Este es un manuscrito en **versión post-print** de un artículo publicado por ELSEVIER en Teaching and Teacher Education el 1 de abril de 2023, disponible en: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103035.

Referencia completa:
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.

TEACHER BELIEFS AND APPROACHES TO LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY. SPANISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE IN THE INCLUSION OF IMMIGRANT STUDENTS

Abstract

This study examines teachers' beliefs regarding linguistic diversity and their approaches to teaching Spanish as a second language (SSL) in the inclusion of immigrant students whose first language is not Spanish. Grounded in a qualitative study in multicultural schools in Andalusia (Spain), we compared the voices of two groups of teachers: regular teachers and specialist language teachers. Teachers reflected monolingual beliefs -from assimilationist to deficit approaches- and attached great importance to the role that SSL has for immigrant students. Results indicated the need for professional development for teachers to promote multilingualism based on beliefs of language-as-resource or language-as-right.

Keywords: teachers' beliefs, linguistic diversity, language approaches, Spanish as a second language, assimilationist approach, multilingualism.

1. Introduction

One of the main effects of globalization is the remarkable growth of migratory movements. In the not too distant past, Spain was a country of emigration. During the last decades, immigration has dramatically changed the demographics. Analysing school heterogeneity in Spain currently involves referencing immigrant students, making it a necessity for the educational system to address linguistic diversity. Therefore, it is important to understand teachers' beliefs to linguistic diversity and their approaches to teaching SSL to students whose first language is not Spanish.

Teachers' beliefs and approaches regarding linguistic diversity is central to the success of educating immigrants (Pettit, 2011). Most research propose that beliefs play an important role in many aspects of teaching. For example, teachers' beliefs on linguistic diversity predict students' language learning (Cummins, 2000) and impact instructional decisions and practices (Basturkmen,

2012; Borg, 2011).

While there are several studies on the integration of immigrant students in Spain, there is paucity about teachers' beliefs to linguistic diversity. This paper is likely to be of interest to other countries with a large proportion of newly arrived immigrants. Examining their believes and approaches to linguistic diversity may be a first step toward developing teacher training that support multilingualism immigrant pupils' needs in a 'new' immigration country.

This paper seeks to enrich the discussion about monolingual vs. multilingual approaches in Spain as part of a wider, international dimension of study of teachers' beliefs to linguistic diversity. Additionally, this study is unique in that it compares the perceptions of two types of teachers: 'regular teachers'[1]and specialist teachers who are very complementary in their functions and at the same time unique in their training.

As theoretical framework for this study, we explored three areas in the literature: (1) teachers and immigrant students; (2) teachers' beliefs towards linguistic diversity; and (3) programs for linguistic diversity. The results depict stronger adherence to monolingualism reducing linguistic diversity to learning Spanish or a FL.

2. Theoretical framework

The study draws upon Ruíz (1984) orientations towards languages: language-as-problem, language-as-resource, and language as-right. According to the language-as-problem orientation, which matches Lambert's (1980, p. 3) "subtractive bilingualism" construct, mother language[2] use is an obstacle to L2 acquisition. Furthermore, teacher discourses reveal that languages other than the language of instruction are believed to be obstacles to educational success and are detrimental to other students' learning (Dooly, 2007; Martin- Jones, Blackledge, & Creese, 2012). However, research describes that students may feel demotivated when their languages are considered as causes of school failure (Cummins, 2001).

The language-as-resource orientation suggests that multilingualism is an asset and should be fostered. Teachers with this orientation are likely to include students' backgrounds into teaching; these beliefs are positively associated with teacher self- efficacy, readiness to adjust teaching methods, and keenness for teaching immigrant students, all of which add to more constructive learning environments for immigrant students (Hachfeld, Hahn, Schroeder, Anders, & Kunter, 2015).

Lastly, the language-as-right orientation argues for students' languages maintenance as a civil right and clearly highlights the benefits of first language retention. This approach recognizes the value of the linguistic capital as part of the community cultural wealth that include aspirational, social, linguistic and familial capital.

---

[1] In Spain 'regular teachers' is synonymous with mainstream, content area teacher. The specialist teachers are directly responsible for teaching SSL within the TCLA program. They are often peripatetic, meaning they teach in various schools

[2] For the purpose of this article we use term 'mother tongue' to refer to the first language of immigrant children, and the one used to communicate at home.

3. Review of literature

3.1 Teachers and immigrant students

The importance of teachers' beliefs and approaches to linguistic diversity for teaching immigrant students has been stressed by many researchers (García, 2011; García & Wei, 2014; Gkaintartzi, Kiliari, & Tsokalidou, 2015; Pulinx Van Avermaet & Agirdag, 2017). Teachers' beliefs might possibly influence pupils' opportu- nities to learn (Gay, 2010). Hence, one might assume that positive teacher beliefs towards linguistic diversity will have advantageous. have to be negotiated (Wassell, Kerrigan, & Hawrylak, 2018). Often, the immigrant students have a complete or partial lack of the vehicular teaching language. This latter issue causes great concern among teachers and they generally feel unprepared to teach immigrant students (Author1, 2009). In previous work, (Authors, 2018). revealed that immigrant students were perceived as having deficits and were integrated into remedial classes. Here, teachers have found an ally in the Education Administration, which has created programs to accelerate language acquisition for emergent bilinguals[3]. The fact that a great number of immigrant students are bilingual still remains unanswered, due to the dominant school language attitudes, which are largely driven by the monolingual ideology.
Altogether, teachers frequently associate linguistic diversity with the existence of immigrant populations[4], and often view them as burdens within regular classrooms (Pettit, 2011). This conception is based fundamentally on the teachers' difficulties in dealing with students with different languages. Teachers primarily understand linguistic diversity as a broad concept. It is worth noting that linguistic background of immigrant students is very diverse, and Spanish teachers tend to be a rather homogeneous workforce, who usually do not speak other language than Spanish. It is also important to remark that, while Spanish is the main language of instruction, in several areas some regional languages also have an official status (Balearic Islands, Catalonia, Galicia, the Basque Country and Valencia), and are frequently the main languages in schools. However, contrary to the U.S., Spain does not hold a linguistic census that would inform us about the different languages spoken in Spain.

3.2 Teachers' beliefs towards linguistic diversity

The polysemic nature of beliefs has generated various definitions (Fives & Buehl, 2012). For the purposes of this study, beliefs encompass many mental constructs such as views, attitudes, conceptions, dispositions, and perceptions that an individual has about an object, person or group (Fives and Gill, 2015). In

[3] Following García et al. (2008) we opted for this term to indicate that SSL students through school and through acquiring Spanish, these children become *bilingual*, able to continue to function in their mother tongue as well as in Spanish.

[4] The definition of 'migrant population' can be problematic owing to the het- erogeneity of the group. This paper uses the term immigrant population to signify the foreign economic migrant population. For the purposes of this article, 'immigrant students' are defined as children whose parents were born outside of Spain and who require additional teaching in the language of instruction. Bearing in mind the recent nature of immigration in Spain, school-aged children tend to be first generation immigrants. The profile is very heterogeneous in terms of ethnicity, cultural background, and language, as well as academic achievement.

recent years numerous studies have focused on the relationship between beliefs and practices (Alisaari, Heikkola, Commins, & Acquah, 2019; Basturkmen, 2012; Borg, 2011; Isikoglu, Basturk, & Karaca, 2009; Pettit, 2011). Beliefs are important because they serve as predictors of teaching behaviors (Youngs & Youngs, 2001) and students' outcomes (Cummins, 2001). For example, teachers with negative beliefs about linguistic diversity are likely to communicate lower expectations of academic achievement to language-minority students (García & Hesson, 2015). Youngs and Youngs (2001) report several predictors that affect positive views of students' potential such as teachers' "completion of foreign language or multicultural education courses, ESL training, experience abroad, work with diverse ESL students and gender" (p. 97). Studies have also shown that as teachers work with culturally diverse student populations, their familiarity and contact with these populations increased, leading to more positive attitudes towards multilingual pupils (Borg, 2011; Dooly, 2007; Pulinx, Van Avermaet, & Agirdag, 2017).

Moreover, studies have revealed that some teachers' orientations can be positive towards the theoretical aspects of bilingual education and students' languages instruction but appear less positive towards the practical implementation of these principles in the classroom (Lee & Anderson, 2009). Many teachers find themselves ill-prepared for working with linguistically diverse students and unable to use the language of students as a resource (Ga´ndara & Hopkins, 2010; Martin-Jones et al., 2012). Those teachers do not see a role for themselves in students' languages maintenance perceiving it as the sole responsibility of immigrant parents (Lee & Anderson, 2009).

In summary, teachers' beliefs are vital for improving educational practices. The deeper interpretation of the teachers' beliefs towards linguistic diversity of immigrant children can provide us with a better understanding of language attitudes and school practices as a whole.

Table 1

Types of Educational Programs for Emergent Bilinguals

Program	Language Used in Instruction	Components	Duration	Goals
Submersion (Sink or Swim)	100% English	Mainstream education; no special help with English; no specially certified teachers.	Throughout K-12 schooling.	Linguistic assimilation (shift to English only)
ESL. Pull Out (Submersion plus ESL)	90-100% in English; may include some home language support or not.	Mainstream education; students pulled out for 30-45 minutes of ESL daily; teachers certified in ESL.	As needed.	Linguistic assimilation; remedial English.
Structured Immersion (Sheltered English or Content-Based ESL)	90-100% in English; may include some home language support or not.	Subject matter instruction at students level of English; students grouped for instruction; teachers certified in ESL, should	1-3 years.	Linguistic assimilation; quick exit to mainstream education.

		have some training in immersion.		
Transitional Bilingual Education (Early Exit)	10-50% home language, 50-90% English.	Initial literacy usually in home language; some subject instruction in home language; ESL and subject matter instruction at students level of English; sheltered English subject instruction; teachers certified in bilingual education.	1-3 years; students exit as they become proficient in English.	Linguistic assimilation; English acquisition without falling behind academically.
Developmental Bilingual Education (Late Exit).	90% home language initially; gradually decreasing to 50% or less by grade 4 or 50/50 from beginning.	Initial literacy in home language; some subject instruction in home language; ESL initially subject matter instruction at students level or English; teachers certified in bilingual education.	5-6 years.	Bilingualism and biliteracy, academic achievement in English.
Two-Way Bilingual Education (Two-Way Dual Language, Two-Way Immersion, Dual Immersion).	90/10 model; 90% LI; 10% English in early grades; 50/50 model: parity of both languages.	ELLS and native-English speakers taught literacy and subjects in both languages; peer tutoring; teachers certified in bilingual education.	5-6 years.	Bilingualism and biliteracy, academic achievement in English.

Note. García, Kleifgen, & Falchi (2008, p. 19).

3.3 Programs for linguistic diversity

Throughout the history of education, educational systems have responded to linguistic diversity of students in diverse ways. Different educational programs can be placed on a continuum that begins with a monolingual orientation and evolves towards multilingual perspectives (Author1, 2010). To situate the Andalucía's programs for linguistic diversity in an international context this study used the categorization of García, Kleifgen, and Falchi (2008) (Table 1)[5]. This model illustrates the possible ideologies in which linguistic diversity can be approached and may be able to inform language programs for immigrant students in Spain.

The monolingual approach includes Submersion or "Sink o Swim" programs, with the same educational services provided to all students. A second category

[5] We have chosen to respect the terms used by the authors. They use ESL (English as a second language), which equivalent in our case is Spanish as a second language (SLL). In both cases, it refers to measures of teaching the language of instructions to students who have another language. Additionally, they use home language and we opted for mother tongue - as we have already explained in footnote 2-.

is called Pull-Out ESL (Submersion plus ESL) and provides some language support for students outside of the regular classroom. The goals of this kind of program are linguistic assimilation and remedial English. The third approach is the Structured English Immersion (Sheltered English or content-based ESL) which offers students with a great deal of educational support but uses only English to educate children.

Moving toward the other end of the spectrum, there are the Transitional Bilingual Education and the Developmental Bilingual Education or Two-way Bilingual Education) that are more "bilingual," in that they use the student's language. This position involves recognising the importance of different languages. Using this lens, linguistic diversity is understood as a key element of intercultural communication, and this in turn is a core of multilingual practices (García & Wei, 2014).

In Spain the Temporary Classroom of Linguistic Adaptation (TCLA) program is comparable to the Pull-Out ESL. Therefore, it is neither related to the maintenance of the student's language nor to the promotion of positive multilingual awareness. TCLA is a clearly assimilationist device despite the overwhelming empirical evidence that suggests the efficacy of multicultural and bilingual education, structural inequalities, Nativist sentiments, and a climate of anti-immigration limit opportunities for minoritized students to excel in school and raise their socioeconomic status (Bialystok, 2018; Wiley, García, Danzig, & Stigler, 2014).

3.4 Translanguaging

Some authors (Canagarajah & Wurr; 2011; Martin-Jones et al., 2012) have posited that the education of multilingual students must move from monolingual perspectives to multilingualism as a dynamic phenomenon. The multilingual paradigm recognizes their diversity and requires competence in different codes for survival. For multilinguals, languages are not necessarily at war with each other; they complement each other in communication. Hence, "we have to reconsider the dominant understanding that one language negatively «interferes» in the use of another" (Canagarajah & Wurr, 2011, p. 9). Multilinguals do not have separate competences for separately labelled languages but have an integrated competence that is different in kind (not just degree) from monolingual competence. For multilinguals, languages are part of a repertoire that is accessed for their communicative purposes (García & Hesson, 2015); languages are not discrete and separated (García & Wei, 2014). The term translanguaging is gaining force to explain that "multilingual competence emerges out of local practices where multiple languages are negotiated for communication; competence doesn't consist of separate competencies for each language, but a multicompetence that functions symbiotically for the different languages in one's repertoire" (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 1). From this perspective, languages complement each other within the individual's adaptive response to the environment. To summarize, language programs differ across the world. Opinions tend to vary with most authors criticizing the 'Pull out' and assimilationist approaches. While some countries pursue a bilingual approach by integrating the language of immigrant students into the educational progress, this approach is relatively rare in Spain, possibly due to the diversity of the language background of the new arrivals (Wassell et al., 2018). Considering the recent nature of immigration in

Spain, and adopting a comparative perspective, the current study contributes to argue against assimilationism and advancing towards multilingualism in its broadest possibilities.

4. Research context

The study took place in Andalusia, one Spanish Autonomous Community, which has long been notorious by the intensity and speed of the immigration flows. Andalusia has some interesting peculiarities given that Southern Spain shares a border with Africa, its trends in immigration are different than those of Northern Europe. It is worth noting that in the past 10 years the rise of different nationalities in schools has increased with a predominant Moroccan and Romanian background. Additionally, the region is characterized by educational policies based on a strong mono- lingual ideology and by its reactionary policymaking, and the focus on remedial support in the acquisition of language of instruction. This is particularly interesting considering that research revealed that teachers' beliefs tend to be embedded in government policies (Pulinx et al., 2017).

The first experiences of teaching Spanish to immigrants began in Andalusia in 1997 in response to the arrival to many students from the Maghreb with no knowledge of Spanish. They were placed into special classrooms separated from the main schools, where students remained until they gained a certain level of linguistic competency in Spanish. This model was criticized for its segregationist characteristics, and so these classrooms were subsequently located within the schools. This change led to the creation of the TCLA program (Consejería de Educación de Andalucía, 2007). This program, analogous to the Pull-Out ESL program, provides support to immigrant students who do not speak Spanish through remedial sessions as an effort to regulate immigrant students' languages. The immigrant students are placed in the 'regular classroom' for some subjects that do not require a high level of competency in Spanish (e.g. Arts or Physical Education). Students received supplementary support in 'specific classrooms' for 4e6 h per week, with a maximum of 10 h in Primary and 15 in Secondary education until they reach a proficient level of Spanish to be incorporated to regular classrooms. The maximum attendance period is of one school year or two when there are continued absences.

The study focused in four schools in Andalusia. All are state-run, had the TCLA program and are in the outskirts of Seville. These are areas with major social inequality and high levels of diversity. Ac- cording to schools' reports, they deal with families who are largely from ethnic minorities and nomadic minorities or migrant back- grounds from outside the EU, with a primary level of education or no education at all, and high numbers of single parent families. Other trait of these schools is the high level of unemployment, the prevalence of precarious employment and a strong underground economy.

The TCLA Andalusian experience is relevant for a number of reasons. Firstly, the linguistic background of the immigrants in Andalusia is very diverse, with most immigrants speaking a language other than Spanish. Secondly, it is based on teachers, fairly homogeneous in terms of ethnic, socio-economic and linguistic background, who are not trained in teaching SSL.

5. Method

5.1 Research questions

The study is part of a broader project focusing on teachers' beliefs to linguistic diversity in Andalusia. A mixed methods design was used to gather information from different stakeholders (i.e., principals, teachers, students, and families). For the quantitative strand, a questionnaire was designed to collect demographic data on immigrant students and teachers and information on the TCLAs and other measures to address linguistic diversity. This first phase allowed us to have a general overview on the object of study, although the choice of schools for the qualitative phase was not directly linked to these results. In the qualitative phase, a total of 10 schools where selected from four provinces of Andalusia, two of them in Seville. Ethnographic observation in the classrooms and the school context, informal interviews and formal in-depth interviews were applied (Auhors, 2018).

Schools selection was based on the ensuing reasons: the percentage of immigrant students (more than 20%), their willingness to participate in the study and the representativeness of two schools per province. In the two schools in Seville, the percentage of immigrant students was around 30%. There was a great diversity of nationalities (more than 15) with a greater representation of students from Morocco, Romania and China, followed by Poland, Bulgaria, Colombia, Bolivia, Ecuador and Algeria. The use of Spanish, in its different modalities, was predominant but other languages also coexisted. Among them, Arabic, Romanian, Chinese, Polish, Portuguese, English, French or Catalan.

The present article is contextualized in the qualitative phase of the project and compare the voices of two groups of four teachers: regular teachers and specialist teachers of four schools in Seville (two Primary and two Secondary). The specific research questions were as follows:

RQ 1. What are teachers' beliefs about linguistic diverse immigrant students?

RQ 2. How do teachers consider that linguistic diversity should be approached, what strategies they report adopting and what do they consider their responsibility towards linguistic diversity?

5.2 Participants

The participants in this study were: two regular teachers and two specialists. Teachers' selection was based on the following criteria: 1) teaching immigrant students for at least three years, and 2) availability and willingness to collaborate in the study. Therefore, the teachers were selected intentionally in accordance with the research goals (Olafson, Grandy, & Owens, 2015).

The mean age of the participants was 45 years; all are women. Two were Primary and two Secondary teachers. In Spain, Primary teacher training is more generalistic; teachers manage the class, teach all subjects, and help children develop not only basic competencies, but also emotional and social awareness. Secondary teachers have training in traditional subject areas, teach to several different classes, focus on academic skills and are almost exclusively concerned with academic achievement. The Secondary teacher who participated in this

study taught Mathematics and Social Studies. Furthermore, the latter reported not having any training in teaching L2. Nevertheless, they all have had teaching experience with immigrant students (Table 2).

Table 2
Teachers´ profiles

Codes	Age	Type of Teacher	School level	Years of teaching experience	TCLA Time	Training	Years of teaching experience with immigrant students	Training in multilingualism - L2 teaching
CA	56	Regular Classroom	Primary	14 years		Teaching Diploma	5 years	No
CB	34	Regular Classroom	Secondary	7 years		Honours Degree	4 years	No
CC	39	Specialist language teachers	Primary	8 years	5 years	Honours Degree	3 years	Yes
CD	51	Specialist language teachers	Secondary	11 years	3 years	Honours Degree	5 years	Yes

5.3 Procedure and interview protocol

Results are based on the responses of 12 in-depth interviews (King & Horrocks, 2010), three per participant. Teachers were contacted by phone or email, provided informed consent, and were interviewed at schools. The interviews were conducted in Spanish and in-person by the senior author over a period of 6 months. Interviews lasted between 60 and 950 and were recorded for transcription. Notes were made after the interviews and were added to field notes which were taken during the larger study, in order to contextualize the way linguistic diversity is perceived by teachers. The interviews started with general introductory questions about the presence of immigrant children in their classrooms and their past experiences with linguistic diversity. Then, guiding questions were as follows for all teachers: (1) What comes to mind when you hear linguistic diversity? (2) How do you perceive linguistic diversity in the classroom? (3) What role does language play in the inclusion of immigrant students? (4) What would be the best way to approach linguistic diversity? (5) What strategies do you use to deal with linguistic diversity?
The question protocol was preceded by sociodemographic data that included information about gender, age, years of teaching experience, initial and additional qualification level, courses received about multilingualism/language teaching, contact/experience with immigrant people and the languages they speak.

5.4 Data analysis

To carefully study the teachers' beliefs and approaches to linguistic diversity, we analyzed the data in two phases using content analysis after all the 12 interviews had been collected (Krippendorff, 2013). Data were analyzed thematically using first and second cycle coding procedures for qualitative analysis (Miles,Huberman, & Saldan~a, 2014). In the first cycle, two researchers

independently coded a full interview and discussed their codes. To confirm categories and to reduce subjective bias, outcomes were compared, if needed, each segment of analysis was renamed or recoded. For example, with the category regarding the concept of linguistic diversity. In the initial coding analysis, both researchers noted different aspects. One researcher, understood the concept in a broad sense, including references to the learning of FL, while the other linked it exclusively to the immigrant students' languages. After a debate, the most inclusive option was chosen. Consequently, new codes emerged such as LD-FL (linguistic diversity and foreign languages), LD-MT (linguistic diversity and mother tongue) or DL-S (linguistic diversity and Spanish).

During the second cycle, these same two researchers coded the remaining interviews. Codes were organized as a cross-case thematic categories (Borman, Clarke, Cotner, & Lee, 2006) using the constant comparison method (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) in response to research questions. This recurrent process was continued until solid themes emerged and patterns could be identified. This enabled checking for recurring themes and allowed a systematic approach to emphasize the similarities and differences in their respective beliefs. We then developed a final comprehensive report where codes were organized as themes and sub-themes with respect to the research questions. The QSR N-Vivo 11 was used.

6. Findings

The results are presented ensuing the two main questions of the study. To support research findings, direct quotations of the transcriptions are included. To guarantee the anonymity, an alphabetical classification has been used to refer to each teacher. CA and CB represent regular teachers. Primary and Secondary teachers respectively. CC and CD are specialist teachers. Primary and Secondary correspondingly.

6.1 Teachers' beliefs on linguistic diversity

In this section we focus on two research sub-themes: (1) orientations towards linguistic diversity, and (2) difficulty/ease with which each group acquires language.

6.1.1 Orientations towards linguistic diversity

Both types of teachers associated linguistic diversity with immigrant students and with their need to learn the vehicular language of instruction. Specialist teachers (i.e., CC and CD), as compared with the "regular" teachers, highlighted the important role that Spanish has in both the academic and social inclusion of immigrant students. For instance, they claimed:

> "Learning Spanish to these children is crucial if they really want to integrate and progress. It's OK if they speak their language at home but at school, they should improve their Spanish (...) I think that immigrants' first priority

should be learning Spanish, before focusing on other contents" (CC. Line 37e43).

Immigrant students were described by specialists as a grateful, motivated group, frequently setting an example to be followed. Factors influencing these teachers' beliefs may have been linked to their lived experiences in teaching language to immigrant pupils as suggested by Youngs & Youngs, 2001.

Specialist teachers displayed a complex but positive vision of linguistic diversity, grounded in the idea that all languages are important. These teachers tended to positively value each and every language spoken by students, arguing that multilingualism is always enriching similar to the language-as-right orientation (Ruíz, 1984) and to the multicultural approach (Hachfeld et al., 2015).

"These kids speak many other languages at home. They could teach other kids. It would be very educational indeed but they need to learn Spanish first" (Cd. Line 99e100).

Linguistic diversity was seen as a challenge more than a problem. However, they practically did not allude to other languages, expressions or forms of communication in the school and their conceptions about the linguistic diversity in general revolve around the importance of SSL as the steppingstone to successful integration into Spanish culture and schooling. Yet when it came to the actual use of different languages at schools, teachers' beliefs were more negative, and did not appear to support multilingualism in the classroom. Thus, their rhetoric features contradictions concerning linguistic diversity, which speaking their language was perceived as a right but "at home".

Regular teachers, particularly in Secondary education, displayed a more restrictive understanding of Spanish as an instrument of learning the curriculum, or as a basic skill to get on at school. The tendency manifested by these teachers was to understand SSL as a means of acquiring curricular contents and a key conditioning factor in the academic failure of immigrant students. One teacher affirmed:

"Without Spanish they cannot learn the contents. They are cannon fodder for failure because as well as having a very low curricular level, they are also not going to be able to succeed unless they learn Spanish" (CB. Line 46e49).

In this case, the language differential was overinflated, perceiving it as a shortcoming for school achievement and without considering the positive aspect of speaking another language (Bialystok, 2018). Participants understood linguistic diversity merely as teaching Spanish. None of our teachers referred to immigrant students as bilingual individuals and consistently ignored students' languages (Gkaintartzi et al., 2015; Pulinx et al., 2017). Additionally, immigrant students were classified as Spanish learners, rather than as emergent bilinguals (García et al., 2008). The following excerpt reflects the teachers' belief in this regard:

> "These students don't speak Spanish. Their parents don't speak either. This makes it very difficult for them to learn Spanish and have success. Students don't know anything when they first come. They need to put double effort" (CA. Line 25e28).

We also noticed that these teachers have not been introduced to multilingualism. Thus, teachers seem have to perceive the linguistic diversity provided by immigrant students as a source of problems, based on a monolingual view and a language deficit assumption, which would appear to reflect the stigmatisation of immigration within the school. For these teachers, immigrant students' languages were viewed as an obstacle to learning Spanish (Alisaari et al., 2019). Studies on teachers' attitudes towards linguistic diversity have also revealed that teachers' negative attitudes towards linguistic diversity can be brought about by perceived difficulties in dealing with it in the classroom (Dooly, 2007; Lee & Anderson, 2009).

Interestingly, a few references were made to the school policy on teaching FL (English or French), essentially due to the value attributed to these languages for the future employment of students (CA, CB).

> "More than their languages I think, pragmatically, that it is better that immigrants focus on another European language because it is going to be helpful for their future" (CA. Line 29e31).

According to our regular teachers, different languages have different status, and especially the languages of immigrant students were not always seen as valuable as, specifically, the FL studied at the schools. Beliefs that teachers had about multilingualism tend to identify some languages as more acceptable than others. Thus, they indicated a prevailing power relations and language hierarchical order associated with an ethnocentric-Eurocentric position (G´andara & Hopkins, 2010).

In brief, specialist teachers' beliefs toward linguistic diversity were contradictory. In general, teachers' beliefs were strongly founded in monolingualism. Furthermore, teachers seem to reduce linguistic diversity to Spanish and the maintenance of immigrant mother tongues as a responsibility of families, which suggests a non-recognition of multilingualism (Gkaintartzi et al., 2015; Pulinx et al., 2017; Ruíz, 1984). Hence, some of these beliefs lead us to wonder whether there is a certain concealed assimilationist attitude (Cummins, 2000) in relation with immigrant students.

6.1.2 Difficulty/ease with which each group

Another sub-theme reflected by participants was the competency in language acquisition depending on the nationality of the students. Nationality is sometimes applied to an entire continent and is associated with the difficulty of adapting into the host country. Previous research highlights the influence of student ethnicity on teachers' perceptions and judgments of their pupils, and hence the ways they interact with them (Pulinx et al., 2017). The most frequently

mentioned groupings in the discourses were: Moroccans, Eastern Europeans, and Chinese. Although they recognised the diversity of immigrant students, teachers seem to establish a grading in the difficulty/ease of language learning based on their origins, as it can be seen in the next extracts:

> "The most difficult ones are the Chinese. They close themselves up and it's really hard to reach them. Also, there are certain sounds that don't exist in their language and which they find impossible to pronounce" (CC. Line 201e205).

Our teachers considered Moroccan students as a separate group. There are constant contradictions in the discourses between positive and negative aspects to describe them: integrating easily and failing at school. Namely, "they integrate perfectly at a social level, but at an academic level they're a disaster" (CD. Line 102e103). Moroccan students were particularly associated with difficulties, requiring additional work on account of their education support needs, and representing a negative influence for the class group.
Immigrant students from Eastern European countries were perceived as being "European", and more similar to the "Spanish". Participants highlighted the ease with which they learn Spanish and how polite they are:

> "The best ones are students from Eastern European countries. They adapt well. They are quick to learn Spanish; they follow instructions and are usually highly motivated. Working with them is very easy and rewarding" (CD. Line 64e66).

In the discourses, emphasis was laid on pupils' weaknesses while most of the teachers interviewed alluded to the differences in language learning according to students' nationality.

6.2 Teachers responses to linguistic diversity

Three sub-themes emerged in answer to the second research question: (1): approaches to linguistic diversity, (2) educational practices and strategies used, and (3) teachers' responsibility to- wards linguistic diversity.

6.2.1 Approaches to linguistic diversity

During the interviews, we also inquired about teachers views on best approaches to respond to linguistic diversity. Teachers' responses, however, were often ambivalent, contradictory and with few allusions to bi-/multilingualism. On the one hand, regular teachers stressed that students must be integrated into rich and varied classrooms and "real learning contexts". On the other hand, it also appeared that their main concern is how to ensure that the immigrant students learn Spanish as soon as possible in special classrooms. In other words, the positions expressed waver between segregation and inclusion. As explained by one teacher:
"It's essential that immigrant students learn Spanish before entering their

regular class (…). For this, the best thing for them is to be in special classrooms where they can get direct attention" (CA. Line 156e159).

Conversely, specialist teachers generally proposed integrating immigrant students into the regular classroom as quickly as possible. However, they were not convinced of the viability of this approach. One of the main reasons given was the limited resources available to support them within regular classrooms. As described by one teacher:
"I firmly believe in integration, but given the lack of resources in regular classrooms, for them to get more attention, it's better for immigrants to be in specific classrooms" (CC. Lines 136e138).

Specialist teachers also argued that having students at several schools forces them to sacrifice an inclusive approach in their practices because they had to take the students out of their regular classroom. Hence, they ultimately continued to defend the expediency of providing language education to immigrant students in differentiated spaces. These teachers reported that:
"You can't look after that many students, our peripatetic time- table doesn't allow us to. I would prefer to provide support within the classroom, but that's not viable" (CD. Line 112e116).

That is, inclusive beliefs are not enough to implement inclusive practices. At a theoretical level, the approach was towards inclusion, but it was not considered to be viable in practice. The results of this study confirm that attitudes towards linguistic diversity can be affected by a lack of support and resources. A conclusion also
reached by Ga´ndara, Maxwell-Jolly, and Driscoll (2005) that found that teachers felt frustrated about having insufficient time to pro- vide language support to students. Similarly, teachers in a study by Youngs and Youngs (2001) considered time as a constraint in meeting the needs of linguistic diverse students. Basturkmen (2012) also proved the role of contextual factors in mediating the relationship between teachers' stated beliefs and practices.

Furthermore, specialist teachers did not show a simplistic mentality about how to handle linguistic diversity. They understand that it is not enough for the immigrant students to be physically in regular classrooms, but barriers that prevent them from participating in the regular curriculum with their peers need to be removed. One of the participants stated:

> "Real inclusion is beneficial for children, but can inclusion be achieved in a non-inclusive school? So maybe we must reflect and clarify better what we understand by inclusivity. Putting a child in the classroom and whispering things in his ear, is that inclusivity?" (CC. Line 96e99).

6.2.2. Instructional practices and strategies

The second sub-themes that emerged pertains to practices and classroom strategies. In this regard, specialist teachers reported that they usually learned a

basic vocabulary in the students' languages with which to welcome those who are completely unfamiliar with Spanish (CC and CD). Additionally, they used Google Translator to communicate with students. In their classrooms, however, it is not usual to recognise the language of immigrant students. The focus of their teaching is on Spanish. Our teachers did not actively promote the use of mother tongues and if they are used, this is often transitional. As one of the participants shared:

> "When these students first come, I do use some words in Arabic or Romanian, for example (….). After a few weeks, they need their language less and less and I made them speak Spanish only" (CC. Line 70e73).

Thus, teachers barely mentioned the language skills that these students already have, nor they considered it possible to incorpo- rate their languages into the curriculum and life of the school (Ga´ndara et al., 2005).
This position was even clearer in regular teachers and Secondary teachers (CA and CB) who reported not allowing their students to use their mother tongues during the lessons because they thought it would hinder the learning of both content and Spanish. As one teacher puts it:

> "We cannot know all the languages of immigrants, nor can each of them be taught at the school. The priority of immigrant stu- dents is to learn Spanish as soon as possible so that they can keep up with their subjects and join their group. If they continue speaking their languages, they will lag behind and I won't be able to support them" (CA. Line 97e103).

Overall, the student's languages are used as the first tool of communication and integration. However, as Spanish becomes stronger, it loses representation and influence at school. Teachers showed a monolingual approach, in which the language of the students is restricted to the family sphere, outside the education system (Bialystok, 2018) or is perceived as an obstacle, as language deficiency and lack of knowledge that causes learning difficulties and places an extra burden on teachers (Gkaintartzi et al., 2015).
Finally, it must be noted that the main strategy mentioned by specialist teachers was to make immigrant students feel accepted at school to avoid discrimination. One of the teachers reported the following:

> "A lot of my time goes in listening to the students in my class. My main concern is that they feel at home and I may also be able to see whether they are suffering isolation or even some sort of exclusion by other kids" (CC. Line. 98e100).

6.2.3 Teachers' responsibility towards linguistic diversity

The analysis revealed that regular teachers considered that language teaching is not part of their job (Lee & Anderson, 2009). Despite recognising the 'impact' of having students in their class- room who do not know Spanish, they argue that their role is limited to teaching their subject. This position is particularly

prevalent among Secondary school teachers who seem to view the education process from a merely instructional approach. They recommended having special classrooms where the language teachers will help immigrant students to acquire Spanish at the curricular level of their corresponding group so that they can join the regular class- room later. This leaves no space for multilingual students' languages in regular classrooms. This is shown in the following extracts:

> "My task is not to teach Spanish. My job is to teach my subject, and that's more than enough. For that we have the TCLA col- leagues" (CB. Line 92e93).

The main argument from regular teachers, who do not consider teaching of language part of their task, was that they do not speak the students' language, and, have not been trained to do so. Former research shows that teachers are underprepared for linguistically diverse classrooms and follow a monolingual ideology when considering how to teach multilingual pupils (Ga´ndara & Hopkins, 2010; Martin-Jones et al., 2012). One teacher explained:

> "When I was studying, I had no idea that I might have immigrant students. In my first school, I was dumbstruck. I had a Russian girl, and I felt helpless and disconcerted. I haven't been trained for this. I can't really do it. That's why I really value what my language colleague does. She's the one who takes care of the immigrant students (…) (CA. Line 174e179).

Conversely, specialist teachers unanimously agreed that it is, in fact, their job and are delighted to be able to fulfill this mission, as highlighted by previous research (Authors, 2018). They understand that their role goes much further, and includes mediation, integration and emotional support, pedagogical guid- ance, etc. It is, therefore, a dynamic that is reinforced: specialist teachers satisfied with their mission, and regular teachers 'not willing or trained' to do it. One teacher articulated it as follows:

> "I get a great deal of satisfaction in my job, despite being a peripatetic teacher, and having the difficulty of communicating with families (…). It brings me joy to see how quickly immigrant students learn Spanish" (CC. Line 54e58).

Likewise, specialist teachers tend to talk about the lack of an inclusive culture in schools, exemplified by the refusal often expressed by regular teachers to work with a colleague in the same classroom. They highlighted the difficulties to collaborating with regular teachers. In the words of one:

> "Colleagues are not used to having another teacher in their classroom. There's no tradition of this, and they feel uncom- fortable. Some think that I'm going to observe their work and assess them. You have to win them over" (CC. Line 86e88).

In short, the 'normalisation' of the exceptional, as well as the existence of a

specialist facility and teachers for students labelled as being 'lacking', seems to lead regular teachers to shun responsibility for teaching Spanish. Certain beliefs about the roles of specialist teachers as facilitators in the teaching of language to immigrant students made these special classrooms to look as 'bubbles'.

Ultimately, for specialist teachers, the goal of their teaching is the integration, not inclusion, of these students. In other words, social assimilation and assimilation of the pre-existing educational norms in the school without questioning them (Flores & Rosa, 2015).

7. Conclusions

This article examined teachers' beliefs and approaches towards linguistic diversity. The regular teachers seemed to have a less positive orientation towards linguistic diversity, associating it more with problems. We could place them in the language-as-problem position (Ruíz, 1984). Consequently, regular teachers believed that educating immigrant students is difficult, on account of the students' lack of Spanish, their lack of training and resources. Essentially, they emphasized the importance of learning Spanish as an indispensable tool to access the curriculum and for academic achievement. Furthermore, although Spain is a multilingual country, and schools mirror this linguistic situation, participants tended to adherence to a monolingual orientation that values dominant languages more than others and imposes a distinctive linguistic hierarchy with Spanish at the top as the dominant language immigrant students have to learn, followed by FL as the most important, and the mother tongue of students trailing at the end. Thus, they established hierarchies in the value of languages (Flores & Rosa, 2015).

The consequences of the findings might be that: 1) linguistic competency may not be developed in either L2 or in L1, since the latter is not present in their schoolwork, which has a negative effect on the rest of the subjects taught in any of the L2 (Cummins, 2000). 2) students quickly internalize messages about the value and legitimacy of the mother tongue (Gkaintartzi et al., 2015). Cummins (2001) uses the term "semilingualism" to develop a general theory of why elite bilingualism (bilingualism of affluent communities) appears to lead to improved cognitive ability while minority bilingualism (bilingualism of marginalized communities) appears to lead to cognitive deficiencies.

Conversely, the specialist teachers hold a more positive orientation towards linguistic diversity -at least in rhetoric-, defending the value of the linguistic diversity of immigrant students (Alisaari et al., 2019; Hachfeld et al., 2015; Ramos, 2001). We could place them in a language-as-resource orientation in the Ruiz's scheme (1984). Moreover, they understood learning Spanish as a fundamental tool for social integration. Specialist teachers did not characterize linguistic diversity as problematic as regular teachers, and do not believe that it impedes overall learning. However, they also focused on the importance of learning Spanish. They largely detected difficulties due to their working conditions e the peripatetic nature of their job and lack of resources and time (G´andaraet al., 2005; Lee & Anderson, 2009; Ramos, 2001).

One reason to explain these different perceptions may be linked to the

formation of each type of teachers and their experience in teaching (Youngs & Youngs, 2001). The fact that specialist teachers focused on language teaching may allow them to view linguistic diversity less as an obstacle to achieving academic standards, and more as a potential resource for integration. We hypothesize that Secondary teachers subscribe more to the prevailing monolingual language policy in Spanish than do their colleagues, because of their limited training in teaching language (Dooly, 2005, 2007; Pulinx et al., 2017). Specialist teachers, on the other hand, can rely on their lived experiences with immigrant students, observing that students are ready to learn. This finding reflects previous research that connects experience and teachers' beliefs towards immigrant students (Youngs & Youngs, 2001).

Overall participants hardly allude to multilingualism and, to different degrees; teachers have expressed assimilationist views which evolve around monolingualism. It is revealing that none of the participants think in terms of language-as-right (Ruíz, 1984). Note that even specialist teachers -who are supposed to have a higher awareness of linguistic diversity and to be more responsiveness to the needs of immigrant students-did not adhere to this orientation. The monolingual orientation stands in contrast to research advocating the recognising of the mother tongue as a substantial element of identity building and cultural integrity for children from diverse linguistic backgrounds (Cummins, 2001; García, 2011).

Second, our findings also suggested differences in these two groups of teachers' beliefs concerning approaches to linguistic diversity. Regular teachers were in favour of immigrants attending a special program to learn Spanish. They particularly stressed their lack of knowledge or experience. Specialist teachers were more in favour e theoretically at least e of inclusion, although they recognise the difficulties of implementing this model. For practical purposes, they also agreed with the regular teachers e more than it might seem initially e with teaching immigrant students outside of their regular classroom, providing language support and curricular contents in a special classroom. In congruence with Gkaintartzi at al. (2015) confusion, ambivalence and ambiguity were revealed from contradictions that emerged in their discourse concerning their aspiration to encourage the inclusion in regular classrooms and the assimilative agenda that underlies their monolingual approach. A discrepancy also aroused between the 'liberal' positions they advocated concerning integration into regular class- rooms on a theoretical level and its categorization as problematic, 'invisible' or 'silencing linguistic diversity' in terms of immigrants' multilingualism (Pulinx et al., 2017).

Finally, although immigrant students are very heterogeneous in terms of the types of capital they possess, linguistic diversity was still often perceived by teachers as a problem (García & Hesson, 2015; Martin-Jones et al., 2012). These findings echo those of Ramos (2001) and Dooly (2007), in which teachers considered linguistic diversity beneficial for students but more difficult for teachers. It is clear that the European Commission's objective (2018) to develop language awareness and multilingual pedagogies, that is, linguistically responsive teaching in schools has not been achieved yet.

Teachers focused on acquisition of the vehicular teaching language, since they were not aware of the benefits of mother tongue maintenance not only for the social and cultural life of the student, but also for developing academic excellence (Bialystok, 2018; Canagarajah & Wurr; 2011; García & Kleyn, 2016; García & Wei, 2014). This and the other numerous benefits of maintaining the students' languages imply that Spanish schools should implement policies that encourage the language-as-right orientation if immigrant students are to be academically successful.

7.1 Implications for teacher education

This study is novel because it compares the beliefs and approaches to linguistic diversity of two types of teachers: specialist and regular teachers. Revealing the teachers' beliefs and approaches to linguistic diversity may be crucial steps toward improving educational equity and meeting the needs of immigrant students. Thus, this study is relevant to policymakers particularly for the design of multilingual programs in the school and for training teachers.

Our findings have revealed discrepancies and a degree of confusion in teachers' beliefs concerning linguistic diversity which highlights to a clear need for professional development in multilingualism. Considering the advantages multilingualism has for immigrant students and the use of multilingual practices in classrooms in Spain it would be convenient to move towards a bi-/multilingualism system. The teacher's discourse calls for what Canagarajah (2011), García and Hesson (2015), and García and Kleyn (2016) label translanguaging framework, where immigrant students have the right to study in a context where all their lan- guages are considered as a resource for learning (Ruíz, 1984). This way, teachers would have more options to see immigrant students not as children 'who are lacking a language' but instead as 'emer- gent bilinguals' (García et al., 2008).

According to Skutnabb-Kangas (2017) linguistic human rights are realized only when the students learn through the language of schooling, and to their own languages. This is particularly essential for multilingual learners from immigrant backgrounds. Languages form part of identity and when immigrant students do not find their languages represented at schools, they tend to feel discour- aged. Thus, students need to find social spaces of value for their languages at school, and this includes allowing them to use their mother tongue as it affirms multilingual students' identity, strengthens their feeling of belonging in the school community, and engages them in literacy practices more actively (Cummins, 2008). Furthermore, teachers trained in multilingualism would be more sensitive to consider the background of students and would be capable of using sensitive cultural and linguistic materials (Gay, 2010).

Additionally, the interaction between the discourses of specialist teachers and the regular teachers, and their interlinking should allow for reflection on the need to foster team-work and greater collaboration in the task of teaching Spanish to immigrant children (Youngs & Youngs, 2001). As indicated Basturkmen (2012), Cummins (2000) and Lee and Anderson (2009), the effective teaching of language cannot only be in the hands of those who work on special programs.

Thus, regular teachers also need to take re- sponsibility for the teaching of Spanish in their classrooms, rather than expecting the specialist teacher alone to have this role.

A very important step towards enhancing the regular teachers consciousness and knowledge regarding multilingualism is to expose their underlying language beliefs, which could be consid- ered hegemonic since they are sustained unconsciously as the natural, obvious and common-sense beliefs about multilingualism in the school context, and as an objective set of linguistic forms that are appropriate for an academic setting (Cummins, 2008; Flores & Rosa, 2015; Lambert, 1980, pp. 1e4). Once we trace and study po- tential confusion and contradictions in their views, teachers may be assisted to critically negotiate, challenge and deconstruct them. Lastly, critical awareness of beliefs about the increasing linguisti- cally diverse immigrant students is indispensable for aligning in- dividual beliefs with sensitive teaching practices (Gay, 2010). Through these efforts, we aspire to increase the possibilities of what immigrant children can achieve when their full potential to learn the language is supported. In sum, in Spain, it would be beneficial for the individual and for society to foster the language-as-right approach, since multilin- gualism is beneficial for all, and the mother tongue is an important part of identity and everyone's right. If Spain teachers continue to adopt monolingual orientation, it can result in increased anti-immigrant sentiments that would ultimately jeopardize the aca- demic success and general well-being of Spanish students. Lan- guage programs that are more respectful of linguistic diversity have proved to be more effective, not only with respect to language learning, but also regarding the school integration of students who speak other languages (Cummins, 2001).

It is of paramount importance to highlight the worth of lin- guistic competences other than European languages. The development of educational policies that value languages in general, without hierarchies, implies a commitment to democratic recognition of all the languages, not only the spoken in Europe.

7.2 Limitations of the study's scope

We acknowledge that our research focus on a limited geographical area of Spain and our intentional sample means our results are not generalizable, beyond the specific data context. Our purpose was not to generalize, but to provide insight into the issues concerning teachers' beliefs and approaches to linguistic diversity and potential implications for teacher education programs.

7.3 Future research possibilities

Our study design does not allow inferences about how teachers' beliefs on linguistic diversity are related to immigrant students' outcomes. Follow-up studies might extend this study through other methodological strategies, not based on self-report but on stan- dardized questionnaires and context-specifically for teaching immigrant students. Our results need to be validated with different samples and methods, in different contexts, assessed longitudi-nally, and correlated with student outcomes. However, we believe our study

may serve as a useful springboard for refining current theories on teachers' beliefs and approaches on linguistic diversity. Finally, our findings suggest that teachers need to develop an orientation of language-as-right, not only in the private sphere but in the school domain. This is particularly significant for immigrant students for a number of reasons: 1) to increase their chances of academic success and interact with their peer group, 2) to enhance their identity, and finally 3) to eliminate or minimize any potential barriers that would eventually lead to the exclusion of students who are perceived as linguistic different. These are important motives to be considered by policymakers to ensure the language- as-right orientation to support immigrant children in reaching their potential. Specifically, additional research should discern the extent to which future teachers are being prepared to promote a multilingual perspective. To this end, studies on the barriers that find immigrant persons to become teachers could be also pertinent because a diverse corpus of teachers is the best demonstration of a
diverse but cohesive society.

Acknowledgements

We are deeply grateful to the editors and unknown reviewers of this article for the valuable comments we received for writing this paper. We would also like to thank the XXX who supported the research.

References

Alisaari, J., Heikkola, L., Commins, N., & Acquah, E. (2019). Monolingual ideologies confronting multilingual realities. Finnish teachers' beliefs about linguistic di- versity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 80*, 48e58. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.tate.2019.01.003.

Basturkmen, H. (2012). Review of research into the correspondence between lan- guage teachers'stated beliefs and practices. *System, 40*(2), 282e295. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2012.05.001.

Bialystok, E. (2018). Bilingual education for young children: Review of the effects and consequences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 21*(6), 666e679. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1203859.

Borg, S. (2011). The impact of in-service education on language teachers' beliefs. System, 39, 370e380. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.07.009.

Borman, K. M., Clarke, C., Cotner, B., & Lee, R. (2006). Cross-case analysis. In J. L. Green, C. Camilli, & P. B. Elmore (Eds.), Handbook of complementary methods in education research (pp. 123e139).

Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. Applied Linguistics Review, 2, 1e28. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110239331.1.

Canagarajah, S., & Wurr, A. (2011). Multilingual communication and language acquisition: New research directions. The Reading Matrix, 11(1),

1e15.
Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and pro- cedures for developing grounded theory. Thousand Oaks. SAGE.
Cummins, J. (2000). Language, power and pedagogy. Clevedon: Multilingual matters.
Cummins, J. (2001). Bilingual children's mother tongue: Why is it important for education? SPROG Forum, 19, 15e20.
Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assump- tion in bilingual education. Encyclopedia of Language and Education, 5, 65e75.
Consejería de Educación de Andalucía. (2007). Medidas y actuaciones a desarrollar para la atencio´n del alumnado inmigrante. Boletín Oficial Junta de Andalucía, 33, 7e11.
Dooly, M. (2005). How aware are they? Research into teachers' attitudes about linguistic diversity. *Language Awareness, 14*(2e3), 97e111. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/09658410508668827.
Dooly, M. (2007). Constructing differences: A qualitative analysis of teachers' per- spectives on linguistic and cultural diversity. *Linguistics and Education, 18*(2), 142e166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2007.05.001.
European Commission. (2018). Council recommendation on improving the teaching and learning of languages. https://ec.europa.eu/education/initiatives/european- education-area/improving-the-teaching-andlearning-of-languages_en.
Fives, H., & Buehl, M. M. (2012). Spring cleaning for the "messy" construct of teachers' beliefs: What are they? Which have been examined? What can they tell us? In K. Harris, S. Graham, & T. Urdan (Eds.), APA educational psychology Handbook (pp. 471e499). Washington: APA.
Fives, H., & Gill, M. G. (Eds.). (2015). International handbook of research on teachers' beliefs. New York: Routledge.
Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. Harvard Educational Review, 85(2), 149e171. https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149.
Ga´ndara, P., & Hopkins, M. (2010). Forbidden languages. English learners and
restrictive language policies. New York: Teachers College Press.
Ga´ndara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Driscoll, A. (2005). *Listening to teachers of English language learners: A survey of California teachers' challenges, experiences, and professional development needs* (CA: Berkeley).
García, O. (2011). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
García, O., & Hesson, S. (2015). Translanguaging frameworks for teachers: Macro and micro perspectives. In A. Yiacoumetti (Ed.), Multilingualism and language in education: Current sociolinguistic and

pedagogical perspectives from common- wealth countries (pp. 221e242). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
García, O., Kleifgen, J., & Falchi, L. (2008). From English language learners to emergent bilinguals. Equity matters. Columbia University: Campaign for Educational Eq- uity, Teachers College. Research Review, 1.
García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments. New York: Routledge.
García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education.
New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
Gay, G. (2010). Acting on beliefs in teacher education for cultural diversity. Journal of Teacher Education, 61, 143e152. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347320.
Gkaintartzi, A., Kiliari, A., & Tsokalidou, R. (2015). Invisible' bilingualism e invisible language ideologies: Greek teachers' attitudes towards immigrant pupils' her- itage languages. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 18(1), 60e72. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2013.877418.
Hachfeld, A., Hahn, A., Schroeder, S., Anders, Y., & Kunter, M. (2015). Should teachers be colorblind? How multicultural and egalitarian beliefs differentially relate to aspects of teachers' professional competence for teaching in diverse classrooms. Teaching and Teacher Education, 48, 44e55. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.tate.2015.02.001.
Isikoglu, N., Basturk, R., & Karaca, F. (2009). Assessing in-service teachers' instruc- tional beliefs about student-centered education: A Turkish perspective. Teach- ing and Teacher Education, 25(2), 350e356. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.tate.2008.08.004.
King, N., & Horrocks, C. (2010). Interviews in qualitative research. London: Sage. Krippendorff, K. (2013). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology (3rd ed.).
London: Sage.
Lambert, W. (1980). The two faces of bilingual education (Focus No. 3). Washington, D.C: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Retrieved from http:// www.diversitylearningk12.com/resources/CH9/Two%20Faces%20of%20Bilingual%20Education.pdf.
Lee, J., & Anderson, K. (2009). Negotiating linguistic and cultural identities: Theo- rizing and constructing opportunities and risks in education. Review of Research in Education, 33(1), 181e211. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X08327090.
Martin-Jones, M., Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2012). The routledge handbook of multilingualism. New York: Routledge.
Miles, M., Huberman, A., & Saldan~a, J. (2014). Qualitative data analysis (3rd ed.).
Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Olafson, L., Grandy, C., & Owens, M. (2015). Qualitative approaches to studying teachers' beliefs. In H. Fives, & M. G. Gill (Eds.), International handbook of research on teachers' beliefs (pp. 128e149). New York: Routledge.

Pettit, S. K. (2011). Teachers' beliefs about English language learners in the main- stream classroom: A review of the literature. International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 5(2), 123e147. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2011.594357. Pulinx, R., Van Avermaet, P., & Agirdag, O. (2017). Silencing linguistic diversity: The extent, the determinants and consequences of the monolingual beliefs of Flemish teachers. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,

20(5), 542e556. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1102860.

Ramos, F. (2001). Teachers' opinions about the theoretical and practical aspects of the use of native language instruction for language minority students: A cross- sectional study. Bilingual Research Journal, 25(3), 357e374. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/15235882.2001.10162798.

Author 1 (2009). XXX

Author 1 (2010). XXX

Authors (2018). XXX

Ruíz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. NABE Journal, 8(2), 15e34. https://doi.org/10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2017). Language rights. In W. Wright, S. Boun, & O. Garcia (Eds.), The Handbook of bilingual and multilingual education (pp. 185e202). Oxford: Wiley.

Wassell, B., Kerrigan, M., & Hawrylak, M. F. (2018). Teacher educators in a changing Spain: Examining beliefs about diversity in teacher preparation. Teaching and Teacher Education, 69, 223e233. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.10.004.

Wiley, T., García, D., Danzig, A., & Stigler, M. (2014). Introduction. Language policy, politics, and diversity in education. Review of Research in Education, 38, viiexxiii. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X13512984.

Youngs, C., & Youngs, G. (2001). Predictors of mainstream teachers' attitudes toward ESL students. Tesol Quarterly, 35, 97e120. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587861.