
Language Teachers' Ideologies in a Complementary Greek School in Montreal: Heteroglossia and Teaching

Argyro Panagiotopoulou, Lisa Rosen, and Ofelia García

Abstract

This contribution is centered around the following question: What are the various ideologies about language and multilingualism held by teachers of a complementary Greek school in Canada? It focuses on the tensions between the multilingual nature of Canadian society and that of the Greek-Canadian children who attend this nonmainstream school, and the ideologies of teachers about teaching a community language in a Greek complementary school.

Analytical results from four theory-generating expert interviews within the project “Migration-Related Multilingualism and Pedagogical Professionalism” (Panagiotopoulou and Rosen, Professionalism and multilingualism in Greece and Canada: An international comparison of (minority) teachers' views on linguistic diversity and language practices in monolingual vs. multilingual educational systems. In D. Lengyel, L. Rosen (Eds.), *Minority teachers in different educational contexts – Recent studies from three German-speaking countries. Tertium comparationis. Journal für Internationale und Interkulturell Vergleichende Erziehungswissenschaft*, 21(2), 225–250, 2015) about teachers' views on multilingualism and language practices at school are presented. The multilingual context of Montreal, the context of complementary schools, in this case that of a Greek school, the research design, as well as the methodology are described.

A. Panagiotopoulou (✉)
University of Cologne, Cologne, Germany
e-mail: a.panagiotopoulou@uni-koeln.de

L. Rosen
Osnabrueck University, Osnabrueck, Germany
e-mail: lisa.rosen@uos.de

O. García
Graduate Center, City University of New York, New York, NY, USA
e-mail: ogarcia@gc.cuny.edu

The results are discussed with regard to the professionalization of teachers in multilingual and migration contexts. All interviewed teachers are positive that the children they teach are multilingual, and see this as an asset. However, even though all four teachers lead multilingual lives, according to their self-reports, the ways they handle their own and their students' multilingualism vary greatly. For instance, what has emerged as a particularly interesting result is the fact that teachers with the least academic preparation tend to have the most dynamic views on bilingualism.

Keywords

Bilingualism • Complementary schools • Pedagogical professionalism • Teachers' ideologies • Translanguaging pedagogy

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 2 |
| Language Teachers' Ideologies in Complementary Greek Schools | 3 |
| Contexts for the Study: Montreal and Complementary Schools | 3 |
| Research Design and Methodology | 4 |
| Results | 6 |
| Conclusion and Future Directions | 14 |
| References | 15 |

Introduction

Mario is 10 years old and is sitting in a Saturday classroom for Greek children in Montreal, Canada. Mario is multilingual. During the week, his schooling is mostly in French, although English is taught and is also used in the school. But his parents came from Greece 12 years ago, so besides French and English Mario also speaks Greek, a language he hears from his parents, the Greek television programs, and his peers in the Greek Saturday school. Mario identifies as a multilingual Canadian of Greek heritage. And yet, in none of the school spaces that Mario inhabits are his teachers' ideologies about multilingualism the same as those that Mario holds. That is, his teachers pay attention to pieces of Mario's language identity – his French, his English, his Greek; but for the most part, his teachers do not recognize and nurture Mario's multilingual identity.

This chapter is about the different language ideologies about multilingualism and the teaching of Greek held by teachers in a complementary Greek school in Montreal. It focuses on the tensions between the multilingual nature of Canadian society and that of the Greek-Canadian children who attend the school, and the ideologies about teaching a community language of teachers of Greek in a complementary school. That means it is centered around the following research question: What are the various ideologies about language and multilingualism held by teachers of a complementary Greek school in Canada? In order to answer the research questions, expert interviews with four teachers who were part of a larger case study on Greek and German teachers

in complementary schools (see Panagiotopoulou and Rosen 2015) are analyzed. These selected teachers represent the prime examples from which the continuum of monoglossic-heteroglossic ideologies (see chapter “[Culturally Responsive Pedagogy and Teacher Professional Learning](#)”) is shaped. Before turning to the four teachers and their language and multilingualism ideology, it is important to first describe the local contexts in which they teach – the multilingual context of Montreal – and the context of complementary schools, in this case that of a Greek school (see chapter “[Professional Development of Heritage Language Instructors: Profiles, Needs and Course Evaluation](#)”). Secondly, the research design as well as the methodology (see chapter “[Heritage Language Learners in Mixed University Classes: Implications for Curriculum and Syllabus Design](#)”) are described.

Language Teachers' Ideologies in Complementary Greek Schools

Contexts for the Study: Montreal and Complementary Schools

Montreal today is a multilingual city located in the province of Québec. In 2000, Francophones were said to predominate (67%), only 12% were said to be Anglophones, and “allophones” (the Canadian term for those who are said to speak neither French nor English as a “first language”) made up 21% of the population (Lamarre et al. 2002). Although French is heard more in Montreal today than before the Quiet Revolution and the passage of Bill 101 (The Charter of the French Language) in 1977, there has also been a steady increase in the bilingualism and even multilingualism of the population (Marmen and Corbeil 1999). In fact, one in six Montrealers are said to be trilingual or multilingual (Authier 2002). And because of the growing population of young Montrealers, multilingual practices are becoming more commonplace (Lamarre et al. 2002).

Complementary schools in Canada, known sometimes as heritage language schools, have enjoyed much more government support than other supplementary forms of education around the world. Canadian Heritage language programs started as Cultural Enrichment Programs in 1977 and have grown considerably as a result of Canada's Multiculturalism Act in 1988 (Cummins and Danesi 1990; García 2009).

Schools organized by ethnolinguistic communities outside of the government-sponsored day school are not new and do not just exist in Canada. These educational institutions have been especially important to influence identity and cultural socialization among ethnolinguistic minorities and to extend their bilingualism (Creese et al. 2008). In the USA, it was Joshua A. Fishman (1980a, b) who first studied their effects on minority language maintenance, calling them “ethnic-mother tongue schools.” García et al. (2013) have also studied the efforts of what they call “bilingual community education” to support the language and cultural practices of diasporic communities. In the United Kingdom, the study of “complementary schools” has received much attention especially through the work of Angela Creese and her collaborators (2006, 2008; see also Li Wei 2006).

Perhaps most prevalent throughout the world are complementary schools established by Chinese diasporas where Chinese language but also Chinese cultural values of perseverance, obedience, etc. are taught and emphasized (for such an effort in Canada, see Curdt-Christiansen 2006, 2008). Also popular throughout the world are complementary schools of groups where language, ethnicity, and an established religion are linked. In the Hebrew schools in the USA, South America, the UK, South Africa, Australia, and other places, children are taught to read the *Torah* in classical Hebrew and learn the values of being Jewish. And Muslim children throughout the world often attend complementary schools where they are taught Classical Arabic (Fuṣḥá) to read the Qu'ran. The Armenian and Greek Orthodox communities throughout the world also have large networks of complementary schools. Although Classical Armenian (Krapar) is the liturgical language, the emphasis in Armenian complementary schools is the development of Armenian language and culture among the diaspora that were decimated as the result of the 1915 Armenian genocide. Greek complementary schools also emphasize the Greek culture and language rather than Greek Orthodox religion, although a prayer in Greek is often said before classes start.

In this chapter, the research interest is *not* on how the Greek language is used by teachers or students in Greek complementary schools. Rather, the attempt is to excavate in an exemplary manner the language ideologies of four teachers, following a grounded theory analysis (Charmaz 2014) of the theory-generating interviews (Bogner and Menz 2005) that were conducted.

Research Design and Methodology

In schools, linguistic practices are often constructed through “monoglossic ideologies” (García 2009) that promote socialization to the language that “ideally expresses the spirit of nation and the territory it occupies” (Gal 2006, p. 163). These monoglossic ideologies reify what is a standard language and what is academic language, presenting them as discrete autonomous linguistic categories that can be taught and assessed. As a result of these monoglossic ideologies, students are categorized as “native speakers” or stigmatized as “second language learners.” Through rituals, teachers in schools tend to reproduce these ideologies. And although complementary schools also have such rituals, it becomes obvious that teachers can indeed escape these monoglossic ideologies and create spaces for heteroglossic contestation, even when the school has been set up precisely to defend and maintain what is Greekness and what is the Greek language. At least this is what the accounts of teachers about their own teaching practices collected within an interview-based study point to.

This study is the international comparative research project “Educational Professionalism, Migration, and Multilingualism in Canada (Montreal, Quebec), Germany (Cologne, North Rhine-Westphalia), and Greece (Athens and Thessaloniki).” Panagiotopoulou and Rosen explore how (minority) teachers view migration-related multilingualism, linguistic diversity, and translanguaging practices (Panagiotopoulou

and Rosen 2015). So far they have conducted 54 “theory-generating” expert interviews (Bogner and Menz 2005). The epistemological interest of this kind of interview focuses less on factual knowledge and more on the “interpretive knowledge” of teachers (ibid, p. 44), meaning their subjective proclivities to act in certain ways, (implicit) decision-making maxims as well as knowledge constituents and routines which they develop throughout their work (cf. ibid, p. 38). This know-how is generally considered not to be directly retrievable; instead, it has to be deduced, meaning reconstructed, through communication by which – building on Bogner and Menz – “the field of ideas and ideologies” (ibid, p. 42 and 44) and therefore also the field of language ideologies can be accessed.

The interview guides used by Panagiotopoulou and Rosen contain various prompts and questions through which the teachers’ language ideologies within the scope of institutional contexts are explored (for the complete guidelines, see Panagiotopoulou and Rosen 2015, p. 250). First, the teachers are invited to report on their own teaching plan/lesson conception and thus to reflect on their own practice. But also, there are questions that focus on the language practices, which pay attention to the language practices of multilingual children and youth both within educational institutions and outside of them. The interviewees are asked to express their opinions and observations. For example: “We assume that your students use different languages in their everyday lives. In what way is this also the case in everyday school life? In what way do your students mix languages, and does this affect your lessons and teaching?” (ibid). Moreover, the interviewees are encouraged to state their opinions about scientific findings concerning multilingualism and bilingual education and to further elaborate using personal examples. Panagiotopoulou and Rosen also ask a question about the experts’ personal (private and/or familial) language use in order to deliberately and methodologically “integrate the expert as a ‘private person’” and ensure a “substantially rich elicitation” of experts’ interpretative knowledge (Bogner and Menz 2005, p. 44). It is important to note that what makes the expert an expert is not his or her knowledge advantage, but rather his or her power to shape situations that go along with knowledge, in our case, in the context of educational institutions: “During the theory-guided expert interview, we interview experts because their proclivities to act in certain ways, their knowledge and their assessments (help) structure the other actors’ options for actions; due to this, expert knowledge exhibits the dimension of social relevance” (Bogner and Menz 2005, p. 45).

The four teachers referred to in this contribution were interviewed in Montreal in 2014 by Panagiotopoulou and Rosen. Two were interviewed in Greek and two were interviewed in English. The interviews were transcribed, and the Greek transcripts translated to English. These transcripts were then shared with various “critical friends” that included Greek, American, German, Austrian, Luxembourgish, and Swiss sociolinguists and intercultural education scholars on two different occasions (June 2015 and February 2016; for further information on the participating colleagues from various European universities, please refer to http://sinter.uni-koeln.de/sites/ca5/Veranstaltungen/Flyer_160212_final.pdf). Some in the group were senior scholars, others were junior scholars, still others were doctoral students. The

transcripts were discussed and the data analyzed over the course of the two sessions that lasted approximately six hours each. The groups were organized into a Greek-speaking group that had the transcripts in Greek and an English and German group. The three authors then spent 3 days reviewing the group discussions that were taped, as well as conducting the final analysis. Our purpose in having a cross-linguistic, cross-cultural, iterative, and in-depth look at the data had to do with our goal of excavating the language ideologies of teachers without imposing a single view or perspective that was language- or culture-specific. What is avoided by proceeding this way is the pitfall that Foucault (1980, 2002) identifies in knowledge production, that is, that each society has a “general politics” of truth that regulates what can be said and done and what constitutes right and wrong.

Results

Being Multilingual in Montreal: The Four Teachers

Our four teachers taught in the same complementary Greek school in Montreal. Three of the teachers were born in Greece and one was born in Canada, although he lived in Greece for 22 years. All would be considered multilingual. Two are females and two are males. The teachers are between 35 and 45 years of age.

- **Anna** moved to Montreal in 2013. She had taught English in Greece for 19 years. She does not consider herself multilingual and is certain that she will never be multilingual, because she learned English as a second or a foreign language. Even though Anna is bilingual, and has been prior to her immigration to Canada, her ideologies about her bilingualism are monoglossic. She sees bilingualism as “a button you switch on and off, on and off.” When Greek is on, English cannot be, and viceversa. Thus, she describes all heteroglossic language practices as being “a trap a lot of people fall into when they try to express themselves using two, even three languages.” And she says it is “wrong, of course.” Anna’s views of her language practices follow notions of *additive diglossic bilingualism* (Lambert 1974; Fishman 1972). For herself, Anna has not developed the notion of bilingualism and multilingualism that a multilingual, multicultural society like Montreal demands. Hers is an old-fashioned bilingualism, responding to interests that are personal for Anna, but not societal.
- **Fotis** was born in Canada to a Greek family. He attended an elementary Greek school in Montreal, as well as the Greek complementary school in which he now teaches. Fotis then lived in Greece for 22 years before returning to Montreal 2 years ago. Unlike Anna, Fotis’ ideology of multilingualism is related to the political interests of Canada as a multilingual society. Having been raised in Montreal and having attended Greek schools mean that Fotis’ multilingualism is *lived* and is a product of a Canadian life. Fotis views his multilingualism as a resource, giving him an advantage at the Greek company where he works. Although he does not dwell on how his multilingualism works, it can be

characterized as being dynamic and not simply additive as in Anna's case (for the difference between additive and dynamic bilingualism, see García 2009).

- **Evi** has been in Montreal only 7 years, but she previously taught in Toronto for 2 years and in Los Angeles for 5 years and had studied for her Masters degree in Greek Paleography and Classical Philology in England. If Fotis is about *being* multilingual, Evi is about *thinking* multilingualism. For her, multilingualism is about being able to make structural connections in her brain. This, of course, stems from her graduate education and her university teaching. Evi considers herself multilingual, she has studied the languages (Greek, English, French, German, Spanish) carefully, identifying cross-linguistic connections and she is sure that the exercise of learning many languages is good for the brain. It is precisely because she has this superior advantage that she considers herself a model for her children of how to be multilingual in Canada. Unlike Anna who clearly differentiates when she speaks what language to whom in a diglossic sense, Evi reports that she uses the language that optimizes her chances of communicating effectively. She has a transglossic use of her multilingualism (García 2009; 2014) and does not simply use one language with one person. This different ideology from that of Anna is shaped by Evi's longer contact with the Montreal community where so many interlocutors are multilingual, therefore giving speakers freedom to select features from their repertoire to communicate with people that do not have a single language identity. Unlike Fotis, she is cerebral about languages and multilingualism, and yet she says that she does not want "named" languages to be "a taboo in her brain." For Evi, the multilingualism that children experience in schools is important, as will become more obvious when presenting her teaching approach.
- **Kostas** has been in Montreal for 7 years. However, prior to that, he lived in Spain and England. As seen above, Anna has a diglossic approach to her multilingualism that places her outside of Québécois society. Fotis has a natural approach that is the product of being a Québécois. And Evi has a cerebral approach to her multilingualism that has more to do with her understandings of the capacities of multilinguals than of her own lived experience. In contrast, Kostas experiences with multilingualism are the product of his global experience, living in England and Spain, and speaking a fourth language – Spanish. Whereas Evi holds herself up as an example of multilingualism and as the expert, Kostas clearly declares: "I am not an expert." Multilingualism for Kostas is not to think, to have more cognitive brain advantages, or to simply live in Canada; multilingualism is, he says, "to dig further," "to really deepen into culture," "to enter into the culture." Clearly Kostas' multilingualism enables him to live across and beyond cultures, and this is what makes multilingualism important for him. Therefore, Kostas goes beyond the established boundaries of "named" languages to use all his features, all his semiotic repertoire. This is precisely the way in which most multilingual communities use language, going beyond the boundaries of "named" national languages (the external perspective), and instead using all the features of their repertoire, *translanguaging* to make meaning (García and Li Wei 2014).

Translanguaging, as Otheguy et al. (2015, p. 281) have said “is the deployment of a speaker’s full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named (and usually national and state) languages.” Kostas is not afraid to go beyond established named languages, to be creative in his linguistic performances because to him, language is life, freedom from the national borders and constraints in which he was born and socialized. He is a global multilingual citizen.

Despite the similarities in their backgrounds and the institutional consistency of a Greek complementary school, all four teachers display different language ideologies that could be placed along a continuum of monoglossic-heteroglossic ideologies.

The following sections focus on teachers’ ideologies about teaching a heritage language like Greek and how that impacts their teaching practices.

Being a Greek Teacher in Multilingual Montreal

All teachers are very sure and certain that the children they teach are multilingual and see this as an asset. And yet, their teaching practices and ideologies about teaching Greek certainly differ.

When asked whether their children are multilingual, Anna repeats four times in the course of replying, “yes, they are.” And Fotis repeats three times, “Yes,” and emphasizes, “they are.” Kostas answers with an enthusiastic “definitely,” “for sure.”

All of the teachers also perceive multilingualism in a very positive light. Anna says her students “are very lucky” because they “can pick up the following languages with much more ease, and faster,” because “they are more linguistic,” and adds “that part of the brain works.”

Evi, following her cerebral cross-linguistic approach to multilingualism says that “children make easier connections in their brain, grammatical analogies [are] easier, certainly.” And she adds “it’s really easy.” In fact, Evi gives the example of a friend who is doing a study about giftedness and multilingualism. She explains: “A child who is growing up being multilingual,... the brain structures are more dense and they function, and has superior intelligence.” With certainty she explains that the higher results of the intelligence tests of bilingual children have to do with their bilingualism. She says:

It’s obvious. These kids are not having anything more. They were not fed better and did not have better life conditions. So the only thing which differentiates them from the rest of the world is being bilingual.

And yet, Evi acknowledges that “family demands” and “pressing from their environment” make a difference as to whether these children will become “University professors, doctors and lawyers” or have “simpler jobs” such as working “in restaurants.”

Kostas certainly views the children’s multilingualism as “a big privilege.” He sees “the fact that they’re multilingual” as “an amazing fact,” “a plus.” A child who is multilingual, he tells us, “only has a plus; he only has benefits. It’s an advantage for

them.” Kostas repeats three times that studying in the complementary Greek school is “a nice and great opportunity.”

Despite their absolute agreement on the advantages of multilingualism, these four teachers act differently, a product of different life experiences that have shaped their ideologies about teaching these Greek-Canadian children. Each of the teachers is characterized with a metaphor that captures their positionalities in terms of teaching. That metaphor is put alongside the ideologies about language and multilingualism that have been discussed above to create an accurate portrait of the different ideologies these four teachers hold.

Anna: The Nonmultilingual Gardener

Anna positions her teaching-self as just presenting the children with a garden from which they can freely choose. Because she deeply believes that “the earlier, the better,” she believes in an immersion approach to the teaching of Greek. She repeatedly says that children “can pick up” languages if “surrounded” by the language, if “exposed” to the language. She believes that children find it much easier “to pick up” the language from peers, so she makes sure that she sets up the conditions in her classroom so that children can speak to peers because then “everything comes easier.” In teaching, she makes sure that she provides a Greek immersion “surround.” When the children use features beyond those of Greek in speaking to her, she “repeat(s) the sentence that they have said in the Greek language.” Thus, Anna’s only multilingual concession in her classroom is for what are called “recasts” (Ellis and Sheen 2006), repeating in Greek what the child has said in English or French. Anna believes that a good teacher of Greek is one who uses only Greek in the classroom because otherwise “you don’t learn to fly on your own,” “you prolong your flight,” “it delays, it prolongs the acquisition of the language.” She teaches Greek in multilingual Canada in the same way she would teach in a monolingual context. And as a teacher she ignores the multilingual resources that the children bring.

Fotis: The Multilingual Greek Social Actor

Like Anna, Fotis believes in reproducing an immersion experience for his children in his classroom. Like Anna, he believes that “French and English, they’re gonna learn anyways.” If “you live in a bilingual country, you are gonna learn the language, even if you don’t want to. You’re eventually gonna have to learn it.” He recognizes the multilingual character of the children – “the kids that come here their mother tongue is not Greek.” So he “acts like I don’t speak English in my lesson.” “I act like I don’t understand what they’re saying.” He continues:

So I tell them, like, ‘I don’t understand. What you’re talking? What language is that?’ They’re like, they say it, they repeat it a second time. I say it again. They’re like, ‘Oh, sure, okay,’ and they switch into ‘Engl-Greek’ so they can do so. I do that. I try *not never* to speak English in class.

Despite his insistence in providing a Greek immersion experience, Fotis recognizes the multilingual practices of his students, what he calls “Engl-Greek.” But he tries “not never” to speak English in class. Yet, he is willing to make exceptions: “When there’s a word that they don’t understand no matter what I do, so I have to tell them in English what the word is, but that’s it.” Unlike Anna who does not validate the multilingualism of her students, Fotis does, although like Anna he tries to create an immersion experience in Greek. He adds:

When I hear English, I tell them ‘In Greek. Speak in Greek.’ They don’t, but okay; it’s easier for them to speak [in English]; and especially when they’re among themselves they only speak English.

Fotis accepts the children’s multilingual use among themselves and recognizes their multilingual practices, even though he would wish for Greek performances, and thus he “acts as if.”

Evi: The Cross-linguistic Greek-Canadian Multilingual Model and Thinker

If Anna and Fotis believe in different degrees of immersion in Greek as a teaching practice, Evi believes in cross-linguistic analyses to support children’s metalinguistic abilities. She focuses on linguistic connections, and despite the fact that English and Greek belong to different families, she emphasizes that their “grammatical structures are similar because they are near one to the other.”

Evi is certain that the children she teaches will have no difficulty precisely because they are developing their trilingualism in a multilingual society that supports their use of the three languages. They are, as she says, “living as trilinguals.” She is conscious of the fact that this can only happen with societal support and acknowledges Canada’s role in institutionalizing multilingualism: “Canada declares multiculturalism in its Constitution, as one of its liberties.... It is officially documented. It’s not simply tolerated by Canada; it’s even promoted.”

Besides teaching in the Greek complementary school where the rest of the teachers teach, Evi is qualified to teach in a trilingual day school. She is especially supportive of trilingual day schools and recognizes Canada’s unique contribution to the proliferation of such schools. After explaining Canada’s support for multilingualism, Evi continues:

That’s why we receive money from the Ministry of Education. The Ministry cannot forbid us from teaching Greek. They can say that we must teach more hours of French, but they cannot say to us: ‘Do not teach Greek’... This would be a breach of our right.

Greekness in the day school is not simply artificially created in the immersion experiences narrated by Anna and Fotis or in the cross-linguistic analyses in which Evi engages the children in the complementary schools. Instead, she says:

The children have an everyday touch, an everyday exposure to the Greek element. . . . We will do our ceremonies as part of our everyday schedule, and not like if it were an extra activity, mandatory to attend on Saturday.

And she explains that, for example, not only the Greek children participate in a celebration about Greek Independence Day, but so do English and French students, celebrating liberty and freedom. And so Greek Independence Day is shared among all Canadians for its emphasis on liberty and freedom, which connects to the French Revolution.

It is precisely Evi's understanding of the interrelationships of languages and cultures that leads to Evi's more heteroglossic practices when it comes to teaching Greek. She says:

As much as it concerns vocabulary, it's not a problem for me to explain it to my students in either French or English. I don't care. It's a matter of time. If I have little time to explain unknown words... that is not my priority. I want to do other things. I could say to them a phrase in Greek, and then they will understand. And then they will reply, and say the word in French or English. So, I confirm it. I am not limited. I don't want to be limited by trilingualism.

Evi sets herself up as an example to her trilingual children. She uses her three languages to teach in a transglossic type of way, not caring whether the specific language has to be taught and used in only one classroom space. She continues:

If you feel that you can't [use the other language], if you feel that you are not doing well your job if you use another language, No! It can't be! We are living in a multilingual environment. It would be silly not to speak in other languages.... I am an example for these children.... I am speaking the three languages which I demand them to learn. Isn't it so?

Evi's cross-linguistic pedagogy has to do with her wish to help the students "make the linguistic connections." She continues, "if I don't offer them the other language the students cannot [make the connections]."

Because of Evi's cross-linguistic pedagogy, she crosses also subject and language lines. And so she can say that the French teacher says to her: "Oh kids told me that you are doing that subject" [meaning the same grammatical structure].

Evi's pedagogy is not about immersing students in Greek. Her Greek language pedagogy acknowledges the children's multilingualism and uses cross-linguistic comparisons to go beyond simply the teaching of Greek. In that respect, Evi is enabling the children's translanguaging, acknowledging their full language repertoire. But her pedagogy falls short of what a translanguaging pedagogy needs, for Evi translanguages only to provide cross-linguistic analyses and not to disrupt the language hierarchies and provide multilingual children with ways of using language that go beyond these named languages. Translanguaging for Evi is all in the head, in the linguistic analyses, but not in the language practices themselves.

Kostas: The Global Translanguaging Companion and Pragmatist

Kostas' pedagogy parallels the language practices of his multilingual students. He acknowledges the fact that children "are speaking English and French with their friends," "they're watching movies and they're listening to English songs." So it's natural that in the Greek complementary school, "during their break, they speak

English between themselves.” Kostas also describes how children are “thinking in one of the other languages before expressing themselves in Greek,” but that’s “okay.” And they’re constantly “translating. They’re thinking either in English or in French.” Unlike Anna and Fotis who may see all of this as a problem, Kostas sees it as “a big plus.” The children’s multilingualism is a plus for the complementary Greek school. Kostas doesn’t see Greek as competing with English and French, but in interrelationship with them.

This idea that teaching a language has to adjust to the local context in which it is performed also relates to Kostas’ privileging oral abilities beyond literacy abilities. He says:

These kids, they do not read. Apart from their [Greek] books, they do not read literature in Greek. Okay, they watch TV, some of them at home Greek channels and Greek series. The parents... are pleased if they, the kids, understand and speak orally... The fact that there are rules of grammar and orthography; it’s not perfect; it’s not the number one issue for them.

Kostas does not have any unrealistic expectations of what performances in Greek should be for children growing up multilingual in Canada. He is happy with it not being “perfect,” as are the parents. He does not care if the “grammar and orthography” are “not perfect.” He looks at how the children are using Greek in the home, mostly to talk to parents and to watch Greek television programming. He builds on those oracy skills, which are so important for literacy later on. And he does not dwell on what should be a “perfect” monolingual performance in Greek.

Kostas is patient. He accompanies the children in what he calls “the process of learning” Greek. He does not “judge,” for he says that he “knows many adults” who also “make mistakes, either multilingual or unilingual.” That is, Kostas perceives language as a series of social practices that come “bit by bit.” He does not expect children to get the language as an autonomous structure, but he wants them to use the features that they do acquire, “bit by bit, more and more” within their other linguistic performances. Kostas does not have a view of acquisition of an additional language as additive, but as dynamic, in interrelationship with other language practices. And he certainly does not see multilingual performances as having an end point, as being “perfect,” as moving towards what second language acquisition scholars have called “ultimate attainment” (Birdson 1992), an end point or final state of acquisition. Kostas focuses on the *process* of learning, not on the product.

As such, he engages the children in team collaborative work. He makes them “feel good,” “work as a team,” to feel as if “they are a team.” He recognizes that the best thing he can do as a teacher is to use the Greek language authentically within a multilingual environment. To do that, he uses Greek in interrelationship with French and English. He brings in French newspapers and English cultural facts. The children are surrounded by multilingual texts, not just Greek texts. But Kostas supplements these texts with songs and movies, multimodal texts that optimize the meaning potential of the Greek texts. In teaching Greek, he also uses Latin characters. Children are engaged with Greek not as simply in Classical Greece, but as in our global times and world where texts are multimodal, and Greek can be read, heard,

seen, listened to, and embodied in gesture and life. Kostas pedagogy goes across and beyond languages and scripts, as well as modes.

As Evi, Kostas also works with relationships between Greek and French and English, but his approach is different. He asks the children to see the relationship between a headline in French from the French newspaper and the Greek language. He tells them:

Many French will not understand, but you have a big advantage because you know Greek and you can see it, and this makes them feel proud because the language [Greek] has lent so many terms.

And he goes on to say that Greek is useful if children go to a doctor, to a hospital, or if they are sick with an illness. He continues:

If you say *ophthalmologiste* to a French, they have to learn that it's a guy, a doctor, who is treating eyes; but if you speak Greek or if you understand Greek you know that *ophthalmos* means eye.

The comparisons that Kostas draws are not for linguistic prowess, as are Evi's. They are to make life more simple, to understand more, and to feel the pride that comes from speaking a language like Greek from which so many have drawn.

When asked whether he "mixes" languages in teaching, Kostas simply replies "I do." His use, however, is different from what he perceives the children speaking, which he terms "Grenghish." One of the activities in which he engages the children is to:

Talk with everybody that you know, your grandpa and your parents and collect as many words as you can, and then we will see what is the English word, what is the Greek word, the proper one that we use, and what is the Grenghish.

Kostas pedagogical ideology has much to do with translanguaging. He allows the children to use all the linguistic features in their repertoire in order to make sense of new linguistic features and appropriate them into their single unitary system that makes them Greek Canadians. He acknowledges that multilingual practices can cross "named" language boundaries and produce what he calls "Grenghish." He knows these practices exist in multilingual communities, even among adult parents. At the same time, he makes children aware of how to select appropriate features from their single repertoire in different circumstances. In their multilingual community, blended features are common in practice because multilinguals speak not a series of bounded languages, as linguists and educators would have us believe. And yet, multilingual children have to be able to suppress some of the features of their repertoire at times, especially in schools. Kostas' translanguaging pedagogy includes making multilingual children aware of their unitary multilingual repertoire (the internal psychological/linguistic perspective), at the same time that it raises their consciousness as to which features are associated with different named languages and social positions. Thus, Kostas' translanguaging pedagogy also helps children

learn to suppress certain features at specific times (the external sociolinguistic perspective).

Unlike Evi, Kostas does not promote himself as the linguistic model. He simply accompanies the children, helps them, and usually turns to a peer or classmate to rephrase, rather than recasting what the child wants to say. He says “It’s better to hear it from a classmate, from another student [than from me].” Kostas is accompanying the children in their global existence as multilingual beings. His pragmatism in teaching Greek to multilingual children in Montreal has to do with his extreme pragmatism about how language functions in a multilingual society.

Conclusion and Future Directions

All four teachers lead multilingual lives; however, according to their self-reports, they handle their own and their students’ multilingualism differently. Hence, they would hold varying views on 10-year-old Mario, the Saturday Greek Complementary School student presented at the beginning of this contribution, and his multilingual life, and would most probably handle his linguistic practices very differently in their own classes as well. Similar to the teachers of the regular school that Mario attends during the week, some of the Complementary School teachers would certainly consider only the piece of Mario’s language identity most relevant to their work: Mario’s Greek; the language to be used and learned in their Saturday classes according to the school’s language policy. Thus Mario is expected to act as a monolingual person in this particular context and to adjust to the logic of an institution that promotes and fosters one language only.

Other teachers focusing primarily on the multilingual practices of their students rather than on language itself would consider Mario’s multilingualism in relation to his dynamic language acquisition. Those teachers would not insist on monolingual performances but would acknowledge Mario’s multilingual identity and everyday practices as the norm. His linguistic repertoire should be enriched by attending their classes and his translanguaging discursive abilities should be extended.

Within this context of the Complementary School, professionals such as Evi, who enjoyed a diverse pedagogic education, converge with people like Kostas, who is not formally pedagogically trained. Both have gained experience within the context of various migration societies and have lived multilingually for years. Teachers who grew up within the community, such as Fotis, teach within the same school as teachers who have lived in Greece up until recently and who, like Anna, perceive the linguistic practices of Greek-speaking Montrealers as deviant.

The various views and ideologies in the context of an institution that exists parallel with mainstream school and that is not subjected to the governmental mandate and hegemonic logic of the education system constitute a specific pedagogical field: These schools “are institutions that endorse multilingualism as a usual and normative resource for identity performance” and they “potentially provide an alternative (Mirza and Reay 2000), safe (García 2005; Martin et al. 2004), and multilingual (Hornberger 2005) space for institutional bilingualism” (Creese and

Blackledge 2010, p. 104). It is for that reason that researchers expect to find similar concepts when reconstructing the teachers' views on multilingualism.

However, what was found in this research context are diverse concepts that exist parallel to each other as well as in a broad continuum (exemplarily illustrated in this contribution) of monoglossic-heteroglossic teachers' ideologies. That is, even with multilingual teachers one cannot assume that their own linguistic reality and that of their students is being addressed in the daily life of a complementary school. Especially, what has emerged as a particularly interesting result is the fact that teachers like Kostas, with little formal training to be a teacher, tend to have the most dynamic views on bilingualism. This is why, with regard to the future professionalization of teachers, it appears critical to look into the question of how teachers field-test alternative concepts, such as a translanguaging pedagogy, that cater to the heteroglossic reality of students like Mario in the context of nonmainstream schools. In order to accompany this process using ethnographic research beyond the interviewing of teachers, the interactions between teachers and their multilingual students in everyday class life of complementary schools need to be reconstructed.

References

- Authier, J. (2002). City is bilingual capital. *The Gazette*, 19, 1–2.
- Birdson, D. (1992). Ultimate attainment in second language acquisition. *Language*, 68(4), 706–755.
- Bogner, A., & Menz, W. (2005). Das theoriegenerierende Experteninterview. Erkenntnisinteresse, Wissensformen, Interaktion. In A. Bogner, B. Littig, & W. Menz (Eds.), *Das Experteninterview. Theorie, Methode, Anwendung* (2nd ed.). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing Grounded Theory*. 2nd edition. London: Sage Publications.
- Creese, A., Bhatt, A., Bhojani, N., & Martin, P. (2006). Multicultural, heritage and learner identities in complementary schools. *Language and Education*, 20(1), 23–43.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94, 103–115.
- Creese, A., Baraç, T., Bhatt, A., Blackledge, A., Hamid, S., Li Wei, et al. (2008). Investigating multilingualism in complementary schools in four communities. Final Report for the ESCR for Project No: RES-000-23-1180.
- Cummins, J., & Danesi, M. (1990). *Heritage languages: The development and denial of Canada's linguistic resources*. Toronto: Our Schools/Our Selves Educational Foundation.
- Curd-Christiansen, X.-L. (2006). Teaching and learning Chinese: Heritage language classroom discourse in Montreal. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 19(2), 189–207.
- Curd-Christiansen, X.-L. (2008). Reading the world through words: Cultural themes in Heritage Chinese Language textbooks. *Language and Education*, 22(2), 95–113.
- Ellis, R., & Sheen, Y. (2006). Reexamining the role of recasts in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(4), 575–600.
- Fishman, J. A. (1972). Bilingualism with and without diglossia and diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Social Issues*, 23(2), 26–38.
- Fishman, J. A. (1980a). Ethnic community mother tongue schools in the USA: Dynamics and distributions. *International Migration Review*, 14, 235–247.
- Fishman, J. A. (1980b). Minority language maintenance and the ethnic mother tongue school. *Modern Language Journal*, 64, 167–172.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon.

- Foucault, M. (2002). *The archaeology of knowledge, 1972*. London: Tavistock.
- Gal, S. (2006). Contradictions of standard language in Europe: Implications for the study of publics and practices. *Social Anthropology, 14*(2), 163–181.
- García, O. (2005). Positioning heritage languages in the United States. *Modern Language Journal, 89*, 601–605.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Wiley: Malden/Oxford.
- García, O. (2014). Countering the dual: Transglossia, dynamic bilingualism and translanguaging in education. In R. Rubdy & L. Alsagoff (Eds.), *The global–local interface, language choice and hybridity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O., & Li Wei. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan Pivot.
- García, O., Zakharia, Z., & Otcu, B. (Eds.). (2013). *Bilingual community education and multilingualism: Beyond heritage languages in a global city*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2005). Opening and filling up implementational and ideological spaces in heritage language education. *Modern Language Journal, 89*, 605–609.
- Lamarre, P., Paquette, J., Kahn, E., & Ambrosi, S. (2002). Multilingual Montreal: Listening in on the language practices of young Montreales. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 34*(3), 47–75.
- Lambert, W. E. (1974). Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In F. E. Aboud, & R. D. Meade (Eds.), *Cultural factors in learning and education. 5th Western Washington Symposium on Learning*. Washington, DC: Bellingham.
- Li Wei. (2006). Complementary schools: Past, present and future. *Language and Education, 20*(1), 76–83.
- Martin, P., Creese, A., Bhatt, A., & Bhojani, N. (2004). Final report on complementary schools and their communities in Leicester. University of Leicester/University of Birmingham.
- Marmen, L., & Corbeil, J. P. (1999). *Les langues au Canada: Recensement de 1996*. Canada: Ministère des Travaux publics.
- Mirza, H. S., & Reay, D. (2000). Spaces and places of black educational desire: Rethinking black supplementary schools as a new social movement. *Sociology, 34*, 521–544.
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review, 6*(3), 281–307.
- Panagiotopoulou, A., & Rosen, L. (2015). Professionalism and multilingualism in Greece and Canada: An international comparison of (minority) teachers' views on linguistic diversity and language practices in monolingual vs. multilingual educational systems. In D. Lengyel, & L. Rosen (Eds.), *Minority teachers in different educational contexts – Recent studies from three German-speaking countries. Tertium comparationis. Journal für International und Interkulturell Vergleichende Erziehungswissenschaft, 21*(2), 225–250.