Supporting Teachers of Multilingual Young Learners: Multilingual Approach to Diversity in Education (MADE)

MaryAnn Christison, Anna Krulatz, and Yeşim Sevinç

Abstract With the growing numbers of culturally and linguistically heterogeneous children in classrooms around the globe, the education of multilingual young learners (MYLs) is undergoing a multilingual turn (Conteh & Meier, 2014; May, 2014, 2019). Teachers are important agents of change who can foster the development of children's multilingual competences both inside and outside the classroom (De Angelis, 2011). However, research suggests that while teachers may respect and value minority-language students' linguistic and cultural heritages (Alisaari et al. 2019; Rodríguez-Izquierdo et al. 2020; Sevinç et al. forthcoming), they have a superficial understanding of language acquisition processes (first and additional) and do not feel sufficiently prepared to support students' multilingual development (Burner & Carlsen, 2019; De Angelis, 2011; Surkalovic, 2014). In this chapter, we introduce the Multilingual Approach to Diversity in Education (MADE), which is a comprehensive, multidimensional model for education in multilingual settings that consists of the following indicators: Classroom as Multilingual Space, Interaction and Grouping Configurations, Teacher Language Use, Learner Language Use, Language and Culture Attitudes, Metacognition and Metalinguistic Awareness, Teaching Materials, and Multiliteracy. We illustrate the model with observation data from classrooms for MYLs in Norway, which we use to examine to what degree and in what ways teachers satisfy the MADE criteria when delivering instruction to MYLs. We conclude with general implications for teachers who are working with young, heterogenous, multilingual learners in other contexts.

M. Christison (✉)
University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, USA
e-mail: ma.christison@utah.edu

A. Krulatz
Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway
e-mail: anna.m.krulatz@ntnu.no

Y. Sevinç
Center for Multilingualism in Society across the Lifespan (MultiLing), University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
e-mail: yesim.sevinc@iln.uio.no

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021

J. Rokita-Jaśkow and A. Wolanin (eds.), *Facing Diversity in Child Foreign Language Education*, Second Language Learning and Teaching,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-66022-2_15

Keywords Approaches to education · Language teacher education · Multilingualism · Multilingual young learners · Professional learning

1 Introduction

Contemporary societies are characterized by transnational mobility, increasing ethnic, cultural, and linguistic diversity, and multilingualism. As a result, multilingual young learner (MYL) classrooms around the world are becoming more heterogeneous, a situation that poses new demands on teachers. While monolingual ideologies continue to dominate mainstream education, the amount of evidence pointing to the benefits of multilingualism is increasing (e.g., Bialystok, 2009; Hamers & Blanc, 2000; Li Wei, 2000), and the call for a multilingual turn in education is gaining momentum (Conteh & Meier, 2014; May, 2014, 2019).

To be able to implement multilingually-oriented pedagogies, however, teachers of MYLs need to be equipped with relevant knowledge and appropriate tools. For instance, it has been proposed that teachers should be familiar with current research on multilingualism and know how to foster multilingual development in learners. They should also develop an understanding of multilingual learners and their families, be able to serve as model multilinguals, and possess high levels of cross-linguistic and metalinguistic awareness (De Angelis, 2011; García & Kleyn, 2016; Haukås, 2016; Hufeisen, 2011; Lucas & Villegas, 2013; Otwinowska, 2014). Research suggests, however, that many teachers continue to display monolingual ideologies and that most teacher education programs for pre-service teachers and professional learning programs for practicing teachers do not sufficiently prepare them to deliver instruction that draws on and supports multilingual competence (Alisaari et al., 2019; Burner & Carlsen,2019; Cenoz & Santos, 2020; De Angelis, 2011; Gorter & Arocena, 2020; Haukås, 2016; Heyder & Schädlich, 2014; Otwinowska, 2014; Rodríguez-Izquierdo et al., 2020; Sevinç et al. forthcoming). Therefore, both pre- and in-service teachers of MYLs need to receive specific training and professional development to help them bridge these gaps in knowledge and skills (Alisaari et al., 2019; De Angelis, 2011; Illman & Pietilä, 2017), and teacher education programs should provide teachers with access to holistic and multidimensional approaches "where the how, what, and why of teaching are unified and meaningful" (Wlodkowski & Ginsberg, 1995, p. 17). In this chapter, one such model is introduced, the Multilingual Approach to Diversity in Education (MADE), and described in terms of how it was implemented as a tool for classroom observation and feedback for teachers working with MYLs. The results are also reported for the first phase of a research study, which concentrated on understanding the classroom practices of MYL teachers prior to specific professional learning experiences with MADE.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Multilingual Young Learners

MYLs in K12 educational contexts are described in the literature in a variety of different ways, such as in terms of their overall numbers and the rate at which the MYL population is growing within an educational system, their scores on standardized tests, the percentage of MYLs who read at grade level, their language backgrounds, or their graduation rates (see, for example, Language Council of Norway n.d.; MER, 2004; NCES, 2020; NDET, 2015). Although these ways of describing MYLs may be useful for the purposes of language policy and planning, individual teachers need specific information about the diverse backgrounds of their learners, as well as an understanding of the profound effect that individual differences can have on learning if they are to provide effective instruction in the classroom. MYLs differ in terms of age, grade level, language background(s), language proficiency, socio-economic status, literacy development in the home language (HL), as well as in their personal and individual likes and dislikes, individual differences in how they perceive and process information, and their preferences and experiences for learning, just to name a few. The following vignette illustrates these differences:

> Raul is aged six and is entering first grade and attending school for the first time. His home languages (HLs) are Aymara and Spanish, neither of which are the languages of instruction in his school. He does not yet read or write in any language. Graciela is also aged six and is entering first grade after three years of pre-school and one year of Kindergarten. Her HLs are Spanish and Portuguese, neither of which are the languages of instruction in her school. She has been studying English as an additional language (EAL) in pre-schools since she was three, and her mother is an English teacher. She already has basic literacy skills in three languages although her literacy skills are not equally developed in the three languages. Spanish is her strongest language for both oral language and literacy. Although Nasim is aged 7, he is entering first grade with no prior schooling experiences. His HL is Arabic; it is not the language of instruction in his school. He has emerging literacy skills in Arabic, but Arabic and the language of instruction in his school use different orthographic systems. (Researcher field notes, May, 2019)

The three MYLs described here have diverse backgrounds, yet they attend the same school, are in the same grade and class, and receive instruction from the same teacher. To create optimal classroom experiences for these three MYLs, the teacher needs to recognize that knowing the individual students' backgrounds of her learners is important for creating a classroom space that promotes learning and multilingualism. For example, Raul has no experience with literacy while Graciela has basic literacy skills in three languages. In addition, four different home languages are represented. These differences influence oral language and literacy development in complex ways as certain language skills and abilities are known to transfer across languages (August & Shanahan, 2006). It is a complex process to be certain.

To create optimal classroom experiences for young MYLs, teachers need to be supported by instructional and curricular goals that promote multilingualism, as well as have access to human and material resources that match learners' needs. Most

often, K12 schools and teachers embrace a reductionist approach to teaching MYLs, meaning that teaching MYLs is viewed as just good teaching (JGT) (Ladson-Billings, 1995a; Lindahl, 2013), which, in practice, means using teaching strategies that have been developed for monolingual learners (de Jong & Harper, 2005; Harper & de Jong, 2004). JGT is embraced as an approach to teaching MYLs throughout K12 contexts and in multiple countries that accept large numbers of immigrants; however, it de-emphasizes complex learner variables while, at the same time, it simplifies the overlap between first and second language learning, placing the focus on integrating teachers' existing knowledge base into classroom practices for MYLs, for example activating and building background knowledge, allowing for thinking time, and using pair and group work (Harper & de Jong, 2004). While no one would disagree that such strategies are beneficial, they are not sufficient. For example, it is well established that grade level content area benchmarks are often inappropriate for MYLs because MYLs may have different developmental trajectories (Davison, 1999; Harper & de Jong, 2004). In addition, MYLs have to work twice as much as monolingual learners (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007) as they must acquire the language of instruction at the same time learning rigorous academic content.

Teaching from a multilingual perspective is fundamentally different from JGT in that it embodies the purposeful use of home language and cultural backgrounds in teaching, as well as a point of view that all languages are seen as resources (Ruiz, 1984) that can be used for thinking and communication. There is a growing body of research that supports teaching MYLs from a multilingual perspective. Because most teachers have been educated in teacher education programs that embrace monolingual ideologies, shifting to multilingual ideologies and recognizing multilingualism as a resource in the classroom is often a challenge; teachers need support in recognizing and implementing diverse linguistic and cultural practices.

2.2 The Multilingual Turn in Education

In the recent decades, the fields of second language acquisition (SLA) and language education have witnessed a shift away from the dominant monolingual ideologies that take native speakers as the reference point for language learners and insist on a strict separation of languages, both in the mind and in the classroom (e.g., Cook, 2010; Ortega, 2014). The assumption that monolingualism is the norm in human communication is gradually being replaced by an acknowledgment of multilingualism as the new linguistic dispensation (e.g., Aronin & Singleton, 2012; Conteh & Meier, 2014; May, 2014). Deficit approaches to SLA, which view second language learners as inferior to monolingual native speakers, have been questioned; instead, multilinguals should be recognized as language users who are competent even if qualitatively different from native speakers (Grosjean, 2010). Multilinguals' language trajectories are complex and dynamic, and they draw on their resources in different ways depending on the communicative needs that vary by a range of factors, such as contexts and participants (Creese and Blackledge 2010).

As a result of the multilingual turn (Conteh & Meier, 2014; May 2014), there have been calls for softening the boundaries between languages (Blommaert, 2010; Cenoz & Gorter, 2013) and for the integration of learners' linguistic resources through instructional practices, such as linguistically and culturally responsive teaching (Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Lucas & Villegas, 2011) and pedagogical translanguaging (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020; Cenoz & Santos, 2020; Gorter & Arocena, 2020). Conteh and Meier (2014) have argued that to enact the multilingual turn in education, all learners should be considered "as users of language in diverse ways, and as potential and emergent multilinguals" (p. 294). New, multilingual approaches to education should draw on learners' linguistic and cultural resources as bridges to new learning and promote the use of their full linguistic repertoires to raise learners' awareness about language and help them develop links between languages in a planned and systematic way (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020). A broader goal of multilingual education is to provide equal opportunities for learning for all students by legitimizing diverse language repertoires, identities, and other resources that learners bring with them to the classroom (Conteh & Meier 2014).

In order for the multilingual turn to gain a stronghold in educational contexts, however, teachers need to be seen as central players and agents of change. For teachers to implement multilingual pedagogies, a shift must occur in teacher cognition. To date, most studies have found that despite holding positive attitudes towards multilingualism and multilingual learners, teachers continue to display monolingual ideologies (Alisaari et al., 2019; De Angelis, 2011; Rodríguez-Izquierdo et al. 2020), which has led many researchers to conclude that changes are needed in teacher preparation programs (e.g., Alisaari et al., 2019; De Angelis, 2011). It has been argued that teacher education should focus more extensively on general knowledge about multilingualism and language acquisition, cross-linguistic and metalinguistic awareness, sensitivity to learner differences, school-home collaborations, and multilingual pedagogies (De Angelis, 2011; Haukås, 2016; Hufeisen, 2011; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Otwinowska, 2014). Thus, equipping teachers with tools that can help them implement multilingually-oriented teaching is one of the central factors in promoting the multilingual turn in education. In the following sections, we give an overview of the existing models of multilingual education and introduce the Multilingual Approach to Diversity in Education (MADE), which is intended as a tool to support teachers in the design and delivery of linguistically and culturally appropriate instruction in multilingual settings.

2.3 Models of Multilingual Education

Aiming to provide multilingual learners with equal access to education and to optimize their learning potential, a number of models and approaches specific to multilingual education have been proposed and implemented. This quest for the perfect model has its roots in bilingual education. Although these models come in various forms, including one- and two-way immersion, many are classified as

weak rather than strong (Baker, 2011) because they are designed to support minority language speakers in attaining native-like proficiency in a majority language rather than help them attain a bilingual competence. Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) (Echevarría et al., 2017) is an example of a model that aims to close the achievement gap between minority and majority language students by providing the former with instruction that "[makes] the content concepts accessible and also develop[s] students' skills in the new language" (Short et al., 2012, p. 334). Although the SIOP and other sheltered instruction programs have had some success in developing minority learners' mastery of academic content and the majority language (Echevarría e al., 2011a, 2011b; Short et al. 2012), they are assimilationist in nature and do not lead to bilingual development (Baker, 2011).

In contrast, multilingual approaches to education draw on research on multilingualism, reject the notion of a native speaker as a yardstick for multilingual language attainment, and aim to help learners draw on the linguistic resources they possess as a way to support and develop a multilingual competence. Many of these approaches embrace as central the notion of translanguaging, defined as "the process by which bilingual students and teachers engage in complex discursive practices in order to make sense of, and communicate in, multilingual classrooms" (García & Sylvan, 2011, p. 389). Pedagogical translanguaging (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020) employs intentional teaching strategies to utilize learners' full linguistic repertoires to support language and content learning. It is one of the central components of Focus on Multilingualism (Cenoz & Gorter, 2014), an approach that utilizes two or more languages in education with a goal of developing multilingualism and multiliteracy. The approach considers all languages and discursive practices of learners as valuable assets that can be utilized as bridges to new learning, aims to help learners activate the linguistic resources they have in a systematic way, and prompts teachers to disavow the ideology of language separation in favor of softening the boundaries between languages.

A comprehensive model that aims to support dynamic multilingualism has been proposed by García and Sylvan (2011). The model is guided by the following principles: heterogeneity, collaboration, learner-centeredness, language and content integration, plurilingualism, experiential learning, and local autonomy and responsibility. Other existing approaches to multilingual education, for example "Awakening to languages" (Candelier, 2004; Candelier et al., 2012) and linguistically and culturally responsive teaching (Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Wlodkowski & Ginsberg, 1995) stress the importance of promoting intercultural awareness through curricula that introduce learners to linguistic and cultural diversity, not necessarily with a goal to develop competence in additional languages, but rather as a way of acknowledging and celebrating learners' cultural and linguistic resources. Although "Awakening to languages" and linguistically and culturally responsive teaching originated in very different contexts, both of these approaches aim to promote academic achievement by helping learners develop positive linguistic and cultural identities, by stimulating curiosity about other languages and cultures and by fostering language awareness.

We by no means intend to dismiss the existing approaches to multilingual education. Nevertheless, we acknowledge that from the perspective of teachers, few of the approaches provide straightforward guidelines for classroom implementation. Additionally, many of the approaches tend to focus on one facet of multilingual education (for example, translanguaging or cultural diversity), rather than offering a holistic model for instruction. In the next section, drawing on the existing models and current research on multilingualism and multilingual education, we propose and describe MADE. The model is unique in that it provides an extensive, holistic instrument consisting of research-based teacher indicators, each of which is broken down into observable and measurable features. MADE is intended for teachers, teacher educators, and administrators who want to deliver optimal, high-quality education to multilingual learners, including MYLs, in a range of contexts.

2.4 Multilingual Approach to Diversity in Education (MADE)[1]

Intended as a tool for classroom observation and feedback for teachers, instructional design, and teacher professional learning, MADE presents eight research-based indicators and identifies specific features that are associated with each indicator and underpin how they are conceptualized in practice. The indicators are grounded in current research, and the features provide clear guidelines and suggestions for implementation. The approach is described briefly here.

The first indicator is identified as *Classrooms as Multilingual Space*. It is intended to sensitize teachers to the importance of paying attention to visual spaces in the classroom so that they reflect linguistic and cultural diversity not only in terms of art and wall displays but also in terms of learners' involvement in creating the spaces. The second indicator, *Interaction and Group Configurations*, explores potential grouping configurations in classrooms and the importance of providing opportunities for interaction, elaborated responses, and open discussion among learners and between teachers and learners. The third and fourth indicators are *Teacher* and *Learner Language Use*, and they focus on how teachers and learners use language in the classroom, including whether teachers are able to adjust their teacher talk for the language proficiency levels of their MYLs and model translanguaging and whether MYLs have opportunities to use their full linguistic repertoires. The fifth indicator focuses on *Language and Culture Attitudes*, such as whether teachers display an interest in learners' home languages, how they show their sensitivity to cultural differences, and what they do in practice to draw on learners' cultural and linguistic funds of knowledge. Giving learners opportunities to prepare and plan for learning, use strategies, and reflect on language, drawing on their home and additional languages

[1] We provide a summary of the model here. Readers interested in obtaining a copy of the instrument should contact Anna Krulatz at anna.m.krulatz@ntnu.no.

to support learning, are some of the key features of the sixth indicator, *Metacognition and Metalinguistic Awareness.* The seventh indicator, *Developing and Using Teaching Materials*, concentrates on how teachers can identify and create culturally and linguistically appropriate materials to promote all four language skills as well as grade-level content. The eighth indicator focuses on *Multiliteracy* and on what teachers can do to support and encourage literacy practices across languages. The research study presented below utilized MADE as an observation and feedback tool for professional learning.

3 Methods

This chapter reports on a study that employed MADE as an observation and feedback protocol for teachers working at a school with a large linguistically and culturally diverse student population. Data were collected through classroom observations. The following research question guided the study: To what degree and in what ways do teachers address the MADE criteria when delivering instruction to MYLs?

3.1 Context

Classroom observations for this study were conducted in a multilingual school that serves newly-arrived immigrant and refugee students in Grades 4–7 in Norway. This particular school was chosen as one of the most multilingual and multicultural schools in the country, comprising around 460 students, approximately 100 of whom are multilingual. About 25 different languages are represented at the school. Classroom observations reported in this contribution were carried out as a part of an ongoing research project which investigates English teaching and learning in multilingual classrooms in Norway, drawing on a mixed-methods approach (e.g., questionnaires, interviews, observations, and workshops with teachers).

3.2 Participants and Procedure

Ten two-hour English classes taught by four teachers of English as an Additional Language (EAL) (three females, one male) were observed. Five of the observations were carried out in mixed grade-level classes for newly arrived students, two in Grade 4,[2] and three in Grade 5. Grade 4 and Grade 5 classes consisted primarily of majority language students with a few multilingual learners.

[2]In Norway, students enter Grade 1 at the age of six. They are therefore 10 years old in Grade 4 and 11 years old in Grade 5.

Table 1 EAL teachers' background and teaching experience

	Gender	Education	Experience in teaching	Grades
Teacher 1	Female	MA (in progress)	8 years	Mixed grade level classes for newly-arrived students
Teacher 2	Male	BA in education	3 years	Mixed grade level classes for newly-arrived students
Teacher 3	Female	MA in Norwegian linguistics	8 years	Grade 5
Teacher 4	Female	BA in education	4 months	Grade 4

Table 1 provides information on the EAL teachers' background, including education level, the length of teaching experience, and the grades in which they were teaching at the time of the data collection. In five of the observed classes, the teachers were assisted by two and three resource teachers with immigrant backgrounds (not specified in the table).

Teacher 1 completed her bachelor's degree on English literature and English language in Syria and was enrolled in a master's program in childhood studies in Norway at the time of the data collection. The other three teachers obtained bachelor's degrees in education in Norway. Additionally, Teacher 3 held a master's degree in Norwegian Linguistics. Teacher 1 and Teacher 2 taught English in classes for newly-arrived multilingual students in Grades 4 to 7, while Teacher 3 taught Grade 5, and Teacher 4 taught Grade 4. The teachers varied with respect to the length of their teaching experience, ranging from four months to eight years.

3.3 Data Collection and Analysis

The main aim of the project presented here was to conduct a formative assessment of teachers' practices with regard to how these practices address the unique needs of MYLs in their classes. Keeping this aim in mind, 10 observations, each lasting up to two hours, were performed by two teacher trainers/researchers. Notes were chronicled in the MADE observation rubric; the sessions were not audio- or video-recorded for ethical reasons.

In addition to detailing their observation notes about teacher performances for each feature within the MADE rubric, the researchers assigned a score using the following scale: 0 = feature not observed; 1 = feature observed once; 2 = feature observed multiple times. Internal consistency and reliability were calculated by applying Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient (α). The analysis showed that the scales of MADE were valid and reliable with a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.93 (very satisfactory) for the eight indicators. Mean scores (M) and standard deviations for each indicator in MADE were computed. The expected mean score for each indicator was calculated

based on the assumption that if the teachers were actualizing multilingual practices in their classrooms, they should score at least ‘1’ for each of the features within the indicators (Table 2).

Through processes of *open coding*, concepts from observational data were coded and central themes related to multilingual practices emerged. Through the process of *axial coding*, examining, comparing, conceptualizing, and categorizing the data, relationships among and between the open codes provided structure to the observers’ notes (Strauss & Corbin 1990). Two researchers read through the data several times and created codes for chunks of data for each of the eight MADE indicators and for each observed class. They highlighted examples of observers’ notes and established properties for each indicator. The coded notes and central themes of the indicators were then compared for similarities and differences. Following the merging data approach (Creswell & Plano Clark 2011), excerpts from the coded observers’ notes were selected to further support certain findings from the quantitative analysis, including additional details that could not be obtained through scores.

4 Results

In this section, we first provide a summary of the quantitative results for each of the indicators in MADE and then a report of the findings from the analysis of the qualitative data. For the purpose of this study, the focus of the analysis was directed to the formative assessment of teacher performances relative to the eight indicators in MADE.

4.1 Quantitative Assessment of Teacher Performance on the Eight MADE Indicators

Table 2 summarizes the descriptive statistics for teacher performances on the eight MADE indicators. The results show that mean scores were lower than the expected mean scores (i.e., the midrange of the scale scores) on each of the eight MADE indicators. At least one of the four teachers scored at or above the expected mean on the first four indicators.

The fourth indicator, Learner Language Use, had a mean score that was closest to the expected mean ($M = 1.81$). Conversely, three indicators, 6, 7, and 8, had mean values that were the most distant from the expected mean scores, Multiliteracy ($M = .86$), Teaching Materials ($M = 1.55$), and Metacognition and Metalinguistic Awareness ($M = 2.02$).

Indicators 2 and 3, Interaction and Group Configurations and Teacher Language had the highest SDs (1.93 and 1.90), illustrating considerable variability among the teachers with at least one teacher scoring above the mean on both indicators and at

Table 2 Summary of the descriptive analysis on the eight MADE indicators

	Expected Mean	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Score range
1. Classroom as a Multilingual Space	3.00	2.06	.66	1.50	3.00	0–6
2. Interaction/Grouping Configurations	4.00	2.74	1.90	1.00	5.35	0–8
3. Teacher Language Use	4.00	2.85	1.93	.50	5.00	0–8
4. Learner Language Use	2.00	1.81	.90	.50	2.50	0–4
5. Language and Culture Attitudes	6.00	2.84	1.89	.75	5.30	0–12
6. Metacognition	5.00	2.02	1.49	.50	3.30	0–10
7. Teaching Materials	4.00	1.55	1.10	.50	2.80	0–8
8. Multiliteracy	3.00	.86	.35	.50	1.35	0–6

least one teacher scoring well below the mean. Indicators 1 and 8, Classroom as a Multilingual Space and Multiliteracy, had the lowest SDs (.66 and .35), illustrating less variability for the group.

4.2 *Qualitative Assessment of Teacher Performance on the Eight MADE Indicators*

4.2.1 Classroom as a Multilingual Space

The analysis of qualitative data emerging from the observers' notes revealed that while the school hallways reflected the multilingual and multicultural backgrounds of students through decorations such as student work, flags of various countries, and personal stories written in a mix of languages, the classrooms of the observed teachers did so to a much lesser degree. Most of the signs and decorations on the classroom walls were in Norwegian, with a few posters featuring English grammar rules and some with Latin and runes on them; overall, there were very few traces of multilingualism in the classroom spaces. Some student work was displayed on classroom walls, but it was mostly in Norwegian. However, one classroom featured a sign with the word "hello" in 16 different languages.

4.2.2 Interaction and Grouping Configurations

In most of the observed classes, there was very little student interaction or group work. In the majority of the classes, the teachers opted for individual work or teacher-centered instruction. When interaction did occur, the focus was on the teacher interacting with the whole class or with individual students. In a few cases, the teachers

appeared to group students explicitly based on student language background. For example, learners speaking the same heritage language (HL) were asked to work together so that they could support one another, and newly-arrived students were paired with more experienced peers who served as translators. In one case, students were allowed to choose one of three tasks and join the group that was working on the task they had selected, which was a process that suggested the teacher trusted the learners to appropriately consider their own needs, including language demands.

4.2.3 Teacher Language Use

Some variation was observed among the teachers with regard to this indicator. Some employed English-Norwegian translation extensively, for instance when giving task instructions or when eliciting answers from students, and explicit teacher actions were noted that supported translanguaging practices among students. For instance, one of the teachers regularly prompted the students to provide equivalents of newly introduced words in English in their HLs. In other classes, however, most notably in the cases where teachers themselves practiced a monolingual approach, such opportunities for students were lacking. One of the teachers attempted to adhere to the English-only principle, switching to Norwegian as the last resort when students were non-responsive. Another monolingual situation was observed in the classroom of the Arabic-speaking teacher, who used exclusively Arabic with the students even though they were working on a written task in English. Finally, some discrepancies were noted between teacher beliefs and actions: one teacher explicitly stated at the beginning of class that “This is an English class, so we only speak English” and yet in the course of the lesson, enacted frequent switches between English and Norwegian. Overall, however, there was no evidence of systematic, planned translanguaging taking place in the observed classes.

4.2.4 Learner Language Use

The school where the research was conducted has a language policy that allows students to use any languages they know during class, recess, and in the hallways. The results of the observations confirm that this policy is enacted as we witnessed MYLs alternating among the languages in their linguistic repertoires in oral communication when interacting with other students. However, the use of languages other than English and Norwegian appeared to be restricted to oral communication; no instances of students writing in their HLs were noted during the observations. When addressing the teachers, the learners used English or Norwegian, which clearly led to communication difficulties for newly-arrived students who were not sufficiently proficient in either one of these languages. These students either relied on more proficient “learning partners” or remained silent. Students who speak Arabic as their HL were in an advantageous situation as at least in some of the classes, they were able to obtain help from the Arabic-speaking teacher.

4.2.5 Language and Culture Attitudes

The analysis of observation notes indicated that overall, the school was characterized by positive language and culture attitudes. The teachers appeared to value and show interest in students' linguistic resources. This attitude was mainly manifested through the allowance of students' HLs on school premises. However, it is difficult to disambiguate attitudes through observation alone and determine if the teacher's actions result from a more general ideology that values all students as individuals rather than specific focus on multilingualism and multiculturalism. Some inconsistencies in cultural and linguistic sensitivity were also observed, as when all students in one class were required to participate in an arts and crafts project and make Easter eggs, and when no differentiation aimed at religions, cultures, and traditions other than a Christian one was visible. In the majority of the observed classes, there was no evidence of learners being encouraged to actively draw upon their own cultural and linguistic funds of knowledge as a scaffold for new learning.

4.2.6 Metacognition and Metalinguistic Awareness

The observation notes revealed little evidence of teachers working explicitly with metacognition and metalinguistic awareness. Some of the teachers established links with past learning when introducing the topics and objectives for a new lesson or explicitly focused on similarities and differences between Norwegian and English. One of the teachers prompted the students to provide HL equivalents of key terms. On several occasions, there were opportunities to raise learners' metalinguistic awareness, such as when new words were being introduced in English were cognates of Norwegian terms, but these opportunities were generally missed by the teachers. Overall, any explicit focus on metalinguistic features of language appeared to be narrow and limited to English and Norwegian.

4.2.7 Teaching Materials

No linguistic and cultural diversity was present in the teaching materials, and few of the observed activities promoted language skills other than speaking and writing. The available teaching materials were mostly in English or Norwegian, and they did not promote the development of multicompetence. For example, no materials or activities were noted that would prompt translanguaging in a pedagogically planned fashion, and many of the tasks in which the students participated had no clear language objectives (for example, coloring flags or drawing Easter eggs). Even in those cases when students were practicing oral language skills, the activities were limited in scope to one-word responses prompted by the teacher. Most of the materials and activities used did not reflect or incorporate learners' diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds in any visible way.

4.2.8 Multiliteracy

This indicator had the lowest mean score and the lowest SD, which means that there was little variability among the teachers. The same trend emerged from the observer notes. In one of the classrooms, there was a collection of books in English and Norwegian available to the students, but these resources were not used in any of the observed classes. In some of the classes, the students were using online dictionaries, but the teachers revealed that there was only one hard copy of an English-Norwegian dictionary at the whole school. No printed materials in students' HLs were noted in any of the classrooms, nor were such materials used in any of the observed lessons. In fact, no reading-focused instruction was observed, and none of the teachers made explicit statements about the importance of reading, be it at school or at home with parents or other family members. Overall, the observed classes can be characterized as impoverished literacy environments.

5 Discussion and Conclusion

5.1 Summary of Findings

The quantitative results helped the researchers, who were also teacher educators, understand the multilingual practices of these teachers in relationship to the MADE indicators. As the MADE indicators would frame the professional learning activities, it was important to obtain an overall picture of the strengths and weaknesses of the group as a whole. The quantitative results show that as a group, the teachers scored below the expected mean on all indicators, suggesting that these teachers could benefit from professionals focused on working with MYLs. The indicator with the lowest mean score was multiliteracy. In addition, multiliteracy had a low SD (.35), which means that there was not much variability among the group, thereby making multiliteracy a top choice for professional learning. Also, the low mean scores of the indicators 6 and 7 point to the fact that teaching materials need to be improved and adapted for multilingual classrooms and that metacognition and metalinguistic awareness should be targeted for improvement. On the contrary, the Indicator 4, Learner Language Use, received a mean score of 1.81, which was closest to the expected mean, while the Indicator 1, Classroom as a Multilingual Space, had the lowest SD (.66). These findings reveal that, to some extent, the teachers are supportive of HL use in their classrooms and that the school and its individual classrooms have some characteristics of multilingual spaces. One cautionary note is that our analysis is limited to a small number of teachers, and we see this as a limitation of our study.

Findings from the qualitative assessment of teacher performances on the MADE indicators suggest that the school where the data were collected, at least on the surface, appears as a multilingual institution supportive of MYLs, as testified by wall decorations in the school's hallways. The teachers observed in this study displayed positive

attitudes towards linguistic and cultural diversity among students, yet they lacked knowledge and awareness of how to draw on learners' diverse linguistic resources as an asset for learning (Alisaari et al., 2019; De Angelis, 2011). Even in the cases when teachers practiced translanguaging themselves or encouraged translingual practices among students, such actions appeared to be spontaneous rather than explicitly planned pedagogical practices (Burner & Carlsen, 2019). Moreover, the use of students' HLs was restricted to oral communication, with no teaching materials or literacy practices in languages other than Norwegian and English. The learners mostly relied on their HLs when communicating with peers, and Norwegian and English were the main languages employed when addressing the teachers. The observed teaching practices were not culturally relevant; rather, they reflected the majority, mainstream culture. Based on the quantitative and qualitative findings, we conclude that the teachers who participated in this research project clearly need more theoretical and practical knowledge pertaining to working with MYLs and could benefit from professional learning focused on multilingualism in education (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020; Cenoz & Santos, 2020).

5.2 Implications for Teacher Professional Learning

Professional learning has long been associated with external events for practicing teachers, such as conferences and workshops taught by well-known experts. Research on the effectiveness of this type of professional learning for practicing teachers is quite consistent in reporting that these activities are ineffective in fostering change and bringing about improvements in teaching (OECD, 2009; Timperley, 2008). Even when teachers' experiences of professional learning during external events are positive and even when the experiences result in the acquisition of new knowledge, unless there is follow up, the transference of learning is very low (Cole, 2012; Supovitz & Turner, 2000). Professional learning that is long term and closely tied to the work of individual teachers and to the school, is more likely to bring about change in teaching.

The professional learning described in this research study consisted of the formative assessment phase of a multi-year research project focused on one school and four of its teachers. After the observations had been completed and analyzed, the observers met with the teachers for a two-hour workshop to deliver structured feedback, focusing specifically on some areas for improvement. Additionally, based on the results, a series of professional learning workshops was designed and delivered at the school during the following school year. The overall purpose of the professional learning was to support the teachers in improving multilingual practices and ultimately the school's collective effectiveness. To understand how to guide teachers and encourage them to take up the multilingual practices and strategies presented in MADE, it is necessary for researchers and teacher educators to understand the current practices of the individual teachers, as well as their profile as a group. As a professional learning tool, MADE is intended to be used by teachers for both self-

and peer reflection, as well as a guide for discussions during ongoing workshops and training. When professional learning is evidenced-based and data driven, closely tied to the work of individual teachers and to the school in which they work, and supported in the long term, it is more likely to have an impact on altering or changing teacher behaviors.

Conteh and Meier (2014) argue that all teachers need to be equipped with "a basic toolkit of strategies for developing multilingual practices in their classrooms" (p. 296). MADE is a response to this call. As a holistic approach to multilingualism, MADE offers teachers multidimensional perspectives and an array of strategies for working with linguistically and culturally diverse learners. Because it is evidence-based, it provides both researchers and language teacher educators with a way to investigate and understand the complex nature of multilingual classrooms.

References

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

Aronin, L., & Singleton, D. (2012). *Multilingualism.* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the national literacy panel on language minority children and youth.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism.* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bialystok, E. (2009). Bilingualism: The good, the bad, and the indifferent. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 12*(1), 3–11.

Bloommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Burner, T., & Carlsen, C. (2019). Teacher qualifications, perceptions and practices concerning multilingualism at a school for newly arrived students in Norway. *International Journal of Multilingualism.* https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1631317.

Candelier, M. (Ed.). (2004). *Janua Linguarum—The gateway to languages. The introduction of language awareness into the curriculum: Awakening to languages.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Candelier, M., Camilleri-Grima, A., Castellotti, V., de Pietro, J.-F., Lőrincz, I., Meiszner, F.-J., Schröder-Sura, A., & Noguerol, A. (2012). *A framework of reference for pluralistic approaches to languages and cultures: Competences and resources.* Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe Publishing.

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

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2014). Focus on multilingualism as an approach in educational contexts. In A. Creese & A. Blackledge (Eds.), Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy (pp. 239–254). Berlin: Springer.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes, 39*(2), 300–311.

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

Cole, P. (2012). *Linking effective professional learning with effective teaching practice.* Carlton South, Australia: Australian Institute for itching and School Leadership. https://ptrconsulting.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/linking_effective_professional_learning_with_effective_teaching_practice_-_cole.pdf.

Conteh, J., & Meier, G. (Eds.). (2014). *The multilingual turn in languages education: Opportunities and Challenges*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cook, V. (2010). The relationship between first and second language acquisition revisited. In E. Macaro (Ed.), *The Continuum companion to second language acquisition* (pp. 137–157). London, UK: Continuum.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching. *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(1), 103–115.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Davison, C. (1999). Missing the mark: The problem with the benchmarking of ESL students in Australian Schools. *Prospect, 14*(2), 66–76.

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

De Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2005, Spring). Preparing mainstream teachers for English-language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly, 32,* 101–124.

Echevarría, J., Richards-Tutor, C., Canges, R., & Francis, D. (2011a). Using the SIOP Model to promote the acquisition of language and science concepts with English learners. *Bilingual Research Journal, 34*(3), 334–351.

Echevarría, J., Richards-Tutor, C., Chinn, V., & Ratleff, P. (2011b). Did they get it? The role of fidelity in teaching English learners. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 54*(6), 425–434.

Echevarría, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. J. (2017). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP Model* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). Translanguaging theory in education. In O. García & T. Kleyn (Eds.), *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments* (pp. 9–33). New York, NY: Routledge.

García, O., & Sylvan, C. E. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 385–400.

Gorter, D., & Arocena, E. (2020). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism in a course on translanguaging. *System, 92,* 102272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102272.

Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and reality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hamers, J. F., & Blanc, M. H. A. (2000). *Bilinguality and bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Harper, C., & de Jong, E. (2004). Misconceptions about teaching English-language learners. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 48*(2), 152–162.

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

Heyder, K., & Schädlich, B. (2014). Mehrsprachigkeit und Mehrkulturalität – eine Umfrage unter Fremdsprachenlehrkräften in Niedersachsen. *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht, 19*(1), 183–201.

Hufeisen, B. (2011). Gesamtsprachencurriculum: Überlegungen zu einem prototypischen Modell [Gesamtsprachencurriculum: Perspektiven zu einem prototypischen Modell]. In R. Baur & B. Hufeisen (Eds.), '*Vieles ist sehr ähnlich' – Individuelle und gesellschaftliche Mehrsprachigkeit als bildungspolitische Aufgabe* ['A lot is very similar'—Individual and social multilingualism as an educational task] (pp. 265–282). Baltmannsweiler, Germany: Schneider Hohengehren.

Illman, V., & Pietilä, P. (2017). Multilingualism as a resource in the foreign language classroom. *ELT Journal, 70*(3), 237–248.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice, 34*(3), 159–165.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995b). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465–491.

Language Council of Norway. (n.d.). *Språkrådet.no.* https://www.sprakradet.no/Vi_og_vart/Om_oss/English_and_other_languages/English/.

Lindahl, K. (2013). *Exploring an invisible medium: Teacher language awareness among pre-service K12 educators of English language learners* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Utah: University of Utah.

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2011). A framework for preparing linguistically responsive teachers. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms* (pp. 35–52). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2013). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: laying the foundation in preservice teacher education. *Theory into Practice, 52*(2), 98–109.

May, S. (Ed.). (2014). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education.* New York, NY: Routledge.

May, S. (2019). Negotiating the multilingual turn in SLA. *The Modern Language Journal, 103*(Supplement), 122–129.

MER (Ministry of Education and Research). (2004). *Country report Norway: Language education policy profile 2003–2004.* https://rm.coe.int/language-education-policy-profile-norway-country-report/16807b3b42.

NCES. (2020). *Projections of education statistics to 2028, 47th edition.* https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2020024.

NDET (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training). (2015). *Norway's national minorities.*https://www.udir.no/globalassets/filer/samlesider/nasjonale-minoriteter/nasjonale-minoriteter_eng_trykk-01.02.pdf.

OECD. (2009). *Creating effective teaching and learning environments: First results from the TALIS* (Teaching and Learning International Survey). www.oecd.org/dataoecd/17/51/43023606.pdf.

Ortega, L. (2014). Ways forward for a bi/multilingual turn in SLA. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 32–52). New York, NY: Routledge.

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

Rodríguez-Izquierdo, R. M., Gonzàlez Falcón, I., & Goenechea Permisán, C. (2020). Teacher beliefs and approaches to linguistic diversity. Spanish as a second language in the inclusion of immigrant students. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 90*, 103035. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103035.

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientation in language planning. *NABE Journal, 8*(2), 15–34.

Sevinç, Y., Krulatz, A., Torgersen, E., & Christison, M. A. (forthcoming). Teaching English in linguistically diverse classrooms in Norway: Teachers' beliefs, practices, and needs in multilingual education. In A. Krulatz, G. Neokleous, & A. Dahl, A. (Eds.), *Theoretical and applied perspectives on teaching foreign languages in multilingual settings: Educational implications.* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Short, D. J., Fidelman, C., & Lougiut, M. (2012). Developing academic language in English language learners through sheltered instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 46*(2), 334–361.

Short, D. J., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners.* New York, NY: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory processes and techniques.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Supovitz, J., & Turner, H. (2000). The influence of standards-based reform on classroom practices and culture. *Journal of Research on Science Teaching, 36*(9), 963–980.

Surkalovic, D. (2014). Forbereder grunnskolelærerutdanningen engelsklærere for undervisning i engelsk som tredjespråk i Norge? *Acta Didactica Norge, 8*(2), Art. 6.

Timperley, H. (2008). *Teacher professional learning and development: Best evidence synthesis iteration* [BES]. Paris, France: International Academy of Education and & International Bureau of Education, UNESCO. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0017/001791/179161e.pdf.

Wei, L. (2000). Dimensions of bilingualism. In Li Wei (Ed.), *The bilingualism reader* (pp. 3–25). London, UK: Routledge.

Wlodkowski, R. J., & Ginsberg, M. B. (1995). A framework for culturally responsive teaching. *Educational Leadership, 53*(1), 17–21.