



Embracing linguistic and cultural diversity in multilingual EAL classrooms: The impact of professional development on teacher beliefs and practice



Eliane Lorenz^{*}, Anna Krulatz, Eivind Nessa Torgersen

Department of Teacher Education, NTNU-Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway

HIGHLIGHTS

- Monthly professional development (PD) with in-service English teachers in Norway.
- Teachers hold positive views of multilingually-oriented education.
- Participation in PD can heighten sensitivity towards multilingual students.
- Monolingual teaching practices continue to dominate linguistically diverse classrooms.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 14 May 2020
Received in revised form
27 April 2021
Accepted 18 June 2021
Available online xxx

Keywords:

English as an additional language (EAL)
Multilingualism
Multilingual approaches in education
Teacher beliefs
Professional development
Teaching practices

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the impact of professional development on teacher beliefs and practices in linguistically heterogeneous EAL classrooms. Structured classroom observations and semi-structured interviews were used to assess the progress of three EAL teachers at a Norwegian primary school who participated in monthly professional development workshops. The longitudinal findings suggest that although the teachers developed positive beliefs about multilingualism and multilingually-oriented education, they tended to persist in monolingual teaching practices, did not acknowledge linguistic and cultural diversity in the classroom, and failed to employ multilingual teaching strategies systematically.

© 2021 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Recent decades have witnessed a steady growth in the number of linguistically and culturally diverse learners globally and an acknowledgment of multilingualism¹ as “the new linguistic dispensation” (Aronin & Singleton, 2012, p. 42). This has led to an

increased emphasis of the role teachers of English as an additional language (EAL)² in implementing pedagogical practices that draw on and promote multilingualism and thus enacting “the multilingual turn” in education (May, 2014, 2019). However, for teachers who did not receive pedagogical training for multilingual contexts and who up until recently worked in linguistically and culturally homogeneous classrooms, this change can present a challenge (De Angelis, 2011; Otwinowska, 2014). As a result, there have been calls for more focus on multilingualism in teacher education (De Angelis, 2011; García & Kleyn, 2016; Lundberg, 2019). It is equally important to assess the impact of professional development focused on multilingualism on English teachers’ beliefs about multilingualism and their pedagogical practice in linguistically heterogeneous classrooms.

In Norway, the new national curriculum for English promotes increased multilingual awareness in language teaching and

^{*} Corresponding author. Department of Teacher Education Norwegian University of Science and Technology, NO-7491, Trondheim, Norway.

E-mail addresses: eliane.lorenz@ntnu.no, eliane.lorenz@anglistik.uni-giessen.de (E. Lorenz), anna.m.krulatz@ntnu.no (A. Krulatz), eivind.torgersen@ntnu.no (E.N. Torgersen).

¹ In this paper, we use the term multilingualism to refer to both individuals and societies that use two or more languages to varying degrees.

² The term EAL was chosen to bypass the potentially problematic terms foreign or second language and the status of English in Norway as a foreign or second language.

learning (The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019).³ While the previous version of the curriculum stated that students should be able to “find words and phrases that are common to English and one’s native language” (The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2006, n. p.), the most recent curriculum in primary and secondary education now acknowledges the relevance and value of multilingualism: “students should experience that mastering several languages is a resource in the school and society” (The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019, n. p.). The learning outcomes in the curriculum for English similarly emphasize the development of linguistic awareness across languages and the use of the languages students speak to discover similarities at different linguistic levels from vocabulary and expressions for primary school students to more complex linguistic similarities and differences for secondary school students (The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019).

However, it is unclear to what extent the recent changes in policy documents are reflected in teachers’ beliefs and practices. This article examines Norwegian English teachers’ beliefs about multilingualism and multilingual education and how these correspond to their pedagogical actions. It also assesses whether and how beliefs and practices of in-service primary EAL teachers change in response to professional development (PD) workshops.

1.1. Pedagogical approaches in multilingual classrooms

The contexts in which teachers work with multilingual learners are far from uniform and include settings such as bilingual or immersion education and foreign language classrooms that serve both majority and minority language students. Therefore, a range of pedagogical approaches to working with multilingual learners have been proposed to address the unique needs of these learners and to foster their language skills in both home language(s) and the language(s) of instruction. These include awakening to languages (Candelier, 2004, 2017), models based on inter-comprehension of related languages (e.g., Hufeisen & Marx, 2007), linguistically responsive teaching (Lucas & Villegas, 2011, 2013), focus on multilingualism (Cenoz & Gorter, 2014, 2019), and pedagogical translanguaging (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020).

It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss these approaches in detail and examine similarities and differences among them. However, the main principles that transpire in most approaches that support multilingual skills of learners include the following: (a) acknowledgment of the value of learners’ full linguistic repertoires and cultural knowledge; (b) stimulation of positive attitudes to linguistic and cultural diversity in the classroom and beyond; (c) focus on the development of metalinguistic awareness to establish associations between different languages; (d) a use, to varying degrees, of all languages present in the classroom, including learners’ home languages, as a resource in instruction; and (e) a transition from monolingual views of language(s) and language instruction based on strict separation of languages towards a more holistic and fluid view.

The holistic model for multilingualism in education proposed by Duarte and van der Meij (2018) organizes the different existing approaches towards multilingual education on continua clustered around three dimensions: aim, languages, and stakeholders. For instance, along the dimension “aim,” teacher actions vary from fostering positive attitudes towards languages to promoting

receptive skills among typologically similar languages. The dimension “language” ranges from acknowledgment of different languages and dialects that exist inside and outside of the classroom to a use of different languages for instruction, as is done in immersion programs. “Stakeholders” can be limited to teachers and learners in one classroom or can be expanded to a whole school or even a community, including parents and other community members. The overarching goal is to see multilingualism as an asset, use students’ pre-existing knowledge to develop new concepts and skills, affirm learners’ linguistic and cultural identities, strengthen their sense of belonging in the classroom and at school, and engage learners’ oral and literacy skills in different languages more actively (Cummins, 2005).

1.2. Teacher beliefs, preparation, and practices in multilingual settings

Teacher beliefs about learners and learning, curriculum, and self as a teacher exert a strong influence on teachers’ pedagogical choices and classroom practices (Borg, 2006). Beliefs held by teachers impact their perceptions about teaching and learning and lead to construction of ideologies about the social identities and values of the languages spoken by their students (Barcelos, 2003; Fitch, 2003). The sources of teacher beliefs include own experiences as learners (Lortie, 1975), and knowledge gained through education, teaching experience, and curricula (Borg, 2006; Phillips & Borg, 2009).

Recent research has investigated teacher beliefs and knowledge about multilingualism (e.g., Alisaari et al., 2019; Burner & Carlsen, 2019; Cenoz & Santos, 2020; De Angelis, 2011; Gorter & Arocena, 2020; Haukås, 2016; Heyder & Schädlich, 2014; Lundberg, 2019; Otwinowska, 2014; Rodríguez-Izquierdo et al., 2020; Sevinç et al., 2022). Although teachers are generally positive towards multilingualism (Alisaari et al., 2019; Haukås, 2016), many continue to believe that learning the majority language is the most important goal and recommend that minority language students and their families use it at home (Alisaari et al., 2019; Rodríguez-Izquierdo et al., 2020). While some teachers see the benefits of drawing on other languages known by learners, multilingualism is rarely systematically employed in the classroom as a resource; if learners’ other languages are engaged, it is often done in an ad-hoc manner (Burner & Carlsen, 2019; Heyder & Schädlich, 2014); or the translanguaging practices (i.e., flexible and creative use of linguistic resources from different named languages to make meaning) tend to be restricted to the majority language(s) rather than also engaging learners’ home languages (Haukås, 2016). Language teachers, teachers who are themselves multilinguals, and teachers with some years of experience in multilingual settings may display more positive attitudes towards multilingualism and draw on learners’ other languages in their teaching more often than teachers who are monolinguals, content area teachers, or teachers with little or no experience with linguistically diverse learners (Alisaari et al., 2019; De Angelis, 2011; Otwinowska, 2014). Overall, however, most teachers’ ideologies, defined as “the values, practices, and beliefs associated with language use by speakers, and the discourse that constructs values and beliefs at state, institutional, national and global levels” (Blackledge, 2008, p. 29), are characterized by mere recognition or even denial of multilingualism, with few teachers displaying advocacy for the use of multiple languages in the classroom (Alisaari et al., 2019; Rodríguez-Izquierdo et al., 2020). Studies have also reported a discrepancy between teachers’ beliefs and their classroom practices in multilingual settings – although teachers acknowledge multilingualism and view it as a resource, they rarely actively promote it (e.g., Kratzmann et al., 2017).

³ Here, as well as in the Norwegian curriculum for English, multilingual awareness denotes students’ (and teachers’) knowledge about more than one language and teachers’ practices that draw on multilingualism as a resource (García, 2008).

Current literature on multilingual education suggests that teachers working with linguistically and culturally diverse learners need to possess special knowledge and characteristics to be able to deliver multilingual pedagogical approaches. Having reviewed conclusions presented in De Angelis (2011), Hufeisen (2011), and Otwinowska (2014), Haukås (2016) listed the following demands: serving as a model multilingual for learners, possessing highly developed cross-linguistic and metalinguistic awareness, being familiar with research on multilingualism, knowing how to foster multilingualism, being sensitive to learners' cognitive and affective differences, and collaborating with others to enhance multilingualism. García and Kleyn (2016) claim that in order to help teachers implement pedagogies that support multilingualism, teacher education programs should include courses on topics such as understanding multilingual students and their families, knowledge of language acquisition and multilingualism, and multilingual pedagogies. Siwatu (2007) also listed knowledge about linguistic and cultural diversity as essential, while Lucas and Villegas (2011, 2013) suggested familiarity with learners' linguistic backgrounds and ability to scaffold learning. However, to date, teachers have been found to have limited knowledge and skills needed to address the needs of multilingual learners, often resulting from the lack of training (De Angelis, 2011; Illman & Pietilä, 2017; Krulatz & Dahl, 2016; Surkalovic, 2014; Valentine, 2006).

Although there is no straightforward correspondence between teachers' beliefs and practices (Basturkmen, 2012; Borg, 2017; Pajares, 1992), and teacher beliefs are difficult to alter (Tarnanen & Palviainen, 2018), education programs and PD have been found to have a positive impact in stimulating change (Kirsch & Aleksić, 2018; Kirsch et al., 2020). Some recent initiatives suggest that teachers respond positively to PD, and that PD can lead to changes in their knowledge and beliefs (Gorter & Arocena, 2020; Kirsch & Aleksić, 2018). Likewise, supporting teachers in planning and enacting instruction that draws on students' existing language knowledge can enrich language learning and increase students' language awareness (Cenoz & Santos, 2020). PD that focuses on multilingualism and pedagogical approaches for multilingual classrooms can help teachers develop knowledge about multilingualism, change attitudes towards multilingualism and home languages, and increase motivation to change pedagogical practices (Kirsch & Aleksić, 2018; Kirsch et al., 2020). It follows as logical, therefore, that it is important to strengthen the focus on multilingualism in teacher education programs and PD for teachers. The existing literature investigated examples of PD and examined its effectiveness relative to teacher beliefs or practice. However, to our knowledge, no study to date examined the effect of PD on both aspects of teacher work, namely the interrelationship between teachers' beliefs and how these are enacted in the classroom. The present paper aims to address this gap.

1.3. The current study

In this paper, we report on data from an ongoing, longitudinal project set at a Norwegian primary school with high numbers of newly arrived refugee and immigrant students. In addition to learning Norwegian and English (which is a compulsory subject in primary school), these students typically have competencies in at least one additional language, which we refer to as home language. These languages include, among others, Arabic, French, German, Hungarian, Lithuanian, Polish, Somali, Swahili, Thai, and Vietnamese. To help EAL teachers address the needs of this unique student population, the research team provided PD in form of monthly 1.5-h long workshops. To acknowledge the role of teacher experiences and beliefs, no single approach to working with

multilingual learners was imposed on the teachers. Rather, the researcher team chose to provide the teachers with access to knowledge about multilingualism and a range of pedagogical tools and to allow them to make choices that they themselves considered the most suitable for their classrooms.

In this paper, we zoom in on three EAL teachers via lesson observations and two rounds of semi-structured interviews. These two methods were chosen to assess the attitudes of these teachers towards multilingualism as a resource for additional language learning and the extent to which they implement pedagogies that draw upon and support learners' multilingualism. The study aimed to answer the following research questions:

- (1) What are teacher beliefs about multilingualism and about their own as well as their students' language use in multilingual EAL classrooms?
- (2) To what extent do teachers employ multilingual pedagogies in linguistically diverse EAL classrooms?
- (3) Is there any change in teachers' beliefs and practices over time as a result of participation in PD?

1.4. Participants

Three EAL teachers (T1, T2, and T5) were selected for this study. They had been working at the school for at least four years, with varying previous teaching experience (Table 1), and they participated in the project since its start in 2018. Primary school teachers in Norway may teach different subjects and grade levels, which means that students are taught by different subject teachers.⁴ In this study, we focused exclusively on EAL classes. Each grade level was taught by one EAL teacher.⁵ All participating teachers were multilinguals – they were fluent in English and Norwegian and had varying levels of proficiencies in other languages, namely Arabic, Thai, Swedish, Danish, German, French, and Spanish.

1.5. Research design

1.5.1. Professional development

PD was a central component of the ongoing project and the present study. PD was initially discussed with the school's principal, who displayed a strong support for the project and saw it as an opportunity to help the teachers improve their pedagogical skills. It was decided that 1.5-h workshops would be offered on a monthly basis, adding up to seven sessions during each school year. Participation in the workshops was obligatory for the EAL teachers as they took place during their scheduled staff meeting time. The present study considered the impact of 11 workshops, conducted in the fall semester in 2018 and spring and fall semesters in 2019, on teacher beliefs and classroom practices. The workshops focused on the following topics: introduction to multilingualism; teaching pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, reading, and writing (in English, comparisons with home languages); morphological awareness; language typology; learner identity; linguistically and culturally supportive classroom environment; translanguaging; and multiliteracy and multilingualism in the new English subject curriculum. Research suggests that effective PD is contextualized, uses models of effective practice, prompts reflection, and is of sustained duration (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Kirsch et al.,

⁴ Primary school teachers in Norway are either subject specialists or generalists.

⁵ Ideally, the subject teacher, for instance the EAL teacher, would follow a group of students from Grade 1 to Grade 7. However, due to staff changes, periods of leave, etc., this may be subject to change.

Table 1
Teacher’s background, teaching experience, and data collection status (classroom observations and interviews).

	Teacher 1 (T1)	Teacher 2 (T2)	Teacher 3 (T5)
Gender	Male	Female	Female
Ethnic background	Norwegian-Thai	Norwegian	Syrian
Age	26	46	29
Education	BA in General Teaching (4 years); University courses as part of the program <i>Kompetanse for kvalitet</i> (KFK – competence for quality; a Norwegian initiative to further qualify in-service-teachers) in Multilingual Pedagogy (ongoing)	MA in Norwegian linguistics; University courses as part of the program <i>Kompetanse for kvalitet</i> (KFK – competence for quality; a Norwegian initiative to further qualify in-service-teachers) in English Teaching (ongoing)	BA in English language and literature, 1-year additional educational Diploma; MA in Childhood studies (in progress)
Experience in teaching (in 2020)	4 years (start 2016)	9 years (start 2011)	9 years (start 2011)
School year (phase 1)	Mixed grade levels (newly arrived students)	Grade 5	Mixed grade levels (newly arrived students)
No. Of observations (phase 1)	3	3	3
School year (phase 2)	Grade 4	Grade 6	Mixed grade levels (newly arrived students)
No. Of observations (phase 2)	5	4	1
Date Interview 1	September 12, 2018	November 6, 2018	December 2, 2018
Date Interview 2	November 12, 2019	January 10, 2020	January 9, 2020

Table 2
Short descriptions of two sample workshops (December 4, 2018, February 26, 2019).

	Workshop 3: December 4, 2018	Workshop 5: February 26, 2019
Topic	Designing multilingual teaching materials: “My personal language portrait” and “Move your body”	Learning new sounds in a new language
Workshop phases		
Warm up/ Discussion	What do you do to engage your (multilingual) students in the classroom? Which factors do you take into account when planning your classes and activities?	What is the most important to you when learning new sounds in a new language? Should you worry about perfect pronunciation when learning new languages? Do you include pronunciation practice as part of your teaching activities?
Lecture	1. Factors to consider when designing activities and teaching materials (student motivation, home languages, learning styles, cultural contexts). 2. Creating a safe classroom environment (linguistic and cultural diversity as a resource, value of individual multilingualism, peace and solidarity, low anxiety, enjoyment).	1. How languages are stored in the brain. 2. Oral communication in a new language. 3. Learning new vowel sounds, cross-linguistic comparison, nativeness and intelligibility principle. 4. Minimal pairs in English. 5. Place of pronunciation in the Norwegian curriculum for English.
Reflection with a partner	What does a safe classroom environment mean to you? How can you create it?	Are oral drills useful in teaching pronunciation? Do you think oral drills can work well with your language learners?
Activities	1. Language portrait: Draw your personal language portrait. Detailed procedures for using personal language portraits with multilingual students. 2. Move your body: Benefits and procedures for implementation.	1. Listening and speaking activities: Which listening and speaking activities do you use in your classes and how do they work? 2. Building up awareness for phonological contrasts: Pronunciation bingo, semantic contexts, stress placement. 3. Plan an activity you would like to try in your own class.
Suggestions for further reading		1. Multilingualism and growing up as a multilingual: https://site.uit.no/flerespraaktilflere/ 2. Teaching pronunciation: (Torgersen, 2018), pp. 215–230.

2020). All workshops contained a balance of theoretical and practical perspectives and aimed to equip teachers with specific activities and strategies that they can implement in their own classrooms. To provide examples of PD, two workshops are detailed in Table 2.

1.5.2. Semi-structured interviews

Each teacher participated in two one-to-one semi-structured interviews: one in the early stages of the project (end of 2018), and another one about a year later (late 2019/early 2020), after the teachers had participated in up to 11 workshops. Each round of interviews was conducted by a different researcher. Each interview

lasted around 30–60 min⁶ and was transcribed by the interviewer using ELAN (Version 5.8). Table 3 lists the main topics that were addressed during the first (1) and the second (2) interview. These topics were based on our aim to evaluate and assess the teachers’ attitudes towards multilingualism as a resource in the EAL classroom. The themes were overlapping and were extended during the follow-up interview to survey in what ways the teachers’ attitudes had developed over the course of PD.

⁶ The interviews followed a semi-structured approach which gave the teachers the freedom to elaborate on topics of choice in their responses. This explains the relatively wide time difference among the six interviews.

Table 3
Main topics discussed with EAL teachers during interviews.

Interview round	Topics
1	Background and teaching experience Attitudes, beliefs and knowledge about multilingualism Experience and understanding of multilingualism and pedagogy Students' linguistic repertoires School management and teacher collaboration Teaching curriculum and learning and teaching materials Expectations from the project
2	Attitudes, beliefs and knowledge about multilingualism Experience and understanding of multilingualism and pedagogy Students' linguistic repertoire School management and teacher collaboration Multilingualism as a resource Teaching curriculum and learning and teaching materials Expectations from the project Experience with the project

To illustrate the types of questions, Table 4 lists the questions asked during the second interview pertaining to “attitudes, beliefs and knowledge about multilingualism” and “student’s linguistic repertoire.”

1.5.3. Classroom observations

The second data set came from observations of 18 EAL lessons, each lasting 60 min. Permission to observe classes was obtained in advance. Each lesson was observed by two researchers, who were introduced by the teacher at the beginning of each session and then stayed quietly in the back of the room so as not to disturb the teachers and students, taking notes in a notebook or on a computer.

Classroom observations were divided into two phases, phase 1 (March–June 2019; eight observations), and phase 2 (October 2019–January 2020; 10 observations) (see Table 1). In phase 1, the teachers participated in the first interview as well as in five to seven workshops. In phase 2, they participated in up to four workshops,⁷ and in the follow-up interview. Note that the total number of observations added up to 19, instead of 18, because one class during the first observation phase was co-taught by T1 and T5. Moreover, due to last minute changes in the teaching schedules and canceled sessions, the number of observations for each teacher was not identical. T1 was observed eight times, T2 seven times, and T5 four times (see Table 1).

Two different types of classes were observed: mainstream English classes and English teaching in so-called *mottak* (“reception”) classes, which are sheltered-instruction classes for newly arrived students.⁸ Each session was observed by two researchers who filled out an observation form, which we refer to as Multilingual Approach to Diversity in Education (MADE), with copious notes. MADE, designed for this project and intended as a holistic model for education in multilingual settings, consists of eight indicators, each with 2–6 features (see Christison et al., 2021). The indicators are as follows: (1) classroom as a multilingual space, (2) interaction and grouping configurations, (3) language and culture attitudes, (4) language use: learner, (5) language use: teacher, (6) metacognition and metalinguistic awareness, (7) multiliteracy, (8) teaching materials. In this paper, we focus on the notes relative to the indicators (3), (4), and (5). These indicators were selected because they align

with the topics covered during PD workshops and the themes discussed during the interviews. Table 5 illustrates the three indicators with their respective features that are the focus of this paper.

1.6. Analysis

The classification and coding of both the transcribed interviews and the observation protocols were conducted using the QSR International’s NVivo 12 software (2018), adhering to the principles of qualitative content analysis (Gläser & Laudel, 2009; Mayring, 2010). We employed deductive coding with pre-defined categories based on the interview themes and respective sections of the observation tool. The interview analysis was guided by the following main categories (each divided into up to five sub-categories): (1) views relative to teaching multilingual students or classes; (2) attitudes towards multilingualism or multilingual students; (3) knowledge about the multilingual background of the students; (4) beliefs about students’ languages, language use in the classroom, and language learning; (5) use of multilingual teaching practices; and (6) support from the curriculum or school for multilingual teaching. For the analysis of the EAL lessons, the comments entered in the observation tool were coded according to three MADE indicators and their respective features (Table 5).

Each file (interview transcript and observation protocol) was coded twice. During the second round, the initial coding decisions were reconsidered and, if necessary, changed, and new codes were added. For instance, categories (4) and (6) were only added in a second step, and the subcategories of (1) initially consisted of two codes only, namely (1.1) enjoyment and (1.2) stress or challenging. Later, these were refined into four codes (see Table 6 and Table 7 for the final codebooks). Thereafter, the cross tabulation function of NVivo 12 was employed to distinguish between the two-time stamps (interview round 1 versus 2; observation phase 1 versus 2).

2. Results

The following four sections zoom in on the teacher interviews and the classroom observations and present the results based on the coding decisions. The interviews focused on the teachers’ views about multilingualism, attitudes and beliefs towards their own as well as their students’ languages use, and beliefs about teaching multilingual learners. The observations examined teacher and learner language use, and language and culture attitudes demonstrated by the teachers in the classroom. The longitudinal research design allowed us to investigate whether the attitudes and teaching practices changed over time.

⁷ Although participation in the PD was mandatory for teachers, some teachers were not able to attend all workshops due to illness and personal reasons.

⁸ At this school, immigrant or refugee students with no or low proficiency in Norwegian receive targeted instruction in separate cohorts before being admitted to mainstream classes. The cohorts are not divided based on grade level, but several age groups are combined. The main focus is on learning Norwegian, but other subjects such as EAL are taught as well.

Table 4
Selection of questions asked during round 2 of the semi-structured interviews.

Topic	Questions
Attitudes, beliefs and knowledge about multilingualism	What do the terms multilingualism and multilingual students mean to you? Do you think multilingual students need to be able to speak all of their languages fluently? It is often said that the more languages one knows, the easier it is to learn new languages. What are your views about this statement?
Student's linguistic repertoire	Do you think student's knowledge of other languages is useful when learning English? Why?/Why not? Do you think it is useful to draw on students' language learning experiences from their first or second language(s)? Why?/Why not? In what ways do you draw on your students' knowledge of Norwegian and/or other languages when teaching English)? How do you think multilingual students take advantage of their multilingual experiences and/or first languages when learning English?

Table 5
Three indicators of the Multilingual Approach to Diversity in Education (MADE).

Category	Characteristics	Notes
(3) Language and culture attitudes	Teacher shows explicit interest in students' home languages All languages are allowed and valued in the classroom. Teacher performs explicit actions that encourage students to use their full linguistic repertoires Teacher shows sensitivity to cultural differences among students	
(4) Language use: learner	Students have opportunities to draw upon cultural and linguistic funds of knowledge for academic use Learners have opportunities to use their full linguistic repertoires in oral and written communication There are opportunities for learners to clarify key concepts in their L1 or other languages in which they may have proficiency as needed with either the teacher, teacher assistants, peers, or L1 texts	
(5) Language use: teacher	Teacher talk is adjusted for the proficiency level of the learners Teacher provides clear explanations for classroom activities Teacher acts as a model multilingual Teacher uses a variety of techniques to make concepts clear If behavioral issues arise, the teacher deals with behavioral problems in culturally sensitive ways	

2.1. Multilingual pedagogies – beliefs and self-perceptions

The first points discussed with the teachers in each interview were the concepts of multilingualism and multilingual students. The teachers explicitly stated that they enjoyed teaching multilingual cohorts, as these students added different experiences, cultures, and languages to the classroom, and that teaching without multilingual students in the classroom would not be as enjoyable. T5 expressed this in both interviews and T1 during interview round two. Overall, all three teachers voiced their interest in multilingualism during both interview rounds. T5 (interview 1) reported that she even searched for additional online information about multilingualism. T2 (interview 1) told us that she kept the textbooks from her studies, including the ones that deal with multilingualism, and she reiterated that she was highly interested in this topic.

However, the teachers uniformly agreed that teaching linguistically diverse groups can pose challenges. They explained that it was more demanding to find adequate teaching materials (T1, interview 2), and that the level of English proficiency may be significantly different among heterogeneous students, making designing lessons and selecting materials difficult (T5, interview 2). In particular, the teachers appeared to be concerned about students' proficiency in Norwegian and they were therefore reluctant about relying on this language when teaching EAL. Moreover, the teachers needed a great deal of trust in their students to allow them to use languages they themselves do not understand (T2, interview 2), although they sometimes attempted to prompt students to draw on their home languages, in particular when they suspected the existence of cognates.

Furthermore, the teachers regarded multilingualism as a benefit to varying degrees. They understood it as “an asset” (T1, interview 1), “a good thing” (T5, interview 1), or as “something inside of you [which] just makes it easier” (T2, interview 2) to learn further

languages. They agreed that home languages can provide support for EAL learning. However, teacher T2 (interview 1 and 2) saw this positive effect of multilingualism as limited and specifically argued that only once multilingual students have grown older and developed advanced skills in their home languages and Norwegian, can multilingualism be an advantage for them. The same teacher believed that previous foreign language learning experience should be helpful in further language acquisition (T2, interview 2). In addition, the teachers believed that having an advantage in acquiring EAL was highly individual (T2, interview 1 and 2; T5, interview 2) and not related to either being an ethnic Norwegian or a multilingual learner of English (T1, interview 2). Rather, the teachers claimed that ease of foreign language learning, language aptitude, or higher proficiency in English largely depended on students' general ability to learn new things. For instance, T2 (interview 1) stated that “[...] in general no, I don't think there are more umh there are bigger difference between them or than the Norwegian pupils.”

On the contrary, there was a recurrent concern that some of the multilingual students may in fact be in an unfavorable situation due to low proficiency in Norwegian (T2, interview 1 and 2; T5, interview 2), or in their home language, in which they may not be fluent, may lack literacy skills, or may only have receptive skills (T2, interview 2). In addition, the teachers were concerned that, as a result of learning so many languages at the same time, students may mix up languages (T2, interview 1 and 2). Moreover, the teachers maintained that students who were originally from outside of Europe and who may not have attended school prior to moving to Norway faced additional obstacles (T1, interview 1; T2, interview 2).

Another point of discussion was how well the school management deals with multilingualism, that is, whether the teachers receive support from the school and what role multilingualism plays in the school routines and the syllabi. The school follows a

Table 6
Categories for interview coding.

-
- 1) Attitudes towards teaching multilingual students or classes
 - 1.1) Enjoyment
 - 1.2) Challenging in a good way
 - 1.3) Additional challenges
 - 1.4) Stress or challenging in a negative way
 - 2) Attitude towards multilingualism or multilingual students
 - 2.1) Positive
 - 2.2) Negative
 - 2.3) Neutral
 - 2.4) Interest
 - 3) Knowledge about the multilingual background of the students
 - 3.1) Insecurity about the students' background
 - 3.2) Knows something about the students' background
 - 3.3) Good or extensive knowledge of the students' backgrounds
 - 4) Belief about students' languages, language use in the classroom, and language learning
 - 4.1) Multilingual advantage
 - 4.2) Useful to rely on all language sources
 - 4.3) No difference between mono- and multilinguals in the EAL classroom
 - 4.4) Important to know the home language well
 - 4.5) Students use their home language to learn English
 - 4.6) Teaching needs to be adapted
 - 4.7) Individual differences
 - 4.8) Multilingual disadvantage
 - 5) Use of multilingual teaching practices
 - 5.1) Frequent uses
 - 5.2) Some use
 - 5.3) Openness to incorporate it into the classroom
 - 5.4) Idea of what to do or how to do it
 - 5.5) Hesitation
 - 5.6) Unsure how to do it
 - 5.7) No uses
 - 5.8) Mainly English
 - 5.9) Interest
 - 6) Support from the curriculum or school for multilingual teaching
 - 6.1) No support
 - 6.2) Some support
 - 6.3) Lots of support
 - 6.4) Freedom how to teach
 - 6.5) Individual initiatives
-

Table 7
Categories for MADE coding.

-
- A) Teacher language use
 - A 1) Instructions mostly in Norwegian
 - A 2) Instructions mostly in English
 - A 3) Instructions in Norwegian and English
 - A 4) Encourages heritage language (L1) or Norwegian use
 - A 5) Does not encourage heritage language (L1) or Norwegian use
 - A 6) Mix of Norwegian and English, i.e. multilingual model, frequent code switching
 - A 7) Teacher not a multilingual model
 - A 8) Individual language use, depending on specific students' needs
 - A 9) Use of heritage language (i.e., Arabic)
 - B) Learner language use
 - B 1) Use of English
 - B 2) Use of Norwegian
 - B 3) Mixed language use
 - B 4) Use of heritage language (L1)
 - B 5) No use of heritage language (L1)
 - B 6) Students are allowed to use the language they want
 - C) Language and culture attitudes
 - C 1) Explicit interest in students' or visitors' home languages
 - C 2) All languages allowed and valued in the classroom
 - C 3) Actions of teacher encourage students to use full linguistic repertoire
 - C 4) Sensitivity to cultural differences
 - C 5) Students have opportunity to draw upon cultural and linguistic funds of knowledge
 - C 6) Teacher deals with problems in culturally sensitive ways
 - C 7) L1 or cultural knowledge as resource not used
-

local curriculum (at least for the mainstream cohorts), which was put together by a group of EAL teachers some years ago and which is updated regularly. However, the two teachers who teach mainstream classes (T1 and T2) were neither very familiar with it nor could they tell us by whom and when it would be updated (interview 2). Moreover, they disclosed that they followed their own teaching plan and only occasionally made use of the local curriculum (interview 2). All teachers sensed that they had a high level of freedom to teach, and that as long as students reached a specific goal, they were free to choose which pedagogies to implement (interview 2). Hence, instead of sharing teaching materials which each other, they searched for them independently, mainly on the internet (T5, interview 2).

Moreover, the teachers explained that there were no resources provided by the school that involved multilingualism or that included activities to use in multilingual classrooms (T1 and T3, interview 1 and 2; T2, interview 2). The teachers repeatedly mentioned that the school values multilingualism (T1, interview 2; T5, interview 2), which was visible for instance in decorations such as flags from all over the world on display in the corridors and in the morning routine when teachers and students greet each other in a different language every day (T1, interview 1; T2 interview 2). However, no specific multilingual resources (e.g., bilingual dictionaries, literacy materials in home languages) had been provided before the researcher team organized PD workshops.

Nevertheless, all three teachers expressed an openness and willingness to try out multilingual activities. When asked if they had concrete ideas for multilingual teaching strategies or whether they had already made use of the tasks we had distributed during PD, the teachers responded positively and shared tasks and situations that allowed them to successfully draw on multilingualism in their teaching. These included inviting their students to share vocabulary from their home languages (T1, interview 1), comparing words from different languages (T2 and T5, interview 2), talking about word order rules in different languages (T1, interview 2), and including cultural events (T2, interview 1). T1 also admitted that not every student felt at ease to share knowledge about their home language with the rest of the group, but that he was actively trying to make his students more comfortable about using all of their languages and sharing information about themselves (interview 2). T2 (interview 2) reported that in the previous school years, she had always used multilingual greetings with her students in the morning. This is one specific routine all EAL teachers typically followed with their students to embrace multilingualism as part of the school's philosophy. Every week, a different language, selected from the languages spoken in the student cohort, was used to say, "good morning." However, T2 stated that she no longer implemented this practice with her EAL class during the current school year.

During the second interview, the teachers also mentioned activities that they had not yet tried but were planning to use. T1 had many ideas, for example to let students write multilingual stories. T2 told us that she was planning to use a song which was available in several languages. She had already spoken to the music teacher and the Norwegian teacher, and they were interested in turning it into a cross-curricular theme.

Nevertheless, the teachers admitted that they were still in the planning stages of implementing multilingual approaches. Specifically, T1 (interview 2) remarked that he was currently trying to envision how he could add a multilingual teaching component to his way of teaching the following year, and that he was still hoping for more input during PD. He requested teaching activities and materials that explicitly focus on multilingualism that he could use in his English classes. T2 and T5 shared this view and also repeatedly asked for more practical tips and less theoretical input during

the workshops (interview 2).

2.2. Multilingual pedagogies – implemented practice

The results of the classroom observations suggest that the three teachers differed in the extent to which they implemented multilingual pedagogies. Teacher T2 largely provided instructions in English. She used Norwegian for additional explanations with individual students if she noticed comprehension problems. When giving examples, or when she encountered difficult vocabulary, she also made use of translation and translanguaging practices (see Fig. 1 and Fig. 2). Moreover, she did not specifically encourage the use of languages other than English or Norwegian, though she did not prohibit it either. Yet, overall, English clearly dominated this teacher's language use and apart from Norwegian, students in her class did not use any other languages, although some knew other languages in addition to these two.

Teachers T1 and T5 showed distinctly different patterns and employed some multilingual activities beyond the majority language Norwegian. In phase 1, T1 worked with multilingual learners in sheltered classes. In these sessions, he used English or a mix of English and Norwegian to a large degree (see Fig. 3). In phase 2, however, he taught a mainstream Grade 4 class. With these students, he used Norwegian much more frequently. Apart from this difference, he often employed code-switching and translations between Norwegian and English. Moreover, he sometimes, though not in every session, encouraged the multilingual students to activate their home languages, and he elicited vocabulary examples in languages other than English or Norwegian (see Fig. 4). He invited students to make use of their entire linguistic repertoires, which was reflected in student language use. Overall, they responded in Norwegian a lot, but they also used English and occasionally shared some knowledge of their other languages with either the entire group or with peers who spoke the same language. For instance, one student, a relatively competent speaker of English, was asked to translate what the teacher had said into Swahili to help a fellow student with a much lower English proficiency. The same student then translated what his peer had responded in Swahili into English for the teacher. All in all, T1, who is a fairly new teacher, appeared to be particularly open to including all languages present in the classroom.

T5 also employed multilingual teaching approaches frequently in her English classes. As a teacher working exclusively with newly arrived students and a native speaker of Arabic herself, T5 differed from the other two teachers in her background and teaching approach. She frequently used Arabic to give instructions and interact with her students, but also switched between English, Norwegian, and Arabic, especially in the session in phase 2 (see Fig. 5 and Fig. 6). She co-taught one of the sessions with T1 and had at times support from resource teachers (i.e., specialized educators assisting in class). Furthermore, her groups were much smaller than the mainstream English classes, and she used this to respond to the individual student's language needs, mostly by using Arabic. This high level of individualization would not be possible in large classrooms or without a second teacher present, and without a competence in the students' home language(s). Moreover, T5 frequently showed an interest in the language backgrounds of her students and created an atmosphere where students had numerous opportunities to draw upon their previous cultural and language knowledge. Students with the same language background were usually seated next to each other, and they were encouraged to use home language or Norwegian if they were unsure about an answer in English. During the three observed sessions in phase 1, Arabic was used in oral conversation even more frequently than English. In phase 2, all three languages, English, Arabic, and Norwegian, were

<p>Teacher acts as a model multilingual (e.g., displays behaviors such as encouraging translanguaging, borrowing among languages, and translating when appropriate).</p>	<p>She encourages English use in a very traditional way (classical translation method) - no borrowing or code-switching ≥ only translation.</p>
---	---

Fig. 1. Observer's notes on teacher language use; T2 (June 13, 2019).

<p>Teacher acts as a model multilingual (e.g., displays behaviors such as encouraging translanguaging, borrowing among languages, and translating when appropriate).</p>	<p>A couple of times, she switched into Norwegian, and then back into English; and once, when a girl had trouble finding the right words in Norwegian, she encouraged her specifically to use some Norwegian words in between (“Just use Norwegian words in between, that is ok.”)</p>
---	--

Fig. 2. Observer's notes on teacher language use; T2 (November 12, 2019).

<p>Teacher acts as a model multilingual (e.g., displays behaviors such as encouraging translanguaging, borrowing among languages, and translating when appropriate).</p>	<p>Teacher switches between English and Norwegian himself. This doesn't appear to be very systematic at this point, although perhaps he uses more Norwegian with weaker students?</p> <p>At some point, the teacher says “I speak English when we have English” but then he continues switching to Norwegian. He does that, for example, after he asks a student “What do you like to do in free time?” and the student responds in Norwegian. The teacher takes it up, “Ingenting? Du liker å gjøre ingenting?” [Nothing? You like to do nothing?]</p> <p>Teacher reveals to the students that his mom is from Thailand, and he demonstrates how to say “Thank you” in Thai.</p>
---	---

Fig. 3. Observer's notes on teacher language use; T1 (March 7, 2019).

<p>Teacher acts as a model multilingual (e.g., displays behaviors such as encouraging translanguaging, borrowing among languages, and translating when appropriate).</p>	<p>He asks students whether they know how to say some words in their mother tongue, which is an explicit example.</p>
---	---

Fig. 4. Observer's notes on teacher language use; T1 (December 4, 2019).

<p>Teacher acts as a model multilingual (e.g., displays behaviors such as encouraging translanguaging, borrowing among languages, and translating when appropriate).</p>	<p>Teachers use different languages (Norwegian, English, Arabic) when giving instructions and feedback, yet only for students with Arabic or English language background, since all these three bilingual teachers speak Arabic as L1.</p>
---	--

Fig. 5. Observer's notes on teacher language use; T5 (and two resource teachers present) (April 11, 2019).

used frequently and flexibly, including code-switches and language comparisons.

In almost every class, regardless of who was teaching, we observed an open and welcoming atmosphere and a teaching space where all languages were permitted and valued. Responding in

Norwegian was allowed, though T2 strongly recommended using English instead. Notwithstanding, she was also open to translanguaging, and explained that students could use Norwegian if they did not know the right word in English (see Fig. 2). In general, Norwegian was frequently employed and activated in all classes, via

<p>Teacher acts as a model multilingual (e.g., displays behaviors such as encouraging translanguaging, borrowing among languages, and translating when appropriate).</p>	<p>Teacher used all three languages, and mostly switched between Arabic and English.</p>
---	--

Fig. 6. Observer’s notes on teacher language; T5 (January 9, 2020).

translations, comparisons, or explanations. Besides, students were allowed to use their L1 with their partners, and the observing researchers repeatedly noted that the atmosphere in the classrooms was one of tolerance and respect.

At the same time, however, not every situation which potentially allowed to add further languages beyond Norwegian or additional cultural resources was adequately deployed. For instance, when working with Easter traditions (T5, April 11, 2019), the teacher could have expanded the topic to include other holidays or different traditional celebrations. Many of the students at the school do not have a Christian background, and they could have been encouraged to share some of their own cultural traditions. Another opportunity to create a culturally sensitive space occurred when the students talked about their hobbies. The teacher mentioned *skiing* as an example activity and automatically assumed that everyone was familiar with it, which suggests a lack of awareness that many of his students come from countries where winter sports do not exist (T1, June 6, 2019). Overall, we noted situations where opportunities to engage learners’ additional language resources and knowledge were neglected in 14 out of 18 observed sessions.

Moreover, all instances of use of languages other than English or Norwegian were exclusively spoken. The only exception was when T1 asked the class if there was anyone who could write a word or a letter in a foreign language (November 6, 2019). In response, one student wrote an Arabic letter on the whiteboard and everyone else was asked to copy it. However, rather than taking advantage of this learning moment to talk about differences between languages, alphabets, and writing conventions (right to left instead of left to right), the teacher quickly returned to the previous activity.

2.3. Changes over time – attitudes, awareness, and self-perception

A number of changes in the teachers’ attitudes, awareness, and perceptions emerged in interview 2. For example, during the first interview, the teachers seemed to know very little about their multilingual students’ backgrounds. One teacher even had to check where her students were from on her smartphone (T2). However, during the second round of interviews, all teachers were able to provide quite detailed information about the origins of their students and the languages spoken by them. This change likely resulted from a task given to the teachers during one of the workshops in which they were instructed to investigate their students’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds. In addition, T5 (interview 2), who herself was born outside of Norway, remarked that it was not enough to know where students were born, and she emphasized the importance of knowing some traditions from their countries of origin.

Moreover, during the second interview, the teachers acknowledged to a larger degree that the home languages of multilingual students were a valuable resource for learning English. T2 shared her experiences with allowing students to use languages she herself did not understand. She reflected on this and admitted that teachers would need a great deal of trust in such situations. This

was a new level of awareness that was not transparent during the first round of interviews. It appears that the teachers started to reflect more on multilingualism in general, and the potential difficulties and challenges they may encounter in the classroom when allowing the use of languages other than English and Norwegian. Overall, the teachers appeared more open towards multilingualism, they assigned home languages an important function in learning of additional languages, and they were interested in exploring and using multilingual activities. At the same time, however, there remained the negative attitude towards mixing up of languages as the teachers feared that it can create challenges for multilingual students.

There was also a great deal of insecurity and hesitation when the teachers considered and reflected on the approaches that they learned about in PD and tried to implement in their teaching. As a result, only some of the multilingual tasks that had been introduced and explained during the workshops were actually implemented in the classroom. The teachers still perceived themselves to be in the planning phase relative to multilingual approaches and postponed introducing major changes until the following school year (2020/2021). That a change in thinking does not immediately lead to a change in behavior is reinforced by a comment made by T1, who remarked that he was currently trying to figure out how to add multilingual teaching to his pedagogical approach and that he hoped for more input from PD. Overall, however, the observed changes in the teachers’ beliefs and perceptions were less substantial and significant than could be anticipated, given that at the time of the second interview, the teachers had participated in PD for more than a year, including up to 11 workshops.

2.4. Changes over time – teaching practices

Although the teachers evidenced some attitudinal and awareness development, few changes were noted in their teaching practices. There was no observable change in the teaching style of T2 from phase 1 to phase 2. She had been the teacher of this cohort from Grade 1 onwards, and they had clearly established a routine over the years. Up until the initiation of PD, multilingualism and multilingual activities did not play a role in T2’s teaching style. Even though she expressed an interest and willingness to include multilingual strategies during the interviews, no application of such was noted in the lessons we observed.

There was a noticeable difference from phase 1 to phase 2 in T1’s English classes. However, the reasons for this may be more complex than merely his participation in PD. In phase 1, T1 taught English in a sheltered class, while during phase 2, he taught a group of mainstream students. Some differences in his teacher language use were noted between phase 1 and phase 2: more English was used in the sheltered classes and more Norwegian in the mainstream classes. In addition, already in phase 1, we observed that T1 encouraged multilingual students to rely on their home languages. He continued to occasionally invite multilingual students enrolled in his mainstream class to draw on their home languages in phase 2. However, due to the new teaching context, we cannot disentangle

whether this teaching strategy resulted from PD or whether he relied on his experiences from the previous school year. It may be more straightforward to include home languages when working with multilingual cohorts than in mixed mainstream classes that also include ethnic Norwegian students. Yet, since T1 had used this practice previously, he might have naturally transferred it to the new teaching setting. In addition, T1 was taking a university course in Multilingual Pedagogy for in-service-teachers while he was participating in PD, which may have further influenced his teaching style.

Given that T5 was only observed once during phase 2, we cannot argue for any changes in her teaching practices. However, in the session we observed in phase 2, all three languages she is fluent in, namely English, Arabic, and Norwegian, were frequently and flexibly used, including code-switches and language comparisons. Further observations are necessary to confirm this initial result.

In general, given the input provided during PD as well as the teachers' increasingly positive views about the relevance of learners' full linguistic repertoires when learning EAL, we expected to observe more carefully planned multilingual activities in the EAL classes during phase 2 of the observations. We anticipated that the teachers would use, adapt, and extend the activities introduced and discussed during the workshops. Already during phase 1, Norwegian was frequently activated and there was no qualitative change in comparison to phase 2. In T1's and T5's session, there were situations where additional languages were activated, either via encouraging students to share knowledge of home languages or, in T5's case, also because she actively used Arabic in addition to Norwegian and English. However, this was observed during both phases, and no change in quality or quantity was noted.

3. Discussion

This study examined teacher beliefs and teaching practices in linguistically and culturally heterogeneous EAL classrooms in a Norwegian primary school and investigated whether participation in PD workshops led to any changes in the participating teachers' beliefs and practices. The key findings indicate that although the teachers had generally positive attitudes towards multilingualism and supported the idea of using multilingual teaching approaches in EAL classes, they lacked the ability to systematically implement such approaches. Participation in PD led to a change towards more positive views of multilingualism and multilingual teaching approaches yet little change in the teaching practice. In the following section, we restate the research questions and address each of them in turn.

The first research question concerned teacher beliefs about multilingualism and about their own and their students' language use in multilingual EAL classrooms. The teachers displayed a generally positive attitude towards multilingualism, which corresponds to findings from previous research (e.g., Burner & Carlsen, 2019; Haukås, 2016). Nevertheless, they were uncertain whether being a multilingual speaker should be considered a challenge or an advantage (see Sevinç et al., 2022). One argument they put forward was that students first have to master both Norwegian and their home language(s) in order to benefit from being bilingual, which is in line with Alisaari et al. (2019) and Rodríguez-Izquierdo et al. (2020). Moreover, when comparing minority language students with their Norwegian peers, the teachers stressed individual learner differences in language learning aptitude and did not

consider the impact of multilingualism on additional language acquisition. The teachers were also concerned about mixing up of languages, thus potentially viewing multilingualism as a disadvantage (see Alisaari et al., 2019; Lundberg, 2019). This concern may also reflect the "fractional" understanding of bilingualism (Grosjean, 1989, p. 4), underscoring the importance of the framework put forward in Duarte and van der Meij (2018).

Nevertheless, the teachers signaled their interest in multilingual teaching practices and in allowing additional languages to be used in the EAL classroom, which coincides with conclusions from Gorter and Arocena (2020). Yet, at the same time, they were concerned about how this should be implemented and how they could promote the use of languages with which they are not familiar. Overall, however, the teachers showed awareness and sensitivity towards the needs of all their students, including the multilingual ones. They were cognizant of potential challenges and signaled willingness to adapt their teaching styles.

The second research question asked about the extent to which the teachers implemented multilingual pedagogies in linguistically diverse EAL classrooms. The teachers employed translations between English and Norwegian frequently, hence activating both languages as a learning resource. This confirms Haukås's (2016) findings, namely that the majority language is often the only language that is employed in the foreign language classroom. Nevertheless, we also observed several initiatives by T1 and T5 to invite other languages than English and Norwegian into the classroom. However, many of these appeared to be rather ad hoc and would require more careful planning to take advantage of learners' full linguistic repertoires. This finding is in line with Burner and Carlsen (2019), as well as Heyder and Schädlich (2014), who also observed that multilingual activities are not systematically incorporated, and it confirms the need for continued support for the teachers through PD to help them integrate multilingualism in their teaching in a more planned and self-confident way.

When new vocabulary was introduced, students were occasionally asked to translate it into Norwegian and other languages they know. Usually, the discussion stopped here. Furthermore, even though the teachers drew on learners' oral skills in languages other than English and Norwegian to some extent, there was very little evidence of integration of their home languages in literacy tasks such as reading and writing. This could be related to the teachers' concerns about students' proficiency in Norwegian and the teachers' own lack of knowledge of students' home languages. As the overall linguistic landscape at the school appeared to be very multilingual (e.g., classroom and hallway decorations, and the school policy that allows all languages on school premises), another possible explanation is that the teachers may be unconsciously perpetuating the monolingual ideologies that enforce strict separation of languages and that advocate maximum exposure to target language input. Although these topics were discussed in the PD workshops, there seemed to be little uptake on the part of the teachers; in fact, in the observed classes, none of the activities introduced in the workshops were used. Thus, we concur that although "beliefs and practices are amenable to change through professional development" (Kirsch et al., 2020, p. 198), it is a process that takes time and adaptation.

Our findings resonate with Alisaari et al.'s (2019), de Angelis' (2011), and Otwinowska's (2014) claims that teachers with a multilingual background as well as teachers with prior experience of teaching in linguistically diverse classrooms tend to draw on learners' other languages in their teaching more often than teachers who are monolinguals or who have little or no experience with specifically multilingual classes. Both T1 and T5 considered themselves multilinguals and had prior experience teaching in

sheltered classes. In comparison to T2, who was hesitant about referring to herself as a multilingual, and who had exclusively taught mainstream English classes, the former showed more multilingual initiatives. For T2, the idea of including multilingual activities was a rather new concept.⁹

In addition, we need to acknowledge that each teacher worked in a distinct classroom setting, including different grade levels, but also teaching in sheltered versus mainstream classes. In the sheltered classes, the grade levels were mixed; hence, the teachers were working with learners of different proficiency levels, home-language backgrounds, and ages. However, in the mainstream classes, students were grouped by age and grade level. When working with older learners, the teachers likely aspired to employ a more advanced level of English, which may have impacted their language use and the activation of additional languages. They likely opted to use English more frequently at the expense of Norwegian and other home languages. Yet, in each context, we observed multiple situations where multilingualism and multiculturalism were not drawn upon as valuable resources even though opportunities to do so arose naturally, which confirms findings from related studies (Burner & Carlsen, 2019; Heyder & Schädlich, 2014).

The third research question examined the changes in the teachers' beliefs and practices over time, as a result of participation in PD. Even though we witnessed some change in the teachers' attitudes and their awareness, a similar change was not observed in the classroom, indicating some lack of overlap between beliefs and practice (Bastrukmen, 2012; Borg, 2017). One explanation is that change in teacher ideologies does not happen easily and quickly (Borg, 2006; Tarnanen & Palviainen, 2018), as we saw in the example of T2. Even though she clearly expressed her interest and willingness to include multilingual approaches, she did not make extensive use of these in her EAL classes. Our findings thus confirm that teacher beliefs and teaching practices are hard to modify, but that education initiatives have the possibility to positively impact on and stimulate change (Kirsch & Aleksić, 2018; Kirsch et al., 2020). Similar observations were made in Haukås (2016), whereas a more positive outcome was reported by Gorter and Arocena (2020), indicating that the current initiatives are promising, and that continuing PD has the potential to cause a qualitative shift not only in beliefs but also in teaching practices.

4. Conclusion

This longitudinal, qualitative study explored the beliefs about multilingualism and multilingual pedagogies of three English teachers in Norway and how they applied multilingual teaching practices in the English language classroom before and after participating in a series of PD workshops. The increasingly heterogeneous EAL classrooms require new teaching approaches to address the needs of both the ethnic majority as well as the multilingual learners. Specifically, there is the demand to create learning conditions where all learners have opportunities for equal and meaningful participation and where multilingual learners can profit from drawing on their previous linguistic and cultural knowledge as valuable resources for learning (Cummins et al., 2005; Lucas & Villegas, 2011). Based on these assumptions, the monthly workshops were designed to provide the teachers with theoretical and practical knowledge on how to implement multilingual teaching strategies in their EAL instruction.

We employed semi-structured interviews and classroom

observations to assess the effectiveness of PD offered over the course of more than one year. The results suggest that even though the teachers showed heightened awareness and sensitivity towards their multilingual students, understood the importance of home languages for learning English, and expressed an openness to include multilingual teaching approaches in the EAL classroom, the effects on teaching, particularly beyond including the majority language Norwegian, were minor and teaching practices that draw on learners' multilingual skills were employed in an ad hoc manner.

In line with previous research, we conclude that having a multilingual background in addition to previous teaching experience with multilingual students can increase the likelihood to employ multilingual pedagogies (Otwindowska, 2014). However, even the two teachers in this study who met this criterion did not extensively activate the entire linguistic repertoires of their students and missed many opportunities to build upon existing language knowledge. One of the reasons is a continued, subconscious belief in monolingual approaches and strict separation of languages. This finding underscores the importance of engaging teachers in explicit, focused examination of their beliefs and practices.

These are important findings that have direct consequences for the future planning of the workshops and the entire project. Teachers' beliefs and their corresponding teaching practices are neither easily nor quickly altered (Basturkmen, 2012; Borg, 2017; Parajes, 1992). Nevertheless, we have seen that within one year of continuous PD, initial, promising progress was visible, indicating that the workshops had some positive impact on the teachers. Yet, based on the findings, we conclude that exposing teachers to lectures on topics related to multilingualism, providing examples of pedagogical practices, presenting topics for discussion, and suggesting further readings, as was done in the PD sessions, is insufficient. In what follows, we offer some recommendations for PD for EAL teachers working with multilingual learners.

Research on PD suggests that in addition to being contextualized and providing models of effective pedagogies, PD should also prompt teachers to reflect on their beliefs and practice (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Kirsch et al., 2020). One possible route to design PD that aims to raise teachers' awareness about the positive aspects of multilingualism and multilingual approaches to EAL teaching is to incorporate teacher beliefs and reflection as integral components of PD and as a way to foster transformations (Yazan & Lindahl, 2020). This would allow teachers to increase their awareness of the beliefs and ideologies that shape their practices and enable them to steer their own PD. For instance, our findings suggest that teachers who consider themselves to be multilinguals are more likely to display positive views of multilingualism and to experiment with multilingual approaches to EAL education. Through PD, teachers could be prompted to reflect on what it means to be a multilingual (e.g., does multilingualism have to be balanced or can multilingualism entail knowledge of different varieties of a language), to examine their own linguistic repertoires, and to perceive themselves as multilinguals. In addition, teachers could be asked to observe other classes at the same school and provide each other with feedback, as well as receive comments and engage in a dialog with the instructor leading the PD (Kirsch & Aleksić, 2018; Kirsch et al., 2020). Such observation and feedback sessions could help teachers reflect on a number of issues, including learner language identities and learners' reluctance to speak home languages on school premises. It would allow teachers to reflect on specific situations that they or their peers noted as needing attention. Combining self-evaluations, in which teachers could reflect on their beliefs and practice, with peer feedback would prompt stimulating discussions that would grant teachers a

⁹ We have to acknowledge that this study did not set out as a comparison, and any possible comparison between the three teachers should be understood as tentative only.

sense of agency and ownership. Finally, teachers can benefit from instructional design tools such as MADE (Christison et al., 2021) that are holistic and straightforward to implement to help them plan lessons, select materials, and design activities that are most appropriate for the unique student populations with which they are working.

It is important to acknowledge that this study is not without limitations. First, the researchers were not just neutral observers, but rather human agents who themselves hold ideologies of multilingualism and beliefs about language learning and teaching in linguistically diverse contexts. Although we tried to remain objective and neutral during the interviews and observations, we may have prompted the teachers to shift towards more positive views of multilingualism (and this, in fact, was the objective of the PD). Another limitation is the small scale of the project. It is difficult to judge the effectiveness of PD based on interviews and observations of three teachers – future studies should examine larger groups and include several cycles of data collection and analysis. We should also record our own reflections as PD instructors to better examine what worked well and what should be improved so that we can redesign the program in the future.

Overall, our findings and conclusions not only have a direct relevance for the current project, but they have further implications for teacher education programs and PD that aim to alter teachers' beliefs and practices in multilingual contexts. We argue that it is crucial to emphasize multilingual pedagogies and linguistically and culturally sensitive teaching already during teacher education as well as in PD. There should be a stronger focus on embracing multilingualism as a valuable asset for themselves – including learning additional languages and recognizing self as a multilingual speaker – and for both majority and minority language students. Furthermore, in-service teachers need to be supported with up-to-date materials that include ideas for multilingual activities and pedagogical models such as MADE, so that they have access to useful resources for multilingual EAL classrooms. PD is an essential step in enacting the “multilingual turn” (May, 2014, 2019), but it has to be carefully designed and delivered, adapted to the contextual needs of teachers and their learners, and implemented as a collaboration rather than an ordinance.

Funding

We are grateful to the Research Council of Norway for funding the project *Acquisition of English in the Multilingual Classroom* (Ref. 273406), of which the work reported here forms a part.

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, 48–58.
- Aronin, L., & Singleton, D. (2012). *Multilingualism*. Benjamins.
- Barcelos, A. M. F. (2003). Teachers' and students' beliefs within a Deweyan framework: Conflict and influence. In P. Kalaja, & A. M. F. Barcelos (Eds.), *Beliefs about SLA: New research approaches* (pp. 171–199). Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Basturkmen, H. (2012). Review of research into the correspondence between language teachers' stated beliefs and practices. *System*, 40, 282–295.
- Blackledge, A. (2008). Language ecology and language ideology. In A. Creese, P. Martin, & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Ecology of language: Vol. 9. Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 27–40). Springer.
- Borg, S. (2006). The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs. *System*, 29, 370–380.
- Borg, S. (2017). Teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. In P. Garrett, & J. M. Cots (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language awareness* (pp. 75–91). Routledge.
- 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>
- Candellier, M. (Ed.). (2004). *Janua Linguarum - the gateway to languages. The introduction of language awareness into the curriculum: Awakening to languages*. Council of Europe.
- Candellier, M. (2017). Awakening to languages and educational language policy. In J. Cenoz, D. Gorter, & S. May (Eds.), *Language awareness and multilingualism* (3rd ed., pp. 161–172). Springer.
- 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). Springer.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2019). Multilingualism, translanguaging, and minority languages in SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, (Supplement 2019), 130–135.
- 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>
- Christison, M. A., Krulatz, A., & Sevinç, Y. (2021). Supporting teachers of multilingual young learners: Multilingual Approach to Diversity in Education (MADE). In J. Rokita-Jaśkow, & A. Wolanin (Eds.), *Facing diversity in child foreign language education* (pp. 271–289). Springer.
- Cummins, J., Bismilla, V., Chow, P., Cohen, S., Giampapa, F., Leoni, L., Sandhu, P., & Sastri, P. (2005). Affirming identity in multilingual classrooms. *Educational Leadership*, 63(1), 38–43.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.
- 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.
- Duarte, J., & van der Meij, M. (2018). A holistic model for multilingualism in education. *EuroAmerican Journal of Applied Linguistics and Languages*, 5(2), 24–43.
- ELAN (Version 5.8) [Computer software]. (2019). Nijmegen: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics. <https://tla.mpi.nl/tools/tla-tools/elan/>.
- Fitch, F. (2003). Inclusion, exclusion, and ideology. Special education students' changing sense of self. *The Urban Review*, 35(3), 233–252.
- García, O. (2008). Multilingual language awareness and teacher education. In J. Cenoz, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 385–400). Springer.
- 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). Routledge.
- Gläser, J., & Laudel, G. (2009). *Experteninterviews und qualitative Inhaltsanalyse*. Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- 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. (1989). Neurolinguists, beware! the bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and Language*, 36, 3–15.
- 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. In R. Baur, & B. Hufeisen (Eds.), *“Vieles ist sehr ähnlich” – Individuelle und gesellschaftliche Mehrsprachigkeit als bildungspolitische Aufgabe* (pp. 265–282). Schneider Hohengehren.
- Hufeisen, B., & Marx, N. (2007). How can DaF/E and EuroComGerm contribute to the concept of receptive multilingualism? Theoretical and practical considerations. In J. D. ten Thije, & L. Zeevaert (Eds.), *Receptive multilingualism. Linguistic analyses, language policies and didactic concepts* (pp. 307–321). Benjamins.
- Illman, V., & Pietilä, P. (2017). Multilingualism as a resource in the foreign language classroom. *ELT Journal*, 70(3), 237–248.
- Kirsch, C., & Aleksić, G. (2018). The effect of professional development on multilingual education in early childhood in Luxembourg. *Review of European Studies*, 10(4), 148–163.
- Kirsch, C., Duarte, J., & Palviainen, Å. (2020). Language policy, professional development and sustainability of multilingual approaches. In C. Kirsch, & J. Duarte (Eds.), *Multilingual approaches for teaching and learning: From acknowledging to capitalising on multilingualism in European mainstream education* (pp. 202–219). Routledge.
- Kratzmann, J., Jahreiß, S., Frank, M., Ertanir, B., & Sachse, S. (2017). Einstellungen pädagogischer Fachkräfte in Kindertageseinrichtungen zur Mehrsprachigkeit [Beliefs on multilingualism of practitioners in early years institutions]. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 20(2), 237–258.
- Krulatz, A., & Dahl, A. (2016). Baseline assessment of Norwegian EFL teacher preparedness to work with multilingual students. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 7(2), 199–218.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. University of Chicago Press.
- 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). 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.
- Lundberg, A. (2019). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism: Findings from Q method research. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 20(3), 266–283.
- May, S. (Ed.). (2014). *The multilingual turn – implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual*

- education. Routledge.
- May, S. (2019). Negotiating the multilingual turn in SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, (Supplement 2019), 122–129.
- Mayring, P. (2010). *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken*. Beltz.
- Otwinowska, A. (2014). Does multilingualism influence plurilingual awareness of Polish teachers of English? *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 11(1), 97–119.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307–332.
- Phillips, S., & Borg, S. (2009). Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System*, 27(3), 380–390.
- QSR International's NVivo. (2018). (Version 12). QSR International Pty Ltd. <https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-qualitative-data-analysis-software/home>.
- Rodríguez-Izquierdo, R. M., González 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>
- Sevinç, Y., Krulatz, A., Torgersen, E., & Christison, M. A. (2022). Teaching English in linguistically diverse classrooms in Norway: Teachers' beliefs, practices, and needs in multilingual education. In A. Krulatz, G. Neokleous, & A. Dahl (Eds.), *Theoretical and applied perspectives on teaching foreign languages in multilingual settings: Educational implications*. Multilingual Matters.
- Siwatu, K. O. (2007). Preservice teachers' culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(7), 1086–1101.
- Surkalovic, D. (2014). Forbereder grunnskolelærerutdanningen engelsklærere for undervisning i engelsk som tredjespråk i Norge? *Acta Didactica Norge*, 8(2). Art. 6.
- Tarnanen, M., & Palviainen, Å. (2018). Finnish teachers as policy agents in changing society. *Language and Education*, 32(5), 428–443.
- The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. (2006). *English subject curriculum (ENG1-03)*. <https://www.udir.no/kl06/ENG1-03?lplang=http://data.udir.no/kl06/eng>.
- The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. (2019). *Læreplan i engelsk (ENG01-04)*. <https://www.udir.no/kl20/eng01-04>.
- Torgersen, E. (2018). Teaching pronunciation. In H. Bøhn, M. Dypedahl, & G. Myklevold (Eds.), *Teaching and learning English* (pp. 215–230). Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- Valentine, S. (2006). Assessing diversity in teacher education programs. *Education*, 127(2), 196–202.
- Yazan, B., & Lindahl, K. (Eds.). (2020). *Language teacher identity in TESOL: Teacher education and practice as identity work*. Routledge.