

TEACHER MULTILINGUAL BELIEFS AND PRACTICES IN THE ENGLISH CLASSROOM: IMPLICATIONS FOR COURSE DEVELOPMENT

Viktoriiia Osidak,¹

Associate Professor, Department of Methodology of Teaching Ukrainian and Foreign Languages and Literature

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine

viktoriya_osidak@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-7304-3026

Maryana Natsiuk,²

Associate Professor, Department of Methodology of Teaching Ukrainian and Foreign Languages and Literature

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine

nymaryana@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-5887-8321

Karin Vogt,³

Professor, Head of English Department

University of Education, Heidelberg, Germany

vogt@ph-heidelberg.de

ORCID: 0000-0001-6019-2655

Abstract. *The CEFR and the Companion Volume to the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001, 2020), as the main language policy documents in Europe, intend to improve the standard of language teaching, learning and assessment. These documents among other things proclaim students' diverse linguistic repertoire as an asset in the language classroom. In this light, the promotion of multilingual education initiatives and enhancing students' plurilingualism is an educational requirement. Teachers, language teachers included, are seen as agents of change who can foster multilingual approaches in their language classrooms (Krulatz et al., 2022). Although previous studies have found that many language teachers hold favourable views on multilingualism, they face challenges when implementing multilingual approaches in the (foreign) language classroom. Teachers' beliefs on multilingualism in (foreign) language teaching and learning and how these impact their teaching practices have not been investigated in the Ukrainian education context, which has always been multilingual. The purpose of the article is to share and discuss the results of a quantitative study designed to investigate Ukrainian teacher beliefs in learning English and whether these beliefs are reflected in teaching practices. Data were collected using an online questionnaire administered to 73 English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers from 12*

¹ Corresponding author, responsible for conceptualising, methodology, investigation, resources, data curation, writing – original draft, validation, formal analysis.

² Co-author, responsible for investigation, resources, validation, formal analysis, writing – review & editing.

³ Co- author, responsible for writing – review & editing, supervision, project administration.

Ukrainian universities. The research questions were ascertained using descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation analysis. The collected insights helped to identify areas that require a more careful consideration in the multilingual education in Ukraine. The outcomes reveal complex and uneven relationships between teacher multilingual beliefs and the implementation of multilingual practices in EFL classrooms in Ukraine, with discrepancies in their perceptions and practices. The main finding suggests that the majority of Ukrainian language teachers have a favorable perception of multilingualism, yet they lack the required expertise and confidence to effectively build on their students' linguistic resources in teaching English. In addition, there are some critical gaps in teacher understanding of fundamental concerns about multilingualism. Suggestions will be made for a scenario-based approach to a teacher professional development course.

Keywords: *multilingualism, linguistic repertoire, belief system, multilingual practices, teacher professional development course.*

БАГАТОМОВНІСТЬ У ВИКЛАДАННІ ІНОЗЕМНИХ МОВ: ВИВЧЕННЯ ДОСВІДУ ВИЩИХ НАВЧАЛЬНИХ ЗАКЛАДІВ УКРАЇНИ

Багатомовність стала реалією у більшості регіонах світу внаслідок глобалізаційних та демографічних змін, які призвели до зростання числа багатомовних спільнот. У зв'язку з потребою в адаптації до соціальних трансформацій у сфері освіти, цілі мовної політики Ради Європи орієнтовані на підтримку багатомовних та багатокультурних груп студентів (Council of Europe, 2020). Для ефективного впровадження сучасних підходів у підготовці викладачів та застосування навчальних методик, спрямованих на врахування мовної різноманітності при вивченні іноземних мов, важливо визначити рівень професійної підготовки викладачів іноземних мов з впровадження методики багатомовності у викладанні мов та використання технологій для формування багатомовності студентів у навчальному процесі. Аналіз попередніх досліджень щодо необхідності урахування багатомовності у викладанні іноземних мов вказує, що, незважаючи на усвідомлення значення багатомовності студентів у вивченні мов, викладачі мовники стикаються з труднощами при впровадженні багатомовних підходів у навчальний процес. Відповідно, мета статті полягає в дослідженні поглядів та переконань викладачів мовників українських вишів щодо ролі багатомовності у викладанні іноземних мов та їх здатності створювати сприятливі умови для залучення багатомовного лінгвістичного ресурсу студентів на заняттях з англійської мови. Дослідження охопило 12 українських університетів, залучивши 73 викладачі англійської мови як іноземної через онлайн-опитування. Результати демонструють розбіжності між переконаннями викладачів та впровадженням багатомовних практик у вивчення англійської мови. Отримані результати дозволити визначити підхід до розробки курсу з багатомовності, який розширить обізнаність викладачів мовників з проблемою багатомовності у навчанні мов та сформує у них практичні вміння впровадження багатомовних практик у викладання англійської мови.

Ключові слова: *багатомовність, лінгвістичний репертуар, система поглядів та переконань, багатомовні практики.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Understanding local teacher beliefs may explain gaps between policy and practice in the language classroom. In addition, understanding educational and cultural contexts that impact teacher beliefs seem to contribute to a more accurate specification how the gap between language policy, theory and practices can be bridged. In this light, educational initiatives that introduce new policies and curricula such as multilingual language education, should be introduced after considering various educational landscapes including teacher beliefs which are impacted by their professional context.

The study on teacher beliefs has a long established tradition and has had an important impact on developing pre-service programmes and assisting in-service teachers with professional development (Arocena et al., 2015; Borg, 2015; Dignath et al., 2022; Fives & Buehl, 2016; Haukås, 2016; Krulatz et al., 2022; Nishino, 2012). Studies that provided insights into teachers' beliefs on multilingualism (Arocena et al., 2015; Calafato, 2020; Escamilla et al., 2021; Haukås, 2016; Gorter et al., 2020; Lundberg, 2019; Otwinowska, 2014; Sundqvist et al., 2021; Tsagati et al. 2023) were mostly carried out in multilingual contexts. Few studies explored relatively monolingual contexts where languages are traditionally taught in isolation (Cybulska & Borenić, 2014; Otwinowska, 2014; Trinki & Krevelj, 2020).

Studies on teacher beliefs on multilingualism in different environments report teachers' overall positive attitude towards multilingualism and multilingual pedagogy (Krulatz et al., 2022). Another similarity is that in both multilingual and monolingual contexts teachers quite frequently resort to the analysis of spontaneous structural similarities (cf. Escamilla et al., 2021; Gorter & Arocena, 2020; Lundberg, 2019). However, in monolingual settings (Cybulska & Borenić, 2014; Otwinowska, 2014; Trinki & Krevelj, 2020) the range of practical activities to engage learners' plurilingual repertoire is restricted or not often used. For example, according to Trinki and Krevelj (2020), teachers do not often resort to the use of multilingual materials, and code-switching and collaboration between language teachers is not a common practice. On the other hand, teachers of heterogeneous communities use a range of multilingual practices such as translanguaging (Gorter & Cenoz, 2020), engaging students' L1 as a scaffold when teaching content through the medium of the second language (Aslan, 2015; Kawafha & Masaeed, 2023), employing cross-linguistic intervention in teaching academic vocabulary and reading skills with the focus on English-Spanish cognates (Arteagoitia & Howard, 2015); translating from English into Spanish to facilitate understanding in a content subject (Garcia & Li, 2015). Overall, the analysis of teachers' multilingual beliefs demonstrates that even despite teachers' general positive attitudes towards their learners' plurilingualism (Tsagari et al, 2023), language separation practices are widespread, which promote the idea that each language is best learnt through isolation from other languages.

Local context

Ukraine is a linguistically diverse country of around 130 nationalities (Nikolska & Pershukova, 2020), where Ukrainians make up approximately 75% of the population. The Ukrainian language education policy complies with European language policy objectives

that target at promotion of interculturalism, plurilingualism and multilingualism (Erasmus+, 2022). These objectives aim at enhancing foreign language learning at pre-school, primary, secondary and tertiary levels and recognising national linguistic minorities' right to learn their languages (Erasmus+, 2022; Zabolotna et al., 2019). The Ukrainian Ministry of Education has developed specific guidelines that acknowledge multilingualism in and around foreign language teaching. It is recommended to use learners' previous linguistic repertoire and learning strategies in teaching an additional language (Nikolska & Pershukova, 2020; Redko et al., 2021). Moreover, there are recommendations how to sustain multilingual education in diverse linguistic communities (Shchudlo et al., 2019). Several international projects pertained to the development of guidelines assisting teachers with planning and conducting teaching in multicultural learning environments (Multilingual Education Project Partners, n.d.). Thus, it can be stated that today at the legislative level conditions have been created for the promotion of multilingual education.

In most schools, teaching is carried out in the state language - Ukrainian, and a foreign language is studied as a separate subject. Primary and secondary schools may offer any language of the national minority as a separate subject on the demand of the community. At the same time, there are schools with instruction in the languages of national minorities, where all academic disciplines, except the Ukrainian language and literature, and a foreign language, are studied in the language of a national minority (Crimean Tatar, Polish, Russian, Hungarian, etc.). Altogether, 19 languages of national minorities are studied in Ukrainian schools (Nikolska & Pershukova, 2020, p. 6).

Foreign languages in school education are a priority in Ukraine as the gateways for better prospects and opportunities. The emphasis on foreign language learning is supported on a legislative level by expanding a number of languages offered to study in schools and recognising the importance of building bridges between all languages in the curriculum (Council of Europe, 2017; Redko et al., 2021). Foreign languages are taught for 12 years beginning with the first grade of primary school.

The introduction of plurilingual and multilingual initiatives in educational settings is a relatively new development concerning foreign language teaching and learning (Nikolska & Pershukova, 2020; Redko et al., 2021). While some language policy documents do recognize essential multilingual principles for teaching foreign languages, such as integrating language instructions based on learners' existing skills in other languages, this practice is not yet fully embraced in actual foreign language teaching. As a result, in Ukraine, multilingual education has been described in certain studies as a fragmented process of teaching and learning several foreign languages (Gamanyuk, 2014).

While the study of multilingual teacher beliefs and practices in the language classroom has a well-established tradition, there is a notable gap in understanding these beliefs in relatively monolingual environments (e.g. Ukraine) where languages are traditionally taught in isolation. Only a few studies have investigated these settings, revealing that practical activities to engage learners' plurilingual repertoire are often restricted or underutilised. For instance, in monolingual contexts, teachers rarely use multilingual materials, engage in code-switching, or collaborate with colleagues teaching other languages. This gap is particularly evident in the Ukrainian context, where recent language policies promote multilingual education, but practical implementation in classrooms remains

fragmented. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to add to the volume of research that explores language teacher multilingualism in the English classroom through the analysis of Ukrainian university language teacher beliefs about multilingualism and their reported classroom practices. The findings could be used in developing a course on multilingualism that will expand teachers' multilingual awareness and furnish them with practical skills on how to implement their multilingual practices in the English classroom.

2. METHODS

A quantitative study was designed to investigate teacher beliefs concerning multilingual education in general and whether teacher multilingual beliefs are reflected in their classroom activities in particular. The insights of this study aim at informing teacher education about areas that require a more careful consideration in the language educational development. Therefore, the following *research questions* have been formulated:

RQ 1: How do Ukrainian university teachers understand social context?

RQ 2: To what extent do Ukrainian University language teachers possess the components of multilingual cognition?

RQ 3: In what ways do Ukrainian University language teacher multilingual beliefs reflect their classroom practices?

RQ 4: What are the implications of the established data for the design of the intended professional development?

Participants

This study participants were 73 university English teachers representing departments that specialise at preparing pre-service foreign language teachers. A convenience and snowball sampling (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010) was used to invite teachers to the study. Although we were aware of the downsides of employing these types of samplings such as a possibly imbalanced sample, convenience and snowball sampling was used due to ease of recruiting a sample and the participants' voluntary agreement to commit their time and effort to the research goals. An invitation email to participate in the questionnaire was sent to colleagues from 12 Ukrainian universities. The participants' background information about their teaching and multilingual experience is presented in table 1.

As can be seen from table 1, in this study most teachers have 20-25 years of teaching experience. The majority of the teachers report the knowledge of 4 languages. Surprisingly, two English teachers (2.7%) claim to know only 1 language. However, in the Ukrainian educational context it is expected that English teachers know at least 2 languages – the state language (Ukrainian) and English. In addition, only a bit over 75% of the teachers consider themselves multilingual, yet 93% of the teachers (n=68) report to know two or more languages. Teachers also report that they draw on their linguistic repertoire, including L1 in learning/ improving their languages. An impressive 86% of the teachers reflect on their language learning strategies and acknowledge positive effects of language comparison in learning an additional language. On the other hand, around 18 % of the respondents has never contemplated on the idea of their personal multilingualism. This fact is in line with the findings of other studies that report that Ukrainian multilingualism is often unacknowledged and unregistered by the population (Language Education Policy Profile, 2008-2011).

However, for language teachers being unaware of their linguistic repertoire may have other explanations. One reason might be that some teachers still measure language proficiency against a 'native-speaker's standard'. Therefore, we might assume that if a teacher's proficiency level is lower than B2, it might be a reason for teachers not to include this language into their linguistic repertoire.

Table 1. The teachers' (n=73) background information

For how many years have you been teaching?						
0-5	5-10	10-15	15-20	20-25	more than 25	
1 (1.4%)	7 (9.6%)	7 (9.6%)	13 (17.8%)	24 (32.9%)	21 (28.8%)	
How many languages do you know?						
1	2	3	4	5	6	more than 6
2 (2.7%)	4 (5.5%)	28 (38.4%)	27 (37%)	8 (11%)	3 (4.1%)	1 (1.4%)
Are you multilingual?						
Yes		No		Have never thought about it		
55 (75.3%)		5 (6.8%)		13 (17.8%)		
Do you reflect on how you learn a language						
Yes		No		Not always		
56 (76.7%)		3 (4.1%)		14 (19.2%)		
Do you compare and contrast the languages when you learn/improve them						
Yes		No		Not always		
63 (86.3%)		1 (1.4%)		9 (12.3%)		
Do you think you learn better when you compare the languages you are learning with your L1 or other languages that you know?						
Yes		No		Not always		
55 (75.3%)		3 (4.1%)		15 (20.5%)		
Where did you first come across the idea of multilingualism/plurilingualism?						
at school	at university	at training courses	Internet content	have never come across the idea	Other	
13 (17.8%)	32 (43.8%)	22 (30.1%)	(3.4%)	2 (2.7%)	1 (1.4%)	

Figure 1 illustrates the teachers' language proficiency according to the CEFR levels (Council of Europe, 2001) in each of the languages they know. According to this data, respondents report partial competencies in several languages. For example, in their L1, 61 (83,6%) respondents report C2 and C1 levels, 9 respondents – B2, 2 respondents – B1, and 1 respondent report A1 level. On the other hand, in their L6, only 3 respondents have C2 and C1, and 2 respondents have A2 level. In addition, this data is to some extent

contradictory to the findings obtained in the item that looked into the number of languages that teachers know. According to table 1, three respondents claim to know 6 languages, however figure 1 shows that 5 teachers claim proficiency in 6 languages. In addition, eight teachers provide incomplete data about the number of languages they know. For example, some respondents claim to know 4 languages, but define the level of proficiency only in three languages. On the contrary, other teachers report to know 4 languages, but indicate the proficiency in 5 languages. These findings may indicate that language teachers may be confused about the meaning of some key terms and concepts such as the knowledge of a language, language competence, partial language proficiency, etc.




Figure 1. Proficiency in languages that teachers (n=73) know according to the CEFR levels

Data Collection

A structured questionnaire was used to collect data to answer the research questions. The questionnaire was administered online, using Google Forms Platform. The questionnaire was piloted among 37 language teachers from various European and Ukrainian universities. Convenience sampling was employed to pilot the questionnaire and participation was limited to university foreign language teachers, some of whom were involved in various research projects centred on multilingual education. Additionally, an expert in multilingualism specialising in teaching English as a foreign language with a vast experience in projects on multilingualism and multimodal language assessment was invited to analyse the questionnaire for content validation. The verification of the questionnaire included conducting item analysis using Cronbach's Alpha to ensure internal consistency of the items, gathering feedback from participants and experts to examine content validity, and obtaining feedback from participants to assess feasibility (for more information regarding the development and validation of the questionnaire see Osidak et al., 2023).

The validated questionnaire includes 79 items that capture focal fields of multilingualism and collect generalised data about Ukrainian foreign language teachers' understanding of the social context, their multilingual cognition and practices (Table 2). Part 1 of the questionnaire looked into language teacher understanding of the social context. Part 2 included 45 items to explore English teacher multilingual cognition across 6 fields (Table 2). A five-step Likert scale, ranging from '1-totally disagree', '2-disagree', '3-agree', to '4-totally agree', was employed to gauge teachers' multilingual cognition and their

understanding of the social context. The participants could also choose an option '5- *have never thought about it*' while reporting their multilingual beliefs. In addition, part 1 included two open-ended items that collected information about how parents promote their children's multilingualism and languages spoken in the classroom. Twenty-five items were developed to collect data regarding whether teacher multilingual beliefs are implemented into their teaching practices. A five-step Likert scale, ranging from (1) *never* – (2) *rarely* – (3) *sometimes* – (4) *often* to (5) *very often*, collected information about teaching practices employed in the language classroom.

Table 2. The questionnaire design

Question content		Final version Items (n)
Part 1: Focus on social context		9
Field 1	contextual factors concerning language use	5
Field 2	students' linguistic repertoire	4
Part 2: Teacher Multilingual cognition		45
Field 3	cognitive characteristics of a multilingual person	12
Field 4	psycholinguistic knowledge in multiple language acquisition	7
Field 5	metalinguistic knowledge in multiple languages acquisition	6
Field 6	crosslinguistic knowledge in multiple languages acquisition.	6
Field 7	knowledge of multilingual approaches	7
Field 8	beliefs about teachers' multilingual identity	7
Field 9	Part 3: Teaching Practices	25
Total number of items		79
Background information		8

Data Analysis

The collected data was transferred to SPSS 29.0. Descriptive statistics (percentage, mean, mediate, mode and standard deviation) and Pearson correlation were used to test research questions. Descriptive statistics helped to get an overall insight into teachers' multilingual beliefs and how frequently multilingual practices are employed in the classroom. Pearson correlation analysis was used to measure the strength and direction of the correlations between the participants' beliefs and their self-reported use of multilingual practices.

3. RESULTS

For the purpose of this paper, the results are presented along the four research questions.

Research Question 1 asked how Ukrainian university teachers understand social context.

Knowledge of foreign languages has always been considered to be an asset in Ukraine on individual and societal levels (Kravets, 2019; Nikolska & Pershukova, 2020). As a result, much has been done to promote English and other foreign language learning at all levels. As table 3 shows, around 96% of the participants tend to agree or strongly agree that the knowledge of foreign languages provides better job opportunities. In this light, a special status is given to English. As a result, parents purposefully promote their children’s multilingualism in a variety of ways. They encourage children to learn several languages; pay for private tutorials and enrol their children into speaking clubs and language courses, expose them to language use during travelling or use several languages at home.

Table 3. Descriptive statistic representing data of the social context

		N	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. D.
1	In Ukraine, in addition to the state language it is more important to know English than any other language	70	3.39	4.00	4.00	.804
2	In Ukraine, your chances of getting a job increase if you are multilingual	70	3.29	3.00	3.00	.801
3	Parents promote their children's learning of multiple languages in Ukraine.	71	2.99	3.00	3.00	.597
4	Most people in Ukraine are bilingual or multilingual	66	2.97	3.00	3.00	.631

The majority of the teachers in the study (93%) also acknowledge linguistic diversity of their classrooms in general and of every student in particular (Table 4). However around 5% of the teachers (6 teachers) have never speculated about their students’ bilingualism and whether they work in a multilingual class.

Table 4. Linguistic diversity of the classroom on a scale from ‘1-totally disagree’, ‘2-disagree’, ‘3-agree’, ‘4-totally agree’, to ‘5-have never thought about it’

	N	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. D
I think I teach in a multilingual class	68	2.868	3.00	3.00	.689
I think my students are bilingual	69	3.058	3.00	3.00	.539

According to table 5, 80% of the teachers report the use of other languages during their English lessons. Among the languages that their students might know apart from Ukrainian and Russian, teachers indicate also German, French, Polish, Spanish, Italian and Oriental languages. This is an indication of the diverse and rich students’ linguistic repertoire.

Table 5. Languages used by students during English lessons

	Frequency (n)	%
One – English	14	19.2
Two - English and Ukrainian	47	64.4
Three or more languages	12	16.4

Research Question 2 asked to what extent Ukrainian university language teachers possess the components of multilingual cognition.

To answer RQ2 we explored the data of language teachers' multilingual cognition. In total teachers' multilingual cognition included six key components: knowledge of psycholinguistics (teachers' understanding of how individuals acquire language), metalinguistics (explicit and declarative knowledge that learners have regarding language), and crosslinguistics (the awareness of similarities and differences between the target language and learners' L1, L2 and L3 or other languages known by learners); understanding of the cognitive characteristics of multilingual learners; beliefs regarding the impact of a multilingual teacher on teaching; and knowledge of plurilingual approaches (Osidak et al., 2023). Descriptive statistics of part 2 gauging Ukrainian university language teacher multilingual cognition is presented in Appendix A. While answering the part of the questionnaire that gauged Ukrainian university teachers' multilingual beliefs, around 6.8 % of the participants (5 teachers per item) chose the option 'have never thought about it'.

In general, the collected data (see table 6) demonstrates that Ukrainian language teachers claim to possess multilingual cognition across all components by agreeing or strongly agreeing with the items of the questionnaire. Over 84% of the participants recognize cognitive advantages of multilingual speakers in terms of learning additional languages, positive effects of learning multiple languages on performance in non-language subjects and students' autonomy etc. These findings reiterate the ideas previously mentioned in many other studies that multilinguals exhibit enhanced metalinguistic and metacognitive skills (cf. De Angelis, 2011; Haukås, 2016). In addition, 78% of the participants claim that they recognise the value of students' linguistic repertoire and the importance of raising their linguistic awareness in learning languages. Moreover, 69% of the teachers acknowledge the importance of crosslingual comparisons or the value of noticing similarities between languages in learning or improving languages. Also around 90% of the teachers agree or strongly agree that explicit knowledge of grammar rules and word-building patterns contribute to students' understanding about language structure in general and how prior language skills can be transferred across languages. Three quarters of the teachers indicate their knowledge of the approaches (CLIL, translanguaging, language awareness) that can be used in promoting students' multilingualism. Over 75% of the participants believe that it is important for the teacher to be multilingual themselves in order to implement strategies that involve multiple languages in the classroom and foster the development of students' sense of being multilingual.

Table 6. The results in percentage representing teacher agreement or strong agreement with the items in each of the fields

Teacher Multilingual cognition		%
Field 3	cognitive characteristics of a multilingual person	84.5%
Field 4	psycholinguistic knowledge in multiple language acquisition	78%
Field 5	metalinguistic knowledge in multiple languages acquisition	89.9 %
Field 6	crosslinguistic knowledge in multiple languages acquisition.	69 %
Field 7	knowledge of multilingual approaches	76%
Field 8	beliefs about teachers' multilingual identity	75.5%

The data of this section of the questionnaire brought into light an interesting and contradictory finding regarding teacher beliefs about students' linguistic repertoire in learning languages (see Appendix A, item 13). An impressive 87% of the teachers agree or strongly agree with the statement that learners' linguistic repertoire is a valuable resource for learning English. This claim agrees with the claim of 80% of the teachers (section Social context, table 3) who indicate that in their English classroom students regularly resort to other languages, including their L1. The other students' languages in the English classroom are introduced through translation (54.4%); comparing grammar (79.4%); crosslinguistic mediation (38.3%); and code-switching (54.8%). At the same time, around 73% of the teachers believe that one learns more effectively if only English is used during English lessons.

Another finding regards the percentage of teachers that have never thought about multilingualism in learning foreign languages. Thus, 9.6% (7 teachers) has never thought about whether learners' multilingual repertoire can be a valuable resource in the classroom or that it might be important to build on other languages the students know or are learning in the English classroom. A bit over 16% (12 teachers) has never thought about whether teacher multilingualism influences the use of more appropriate teaching methods in language teaching; 13.7% (10 teachers) – whether multilingual learners are more willing to take responsibility for their own language learning process. Some teachers also report that they have never heard about such approaches as language awareness (4%), immersion (6.8%), intercomprehension, total physical response (12.3%) and translanguaging (19.2%).

Research Question 3 asked in what ways Ukrainian university language teacher multilingual beliefs reflect their classroom practices.

To understand in what ways Ukrainian university English teacher multilingual beliefs reflect their classroom practices we applied both descriptive statistics and Pearson-correlation analysis of the collected data. We started the analysis of the data with the comparison of the components of teacher multilingual cognition with the respective multilingual practices. Table 7 presents data in percentage. Teacher beliefs represent data regarding the teachers' agreement and strong agreement with the items of the sections. Teacher practices present three sets of data: the first set demonstrates the percentage of

the teachers that often and very often apply multilingual practices in the classroom, the second set – the percentage of the teachers that apply those practices sometimes; the third set – the percentage of the teachers that never or rarely apply those practices. According to the data in table 7, there is a visible discord between teachers' multilingual beliefs and their application in the classroom. Moreover, a significant gap is observed between the knowledge of multilingual approaches and their actual application in the classroom. As can be seen, only approximately half of the teachers who have strong multilingual beliefs often or sometimes apply multilingual strategies in the classroom (84.5% vs 49.1%; 78% vs 43.1%; 89.9% vs 42.5%; 69% vs 35.4%; 76% vs 25.5%; 75.5% vs 41,1%).

Table 7. Consistency between teacher multilingual beliefs and practices in percentage (%)

		Teacher beliefs	Teacher practices		
		Agree and strongly agree	Often and very often	Sometimes	Never or rarely
1	Cognitive characteristics of a multilingual person	84.5%	69.9%	28.2%	1.4%
2	Psycholinguistic knowledge/ its implementation in multiple language acquisition	78%	45%	41.1%	14.2%
3	Metalinguistic knowledge/ its implementation in multiple languages acquisition	89.9 %	44.5%	40.4%	15.1%
4	Crosslinguistic knowledge/ its implementation in multiple languages acquisition.	69 %	27.8%	43%	33.1%
5	Knowledge of multilingual approaches/ implementation of multilingual approaches	76%	16.2%	34.7	42.8%
6	Teachers' multilingual identity	75.5%	35.6%	46.6	17.8%

The analysis of the means represented in table 8 demonstrates that 33 teachers (45.2%) in the study rarely allow other languages in the English classroom (item 1), which is quite explainable as the majority (74% = 54 teachers) stick to English-only policy (item 5). In addition, around 60% of the teachers almost never combine listening/reading or speaking writing in other languages with speaking/writing or reading/listening in English (items 2, 3). Moreover, standard deviation (St.D) values (.884-1.233) indicate that the dataset is not homogeneous and that the participants of the survey provided data that tend to spread further from the mean.

Table 8. The results of the questionnaire gauging the use of multilingual strategies and practices in the English classroom on the scale from (1) never – (2) rarely – (3) sometimes – (4) often to (5) very often

#		N	Mean	Median	Mode	St.D
1	I try to incorporate the other languages my students know or are learning into English lessons	73	2.5479	3.0000	3.00	.94341
2	I combine reading/listening activities in other languages that students know with speaking/writing activities in English	73	2.3562	2.0000	1.00	1.2733 4
3	I combine speaking/writing activities in other languages that students know with reading/listening activities in English	73	2.1781	2.0000	1.00	1.1825 4
4	I accept code-switching in the English classroom	73	2.5205	3.0000	3.00	.88364
5	I stick to 'English only policy' in my English classroom	73	3.8767	4.0000	4.00	.92714
6	I adapt tasks to the plurilingual context	73	2.4110	3.0000	3.00	1.0650 5
7	I encourage my students to use resources in any language to prepare a task in English	73	2.7397	3.0000	3.00	1.0277 7

As figure 2 demonstrates, an impressive 97% of the teachers work according to the framework of the communicative approach. This finding is in line with the teachers' belief that one learns more effectively if only English is used during English lessons (see appendix A, item 14). Moreover, the teachers' other language classroom practices are the evidence of the above finding: 74% of the teachers stick to English-only policy. As a result, they do not often integrate other languages in the classroom. Around 45% of the teachers only sometimes allow code-switching; 42.5% sometimes and only 19% of the teachers often encourage students to use resources in other languages (for more information see Appendix B). Over 50% of the teachers also implement the action-oriented approach. This teachers' claim accurately reflects teacher positive beliefs regarding multilingual learners' autonomy and the use of self-directed learning strategies.




Figure 2. The results of the questionnaire gauging the framework approach(es) according to which the teachers work in the English classroom

The data presented in figure 3 accurately reflects teachers' reported beliefs regarding the approaches that can contribute to the development of learners' multilingualism. Most often teachers resort to language awareness (78%), immersion (71%) approaches and CLIL ($\approx 69\%$). Fifty-two percent of the teachers employ a grammar-translation approach. This finding correlates with the teacher reported beliefs regarding the importance of comparing languages (86.3%) practising language use more explicitly and the knowledge of grammar terms (89.1%), usage of students' L1 in English lessons (58.9%), and monopoly of 'English-only' policy in the classroom (72.6%).




Figure 3. The results of the questionnaire gauging the use of multilingual approaches in the English classroom on the scale from (1) never – (2) rarely – (3) sometimes – (4) often to (5) very often

A Pearson product-moment correlation was run to determine the relationship between teacher beliefs and practices (see Fig. 4). Figure 4 demonstrates overall weak correlation between teacher beliefs and the practices that they employ in teaching English.




Figure 4. Visualising the Pearson correlation coefficient between teacher beliefs and practices

Appendix C demonstrates the identified correlations between language teacher multilingual beliefs and how often they apply strategies that reflect those beliefs in the classroom. There is a small or medium positive correlation between teachers' beliefs

regarding cognitive advantages of multilingual learners and teacher strategies to build on students' cognitive skills to promote students' autonomy, which is statistically significant ($r =$ between .234 and .358). For example, according to the data, there is a correlation between teachers' beliefs that knowledge of multiple languages makes it easier to learn additional languages and the use of students' diverse repertoire in teaching languages ($r = .358$). This belief also correlates with teachers helping their students understand concepts in English by relating them to the languages they already know or are learning; using their students' knowledge of their L1 to explain English grammar; and promoting comparisons between the different languages.

In addition, there is a very close positive correlation between teacher crosslinguistic knowledge (the awareness of similarities and differences between the target language and learners' other languages) and their practices in the classroom ($r =$ between .224 and .504, $p = .005$) (see figure 4). Therefore, we may assume that because teachers believe that it is important to build on the learners' prior knowledge in other languages, they focus on explaining the structure of the language and introduce activities that involve other languages in teaching English. This assumption is reinforced by a negative correlation between the crosslinguistic beliefs and the application of the 'English only policy' in the English classroom. According to the obtained data, the stronger the teachers' crosslinguistic beliefs are, the less frequently they stick to English-only policy ($r =$ between -.258 and -.386, $p = .005$).

There is a strong negative correlation between language teachers' understanding of the social context, the role of foreign languages for better educational, professional and economic prospects and the approaches used in the classroom. According to the results of Pearson correlation analysis, the more teachers recognise the importance of English in the Ukrainian context, the less they tend to encourage students to translate from English during pair/group work ($r = -.290$, $p = .005$) or to point out similarities and differences between English and the other languages ($r = -.274$, $p = .005$) or promote comparisons between the different languages ($r = -.294$, $p = .005$). For other cases of negative correlation in the part *Social context* see figure 4.

According to the results of Pearson correlation analysis, we were not able to detect many positive correlation between teacher beliefs and practical application of multilingual approaches in the classroom. One of the correlations is that if the teachers believe that language awareness promotes multilingual beliefs, they accept code-switching less in the English classroom ($r = -.271$, $p = .005$). Another correlation is that if the teachers know that immersion promotes multilingualism, they use immersion in the classroom ($r = .262$, $p = .005$). At the same time, they do not try to incorporate other languages into English lessons ($r = -.333$, $p = .005$), do not accept code-switching in the English classroom ($r = -.373$, $p = .005$), and do not adapt tasks to the plurilingual context ($r = -.255$, $p = .005$). All these correlations between teacher beliefs and the implemented approaches in teaching English look logical and establish direct belief-practice relationship.

Teacher multilingual identity has few positive correlations with the teacher implemented practices in the classroom. The most prominent correlation appears to be between teacher multilingual identity and teachers' adaptation of language activities to the plurilingual context ($r = .312$, $p = .005$). In addition, the results in this section demonstrate that multilingual teachers tend to focus on practising communication and learning languages

implicitly ($r=.255$, $p = .005$), and learn more about the languages that their students know and use in the English classroom ($r=.252$, $p = .005$), draw on the similarities between the languages ($r=.234$, $p = .005$), and use of crosslinguistic mediation ($r=.293$ $p = .005$).

Research question 4 asked about the implications of the established data for the design of the intended professional development.

There are several key findings of this study that can decide the design of the course on multilingualism.

According to the collected data regarding the number of languages the respondents know and their proficiency levels in these languages, Ukrainian university English teachers seem to be uncertain when it comes to the definitions of some crucial terms and concepts, such as language proficiency, language competence, and partial language skills. This finding looks unique, as a similar context has not been mentioned in other studies on foreign language teaching.

The English teachers in this study are aware of the linguistic diversity of the Ukrainian population in general and their students' multilingualism. In addition, they believe that establishing similarities between the languages and drawing upon learners' prior knowledge is important in the language classroom. They are positive about comparing languages in the classroom and believe that L1 may be used in building new concepts and negotiating meaning. They also admit that students' multilingualism is an asset as multilingual students demonstrate higher cognitive abilities and are more independent in language learning. Moreover, they demonstrate understanding of the approaches that can be applied in the language classroom to promote their students' multilingualism. In general, it appears that the collected data aligns with the findings of many other studies (Krulatz et al., 2022; Lundberg, 2019; Otwinowska, 2014; Tsagari et al., 2023) that establish universally positive attitudes of language teachers to the promotion of students' multilingualism and understanding strategies and practices that enhance their learners' multilingualism.

At the same time, there is an obvious tension and contradiction in many respects between the teacher beliefs and their actual use of multilingual practices in the classroom. Thus, around 45% of the teachers report that they never or rarely use the practices to foster learner multilingualism in the classroom. For example, despite the teachers' positive attitude to comparing languages they do not promote comparisons between the different languages or do not build on their students' knowledge of their L1 when they explain to them English grammar. In addition, most teachers claim that they hold monolingual views and stick to English-only policy (78%), and most often they work within a communicative method framework that proclaims focus on an isolated approach to teaching languages and a native-speaker's standard in language proficiency.

Based on these generalised findings, Ukrainian university English teachers' knowledge base might have some critical gaps in understanding fundamental concerns in multilingualism overall. The discrepancy between strong positive attitudes towards multilingualism across all components of teacher multilingual cognition and the practices that teachers apply in teaching English might require a professional development course that engages teachers in active learning, critical thinking, reflection and articulation of all the key concerns about multilingual education by providing them with authentic context and

activity, expert performances, multi perspectives, coaching, scaffolding and collaboration. More specifically, we intend to give an overview of the input related to multilingualism vs plurilingualism and pluriculturalism, language competence, partial competence, native-speaker standard, language portraits and individual language profiles, linguistic repertoires, monolingual/ multilingual approaches to language teaching etc. With this, we intend to familiarise teachers with the key concepts related to the field of multilingualism and eliminate their misinterpretations.

Moreover, the results of the statistical analysis demonstrate that the teachers in the study provided less homogeneous answers (St.D .6897-1.18254), which lay further from the mean (see Appendix B) regarding their multilingual practices in the English classroom. This finding implies that a prospective course should include the activities in which participants can assess real-life situations and context through which they can find practical application of their knowledge regarding multilingualism. Scenario-based learning is viewed as an active learning strategy that includes integration of knowledge and problem-based skills (Piccardo & North, 2019). Thus, we expect that a scenario-based course on multilingual education will encourage its participants to extract valuable insights from practices representing real-life context.

4. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study regarding teachers' multilingual beliefs are in many ways consistent with the findings of the studies carried out in other countries (Calafato, 2020; Cybulska & Borenić, 2014; Haukås, 2016; Krulatz et al., 2022; Otwinowska, 2014). The main highlight across countries suggests that the majority of language teachers have a favourable perception of multilingualism, yet they lack the required expertise and confidence to effectively incorporate their students' linguistic resources consistently in the language classroom (Trinki & Krevelj, 2020).

In this study the majority of the teachers considered the statements about the potential cognitive benefits of multilingualism, the positive influence of previous linguistic knowledge and language learning strategies on learning an additional language, the importance of explicit knowledge of grammar and word-building patterns for raising language awareness; the positive influence of teacher multilingual identity on decision-making as true. This finding aligns with the extensive empirical research according to which teacher metalinguistic and crosslinguistic knowledge helps them implement multilingual practices in the language classroom (Aslan, 2015; Brown, 2021; Otwinowska, 2014). However, other research outcomes (cf. Haukås, 2016) are not so unanimous regarding the potential of multilingualism for learners. A general conclusion of Haukås' study (2016) is that in order to effectively utilise learners' existing knowledge and apply it to their language learning, it is imperative that learners possess the motivation and willingness to activate what they have learned from their prior experiences. In the same vein, Moore, (2006) concluded that multilingualism does not automatically foster further language learning and is not always an asset in the classroom. Therefore, learners should be assisted with strategies that will help them become aware of their existing linguistic repertoire and the teacher facilitation in the classroom should be high (Haukås, 2016).

The obtained data in this research generally demonstrates the uneven correlation between teachers' beliefs and their implementations in the classroom (see figure 4). Among known multilingual teaching practices one can name the use of students' L1 for constructing meaning, translanguaging and translation, crosslinguistic comparison, the focus on language structure, collaborative learning etc. (cf. Haukås, 2016). However, in the Ukrainian education context, we can suggest that an emphasis on English-only policy might be a reason that the teachers in the study do not draw on multilingualism as a resource in the language classroom despite their strong reported multilingual beliefs.

A related issue is that although the majority of the teachers in this study believe that multilingualism is an asset, few teachers help their students to build on the resources in other languages. On the other hand, the teachers report that they admit that Ukrainian (which is the majority of students' L1) is often present in their classroom. Based on these contradictory findings, we may assume that the teachers do not explicitly encourage their students to build on their L1. An additional evidence of our assumption might be that the prevailing majority of the teachers report to stick to 'English only' policy. A similar finding was reported in Haukås' (2016) and Barnes and Almgren's (2021) studies where teachers assisted their students in becoming aware of how to use their previous linguistic knowledge in Norwegian and English, but they never resorted to students' L1.

Another finding in this study is that the teachers claimed to use strategies to promote their students' autonomy in learning English regardless of their students' multilingualism. Moreover, it looks that the teachers do not attribute students' autonomy, efficacy and responsibility in language learning to their students' multilingualism. The benefits of autonomous strategies in language learning have been extensively discussed for some decades (Boud, 1987). Thus, it is not surprising that the teachers have strong beliefs about the importance of language learners' independence in language acquisition and equip students with strategies that promote their language learning autonomy.

Although the teachers' classroom language learning practices are generally framed within a 'communicative' approach which emphasises interaction, implicit language learning and the English only policy, they also often involve language awareness approach with a more 'traditional' focus on form, knowledge of grammar and word-building patterns, syntactic composition of the sentence and linguistic terms. Raising students' language awareness provides them with a more advanced and deeper understanding of the subject matter, skills and processes; lifts the role and status of the student from a passive learner to an active learner and involves students in critical reflection (Boud, 1987). In addition, teachers who are confident how to teach different language aspects can rely on their knowledge of the language to provide their students with constructive feedback and use practices that boost students' cognitive skills (Aslan, 2015; Brown, 2021; Calafato, 2020).

There is also an evidence (see Appendix C, and figure 4) that the teachers have conflicting relations between their multilingual beliefs and practices. The collected data demonstrates that some beliefs reinforce the implementation of certain practices and at the same time other beliefs exclude the same practices from the classroom. One of the possible explanations for this controversy might be the persistence of a monolingual bias. The outcomes of other studies also report that teachers, despite their positive attitudes towards multilingual education, do not apply this knowledge in the classroom (Otwińska, 2014;

Tarnanen & Palviainen, 2018). Another reason might be that practical implementation of multilingual initiatives is a new trend in Ukraine. Little assistance has been given to Ukrainian teachers in this respect. There are few training programmes that prepare prospective language teachers for the work in the multilingual context (Multilingual Education Project Partners, n.d.). Consequently, teachers might lack knowledge about multilingual education and an additional language acquisition. Similarly, in many contexts multilingualism as a resource is a recent development and therefore implementing new initiatives in language education might require a more systematic focus, time and adjustment (cf. Calafato, 2020; Gorter & Arocena, 2020; Krulatz et al., 2022).

Based on the obtained data, several recommendations can be made to enhance the effectiveness of multilingual practices in the English classroom. Teacher training and professional development focused specifically on multilingual education are vital in the light of the findings. These programmes should cover theoretical knowledge, practical strategies, and classroom management techniques for integrating students' plurilingual resources in learning. The success of teacher professional development depends on the adjustment of the English-only policies currently prevailing in Ukraine to allow for the strategic use of students' L1 and other languages as resources in the classroom. This can be achieved by the integration of plurilingual practices within the curriculum, encouraging the use of translanguaging, cross-linguistic comparisons, mediation and translation practices. Additionally, addressing belief-practice discrepancies by engaging language teachers in reflective practices and critical examination of the discrepancies can better align teachers' multilingual beliefs with their classroom practices. This can also help in identifying and overcoming potential biases.

This is a small-scale study, which is its main limitation. Therefore, although we tried to obtain data from different parts of the country, this study cannot present any generalised findings because of the sample size. In addition, self-reported data has a certain degree of subjectivity. Yet, the findings give us a general idea about Ukrainian teachers' multilingual beliefs and teaching practices in the English classroom.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Since promoting students' multilingualism is the language policy requirement and expectation as a consequence to demographic changes in society (Council of Europe, 2001, 2020), a multilingual approach to teaching languages requires a competent teacher who is able to effectively implement new initiatives in the classroom. Therefore, the main purpose of this study was to understand teacher beliefs about the role of students' linguistic repertoire in learning English and whether these beliefs are incorporated into teaching practices. According to Borg (2015), teacher pedagogical decisions and practical strategies are heavily influenced by their beliefs, at the same time these beliefs tend to be resistant to changes.

Both practices and beliefs are shaped by pedagogical and cultural traditions that "may differ not only among countries but also among teachers within a country" (OESD, 2009, p.89). Beliefs and practices represent different though related parts of the pedagogical context for student learning. Taking into account the cultural and educational situations that influence teachers' viewpoints may help better define how we can bridge the divide between language policies, theories, and real-world teaching methods. This quantitative study

provided an insight into local traditions of learning, including the approaches the teachers employ to enhance students' multilingualism. In general, for mainstream English language teachers in Ukraine a tension between their beliefs and a new direction in language learning strategies exists. Engaging teachers in professional development activities has the potential to alter beliefs and attitudes (Gorter & Arocena, 2020; OESD project, 2009). However, it should be acknowledged that teachers' decision to participate in these activities can be influenced by their existing beliefs. Consequently, the introduction of a mandatory course on multilingualism for pre-service teachers might be a necessary step to raise their awareness about diverse society, multilingualism, and multilingual education. The acquired data of the study hold also important implications for the indented course developers placing an emphasis on scenario-based learning as an active learning strategy that includes integration of teacher professional knowledge and problem-based skills (Piccardo & North, 2019). Further research focus will be on developing a mandatory course on multilingualism in language education for pre-service teachers. The authors intend to implement this course at their departments and disseminate and promote the course at professional programmes that assist teachers in their development.

REFERENCES

- Aslan, E. (2015). When the native is also a non-native: "Retrodicting" the complexity of language teacher cognition. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 71(3), 244-269.
- Arocena, E., Cenoz, J. & Gorter, D. (2015). Teachers' beliefs in multilingual education in the Basque country and in Friesland. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 3(2), 169–193. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.3.2.01aro>
- Arteagoitia, I. & Howard, E. R. (2015). The role of the native language in the literacy development of Latino students in the U.S. In J. Cenoz & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Multilingual education: Between language learning and translanguaging* (pp. 61-83). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009024655.004>
- Borg, S. (2015). Researching teachers' beliefs. In B. Paltridge & A. Phakiti (Eds.), *Research methods in applied linguistics: A practical resource* (pp. 487–504). Bloomsbury Academic.
- Boud, D. (1987). Moving towards autonomy. In D. Boud (Ed.), *Developing student autonomy in learning* (pp. 17-40). Routledge
- Brown, A. (2021). Monolingual versus multilingual foreign language teaching: French and Arabic at beginning levels. *Language Teaching Research*, 27(6), 1634-1659. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168821990347>
- Calafato, R. (2020). Evaluating teacher multilingualism across contexts and multiple languages: Validation and insights. *Heliyon*, 6(8), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.HELIYON.2020.E04471>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging, *World Englishes*, 39, 300–311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12462>
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment (CEFR)*. Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European framework of reference for languages (CEFR): Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume*. Council of Europe. www.coe.int/lang-cefr.
- Cybulska, K., & Kabalin Borenić, V. (2014). EFL teacher trainees and European goals of multilingualism and plurilingualism. A survey of attitudes in Poland and Croatia. In A. Otwinowska, G. De Angelis (Eds.), *Teaching and Learning in Multilingual Contexts*. Multilingual Matters.

- Osidak, V. et al. (2024). Teacher multilingual beliefs and practices in the English classroom... . *Advanced Education*, 24, 92-117. DOI: 10.20535/2410-8286.298917
- Dignath, C., Rimm-Kaufman, S., & van Ewijk R., & Kunter, M. (2022). Teachers' beliefs about inclusive education and insights on what contributes to those beliefs: A meta-analytical study. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34, 2609-2660. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-022-09695-0>
- De Angelis, G. (2011). Teachers' beliefs about the role of prior language knowledge in learning and how these influence teaching practices. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 8(3), 216-234.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing* (2nd ed). Routledge.
- Erasmus+. (14 April, 2022). *Background on the Ukrainian education system since 2016. Europe's online platform for school education*. School Education Gateway.
- Escamilla, E., Hopewell, S., & Slavick, J. (2021). Teaching (bi)multilingual learners: Connecting languages. *The Reading Teacher*, 75(3), 363-371. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.2044>.
- Fives, H., & Buehl, M. M. (2016). Teachers' beliefs, in the context of policy reform. *Policy insights from the behavioral and brain sciences*, 3(1), 114-121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732215623554>
- Haukás, A. (2016). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 13(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2015.104196>.
- Gamanyuk, V.A. (2014). Pidhotovka vchyteliv inozemnykh mov na tli tendentsiy do bahatomovnoyi osvity [Foreign language teachers' training for multilingual education]. *Scientific Bulletin of the National University of Bioresources and Nature Management of Ukraine. Series: Pedagogy, Psychology, Philosophy*, 199(1), 86-91. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/nvnau_ped_2014_199%281%29__14
- García, O. & Li, W. (2015). Translanguaging, bilingualism and bilingual education. In. W. Wright, S. Boun, & O. García, (Eds.), *Handbook of bilingual education* (pp. 223-240). John Wiley.
- Gorter, D., Arocena, E. (2020). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism in a course on translanguaging. *System*, 92, 1-10. Elsevier. <http://hdl.handle.net/10810/50060>
- Kawafha, H. & Al Masaeed, K. (2023). Multidialectal and multilingual translanguaging in L2 Arabic classrooms: Teachers' beliefs vs. actual practices. *Frontiers in Education*, 8, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2023.1060196>
- Kravets, L. A. (2019). Training students for cross-cultural communication at foreign language classes in the context of internationalisation of higher education institutions. *Theory and Methodology of Professional Education*, 14(1), 105-109. <https://doi.org/10.32843/2663-6085-2019-14-1-21>
- Krulat, A., Christison, M., Lorenz, E & Sevinç, Y. (2022). The impact of teacher professional development on teacher cognition and multilingual teaching practices. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 21(2), 711-727. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2022.2107648>
- Language Education Policy Profile (2008-2011). *Ukraine, Council of Europe Language Policy Division*. Strasbourg. <https://rm.coe.int/language-education-policy-profile-ukraine/16807b3c3a>.
- Lundberg, A. (2019) Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism: findings from Q method research. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 20(3), 266-283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2018.1495373>
- Multilingual Education Project Partners. (n.d.). <http://www.multied.com.ua/en/>
- Nikolska, N. & Pershukova, O. (2020). Development of multilingual education in Ukraine. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 75. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20207501004>.
- Nishino, T. (2012). Modeling teacher beliefs and practices in context: A multimethods approach. *The Modern Language Journal*, 96(3), 380-399. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2012.01364.x>
- OECD. (2009). *Creating Effective Teaching and Learning Environments: First Results from TALIS*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264068780-en>.

- Osidak, V., Natsiuk, M., & Vogt, K. (2023). Creating a questionnaire to explore language teacher multilingual beliefs and practices. *East European Journal of Psycholinguistics*, 10(1), 152-176. <https://doi.org/10.29038/eejpl.2023.10.1.osi>
- Otwinowska, A. (2014). Does multilingualism influence plurilingual awareness of Polish teachers of English? *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 11(1), 97-119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2013.820730>
- Piccardo, E., & North, B. (2019). *The action-oriented approach: A dynamic vision to language education*. Multilingual Matters.
- Redko, V.G., Shalenko O.P., Sotnikova S.I., Kovalenko O.Y., Koropetska I.B., Yakob O.M., Samoilukevich I.V., Dobra O.M., Kior T.M., Mackovich M.R., Hlyniuk L.M., & Braun E.L. (2021). *Modelna navchalna prohrama «Druha inozemna mova. 5-9 klasy» dlya zakladiv zahalnoyi serednoyi osvity* [Model curriculum for general secondary education: Second foreign language. 5-9 grades.]. The Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine.
- Shchudlo, S., Zabolotna O., Medina, T. (2019). *Sotsiokulturnyy dyskurs shchodo movy navchannya natsional'nykh menshyn u Chernivets'kiy oblasti* [Sociocultural implications of teaching national minorities in Chernivetska oblast]. UADO, OzOV «Trek LTD».
- Sundqvist, P., Gyllstad, H., Källkvist, M., & Sandlund, E. (2021). Mapping teacher beliefs and practices about multilingualism: The development of the MultiBAP questionnaire. In P. Juvonen & M. Källkvist (Eds.), *Pedagogical translanguaging: Theoretical, methodological and empirical perspectives* (pp. 56-75). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.1832/9781788927383-006>
- Tarnanen, M., & Palviainen, Å. (2018). Finnish teachers as policy agents in a changing society. *Language and Education*, 32(5), 428-443. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2018.1490747>
- Trinki, M. & Krevelj, S.L. (2020). Multilingualism in English language classrooms: Can we think outside the box? In R. Geld & S.L. Krevelj (Eds.) *Conference UZRT: Empirical Studies in Applied Linguistics, 2018*, 56-74. <https://doi.org/10.17234/UZRT.2018.7>
- Tsagari, D., Reed, K. & Lopriore, L. (2023). Teacher beliefs and practices of language assessment in the context of English as a lingua franca (ELF): Insights from a CPD course. *Languages* 8(58), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages8010058>
- Zabolotna, O., Shchudlo, S., Medina, T., Panchenko, E., & Kozlov, D. (2019). Teaching Ukrainian as a non-native language to national minorities in Ukraine: Challenges for evidence-based educational policies. *Advanced Education, Special Issue 11*, 60-67. <https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.164167>.

Received: 22 February, 2024

Accepted: 25 July, 2024

Funding

This study was funded by the Volkswagen foundation research programme and DAAD programme STIBET I, funded by the Federal Foreign Office of the German government.

Conflict of interest

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Appendix A

The results of the questionnaire gauging Ukrainian English teacher multilingual beliefs on a scale from '1-totally disagree', '2-disagree', '3-agree', '4-totally agree', to '5-have never thought about it'

	N	Mean	Median	Mode	St.D
Beliefs about cognitive characteristics of a multilingual person					
1 Learning multiple languages (ML) significantly improves cross-cultural awareness	73	3.49	4.0000	4.00	.690
2. Learning ML improves one's cognitive skills	73	3.47	4.0000	4.00	.899
3 Learning ML can improve performance in Sciences, Maths and Technology subjects	61	3.18	3.0000	3.00	.646
4. Students who speak several languages can serve linguistic role models	70	3.27	3.0000	3.00	.658
5. Knowing ML makes it easier to learn additional languages	71	3.44	3.0000	3.00	.603
6. Learning additional languages improves knowledge of previously learned languages	66	3.18	3.0000	3.00	.699
7. A multilingual person has cognitive advantages over a monolingual person	71	3.34	3.0000	4.00	.773
8. Multilingual people have better cognitive skills for language learning than monolingual people	70	3.33	3.0000	3.00	.631
9. Multilingual learners are more autonomous language learners	66	3.106	3.0000	3.00	.726
10. Multilingual learners manage their language learning more efficiently	70	3.129	3.0000	3.00	.635
11. Multilingual learners are more willing to take responsibility for their own language learning	63	3.064	3.0000	3.00	.669
12. Multilingual learners depend less on a teachers support in language learning	66	2.95	3.0000	3.00	.666
Beliefs concerning psycholinguistic knowledge in multiple language acquisition.					
13. I believe that my learners' linguistic repertoire is a valuable resource for learning English.	66	3.08	3.0000	3.00	.441
14. I believe that one learns more effectively if only English is used during English lessons.	73	2.84	3.0000	3.00	.764
15. I believe that multilingual learners have a greater sensitivity for recognising functions of grammatical structures.	69	3.03	3.0000	3.00	.484
16. I believe that multilingual learners are able to deduce meaning of new words relying on their knowledge of other languages.	73	3.21	3.0000	3.00	.526
17. I believe that multilingual learners have a greater sensitivity to the proper use of words in context.	66	3.18	3.0000	3.00	.493

18. I believe that multilingual learners always compare the target language grammar to the grammar of other languages.	70	3.04	3.0000	3.00	.523
19. I believe that multilingual learners understand how to deduce language rules of the language system.	67	3.05	3.0000	3.00	.535
Beliefs concerning metalinguistic knowledge in multiple languages acquisition.					
20. I believe that it is important for my students to know grammar rules.	73	3.37	3.0000	3.00	.656
21. I believe that it is important for my students to explain syntactic composition of the sentence.	72	3.18	3.0000	3.00	.657
22. I believe that it is important for my students to know linguistic terms.	73	3.15	3.0000	3.00	.681
23. I believe that it is important for my students to understand word-building patterns.	73	3.32	3.0000	3.00	.664
24. I believe that it is important for my students to be able to explain the use of grammar structures.	72	3.10	3.0000	3.00	.754
25. I believe that it is important for my students to be able to notice similarities between the languages.	73	3.25	3.0000	3.00	.596
Beliefs concerning crosslinguistic knowledge in multiple languages acquisition.					
26. I believe that it is important to encourage students to translate from the target language during pair/ group work.	71	2.58	3.0000	3.00	.625
27. I believe that it is important to encourage students to use other languages they know or are learning in the English classroom.	66	2.56	3.0000	3.00	.704
28. I believe that it is important to point out similarities and differences in English and the other languages my students and I know or are learning.	71	2.99	3.0000	3.00	.621
29. I believe that it is important to create conditions when students compare English with their other languages.	68	2.96	3.0000	3.00	.584
30. I believe that it is important to provide conditions for comparing English grammar to the grammar of other languages.	69	2.88	3.0000	3.00	.583
31. I believe that it is important to allow my students to use their L1 in English lessons.	73	2.58	3.0000	3.00	.575
About your knowledge of multilingual approaches .					
32. I believe that Language Awareness promotes my students' multilingualism	70	3.19	3.0000	3.00	.708
33. I believe that Immersion promotes my students' multilingualism	68	3.16	3.0000	3.00	.704
34. I believe that CLIL promotes my students' multilingualism	73	3.27	3.0000	3.00	.786
35. I believe that Intercomprehension promotes my students' multilingualism	64	3.05	3.0000	3.00	.785

36. I believe that Translanguaging promotes my students' multilingualism	59	3.07	3.0000	3.00	.717
37. I believe that Total Physical Response promotes my students' multilingualism	64	2.89	3.0000	3.00	.737
38. I believe that Task-Based Learning promotes my students' multilingualism	73	3.23	3.0000	3.00	.698
Beliefs about teachers' multilingual identity					
39. I believe that the more languages teachers know the better they can explain language structure.	68	3.01	3.0000	3.00	.702
40. I believe that the more languages teachers know the better they can identify the language-related challenges that learners face.	71	3.10	3.0000	3.00	.636
41. I believe that the more languages teachers know the better they can use more appropriate teaching methods/ approaches.	63	2.81	3.0000	3.00	.715
42. I believe that the more languages teachers know the better they can increase their repertoire of activities.	68	2.79	3.0000	3.00	.724
43. I believe that the more languages teachers know the better they can develop learners' language learning strategies.	68	2.94	3.0000	3.00	.731
44. I believe that the more languages teachers know the better they can develop learners' cross-cultural competence.	72	3.22	3.0000	3.00	.633
45. I believe that the more languages teachers know the better they can inspire students to learn languages.	71	3.28	3.0000	3.00	.759

Appendix B

The results of the questionnaire gauging the use of application of multilingual beliefs in the English classroom on the scale from (1) never – (2) rarely – (3) sometimes – (4) often to (5) very often

1	I try to incorporate the other languages my students know or are learning into English lessons	2.5479	3.0000	3.00	.94341
2	I combine reading/listening activities in other languages that students know with speaking/writing activities in English	2.3562	2.0000	1.00	1.27334
3	I combine speaking/writing activities in other languages that students know with reading/listening activities in English	2.1781	2.0000	1.00	1.18254
4	I accept code-switching in the English classroom	2.5205	3.0000	3.00	.88364
5	I stick to 'English only policy' in my English classroom	3.8767	4.0000	4.00	.92714
6	I adapt tasks to the plurilingual context	2.4110	3.0000	3.00	1.06505
7	I encourage my students to use resources in any language to prepare a task in English	2.7397	3.0000	3.00	1.02777
Engaging cognitive characteristics of a multilingual person and teacher multilingual personality					
8	I promote my students' autonomy in learning languages	3.8630	4.0000	4.00	.76947
9	I anticipate language difficulties more easily using my knowledge of my students' other languages	3.1781	3.0000	3.00	.82230
Implementation of crosslinguistic knowledge in multiple language acquisition					
10	I encourage students to translate from English during pair/group work.	2.6027	3.0000	3.00	.99638
11	I try to learn about the other languages my students know and use in my English lessons	2.5068	3.0000	3.00	1.02907
12	I point out similarities and differences between English and the other languages my students and I know or are learning	3.1781	3.0000	3.00	.94784
13	I use my students' knowledge of their L1 to explain them English grammar	2.8356	3.0000	3.00	.85006
14	I promote comparisons between the different languages	3.1370	3.0000	3.00	.85497
Implementation of metalinguistic knowledge in multiple language acquisition					
15	I focus on explaining the structure of the language	3.6712	4.0000	4.00	.76476
16	I focus on practicing communication and learning language structure more implicitly	3.9452	4.0000	4.00	.68497
17	In teaching English, I link new linguistic structures to other languages that students know.	2.9863	3.0000	4.00	.93531
Implementation psycholinguistic knowledge of in multiple language acquisition					
18	I give my students advice on how to understand concepts in English by relating them to the languages my students know/are learning	3.3699	3.0000	3.00	.87412
19	I use my students' diverse linguistic repertoire in teaching English	3.1096	3.0000	4.00	.97982
20	I encourage my students to reflect on their learning strategies.	3.5890	4.0000	4.00	.77881