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Abstract

Human mobility across socially constructed borders is on the rise and Greece is a country which for its advantageous geographical position receives many of these people. This new reality challenges the notion of the traditional nation–state and calls for educational reform to address the needs of its diverse population. In this context, the present research attempts to describe the situation in foreign schools in Greece, assuming that they promote multilingualism. In particular, we seek to explore the attitudes of teachers teaching Greek as a second language in these schools towards translanguaging and their actual practices in the language classroom. Towards this goal, an online questionnaire featuring both quantitative and qualitative questions was designed and addressed to all thirty foreign schools in Greece to get answers from twenty-two teachers who work in nine of these schools. It has been found that although the teachers recognize the benefits translanguaging can have on students and their learning to a certain degree, many amongst them do not involve students’ first languages in learning and instead opt for the use of a third common language, mainly English, for instruction. Still they consider translanguaging as a scaffold for the learning of the second language and limit its acceptable use to low proficiency levels ignoring its potential benefits in high-order thinking and the development of a strong linguistic repertoire for different social functions. This study concludes that further teacher training is required along with revision of monolingual policies and proper implementation of intercultural education for all students. Finally, it reveals the need for an update of the legal framework concerning the function of foreign schools in Greece.

Keywords

Translanguaging, practices, teachers’ beliefs, education, benefits, language, equity.
Περίληψη

Η ανθρώπινη κινητικότητα κατά μήκος κοινωνικά κατασκευασμένων συνόρων ανεξάντει και η Ελλάδα είναι μια χώρα που χάρη στην προνομιακή γεωγραφική της θέση δέχεται πολλούς από αυτούς τους ανθρώπους. Αυτή η νέα πραγματικότητα θέτει υπό αμφισβήτηση την έννοια του παραδοσιακού έθνους-κράτους και καλεί σε αναμόρφωση του εκπαιδευτικού συστήματος για να καλυφθούν οι ανάγκες του διαφοροποιημένου πληθυσμού. Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο, η παρούσα έρευνα επιχειρεί να περιγράψει την κατάσταση στα ξένα σχολεία στην Ελλάδα, με την υπόθεση ότι προωθούν τη διαγλώσσια. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, θέλουμε να διερευνήσουμε τις αντιλήψεις εκπαιδευτικών που διδάσκουν τα Ελληνικά ως δεύτερη γλώσσα σε αυτά τα σχολεία ως προς τη διαγλώσσικότητα και τις πρακτικές τους στη γλωσσική τάξη. Για αυτόν τον σκοπό δημιουργήθηκε ένα διαδικτυακό ερωτηματολόγιο με ποσοτική και ποιοτική προσέγγιση και απευθύνθηκε στα τρίαντα ξένα σχολεία στην Ελλάδα. Τελικά συνελέγησαν απαντήσεις από είκοσι δύο εκπαιδευτικούς που εργάζονταν σε εννέα από αυτά τα σχολεία.

Βρέθηκε ότι, αν και οι συμμετέχοντες αναγνωρίζουν τα οφέλη της διαγλώσσικότητας για τους μαθητές και την μάθηση ως ένα βαθμό, πολλοί από αυτούς δεν εμπλέκουν τις πρώτες γλώσσες των μαθητών στη μάθηση και αντί για αυτό, επιλέγουν τη χρήση μιας τρίτης κοινής γλώσσας, κυρίως τα αγγλικά, για τη διδασκαλία. Ακόμη, θεωρούν τη διαγλώσσικότητα ως μια σκαλωσιά/ υποβοήθημα για την εκμάθηση της δεύτερης γλώσσας και περιορίζουν την αποδεκτή χρήση της σε χαμηλά επίπεδα αγνοώντας τα πιθανά οφέλη της στην περίπλοκη σκέψη και την ανάπτυξη ενός γλωσσικού ρεπερτορίου για διαφορετικές κοινωνικές λειτουργίες. Αυτή η μελέτη συμπεραίνει ότι απαιτείται περαιτέρω εκπαίδευση των εκπαιδευτικών όπως και αναθέωρηση των μονογλωσσικών πολιτικών και ουσιαστική εφαρμογή της διαπολιτισμικής εκπαίδευσης για όλους τους μαθητές. Τέλος, διαπιστώνεται η ανάγκη για αναθέωρηση του νομικού πλαισίου που αφορά στη λειτουργία των ξένων σχολείων στην Ελλάδα.
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1. Introduction

The performative role of language in every aspect of human, social life is undisputable (Fairclough, 1995). In the modern world the concept of borders tends to blur and the movement of people across these socially constructed lines is becoming a commonality. That seems to be the case when it comes to linguistic borders as well (Creese & Blackledge, 2010). People tend to use all their communicative repertoires, all their means to make meaning of the fluid world that surrounds them and to get their messages across (Garcia, 2009). However, this process is not always easy, nor should it be considered given. Monolingual language policies spread all over the world (Avermaet et al., 2014; Wang, 2016), limit down peoples’ opportunities to learn and express themselves multilingually (Makalela, 2015) and fill them with sentiments of inferiority and even guilt (Creese & Blackledge, 2010). Especially in formal education, multilingual practices are demonized as non-academic and destructive of the official school language and blamed for bilingual students’ low achievement rates (Helot & Young, 2005). As a result, the use of home languages at school or even medium languages in learning is considered -by a certain group of education specialists- inappropriate, and they contest it should be avoided.

However, contemporary approaches of the problem and research on bilingualism, multilingualism and education seem to have overpassed these biases starting from a holistic view of language as a complex and fluid system that allows people to communicate in different contexts (Garcia, 2016). Reconceptualizing language as a whole –integrated- system and leaving behind dichotomies created by traditional named languages (Makoni & Pennycook, 2005; Busch, 2013), these approaches reframe the problem of flexible language use at school and set the scene for an inclusive education, allowing bilingual, multilingual or plurilingual people to overcome these conventional barriers to their learning and communication, and promoting equity for all students (Yadira-Herrera, 2017). Research shows that translanguaging, or else, the natural process of using all potential resources to make sense of the world and communicate meanings, is indeed beneficial, not only in learning but in all students’ wellbeing as well (Garcia, Johnson & Seltzer, 2017; Garcia, 2016; Tsokalidou & Koutoulis, 2015).

Considering the situation in Greece, which is the context of the present research, it has been a destination country for migrants from Albania, other ex-communist Balkan countries and countries of eastern Europe, countries of the former Soviet Union, as well as of the Middle East, Asia and Africa since the end of the 80s (Triantafyllidou, 2005) and more recently, since
2015, Europe’s doorway for refugees from the suffering East and Africa (Henley, 2018). More precisely, according to IOM Europe flow monitoring, 1,119,822 people have arrived at Greece from 1.1.2015 to 7.1.2019. The UNHCR fact sheet for 2018 issued in October 2018 estimates that 67100 people have remained in Greece since the 2015 flow and according to the same source, the ministry of education estimates that over 11000 refugee and asylum-seeking children attend formal education on the islands and the mainland.

As Tsaliki (2016) reports, “the Ministerial Decision 2/378/1/1124/1994 published in 1994 includes all the necessary information regarding the foundation and operation of reception classes and intensive classes...They operate as parallel classes which help pupils to adjust themselves to the mainstream class”, whereas, she notes, “no provision was made for the preservation and teaching of their first language and culture”. Additionally, in 1996, public schools with foreign pupils above 40% of the total school population were granted the option to be characterized Intercultural schools by law 2413/1996 on intercultural education. These schools apart from Greek, “provide courses on the language and culture of the country of origin of migrant pupils”. Since 1996, a total of 26 such schools had been established across the country until 2012. Out of 15,174 state schools, these intercultural schools corresponded to 0.17%, whereas there were 12% of students with a migrant background (excluding Muslims and Roma children) in Greek primary schools (Palaiologou and Evangelou, 2011, as cited in Palaiologou & Faas, 2012, pages 566-567). The State did not respond immediately to the need to accommodate the 2015 influx of people for education and this role was undertaken solely by NGOs until October 2016 when the State (decision number 180647/ΓΔ4) founded institutions called DYEP (Reception structures for the education of refugees) and the following year, ZEP (zones of educational priority) for the preparation of refugee children to attend mainstream education. However, teachers who work there contend these classes are not properly organized and any work done, rests with teachers’ good will. Ziomas, Capella and Konstantinidou (2017) recognize the deficiencies of this institution at its initial phase as follows: “absence of afternoon Reception/Preparatory Classes on the islands (which implies that refugee and migrant children did not have access to any formal educational activities), lack of cooperation (in both administrative and educational terms) between the school and the Reception/Preparatory Classes, insufficient numbers of teachers with relevant experience and appropriate skills, non-regular attendance of many pupils along with the fact that many dropped out of school”. Counting the children that make up the multicultural capital of schools in Greece
we should not forget those children coming from other countries mostly as migrants, assumingly the most privileged ones, who have the chance to get an education in one of the 30 privately-run, recognized by the State as Foreign/ International schools in Greece (by par.8 of article 35 of law 4186/2013, as supplemented by par.1 of article 90 of law 4485/2017, see Appendix A).

Summing up, as the population of the country is increasingly diverse, so are the classrooms where children are educated. Apart from DYEP, ZEP, informal classes given by NGOs, intercultural and foreign schools, all mainstream classrooms are either already or on the verge of being multilingual. As Greece is an increasingly multicultural country, the need for an inclusive education that accommodates all children's needs is imperative, and the revision of the long-standing monolingual policy in mainstream classrooms is relevant more than ever. Translanguaging pedagogy is to be seriously considered. The present research draws on the assumption that Foreign and International schools are ideal places for the development of bilingualism/ multilingualism, places of tolerance of diversity, that can provide teachers and policy-makers with good school practices responding to the contemporary multicultural needs of the society. This research aims to reveal patterns related to translanguaging pedagogy that appear in assumed as ideal multilingual spaces and which could be deployed in informing general education curricula and state policies concerning language issues.

This research is important, as it will allow the reader, possibly a teacher of language or other subject, to reflect on his/her own beliefs and practices and to enhance his/her professional development. Potentially, this research can be expanded on other settings (DYEP, mainstream schools and other organizations that offer second language classes) and in other school subjects, and its findings could inform new curricula and policies related to the use of language in schools. Finally, this research could simply inspire teachers to try harder for their students, because, practice has shown, teachers truly can make a difference.

Towards this goal, this thesis attempts a critical review of literature concerning current theorization of language as a concept, translanguaging and code-switching, translanguaging pedagogy in the classroom and its benefits, and translanguaging practices in the language classroom. The literature review concludes with a presentation of teachers’ beliefs on TL as found by research with the purpose to describe the case of foreign schools in Greece through the eyes of teachers who work there. This thesis is thus attempting an inclusive presentation of
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the situation as far as translanguaging practices are considered in foreign schools in Greece by gathering and analyzing teachers’ of Greek views of translanguaging, their reported practices in the classroom and their suggestions for effective second language teaching.
2. Literature Review

2.1. Theory of Language

In the context of this research translanguaging, is viewed as a language teaching practice, one of the practical realizations of teachers’ methodology as it is illustrated by Rodgers (2001) in Table 1. As a method is theoretically related to an approach, a theory of language in this particular context, it is necessary to look into the theories of language that inform teachers’ selected instructional designs and of course their practices.

To begin with, traditionally language was “conceptualized as discrete “codes” with stable boundaries” (Lin, 2013, page 196). Makalela (2015, page 200) also asserts that customarily teachers have “treated languages as separate and bounded entities in order to avoid contamination of one language by the other” and monolingual policies in education reflect the “nation building ideology (…) that used separation as a strategy to control and form nation states”.

However, more recently, language is seen as a social practice, a fluid resource (Pennycook, 2013) used by people in order to communicate with others. Makoni and Pennycook (2005) in their article entitled “Disinventing and (Re)Constituting Languages” problematize scholarly perception of languages as fixed entities and consider them to be “inventions of a very specific apparatus” (page 141). Additionally, they challenge linguists’ practice of enumerating languages, as such quantitative approaches of diversity constitute a reproduction of the segregational tradition that “languages can be distinguished and named”. Finally, Makoni and Pennycook (2005) question the use of the terms monolingualism, bilingualism, multilingualism, additive bilingualism and code-switching, as they are all “founded on notions of language as objects” (page 148). Indeed, contemporary approaches of the issue contend
language boundaries are permeable or even do not exist for bilinguals, who tend to adopt more fluid, versatile linguistic resources for their communicative needs in the classroom (Hornberger & Link, 2012; Makalela, 2015).

As for the term bilingualism, Creese and Blackledge (2010, page 105) contest, Baker (2003) “described bilingualism with diglossia in which each language is used for distinct and separate social functions; Swain (1983) used the phrase “bilingualism through monolingualism” (p. 4)” to present the bilingual learner as two monolinguals and the situation as “separate” or “parallel” monolingualism”. Such theorizations, indeed are “founded on notions of language as objects” (Makoni & Pennycook, 2005, page 148) but there are still theorists who believe in this compartmentalization for practical reasons: Ekkehard (2018, page 18) concludes in his article, “a named language is (a) a theoretically useful concept for heuristic and taxonomic purposes, (b) a socio-psychological and sociocultural reality, (c) a very convenient concept for public discourse, and (d) an unavoidable notion for legitimate and necessary language activism and critical assessment of the essential ideological dimension located in language itself”. It should be noted here, that although in this postgraduate thesis the terms bilingualism and multilingualism are adopted along with terms like second language acquisition, which imply that languages are separate, named and countable, this choice of concepts is only made to communicate with common and widely accepted terms with the teachers-participants of the research and it does not reflect the researcher’s view of these terms.

Traditionally, bilingualism has been characterised subtractive, when “the first language (L1) is taken away as the second language (L2) is added, resulting in monolingualism in a second language (L1+ L2=L1) and additive, when “a second language is added without any loss of the first language (L1+L2=1=L2)” (Garcia, 2011, page 142). However, Garcia (2011, page 143) argues for the existence of two more models of bilingualism: recursive “when bilingualism is developed after the language practices of a community have been suppressed” and dynamic bilingualism which “refers to language practices that are multiple and ever adjusting to the multilingual multimodal terrain of the communicative act” (page 144), a view relevant to plurilingualism as defined by the Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe (as cited in Garcia, 2011).

Garcia and Lin (2016, page 2), reviewing translanguaging as a theory of language, distinguish “two competing theories of translanguaging, one which upholds national languages and calls
for a softening of those boundaries in bilingual education and a second “strong” version which posits a single linguistic repertoire for bilingual speakers and thus an essential feature of bilingual education”. In this sense, languages are not separate entities sealed from each other, they are rather part of a linguistic continuum (Brutt-Griffler & Varghese, 2004, page 94, as cited in Tsokalidou, 2017).

Fairclough (1989) sees language as something more than a tool for performing tasks, as a key to the construction of one’s social identity and as a means of negotiating power relations; a view which adds to the overall importance of it for people. As language is an aspect of one’s identity (Norton, 2010), it cannot but be diverse and dynamic, as the process of becoming who we are. Normal language use cannot be seen outside of the particular context within which it is realized. So, countries may have official languages, but people who move across countries or who come in contact with people who have, develop their own language, a language that crosses borders of named languages to serve the needs of the people who use it.

### 2.2. Translanguaging and code-switching

The term “translanguaging” is relatively new and constantly developing. It is argued that it was first used by Cen Williams in Welsh (trawsieithu) to describe the “planned and systematic use of two languages for teaching and learning inside the same lesson” in schools in Wales in the 1980s (Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012, page 643) and was then translated in English, popularised and enriched by Garcia (2009) and Baker (2011). Baker defines translanguaging as “the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages”. Garcia (2009) broadens the term considering translanguaging as a process that involves multiple discursive practices. Li Wei (2011, p.2) supports the term encompasses “the combination of structures, the alternation between systems, the transmission of information and the representation of values, identities and relationships”. It includes thus as an umbrella term several kinds of practices, like code-switching, translating but also the mixing of words and structures coming from different languages on the process of meaning making. The emphasis though, is on its dynamic nature as a process. Garcia and Wei (2014) see translanguaging as “the dynamic process whereby multilingual language users mediate complex social and cognitive activities through strategic employment of multiple semiotic resources to act, to know and to be”. Finally, Canagarajah (2011, page 401) defined
translanguaging as “the ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system”.

Code-switching, a term that has been used for long interchangeably with translanguaging, is defined by Gumperz (1982, p.59) as “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems”. Heller (1988, p.1) defines the term as “the use of more than one language in the course of a single communicative episode”. Similar are the definitions of Auer (1984, p.1) and Myers-Scotton (1993, p.vii). More contemporary definitions of code switching refer to “an individual’s use of two or more language varieties in the same speech event or exchange” (Woolard, 2004, p.73-74). Lin (2013, pages 1-2) defines code-switching in the classroom as “the alternating use of more than one linguistic code in the classroom by any of the classroom participants” but problematizes the use of the term wondering if “language should in the first place, be conceptualized as discrete “codes” with stable boundaries”.

Garcia and Wei (2014, page 22) distinguish code-switching from translanguaging saying: “Translanguaging differs from the notion of code-switching in that it refers not simply to a shift or a shuttle between two languages, but to the speakers’ construction and use of original and complex interrelated discursive practices that cannot be easily assigned to one or another traditional definition of a language, but that make up the speakers’ complete language repertoire”. Similarly, Heugh (2015, p.283, as cited in Cahyani et al, 2018), “sees translanguaging as a strategic use of code-switching involving cognitive engagement while working with two or more languages simultaneously rather than separately”. More precisely, Garcia (2011) explains, “translanguaging posits that bilinguals have one linguistic repertoire from which they select features strategically to communicate effectively”, which is contradictory to the very nature of code-switching that assumes the existence of two codes. Tsokalidou (2015) (bilingualism otherwise) explains “If code-switching refers mainly to the language level (…) 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”.

However, as this research focuses in the use of translanguaging in the classroom, relevant research with code-switching is considered and at times the terms are used interchangeably by
the researcher. The researcher also, in the attempt to collect data from teachers, had to resort to terms like first/second language, foreign kids, bilinguals and so on, although she recognises they perpetuate the monolingual bias.

2.3. Translanguaging pedagogy and its added value

According to Garcia and Seltzer (2016, page 23) “A translanguaging pedagogy refers to the strategic deployment of a speaker’s full linguistic repertoire to learn and develop their language repertoire, and at the same time work toward social justice by equalizing positions of learners”. After Cahyani, de Coursy and Barnett (2018), “translanguaging in classrooms is where two languages are used in an integrated and coherent way to manage and facilitate the mental process of learning, whether by teachers or by students”. Garcia (2009) proposes to see “translanguaging as an approach to bilingualism that is centred not on languages but on the observable, natural communicative practice of bilinguals and, if properly interpreted and understood and practiced in schools, as a means to enhance pupils’ cognitive, language and literacy abilities”. Garcia’s view on translanguaging is currently embraced by many educators but the documentation of translanguaging as a formal practice-pedagogy in the curricula of countries around the world remains a pendant issue although research ascerts for the positive pedagogic effects of flexible linguistic practices in the classroom.

Lewis, Jones and Baker (2012) suggest it is important for bilingual educators and bilingual students to recognize the importance and value of translanguaging practices. Baker (2011, pages 289-290) summarises the four advantages of the pedagogical practice of translanguaging as follows:

- it may promote a deeper and fuller understanding of the subject matter,
- it may help the development of the weaker language,
- it may facilitate home-school links and cooperation, and
- it may develop learners’ second language ability simultaneously with content learning.

More precisely, when it comes to the use of home languages in the classroom, Lightbrown and Spada (2011) observe it affects positively the learners’ attitude toward the new language while reassuring them that their home language is somehow preserved; their motivation levels rise as
their communicative needs are better met and their attitude toward the second language community, which shows respect to their language as well, is affected positively. Similarly, Tsokalidou (2017/2018?) sees translanguaging in the classroom as “a means of assisting studentsto overcome any negative feelings attached to their other languages and cultures and giving them a sense of normality and belonging” (p.170). Translanguaging, then, can dissolve prejudice and discrimination toward students and make them feel included in the learning procedure. In a similar vein, Arthur and Martin (2006) refer to the benefits of code-switching in the classroom as follows: it increases the inclusion, the participation, the understanding of pupils in the learning process, develops less formal relationships between participants, conveys ideas more easily, accomplishes lessons and, contributes to a “teachable” pedagogic resource.

2.4. Translanguaging practices in the language classroom

According to Hughes, Shaunessy, Brice, Ratliff and McHatton, (2006), “code-switching may be used in the classroom, for translations, as a “we code” which is used for establishing and maintaining solidarity and group membership, for giving procedures and directions, for clarifications especially when introducing new vocabulary words, and as a check for understanding”. Creese and Blackledge have recognised in their research (2010) the following classroom practices of flexible bilingualism and translanguaging pedagogy:

1. “Use of bilingual label quests, repetition, and translation across languages;
2. Ability to engage audiences through translanguaging and heteroglossia;
3. Use of student translanguaging to establish identity positions both oppositional and encompassing of institutional values;
4. Recognition that languages do not fit into clear bounded entities and that all languages are “needed” for meanings to be conveyed and negotiated;
5. Endorsement of simultaneous literacies and languages to keep the pedagogic task moving;
6. Recognition that teachers and students skilfully use their languages for different functional goals such as narration and explanation;
7. Use of translanguaging for annotating texts, providing greater access to the curriculum, and lesson accomplishment.” (Creese & Blackledge, 2010, pages 112-113)
Garcia and Wei (2014, p. 120) enrich the above teachers’ strategies with collaborative dialogue and grouping of students depending on their linguistic resources, reading multilingual texts and listening and watching multilingual audio and visual resources, project learning, thematic units, research, inner speech, word walls, sentence starters, cognates, vocabulary and syntax/morphology comparing, and translanguaging in writing and speaking.

In Cahyani, de Coursy and Barnett research (2018) in Indonesia participant-teachers’ code-switching fell into four functional categories:

1. **Knowledge construction**: including pedagogical scaffolding of content lessons, conceptual reinforcement, annotation of key second language (L2) technical terms, and review of a topic.

2. **Classroom management**: ranging from a topic shift/footing in lesson content to management of pupil behaviour such as developing self-awareness, gaining attention, and reprimanding/chiding.

3. **Interpersonal relations**: including indexing and negotiating different sociocultural identities and humanising the classroom climate such as by giving praise and establishing rapport.

4. **Personal or affective meanings**: covering teachers’ personal experiences, feelings, and sociocultural functions such as saving face.

All in all, translanguaging in the classroom as presented in literature, falls in the four broad scopes of curriculum access, classroom management discourse, interpersonal relations and affective meanings. Its beneficial effect on students’ learning, participation and psychological wellbeing in the classroom are supported by research (see Papanikolopoulou, 2018) and since “the classroom is not only a place of formal learning but also a social and affective environment in its own right, one where teachers and pupils negotiate relationships and identities” (Ferguson, 2003) flexible linguistic practices in the language classroom are critical for the inclusion of all students.

### 2.5 Teachers’ beliefs on translanguaging as a classroom practice

Cenoz and Gorter (2011) observe that despite the reported by research positive effects of the practice of flexible language use in the classroom, this practice is not encouraged at schools.
nor are languages integrated in the school curricula in a way that would stress the connections between languages and would promote students’ language awareness. Additionally, they note that the non-native speakers are still considered to be deficient communicators in school contexts because what is expected from them is to acquire native like command of the target language.

In the same vain, Hughes, Shaunessy, Brice, Ratliff and Mc Hatton (2006, page 9) report “Teachers’ reactions to code switching are typically quite negative, even when they themselves employ it”. And they go on to explain that teachers switch to students’ home language mainly for “disciplinary-manipulative” purposes, “to reinforce the dominant language and to marginalize the native language of the students”. Overall, they resume that code-switching is believed to influence negatively one or both languages, to be a sign of limited language proficiency, incorrect language use and a factor of social exclusion for monolinguals.

As for the role translanguaging can play in the language development of learners, while some teachers advocate that students should only speak in the target language (Avermaet et al, 2014) to increase exposure to it and to avoid contamination from other languages (Makalela, 2015), others are more flexible with the language they use in the classroom (Vogel & Garcia, 2017).

Algarin-Ruiz (2014) in her research concerning teachers’ beliefs and feelings towards code-switching practices in the classroom found that most of the 13 teachers surveyed agreed it is beneficial as a method to accommodate the students with language barriers, helpful for vocabulary instruction and one of the participants saw it as a way to value students’ identities, create a positive environment and as a scaffolding for understanding. Interestingly, a bilingual teacher said the use of code-switching was acceptable in a bilingual setting but “in a foreign language classroom, it is better to speak the target language”. At the same time, some teachers reported they did not know anything about this practice and how it could help learners and thus exclude it from the classroom. As for their feelings towards code-switching, most of them said they liked it and the rest were indifferent. None of them reported negative feelings. As for their perception of the effects code-switching in the classroom can have on students’ achievement, only some of them were positive and most of them uncertain. In a relevant research by Nambisan (2014) it was found that teachers have positive predispositions towards translanguaging but their actual practice of it in the classroom is not always consistent to their
beliefs. Additionally, she found that one of the reasons why teachers used translanguaging or permitted it was to help low proficiency students.

Fallas Escobar and Dillard-Paltrineri (2015) research in Costa Rica point out that most research on translanguaging has been made with beginners, which reflects the assumption that translanguaging is a “crutch (...) most needed at the beginning levels of L2 learning” (page 307). Their findings confirm that the interviewed BA students in English teaching thought of translanguaging as an ineffective practice which confused them and they were generally against it. Its practice was permissible as a transitional and limited scaffolding and only for beginners. What’s more, they found that teachers were rather unaware of ways to integrate this as a pedagogical practice in the classroom. Finally, they reported participants contradictory feelings as they thought of translanguaging as a natural thing for bilinguals, but not in the classroom.

In the greek context there has been research on teachers’ beliefs about bilingualism and practices that promote it but generally it has been conducted in public schools, as Arvanitoudi (2018) notes. Gkaintartzi (2018) reports that the participant teachers in her research expressed linguistic views that reflected the ideology of monolingualism. Bilingualism is seen as a problem, as an obstacle to students’ success in learning the Greek language. Participant teachers in this research cast responsibilities for the students’ difficulties in language learning to the use of the mother tongue at home and they consider the use of solely Greek in the Greek school as a given and legitimate practice. Merkouriadou (2016) research in elementary schools of Western attica showed a generally positive stance of teachers towards diglossia but most of the times this was not translated in specialised diglossic practices in the classroom.

Tsokalidou (2017) in her book SiDaYes, based on research findings, relates translanguaging to more opportunities, tools for expression and positive and creative aspects for the individuals who embrace it. A very important contribution (Tsokalidou, 2017, p.154) is the report of different teachers’ opinions on Translanguaging as Devika who mentions “a very important aspect of TL in education, namely that of developing a language, with respect for the students’ language of origin and their cultural realities. Another teacher in the same research, Valbona, however expresses contradictory feelings about translanguaging, as she says, TL “may hinder the learning of a target language” but also that it “gives her “enormous” strength of thought” while meaning to her and the students “indescribable freedom” (p.156). Two other teachers, Stacey and Nina, opt for translanguaging in their teaching and consider that not only bilingual
but also bilingual students benefit from this practice. So does Max, who emphasizes on the freedom, positivity and creativity TL can offer in class, and Badal, who considers TL a bridging tool for different cultures.

Arvanitoudi (2018) studied how elementary private school Anatolia of Thessaloniki promotes bilingualism by exploring the attitudes and perceptions of six teachers who work there. She found their attitude towards bilingualism positive and them trying to make use of the linguistic and cultural capital of bilingual students, towards preserving students’ first language and continuing its systematic learning. Maligkoudi, Tolakidou and Chiona (2018) research on teachers’ views who work in an elementary school of Central Macedonia, which had six refugee children from Syria at the time of research, concluded concerning the use of students’ mother tongue in the classroom that it is something most of them would not like and they say that such practice would require teachers who speak students’ mother tongue. They consider its use to be a problem and they exclude it from the classroom.

Mattheoudakis, Chatzidaki and Maligkoudi (2017) report that in their study in 2013-2014 in Thessaloniki, Ioannina and Athens concerning 85 teachers’ beliefs and practices about bilingualism, teachers were divided to those few aware of the benefits of bilingualism who adopted practices that promote it, and those not aware, who did not. They find discouraging the small number of teachers who see the use of other languages as a powerful pedagogical tool and conclude that even those teachers with positive feelings towards bilingualism consider the majority language to be the only suitable for use in the mainstream classroom. Indeed, half of the participants reported they do not make any special provisions in their teaching for bilingual students because their “bilingual students can speak Greek quite well and they don’t need special treatment” (page 367). The situation described by Mattheoudakis, Chatzidaki and Maligkoudi (2017) is one that the researcher has encountered in her teaching career and which has problematised her a lot especially since her more active involvement in teaching Greek as a second language in a foreign school. It has made her want to explore further teachers’ ideas about language teaching along with relevant state policies and directions from private school owners; it has been thus a starting point for this research.

Most optimistic are the findings in the research by Tsokalidou & Koutoulis (2015), who conducted an online survey to explore 92 Elementary school teachers’ beliefs and practices related to translanguaging in the classroom. They found the participants’ views towards the use
of languages other than Greek in the classroom were positive and energetic. The majority of the teachers used multilingual practices in the classroom as they found they enhance students’ cognitive, psychological and linguistic development.
3. Research Methodology

3.1. The purpose, questions, theoretical underpinning and rationale of the research

The purpose of this research is to present the current situation of foreign schools in Greece as far as translanguaging practices are considered, raise awareness concerning issues of bilingualism and second language learning and reveal the role translinguaging pedagogy can have in the process of integration in the society with equitable terms for all children, with a view to demonstrate its benefits for every classroom and its adoption as an official state policy for education. Teachers’ views of translanguaging in the classroom and their actual practices are the object of this study. The questions that guide this research and define the selected methodological tools are:

What is the situation in foreign schools in Greece as far as translanguaging is considered?

What do the teachers think about translanguaging and how do they use it, if they do, in their classrooms?

Starting my research with a mostly relativist ontology about how we construct reality and being a person who sees facts as dependent on the observer’s viewpoint and believes in the existence of many truths I set out to explore teachers’ ideas of translanguaging in the classroom. As far as epistemology is concerned, I will be using a social constructionist approach in my investigation of teachers’ feelings, beliefs and thoughts relevant to translanguaging. My thesis is a mixed methods research that will provide me with qualitative and quantitative data which will allow me to study the case of foreign schools in Greece, present the current situation and make suggestions concerning schools’ language policies.

The rationale behind my choice of teachers who work in International and Foreign Schools is based on the assumption that these are settings where multilingualism/polyglossia is promoted and thus should bring out ideal language learning outcomes for students. Additionally, my personal experience working in one of these international schools as a teacher of Greek, gave me some insights and the advantage of an insider, which was considered important to gain the schools’ principals’ trust and therefore have access to the teachers of Greek who work there. Finally, considering the views of other teachers working in the same post as mine, would be an
opportunity for me to reflect on my own views and practices and develop further my professional skills.

3.2. The research context

3.2.1. Multilingual classrooms in Greece

George Nikolaou (2002) cites Reich (1997) who distinguished three kinds of bilingual education:

a. That of expensive private schools which addresses the kids of foreign, high-rank workers in a country the language of which is not prestigious,

b. That which addresses organized and recognized minorities, the members of which may not belong to the privileged but still can apply political pressure, and finally,

c. That which addresses the kids of migrants and generally of socially, economically and culturally deprived groups which at the same time cannot apply political pressure.

At the given moment, in Greece, we have all three types of bilingual education. Foreign schools in Greece belong to the first two categories, as apart from the prestigious expensive schools which address foreign and local students, there are schools in the approved by the Ministry list that address organized groups like Katipunan Philippines Cultural Academy, the Polish School Zygmunt Mineyko, the Iranian School and the Libyan School of 17th of February. The second type however, primarily includes “the minority schools of Thrace and some schools of national or religious communities with special characteristics and recognised right to express their diversity” (Nikolaou, 2002); such schools can be considered the Jewish and Armenian schools as well as other community schools like the Albanian community schools which however have a “complementary” role in children’s education (Maligkoudi & Chatzidaki 2018). Chatzidaki and Maligkoudi (2018) report their findings from “Mother Tereza” community school in Thessaloniki, where mostly Greek-dominant children are taught the Albanian language and culture by volunteer teachers. Finally, DYEP, ZEP and classes offered by NGOs are the classrooms which belong to the third category along with the schools that by law 2413/96 have been characterised as Intercultural, which however, follow the analytical program of mainstream schools potentially enriched as required to meet the needs of their students.
Similarly, Baker (2001, as cited in Nikolaou 2002) distinguishes two types of bilingual education: The one that uses and promotes two languages and bilingualism and the one that addresses kids of linguistic minorities, includes them in the classrooms but the curriculum followed does not promote bilingualism. Additionally, linguistic education is divided in transitional and preservative bilingual education Hornberger, 1991, as cited in Nikolaou, 2002, the first aiming for assimilation of the minority population by the dominant one and the second targeting preservation and cultivation of the minority language, the enhancement of the cultural identity and the recognition of the rights of the national minority.

In the present study, taking a distance from compensatory or transitional bilingual programs and supporting the need for bilingual education for all the children (Collier, 1992; Fishman, 1976; Lambert 1975; Swain, 1979, as cited in Nikolaou, 2002), the case of foreign schools in Greece is considered as a paradigm of assumed active promotion of bilingualism and it is suggested that main aspects of these schools’ example could be consulted when reviewing general education curricula and policies.

3.2.2. Foreign schools in Greece

The work of David Antoniou (2009, 2011, as cited in Droulia, 2012) is worth mentioning here, as it attempts a first historic recording of French and Italian schools in Greece, presenting data from the general State archives and regional services, the archives of the ministries of External affairs and Education and Religions, the Greek Statistical Authority as well as private archives, newspapers and periodicals. In 2013 (by article 35 of law 4186/2013) the Ministry of Education granted working permission to 29 privately-run foreign schools around Greece and added to these American farm school of Thessaloniki in 2017 (by par.1 of article 90 of law 4485/2017). As the first Greek law on Foreign schools (4862/1931), still valid today, predicts “Foreign schools are considered those private schools of any educational content, which were founded by non-Greek citizen, or legal person, corporation or organization not Greek or not based in Greece, either they belong to such a natural or legal person or they were granted sometime to that natural or legal person” (my translation). The same law predicts all students who go to the elementary schools should be taught Greek by Greek teachers and in Greek and the students of middle school who are Greek should also be taught ancient Greek. The students of middle school who are Greek should also be taught geography and history in Greek by the books used by public school
for these subjects and for the same weekly hours. According to this law only foreign pupils could enroll in foreign elementary school. The access of middle and high school Greek students to foreign schools was not restricted. Law 3794/2009, however, allows the enrollment of Greeks in foreign elementary school under strict conditions but adds extra obstacles to the enrollment of Greek students in middle school of Foreign schools that follow the curriculum of countries that do not belong to the European Union. In particular, only students with double citizenship, a foreign parent, a parent who works in the school or as a diplomat, a family member that goes to the particular school, or those students who have been students of a foreign school in Greece or elsewhere for at least a year in the past six years or who will move to another country in the next three years, can be enrolled in Foreign schools. This detail has caused several problems to many of these schools which follow the American or even the British curriculum due to the extended paperwork required to prove these qualifications on behalf of their students and the huge limitation of their target group. It is a widespread belief in Greek society that, despite the official State directives, which to my perception remain unknown to the public, these schools promote bilingualism and offer students multicultural experiences that broaden their perspectives.

3.2.3. The sample schools

Some of these 30 schools were not included in our sample. In particular, the Canadian Lyceum of Greece is no longer in operation, the Italian school of Athens only has a nursery school, thus not a traditional language classroom, at the Iranian school they only teach Persian, six schools do not have any foreign students (Greek-French School Saint Paul, Greek-French School Kalamari, Greek-French College Delasalle of Thessaloniki, Leontios lyceum of Nea Smyrni, Greek-French School Saint Joseph, American farm school of Thessaloniki) and two schools reported to have only “few bilinguals who do not need any extra support” (American College Anatolia, Greek-French School Ursulines). Finally, the Libyan school of 17th of February said they needed an official permission of the embassy, which was not feasible. This procedure resulted to 18 potential schools-participants, half of which actually responded to the researcher’s call. We did not manage to collect data from the German schools of Athens and Thessaloniki, the Greek-French School of Agia Paraskevi Eugene Delacroix, the American College of Greece, the Greek-French School Jeanne d’Arc, the Leonteio Lyceum of Patisia,
the Elementary School of the French Public Mission and the Polish School Zygmunt Mineyko. Looking back the researcher realises the monolingual bias of the questionnaire and wonders if more teachers would have answered if the questionnaire had been translated in Greek, French, German or Polish.

The teachers who took part in this research were 22 teachers of Greek from 9 Foreign/International schools, namely: Pinewood American International School, American Community Schools of Athens, French School of Thessaloniki, St Catherine’s British school, Campion School, International Community School of Larissa, International School of Athens, St Lawrence College and the Philippine School in Greece.

3.3. The tools

As the purpose of this research was to explore teachers’ beliefs and practices concerning translanguaging and describe through their answers the current situation in foreign schools in Greece, the method of data collection selected because of its appropriateness for our cause was an online questionnaire (Rowley, 2014) created using Google Forms. The questionnaire was considered adequate as this research seeks to describe the language practices exercised in foreign schools in Greece and to profile the population of teachers of Greek as a second language, who work in these schools. For this reason, we had to use a questionnaire, because as a tool it enables us to count the frequency of occurrence of participant teachers’ opinions, attitudes and behaviours (Rowley, 2014). Teachers’ opinions and attitudes have been explored using questionnaires by several scholars (Tsokalidou & Koutoulis, 2015, Gkaintartzi, Mouti, Skourtou & Tsokalidou, in press/2019; Mattheoudakis, Chatzidaki, Maligkoudi, 2017). Additionally, we selected the questionnaire aiming to get responses from a large number of people that would allow us to make generalizations for language teachers in foreign schools, as this population had not been profiled in previous research as a whole. The general research design did not include interviews or class observations mainly for practical reasons as foreign schools are spread in different cities and, in an attempt to counterbalance the limitations a questionnaire poses to the interpretation of the findings, open type questions were added to it, concerning the most important themes, which would provide our study with qualitative data as
well. The online form of the questionnaire was considered convenient for the researcher principally, due to the strict time constraints for the realization of the research.

The questionnaire\(^1\) we created is based on that of Tsokalidou and Koutoulis (2015)\(^2\). Only relevant questions to the research were used in our questionnaire; the original questions were translated in English and their order changed in some cases to achieve better cohesion. To supplement this questionnaire and adjust it to the context of foreign schools, the researcher drew upon her experience as a teacher of Greek in a foreign school and as a polyglot, which provided her with insider information on how these schools work; she reflected on her own practices and beliefs concerning translanguaging in the classroom and located areas of interest that were included in the final form of the tool used.

The first section of the questionnaire defined its aim, its target group—participants, its context and reassured participants that their answers will remain anonymous. Also, participants were informed that filling it in would take less than 10 minutes and the researcher thanked the respondents for their kind participation. In the second section entitled “Teacher’s data”, there were 8 questions concerning gender, age, studies, teaching experience and languages spoken by the teacher potentially and in the classroom. In the third section under the title “School, students and practices”, as it was the first part in which the term translanguaging appeared in a question, there was a brief explanation of the term as follows:

According to Ofelia Garcia (2009ii, p. 140) “Translanguaging is the act performed by bilinguals of accessing different linguistic features or various modes of what are described as autonomous languages, in order to maximize communicative potential”. The act of using resources from different languages together, with very little regard for what we might call the ‘boundaries’ of named languages such as ‘Spanish’ or ‘English’ to communicate more effectively: this is what translanguaging is about! (Further examples can be found online: https://ealjournal.org/2016/07/26/what-is-translanguaging/ ). In classroom practice, it is the

\(^1\) The questionnaire used in this research can be accessed here: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScczqBjx8WKROnR34HaLtbnTJg3cb-UqeZL1rXbkyo5TQTPg/formResponse

\(^2\) Tsokalidou and Koutoulis (2015) questionnaire can be accessed here: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSdBKUfG_clM6sisIE-bTZHScytTW-udvQJ3_BMIK862yBvFhAg/viewform
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use of all available linguistic resources to the students and/or the teacher, for example students’ first languages or/ and a common medium language like English, to make meaning and promote learning by including- engaging everyone in the learning procedure.

Eight open-ended questions followed, concerning the schools’ demographics, policies and language use, in other words, number of students, languages of the students, languages used in the classroom and teachers’ actual practices as well as whether they find there is a connection among the level or the age of the students with the amount of translanguaging they do in the classroom. The fourth section, “Teacher’s beliefs about translanguaging”, included 12 Likert type questions about the respondents’ beliefs concerning translanguaging and its potential benefits in students’ relationships with peers, their emotional status, classroom participation, and learning as a process. The last section entitled “Suggestions” was made up of 5 (4 Likert and 1 open type) questions concerning their advice on the use of translanguaging; using, first or medium language in the classroom and other educational practices they consider to be adequate for a multicultural Greek language classroom. All the Likert type questions were on a scale of 5 possible answers ranging from “I strongly disagree” (1) to “I totally agree” (5). In such a scale answer 3 would show a rather indecisive answer, or a person not sure of her/his answer.

At the initial stage of the research, the researcher had to use google search engine to look up for the schools’ contact information and then the telephone to establish contact with school principals where possible and secretaries where not, who gave her information on the schools and the e-mails to which she had to send the link to the questionnaire. The e-mail was not the same for all the schools as it was addressed to different people every time and was a continuation of talks over the phone. However, all messages were bilingual, in Greek and English and very kindly asked the recipients to forward the mail and link to the teachers for whom the researcher had written a message introducing herself as a colleague who works in an International school and a master’s degree student doing a research on language use in the classroom, requesting them kindly to take part in this research, if they consent and thanking them in advance.

In terms of tools that were used to analyze data, google forms have built in statistical tools the researcher utilized to analyze the quantitative data. The qualitative data that came out from teachers’ responses to open type questions were analyzed as discourse (Dooley & Levinsohn,
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2000) and compared to findings of relevant research. This content analysis method, which “is applied to the verbatim responses given to open-ended questions in order to code those answers into a meaningful set of categories that lend themselves to further quantitative statistical analysis” (Lavrakas, 2008), included studying teachers’ answers line-by-line in order to identify emergent themes/ categories and check for consistency among participants’ answers concerning their views of translanguaging and their actual practices in the classroom.
4. Results

4.1. Teachers’ Profiles

The teachers who participated in the research were mainly women (20) and 2 men. Half of them were middle-aged (41-50), seven of them were 31-40, three were more than 51 and only one teacher was below 30 years old. Sixteen out of twenty-two participants had a Bachelor in Greek philology, three in English philology and three in French philology. Sixteen of the teachers were specialised in second/foreign language teaching, four in intercultural education, one in educational planning and teaching and one in classical studies. The participants’ teaching experience was more than 20 years for eight of them, 11-20 years for seven of them and 6-10 years for the rest. As for their experience in teaching Greek as a second/foreign language, it was almost equally divided in the four bands, more than 20 years (6), less than 5 years (6), 6-10 (5) and 11-20 (5).

4.2. Languages they speak vs Languages they use in the Classroom

Questions 7 and 8 were about the languages teachers can speak and the languages they use in the language classroom providing reasons for this choice. All the teachers spoke at least one foreign language, with most of them speaking two or three. In total, ten languages were reported apart from Greek: English (all of them), French (10), Spanish (4), German (4), Italian (3), Arabic (1), Romanian (1) and Finnish (1). Seventeen out of the twenty-two teachers reported they use English apart from Greek and the reasons most of them gave were as a medium language, because English is the official language of the school, and in order to communicate with the students. Three teachers said they use mostly Greek “to expose students to the language” and only some English/French “when it is completely necessary for the students”. One of these teachers elaborated further: “If the students don’t understand French either I search some vocabulary in their native language in order to make them feel more comfortable. The main language I use is Greek though”. One teacher reported she uses English, French and Arabic but did not give reasons for her choice and another reported she uses mainly Greek and English but also words and phrases from her students’ mother tongues and two more languages
to demonstrate students “all languages are welcome in the classroom and learning several languages is fun and doable”. The following Table (2) shows the correspondence between the languages potentially spoken by the teachers and those actually used by them in the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language skills</th>
<th>Language(s) used in the classroom</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English, French, Italian, Spanish</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>School’s official language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish, Greek, English, French, German</td>
<td>Greek, English</td>
<td>For understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek, English, French</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>School’s official language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek, English, French</td>
<td>Mostly Greek, English /French</td>
<td>For maximum exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek, French, English</td>
<td>Greek, French</td>
<td>For maximum exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School’s official language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native languages for inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, French, Basic Arabic</td>
<td>English, French, Basic Arabic</td>
<td>As a medium of instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three languages</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, German</td>
<td>English, Greek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>School’s official language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek, English</td>
<td>Greek, English</td>
<td>For understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, Greek</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>To avoid language contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek, English, French (basic)</td>
<td>Greek, English</td>
<td>As a medium of instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, French, Italian, German</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>School’s official language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish and English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, French, Romanian</td>
<td>Greek, English</td>
<td>School’s official language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek, English, German</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>For understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek, English</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>School’s official language</th>
<th>As a medium of instruction</th>
<th>For inclusion</th>
<th>To promote multilingualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek, English, French, Spanish,</td>
<td>Greek, English, Romanian, Portuguese, French, Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian, Finnish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>For understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>For understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, Spanish</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>For understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Language Skills vs Use

4.3. Schools’ Profiles

Questions 9,10 and 11 were about the name of the school, the number of bilingual students taught by the particular teacher and the approximate number of students in a classroom. Table 3 shows our findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Foreign school</th>
<th>Number of bilingual students taught</th>
<th>Approximate number of students in a classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pinewood American International School</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinewood American International School</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Community Schools of Athens</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Community Schools of Athens</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French school of Thessaloniki</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Community Schools of Athens</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine's British School</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine's British School</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21 +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chrysoula Kokkini, “Translanguaging in the Greek Language Classroom: The Case of Foreign Schools in Greece”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine's British School</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine's British School</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campion School</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine's British School</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Community School of Larissa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International School of Athens</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International School of Athens</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International School of Athens</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lawrence College</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lawrence College</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Community School of Larissa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Philippine School in Greece</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Philippine School in Greece</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Philippine School in Greece</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Schools’ Profiles

In addition to the above information on the schools that were part of the sample of this research, after web research on the schools’ official sites we can provide some information on the educational levels that these schools offer services and the curricula they follow. Pinewood American International School and American Community Schools of Athens offer all levels
from pre-school (early childhood) to high school and they both follow the American curriculum and provide students with the opportunity to follow IB (International Baccalaureate) Diploma program as well. International School of Athens and International Community School of Larissa offer international education at all levels from pre-school to high-school and IB diploma programs based primarily on British and American standards. St. Catherine’s British School, Campion School and St. Lawrence College follow the British curriculum and offer their services to students aged 3 to 18. The French School of Thessaloniki offers trilingual (French-English-Greek) and multicultural education to students from the age of 3 to graduation. Finally, the Philippine School in Greece follows the Philippine curriculum but uses English language for instruction.

4.4. The Linguistic Landscape of Greek Language Classrooms in Foreign Schools

Question 12 was about all the languages students in Foreign schools in Greece can speak. Only 3 teachers from a British school wrote that their students speak English and Greek, while one of their colleagues reported 4 additional languages. The rest of the teachers wrote more than 3 languages and up to 10. Namely: English, Chinese, Russian, Spanish, French, Italian, Greek, Albanian, Arab, Dutch, German, Flamand (Flemish Dutch), Polish, Farsi, Urdu, Romanian, Turkish, Serbian, Slovakian, German, Korean, Bulgarian, Ukrainian, Hebrew, Finnish, Danish, Portuguese, Brazilian Portuguese and Filippino. Figure 1 below, depicts the frequency with which languages appeared in teachers’ answers.
4.5. Other languages in the Greek as a Second Language Classroom

Question 13 asked teachers whether they allow or encourage their students to use their first languages in the classroom. 32% of the teachers said they don’t. 23% of the teachers said they allow it under conditions, 41% answered “yes” and only one (4%) wrote she encourages them because “it helps them make meaning and empowers them”.

The following question (14) was if they allow or encourage the use of other languages in the classroom apart from Greek. Only one teacher answered negatively, seven used the word “allow” and the rest answered positively saying yes. Four of these teachers limited their use of other languages to beginners. No teacher said she/he encourages the use of other languages in the Greek language classroom. Figure 2 below visualizes the answers given to questions 13 and 14.
4.6. Language Level and Age affecting Translanguaging

Question 15 asked participants to answer if the level of the students in Greek affects the amount of translanguaging they do in the classroom. Only three of them responded negatively. Of the nineteen teachers eight responded yes and gave reasons why they use English (“to explain grammar and vocabulary rules” and “because it helps the students to understand better Greek”, actually irrelevant information to the given question) and eight clearly related the amount of translanguaging they do to the students’ level in Greek. They all agreed that translanguaging is more with beginners. An indicative answer was: “The better the level they have in Greek the less the amount of translanguaging I do in the classroom”.

Question 16 was related to the age of students and the amount of translanguaging in the classroom. Almost half the respondents said there is no connection, age does not affect the amount of translanguaging they do, four said they translanguage more with older learners and six that they translanguage more with younger learners. Two answers were positive but did not elaborate. Analytically, 18% of the teachers declared they translanguage more with older learners because: “older students are more familiarised with sources in different languages”,...
“they already have a perception of the world”, they “feel more insecure when they don’t understand many words and want to translate more and compare to their own language” and “if you start later you need more translang(uaging)”); whereas, 27% of their colleagues translanguage more with younger learners explaining that “the younger they are they are more incline to translang(uaging)”.

4.7. Teachers’ Beliefs about the Benefits of Translanguaging

4.7.1. for all the classroom

Moving on to the results from the closed Likert type questions measuring teachers’ beliefs about the benefits of translanguaging we find questions 17, 18 19 and 20; Question 17 revealed that 64% of the teachers agreed (4, 5) that translanguaging contributes to the communication among students, while 32% were indecisive (3) and only one teacher strongly disagreed (1). Question 18 showed that 77% of the participants agreed (4, 5) that translanguaging (TL for short) increases the level of interaction between monolingual and bilingual students, 18% were not sure (3) and again, one teacher strongly disagreed (1). From question 19 it came out that 68% of the participants think TL contributes to tackling stereotypes concerning students of diverse origins, 27% are indecisive and one teacher strongly disagrees. Finally, question 20 revealed that 64% of the participants believe TL changes the attitude of monolingual students towards their bilingual peers, 27% were not sure and 2 teachers felt there is no connection between TL and the kids’ attitude. Table 4 presents these findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TL benefits for all the classroom</th>
<th>N=22</th>
<th>strong disagreement</th>
<th>disagreement</th>
<th>uncertainty</th>
<th>agreement</th>
<th>strong agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it contributes to communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (4.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
<td>8 (36%)</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it increases student interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (4.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (18%)</td>
<td>10 (45.5%)</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it tackles stereotypes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (4.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
<td>8 (36%)</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it changes students’ attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
<td>8 (36%)</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Benefits for All Students
4.7.2. for the bilingual students

The following two questions (21, 22) sought to explore the connection between the use of students’ first language and increase in students’ emotional security and self-confidence respectively. 77% of the teachers found a positive connection between first language use and emotional security, the rest were indecisive. As for question 22, 82% of the respondents agreed that first language use increases bilingual students’ self-confidence, three teachers were not sure and one disagreed.

Question 23 was about TL as a means to develop students’ emotional intelligence. Again, 64% of the participants agree that it helps, 32% were not sure and one teacher disagreed.

Question 24 had to do with the assumption that TL motivates bilingual students to participate in the language lesson. 86% of the participants think that indeed TL can increase student participation and the rest were not sure.

Question 25 measured teachers’ opinion on whether translanguaging promotes bilingual students’ general cognitive development. Six teachers are not sure and all the rest, representing 73% of our sample, agree or strongly agree that it does. Table 7 gathers teachers’ answers on whether translanguaging benefits bilingual students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TL benefits for bilingual students</th>
<th>N=22</th>
<th>strong disagreement</th>
<th>disagreement</th>
<th>uncertainty</th>
<th>agreement</th>
<th>strong agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>emotional security</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (23%)</td>
<td>9 (41%)</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-confidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (4.5%)</td>
<td>3 (14%)</td>
<td>11 (50%)</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotional intelligence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (4.5%)</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
<td>8 (36%)</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (14%)</td>
<td>13 (59%)</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general cognitive development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
<td>9 (41%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Benefits for Bilingual Students

4.7.3. for learning

The following three questions (26, 27, 28) were about the alleged effect TL can have on students’ learning of Greek and overall performance at school. Participants responded positively by 73% for learning of Greek and by 55% for overall performance at school. The rest were indecisive. Question 28 was about the use of a common third language as a medium for the instruction and the degree to which teachers think it helps students’ learning of Greek. 86% of the respondents agreed that it helps, 32% of
whom strongly. The rest of the participants were indecisive. By these questions we aimed to explore if teachers have observed any measurable, if I may say, benefits of translanguaging on students’ learning of Greek and overall performance at school. It came out that almost all of them believe translanguaging can have measurable benefits on students’ school performance; more precisely, fourteen of the twenty-two respondents agreed to a level higher than 4, seven teachers were rather positive giving answers that ranged from 3.33 to 3.66 level of agreement and only one teacher answered she was not sure (3). The fact than no teacher answered negatively gives us an indication that (deep inside) they recognise the benefits translanguaging can have in the classroom. Table 6 presents teachers’ opinions as expressed in the context of questions 26 and 28.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning of Greek is promoted by:</th>
<th>N=22</th>
<th>strong disagreement</th>
<th>disagreement</th>
<th>uncertainty</th>
<th>agreement</th>
<th>strong agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translanguaging</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
<td>9 (41%)</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a common medium language</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (14%)</td>
<td>12 (55%)</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Translanguaging and Language Learning

Figure 3 visualizes the findings of question 27 and shows more than half of the teachers think translanguaging contributes to a better performance at school, while the rest appear uncertain of its effect on school performance.
4.8. Teachers’ suggestions for effective language teaching

The last part of the questionnaire under the title “Suggestions”, was about what these teachers considered to be good practices concerning language use in a multicultural Greek language classroom. Question 29 suggested students should avoid changing codes. 55% disagreed with this affirmation (1,2), 32% were not sure (3) and only 3 teachers agreed (4) reflecting a monolingual ideology. However, teachers’ overall stance towards translanguaging in the classroom was positive.

The next affirmation (question 30) also reflected the monolingual ideology and was about the exclusive use of Greek in the classroom. Half the teachers disagreed, 32% were not sure and four teachers representing 18% of our sample agreed that students should only use Greek in the classroom.

Affirmation 31 suggested students may use their first languages in the classroom. Half the participants consider first language use in the classroom legitimate, whereas 32% disagree with the suggestion and the rest 18% are not sure. There is thus a stable percentage of teachers that consistently support translanguaging, more than half the participants, an important percentage (32% in questions 29 and 30 and 18% in question 31) who seem confused about translanguaging and there are some teachers (13%, 18% and 32% respectively) who express monolingual beliefs or more accurately for question 31, suggest we should exclude students’ first languages from the classroom.

The last affirmation (32) had to do with the use of a common for all medium language for instruction as a good suggested practice. The grand majority of the teachers suggest this practice (86%), 2 teachers are not sure, and one teacher does not consider it to be a good practice. The high percentage of teachers embracing this practice contrasted to the relatively high 32% who exclude first languages from the classroom (question 31) reveal teachers’ partially positive stance towards translanguaging.

These four questions of the questionnaire (29,30,31,32) were intentionally supplementing and double checking each other, because their content, teachers’ suggestions for classroom use, was of major importance for this study. In particular, affirmation 29 “students should avoid changing codes”, reflected a rather monolingual practice that could however allow some space for scaffolding from another language; affirmation 30 “students should only use Greek” was
there to express those teachers who believe in and implement monolingual policy in their classroom, affirmation 31 suggested “students can use their first languages” a choice that would show that the teacher embraces students’ first languages in the classroom and one that supports and implements translanguaging practices in the classroom while affirmation 32 “students can use a medium language (eg. English) to learn Greek as long as it is a common language for all” was there to explore teachers’ stance towards translanguaging in a medium language. The teachers’ answers to these questions were considered simultaneously and compared to draw conclusions on each teacher’s overall stance. If their declared level of agreement in a question was 3, then this answer was not considered, and we tried to make sense of one’s stance by the other answers. We found that eight of twenty-two teachers, that is 36% of the participants, clearly and consistently supported translanguaging either it involves students’ first languages or a medium language. Ten teachers, representing the 45% of our sample, had positive feelings about translanguaging but excluded from this practice students’ first languages, which means they opted for instruction through medium language, supposedly English; two teachers’ answers showed a positive stance towards the use of students’ first languages in the classroom but they would not use a third common language as a medium of instruction. Finally, two teachers gave neutral or opposing answers to all questions, not allowing us to form a clear image of their beliefs. In an attempt to clear my understanding of these two teachers mixed feelings-beliefs about translanguaging in these four questions I resorted to their answer in question 8 “Languages you use in your Greek as a second/foreign language class and why” and found that one of them tries to use “mostly Greek” but “if the students don’t understand”, she allows some space for French as a medium and for students’ first languages as well. The other teacher reported she uses “English in order to communicate with the pupils”. Figure 4 provides a rough image of participant teachers’ overall stance towards language practices in the Greek language classroom as they were inferred from their answers to questions 29, 30, 31 and 32.
The last open-ended question about the educational practice they consider to be the best for a multicultural language classroom got diverse answers some of which did not refer at all to the issue of translanguage practices discussed here but which however gave us an insight to these teachers’ actual practices. Seven of the twenty-two teachers referred implicitly or explicitly to individualized teaching according to the needs of the students or the particular classroom. Five respondents were more concrete opting for a method; their answers included level-based teaching, communicative and CLIL and interactive teaching. Three teachers suggested the use of new technologies and multimedia along with role plays help students’ learning. Three more emphasized on the role respect of all cultures and individual differences, along with the fostering of a welcoming and inclusive environment can play in students’ wellbeing, but they did not elaborate on the means that would make this possible. However, there were some answers, relevant to the use of language in the classroom in a broad sense that are highlighted here; two teachers referred to peer teaching and group work during which students are allowed to “use their mother language to communicate and explain each other what they are learning in Greek”. Five teachers suggest using a common to all language as a medium for instruction of the target language but two of them limit its use until “a solid background of Greek has been acquired by the pupils”, then they should “try to focus in Greek” and “teachers can encourage them to use as much Greek as possible”. Interestingly the second teacher remarks “I believe
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that in order to learn Greek and become bilingual the mother language should also be developed”. Finally, one teacher explicitly refers to translanguaging as “a practice that can enhance teaching in multicultural contexts”, but she does not explain how.
5. Discussion

5.1. Demographics

Moving on to discuss the data that came out from the questionnaire, the twenty-two participants were all active teachers of Greek in foreign schools in Greece in school-year 2018-2019. The fact that the respondents were almost exclusively women was anticipated by the researcher as the teaching profession and most notably language teaching profession, is a domain dominated by women in Greece (Maragkoudaki, 1997). From their answers it came out that they are all experienced teachers with more than 6 years teaching experience and almost all of them declared they had some specialization in second language teaching or intercultural education. Additionally, they were all able to speak at least one foreign language and most of them spoke two or three. This shows that foreign schools recruit people with a certain level of specialization and certainly those who speak foreign languages, assumingly, for them to promote multilingualism amongst the pupils. We will not elaborate further on the gender, age, studies or teaching experience because no connections could be made based on these factors, which could be generalized, probably due to the small size of the sample.

It is interesting to review, however, the correspondence of languages potentially spoken by teachers and those actually used by them in the classroom as they appear in table 2; the great majority of the teachers, seventeen out of twenty-two, only use English apart from Greek, as a medium language and because it is the school’s official language (policy). Two teachers report they use mostly Greek and some French/English when absolutely necessary, one teacher uses only Greek “for a better contact command” and two teachers report they use three or more languages in the classroom. These findings are consistent with research that asserts the dominance of English language as a medium in third, if I may say, language teaching (Brutt-Griffler, 2017). The teachers who use “mostly Greek” and other languages when absolutely necessary obviously recognize the benefits of the practice but are so delved into monolingual practices that they feel guilty when they have to use a language other than the language target (Creese & Blackledge, 2010, Garcia & Lin, 2016). The participant who chooses to teach her bilingual students monolingually reflects the common worry among educators that languages in contact can destruct each other or one language will develop to the detriment of the other (Cenoz & Gorter, 2013). Cummins (2001, ch.5) reassures however that languages in contact...
can rather scaffold the development of each other when used simultaneously. The teachers who use more languages in the classroom and include their students’ first languages in the learning procedure although they reportedly, do not know them sufficiently, seem to have a better understanding of plurilingualism (Garcia, 2011).

The total number of bilingual students taught Greek by the particular teachers-participants in the research in nine out of thirty in Greece is 1145, as reported by the teachers. The number of bilingual students going to foreign schools in Greece is assumingly much larger. Even more fascinating is the variety of languages spoken by these students. The languages reported by the teachers were 29 and some of them had written “etc.” at the end of their response, which implies they are probably more. According to data provided by the Greek ministry of education during school year 2010-2011, 33 different mother tongues were registered at schools (Hellenic statistical Authority, 2010, https://www.statistics.gr/el/statistics/-/publication/SED24/-).

5.2. Teachers’ actual classroom practices

Having this pluralism at hand about one third of the teachers in this research exclude students’ first languages from the classroom, more than half allow limited use (Cook, 2001) and only one encourages the use of students’ first language in the classroom, finding which implies the need for further teacher education on the role students’ first language can play in their overall literacy development (Cummins, 2001; Gkaintartzi, Mouti, Skourtou, Tsokalidou, in press/2019). Disproportionally, and having in mind that the research was conducted in the context of Foreign schools in Greece and that the great majority of the participants work in schools that follow british or american curricula, when asked if they allow or encourage the use of other languages apart from Greek in the classroom only one responded negatively and two teachers reported they only allow students’ native language. Most teachers allow English as a medium language or because it is the school’s official language, and some allow any language in the classroom for better communication. There is however, a certain prevalence of English language as a lingua franca (Cenoz, 2019) in teaching Greek as a second language in foreign schools in Greece, a practice that is certainly realistic but still contradictory to the directions for the teaching of Greek language in Greek that the law of 1931 on foreign schools in Greece predicts. The findings of Kopsidou (2006, page 411-420) who studied the linguistic strategies
of teachers and students at the Pinewood school of Thessaloniki in 2003-2004, also conclude that in the multilingual and multicultural classroom code-switching and most particularly the use of English language is the most prevalent solution for achieving communication.

5.3. Translanguaging: relation to level and age

The next theme that came out of the data collected across the questionnaire was whether teachers translanguage more or less when they teach students of different levels of linguistic competency. It came out that more than half of the participants translanguage more with beginners and less with more advanced learners, six found there is a connection between TL and the learners ‘level but did not elaborate on their answers, and three found no connection. As researchers have noticed, research on translanguaging and code switching in the classroom is more usual with beginners reflecting the belief that the practice is more acceptable at lower levels (Duarte, 2019; Mwinda & Walt, 2015). However, Garcia (2018, page 41) extends the benefits of translanguaging to learners of all levels explaining: “Translanguaging classrooms do not just use the students’ language practices as a scaffold to learn a dominant language (or languages). Translanguaging classrooms are transformative (…) because they show students how to be agents of their semiotic repertoires, free to create and be”.

No positive correlations could be made between the age of learners and the amount of translanguaging they need, as very few respondents found there is a connection and indeed, they almost equally expressed two opposing views. This finding did not allow us any safe conclusions.

5.4. The benefits of translanguaging

As for the benefits the whole classroom can have from the practice of translanguaging in terms of establishing relationships among monolingual children and their bilingual peers, it seems that the participant teachers’ views are all positive excluding one teacher who disagrees and another who is not sure. These findings are in accordance with Tsokalidou (2017/2018), Lightbown and Spada (2011), Hughes and colleagues (2006) and Arthur and Martin (2006),
who consider inclusion in the community, increased participation in the classroom and amelioration of the relationships among students, to be some of the benefits of multilingual practices in the mainstream classroom.

Moving on to discuss teachers’ beliefs on the use of students’ first languages in particular and the positive effects this practice can have on bilingual students’ emotional security and self-confidence, almost all teachers agree. However, when comparing these positive answers to the results from question 13 about whether they allow or encourage the use of the students’ first language in the classroom one third of them say they don’t and five more say they do, but they limit this practice to finding words’ equivalents in their language or “only when it is necessary”. Why do teachers believe that the first language helps students but still do not allow its use? As Skourtou (2008, as cited in Gkaintartzi et al., 2019) observes, teachers with positive attitudes towards bilingualism do not integrate first languages in their teaching as they do not connect it to learning Greek as a second language. To the same vain, Pulinx, Van Avermaet and Agirdag (2017) find that although teachers have positive beliefs about multilingualism, they do not include in their teaching languages with which they are not familiar. Gkaintartzi, Mouti, Skourtou and Tsokalidou (in press/ 2019) more optimistically find that the teachers-students of the postgraduate program “Language education for Refugees and Migrants” are all willing to include students’ first languages in the classroom recognizing the various benefits of such practice for all. However, when it comes to using themselves these languages, some of them appear hesitant to use languages that they do not know. The researchers note however, that they cannot be sure whether the teachers’ reported beliefs reflect their actual practices in the classroom.

Similarly, almost all teachers-participants in this research agreed that translanguaging in the classroom contributes to the development of bilingual students’ emotional intelligence and motivates them to participate in the language lesson. Garcia, Johnson and Seltzer (2017) contend that translanguaging promotes students’ socioemotional development and Tsokalidou (2018) explains it helps them feel better. In his study of teachers’ attitudes Koutoulis (2015) found his participants also had positive understandings of the relationship between translanguaging, students’ emotional intelligence and their motivation to participate in the lesson. Gkaintartzi, Mouti, Skourtou and Tsokalidou (in press/ 2019) find that the teachers doing their postgraduate degree on language education for refugees and migrants express very positive opinions on the role translanguaging can play for inclusion and its other affective
benefits but very few amongst them recognise the potential cognitive benefits this practice can have on the learning of the target language, which brings us to the next issue this research explored, teachers’ beliefs concerning the cognitive benefits translanguaging as a classroom practice can have on bilingual students.

5.5. First languages vs English as a medium in teachers’ practices

About half the respondents don’t allow the use of students’ first language in the classroom and most of them allow English as a medium language and in fact answer to question 28 agreeing almost all of them (apart from three who are not sure) that English as a medium for instruction helps students’ learning of Greek. Baker (2011, as cited in Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012) argues that students’ linguistic and cognitive capability is maximised when their languages are used in the classroom. This view is consistent with Garcia’s (2009) theorization of translanguaging “as a means to enhance pupils’ cognitive, language and literacy abilities” (page 44, as cited in Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012) and is reflected in the teachers’ answers in this research. However, as Garcia and Lin (2016) observe, it is difficult for teachers “steeped in monoglossic language ideologies” to accept and embrace translanguaging in the classroom. The participant teachers’ tendency or inclination to allow English in the classroom instead of their students’ first languages, probably reflects their insecurity connected to the fact that they do not know their students’ languages, also observed in the research of Gkaintartzi, Mouti, Skourtou and Tsokalidou (in press/2019) in the Greek context and Pulinx, Van Avermaet and Agirdag (2017) in Flanders, but also signals a dominance of English language as a medium of instruction of other languages as presented by Cenoz (2019) and Brutt-Griffler (2017).

5.6. Theory and practice in the Greek language classroom

The findings of the teachers’ suggestions for effective language teaching section of the questionnaire are consistent with those of Maligkoudi and Chatzidaki (2018) who explore the diverse beliefs of three teachers teaching the Albanian language in a community school and find that the participant teachers’ views range from embracing translanguaging practices in the classroom to teaching in a traditional monolingual way. What’s more, a teacher who
participated in this research and uses translinguaging as a practice in her community classroom, similarly to the two participants in our research, explains that they resort to Greek “when there is a difficulty, when we have to explain something” (page 9, my translation); the other teacher in that research, who also recognises the pedagogic value of translinguaging, admits that “mostly we try to speak in Albanian, for their ear to get used to the Albanian language, but Greek also. Since it is necessary” (page 9, my translation). This reasoning of the use of translinguaging practices as a scaffold for the acquisition of the target language is not reflected in Maligkoudi and Chatzidaki’s teachers’ views of translinguaging as they consider it to be a dynamic process that activates their students’ bilingual skills. No such inferences could be made from the limited open-type answers of the participant teachers to the present research.

As for the concrete practices that some of the teachers use in their classrooms as they came out from the open type questions, they are limited when compared to those proposed by Creese and Blackledge (2010) and Garcia and Wei (2014) but still important, as the participant teachers mostly refer to translation of words, explanation of grammar and new concepts, explanations for deeper understanding, activities concerning cultural information, making inferences and connections, language comparisons, flashcards and drawings. Additionally, some of them, recognizing the contribution translinguaging can have on the development of interpersonal relations and the expression of affective meanings (Cahyani, de Courcy & Barnett, 2018) appear to use other languages to increase student participation and inclusion. One teacher suggests “to respect students’ differences and make them feel comfortable and accepted” but does not explicitly say how to do this. Assuming that the teacher means through translinguaging we understand that her focus is on the affective benefits this practice can have for students as it makes them feel comfortable and the benefits on their interpersonal relations as this practice humanizes the classroom climate and includes all students. Another teacher claims she uses all her languages and her students’ languages “to demonstrate...that all languages are welcome in our classroom and learning several languages is fun and doable” and “to make meaning and empower them”. This active stance towards multilingualism is positive on its own and the teacher seems to be aware of the benefits of translinguaging as presented by Garcia, however she does not mention any particular strategy that she uses in the classroom. Another teacher answers: “peer teaching and group work had helped me a lot this year, because students can help each other in understanding the concepts”. Indeed, Garcia and
Wei (2014) consider group work and collaborative dialogue a very good strategy teachers can use to promote their students’ bilingualism. A teacher suggests, among other things “use of new technologies and learning tools such as quizlet, ppt” and another “cartoons, songs, flashcards and drawings” and although I initially hesitated to integrate these answers to those relevant to translanguaging, I think new technologies and multimedia used as learning tools are in fact part of students’ multiliteracies as explained by Cope and Kalantzis (2009, page 175) who contend: “In a pedagogy of Multiliteracies, all forms of representation, including language, should be regarded as dynamic processes of transformation rather than processes of reproduction”, thus all semiotic codes including computer language, students’ languages visual and audio representations, are the modalities that they use to make meaning of the world that surrounds them and, not shifting from one to the other, but rather navigating amongst them, constitutes some kind of translanguaging. Two teachers consider using a third common language as a medium for instruction a good practice in the Greek as a second language classroom; Brutt-Griffler (2017) suggests using English as a medium of instruction of another language is a way “to overcome the linguistic disadvantage” (page 217) and indeed, doing that is certainly not bad if the third language is part of everyone’s linguistic repertoire, but valorising this third language and forgetting about the students’ first languages by excluding them from the classroom endangers the preservation of these languages and limits students’ multilingual competency. Cummins (2001) argued for the importance of students’ first language in the process of learning a second one and in acquiring academic competency. Three other teachers contend translanguaging is acceptable at the beginning in order to communicate, build students’ self-confidence and learn, but when they have acquired “a solid background of Greek” teachers should “encourage them to use as much Greek as possible”. This last opinion is dominant in literature concerning translanguaging practices in the classroom (Sert, 2005; Nambisan, 2014). Fallas-Escobar and Dillard-Paltrineri (2015) in their research on BA student-teachers’ beliefs on translanguaging found that translanguaging was for most of them, permissible as a transitional and limited scaffolding reserved only for beginners.

5.7. “There is no need for special provisions”

Another finding of this research (see Appendix B) I would like to point out and which has come out from the discussions over the phone with school principals when I was trying to get access
to the teachers of Greek to send them my questionnaire, but which also became obvious in the opinions expressed by some of the participants in the questionnaire, was the comfortable belief that since the bilingual students of the school can speak well and communicate in the majority language, “there is no need for special provisions”. This was an excuse quite a few school principals gave me for not forwarding the questionnaire to the teachers of Greek, because the bilingual students follow mainstream classes of Greek, not Greek as a second language and there are no deviations from the classroom norm to accommodate them. This finding is consistent with what Mattheoudakis, Chatzidaki and Maligkoudi (2017) found in their study of public elementary schools in three cities in Greece, where half of the participant teachers answered that they make no modifications in their teaching for bilingual students because they “can speak Greek quite well and they don’t need special treatment” (page 367). This reasoning excluded several schools from the sample of the present research. Additionally, this belief that when students reach a satisfactory level of competence in the majority language then they do not need support or special classroom practices is reflected in the answers of the teachers in our research, who report they use languages other than Greek or allow students to use other languages: because “we have students that don’t speak at all Greek”, “when necessary for further explanation”, “if the students don’t understand”, “only when it is completely necessary for the students”, “in order to explain what the children cannot understand”, “in order to be understood”, “only when they can’t explain it in Greek”, “I allow them express themselves in all languages at the beginning”, “when they are totally beginners”, “if they cannot communicate adequately in Greek”. Teachers’ judging of students’ overall linguistic competency from their conversational fluency is common according to Cummins (2000) but this theorization ignores their academic language skills. Garcia, Kleifgen and Falchi (2008) suggest it is necessary to “extend educational support to emergent bilinguals beyond the elementary level” (page 47) for educational equity. To the same vain Baker (2011, as cited in Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012) argues for the beneficial effect of translanguaging for academic language development and thus “a fuller bilingualism and biliteracy”.
6. Conclusive remarks

The diversity of the current inhabitants of Greece is undisputable. Given the fact that assimilation policies of the past have brought nothing but injustice for the immigrants in the country, providing them with minimum opportunities to fully integrate, it is now more than ever necessary to review educational policies. Integration is a two-way process, it is not only about immigrants adjusting to natives but also natives adjusting to the new reality. Intercultural education has to take under consideration all different cultures that coexist including the Greek and those of the people who now live in this country. To my understanding, the basis of intercultural education is respect for and embracing of diversity, and, as language is an aspect of each person’s cultural identity, it cannot be ignored in the process of integration. Multilingualism is an asset and not a deficiency and it should be seen like an asset and promoted by the State. Policies ought to change, intercultural schools, foreign schools, DYEP, ZEP, are all half-meters as they isolate a certain part of the society often leading to ghettofication of surroundings. Public education in Greece should be intercultural throughout, monolingual policies should be excluded from schools and all students should be provided with the same opportunities for learning several languages and for accessing the curriculum with equity.

The present research attempted to explore teachers’ translanguaging practices in foreign schools in Greece, assuming that private schools which contend to promote multilingualism, indeed do so. Studying these practices for multilingualism would provide us with evidence that translanguaging does make a difference in the education of children and would set an example for policy makers and educators in all fields to debunk ideologies of deficiency for translanguaging and include it in their practices. The findings of this research point to a certain positive attitude of teachers (who teach Greek in foreign schools) towards translanguaging, which is however reserved for students of low proficiency levels in the target language, Greek. Nevertheless, speaking of a target language disorientates us from our cause, to educate all children and empower them to access knowledge and integrate in this new society with equitable terms. The legal framework concerning the function of foreign schools in Greece dates from 1931 and explicitly excludes other languages from the Greek language classroom, this may be a reason why teachers hesitate to adopt translanguaging practices. Additionally, it restricts the access of Greek children who want to go to such schools by obliging them to follow a separate branch that follows the Greek curriculum and depriving them from the choice to be
part of a multicultural classroom (see Appendix C). The need for retheorization of the legal framework concerning the function of these schools towards a more democratic vain has been made clear in the context of this study.

There were quite a few limitations to this study; primarily, time constraints, as this research had to be completed in the course of a short academic semester; and space constraints, the researcher now lives in Larissa and most of the foreign schools are in Athens and Thessaloniki. As a result of these constraints, the method of an online questionnaire was selected, which although designed carefully with quantitative and qualitative questions, received limited answers in number and length, which in turn provided the researcher with limited data. Another shortcoming of the design of the questionnaire, realized by the researcher in the process of analysing the data, actually too late to correct, was the fact that it was written solely in English, assuming that everyone speaks this lingua franca. This assumption was biased on my part, I should have translated the questionnaire at least in Greek, if not in other languages as well, since my target group was teachers of Greek.

However, this study is important, as it is a first attempt to map foreign schools in Greece. It shows they are here to provide foreign children who live in Greece an International education, give some of them equitable educational opportunities removing for them linguistic barriers and of course prepare Greek students for studies and/or life abroad. Some of these schools, for instance the Philippine School in Greece, promote mother language maintenance and introduce Filipino students to customs of their country of origin. Most of these schools are cradles of multicultural education and multilingualism that grow children with respect to diversity and answer to their learning needs by offering them state of the art facilities, technologies and teaching practices. For all children to have access to such education, the greek educational system needs to recognise this need for intercultural education for all students and invest in quality education for all the children.

Future research should focus on dismantling the monolingual bias and people’s unquestioned theorization of languages as separate entities and propose ways how teachers can implement translanguaging pedagogy in the classroom. Educating teachers and liberating them from monolingual practices as the only legitimate classroom practice is the first difficult step, but we need to take the second one and show them how to do it, we have to provide them with adequate material and media and support them in their work educating our children. Finally,
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valuing the work of teachers, recognizing that to be a good teacher, your work doesn’t end when the school bell rings and remunerating them for their liturgy, are all presupposed for an educational system with increased chances of success.
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Appendix A: List of foreign schools

Law 4186/2013, paragraph 8 on foreign schools, retrieved from: http://dide.flo.sch.gr/site/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/DIDEFlorinas_N_4186_2013_Me_Oles_Tis_Allages.pdf

8. Αναγνωρίζονται ως ξένα σχολεία κατά την έννοια της παραγράφου 1 του άρθρου 1 του ν. 4862/1931 «Περί των ξένων σχολείων» (Α’ 156), όπως ισχύει, τα ακόλουθα σχολεία:
1. ΓΕΡΜΑΝΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ
2. ΓΕΡΜΑΝΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ
3. ΕΛΛΗΝΟΓΑΛΛΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ ΑΓΙΑΣ ΠΑΡΑΣΚΕΥΗΣ ΕΥΓΕΝΙΟΣ ΝΤΕΛΑΚΡΟΥΑ
4. ΙΤΑΛΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ
5. ΑΜΕΡΙΚΑΝΙΚΟ ΚΟΛΛΕΓΙΟ ΑΝΑΤΟΛΙΑ
6. ΑΜΕΡΙΚΑΝΙΚΟ ΚΟΛΛΕΓΙΟ ΕΛΛΑΔΑΣ
7. ΕΛΛΗΝΟΓΑΛΛΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ ΑΓΙΟΣ ΠΑΥΛΟΣ
8. ΕΛΛΗΝΟΓΑΛΛΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ JEANNE D’ ARC
9. ΕΛΛΗΝΟΓΑΛΛΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ ΚΑΛΑΜΑΡΙ
10. ΕΛΛΗΝΟΓΑΛΛΙΚΟ ΚΟΛΛΕΓΙΟ ΔΕΛΑΣΑΛ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ
11. ΛΕΟΝΤΕΙΟ ΛΥΚΕΙΟ NEAS ΣΜΥΡΝΗΣ
12. ΕΛΛΗΝΟΓΑΛΛΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ ΑΓΙΟΣ ΙΩΣΗΦ
13. ΕΛΛΗΝΟΓΑΛΛΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ ΟΥΡΣΟΥΛΙΝΩΝ
14. ΛΕΟΝΤΕΙΟΛΥΚΕΙΟΠΑΤΗΣΙΩΝ
15. AMERICAN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS OF ATHENS
16. ΔΗΜΟΤΙΚΟ ΣΧΟΛΕΙΟ ΤΗΣ ΓΑΛΛΙΚΗΣ ΛΑΪΚΗΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΗΣ
17. ΓΑΛΛΙΚΟ ΣΧΟΛΕΙΟ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ (ΓΥΜΝΑΣΙΟ-ΛΥΚΕΙΟ)
18. INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY SCHOOL OF LARISA
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19. KATIPUNAN PHILLIPINES CULTURAL ACADEMY
20. BYRON COLLEGE
21. PINEWOOD SCHOOL OF THESSALONIKI
22. ΠΟΛΩΝΙΚΟΣΧΟΛΕΙΟ ΖΥΓΜΟΝΤ ΜΙΝΕΥΚΟ
23. ST. CATHERINE’S BRITISH SCHOOL
24. ST. LAWRENCE COLLEGE
25. INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF ATHENS
26. CAMPIONSCHOOL
27. ΙΡΑΝΙΚΟ ΣΧΟΛΕΙΟ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ
28. ΛΙΒΥΚΟ ΣΧΟΛΕΙΟ 17ΗΣ ΦΕΒΡΟΥΑΡΙΟΥ
29. ΚΑΝΑΔΙΚΟ ΛΥΚΕΙΟ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΑΔΑΣ.

«30. ΑΜΕΡΙΚΑΝΙΚΗ ΓΕΩΡΓΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ». (119) Στα σχολεία αυτά χορηγούνται, δια του παρόντος, άδεια ίδρυσης και άδεια λειτουργίας.

(119) Στην παρ. 8 του άρθρου 35 του ν. 4186/2013 (Α’ 193) προστέθηκε περ. 30, ως άνω σύμφωνα με την παρ. 1 του άρθ. 90 του Ν. 4485/2017 (ΦΕΚ 114/Α/4-8-2017)
Appendix B: Unofficial information on schools

Στοιχεία για τα ξένα σχολεία που προέκυψαν από τις τηλεφωνικές συνομιλίες με τους διευθυντές ή τις γραμματείες των σχολείων.

Κατά δήλωσή τους έχουν ξένους μαθητές οπότε τους εστάλησαν ερωτηματολόγια

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Κατά δήλωσή τους έχουν ξένους μαθητές οπότε τους εστάλησαν ερωτηματολόγια</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ΓΕΡΜΑΝΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ΓΕΡΜΑΝΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ΕΛΛΗΝΟΓΑΛΛΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ ΑΓΙΑΣ ΠΑΡΑΣΚΕΥΗΣ ΕΥΓΕΝΙΟΣ ΝΤΕΛΑΚΡΟΥΑ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ΙΤΑΛΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ΑΜΕΡΙΚΑΝΙΚΟ ΚΟΛΛΕΓΙΟ ΕΛΑΔΑΣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ΕΛΛΗΝΟΓΑΛΛΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ JEANNE D’ARC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ΛΕΟΝΤΕΙΟ ΛΥΚΕΙΟ ΠΑΤΗΣΙΩΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. AMERICAN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS OF ATHENS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ΔΗΜΟΤΙΚΟ ΣΧΟΛΕΙΟ ΤΗΣ ΓΑΛΛΙΚΗΣ ΛΑΙΚΗΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΗΣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ΓΑΛΛΙΚΟ ΣΧΟΛΕΙΟ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY SCHOOL OF LARISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. KATIPUNAN PHILIPPINES CULTURAL ACADEMY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. BYRON COLLEGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. PINEWOOD SCHOOL OF THESSALONIKI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. ΠΟΛΩΝΙΚΟ ΣΧΟΛΕΙΟ ZYGMUNT MINEYKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. ST. CATHERINE’S BRITISH SCHOOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. ST. LAWRENCE COLLEGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF ATHENS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. CAMPION SCHOOL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Κατά δήλωσή τους δεν έχουν ξένους μαθητές

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Κατά δήλωσή τους δεν έχουν ξένους μαθητές</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ΑΜΕΡΙΚΑΝΙΚΟ ΚΟΛΛΕΓΙΟ ΑΝΑΤΟΛΙΑ (5 δίγλωσσοι-χωρίς υποστήριξη)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ΕΛΛΗΝΟΓΑΛΛΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ ΑΓΙΟΣ ΠΑΥΛΟΣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ΕΛΛΗΝΟΓΑΛΛΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ ΚΑΛΑΜΑΡΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ΕΛΛΗΝΟΓΑΛΛΙΚΟ ΚΟΛΛΕΓΙΟ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ΛΕΟΝΤΕΙΟ ΛΥΚΕΙΟ ΝΕΑΣ ΣΜΥΡΝΗΣ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. ΕΛΛΗΝΟΓΑΛΛΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ ΑΓΙΟΣ ΙΩΣΗΦ
7. ΕΛΛΗΝΟΓΑΛΛΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ ΟΥΡΣΟΥΛΙΝΩΝ (2 διγλωσσοί- χωρίς υποστήριξη)
8. ΑΜΕΡΙΚΑΝΙΚΗ ΓΕΩΡΓΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Κατά δήλωσή τους δεν διδάσκουν τα Ελληνικά</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ΙΡΑΝΙΚΟ ΣΧΟΛΕΙΟ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Σχολεία για τα οποία δεν ήταν εφικτό να πάρουμε καμία πληροφορία</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ΛΙΒΥΚΟ ΣΧΟΛΕΙΟ 17ΗΣ ΦΕΒΡΟΥΑΡΙΟΥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ΚΑΝΑΔΙΚΟ ΛΥΚΕΙΟ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΑΔΑΣ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Private International Schools

Private International Schools also operate. Natural persons (non-Greek citizens) or legal persons that do not live in Greece may establish them.

Several of these schools are the outcome of bilateral educational agreements signed between Greece and other states. The existence of a transnational agreement does not substitute operation license.

The Hellenic Ministry of Education supervises their operation via the Primary and Secondary Education Directorates.

According to their curriculum, **International schools are classified in:**

- International schools following the curriculum of the foreign country. They address mainly foreign nationals living in Greece. Based on Law 3794/2009, schools adhering to the curriculum of an EU-Member State, allow for EU-Member State pupils attendance without restrictions. In schools following the curriculum of a third country, Greek pupils may also attend, after permission by the Ministry of Education, and under certain conditions

- International schools with a Greek curriculum. They follow the same curriculum as Greek State Schools. They place emphasis on foreign language teaching and cultural elements

- International schools with a Greek and foreign curriculum. They operate as two independent sections.

It should be noted that teaching of Greek subjects according to the Greek curriculum is **compulsory** for all international schools, even if they follow only a foreign curriculum.
Appendix D: The Questionnaire

Translanguaging in the Greek Language classroom

The aim of the present survey is to reveal Teachers' beliefs and practices concerning translanguaging in the classroom. It is addressed to teachers of Greek language who work in Foreign or International schools at the Greek territory (school-year 2018-2019). The research is a prerequisite for a master thesis in the context of Language Education for Refugees and Migrants postgraduate program of the Hellenic Open University. The results of this survey will only be used for research purposes. Your answers will remain anonymous. Filling in this form sincerely is considered to be of major importance for the drawing of safe conclusions. Your kind participation will take about 10 minutes and will contribute greatly to the successful completion of this research.

Thank you for your participation,
Chrysovala Kokkini
kokkinichrysi@gmail.com

* Required

Skip to question 1.

Teacher's data

1. Gender *
   Mark only one oval.
   ○ Female
   ○ Male

2. Age *
   Mark only one oval.
   ○ 18-30
   ○ 31-40
   ○ 41-50
   ○ 51+

3. Bachelor in *
   Mark only one oval.
   ○ Pedagogy
   ○ Greek philology
   ○ English philology
   ○ French philology
   ○ German philology
   ○ Italian philology
   ○ Other: ____________________________
School, students and practices

According to Ofelia Garcia (2009, p. 140) "Translanguaging is the act performed by bilinguals of accessing different linguistic features or various modes of what are described as autonomous languages, in order to maximize communicative potential". The act of using resources from different languages together, with very little regard for what we might call the 'boundaries' of named languages such as 'Spanish' or 'English' to communicate more effectively; this is what translanguaging is about! (Further examples can be found online: https://ealjournal.org/2016/07/26/what-is-translanguaging/). In classroom practice, it is the use of all available linguistic resources to the students and/or the teacher, for example students' first languages or and a common medium language like English, to make meaning and promote learning by including-engaging everyone in the learning procedure.

9. Name of the Foreign or International school where you work *
10. Number of bilingual or multilingual students you teach *

11. Approximate number of students in a classroom *
   Mark only one oval.
   - 1-5
   - 6-10
   - 11-15
   - 16-20
   - 21 +

12. All languages your students can speak *

13. Do you allow/ encourage students to use their first language in the language classroom? *

14. Do you allow/ encourage students to use other languages in the classroom apart from Greek? If yes, which and why? *

15. Does the level of students in Greek affect the amount of translanguaging you do in the classroom? How? *

16. Does the age of the students affect the amount of translanguaging you do in the classroom? How? *

Teacher's beliefs about translanguaging

Translanguaging in the language classroom:

17. contributes to the communication among students (monolingual or bilingual) *
   Mark only one oval.
18. increases the level of interaction between monolingual and bilingual students *
Mark only one oval.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ I totally agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

19. contributes to tackling stereotypes concerning students of diverse origins *
Mark only one oval.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ I totally agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

20. changes the attitude of monolingual students towards their bilingual peers *
Mark only one oval.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ I totally agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

21. and the free use of students' first languages increase bilingual students' emotional security *
Mark only one oval.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ I totally agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

22. and the free use of students' first languages in the classroom increase bilingual students' self-confidence *
Mark only one oval.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ I totally agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

23. contributes to the development of bilingual students' sentimental intelligence *
Mark only one oval.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ I totally agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

24. motivates bilingual students to participate in the language lesson *
Mark only one oval.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chrysoula Kokkini, “Translanguaging in the Greek Language Classroom: The Case of Foreign Schools in Greece”

25. contributes to the general cognitive development of bilingual students *
   Mark only one oval.
   1 2 3 4 5
   I strongly disagree       I totally agree

26. promotes bilingual students’ learning of Greek *
   Mark only one oval.
   1 2 3 4 5
   I strongly disagree       I totally agree

27. strengthens bilingual students’ overall performance at school *
   Mark only one oval.
   1 2 3 4 5
   I strongly disagree       I totally agree

28. and the use of a common-third language (eg. English) as a medium for the instruction helps students’ learning of Greek *
   Mark only one oval.
   1 2 3 4 5
   I strongly disagree       I totally agree

Suggestions

Students in a multicultural Greek language classroom:

29. should avoid changing codes *
   Mark only one oval.
   1 2 3 4 5
   I strongly disagree       I totally agree

30. should only use Greek *
   Mark only one oval.
   1 2 3 4 5
   I strongly disagree       I totally agree
### 31. can use their first languages *
Mark only one oval.

<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I totally agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly disagree

### 32. can use a medium language (eg. English) to learn Greek as long as it is a common language for all *
Mark only one oval.

<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I totally agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly disagree

### 33. In your opinion, what is the best educational practice that can be used in a multicultural language classroom? *

________________________

________________________

________________________

________________________

Please make sure you have answered all questions and press submit. Your help has been of utmost importance.
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