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Abstract
Due to the massive influx of refugees to Greece in the last few years, educators are faced with new educational challenges. The present paper reports on a study of educators’ views and practices with regard to the language development of refugee children. While acknowledging the benefits of bilingualism in general, or supporting the families’ right to speak their own language at home, teachers still express concern that such practices may hinder the acquisition of the majority language and often ban the ‘other’ languages from school (Chatzidaki & Maligkoudi, 2017; Gkaintartzi, Kiliari, & Tsokalidou, 2015; Young, 2014). Our study focuses on primary teachers’ views and practices as reported in interviews conducted in a school of central Macedonia in Greece during the time period January-March 2017. The school in question had six refugee students from Syria. The findings presented and discussed here relate to the teachers’ views towards refugee students and their bilingualism as well as to their reported practices in the classroom with regard to their students’ multilingual background.
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Περίληψη
Τα τελευταία χρόνια, λόγω της μαζικής έλευσης προσφύγων στην Ελλάδα, οι εκπαιδευτικοί αντιμετωπίζουν νέες προκλήσεις, καθώς δημιουργούνται, όχι για πρώτη φορά, σε πολλά σχολεία της χώρας συνθήκες πολυπολιτισμικότητας και επαφής διαφόρων γλώσσων και πολιτισμών. Γίνεται αντιληπτό πως δημιουργείται η ανάγκη της όσο το δυνατόν αποτελεσματικότερης ανταπόκρισης των εκπαιδευτικών στις νέες απαιτήσεις μιας πολυπολιτισμικής σχολικής τάξης. Το παρόν άρθρο αναφέρεται σε μια μελέτη των απόψεων και των πρακτικών των εκπαιδευτικών πρωτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης, όπως καταγράφηκαν σε συνεντεύξεις που διεξήχθησαν σε Δημοτικό σχολείο της κεντρικής Μακεδονίας στην Ελλάδα κατά την περίοδο Ιανουαρίου-Μαρτίου 2017. Το εν λόγω σχολείο είχε έξι πρόσφυγες από την Συρία. Τα αποτελέσματα που παρουσιάζουμε και συζητούμε σε αυτό το άρθρο σχετίζονται με τις απόψεις και τις πρακτικές των εκπαιδευτικών σχετικά με τη γλωσσική ανάπτυξη των παιδιών προσφύγων. Οι εκπαιδευτικοί, αν και αναγνωρίζουν την ανάγκη για τη δημιουργία συνθηκών πολυπολιτισμικότητας και επαφής διαφόρων γλώσσων και πολιτισμών, εξακολουθούν να εκφράζουν περαιτέρω περιορισμούς στην αναγνώριση της ανάγκης για τη διαμόρφωση συνθηκών πολυπολιτισμικότητας και επαφής διαφόρων γλώσσων και πολιτισμών, όπως και στην κατανόηση και ανταπόκριση της εκπαιδευτικής τάξης στις ανάγκες της πολυπολιτισμικής και επαφής διαφόρων γλώσσων και πολιτισμών.
1. Introduction

During 2015 more than one million people entered or transited through Greece in order to escape conflict in their countries (mainly from Syria, Pakistan, Iraq and Afghanistan) and made their way to Europe (UNHCR, 2016; Ziomas, Capella, & Konstantinidou, 2017). The presence of refugee children in Greek schools led educational authorities to establish and operate “Reception Structures for the Education of Refugees” (DYEP) in certain schools during afternoon hours. Pupils who live in apartments or other premises in urban areas were allowed to attend morning “Reception Classes”, which are part of the formal educational system and are addressed to pupils with limited knowledge of the Greek language since 2010.

Actually, the more refugees remain in the country and are moved to the urban fabric, the more they enroll in morning schools to attend the regular curriculum of each grade, and the number of these refugee pupils tends to increase as long as their state of residence is not anymore completely temporary. However, many teachers feel unprepared for this change and do not know how to “handle” this linguistic and cultural diversity in their classes (Scientific Committee for the Support of Refugee Children, 2017; Maligkoudi & Nikolau, 2017). The study reported here investigates teachers’ attitudes and practices regarding the linguistic and cultural diversity of their refugee students.

Refugee children in Greece

According to the Hellenic Migration Policy Institute1 in 2016 there were 23.649 refugees and asylum seekers from Syria, 4.066 from Pakistan, 4.055 from Iraq and 3.295 from Afghanistan in Greece. The main countries of origin of refugees are Syria (47%), Afghanistan (24%), Iraq (15%) and Pakistan (4%). 36.890 refugees are hosted in 40 refugee camps all over Greece and minors constitute 37% of the total refugee immigrants’ population (UNCHR 2016:8). More specifically, children who are at school age (4-15 years old), reached the number of 8.000-8.500 during this time period. As far as educational policies are concerned, Greece is managing this challenging situation mainly through two kinds of educational measures: (1) Reception structures for refugee education and (2) Reception classes and tutorial courses. The reception structures for refugees were 107 during the time period October 2016-March 2017 and they operated in mainstream schools during afternoon hours, from 2:00 to 6:00 pm and offered basic subjects such as Greek and English, Maths, Physical Education, Art and Information Technology. Reception

---

classes and tutorial courses have been operating in Greece since 1983 for foreign or repatriated children and their aim is to offer intensive Greek language courses.

Although Reception Classes have been operating in the Greek educational system for over 30 years, they are not addressed to refugee students. Refugees are special because they have typically experienced both displacement and trauma and now face the task of adapting to a new environment, frequently involving the simultaneous acquisition of a new language (Anderson, Hamilton, Moore et al, 2004). That’s why the current education system should do further planning on efficient intervention methods to meet the needs of refugee students.

According to the Greek Scientific Committee for the Support of Refugee children (2017) the greatest challenges that educators in Greek mainstream schools face are the following: (1) Continuous replacement of teachers, (2) Lack of teachers’ training, (3) Lack of teachers’ experience to deal with refugee children and, finally, (4) Management of “socially sensitive” groups.

**Teachers’ beliefs and attitudes towards linguistic and cultural diversity**

Teachers’ beliefs towards their students’ cultural backgrounds and languages affect all aspects of learning (Montilla, Just, & Triscari, 2014). In particular, teachers’ beliefs strongly influence their pedagogical decisions and such beliefs are typically resistant to change (Borg, 2006). "The educational process must be linked to the experiences of the children themselves and their culture" and the teachers are the ones who design this process (Τσιούμης, 2003). Moreover, their beliefs are a strong predictor of what occurs in the classroom and this is the main reason why researchers in the field claim that insight into teachers’ beliefs is necessary in order to understand and improve language teaching and students’ learning (Borg, 2006).

As far as multilingual and multicultural issues are concerned, teachers often declare that they are positive towards the promotion of intercultural education in the school context and the maintenance of the minority children’s home language (Castro, 2010). However, the majority of the educators fail to see the correlation between discrimination of minority groups and structural and educational inequalities (Mattheoudakis, Chatzidaki, & Maligkoudi, 2017). More specifically, although teachers express positive views towards linguistic and cultural diversity, they do not implement practices that promote intercultural views among their students in their teaching practice (Ramos, 2001). According to Scarcella and Oxford (1992, p. 63) learning strategies are defined as “specific actions, behaviors, steps or techniques used by students to enhance their own learning”.

According to De Angelis’s research (2011) the teachers of her sample (176 teachers) were reported to generally encourage their students to use their home language, but not in their classroom, as they believed that the use of their home language in class may delay or even impair the learning of the majority language. Based on other similar studies Haukas (2015) claims that it is a common phenomenon to have teachers who declare to have positive beliefs about multilingualism and its promotion, but in fact they do not make use of learners’ previous knowledge failing in this way to foster multilingualism. According to Lee and Oxelson (2006) the reason for this discrepancy may be the lack of teachers’ training on intercultural and bilingual education. In addition to
that, Otwinowska’s study (2014) showed that experienced in-service teachers have greater multilingual awareness than pre-service teachers. After all, as Block, Cross, Riggs and Gibbs (2014) explain, schools are a critical point for promoting successful social inclusion but it has not been proven how they can effectively support refugee students and families given the challenges they face when learning a new language, familiarizing themselves with an unfamiliar education system, combined with the lack of previous education and recovering from the injuries they have suffered not to mention the conditions of insecurity or discrimination.

In the Greek context research has shown that teachers who support and promote multilingualism in their classes are only a few, whereas the majority of them either merely show tolerance or even express ethnocentric attitudes with regard to immigrant languages (Μητακίδου & Δανιηλίδου, 2007; Sakka, 2010). Myths about bilingualism, namely that bilingual children may confuse the two languages or that the development of the minority language may hinder the development of the majority language, are quite widespread (Gkaitartzi, Kiliari, & Tsokalidou, 2015; Σκούρτου, 2005; Stamou & Dinas 2009). Moreover, their teaching practices often do not encourage the promotion of bilingual children’s languages and in general multilingualism and multiculturalism (Mattheoudakis, Chatzidaki, & Maligkoudi, 2017). These beliefs are obviously related to teachers’ ignorance of the relevant theories which support the interdependence of languages and the transfer of notions and concepts between them (Cummins, 2000, 2003; Σκούρτου, 2005, 2011). Additionally, research suggests that most teachers do not seem to realize the importance of the development and use of the home heritage language either for psychological or cognitive reasons (Σκούρτου, 2005). Some even prohibit the use of these languages in the classroom on the grounds that Greek is the only ‘legitimate’ school language in their new surroundings (Gkaintartzi, Chatzidaki, & Tsokalidou 2014; Sakka, 2010). Language bias as an axis of orientation regarding school policy has important social implications (Φραγκουδάκη, 1987). The message that the child actually receives is that his/her language, a component of his/her identity, through which he/she defines himself/herself and expresses his/her feelings and personality, is neglected and rejected.

2. The study

2.1 Data collection

The study was designed as a qualitative one, as the general research design included conducting interviews with the teachers of a school and its headmaster/director as well as class observations. The present paper is based on a case study, as the main focus is on one school, the first Elementary School of Sindos in Thessaloniki, Greece. Data was collected during the period January-March 2017.

Interviews were conducted with the educators and the director of the school on the following topics: (1) Educators’ profile (e.g. educational background, years of teaching experience), (2) Educators’ views about their students’ bilingualism, (3) Educators’ practices regarding pupils from diverse cultural backgrounds and, finally, (4) Educators’ attitudes towards general language policies as indicated and implemented by the director of the school, the Greek Ministry of Education etc. regarding the presence of refugee children in Greek schools. Each question was formulated in such a way as to express, in the two researchers’ view, a particular stance towards bilingualism and diversity.
As far as classroom observations are concerned, three classroom observations took place during the period of three months (January-March 2017). The observations’ protocol included five different themes: (1) factors of verbal and non-verbal teacher’s behavior that may influence students’ behavior and form the learning environment, (2) teaching strategies and techniques, (3) factors that may promote student’s interaction, (4) teaching means and, finally, (5) the educational material. The observation sheets allowed the frequency of behaviors or phenomena to be registered through checklists (Hatch, 1995, p. 126). In our case, the categories of the (1) theme match the categories 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7 of the Flanders Interaction Analysis Classroom (Amatari-Odiri, 2015) and our main focus was on specific forms of the teacher’s verbal behavior that characterize to an extent the quality of her interpersonal relationships with her students, affect students’ behavior and may create a fertile learning environment.

2.2 Participants

The participants in our research were five teachers who work in the 1st Elementary School of Sindos as well as the director of the school. Although the factor “gender” is not taken into account in the current research, it can be pointed out that the sample includes four female and two male teachers. The school in question had 325 students during the school year 2016-2017. There were 43 students from an immigrant background (mainly from Albania and Syria) and there were six newly-arrived refugee children from Syria. Finally, there were also 18 Roma students in the particular school.

The age of the educators corresponds to their teaching experience: two teachers claimed to have had more than 30 years of teaching experience, two teachers over more than 20 years and two teachers had 8-12 years of teaching experience. In other words, most teachers were quite experienced. However, they did not have any sort of specialization in issues of intercultural and education or teaching Greek as a second or foreign language. The only exception was one teacher who reported to have attended relevant in-training seminars. With regard to their educational level, all teachers had basic undergraduate studies but not a postgraduate degree. Finally, all the teachers in our research sample had some sort of experience in teaching in multilingual/multicultural classes, whereas one of them had also worked in a Reception Class.

2.3 Research questions

In order to pursue the investigation of the specific sample teachers’ attitudes and practices with regard to the linguistic and cultural diversity in their classes, we formulated research questions that were related to the informants’ attitudes as well as to their practices. In the present paper we shall report findings related to the following research questions:

RQ1: What are the participating teachers’ attitudes towards their students’ bilingualism?

RQ2: What are the teachers’ attitudes towards the use of learners’ home language in class? Do they try to include elements of their learners’ culture and language in their lesson?
In the teachers' attitudes we also include the director's attitudes. Because his attitudes show us the extent to which the teachers are supported in the process of applying bilingual teaching.

RQ3: Do teachers modify their teaching practices in order to accommodate for their bilingual learners?

By looking at their reported views and practices we wished to examine in depth teachers' awareness or their lack of awareness of the importance of valuing and supporting their students' linguistic and cultural heritage.

3. Results

3.1 Teachers' attitudes towards their students' bilingualism

Teachers' attitudes regarding home language maintenance were investigated through questions like “How would you define bilingualism? Is bilingualism a positive or a negative notion, according to your view?” or “Do you think refugee children’s performance and cognitive capacity differs in comparison with the other students of your class?”

First of all, the educators of our sample treat children’s two languages as separate systems and they consider that their use must be compartmentalized. They seem to be unaware of what Cummins (2000) has claimed about the interdependence of one’s languages, i.e. the knowledge of one language functions as scaffolding for the development of other languages.

Bilingualism is when he/ she has acquired language, the first, the native one and the next one. (Maria2)

I think bilingualism is that children...not only children, but also adults, let’s say, all people that have a mother tongue different from the spoken one in the country they live in. (Eleni)

In addition, a teacher from our sample claimed that her student cannot be considered bilingual because he barely speaks Greek. The teacher seems to be unaware of passive bilingualism, which refers to bilingual individuals who have the ability to understand a second language in their oral or written form but cannot speak or write it (Τσοκαλίδου, 2012):

My student knows almost no Greek, so he is not bilingual. (Georgia)

The same teacher commenting on the adaptation of the refugee student at school states that he seems to be lonely and does not seek to interact with other students:

To talk about my own student, (he) is too closed. He doesn’t want to get in touch with the kids so much. In some constructions we do he doesn’t want to participate.

He is distant. I do not know why. Maybe so he has been told [...] When we had a Christmas party, he didn’t want to eat anything. (Georgia)

Furthermore, a teacher from our sample claimed that children’s knowledge and use of their first language hinders their general language development and reports his...

2 The names are pseudonyms.
unwillingness to differentiate his teaching, in order to help these children integrate in class:

   It is not bilingualism. There is no communication, no means of contact. At some point we hope he/she will start participating, although I think it will not be possible this year. I think it is very difficult. Because this is a very demanding class and there is no extra time to cater for the needs that this child has. (Kostas)

   The same teacher argues that there are less important and more important languages, in the sense that if the knowledge of a language helps someone to communicate with a lot of people, then this language is very important:

   Everyone’s mother tongue is important. Ok. Beyond that a language that helps you to communicate with more people, it is important to exist. I think that all languages are important, however a language that helps you to communicate with more people, is more useful. (Kostas)

   However, social meaning includes evaluation of languages themselves (Hymes, 1992), but in the teacher’s view, the communicative competence linked to various sociocultural features drives to the arbitrary assumption that languages are divided into superior and inferior ones.

3.2 Teachers’ attitudes and practices towards the use of learners’ home language in class

   Home language plays a crucial role for children, because it is the language that connects them with their family and country of origin. The importance is both practical (they can communicate with their family and peers) but also symbolic, as it is part of their language and cultural identity (Γκαϊνταρτζή, Γάτση, & Τσοκαλίδου, 2011). Three educators of our sample claimed that they try to encourage the use of their refugee students’ language during class, as they want to achieve effective communication with them and among them:

   No, I don’t discourage them, because it is a way for them to be able to communicate with each other. Perhaps someone will understand something better and he/she translates it for the others. So, in the class they also speak Arabic. It is not only Greek. They cannot express themselves in Greek yet, but no, I do not discourage them, because in this way we can communicate better. (Eleni)

   I encourage the use of Arabic. They say the basics. Of course, I encourage it... I don’t make any remarks because children must speak and understand each one of them.” (Katerina)

   I do not mind using Arabic... that is, with her friends. She cannot use Arabic in the class because no one speaks Arabic... She taught me a couple of “go go”, “get”, something like that. (Maria)
The rest of the teachers report that they do not encourage the use of their refugee students’ language, as their classmates do not speak Arabic. They are aware that in this way these students can be left behind, however they do not engage in any form of flexible teaching/language practices. On the contrary, they seem to engage in “monoglossic” teaching practices (Garcia, 2011), namely they insist on the use of the dominant language. Moreover, as the second extract reveals, their lesson seems to be more traditionally oriented, where the teacher gives orders and students have to follow them, regardless of whether they understand them or not.

I cannot encourage the use [of their home language], because this bilingualism does not exist, we cannot achieve any debate or something like this. Rarely does this happen. Because I should know one language in order to use the other one. So, this is difficult to happen. (Kostas)

He does not speak in the class. I do not know [Arabic] in order to communicate with him. I try because he also goes down, to the Reception Class, to have him beside me for some hours, whenever I can and whenever the rest of the class does something else. Of course, I talk to him in Greek and my orders are simple. Whatever he understands. (Georgia)

3.3 Teachers’ general teaching practices in multilingual classes

The majority of the participants in the current research replied that they largely use visual educational material for their multilingual classes, namely pictures or flash cards for teaching vocabulary or several grammatical phenomena. Moreover, the Reception Class’ teacher argued that she uses specific educational textbooks which were especially prepared for foreign or repatriated children. Regarding the question whether the educators try to differentiate their teaching practices in order to accommodate for the needs of their refugee students, the majority of them replied positively. In particular, they claimed to have made use of printed or flash cards for new vocabulary, exercise sheets with pictures and visual material and they try to give their bilingual students different, less demanding, assignments:

We revise the central notions, the meanings. We see there, we point with our finger. With images, with students’ sheets of the previous class and with the textbook of the previous class. (Maria)

I use a lot of pictures. Either I draw or I find ready pictures and I show them to them, because otherwise we cannot...they cannot understand things. And this is possible only with nouns. Verbs, I try to explain them, but it is very difficult. The same goes for adjectives or adverbs. (Eleni)

I try to do something different for these children. With photocopies. Wherever there is a word, I put a picture. Because the word on its own cannot... A word and a picture together. (Katerina)

However, two teachers from our sample declared that the demands of the school curriculum do not allow them to engage in diversified teaching practices that would help refugee students to get on with the rest of the class. In order words, these teachers set as their main teaching priority the progress of their native students. Moreover, one of these

teachers distinguishes Greek-origin children from refugee children, naming the first ones as “our children”:

No. I can’t. It is impossible to do it in the 5th grade. The demands are enormous, even for our children, not only for a child that has not been in this educational reality and does not understand the language at all. Even for our children, because the level and the demands of 5th grade are very high. (Kostas)

Another teacher claims that she has to follow the curriculum and if her refugee student was in a lower class he could learn more easily:

It is also the 6th grade now. I mean if he was in a smaller grade, he could... Now I’m doing with the students of the 6th grade what I have to do. The gap is too big. If he was at 1st grade it would be much easier. (Georgia).

Regarding teachers’ general teaching practices in multilingual classes, the director of the school refers to his effort to provide auxiliary educational material to teachers in order to assist them in their teaching work on refugee students. Also, it emphasizes the importance of a Reception Class and stresses its contribution to addressing the challenges of teaching in bilingual refugee students. Finally, he expresses his concerns about the availability of refugee students to be trained in the Greek educational system. He points out that refugee students’ families wish to be permanently settled in other European countries and this may be a hindrance to their successful integration into Greek school and social life.

As a school, the Reception Class we have is the biggest aid for us, because there children are taught exclusively language. As I told you, communication is the main problem. Beyond that, every colleague, depending on his mood, looks on the web. I have given some site with ministry material, which colleagues can download to help. Now, it is also that these children themselves want something more than what we give or they rest, let us say, that they are here for a short time and they will leave. (director)

The director’s understanding of the teaching techniques used by teachers in refugee students appears to be largely influenced by the concept of language as a problem (Ruiz, 1984). In particular, the director considers that the first language of refugee students is an obstacle to their education, while creating complications and difficulties in their social and emotional adaptation as it makes it difficult to achieve effective communication. Consequently, we conclude that the director is not in favor of maintaining bilingualism and prefers language assimilation as a solution, with the aim of integrating the group of refugee students into the dominant group.

Diversification in teaching practices plays an important role in bilingual children’s progress, as they can allow interaction, involvement of all language skills and encouragement of bilingual children to use the full range of their language repertoire. The teacher of the Reception Class of the school (Eleni) in question was observed to implement such practices. In particular, she made an effort to connect her students’ former knowledge with new information/input through visual material, encouraged the use of Arabic in several cases for pedagogical purposes, provided her students with additional material for homework and kept repeating grammatical phenomena or syntactical structures that were demanding. In other words, she adopted strategies whose aim was to help refugee students to keep in line with the syllabus but also to teach them how to learn. Thus, the teacher in question aims at making her refugee students
autonomous learners through her strategies, as both the observation of her courses and the interview with her have shown.

4. Discussion

The findings of the present study indicated that although educators claim to be supportive of their refugee students, according to their interviews, not all of them engage themselves and their students in teaching practices that support their students’ language and cultural backgrounds. Some of them argue that they do not want to sacrifice the progress of their “native” students in order to help refugee children in the process of their integration in class. In addition, it was reported that the educators, despite the difficulties they face as they attempt to approach multilingualism in their class, they do not believe that additional teacher training is needed in order to support multilingual teaching.

Moreover, a phenomenon which has been observed, is that Greek is applied as a language of instruction in the general classes as if it were the first language for the students, while there are also students for whom Greek is a second language (Χατζηδάκη, 2000). This practice of teachers, combined with the possibly low self-esteem of refugee students, may very possibly affect negatively their attitudes towards school and society. It appears that both teachers and the director of the school believe that refugee students will learn Greek in the Reception Class in order to join the general class. From this it can be seen that the teachers in our sample consider and treat the first language of bilingual refugee students as a problem.

In all cases, the teacher who is responsible for the Reception Class, showed a positive attitude towards her bilingual students. Moreover, it was indicated that she applied flexible bilingual teaching practices in order to provide opportunities for contact and interaction in Greek and that resulted in improved opportunities for language learning. In other words, students were encouraged to express themselves in a variety of ways. The teacher reported that she has made modifications to her teaching strategies over time from transforming her previous training to a bilingual educational model in combination to her classroom experience.

Culturally sensitive teaching has been designed to help bilingual students to connect their academic with their social knowledge and their worldview through the use of cultural connectors that have meaning for them (Vavrus, 2008). Academic success of students from different cultural environments can be achieved when they are taught through their own cultural and empirical filters (Gay, 2002). Educators have to focus on the students’ interests and on the elements that enhance the students’ positive attitude towards life and their future (Strekalova & Hoot, 2008).

Thus, it is imperative that teachers receive more and better training on issues of bilingualism and intercultural education which will allow them to increase their awareness and sensitivity towards challenges and opportunities involved in the diversity of their multilingual classes (Gkaintartzi & Tsokalidou, 2011).
Strategies about refugee education should have a double direction. Firstly, they should respond to the personal needs of refugees and, secondly, they should aim at changing the perceptions of educators, parents and the general community (Hamilton & Moore, 2004, p. 110). Moreover, the integration of refugees and asylum seekers in the educational system demands a holistic structural approach focused on refugees and their encouragement to build their own knowledge (Hamilton & Moore, 2004; Hayward, 2007). This model includes elements of collaborative and participatory learning as well as of critical pedagogy. Students participating in such education can achieve progress and develop their self-perception as well as their personality (Hayward 2007, p. 11; Naidoo 2009, p. 179; Naidoo 2013, p. 460).
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