραφή και στην ανάγνωση και στις δύο γλώσσες, αποδίδουν καλύτερα σε δοκιμασίες και τεστ. Σε αντίθεση με την Thomas, οι Cenoz & Lindsay (1996) σε έρευνά τους για την κατάλληλη ηλικία και τις διδακτικές μεθοδολογίες της τρίτης γλώσσας σε παιδιά με περιορισμένη διγλωσσία, βρήκαν ότι ο καλός εκπαιδευτικός, οι υποστηρικτικοί γονείς και η θετική στάση στην εκμάθηση των αγγλικών ήταν καταλυτικοί παράγοντες για την επιτυχημένη εκμάθηση της τρίτης γλώσσας. Συνολικά έχει αποδειχθεί ότι υπάρχει θετική επιρροή στις γενικότερες γλωσσολογικές ικανότητες, στην γραμματική αντίληψη, στην μίμηση τεχνικών, καθώς επίσης και στις στρατηγικές επικοινωνιών (Griessler, 2001) στους διγλωσσούς μαθητές οι οποίοι μαθαίνουν μία επιπρόσθετη γλώσσα. Επίσης πολλοί ερευνητές χρησιμοποιούν την υπόθεση αλληλεξάρτησης του Cumming (Interdependence Hypothesis), σύμφωνα με την οποία όλα τα γλωσσικά συστήματα είναι αλληλεξάρτωμενα και θα έπρεπε να τυγχάνουν της ίδιας αντιμετώπισης και χρήσης από τους μαθητές. Επιπλέον, το λεξιλόγιο που προσλαμβάνουν και παράγουν οι τρίγλωσσοι μαθητές είναι κριτικής σημασίας διότι σε αυτό εμπερικλείονται η ίδια η ποικιλομορφία και οι φυσικές αποκλίσεις της, και επομένως το λεξιλόγιο που είναι αποθηκευμένο στους μαθητές μπορεί να επηρεάσει την απόκτηση μιας τρίτης γλώσσας. Η γλώσσα που καταχωρείται στους διγλωσσούς μαθητές χωρίζεται σε δύο άποιο-γλώσσες (την μητρική και την ομιλούμενη γλώσσα), με συνέπεια μικρότερο ποσοστό καταχωρημένου λεξιλογικού υλικού να σημαίνει και χαμηλότερο ποσοστό επιτυχίας σε λεξιλογικές ασκήσεις σε σχέση με μονόγλωσσους συμμαθητές τους. Ενα άλλο πολύ σημαντικό συστατικό στοιχείο για την εκμάθηση μιας επιπρόσθετης γλώσσας αφορά στον αριθμό των ίδιων ομόρριζων λέξεων και εκφράσεων (cognate words and expressions) μεταξύ των γλώσσων, εννοούντας τις λέξεις στις διάφορες γλώσσες οι οποίες έχουν

Πολλοί ερευνητές και άτομα που δραστηριοποιούνται στο πεδίο της διγλώσσιας και της τριγλώσσιας, χρησιμοποιούν διάφορες όρους για να συγκρίνουν και να ερμηνεύονται τον τρόπο με τον οποίο οι διγλώσσοι μαθητές κατακτούν μια επιπρόσθετη γλώσσα (additional language) και τον ρόλο που

Διαγλωσσικότητα (translanguaging)/ Γλωσσική επιρροή μεταξύ διαφόρων γλωσσών (cross linguistic influence)/ Εναλλαγή γλωσσικών κωδίκων (code switching) / Μεταγλωσσική Αντίληψη (metalinguistic awareness)
παίζουν οι άλλες γλώσσες σε αυτό. Η γλωσσική επιρροή ή μεταφορά μεταξύ
dιαφόρων γλώσσων (Cross Linguistic Influence – CLI / transfer) είναι ένας όρος που πρωτοχρησιμοποιήθηκε από τους Sharwood-Smith and Kellerman (1986, όπ. αναφ. στο Iamroz, 2018), για να εμπεριλείσει διαφόρους τύπους 'επιρροών' που
dέχεται μια καινούρια γλώσσα όταν μαθαίνεται, όπως: μεταφορά (transfer),
anάμειξη (interference), αποφυγή (avoidance), δανεισμός (borrowing) και απώλεια
tης γλώσσας (language loss). Ειδικά ο τομέας της τριγλώσσιας είναι ιδανικός για τη
μελέτη αυτού του φαινομένου διότι δεν μπορούμε να γνωρίζουμε ποιά από τις ήδη
dύο γλώσσες που προκατέχει ο ομιλητής λειτουργεί σαν 'πάροχος' στην εκμάθηση
tης τρίτης (source language / language supplier). Κατά τον Grosjean (2013), η
κατάλληλη γλώσσα ενεργοποιείται όταν το απαιτήσουν οι περιστάσεις. Κατ' αυτήν,
η επιλεχθείσα γλώσσα είναι η «βασική» (base/matrix/recipient language) ενώ οι
dύο γλώσσες που δεν ενεργοποιούνται αναφέρονται ως «προσκεκλημένες γλώσσες»
guest languages). Η επιλογή της κατάλληλης γλώσσας που θα λειτουργήσει ως
πάροχος βοηθείας στην επιπρόσθετη εξαρτάται από τη γλωσσολογική απόσταση
μεταξύ των γλώσσων (language distance), την σειρά που έχουν αποκτηθεί οι
προηγούμενες γλώσσες, την επισημότητα του εκάστοτε περιεχομένου και τη
συχνότητα χρήσης (De Angelis, 2007). Παρά το γεγονός ότι μπορεί να υπάρξει και
αρνητική επιρροή των προηγούμενων γλώσσων στην καινούρια (negative transfer),
kυρίως στο συντακτικό, στη γραμματική ή στην επιλογή των λέξεων, η γλωσσική
επιρροή είναι απραίτητο στοιχείο αν και έκτις μαθητές κατέχει ο ομιλητής, τόσο περισσότερες
γλώσσες κατέχει ο ομιλητής, τόσο περισσότερες συγκρίσεις μπορεί να κάνει, άρα
eκατά τόσες περισσότερες στρατηγικές μάθησης μπορεί να επιστρατεύσει και να
εφαρμόσει.

Η μεταγλώσσικη αντίληψη (metalinguistic awareness) έχει επίσης μεγάλη
σημασία, διότι παρέχει στους μαθητές το πλεονέκτημα του «μαθαίνω πώς να
μαθαίνω» (learn how to learn), το οποίο επιτυγχάνεται σταδιακά με την ανάλυση
tης γνώσης και τον έλεγχο της διαδικασίας μάθησης, καθώς ο μαθητής μεγαλώνει
και οριμάζει (Cohen, 2011). Αυτό καθιστά τους διήγησους και τριγλώσσους
μαθητές, ικανότερους σε δραστηριότητες που απαιτούν γνωστικό έλεγχο και
μεγαλύτερη ανάλυση (e.g., Bialystok, 1988). Κατά τον ίδιο τρόπο και η εναλλαγή
κωδίκων (Code switching), που βιβλιογραφικά ορίζεται ως η «ανεπαίσθητη αλλαγή
ή μείξη των γλώσσων αναφορικά με μία λέξη ή μία πρόταση, σε μία συζήτηση

Ο όρος «διαγλωσσικότητα» αναφέρεται στην «ικανότητα των πολύγλωσσων ομιλητών να μεταβαίνουν από τη μία γλώσσα στην άλλη, μεταχειριζόμενοι τις γλώσσες που συνιστούν το γλωσσικό τους ρεπερτόριο σαν ένα ενοποιημένο σύστημα» (Canagarajah, 2011, σελ. 401). Όπως αναφέρει ο ερευνητής, η διαγλωσσικότητα είναι ένα φαινόμενο που μπορεί να συγκριθεί με την εναλλαγή κωδίκων ή την μετάφραση και επιτρέπει στους πολύγλωσσους μαθητές να συμπεραίνουν το νόημα μέσω διαφορετικών πρακτικών. Ο Canagarajah (2011) θεωρεί πως οι μαθητές έχουν την ευκαιρία να χρησιμοποιούν ποικιλότροπα τη διαγλωσσικότητα και για αυτό τον λόγο οι εκπαιδευτικοί πρέπει να διδάσκουν δεξιότητες βασισμένες στις στρατηγικές που πιθανώς οι μαθητές τους χρησιμοποιούν. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, ο ερευνητής μέσω της ανάλυσης των στρατηγικών ανάμειξης κωδίκων (code meshing: η διαγλωσσικότητα σε κείμενα) που χρησιμοποιήσει στην έρευνά του τόνισε τέσσερις κατηγορίες στρατηγικών που ίσως χρησιμοποιούν πολύπολιτες μαθητές: μετασχηματιστικές στρατηγικές (recontextualization strategies), στρατηγικές εξατομικεύσεως (voice strategies), στρατηγικές αλληλεπίδρασης (interactional strategies) και κειμενικές στρατηγικές (textualization strategies). Παρά το γεγονός ότι η διαγλωσσικότητα μπορεί να χρησιμοποιηθεί στην πολυπολιτισμική τάξη προς όφελος των μειονοτικών γλώσσων (Cenoz, 2017), αυξάνοντας παράλληλα και την αυτοπεποίθηση και το κίνητρο των μαθητών, σε Ευρωπαϊκά σχολεία ακόμα δεν έχει υιοθετηθεί σαν παιδαγωγική πρακτική (Creese & Blackledge, 2010).

Ο Ρόλος του Εκπαιδευτικού στην Πολυπολιτισμική Τάξη

Οι εκπαιδευτικοί θεωρούνται ότι είναι στο προσκήνιο σε κάθε σχολική τάξη, αλλά ιδιαίτερα σε τάξεις που χαρακτηρίζονται από ετερότητα, θεωρούνται παράγοντες εξαιρετικής σημασίας για την ομαλή ενσωμάτωση των διαφοροποιημένων μαθητών. Οι εκπαιδευτικοί είναι θα πρέπει να δουλεύουν ταυτόχρονα με τους διαφοροποιημένους μαθητές μέσα σε μία τυπική τάξη και να
είναι προετοιμασμένοι να αντιμετωπίσουν οποιαδήποτε μορφή ποικιλότητας (Alton-Lee, 2005). Οι περισσότερες έρευνες που αφορούν σε ξενόγλωσσους εκπαιδευτικούς, έχουν ως κύριο θέμα τις αντιλήψεις, τις στάσεις και τις συμπεριφορές των εκπαιδευτικών απέναντι τους διαφοροποιημένους μαθητές και λιγότερο τις πρακτικές ή τις στρατηγικές που χρησιμοποιούν έμπρακτα στις μικτές τάξεις Σώμφωνα όμως με μια βιβλιογραφική αναφορά, οι εκπαιδευτικοί πολύ συχνά «νιώθουν απροετοίμαστοι και ανασφαλείς όταν πρέπει να αντιμετωπίσουν στην ίδια τάξη μαθητές από διαφορετικά πολιτισμικά και γλωσσολογικά υπόβαθρα» (Eurydice report, 2019, σελ. 23), ίσως επειδή στην πλειοψηφία των περιπτώσεων έχουν λάβει ελάχιστη εκπαίδευση στον τομέα αυτό (Martin, 2004; Sharma et al., 2011; Mattheoudakis et al., 2017). Τα ίδια αποτελέσματα καταγράφονται και στην έρευνα της Νορβηγής Iamroz (2018), η οποία τόνισε την ανάγκη για μια περισσότερο πολυγλωσσική προσέγγιση στην γενικότερη παιδαγωγική αλλά και στις πρακτικές των εκπαιδευτικών. Ομοίως, ο επίσης Νορβηγός ερευνητής Pedersen (2016), σε έρευνα μεταξύ ξενόγλωσσων εκπαιδευτικών που δίδασκαν την Αγγλική ως τρίτη γλώσσα, παρατήρησε την ελλείψη αποτελεσματικής μάθησης, αλλά και να γνωρίζουν πώς να τις διοχετεύουν σωστά (Price, 2008).

οποίο η παιδαγωγική θεωρία της διαπολιτισμικότητας συνέπιπτε με την έμπρακτη
εφαρμογή της στο σχολείο, εκτός από την ανεπαρκή εκπαίδευση των εκπαιδευτικών
και την ακαταλληλότητα του εκπαιδευτικού υλικού, φάνηκε ότι η οργάνωση του
σχολείου βασιζόταν στην αφομοίωση των μαθητών των οποίων οι μητρικές
γλώσσες δεν αξιοποιούνταν ή εκτιμώνταν. Σε μία άλλη έρευνα, η Σισμανίδου
(2005, όπ. αναφ. στο Tsaliki, 2012 αναφέρθηκε στις πρακτικές των εκπαιδευτικών
προτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης, οι οποίες περιελάμβαναν συζητήσεις σε μεγάλες
ομάδες, εξατομικευμένη διδασκαλία, διάφορες ανταμοιβές, καθώς επίσης και
δραστηριότητες που προωθούσαν τις καλές σχέσεις μεταξύ αυτοχθόνων και ξένων
μαθητών. Σε έρευνά τους οι Griva & Papadopoulos (2018), εξέτασαν πώς οι
dάσκαλοι στο πανεπιστήμιο της Δυτικής Μακεδονίας εκπαιδεύονταν για να
dιδάξουν σε πολυπολιτισμικές τάξεις. Στη συγκεκριμένη έρευνα αναδείχθηκε ότι
ιδιαίτερη έμφαση δίνεται στις σύγχρονες μεθόδους και προσεγγίσεις διδασκαλίας
καθώς επίσης και στις δραστηριότητες που ευνοούν τις δεξιότητες των μεταναστών
στην επίσημη γλώσσα της χώρας στην οποία κατοικούν. Επίσης η Athanasiadou
(2005) μελέτησε την διεπιστημονική προσέγγιση στη διδασκαλία και στη
μάθηση, η οποία φάνηκε να ευνοεί την συμμετοχή όλων των μαθητών και την κοινωνική
tους ενσωμάτωση. Τέλος, η Lytra (2007), μέσα από εθνογραφικές παρατηρήσεις
και συνεντεύξεις, μελέτησε τις ταυτότητες νεαρών μαθητών σε διαπολιτισμικό
σχολείο των Αθηνών. Στην έρευνα αυτή, οι μαθητές που αποτελούσαν μειονότητα
έδειξαν ότι εκτιμούν την μητρική τους γλώσσα και σέβονται τον πολιτισμό τους,
kάτι το οποίο αποδείχθηκε και στην έρευνα της Παπαλεξάτου (2013) με δύο
διέλευσεις μαθητές, στην οποία καταγράφηκε η ανάγκη για αποδοχή της
dιαφορετικότητας. Όσον αφορά τους ξενόγλωσους εκπαιδευτικούς και τον τομέα
της τριγλώσσιας, μόνο δύο ερευνητές έχουν αναφέρει εκτενώς. H Dida (2013),
sτην πρόσφατη έρευνα της με τίτλο “EFL Teacher Training on Multicultural
Classroom Management in Elementary and Junior High School- Επιμόρφωση
Εκπαιδευτικών Αγγλικής Γλώσσας στη Διαχείριση Πολυπολιτισμικών Τάξεων σε
Δημοτικό και Γυμνάσιο”, αναφορικά με την διαπολιτισμική εκπαίδευση στην
Ελλάδα εστιάσει αποκλειστικά σε εκπαιδευτικούς Αγγλικών και διαφωτίζει τις
πραγματικές τους ανάγκες κάνοντας παράλληλα προτάσεις για επιπλέον
επιμόρφωση. Μία ακόμη αξιόλογη έρευνα είναι αυτή που διεξάχθηκε από την
Λαγού (2014), η οποία μελέτησε τους ξενόγλωσους εκπαιδευτικούς που δίδασκαν
σε πολυπολιτισμικές τάξεις του γυμνασίου. Πέραν αυτών των ερευνών, οι
διδακτικές στρατηγικές στον τομέα της πρωτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης στα ελληνικά σχολεία παραμένουν ανεξερεύνητες. Είναι πολύ πιθανό οι διδακτικές στρατηγικές των ξενόγλωσσων εκπαιδευτικών στην πρωτοβάθμια εκπαίδευση να μην έχουν αποτελέσει αντικείμενο έρευνας ακόμη, είτε γιατί οι αντιλήψεις των εκπαιδευτικών για την ετερογένεια θεωρούνται πιο σημαντικές, είτε γιατί θεωρείται αυτονόητο ότι οι στρατηγικές που εφαρμόζονται από τους ξενόγλωσσους εκπαιδευτικούς συμπίπτουν με αυτές που εφαρμόζονται από τους δασκάλους μιας τυπικής τάξης. Παρόλα αυτά, η βιβλιογραφία δείχνει ότι οι διδάσκοντες σε πολυπολιτισμικές τάξεις μπορούν να χρησιμοποιούν ποικιλείς μεθόδους που προάγουν τους στόχους της διαπολιτισμικής εκπαίδευσης και διέπονται από τις βασικές αρχές για τη διδασκαλία και μάθηση μιας επιπρόσθετης γλώσσας. Πρωταρχικά, υπάρχουν συγκεκριμένες αρχές οι οποίες, ανεξαρτήτως διδακτικού περιβάλλοντος ή μαθήματος, έχουν αναπτυχθεί για τη διδασκαλία και μάθηση μιας επιπρόσθετης γλώσσας στο ελληνικό εκπαιδευτικό σύστημα, που βιβλιογραφικά χαρακτηρίζεται ως "μία αδύναμη μορφή πολυγλωσσίας εκπαίδευσης η οποία οδηγεί στην μονογλωσσία ή στην περιορισμένη πολυγλωσσία, αρμοδιότητα της συμμετοχής όλων των μαθητών στην εκπαιδευτική διαδικασία (Mitits, 2018, σελ.29). Για μία εύρυθμη διαπολιτισμική τάξη, προτείνεται η συνεργατική μάθηση (cooperative learning) είτε σε ομάδες είτε σε ζευγάρια, καθώς συμβάλλει στην δημιουργία ισονομίας ευκαιριών και στην ανάπτυξη ισοτιμίας μαθητών στην εκπαιδευτική διαδικασία. Επίσης μέσω της αλληλεξάρτησης (interdependence) και της αμφιδρομίας βοήθειας (mutual help) διασφαλίζεται η ισοτίμια συμμετοχή όλων των μαθητών στην εκπαιδευτική διαδικασία. Η αλληλεπίδραση, ο συμβιβασμός και η γενικότερη κατανόηση διευκολύνονται μέσω των οπτικών μέσων (key visuals) μεταξύ των οποίων συγκαταλέγονται οι ζωγραφιές ή οι κάρτες, μέχρι τις χειρονομίες και τις εκφράσεις του προσώπου (Tsaliki, 2012). Επιπλέον, έρευνες έχουν αποδείξει ότι κάποιοι εκπαιδευτικοί μπορούν να ενθαρρύνουν την χρήση της μητρικής γλώσσας με σκοπό τη συναισθηματική ασφάλεια των μαθητών (Dimitroff, 1972), αλλά και για το λόγο ότι αυτή συνιστά σημαντικό εργαλείο για την ενεργοποίηση της προηγούμενης γλωσσολογικής γνώσης (activation of prior linguistic knowledge), με αποτέλεσμα οι καινούριες γνώσεις να αποκτώνται πιο εύκολα (Tsaliki, 2012). Ο Dimitroff (1972) συνέστησε την κλιμάκωση του επιπέδου δυσκολίας στις δραστηριότητες, καθώς συμβαίνει ότι το κλιμάκωμα της δυσκολίας στις δραστηριότητες, κάτι που συμβαίνει με την κατανοητή εισαγωγή και ενεργοποίηση της καινούριας γλώσσας (comprehensible input) του Krashen (1981, όπου αναφ. στο Ellis, 2005), ώστε να ανταποκρίνονται οι εκπαιδευτικοί στο
εκάστοτε επίπεδο των μαθητών. Ο Skattebol (2003), υπογράμμισε την σημασία της χρήσης παραδειγμάτων και της γενικότερης καθοδήγησης, ενώ άλλοι ερευνητές έχουν αναφέρει την σημασία της επανάληψης (repetition) και της αξιολόγησης (assessment).

Ειδικότερα για τον ρόλο του ξενόγλωσσου εκπαιδευτικού, πρέπει να ληφθούν πολλές προοπτικές υπ’όψιν. Για να επιτύχει η αφύπνιση της πολυγλωσσικής συνείδησης στην τάξη, οι εκπαιδευτικοί θα πρέπει να την κατέχουν από πριν, διαθέτοντας γενικές γλωσσολογικές γνώσεις για την τυπολογία των γλωσσών και τη δομή τους, και να την εκδηλώνουν με κάθε ευκαιρία στο μάθημα (Jessner, 2008). Επίσης κρίνεται σκόπιμο να κατανοήσουν τα προσωπικά τους στερεότυπα και τις προκαταλήψεις μέσα από μια εσωτερική ανασκόπηση, να αναλύσουν τα συναισθήματά τους προς αυτούς που είναι πολιτισμικά διαφοροποιημένοι και να προσδιορίσουν πώς αυτό το φαινόμενο συσχετίζεται με την ισχύουσα κουλτούρα και με ηθική αναφοράς που επηρεάζει αυτά τα συναισθήματα (Dukes, 2006). Σύμφωνα με τους Banks et al. (2001, σελ. 197), οι εκπαιδευτικοί είναι απαραίτητο να κατέχουν και τις κατάλληλες δεξιότητες ώστε να μεταφράζουν τις γνώσεις σε αποτελεσματική διδασκαλία. Σχετικά με τους ιδίους τους μαθητές, ενώ οι εκπαιδευτικοί φαίνεται ότι είναι ανεκτικοί και έχουν θετική στάση, τουλάχιστον σε θεωρητικό επίπεδο, στην πράξη αποτυγχάνουν να ενημερώσουν πρακτικές που προωθούν την πολυγλώσση στους μαθητές. Όπως αναφέρει o Wright (2002, σελ. 115, όπ. αναφ. στο Andrews, 2003), ένας εκπαιδευτικός ο οποίος είναι γλωσσολογικά καταρτισμένος δεν κατανοεί μόνο τη γλώσσα, αλλά είναι ευαίσθητος στα λάθη και στα διαγλωσσικά χαρακτηριστικά. Με αυτόν τον τρόπο τονίζεται και ο ρόλος του εκπαιδευτικού ως αναλυτή της γλώσσας, αλλά και ως του ατόμου ο οποίος αντιλαμβάνεται τις πιθανές γλωσσικές δυσκολίες. Γενικότερα, δεδομένου ότι δεν υπάρχει μία γενικευμένη προσέγγιση που να ταιριάζει σε όλες τις περιπτώσεις, οι εκπαιδευτικοί θα μπορούσαν να επικεντρωθούν στη γλωσσική επιρροή μεταξύ των διαφόρων γλωσσών (cross linguistic influence) και στη μεταγλωσσική αντίληψη (metalinguistic awareness), έτσι ώστε να διακρίνεται ο πολύγλωσσος από τον μονόγλωσσο μαθητή (Surinn et al., 2019). Συνοπτικά, σύμφωνα με τους De la Fuente and Lacroix (2015, in Surinn et al., 2019), ο εκπαιδευτικός χρειάζεται να ενεργοποιεί την πρότερη γνώση των μαθητών και να τους προτρέπει να εντοπίζουν διαφορές και ομοιότητες μεταξύ των γλωσσών. Αντίστοιχα, και οι μαθητές θα
πρέπει να χρησιμοποιούν προηγούμενες μαθησιακές εμπειρίες και να επανεφαρμόζουν στρατηγικές που χρησιμοποιούσαν στο παρελθόν. Αρα, οι καλύτερες πρακτικές που προτείνεται να ακολουθούν οι ξενόγλωσσοι εκπαιδευτικοί εστιάζουν στην πολιτισμική ανταποκρισιμότητα (cultural responsiveness), στη γλωσσολογική ευαισθητοποίηση (linguistic sensitivity), στην επιμόρφωση για κατάλληλες στρατηγικές (strategy training) και στην ενεργοποίηση της μεταγλωσσικής αντίληψης (activation of metalinguistic awareness) (Surinn et al., 2019).

Παιδαγωγική Πολιτισμική Συνάφεια / Διαφοροποιημένη Διδασκαλία


Παράλληλα με αυτό, και αναφορικά με τη διδασκαλία μιας τρίτης γλώσσας, η διαφοροποίηση (differentiation) είναι βασικό συστατικό στοιχείο. Οι εκπαιδευτικοί θα πρέπει να εγκαταλείψουν την ζώνη ασφαλείας τους (comfort zone), και τις δασκαλοκεντρικές μεθοδολογίες τους και αλλάζοντας τη σχολική ύλη και τις αντίστοιχες πηγές θα πρέπει να αυξήσουν τις ευκαιρίες μάθησης για όλους τους μαθητές και να ικανοποιήσουν μεγάλο μέρος των αναγκών τους (Sougari, & Mavroudi, 2019). Η διαφοροποίηση με την έννοια του διαφοροποιημένου εκπαιδευτικού πλαισίου (Walqui, 2007), κρίνεται απαραίτητη στις σημερινές τάξεις εξαιτίας των ανομοιογενειών τους εφόσον απώτερος στόχος της είναι «να πάρει ο κάθε μαθητής τις σωστές δραστηριότητες στον σωστό χρόνο» (Earl 2003, σελ. 86-87). Όταν οι εκπαιδευτικοί ανιχνεύσουν την πρώτη γνώση των μαθητών τους και τις εξατομικευμένες ανάγκες τους, τότε τα διαφοροποιημένα μαθήματα δεν θα είναι πλέον επιλογή, αλλά η προφανής λύση για την επιτυχή έκβαση της διδασκαλίας. Μερικές ενδεικτικές στρατηγικές διαφοροποίησης
(differentiated strategies) είναι η ατομική εργασία ή η συνεργασία σε ομάδες ή ζευγάρια, ανάλογα με τη δραστηριότητα, το επίπεδο ετοιμότητας των μαθητών και τις προτιμήσεις τους. Επιπλέον, τα παιδιά μαθαίνουν καλύτερα σε ένα παιδαγωγικά ασφαλές και φιλικό περιβάλλον, χωρίς απειλές ή φόβο, όπου θα μπορούν να συμμετέχουν ενεργά σε μαθησιακές διαδικασίες, με τους εκπαιδευτικούς τους οδηγούς μάλλον παρά ελεγκτές. Επιπρόσθετα, η διαδικασία και το περιεχόμενο του μαθήματος μπορούν να διαφοροποιηθούν με την απλούστευση τόσο της μεθοδολογίας όσο και του περιεχομένου των δραστηριοτήτων (Sougari & Mavroudi, 2019). Είναι πιθανό οι εκπαιδευτικοί να νιώσουν ανεπαρκείς ή διστακτικοί να εφαρμόσουν τη διαφοροποίηση, κυρίως λόγω του πιθανού στιγματισμού των μαθητών ή της υπερτόνισης των πιθανών διαφορών, αλλά και εξαιτίας της έλλειψης χρόνου ή της σχετικής γνώσης (Nicolae, 2014). Παρόλα αυτά, είναι σημαντικό να συμμετέχουν στη διαδικασία, κυρίως λόγω της εφαρμογής της διαφοροποίησης στα μαθήματα σε μια μικτή τάξη, ανάμεσα στους εκπαιδευτικούς. Στρατηγικές Μάθησης – Διδασκαλίας

Ανεξαρτήτως των διαφόρων τεχνικών που χρησιμοποιεί ο εκάστοτε εκπαιδευτικός στην τάξη του, πολλές από τις στρατηγικές που χρησιμοποιούνται σε μαθητές που διδάσκονται την Αγγλική ως επιπρόσθετη γλώσσα αποτελούν προέκταση των προσεγγισεων που ακολουθούνται με θετικά αποτελέσματα σε διδακτικές καταστάσεις με όλους τους μαθητές (Gray & Fleischman, 2004/5 όπ. αναφ. στο Kottler et al., 2008). Η χρήση συγκεκριμένων στρατηγικών εξαρτάται από πολλούς παράγοντες, όπως: το περιβάλλον διδασκαλίας, τα παρεχόμενα κίνητρα, γνωστικούς και συναισθηματικούς παράγοντες καθώς επίσης την ποιότητα και την ποσότητα της παραχόμενης πληροφορίας της επιπρόσθετης γλώσσας. Πέραν των άλλων, η μητρική γλώσσα των μαθητών, η ηλικία, η γλωσσική ικανότητα και η κοινωνικοοικονομική τους κατάσταση συνδέονται άρρητα με τις μαθησιακές στρατηγικές που χρησιμοποιούνται με σκοπό να διευκολύνουν τη μάθηση και να γίνει πιο αυτόνομη, πιο ενδιαφέρουσα και πιο αποτελεσματική (Oxford, 1999). Γενικότερα, οι μαθησιακές στρατηγικές (learning strategies) μπορούν να οριστούν ως οι «ιδιαίτερες σκέψεις ή συμπεριφορές που χρησιμοποιούν τα άτομα για να βοηθήσουν ως προς την κατανόηση, την μάθηση ή την συγκράτηση
δυνατότητα της διδασκαλίας των στρατηγικών (teachability), έτσι ώστε να καταστούν οι μαθητές πιο ικανοί να επιλέξουν αυτές που θεωρούν πιο κατάλληλες για αυτούς. Ο ρόλος των εκπαιδευτικών εδώ είναι να καθοδηγήσουν τους μαθητές στο «γιατί και πότε οι στρατηγικές είναι σημαντικές, πώς να τις χρησιμοποιήσουν και πώς να τις μεταφέρουν σε νέες καταστάσεις» (Oxford 1990, p. 12). Το τελευταίο χαρακτηριστικό που αναφέρει η Oxford (1990) είναι η ευρύτερη εμπλοκή των μαθητών στη μαθησιακή διαδικασία πέραν της γνωστικής (involvement beyond just cognition), όρος που δηλώνει την ίση αξία του να χρησιμοποιούνται λειτουργίες σχετικές με το χειρισμό της γλώσσας, που άλλωστε αποτελεί τον στόχο της διανοητικής διεργασίας, παράλληλα με μεταγνωστικές λειτουργίες όπως είναι ο σχεδιασμός, η αξιολόγηση και η διαχείριση της μάθησης.

Πάρα πολλοί ερευνητές έχουν παράγει λίστες αποτελεσματικών στρατηγικών που μπορεί να διαφέρουν στην ονομασία ή στην περιγραφή (Chamot, 1998), κατηγοριοποιώντας αυτές σύμφωνα με ποικίλα κριτήρια (Bialystok, 1978; Naiman et al., 1978; O’Malley & Chamot, 1990; Rubin, 1987, ὁπ. αναφ. στο Surinn et al., 2019). Συγκεκριμένα, οι στρατηγικές μάθησης για μια δεύτερη ή ξένη γλώσσα, χωρίζονται σε δύο κατηγορίες: στρατηγικές για μακροπρόθεσμη μάθηση (long-term learning) και στρατηγικές χρήσης της γλώσσας-στόχου σε μια τρέχουσα κατάσταση επικοινωνίας (strategies used for using the target language) (Horvathova et al., 2017). Η ταξινόμηση των στρατηγικών μπορεί να γίνει με βάση την ηλικία των μαθητών, το επίπεδο, τους στόχους που έχουν τεθεί, τις τέσσερις βασικές δεξιότητες καθώς και τη χρησιμότητα τους. Με βάση τα ανωτέρω, αναφέρονται στρατηγικές μνήμης (memory strategies), γνωστικές στρατηγικές (cognitive strategies), μεταγνωστικές στρατηγικές (metacognitive strategies), αντισταθμιστικές στρατηγικές (compensation strategies), κοινωνικές στρατηγικές (social strategies) και συναισθηματικές στρατηγικές (affective strategies) (Cohen and Weaver, 2005). Δεδομένου ότι η ηλικία και η επάρκεια (proficiency level) είναι σημαντικοί παράγοντες για την ταξινόμηση των στρατηγικών, οι εκπαιδευτικοί θα πρέπει να αποφεύγουν τη χρήση ορολογίας αν οι μαθητές είναι νεαρής ηλικίας, ενώ μαθητές με πιο αναπτυγμένη γλωσσική ικανότητα θα μπορούσαν να χειριστούν πιο απαιτητικές νοητικά δραστηριότητες, χρησιμοποιώντας πιο περίπλοκες τεχνικές. Λαμβάνοντας υπ’ όψιν ότι ο τομέας των στρατηγικών αποκαλύπτει μια αναντιστοιχία διαστάσεων ως προς την ταξινόμηση
στρατηγικών, ενώ παράλληλα απουσιάζει ένα σύστημα ταξινόμησης που να έναι
gενικά αποδεκτό» (Vlčková et al., 2013, σελ.97), οι πιο γνωστές ταξινομήσεις
στρατηγικών περιλαμβάνουν: α) την ταξινόμηση που συνδέεται με καλούς μαθητές
(π.χ Rubin, 1975), β) την ταξινόμηση που βασίζεται σε ψυχολογικές λειτουργίες (π.χ
O’Malley & Chamot, 1990), γ) την ταξινόμηση που έχει ως γλωσσολογικό
υπόβαθρο επίσημες και λειτουργικές πρακτικές, όπως π.χ τον σχεδιασμό και την
παρακολούθηση της γλώσσας (π.χ Bialystok, 1981) ή στρατηγικές επικοινωνίας
όπως η παράφραση και οι λέξεις δάνεια (π.χ Tarone, 1983), δ) την ταξινόμηση που
σχετίζεται με γλωσσικές ικανότητες (π.χ Cohen & Weaver, 2005) και τέλος ε) την
ταξινόμηση που βασίζεται σε διάφορους τύπους μαθητών. Οι πιο γνωστές
στρατηγικές για τους μαθητές μας δεύτερης ή ξένης γλώσσας είναι αυτές των
Theory and Practice, n.d). Οι O’Malley και Chamot, πρότειναν μια ταξινόμηση, η
οποία χωρίζεται σε γνωστικές, μεταγνωστικές και κοινωνικοσυναισθηματικές
στρατηγικές (cognitive, metacognitive and socio-affective strategies). Στις
γνωστικές στρατηγικές περιλαμβάνονται η επανάληψη, οι διάφορες πηγές, οι
σημειώσεις, η περίληψη, τα συμπεράσματα, η επαγωγική μέθοδος, η μετάφραση, η
συγκεκριμένη οποιασδήποτε, η ανασύνδεση, η ακουστική και οι εικόνες, η μέθοδος με
λέξεις κλειδιά, η μεταφορά και η αναπαράσταση. Στις μεταγνωστικές στρατηγικές
συγκαταλέγονται η κατευθυνόμενη και επιλεκτική προσοχή, ο λειτουργικός
σχεδιασμός, τα διαγράμματα, η αυτοδιαχείριση, η αυτοπαρακολούθηση και η
αυτοαξιολόγηση, ενώ στις κοινωνικοσυναισθηματικές στρατηγικές
περιλαμβάνονται η συνεργατικότητα, οι διευκρινιστικές ερωτήσεις και ο
αυτοδιάλογος. Η Rubin (1981), από την άλλη πλευρά, διέκρινε τις στρατηγικές σε
έμμεσες (indirect strategies) οι οποίες περιλαμβάνουν επιπλέον ευκαιρίες για εξάσκηση.
Από όλες όμως τις ταξινομήσεις το μοντέλο των μαθησιακών στρατηγικών της
Oxford (1990) θεωρείται το πιο περιεκτικό σύστημα στρατηγικών, το οποίο
tαξινομεί τις στρατηγικές σε έξι λειτουργικές ομάδες: 1) γνωστικές στρατηγικές
cognitive strategies), πώς, δηλαδή, οι μαθητές μαθαίνουν την γλώσσα και ποιες
dιεργασίες και διανοητικούς μηχανισμούς ακολουθούν, 2) στρατηγικές μνήμης
(memory strategies), πως θυμούνται την γλώσσα ή ανακαλούν πληροφορίες, 3) μεταγνωστικές στρατηγικές (metacognitive strategies), πως οργανώνουν, αξιολογούν και σχεδιάζουν την μάθησή τους με τη μέθοδο της λογικής και της ανάλυσης, 4) αντισταθμιστικές στρατηγικές (compensation strategies), πως επανορθώνουν, 5) συναισθηματικές στρατηγικές (affective strategies), πως διαχειρίζονται τα συναισθήματά τους και τέλος 6) κοινωνικές στρατηγικές (social strategies), πως φθάνουν στη μάθηση μέσω της αλληλεπίδρασης με άλλους.

Οι γνωστικές στρατηγικές, οι οποίες αποδεδειγμένα έχουν θετική επίδραση στα επίπεδα γλωσσικής ικανότητας των μαθητών (O’Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990; Oxford & Ehrman, 1995, όπ. αναφ. στο Surinn et al., 2019) περιλαμβάνουν όλες τις διαδικασίες που διέρχονται οι μαθητές και όταν μαθαίνουν τη γλώσσα-στόχο και όταν την χρησιμοποιούν. Παραδείγματα γνωστικών στρατηγικών αποτελούν η επανάληψη, οι σημειώσεις, η περίληψη, το συμπέρασμα, η επαγωγική μέθοδος, η συγκειμενοποίηση, η ανάπτυξη και η μεταφορά (Horvathova et al., 2017), καθώς επίσης και το αυθεντικό ή ρεαλιστικό γλωσσικό περιβάλλον που στοχεύει στην πιο βαθιά επεξεργασία της γλώσσας, την ανάλυση, τη σύνθεση και την αναδιοργάνωση των πληροφοριών (Surinn et al., 2019).

Οι στρατηγικές μνήμης είναι ιδιαιτέρως χρήσιμες στους νεαρότερους μαθητές, ιδιαίτερα για την εκμάθηση νέου λεξιλογίου και αναφέρονται κυρίως στον σχηματισμό συσχέτισεων, στα ακρόνυμα και στις ζωγραφιές, ή στη δημιουργία νοητικών συνδέσμων που επιτρέπουν στις πληροφορίες να εισέλθουν στην μακροπρόθεσμη μνήμη και να ανακληθούν οποιαδήποτε στιγμή (Surinn et al., 2019). Με αυτόν τον τρόπο, οι νέες πληροφορίες συνδέονται με τις ήδη υπάρχουσες στη μνήμη των μαθητών έννοιες.

Οι μαθητές καταφεύγουν στις αντισταθμιστικές στρατηγικές στην περίπτωση κάλυψης κενού στην τρίτη γλώσσα, ή στην περίπτωση που θέλουν να συνεχίσουν την επικοινωνία, όταν θεωρήσουν ότι μια δραστηριότητα είναι πέραν των δυνατοτήτων τους (Horvathova et al., 2017). Αυτές περιλαμβάνουν την ικανότητα να μαντέψουν οι μαθητές μια άγνωστη λέξη ή να ζητήσουν διευκρινήσεις, την παύση, την χρήση χειρονομιών, την παράφραση, ή ακόμα και την περίφραση. Επίσης, οι μεταγνωστικές στρατηγικές που στοχεύουν στη μεγαλύτερη αυτονομία του μαθητή και συμβάλλουν στην επιτυχή μάθηση μέσω του
σχεδιασμό, την ανάλυση, την οργάνωση και την λογική (Oxford, 1992) καθώς επίσης και τον προσδιορισμό των ιδιαιτέρων αναγκών και προτιμήσεων των
μαθητών (Surinn et al., 2019).

Άλλες στρατηγικές μάθησης οι οποίες δεν σχετίζονται τόσο στενά με την
εκμάθηση της γλώσσας είναι οι κοινωνικοσυναισθηματικές στρατηγικές. Η Oxford
(2002), αναφέρει ότι είναι υποτιμημένες σαν στρατηγικές ακόμα και από τους πιο
επιδεξίους μαθητές, διότι έχοντας αγγίξει ένα ποσοστό γλωσσικής επάρκειας
θεωρούν ότι τους είναι άχρηστες. Παρ’όλα αυτά, τις συμπεριλαμβάνει στο σύστημα
tαζιγόμησης, διότι αντιμετωπίζει τους μαθητές σαν ‘ολότητα’ και στόχος της είναι
to καταστεί το σύστημα όσο το δυνατόν pio apotelosmatikó. Οι κοινωνικές
στρατηγικές αναφέρονται στην αλληλεπίδραση μεταξύ των μαθητών, στη
συνεργασία και στην amobía κατανόησης, en ói συναισθηματικές στρατηγικές
βοηθούν τους μαθητές να ελέγχουν συμπεριφορές και συναισθήματα. Τέλος, τα
Φινδόγενη και τα εξοτερικά κίνητρα έχουν ως απότερο στόχο την μείωση του
άγχους και την αύξηση της αυτοενθάρρυνσης (Surinn et al., 2019). Πιο
συγκεκριμένα, αναφορικά με την παρότρυνση ή κινητροποίηση των μαθητών, ο
Dornyei (2001) πρότεινε τέσσερις φάσεις κατά την διάρκεια των οποίων οι μαθητές
θα μπορούσαν να βοηθήσουν άλλους μαθητές στην απόκτηση της γνώσης. Για τον
ερευνητή, οι βασικές συνθήκες απόκτησης (creating the basic motivational
conditions) περιλαμβάνουν την παραγωγή αρχικού κινήτρου (generating initial
motivation), τη διατήρηση και διασφάλιση της παρότρυνσης των μαθητών
(maintaining and protecting motivation), και την ενθάρρυνση της αναδρομικής
αυτοαξιολόγησης (encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation). Εξαιτίας του
ότι η παρότρυνση θεωρείται σημαντικός παράγοντας για την κατάκτηση της
επιπρόσθετης γλώσσας για τους τρίγλωσσους μαθητές, οι ιδέες του Dornyei
παραπέμπουν στη δημιουργία φιλικών μαθησιακών περιβάλλοντων και πολύ καλών
σχέσεων μεταξύ μαθητών και εκπαιδευτικών, στον ορισμό ρεαλιστικών στόχων,
stηn epilogh didaktikou úlikou schetikou me tis epikeiries kai to epípedo twn
machtóν, sthn schédiasmo eugkríston machtikakon empeiríon που προωθούν tηn
autonómia kai tηn auξhsths tis autoektimhs kathòs epísths kai sthn prosforá
antamoión òi baðmíwn me stócho tηn enthárrywnsh twn machtóñ.
Τέλος, ένα διδακτικό μοντέλο το οποίο αναπτύχθηκε από τους Chamot και Robbins (2005) και επηρέασε την έρευνα είναι ‘η γνωστική προσέγγιση της μάθησης της ακαδημαϊκής γλώσσας’ (the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach -CALLA), το οποίο σχετίζεται με τις πραναφερθείσες θεωρητικές αρχές και μπορεί να χρησιμοποιηθεί ως μέσο ένταξης της διδασκαλίας στρατηγικών στο σχολικό πρόγραμμα. Αρχικά κατασκευάστηκε με σκοπό να ‘διορθώσει’ την έλλειψη της γνωστικής επάρκειας της γλώσσας σε μαθητές που διδάσκονταν την Αγγλική ως δεύτερη γλώσσα. Μετέπειτα, όμως, η χρήση του μοντέλου διευρύνθηκε και στην εκμάθηση της επιπρόσθετης ξένης γλώσσας (English Language Arts, 2006). Οι κύριοι στόχοι του περιλαμβάνουν την επικέντρωση των μαθητών σε θεματικές ασκήσεις, την ανάπτυξη γλωσσικών δεξιοτήτων και ακαδημαϊκής γλωσσικής επάρκειας και τη διδασκαλία αποτελεσματικών στρατηγικών μάθησης (Chamot & Robbins, 2005), ενώ το μοντέλο βασίζεται σε τρεις κύριους άξονες θεωρίας: στον κονστρουκτιβισμό (constructivism), που ασχολείται με τους διαφορετικούς τύπους γνώσης και τις νοητικές διεργασίες, στη θεωρία του σχήματος (schema theory), σύμφωνα με την οποία η οργάνωση των καινούριων πληροφοριών πραγματοποιείται σε νοητικούς ‘χάρτες’ (concept maps) και στην κοινωνικογνωστική θεωρία (social-cognitive theory), που εξηγεί πώς οι άνθρωποι αλληλεπιδρούν για τον σχηματισμό της γνώσης (English Language Arts, 2006).

Προσαρμογή των Στρατηγικών στην Μικτή Τάξη

Δεδομένων των προκλήσεων που αντιμετωπίζουν οι εκπαιδευτικοί που διδάσκουν την αγγλική ως επιπρόσθετη γλώσσα σε μαθητές διαφορετικών ικανοτήτων, ακαδημαϊκών υποβάθρων, επιπέδων και ηλικιών, η προσαρμογή της διδασκαλίας (instructional adaptation), η οποία εξαρτάται πάντα από τον τρόπο διδασκαλίας, το επίπεδο των μαθητών και/ή τις ιδιαίτερες ανάγκες τους, θεωρείται επιτακτική για την παροχή κατανοητών πληροφοριών, για την διασφάλιση της συμμετοχής των μαθητών στην κατασκευή ή τη διαπραγμάτευση νοημάτων, στην παρακολούθηση της προόδου τους και κατ’επέκταση στην ακαδημαϊκή τους επίδοση (Lalas & Bustos, 2012). Σύμφωνα με τους Brooks και Thompson (2005), η παιδαγωγική της προσαρμογής (adaptation pedagogy) πρέπει να στοχεύει στην ισότητα, στην εκπαιδευτική δικαιοσύνη, στην ανοικτότητα και στην έκφραση της μοναδικότητας. Μια εφαρμογή της προσαρμογής της γνώσης αντανακλάται στην ‘Ζώνη Επικείμενης Ανάπτυξης’ (Zone of Primal Development) του Vygotsky.
πλαίσια εμπιστοσύνης και αμοιβαίας φροντίδας, στα οποία οι μαθητές δεν θα πρέπει απλά να είναι ικανοί να κατανοούν το καινούριο υλικό, αλλά και να το συσχετίζουν με την προσωπική τους ζωή.

Επομένως, η προσαρμογή αναφέρεται κυρίως στην συνειδητή προσπάθεια του να δημιουργούνται εναλλακτικά μέσα για να μπορούν οι μαθητές να κατακτήσουν και να εξεταρκεύσουν τη σε βάθος γνώση του περιεχομένου. Συνιστά έναν γενικό όρο για την προσαρμογή στην οργάνωση της τάξης (classroom organization adaptation), την προσαρμογή στην παρουσίαση του διδακτικού υλικού (instructional presentation adaptation) και την προσαρμογή στην ενεργοποίηση της απόκρυψης των μαθητών στα κίνητρα (activating student motivation response adaptation) (Lalas & Salomon, 2007, στο Lalas & Bustos, 2012). Για τους ανωτέρω ερευνητές, η πρώτη υποκατηγορία αναφέρεται στην ενεργοποίηση της πρότερης γνώσης, στην παρουσίαση εκ των προτέρων του λεξιλογίου ή των νέων πληροφοριών, στη χρήση της τεχνικής 'σκέφτομαι δυνατά', στη χρήση περίληψεων και σχεδιαγραμμάτων, στην αξιοποίηση καρτών με σχήματα, μουσική, ζωγραφική, θεάτρο και σε ποιλά άλλα. Η δεύτερη υποκατηγορία αναφέρεται στην εφαρμογή συνεργατικών ομάδων συνομηλίκων, στη φυσική διάταξη της τάξης, στον κατάλληλο φωτισμό, σε χάρτες, υπολογιστές, μεγαλυτερούς έντυπου υλικό και σε ποικίλου τύπου υλικό και εξοπλισμό που μπορούν να υποστούν προσαρμογές. Τέλος, η τελευταία υποκατηγορία περιλαμβάνει τη χρήση πινάκων ανακοινώσεων, διαγραμμάτων, αφισών και ποιημάτων, τη διάθεση επιπλέον χρόνου, την μεγαλύτερη γλωσσική εξάσκηση, την ελεύθερη επιλογή δραστηριοτήτων, την εφαρμογή εξετασμένων δραστηριοτήτων και γενικά ένα σύνολο στρατηγικών που προωθούν την εμπιστοσύνη και αυξάνουν την αυτοπεποίθηση των μαθητών.

Τέλος, οι Whitman και Borgerding (2017) διατείνονται ότι για τους μαθητές που διδάσκονται την Αγγλική γλώσσα ως επιπρόσθετη, η στρατηγική της προσαρμογής για τον σχηματισμό των μαθησιακών στόχων αφορά κυρίως στην προσήλωσή τους στις μαθησιακές στρατηγικές (language learning strategies), στις δομές της γλώσσας και στην γραμματική (language structures and grammar), στο ακαδημαϊκό λεξιλόγιο (academic vocabulary) και στις γλωσσικές λειτουργίες και δεξιότητες (language skills and functions). Κατ’αυτούς, οι εκπαιδευτικοί θα πρέπει να αποφεύγουν πολύπλοκες προτάσεις με σύνθετες δομές, να χρησιμοποιούν
φράσεις ή έννοιες -κλειδιά αντι ολόκληρων προτάσεων, να χρησιμοποιούν υψηλής συχνότητας λέξεις και λέξεις-κλειδιά, να βοηθούν την μάθηση με την χρήση εικόνων και να κάνουν ερωτήσεις για να διασφαλίσουν ότι όλα είναι σαφή για τους μαθητές.

Πέραν των διαφόρων προσεγγίσεων, υπάρχουν και κάποια μοντέλα που έχουν αναπτυχθεί από ξενόγλωσσους εκπαιδευτικούς. Εκτός από το μοντέλο CALLA, οι Freeman και Freeman (1998, όπ. αναφ. στο Kottler et al., 2008) προτείνουν συγκεκριμένες ‘αρχές’ για την επιτυχημένη διδασκαλία σε διαφοροποιημένους μαθητές, οι οποίες στηρίζονται σε κάποιες αρχικές ‘θεματικές ενότητες’ (thematic units) που βοηθούν τους μαθητές να δουν ολόκληρη την εικόνα, να την συσχετίσουν με την ζωή και τις εμπειρίες τους και να βρουν τα κατάλληλα παραδείγματα. Μαζί με τις θεματικές ενότητες, ‘ενότητες μελέτης’ (units of study) θα μπορούσαν να οργανωθούν με τέτοιο τρόπο ώστε οι μαθητές να αναζητήσουν τις ‘απαραίτητες’ απαντήσεις, όπως τις αποκαλούν οι Wiggins και Mc Tighe (2005, όπ. αναφ. στο Kottler et al., 2008), σε περιοδικά, βιβλία ή ιστοσελίδες. Επίσης, οι Freeman και Freeman (1998, όπ. αναφ. στο Kottler et al., 2008) τονίζουν την αναγκαιότητα του αυθεντικού υλικού (authentic material) και της ταυτόχρονης διδασκαλίας προφορικών και γραπτών δεξιοτήτων καθώς επίσης και της συνεργατικής μάθησης και της αλληλεπίδρασης μεταξύ των μαθητών. Οι εκπαιδευτικοί, τέλος, χρειάζονται να επιβραβεύουν τις προσπάθειες των μαθητών, να εκτιμούν τις μητρικές γλώσσες και τον πολιτισμό τους και να δείχνουν πλήρη εμπιστοσύνη στις ικανότητές τους (Kottler et al., 2008).

Μεθοδολογικό πλαίσιο

Το συγκεκριμένο κεφάλαιο του θεωρητικού πλαισίου χωρίζεται σε δύο μέρη: το πρώτο αφορά στις αρχές της γλωσσικής κατάκτησης που διέπουν την έρευνα και το δεύτερο στις διδακτικές προσεγγίσεις και τη μεθοδολογία για τους πολιτισμικά και γλωσσικά διαφοροποιημένους μαθητές. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, η θεωρία του κονστρουκτιβισμού που υιοθετεί την «εκ των άνω προς τα κάτω» μεθοδολογία (top down approach) και ενσωματώνει ψυχολογικές, γνωστικές και κοινωνικές μεταβλητές, θα χρησιμοποιηθεί ως το θεωρητικό πλαίσιο για την «δομή, την υποστήριξη και την πλαισίωση της διατριβής» (Merriam, 2001, σελ. 45).
Αρχές Γλωσσικής Κατάκτησης

Στην παρούσα έρευνα, θεωρήθηκε σκόπιμο να χρησιμοποιηθούν κάποιες θεωρίες που αφορούν στη διδασκαλία της Αγγλικής ως δεύτερης γλώσσας ως θεωρητικό υπόβαθρο για την υποστήριξη των βασικών αρχών της τριγλωσσίας. Από τις πιο σημαντικές θεωρίες της διγλωσσίας είναι «η θεωρία ή υπόθεση της παρακολούθησης» (Monitor Theory or The Monitor Hypothesis) του Krashen, η οποία σχετίζεται με την έννοια της διαφοροποίησης, το «μοντέλο επεξεργασίας της πληροφορίας» (information processing model), κατά το οποίο ο μαθητής αντιμετωπίζεται σαν ενεργός οργανωτής της εισερχόμενης γνώσης, η προοπτική του συνδετισμού (connectionist perspective), σύμφωνα με την οποία οι μαθητές αποδίδουν περισσότερη σημασία στο περιβάλλον παρά στην εσωτερική γνώση και τέλος το μοντέλο συναγωγισμού (competition model), που αναφέρεται στον τρόπο που χρησιμοποιείται η γλώσσα (Halimi, 2011). Από τις πιο σημαντικές έρευνες διγλωσσίας που ακολουθούν, είναι το μοντέλο της «πολιτισμικής αφομοίωσης» (acculturation model) του Schumann (1978), κατά το οποίο οι μαθητές καλούνται να προσαρμοστούν σε μια νέα κουλτούρα, και οι δώδεκα αρχές της παιδαγωγικής για τη διδασκαλία της Αγγλικής ως ξένης γλώσσας (principles of EFL pedagogy) του Brown (2001), που χαράζονται σε γνωστικές, γλωσσολογικές και συναισθηματικές, και περιλαμβάνουν τις αρχές των κινήτρων και της επικοινωνιακής διδασκαλίας, καθώς επίσης και έννοιες που αναπτύσσονται στις θεωρίες των Krashen και Schumann. Στη συνέχεια, η θεωρία του «οριακού επιπέδου» ή του «κατώτατου ορίου» (threshold theory) του Cummins (1976) αποτελεί μια σημαντική συνεισφορά στο χώρο της διγλωσσίας διότι αναφέρεται στα επίπεδα εκείνα της γλωσσικής επάρκειας που πρέπει οι δίγλωσσοι μαθητές να φτάσουν για να καρπωθούν τα γνωστικά πλεονεκτήματα (Ricciardelli, 1992). Σύμφωνα με τους Baker και Jones (1998, σελ. 74), ενώ το πρώτο ‘κατώφλι’ (όριο) είναι το επίπεδο εκείνο στο οποίο το παιδί αποφεύγει τις αρνητικές συνέπειες της διγλωσσίας, το δεύτερο υποδεικνύει το σημείο εκείνο όπου συναντώνται οι δύο γλώσσες και αναπτύσσονται προς όφελος του μαθητή. Από την θεωρία αυτή, αναπτύχθηκε η «αναπτυξιακή υπόθεση αλληλεξάρτησης» (developmental interdependence hypothesis) του Cummins (1978b), σύμφωνα με την οποία η ικανότητα του μαθητή στην δεύτερη γλώσσα εξαρτάται από την ικανότητά του στην πρώτη. Βάσει αυτής της θεωρίας και για να αποφευχθούν παρεξηγήσεις, o Cummins (1984b) αναφέρθηκε στις βασικές διαπροσωπικές επικοινωνιακές
δεξιότητες (BICS-Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) και στην ακαδημαϊκή επάρκεια γλώσσας (CALP- Cognitive / Academic Language Proficiency). Οι βασικές διαπροσωπικές επικοινωνιακές δεξιότητες είναι πιο εύκολο να πραγματωθούν, καθώς οι μαθητές μπορούν να χρησιμοποιήσουν εικόνες, εκφράσεις προσώπου ή και χειρονομίες για να υποστηρίξουν τον λόγο τους αλλά και να μεταφράσουν, να παραφράσουν ή να ζητήσουν επεξήγησης (English Language Arts, 2006). Η ακαδημαϊκή επάρκεια γλώσσας, από την άλλη πλευρά, αναφέρεται σε περιπτώσεις που η γλώσσα δεν υποστηρίζεται από κειμενικό πλαίσιο και αποκαλύπτεται χωρίς καμία βοήθεια ή υποστήριξη. Κατά τον Cummins, που συμφωνεί με τον Krashen στο ότι θα πρέπει να υπάρχει πλαίσιο για να γίνει κατανοητή η εισερχόμενη πληροφορία, ειδικά τα παιδιά ‘μειονοτήτων’, θα πρέπει να διαθέτουν ανεπτυγμένη την κοινή υποκείμενη επάρκεια (common underlying proficiency -CUP) πριν μπουν στην τάξη για να έχουν θετικά μαθησιακά αποτελέσματα, διότι οι ακαδημαϊκές δεξιότητες, η πρότερη γνώση και η γνωστική επάρκεια είναι αλληλένδετες έννοιες. Επομένως, η γλωσσική επάρκεια των μαθητών που μαθαίνουν μια επιπρόσθετη γλώσσα μπορεί να εξεταστεί μέσω του μοντέλου των tεταρτημορίων του Cummins, όπου απεικονίζεται η ομαλή και σταδιακή μετάβαση μεταξύ σταδίων για την κατάκτηση της γνώσης.

Όσον αφορά τον σχεδιασμό της έρευνας, ο κονστρουκτιβισμός που έχει δύο πτυχές, τη γνωστική ανάπτυξη του Piaget και την κοινωνικοπολιτισμική θεωρία του Vygotsky, αποτελεί το θεωρητικό της πλαίσιο κύριος άξονας του οποίου είναι ότι η μάθηση είναι πολιτισμικό μεταφέρεται συγκεκριμένα, από τον Vygotsky, ο οποίος τόνισε την σημασία κάθε πολιτισμού αλλά και της παροχής κατανοητού περιεχομένου, μπορούμε να δανειστούμε την ομαδική και την ομαδική εργασία του Piaget από την άλλη πλευρά προωθεί μια πιο υλιστική προσέγγιση, κατά την οποία η μάθηση λαμβάνει χώρα μέσα από την ανάγνωση, την ακουστική, την εξερεύνηση και την εμπειρία και περιλαμβάνει την αφομοίωση, την εισαγωγή, την ενεργή μάθηση και την ασφορπία (Kaufman, 2004). Σε αντίθεση με την παθητική μετάδοση και αφομοίωση της γνώσης, και οι δύο θεωρίες βασίζονται στο ότι οι άνθρωποι δημιουργούν το δικό τους νόημα μέσω εμπειριών (Aljohani, 2017) και η μάθηση είναι αποτέλεσμα κατασκευής νοητικών εικόνων (Bada, & Olusegun, 2015). Αυτές οι θεωρίες συνάδουν με τις εξελικτικές θεωρίες μάθησης των Vygotsky και Bruner,
την κοινωνική γνωστική θεωρία του Bandura (social cognitive theory) (Shunk, 2000, in Kim, 2001), τη θεωρία του κοινωνικού κονστρουκτιβισμού του Dewey (1997) (social constructivism) και τη μαθητοκεντρική θεωρία διδασκαλίας (learner-centered teaching theory) του Weimer (2013). Όλες οι θεωρίες έχουν ως σημείο σύγκλισης τον μαθητή, του οποίου οι εμπειρίες και ο πολιτισμός πρέπει να λαμβάνονται υπ’όψιν από τον εκπαιδευτικό, ο οποίος πρέπει να στοχεύει στην ανάπτυξη των μεταγνωστικών ικανοτήτων και των ενδογενών κινήτρων. Βάσει των θεωριών αυτών, ο ρόλος του εκπαιδευτικού είναι κεντρικός. Οι εκπαιδευτικοί έχουν κλήση να παρουσιάζουν η πιθανότερη, θετική παρουσία της διδακτικής και της καθηγητικής, αλλά και του εκπαιδευτικού χώρου, η οποία θα πρέπει να παρακολουθείται με θετικό τρόπο την διαδικασία και το περιεχόμενο του μαθήματος. Ωστόσο, ο βασικός στόχος του εκπαιδευτικού είναι να παραμείνει κεντρικός, καθώς η ειδική ελεγκτή θεωρία εκπαίδευσης θεωρεί ότι η διδακτική είναι θεωρία καθηγητικής προσέγγισης με την θέση του καθηγητή στο περιεχόμενο του μαθήματος. Οι εκπαιδευτικοί έχουν κλήση να παρουσιάζουν η πιθανότερη προσέγγιση της διδακτικής και της καθηγητικής, αλλά και του εκπαιδευτικού χώρου, η οποία θα πρέπει να παρακολουθείται με θετικό τρόπο την διαδικασία και το περιεχόμενο του μαθήματος. Ωστόσο, ο βασικός στόχος του εκπαιδευτικού είναι να παραμείνει κεντρικός, καθώς η ειδική ελεγκτή θεωρία εκπαίδευσης θεωρεί ότι η διδακτική είναι θεωρία καθηγητικής προσέγγισης με την θέση του καθηγητή στο περιεχόμενο του μαθήματος. Οι εκπαιδευτικοί έχουν κλήση να παρουσιάζουν η πιθανότερη προσέγγιση της διδακτικής και της καθηγητικής, αλλά και του εκπαιδευτικού χώρου, η οποία θα πρέπει να παρακολουθείται με θετικό τρόπο την διαδικασία και το περιεχόμενο του μαθήματος. Ωστόσο, ο βασικός στόχος του εκπαιδευτικού είναι να παραμείνει κεντρικός, καθώς η ειδική ελεγκτή θεωρία εκπαίδευσης θεωρεί ότι η διδακτική είναι θεωρία καθηγητικής προσέγγισης με την θέση του καθηγητή στο περιεχόμενο του μαθήματος. Οι εκπαιδευτικοί έχουν κλήση να παραμείνει η πιθανότερη, θετική παρουσία της διδακτικής και της καθηγητικής, αλλά και του εκπαιδευτικού χώρου, η οποία θα πρέπει να παρακολουθείται με θετικό τρόπο την διαδικασία και το περιεχόμενο του μαθήματος.

Γενικότερα, στην ξενόγλωσση διαφοροποιημένη τάξη, η γλώσσα αντιμετωπίζεται ως μέσο έμπρακτων επικοινωνιακών ενεργειών παρά σαν σύνολο
στατικών κανόνων, επομένως οι μαθητές μαθαίνουν την γλώσσα για να καταστούν ικανά μέλη μιας συγκεκριμένης γλωσσικής κοινότητας (Hymes, 1972). Ένα σημαντικό χαρακτηριστικό γνώρισμα των κονστρουκτιβιστικών μεθόδων, είναι η χρήση ‘αυθεντικού υλικού’ το οποίο βοηθά τους γλωσσικούς τύπους να εμφανίζονται εκεί που πραγματικά ανήκουν. Η πρακτική της δόμησης και η αποστήθιση δεν είναι αρκετά για την ξενόγλωσση τάξη. Η πρακτική της δόμησης και η αποστήθιση δεν είναι αρκετά για την ξενόγλωσση τάξη. Η πρακτική της δόμησης και η αποστήθιση δεν είναι αρκετά για την ξενόγλωσση τάξη. Η διαδικασία της εκμάθησης της ξένης γλώσσας θα πρέπει να βασίζεται στη δράση, ωθώντας τους μαθητές να εξασκούν τη νέα γνώση σε πραγματικές καταστάσεις (Gul, 2016) με διαδραστικό τρόπο στοχεύοντας στις ανάγκες τους. Σύμφωνα με τον Tallowitz (2008), οι πιο γνωστές αρχές του κονστρουκτιβισμού (συνεργατικός διάλογος, μαθησιακοί στόχοι, βοήθεια, αυθεντικότητα και εργασιοκεντρική προσέγγιση στη διδασκαλία της γλώσσας), επικρατούν αρκετά διαδικασίες δύο δεκαετίες, καθώς και η αξία της κονστρουκτιβιστικής επιστημολογίας για την ξενόγλωσση εκπαίδευση υγείται στην δύναμη της νομιμοποίησης, της αιτιολογίας και της επεξήγησης (Reagan, 1999; von Glasersfeld, 1995a, ὸπ. αναφ. στο Tallowitz, 2008, σελ. 24).

Μεθοδολογία

Για την επίτευξη των σκοπών της παρούσας διδακτορικής διατριβής, η προσέγγιση των μεικτών μεθόδων (mixed methods approach) θεωρήθηκε ως η ιδανική ερευνητική μέθοδος, συνεπώς υιοθετήθηκε το σχήμα ποσοτικής και ποιοτικής προσέγγισης. Ειδικότερα, επιλέχθηκε η ‘επεξηγηματική διαδοχική σχεδίαση’ (the explanatory sequential design) κατά την οποία, αφού πρώτα συλλέχθηκαν και αναλύθηκαν τα ποσοτικά δεδομένα και ακολούθησαν τα ποιοτικά σε δύο διακριτές φάσεις, όλα τα αποτελέσματα ενσωματώθηκαν στην ερμηνεία των τελικών αποτελεσμάτων (Creswell, 2014, σελ. 245). Πιο αναλυτικά, η επιλογή της προσέγγισης των μεικτών μεθόδων έγινε αφού σε πρώτη φάση (ποσοτική προσέγγιση) καταγράφηκαν οι απαντήσεις ενός μεγάλου αριθμού υποκειμένων και σε δεύτερη φάση (ποιοτική προσέγγιση) καταβλήθηκε προσπάθεια να γίνουν εναργέστερα ορισμένα σημεία που παρέμεναν “θολά” από την ποσοτική προσέγγιση. Η χρήση μεικτών μεθόδων ερευνητικού σχεδιασμού έχει πολλες σημασίες, καθώς προσφέρει πληρέστερη συνειδητοποίηση του ερευνητικού προβλήματος, έλυσε και αλληλοσυμπλήρωση των αποτελεσμάτων που συλλέχθηκαν μέσω της ποσοτικής και ποιοτικής προσέγγισης. Επιπλέον, μέσα από
αυτό το συνδυασμό τονώνεται η αξιοπιστία και η ακρίβεια της έρευνας (Creswell, 2011; Robson, 2010).

Η ποσοτική προσέγγιση υλοποιήθηκε μέσω απλής τυχαίας δειγματοληψίας και η ποιοτική υλοποιήθηκε μέσω τυχαίας επιλογής των συμμετέχοντων. Ως εργαλεία συλλογής δεδομένων χρησιμοποιήθηκαν το ερωτηματολόγιο και η ημι-δομημένη συνέντευξη. Οι συμμετέχοντες στην έρευνα ήταν εν ενεργεία εκπαιδευτικοί της Αγγλικής γλώσσας, οι οποίοι υπηρετούσαν σε σχολικές μονάδες που εμπερικλείονται στην Περιφέρεια Δυτικής Ελλάδας (Αχαΐα, Ηλεία και Αιτωλοακαρνανία) και η διεξαγωγή της έρευνας πραγματοποιήθηκε από τον Απρίλιο του 2019 έως και τον Φεβρουάριο του 2020. Αναφορικά με τους συμμετέχοντες στην έρευνα, ως προς την ποσοτική προσέγγιση, 93 εκπαιδευτικοί της Αγγλικής γλώσσας (από τον συνολικό πληθυσμό των 243) ανταποκρίθηκαν στο ερωτηματολόγιο, το οποίο αποτελείται από 75 ερωτήσεις. Αναφορικά με την δομή του ερωτηματολογίου, αυτό αποτελείται από ερωτήσεις που εμπεριέχονταν ήδη σε άλλα χρησιμοποιούμενα όργανα (Dörney, 2003, σελ.52), με πρωτεύον τον «Κατάλογο Στρατηγικών Μάθησης» (SILL) της Oxford (1990), που θεωρείται το πιο ευρέως διαδεδομένο όργανο συλλογής δεδομένων για τις μαθησιακές στρατηγικές στον τομέα της δεύτερης/ξένης γλώσσας. Ο κατάλογος αυτός αποτελείται από έξι ομάδες στρατηγικών οι οποίες περιλαμβάνουν τις στρατηγικές μνήμης, τις μεταγνωστικές, τις συναισθηματικές, τις κοινωνικές, τις γνωστικές και τις αντισταθμιστικές στρατηγικές, και οι ερωτήσεις που αντλήθηκαν από εκεί συνδυάστηκαν με αυτές που εμπερικλείονται στο μοντέλο γνωστικής προσέγγισης της μάθησης της ακαδημαϊκής γλώσσας (CALLA). Επίσης, κάποιες ερωτήσεις διαμορφώθηκαν από ένα σετ στρατηγικών υψηλού αντικτύπου από το τμήμα εκπαίδευσης και μόρφωσης στην πολιτεία της Victoria στην Αμερική (HITS) και κάποια εκπαιδευτικά εν ενεργεία προγράμματα: την υπηρεσία υποστήριξης εθνικών μειονοτήτων του Milton Keynes, που στοχεύει στην κατάκτηση των Αγγλικών ως τρίτης γλώσσας από παιδιά μειονοτήτων και το NALDIC, έως τον εθνικό σύλλογο για την εκμάθηση και διδασκαλία των Αγγλικών ως τρίτης γλώσσας. Τέλος για την διαμόρφωση των ερωτήσεων λήφθηκαν υπ’ όψιν οι στρατηγικές μάθησης υψηλής απόδοσης του Marzano (2009) για τους διαφοροποιημένους μαθητές. Γενικότερα, εξαιτίας του ότι υπάρχει πληθώρα στρατηγικών και πολλές μπορεί να επαναλαμβάνονται σε διάφορα μοτίβα, επιλέχθηκαν αυτές οι στρατηγικές που
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αναφέρονται και στις τέσσερις δεξιότητες των μαθητών. Με αυτό το δεδομένο, το ερωτηματολόγιο αποτελείται από πέντε διακριτά μέρη. Το πρώτο μέρος αφορά στα δημογραφικά δεδομένα τα οποία αποτελούνται από ερωτήσεις κλειστού τύπου, που ενιοτε ακολουθούνται από υπο-ερωτήσεις που πρέπει να απαντηθούν ως εξαρτώμενες από προηγούμενες ερωτήσεις. Τα υπόλοιπα τέσσερα μέρη του ερωτηματολογίου χρησιμοποιούν την κλίμακα Likert (0-5) και αφορούν στην οργάνωση και εκτίμηση των διδακτικών στρατηγικών και μάθησης των Αγγλικών ως τρίτη γλώσσα, στην ικανότητα των μαθητών να ανακαλούν πληροφορίες, στην διαχείριση των συναισθημάτων των μαθητών παράλληλα με την προαγωγή της συνεργατικής μάθησης και τέλος στις νοητικές λειτουργίες των μαθητών και στην ελλειπή γνώση.

Ως προς την ποιοτική προσέγγιση, συμμετείχαν ως συνεντευξιαζόμενοι 12 εκπαιδευτικοί της Αγγλικής γλώσσας, οι οποίοι είχαν συμμετάσχει στην ποσοτική προσέγγιση. Η ημιομομένη συνέντευξη χαρακτηρίζεται, συγκριτικά με τα υπόλοιπα είδη συνέντευξης, από λιγότερο “αυστηρή” δομή και προσφέρεται η δυνατότητα στον συνεντευξιαζόμενο να απαντήσει με μεγαλύτερη άνεση. Ο ερευνητής κατά τη διεξαγωγή της ημιομομένης συνέντευξης έχει ένα ‘οδηγό’, ο οποίος συνήθως εμπεριέχει ένα σύνολο ερωτήσεων. Ωστόσο, οι λέξεις που θα χρησιμοποιήσει και η σειρά των ερωτήσεων δύνανται να διαφοροποιηθούν βάσει της ροής που έχει η συζήτηση (Robson & McCartan, 2016). Η ημιομομένη συνέντευξη που υλοποιήθηκε στα πλαίσια της παρούσας διδακτορικής διατριβής αποτελείτο από 6 ερωτήσεις. Όσον αφορά τους κανόνες δεοντολογίας, κατά τον Creswell (2016), η ηθική θα πρέπει να διέπει την έρευνα από την αρχή μέχρι το τέλος και ο ερευνητής να παρουσιάζει τα δεδομένα χωρίς τροποποιήσεις και ψευδή στοιχεία, στοιχείο που χαρακτηρίζει και την συγκεκριμένη έρευνα. Επιπλέον, η συμμετοχή στην έρευνα (και στις δυο φάσεις) ήταν προαιρετική και διασφαλίστηκε η πλήρης ανωνυμία και εμπιστοσύνη των συμμετεχόντων. Τέλος, όσον αφορά την εγκυρότητα και την αξιοπιστία της έρευνας, το τεστ του Cronbach’s Alpha εφαρμόστηκε στην ποσοτική έρευνα και κατά τη διάρκεια του πιλοτικού ελέγχου, εξετάστηκε η εγκυρότητα του περιεχομένου (content validity), εάν δηλαδή η κλίμακα μετράει την καταλληλότητα στο ερευνητικό εργαλείο (Robson, 2007). Σχετικά με την περιγραφική εγκυρότητα των δεδομένων, αυτή διασφαλίστηκε από τις ποσοτικές μεθόδους που εφαρμόστηκαν καθώς επίσης
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και από τις τεχνικές στις συνεντεύξεις και στην μέθοδο αποκωδικοποίησης των ποιοτικών δεδομένων.

Παρουσίαση δεδομένων

Υπό συνοπτική σκιαγράφηση των δημογραφικών στοιχείων του δείγματος (βάσει της ποσοτικής προσέγγισης), η συντριπτική πλειοψηφία των συμμετεχόντων, οι οποίοι ηλικιακά κυμαίνονται από 31-50 έτη ηλικίας, φέρουν την ελληνική υπηκοότητα και πολιτισμικά διαφοροποιημένοι μαθητών είναι χαμηλό. Επίσης, 9 στους 10 συμμετέχοντες ήταν γυναίκες και σχεδόν το 1/3 των συμμετεχόντων ανέφεραν ότι κατέχουν μεταπτυχιακό δίπλωμα ειδίκευσης. Αναφορικά με τη διαπολιτισμική εκπαίδευση, στην πλειοψηφία τους οι εκπαιδευτικοί απάντησαν ότι δεν έχουν ιδιαίτερες γνώσεις, με συχνότερη πιθανότητα προέλευσης των περισσότερων σεμινάρια ή επιμορφώσεις σε συνδυασμό με προσωπική μελέτη σε θέματα πολυπολιτισμικότητας, στοιχεία που δεν μπορεί να προσμετρηθεί ως επαγγελματική επιμόρφωση. Αναφορικά με τις ερωτήσεις που αποτελούν τον κορμό της έρευνας, προέκυψαν ενδιαφέροντα ευρήματα, τα οποία ανέδειξαν και τη διαφορά μεταξύ των ποσοτικών και των ποιοτικών ευρημάτων.

Η ποιοτική ανάλυση λειτούργησε ως επιπρόσθετο εργαλείο για μια πιο πλήρη και σε βάθος μελέτη της έρευνας, ύστερα από κενά που προέκυψαν από την ποσοτική έρευνα. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, κατέστη εμφανές ότι σχεδόν όλες οι αναφερόμενες στρατηγικές χρησιμοποιούνται σχεδόν πάντα από τους εκπαιδευτικούς, παρά το γεγονός ότι 78 από τους 93 συμμετέχοντες δήλωσαν στην ερωτηματολόγιο ότι δεν είχαν κάποιο ακαδημαϊκό προσόν στην πολυπολιτισμική εκπαίδευση και σχεδόν οι μισοί από αυτούς είχαν λάβει την ελάχιστη δυνατή επιμόρφωση σε θέματα που αφορούν στο συγκεκριμένο μαθητικό πληθυσμό. Αυτό μπορεί ίσως να αποδοθεί είτε στο ότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί δεν αφιέρωσαν τον απαιτούμενο χρόνο για την κατανόηση των ερωτήσεων, είτε επειδή δεν αντιμετώπισαν σφαλματικά την κάθε ερώτηση ως μεμονωμένη στρατηγική (Bertrand and Sendhil, 2001). Επίσης, είναι πιθανόν οι εκπαιδευτικοί να ένιωσαν την ανάγκη να δούσουν ‘αντικειμενικές’ απαντήσεις, παρότι δεν τυχαία οι στρατηγικές που δήλωσαν ότι χρησιμοποιούν τόσο συχνά να αποτελούν μέρος της πραγματικής διδακτικής τους διαδικασίας.
Από την ανάλυση των ποιοτικών δεδομένων, οι απαντήσεις που προέκυψαν μπορούν να κατηγοριοποιηθούν σε επτά θεματικούς τομείς (themes): 1) στην γενική διδακτική τους εμπειρία και γνώση στη διαπολιτισμική εκπαίδευση, 2) στις πιο διαδεδομένες στρατηγικές που χρησιμοποιούν οι εκπαιδευτικοί στην μικτή τάξη, 3) στην ενεργή μάθηση, 4) στις σχέσεις μεταξύ εκπαιδευτικών και τρίγλωσσων μαθητών, 5) στην παροχή δυνατοτήτων στους μαθητές για την ανάπτυξη της πολυγλωσσίας και την χρήση όλων των διαθέσιμων γλωσσών, 6) στην διαχείριση της τάξης και στις πιθανές προκλήσεις και τέλος 7) στην επαγγελματική ανάπτυξη των εκπαιδευτικών και την μελλοντική τους εκπαίδευση. Τα αποτελέσματα ανέδειξαν αρκετές ομοιότητες, που σχετίζονται κυρίως με την επαφή των εκπαιδευτικών με τους διαφοροποιημένους μαθητές και την χρήση συγκεκριμένων-ευρέως χρησιμοποιούμενων- στρατηγικών (π.χ. την στρατηγική της βοήθειας, την συνεργατική μάθηση κ.ά.). Ειδικότερα, όσον αφορά τη διαπολιτισμική εκπαίδευση και στις αντιλήψεις των εκπαιδευτικών στον τομέα αυτό, φάνηκε ότι όλοι οι εκπαιδευτικοί, πλην τριών που ανέφεραν στοιχειώδεις γνώσεις και επιμόρφωση στον τομέα της διαπολιτισμικής εκπαίδευσης, δεν είχαν ιδιαίτερες γνώσεις στο πεδίο αυτό, αν και είχαν επίγνωση της έννοιας, εύρημα που συμφωνεί με τις απόψεις των ελλήνων εκπαιδευτικών γενικής παιδείας (Palaiologou & Faas, 2012). Επιπλέον, μερικοί εκπαιδευτικοί ανέφεραν ότι στην ξενόγλωσση τάξη θα έπρεπε να υιοθετηθεί μια πιο διαπολιτισμική προσέγγιση, η οποία θα απέκλινε από τη συμβατική εκπαίδευση και θα ενθάρρυνε την αλληλεπίδραση διαφόρων γλωσσών και πολιτισμών, πρακτική που θα προοήγαγε τον σεβασμό και την ισό συμμετοχή (Tsaliki, 2012). Άλλοι εκπαιδευτικοί τάχθηκαν υπέρ ενός πιο ’διαχωριστικού’ τύπου εκπαίδευσης, που αποκλείει τους διαφοροποιημένους μαθητές από την υπόλοιπη τάξη και στοχεύει στην ομαλή ενσωμάτωσή τους στο σύνολο των γηγενών μαθητών.

Αναφορικά με τις στρατηγικές που υιοθετούνται στην μικτή τάξη, αυτές φάνηκε ότι επηρεάζονται από τις διαφορετικές προσωπικές πεποιθήσεις των εκπαιδευτικών. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, υπήρξε ομοφωνία στην ανάγκη προσαρμογής των στρατηγικών όταν διδάσκονταν τα Αγγλικά ως τρίτη γλώσσα στην μικτή τάξη. Περισσότεροι από τους μηδέν που συμμετέχουν στη συνέντευξη απάντησαν ότι χρειάζεται να επιλέγουν συγκεκριμένες δραστηριότητες ή να αυτοσχεδίασαν όταν δημιουργούσαν καινούριες, να παραλείπουν ασκήσεις, να τις προσαρμόζουν στις
ανάγκες των μαθητών, να τις υπεραπλουστεύουν ή ακόμα να τις υπεραναλύουν. Επίσης κατέστη εμφανές ότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί δίνουν ιδιαίτερη σημασία στην κατανοητή εισερχόμενη πληροφορία, βοηθώντας τους μαθητές είτε με κάποιον συμμαθητή τους είτε οι ίδιοι προσωπικά, και στοχεύοντας με αυτόν τον τρόπο για εκείνους ένα πιο υψηλό επίπεδο μέσα στη ζώνη επικείμενης τους ανάπτυξης, κάτι το οποίο σύμφωνα με τις κονστρουβιστικές αρχές αποτελεί παράγοντα-κλειδί στην διδασκαλία της γλώσσας.

Επίσης κατέστη εμφανές ότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί δίνουν ιδιαίτερη σημασία στην κατανοητή εισερχόμενη πληροφορία, βοηθώντας τους μαθητές είτε με κάποιον συμμαθητή τους είτε οι ίδιοι προσωπικά, και στοχεύοντας με αυτόν τον τρόπο για εκείνους ένα πιο υψηλό επίπεδο μέσα στη ζώνη επικείμενης τους ανάπτυξης, κάτι το οποίο σύμφωνα με τις κονστρουβιστικές αρχές αποτελεί παράγοντα-κλειδί στην διδασκαλία της επιπρόσθετης γλώσσας.

Εν συνεχεία, η πλειοψηφία των εκπαιδευτικών ανέφεραν ότι προσπαθούν να ενσωματώσουν πολιτισμικά στοιχεία των μαθητών στο μάθημα τους, όπως και λογοτεχνικές πηγές που σχετίζονται με τον πολιτισμό τους, επιβεβαιώνοντας ότι η παιδαγωγική της πολυπολιτισμικής ανταποκρισιμότητας αποτελεί καθοριστικό παράγοντα για την εκμάθηση μιας τρίτης γλώσσας. Συγκεκριμένα, η λογοτεχνία λειτουργεί στους περισσότερους εκπαιδευτικούς ως ένας μέσος για ανταλλαγή συναισθημάτων και έκφρασης της διαφορετικότητας. Οι εκπαιδευτικοί φαίνεται ότι λειτουργούν περισσότερο ως τα πρόσωπα που θα διευκολύνουν τον διάλογο και τις ενδιαφέρουσες συζητήσεις στην τάξη. Σκοπός της απαρχής του διάλογου είναι να ακουστούν οι διαφορετικές απόψεις, οι οπτικές, οι αξίες και τα ήθη και να ‘λάμψει’ η διαφορετικότητα (Hoosein, 2014). Η ‘παραδοχή’ της διαφορετικής αντίληψης στοχεύει στην όξυνση της κριτικής σκέψης, στη διεύρυνση της γνώσης, στον σχηματισμό συσχέτισεων και τέλος στον αυτο-στοχασμό και στην διαμόρφωση ξεχωριστών ταυτοτήτων.

Ένα άλλο θεματικό πεδίο που προέκυψε από τις συνεντεύξεις ήταν η ενεργή μάθηση. Αυτή σκιαγραφήθηκε μέσα από την αναφορά των εκπαιδευτικών στη χρήση της ομαδικής συνεργασίας, πρακτικής που καθιστά τους τρίγλωσσους μαθητές ενεργούς και αυτόνομους αποδέκτες της γνώσης, υπεύθυνους για τη διαχείριση της προσωπικής τους μάθησης. Αυτή η ικανότητα των συγκεκριμένων μαθητών ενισχύεται όταν εκείνοι περιβάλλονται από συμμαθητές τους οι οποίοι αναλαμβάνουν τον ρόλο του μεταφραστή ή του απλού βοηθού, όταν προβλήματα γλωσσολογικά ή κατανόησης προκύπτουν κατά την μαθησιακή διαδικασία. Παράλληλα με την έμφαση στην ομαδοσυνεργατική μάθηση και στις σχετικές στρατηγικές που στοχεύουν στην αυτόνομη μάθηση, όπως π.χ. στην ανάλυση διαφορών και ομοιοτήτων, στη συνεργατικότητα, στην αναστοχασμό και στη χρήση εικόνων και οπτικών μέσων, φαίνεται ότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί προσπαθούν να
συνεχίζουν ό,τι διδάσκουν στην τάξη με 'πραγματικές' εμπειρίες και αξίες και με πραγματικές δεξιότητες ζωής. Αυτό ενισχύεται με τη χρήση παιχνιδιών, μίμησης, τραγουδιών, αντικειμένων καθώς επίσης και εναλλαγών λεξικών από ελάχιστους εκπαιδευτικούς, ώστε να προαχθεί η αλληλεπίδραση μεταξύ μαθητών, η κοινωνικοποίησή τους και η αυτο-έκφραση. Πέρα όμως από τη σημασία που αποδίδουν οι εκπαιδευτικοί στο γνωστικό σκέλος, κυρίως στην αντίληψη, στην προσοχή, στην μνήμη και στη λήψη αποφάσεων, ιδιαίτερη προσοχή δίνεται στις συναισθηματικές και κοινωνικές δεξιότητες, προκειμένου να διευκολυνθεί η ενσωμάτωση των μαθητών τους όχι μόνο στην τάξη αλλά και στην κοινωνία στην οποία ζουν.

Σε σχέση με τα προαναφερθέντα, επίσης, αποκαλύφθηκε ότι όλοι οι εκπαιδευτικοί επιζητούν τις ομαλές σχέσεις, στοχεύοντας στην παιδαγωγική της ισότητας (equity pedagogy), καθώς όλοι αποδέχονται τις υπάρχουσες διαφορές και θεωρούν ότι με τον αμοιβαίο σεβασμό και την αίσθηση ότι ανήκουν στην τάξη, αυτές μπορεί να εξομαλυνθούν και να επέλθει η αποτελεσματική μάθηση. Γι’αυτού τον λόγο, όλα τα βοηθήματα και τα εργαλεία μάθησης θα πρέπει να στοχεύουν στη δημιουργία κλίματος αποδοχής και συνοχής. Αυτή η ξεκάθαρη στάση τους απέναντι στη διαφοροτικότητα και την αποδοχή της επιβεβαιώνει την σημαντικότητα του να διαθέτει ο εκπαιδευτικός πολιτισμική συνάφεια, όπως έχει αποδειχθεί από πληθώρα ερευνών, και παράλληλα δείχνει την έμμεση προσπάθεια των εκπαιδευτικών της Αγγλικής γλώσσας να δημιουργήσουν μια μαθητοκεντρική τάξη, στην οποία οι μαθητές είναι υπεύθυνοι για την μάθησή τους υπό το άγρυπνο βλέμμα των εκπαιδευτικών τους.

Αναφορικά με την ποικιλία των διαθέσιμων γλωσσών στην μικτή τάξη, οι εκπαιδευτικοί ανέφεραν ότι αρκούνται στην σπάνια και αραιή χρήση κάποιων λέξεων ή φράσεων, μόνο ως μέσο ενσωμάτωσης των μαθητών αυτών στο ευρύτερο περιβάλλον, αλλά και εξοικείωσης των υπολοίπων με διαφόρους πολιτισμούς. Η αρνηση της χρήσης των ηπειρικών γλωσσών αποδίδεται από τους ιδίους σε έλλειψη βασικών γνώσεων των εκάστοτε ξένων γλώσσων που φέρουν οι μαθητές στις τάξεις, καθώς επίσης και στην έλλειψη χρόνου και προσωπικού ενδιαφέροντος για την εκμάθηση μιας επιπλέον ξένης γλώσσας που θα λειτουργούσε ως βασικό εργαλείο εκμάθησης της τρίτης γλώσσας από τους διαφοροποιημένους μαθητές.
Ειδικότερα, όσον αφορά στο πρώτο ερευνητικό ερώτημα, εξέταστηκε ο βαθμός στον οποίον η επαγγελματική εμπειρία επηρεάζει την κατάκτηση νέου λεξιλογίου. Δεδομένου ότι η προφορική γλωσσική ανάπτυξη είναι ιδιαίτερα σημαντική στην κατάκτηση της τρίτης γλώσσας και στην ανάπτυξη ακαδημαϊκών ικανοτήτων και εγγραμματισμού, οι εκπαιδευτικοί θα πρέπει να είναι γνώστες των πιο γνωστών λεξικών υποδειγμάτων, έτσι ώστε να χρησιμοποιούν το κατάλληλο υλικό που θα συνδράμει στην ανάπτυξη των μαθητών (Fillmore & Snow, 2000).

Όταν λοιπόν ερωτήθηκαν αναφορικά με συγκεκριμένους τύπους γλωσσικής κατάκτησης και συγκειμενοποίησης για τη διδασκαλία καινούριου λεξιλογίου, υπήρξε ποσοστά εμφανίσθηκαν στη χρήση στρατηγικών μνήμης, στοιχείο το οποίο έδειξε ότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί στοχεύουν στην επίτευξη της κοινής γνώσης. Ωστόσο, οι μαθητές προβοήθησαν σε βαθύτερες μαθησιακές διαδικασίες. Συγκεκριμένα, όσον αφορά στην εκμάθηση καινούριων λέξεων, η χρήση ομόρριζων και μη λεκτικών τεχνικών θεωρείται από τους εκπαιδευτικούς καλό εκπαιδευτικό βοήθημα για την κατανόηση του λεξιλογίου, την ετυμολογία και την προφορική τελειότητα στην επιστροφή γλώσσας. Επιπλέον, υπήρξε ποσοστά καταγράφηκαν όσον αφορά το ζήτημα της διευκόλυνσης της κατάκτησης των νέων λέξεων, άλλο σημαντικό στοιχείο που δεν παραπέμπει στην επιπρόσθετη γλώσσα, αλλά στην επιστροφή γλώσσας. Επηρεάστηκαν στην έρευνα του Σηφάκη (2011), ο οποίος πρότεινε την παρατήρηση της εφαρμογής των τεχνικών αυτών με σκοπό την επαλήθευση τους. Ακόμα και στα ποιοτικά δεδομένα, δεν υπήρχε καμία αναφορά στις τεχνικές με τις οποίες θα μπορούσε να χρησιμοποιηθεί το καινούριο λεξιλόγιο προς όφελος των μαθητών, εκτός από αναφορές σε κάρτες και οπτικά βοηθήματα. Συμπερασμάτως, ο γενικός χρόνος ο πόλος της επαγγελματικής εμπειρίας επηρεάζει την κατάκτηση νέου λεξιλογίου, διαφανής ότι αυτή δεν παρέχει απολύτως ρόλο, πιθανόν διότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί αισθάνονται πολύ καλά γλωσσολογικά προετοιμασμένοι σε αυτόν τον τομέα.
et al., 2011; Mattheoudakis et al., 2017) και δεύτερον, διαφαίνεται η έντονη ανάγκη για επαγγελματική επιμόρφωση των εκπαιδευτικών.

Σχετικά με το δεύτερο ερευνητικό ερώτημα, εξετάστηκε κατά πόσο το σύνολο των στρατηγικών που χρησιμοποιούν οι εκπαιδευτικοί συμβάλλουν στην νοητική -και συναισθηματική- εμπλοκή των μαθητών στο μάθημα και στην προώθηση ενός άλληλεπιδραστικού μαθησιακού περιβάλλοντος, πράγμα το οποίο έρευνες έχουν αποδείξει ότι συμβάλλει σημαντικά στην ανάπτυξη των πολιτισμικών και γλωσσικών διαφοροποιημένων μαθητών (Vaughn et al., 2003; Slavin, 1991). Τα ποσοτικά αποτελέσματα, δεν έδειξαν ιδιαίτερα υψηλά ποσοστά χρήσης στρατηγικών που προέρχονται από την διάδραση και την συνεργατικότητα, αφού οι εκπαιδευτικοί ανέφεραν ότι μερικές φορές χρησιμοποιούν το σετ των άμεσων γνωστικών στρατηγικών συγκροτήματος και αλληλεπίδρασης, καθώς επίσης και τις άμεσες κοινωνικές στρατηγικές της ομαδοποίησης. Αντίθετα, στα ποιουτικά ευρήματα, κατέστη εμφανές ότι η επίτευξη της συνεργατικής και διαδραστικής μάθησης αποτελεί προτεραιότητα στις διδακτικές στρατηγικές των εκπαιδευτικών. Συγκεκριμένα, στις ευρέως χρησιμοποιούμενες στρατηγικές συγκαταλέγονται η επιστράτευση συμμαθητών για την παροχή μαθησιακής υποστήριξης, οι συνεργατικές διαδικασίες και η αλληλεπίδραση μεταξύ των μαθητών, αλλά και μεταξύ μαθητών και εκπαιδευτικών, οι οποίες, όπως έχει αποδειχθεί μέσω ερευνών, όχι μόνο ωφελούν μαθησιακά τους διαφοροποιημένους μαθητές, αλλά μπορούν επίσης να σφυριλατήσουν δυνατές διαπροσωπικές σχέσεις (Snowman & Biehler, 2003).

Στο τρίτο ερευνητικό ερώτημα, εξετάστηκε η πιθανή σχέση μεταξύ της καλλιέργειας ενός θετικού μαθησιακού περιβάλλοντος το οποίο διευκολύνει την μάθηση και τη χρήση όλων των υπαρκτών γλωσσών στην μικτή τάξη. Παρότι έρευνες έχουν δείξει ότι η χρήση των μητρικών γλωσσών μειώνει τα επίπεδα αγχούς των μαθητών και συμβάλλει στη δημιουργία θετικού κλίματος (Manara, 2007), τα ποσοτικά αποτελέσματα δεν έδειξαν σημαντική σχέση μεταξύ των δύο αυτών μεταβλητών. Οι συμμετέχοντες, μέσω των ποιουτικών ευρημάτων, φαίνεται ότι βοηθούν ψυχολογικά τους μαθητές τονώνοντας την αυτοπεποίθησή τους, ενώ είναι θετικοί στη χρήση των διαφόρων γλωσσών με αραίη και μεμονωμένη χρήση λέξεων (εξαιτίας της έλλειψης βασικών γνώσεων), εύρημα που έρχεται σε αντίθεση με τα ποσοτικά ευρήματα, τα οποία μαρτυρούν ευρεία χρήση των μητρικών
γλώσσων. Η αντίθεση αυτή στα ευρήματα μπορεί να υποστηριχθεί με τα επιχειρήματα ότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί επιθυμούν την ενσωμάτωση και την κοινωνική αποδοχή των διαφοροποιημένων μαθητών, και ότι δεν είναι γνώστες των θετικών επιδράσεων που οι ήδη γνωστές γλώσσες μπορεί να έχουν στους μαθητές αυτούς. Εάν οι εκπαιδευτικοί προσπαθούσαν, στο ελάχιστο, να κάνουν χρήση των διαφόρων γλώσσων που έχουν ήδη οικειοποιηθεί οι μαθητές, όχι μόνο θα μπορούσαν να δείξουν σεβασμό στον πολιτισμό των μαθητών αυτών, αλλά θα διευκόλυναν -μέσω των συναφών πολιτισμικών εμπειριών- τη μάθησή τους (Lado, 1964). Είναι βεβαίως αδιαμφισβήτητο ότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί δεν μπορούν να είναι τόσο άμεσα προστασιασμένοι ότε αναφορικά με τη δομή μιας έννοιας γλώσσας αλλά ότε και με τους διαφόρους πολιτισμούς. Παρόλα αυτά, είναι υπεύθυνοι για την απαιτούμενη γνώση, την ενσυναίσθηση και τις απαραίτητες δεξιότητες που συμβάλλουν στην υποβοηθούμενη μάθηση (Gibbons, 2008) και συνεπώς για την ακαδημαϊκή επιτυχία του μαθητικού αυτού πληθυσμού.

Εν συνεχεία, το πέμπτο ερευνητικό ερώτημα εξέτασε συγκεντρωτικά τον βαθμό στον οποίον η επαγγελματική εμπειρία, η ηλικία, η εκπαίδευση και η ακαδημαϊκή κατάρτιση των εκπαιδευτικών που σχετίζεται με τους διαφοροποιημένους μαθητές επηρεάζουν τη γνώση τους και την προτίμησή τους σε συγκεκριμένες στρατηγικές. Τα κύρια ευρήματα δείχνουν ότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί που είναι πιο έμπειροι χρησιμοποιούν περισσότερο τις στρατηγικές σκέψεις και αναπτύσσουν ένα πιο δεκτικό περιβάλλον μεταξύ των μαθητών, εφαρμόζουν περισσότερο γνωστές στρατηγικές και τονίζουν τον ρόλο που θα έπρεπε να παίξουν τόσο οι γονείς των διγλώσσων ως και η μητρική τους γλώσσα στην τάξη. Οι εκπαιδευτικοί που έχουν λάβει εκπαίδευση σχετική με τους μαθητές αυτούς συμφωνούν περισσότερο στη χρήση ‘μεταφραστών’ ή παροχής βοήθειας από τους συμμαθητές τους, εύρημα το οποίο αποτελεί σημαντική παράμετρο στην εκμάθηση της επιπρόσθετης γλώσσας, καθώς έχει αποδειχθεί ότι έτσι καλύτερα συμμαθητές είναι ένας μεταφραστής και οι μητρικές γλώσσες στην ομαλή επικοινωνία και συνεργασία (Kline, 1995, in Allison & Rahm, 2007). Επίσης, όσοι εκπαιδευτικοί έχουν αναπτύξει επαγγελματικά σε θέματα που αφορούν σε διαφοροποιημένους μαθητές συμφωνούν με τη χρήση μεταφραστή ή συμμαθητή για μαθησιακή υποστήριξη, αλλά προσπαθούν επίσης να διευκολύνουν τα μαθήματα περισσότερο και να μάθουν στους μαθητές πώς να μαθαίνουν. Αντίθετα, όσοι εκπαιδευτικοί
έχουν επιμορφωθεί μόνοι τους τείνουν να να χρησιμοποιούν περισσότερο γνωστικές στρατηγικές, ταξινομώντας λέξεις και χρησιμοποιώντας γλωσσάρια, ενώ κάνουν και αυτοί εκτενή χρήση των συμμαθητών που παρέχουν βοήθεια μεταφέροντας ή μεταφράζοντας γλωσσικά στοιχεία. Αναφορικά με την επαναλαμβάνομενη στρατηγική της αξιοποίησης συμμαθητών ή μεταφραστών, θα μπορούσε να παρατηρηθεί ότι αυτή η στρατηγική μπορεί να συμπεριληφθεί στην ομάδα αντισταθμιστικών στρατηγικών, δεδομένου ότι συνιστά μια μορφή επίκλησης βοήθειας, ξεπερνώντας πιθανούς περιορισμούς στον προφορικό και γραπτό λόγο. Άλλοι τύποι εκπαίδευσης των εκπαιδευτικών δεν φάνηκε ότι επιδρούν ιδιαίτερα θετικά στη χρήση συγκεκριμένων στρατηγικών, πέραν του ότι δεν διευκολύνουν την κατάκτηση νέου λεξιλογίου. Τέλος, η κατάρτιση των εκπαιδευτικών στην πολυπολιτισμική εκπαίδευση φάνηκε να έχει θετική επίδραση. Οι εκπαιδευτικοί που έχουν λάβει τέτοια εκπαίδευση, προωθούν τον έπαινο και τον σεβασμό, προσαρμόζουν την διδασκαλία τους σε μεγαλύτερο βαθμό, κάνουν μεγαλύτερη χρήση εμπειρικών καταστάσεων και χρησιμοποιούν υποστηρικτικό υλικό μέσω παιχνιδιών και εικόνων. Συνεπώς, χρησιμοποιούν ως επί το πλείστον άμεσες, συναισθηματικές στρατηγικές όταν στοχεύουν στην ενθάρρυνση των μαθητών, και άμεσες στρατηγικές μνήμης όταν επιθυμούν τον σχηματισμό νοητικών εικόνων με σκοπό την ανάκτηση ή αποθήκευση πληροφοριών.

Το έκτο και τελικό ερευνητικό ερώτημα εξέτασε την πιθανή προσαρμογή των μαθημάτων και την χρήση διαφοροποιημένων στρατηγικών διδασκαλίας. Σύμφωνα με το Ενιαίο Πρόγραμμα Σπουδών Ξένων Γλωσσών (ΕΠΣ-ΞΓ), η διαφοροποιημένη διδασκαλία παίζει σημαντικό ρόλο στη διδασκαλία της ξένης γλώσσας (Sougari & Mavroudi, 2019) και οι εκπαιδευτικοί θα πρέπει να την ενσωματώνουν στη διδασκαλία τους. Στην συγκεκριμένη έρευνα, παραδείγματα προσαρμογών και διαφοροποιημένης διδασκαλίας ερευνήθηκαν και στα ερωτηματολόγια και ιδιαίτερως στις συνεντεύξεις, από τις οποίες παρέχονται στιγμιότυπα πρακτικών των εκπαιδευτικών, τα οποία καταδεικνύουν την επιθυμία των εκπαιδευτικών να αποσπάσουν το ενδοιασμό των μαθητών και να παράσχουν ίση πρόσβαση στο μαθησιακό υλικό και στις δραστηριότητες. Κατέστη εμφανές ότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί αναγνωρίζουν την «μη ορατή» διαφοροποιημένη των μαθητών και ευνοούν όλους τους τύπους προσαρμογών, από την παρουσία της διδασκαλίας και της προσαρμοστικότητας στην οργάνωση της τάξης ως τις προσαρμογές στην
απόκριση των μαθητών και στα κίνητρά τους. Επίσης, φαίνεται ότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί είναι ανεκτικοί ως προς τους πολιτισμούς των μαθητών, δημιουργώντας διαδικασίες τέτοιες που να διασφαλίσουν ένα φιλόξενο, φιλικό και ισότιμο μαθησιακό περιβάλλον. Στα ποσοτικά δεδομένα διαφαίνεται ότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί παρέχουν αυθεντικό υλικό που σχετίζεται με τα βιώματα των μαθητών, επιστρέφοντας σχετικές κάρτες και οπτικό υλικό, ενεργοποιούν την πρότερη γνώση, απλοποιούν την ύλη, χρησιμοποιούν την επαγωγική και απαγωγική μέθοδο και παρουσιάζουν από πριν λεξιλόγιο καθώς και πληροφορίες σχετικές με τη θεματική περιοχή του μαθήματος.

Κατά τον ίδιο τρόπο, στα ποσοτικά ευρήματα οι διαφοροποιημένες στρατηγικές φάνηκε ότι αποτελούν κυρίαρχα μέλη των εκπαιδευτικών, οι οποίοι ανέφεραν ότι χρησιμοποιούν την ατομική και συλλογική εργασία -είτε σε ζευγάρια είτε σε ομάδες-, τη στρατηγική του μεταφραστή, καθώς και έντονας επαίνους και σχόλια ενθάρρυνσης για να επιτευχθεί το θετικό παιδαγωγικό κλίμα στην τάξη. Επίσης, μέσα από την ομόφωνη παραδοχή των εκπαιδευτικών της ανάγκης προσαρμογής και διαφοροποίησης του υλικού, διαφάνηκε ότι εκείνοι προσαρμόζουν το υλικό τους είτε απλοποιώντας το είτε προσαρμόζοντάς το στις ανάγκες του εκάστοτε μαθητή, ενώ παρέχουν ταυτόχρονα τόσο ειδικά διαμορφωμένο χώρο εργασίας με τον κατάλληλο εξοπλισμό υποστήριξης, όσο και επιπλέον χρόνο.

Σε ένα γενικότερο πλαίσιο, από τα ποσοτικά δεδομένα, κατέστη εμφανές ότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί έχουν επαρκή παιδαγωγική γνώση αναφορικά με τις πιο αποτελεσματικές και περιεκτικές στρατηγικές που στοχεύουν στον συγκεκριμένο μαθητικό πληθυσμό και χρησιμοποιούν μια μεγάλη γκάμα στρατηγικών, μεταξύ των οποίων οι πιο ευρέως χρησιμοποιούμενες είναι η παροχή βοήθειας, η ενεργοποίηση της πρότερης γνώσης, η απλοποίηση των διδακτικών διαδικασιών και η διαφοροποίηση των διαθέσιμων δραστηριοτήτων. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, στα ποσοτικά δεδομένα καταγράφηκαν υψηλά ποσοστά στη χρήση των έμμεσων μεταγνωστικών στρατηγικών που βοηθούν τους μαθητές να συντονίζουν την μάθησή τους, και στη χρήση των έμμεσων συναισθηματικών στρατηγικών ως προς την παροχή θετικών σχολίων και ανταμειβών. Αντίθετα, η προοπτική της ισότιμης συμμετοχής χωρίς αποκλεισμούς δεν έλαβε υψηλά ποσοστά στα ποσοτικά δεδομένα εν συγκρίσει με τα ποιοτικά, όπου και οι δώδεκα
εκπαιδευτικοί φάνηκαν να χρησιμοποιούν εκτενώς κοινωνικοσυναισθηματικές στρατηγικές, γνωστικές στρατηγικές, οικοσυναισθηματικές, και σπουδαιότερες μυθικές. Αυτό μπορεί να στοιχειωθεθεί με τις απαντήσεις των εκπαιδευτικών που ανέφεραν ότι κύριο μέλημά τους ήταν να διευθετήσουν καθημερινές διαφωνίες ή συγκρούσεις και να προωθήσουν την συνεργατικότητα και πνεύμα πολιτισμικής ανεκτικότητας μάλλον, παρά να βοηθήσουν τα παιδιά να προοδεύσουν σε γνωστικό επίπεδο. Επιπλέον, στις συνεντεύξεις κατέστη εμφανές ότι ενώ οι εκπαιδευτικοί είχαν αντίληψη της έννοιας της διαπολιτισμικής αγωγής και των πιθανών πλεονεκτημάτων που μπορεί να έχουν οι δίγλωσσοι μαθητές έναντι των μονόγλωσσων, η πραγματική εφαρμογή συγκεκριμένων στρατηγικών αποσύρθηκε από τις μικτές τάξεις, στοιχείο το οποίο αυτομάτως μείωσε την εγκυρότητα των ποσοτικών αποτελεσμάτων. Επίσης, έγινε ιδανικό αντιληπτό το ότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί αναλαμβάνουν το ρόλο 'ανθρωπιστών' και χρησιμοποιούν σχεδόν κατ' αποκλειστικότητα κοινωνικοσυναισθηματικές στρατηγικές, στρατηγικές πολιτισμικής συνάφειας, ενώ ακολουθούν πολιτισμικά ευαισθήτες στρατηγικές για να λειάνουν τις σχέσεις, να ελέγχουν το άγχος αυτών των μαθητών και να επιτυχήσουν ένα είδος «κοινωνικής δικαιοσύνης και ισότητας». Ένα άλλο σημείο είναι ότι οι έρευνες έκριναν το ότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί είχαν θεωρήσει τη μικτή τάξη ως μια από τις καλύτερες εκπαιδευτικές διατάξεις, που στόχευαν στην επίτευξη της πολυευαίσθητης ανεκτικότητας και της συνεργατικότητας. Επιπλέον, στις προκριματικές ερευνές έδειχναν ότι τα αποτελέσματα κατατάσσονταν ως ισότιμα με τα αποτελέσματα των μονόγλωσσων γλωσσικών συγκρούσεων, παρά την εθνική και πολιτισμική ανεκτικότητα. Αναφορικά με τη χρήση όλων των διαθέσιμων γλωσσών στην μικτή τάξη, κανένας εκπαιδευτικός δεν αναφέρθηκε στην αξία της χρήσης της μητρικής γλώσσας των μαθητών, στους διαφορετικούς μηχανισμούς επεξεργασίας των δεδομένων ή στις τυπολογικές / γλωσσολογικές ομοιότητες μεταξύ των γλωσσών, παρά το γεγονός ότι τάχθηκαν υπέρ της χρήσης των μητρικών γλώσσων, με σκοπό την τόνωση του γοήτρου αυτών των μαθητών και την αποδοχή και ενσωμάτωσή τους σε ένα περιβάλλον ανοικτό στην ετερότητα και δεκτικό στην ανομοιογένεια και την ποικιλομορφία. Με βάση και έρευνες που αποδεικνύουν την επίδραση των μητρικών γλώσσων στην εκμάθηση μιας επιπλέον γλώσσας, και δεδομένου ότι όλες
οι διαθέσιμες γλώσσες συγκλίνουν και αλληλεπιδρούν μέσω ενός δυναμικού
συστήματος στους τρίγλωσσούς μαθητές (Haukás, 2016) επιφέροντας κυρίως
θετικά αποτελέσματα, συστήνεται η εξοικείωση των εκπαιδευτικών με τις ήδη
υπάρχουσες / αποκτηθείσες γλώσσες των μαθητών στον μέγιστο δυνατό βαθμό,
καθώς επίσης και η χρήση αυτών σε νέα μαθησιακά περιβάλλοντα προς όφελος των
μαθητών.

Περιορισμοί έρευνας – Συζήτηση

Τα ευρήματα της έρευνας τόσο από τα ερωτηματολόγια όσο και από τις
συνεντεύξεις δεν συγκλίνουν. Ενώ κατέστη εμφανές από τα ερωτηματολόγια ότι η
πλειονότητα των εκπαιδευτικών έχουν θετική στάση απέναντι στους γλωσσικά και
πολιτισμικά διαφοροποιημένους μαθητές τους και χρησιμοποιούν διάφορες γενικές
μεθοδολογικές πρακτικές, εντούτοις οι συμμετέχοντες απέφυγαν να αναφερθούν σε
συγκεκριμένες βασικές στρατηγικές οι οποίες -βάσει ερευνών- αποδεδειγμένα
συμβάλλουν στην επιτυχή διδασκαλία και εκμάθηση της τρίτης γλώσσας.

Επίσης, παρά το γεγονός ότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί έχουν επίγνωση των πλεονεκτημάτων
της πολυγλωσσίας στους μαθητές, η πλειοψηφία αυτών δεν περιλαμβάνει την
μητρική τους γλώσσα στην διδασκαλία- παραβλέποντας με αυτόν τον τρόπο τα
πιθανά οφέλη μιας τέτοιας στάσης- και αντ’ αυτού επιλέγουν είτε τη δεύτερη
(Ελληνικά) είτε την τρίτη (Αγγλικά) γλώσσα. Παρ’ όλα αυτά, εκλαμβάνουν τις
μητρικές γλώσσες των μαθητών ως έρεισμα και τις χρησιμοποιούν ως μέσο για την
πιο ομαλή εκμάθηση της επιπρόσθετης γλώσσας. Επιπλέον, αυτά τα ευρήματα δείχνουν
ότι οι εκπαιδευτικοί αντιλαμβάνονται κατά κύριο λόγο το ρόλο τους ως
πολιτισμικοί διαμεσολαβητές αλλά δεν έχουν απόλυτη εμπιστοσύνη στις
στρατηγικές που χρησιμοποιούν η πλειοψηφία των οποίων επίσης συναρτάται με
τους διάφορους πολιτισμούς που συνυπάρχουν στην τάξη. Αυτό υποδηλώνει την
επίπονη προσπάθεια των εκπαιδευτικών να προσαρμοστούν στις απαιτήσεις του
εκάστοτε σχολικού πλαισίου και να το διαχειριστούν αποτελεσματικά.

Αναφορικά με τους σχετικούς περιορισμούς της έρευνας, η συγκεκριμένη
έρευνα αφορά αποκλειστικά σε ξενόγλωσσους καθηγητές πρωτοβάθμιας
εκπαίδευσης και συνεπώς τα αποτελέσματα δεν μπορούν να γενικευτούν σε όλες τις
βαθμίδες. Επίσης, παρά τις προσπάθειες του ερευνητή, το ποσοστό διαθεσιμότητας
tων συμμετεχόντων δεν ήταν ικανοποιητικό, δείχνοντας έτσι είτε την έλλειψη
ενδιαφέροντος από μεριά τους είτε την έλλειψη χρόνου και διάθεσης για την
συμπλήρωση του ερωτηματολογίου. Η υποκειμενικότητα, δε, των συμμετεχόντων
dεν μπορεί να διασφαλιστεί διότι η ερμηνεία των ερωτήσεων μπορεί να διαφέρει
από αυτή του ερευνητή. Επίσης, είναι πιθανό οι συμμετέχοντες να επιθυμούν να
φανούν αρεστοί και κοινωνικά αποδεκτοί ή να μην είναι γνώστες του τι
dιατείνονται ότι ισχύει και του τι πραγματικά συμβαίνει πρακτικά στην τάξη τους.

Συμπεράσματα – Προτάσεις

Με βάση όσα έχουν προαναφερθεί, η έρευνα προτρέπει στην αναθεώρηση ή
ακόμα και στον εκσυγχρονισμό των διαπολιτισμικών πρακτικών στην ξενόγλωσση
τάξη, αλλά και του ευρύτερου νομοθετικού πλαίσιο που προσδιορίζει τη
διδασκαλία της Αγγλικής γλώσσας σε τρίγλωσσους μαθητές στο Ελληνικό
ekπαιδευτικό πλαίσιο. Επιπρόσθετα, τα ευρήματα της έρευνας υποδεικνύουν την
επιτακτική ανάγκη η επιμόρφωση των εκπαιδευτικών να αντικαταστήσει την απλή
αναφορά σε θεωρητικές αρχές ή την σπάνια αξιοποίηση ακόμα και την παράλειψη
συγκεκριμένων στρατηγικών με ένα συμπαγές επιμορφωτικό πλαίσιο ειδικά
σχεδιασμένο για Έλληνες εκπαιδευτικούς της Αγγλικής γλώσσας, το οποίο θα
περιλαμβάνει νέες προτομολογίες και κατευθύνσεις για την πρακτική εφαρμογή
αποτελεσματικών στρατηγικών διδασκαλίας της τρίτης γλώσσας.

Ιδιαίτερα τα ποιοτικά δεδομένα τονίζουν τον κεντρικό ρόλο των
ekπαιδευτικών σε melλοντικές μεταρρυθμιστικές διαδικασίες. Σε αυτά οι
ekπαιδευτικοί υποστηρίζουν ότι η επιθυμητή αλλαγή θα έρθει μόνο εάν
αναπτυξθούν συνεκτικά επιμορφωτικά πλαίσια και εάν δημιουργηθούν
ekπαιδευτικές κοινότητες μεταξύ ekπαιδευτικών και εμπειρογνωμόνων. Εάν
enσωματώνονταν οι απόψεις των δειγματικών μαθητών, αναφορικά με τις
στρατηγικές που χρησιμοποιούν, ίσως θα ήταν πιο σαφής η διαδικασία εκμάθησης
της τρίτης γλώσσας από πραγματολογική και γλωσσολογική πλευράς. Βάσει
ερευνών και θεωρητικών πλαισίων, μια ταυτόχρονη εισπίπτεση σε ekπαιδευτικούς και
μαθητές, και η παραγωγή ενός υβριδικού ekπαιδευτικού μοντέλου, θα ανέσυρε
σημαντικές πληροφορίες και θα διαφώτιζε σημαντικά τον συγκεκριμένο τομέα. Μία
makροσκελής έρευνα θα μπορούσε να καταδείξει τον καλύτερο δυνατό τρόπο με
tον οποίο αποκτώνται οι επιπρόσθετες γλώσσες αφενός, και αφετέρου θα βοηθούσε
tους ekπαιδευτικούς να ενσαχύσουν τις πρακτικές τους, να διευρύνουν τους
ορίζοντές τους και να αποκτήσουν γερό υποβαθμο γνώσεων για να μπορέσουν να
διδάξουν επιτυχώς την επιπρόσθετη γλώσσα. Σύμφωνα με τους Hadjioannou, et al. (2016, σελ. 25), στη θέση ενός σύντομου προγράμματος εκπαίδευσης των εκπαιδευτικών θα ήταν πιο αποτελεσματική μια πιο κονστρουκτιβιστική επιμορφωτική προσέγγιση προς την ανάπτυξη και εδραίωση της διαπολιτισμικότητας, μέσα από μια συνεχιζόμενη και πολυετή εφαρμογή προγραμμάτων που θα διασφάλιζαν τη μόνιμη αναμόρφωση των διδακτικών προσεγγισεων και στρατηγικών. Μια τέτοιας μορφής επαγγελματική ανάπτυξη ίσως θα είχε σημαντική επίδραση στη δημιουργία πιο ισότιμων μαθησιακών περιβαλλόντων, καθώς επίσης και στην παροχή ίσων ευκαιριών προς όλους τους μαθητές ώστε να κατακτήσουν μια ξένη ή επιπρόσθετη γλώσσα.


