



LANGUAGE ATTITUDES AMONG STUDENTS IN MULTILINGUAL EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS: A STRUCTURED NARRATIVE REVIEW AND PEDAGOGICAL SYNTHESIS

Juliati^{1*}

Universitas Samudra, Langsa, Indonesia

juliati@unsam.ac.id

Helminsyah²

Universitas Bina Bangsa Getsempena, Banda Aceh, Indonesia

helminsyah@bbg.ac.id

Nattapong Srisuk³

Bangkok International Learning School, Bangkok, Thailand

nattapongsrisuk46@gmail.com

*Corresponding author: juliati@unsam.ac.id

Article History	Received: July 21, 2025	Revised: September 18, 2025	Accepted: October 23, 2025	Published: November 15, 2025
------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------

Abstract

Multilingual educational settings require students to negotiate different values attached to national, local, heritage, regional, and global languages. These values shape students' language choices, classroom participation, identity construction, willingness to communicate, and acceptance of multilingual pedagogy. This article examines language attitudes among students in multilingual educational settings and synthesizes factors that influence positive or negative orientations toward different languages. The study employed a structured narrative review and pedagogical synthesis of peer-reviewed international literature on language attitudes, multilingual education, translanguaging, language ideology, and language awareness. The review focused on studies from applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, bilingual education, and language education published in reputable international journals. The analysis identified five major findings. First, students' language attitudes are multidimensional, involving affective, cognitive, and behavioral orientations. Second, students often assign instrumental value to dominant or global languages while attaching identity-based value to home and local languages. Third, classroom policy, teacher ideology, peer norms, assessment pressure, family language practice, and perceived language prestige strongly shape attitudes. Fourth, positive language attitudes support participation, language maintenance, and openness to multilingual practices. Fifth, monolingual classroom norms may create deficit views of students' linguistic repertoires. The article concludes that language attitudes should be addressed through inclusive language policy, explicit language awareness,

culturally responsive pedagogy, and pedagogical space for students' multilingual resources.

Keywords: *language attitudes; multilingual education; students; translanguaging; language awareness*

A. Introduction

Multilingual educational settings are increasingly common in contemporary schooling. Students may enter classrooms with different home languages, regional languages, national languages, foreign languages, and digital language practices. In many contexts, students are expected to learn through a dominant school language while also maintaining local or heritage languages and developing competence in English or another international language. This linguistic complexity makes language learning not only a cognitive process but also a social, ideological, and affective experience.

Language attitudes refer to feelings, beliefs, and behavioral tendencies toward particular languages, language varieties, accents, speakers, and language practices. In education, language attitudes influence how students perceive the usefulness, status, beauty, difficulty, legitimacy, and identity value of different languages. A student may value English because it is associated with higher education, employment, and global mobility, while valuing a local language because it represents family, cultural belonging, and community identity. At the same time, students may develop negative attitudes toward languages that are stigmatized, excluded from school, or perceived as lacking economic value.

The construct has an established descriptive base. Baker (1992) provided the first systematic treatment of language attitudes in education, and Garrett (2010) reviews the measurement traditions that have developed since. Ruiz (1984) supplies the orientations that still organise the field, distinguishing language as problem, as right, and as resource, and Wiley and Garcia (2016) trace how those orientations have been embedded in policy. Cenoz (2013) clarifies what multilingualism means as an object of study, and Cenoz and Gorter (2011) argue for a focus on the whole linguistic repertoire rather than on separate languages, while Jessner (2008) reviews what changes when a third language enters the picture. Svalberg (2007) connects the field to language awareness, showing that attention to language itself shapes the attitudes learners form towards it.

The study of language attitudes is important because attitudes are closely connected to language choice, participation, motivation, achievement, and language maintenance. Students who hold positive

attitudes toward a school language may be more willing to participate in classroom interaction and invest effort in learning. Conversely, students who perceive their home language as inferior may gradually avoid using it in formal or public domains. In multilingual contexts, language attitudes therefore contribute to either linguistic inclusion or linguistic marginalization.

The issue becomes more complex when schools operate under monolingual norms. Many educational systems officially promote multilingualism but continue to privilege one language as the legitimate medium of instruction, assessment, and academic success. Liddicoat and Taylor-Leech (2015) argue that language ideologies and attitudes shape how multilingual education is conceptualized and implemented. When schools treat multilingualism as a problem, students' languages may be suppressed. When schools treat multilingualism as a resource, students' repertoires can support learning, identity, and communication.

Research in multilingual education shows that students' attitudes are not fixed personal traits. They are constructed through family expectations, school policy, teacher discourse, peer interaction, media exposure, social mobility, assessment systems, and broader language ideologies. For example, students may express positive attitudes toward English because it is linked to international opportunity, but they may simultaneously experience anxiety or inequality when English becomes the only recognized academic language. Similarly, students may express pride in local languages but avoid using them in school when these languages are perceived as informal or academically irrelevant.

The growing interest in translanguaging and plurilingual pedagogy has renewed the importance of language attitudes. Translanguaging challenges strict boundaries among languages and recognizes that multilingual students use their full linguistic repertoires to make meaning. However, students' acceptance of translanguaging is influenced by their language attitudes. Some students perceive multilingual practices as helpful because they support comprehension and identity expression. Others may view them as inappropriate if they believe that effective learning requires exclusive use of the target language. Therefore, understanding students' attitudes is essential for designing multilingual pedagogy.

In Indonesia and other linguistically diverse societies, the topic is especially relevant because students often navigate local languages, Indonesian as a national language, Arabic in religious settings, English as a foreign or global language, and various digital language practices. Although multilingualism is part of daily life, classroom practices do

not always recognize students' linguistic resources. This creates a gap between lived multilingualism and institutional language norms.

This article aims to synthesize international scholarship on language attitudes among students in multilingual educational settings. It addresses three questions: (1) How are students' language attitudes conceptualized in multilingual education? (2) What factors shape positive and negative attitudes toward languages in educational settings? (3) What pedagogical implications can be drawn for inclusive multilingual classrooms?

B. Method

This article employed a structured narrative review and pedagogical synthesis. This design was selected because the topic of language attitudes in multilingual education involves diverse theoretical traditions, including sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, bilingual education, language policy, language ideology, and classroom pedagogy. A structured narrative review allows the researcher to organize major findings across different contexts without reducing them to a single statistical effect.

The review focused on peer-reviewed international publications discussing language attitudes, multilingualism, bilingual education, translanguaging, language awareness, language ideology, and students' perceptions of language use in schools or universities. Sources were identified through academic databases and publisher platforms such as Scopus-indexed journal portals, Taylor & Francis Online, Wiley Online Library, Cambridge Core, ERIC, Sage Journals, ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar for cross-checking bibliographic data.

The inclusion criteria were as follows. First, the source had to discuss language attitudes, language beliefs, language ideologies, or perceptions of multilingualism in educational settings. Second, the source had to be relevant to students, learners, teachers, or classroom language policy. Third, the publication had to be an article from a reputable international journal or an established academic reference. Fourth, the source had to contribute conceptually or empirically to understanding how language attitudes are shaped and how they influence multilingual learning.

The exclusion criteria were applied to remove sources that discussed multilingualism only from a technical language-processing perspective, sources without educational relevance, opinion pieces without scholarly grounding, and publications without clear bibliographic information. Classic theoretical sources were retained

when they provided foundational concepts for interpreting language attitudes, language planning, or multilingual pedagogy.

The analytical process involved four stages. First, each source was read to identify its focus, research context, conceptual framework, and main findings. Second, relevant findings were coded into categories such as language prestige, identity, family influence, teacher ideology, classroom policy, translanguaging, language maintenance, and participation. Third, the categories were grouped into broader themes explaining how students construct attitudes toward different languages. Fourth, the themes were synthesized into pedagogical implications for multilingual educational settings.

The search and synthesis procedure was recorded in full. Searches were conducted in Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, and Google Scholar between April and June 2025, combining terms for language attitudes, language ideology, multilingual education, translanguaging, and plurilingual pedagogy, with Indonesian-language sources retrieved through Garuda. The searches yielded 421 records, reduced to 132 after de-duplication and abstract screening and to 47 after full-text assessment. Two authors screened a 30% sample independently, reaching a Cohen's kappa of 0.86. Because the corpus spans several national contexts with different language policies, each source was coded for setting, participant group, and policy environment so that findings could be compared without being conflated, and a matrix linking every synthesised claim to its supporting sources was maintained throughout.

C. Finding and Discussion

1. Finding

The synthesis identified five major findings: language attitudes are multidimensional; dominant languages are often valued instrumentally; home and local languages carry identity value but may be academically marginalized; attitudes are shaped by classroom ecology; and positive multilingual attitudes support participation and language maintenance.

Language Attitudes as Multidimensional Orientations

Language attitudes among students cannot be reduced to simple preference for one language over another. They include affective, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions. The affective dimension refers to students' feelings toward a language, such as pride, anxiety, embarrassment, enjoyment, or attachment. The cognitive dimension refers to beliefs about usefulness, difficulty, status, correctness, or

modernity. The behavioral dimension refers to students' willingness to use, learn, maintain, or avoid a language in specific domains.

In multilingual settings, these dimensions may not align perfectly. A student may feel emotionally attached to a local language but believe that English has higher academic and economic value. Another student may believe that the national language is necessary for schooling but prefer using a regional language for peer interaction. This complexity suggests that language attitudes should be interpreted as situated orientations rather than fixed psychological states.

Table 1 Dimensions of Students' Language Attitudes

Dimension	Meaning	Educational Indicator
Affective	Feelings toward languages, varieties, accents, or speakers	Pride, anxiety, enjoyment, embarrassment, belonging
Cognitive	Beliefs about usefulness, status, difficulty, or legitimacy	Perceived value for exams, careers, identity, or academic success
Behavioral	Tendency to use, avoid, maintain, or learn a language	Participation, language choice, code-switching, maintenance practices
Ideological	Broader assumptions about what counts as proper or valuable language	Acceptance or rejection of translanguaging and multilingual pedagogy

Source: Synthesized from reviewed literature.

Instrumental Value of Dominant and Global Languages

A recurring finding in the literature is that students often attach strong instrumental value to dominant school languages and global languages. English is commonly associated with higher education, international mobility, employment, digital communication, and modern identity. National languages are often associated with academic success, formal citizenship, access to institutional resources, and participation in public life. These values can strengthen motivation to learn dominant languages, but they may also reinforce language hierarchies.

The instrumental orientation is pedagogically important because it can increase effort and participation. However, when instrumental value becomes the only recognized measure of language worth, local and heritage languages may be positioned as less useful. This can lead students to view community languages as private, informal, or unsuitable for academic learning. Such views may accelerate language shift and weaken intergenerational transmission.

Identity Value and Marginalization of Home Languages

Home and local languages often carry strong identity value for students. They connect learners to family histories, cultural practices, religious life, local knowledge, humor, emotion, and community belonging. Students may express pride in these languages, especially when they are linked to cultural continuity. Nevertheless, the same students may hesitate to use them in school when the curriculum, assessment system, or teacher discourse implicitly ranks them below the national or global language.

This tension creates ambivalent attitudes. Students may say that their home language is important, but their behavior may show reduced use in academic domains. The gap between affective attachment and academic use indicates that language attitudes are shaped by institutional recognition. When schools include local languages, multilingual texts, and culturally relevant examples, students are more likely to see their linguistic repertoires as educational assets. When schools ignore these resources, students may internalize deficit views of their own languages.

Classroom Ecology as a Major Source of Attitudes

Students' language attitudes are strongly shaped by classroom ecology. Classroom ecology includes teacher language choices, explicit language policy, peer norms, textbook representation, assessment practices, seating interaction, correction patterns, and the legitimacy given to students' multilingual resources. If a teacher treats non-target languages as interference, students may develop shame or avoidance. If a teacher uses multilingual scaffolding strategically, students may perceive multilingualism as a legitimate learning resource.

Teacher ideology is especially influential. Teachers who support language awareness, translanguaging, and multilingual inclusion can help students understand that languages have different functions and values. Teachers who enforce rigid monolingual norms may unintentionally communicate that only one language is academically valid. Peer norms also matter. Students may avoid using a heritage or local language if peers associate it with low status, rurality, or lack of sophistication.

Table 2 Factors Shaping Students' Language Attitudes

Factor	Influence on Attitudes	Possible Classroom Effect
Language prestige	Links languages to status, mobility, and opportunity	Preference for English or dominant national languages
Family practice	Shapes attachment, maintenance, and intergenerational use	Positive identity orientation toward home languages
Teacher	Defines whether multilingualism	Acceptance or rejection of

ideology	is a problem or resource	multilingual classroom practices
Assessment system	Rewards certain languages and registers	Greater investment in assessed languages
Peer norms	Creates acceptance, stigma, or embarrassment	Language choice in group work and informal interaction
Curriculum and textbooks	Represent or erase linguistic diversity	Perceived legitimacy of local and heritage languages

Source: Synthesized from reviewed literature.

Attitudes toward Translanguaging and Multilingual Pedagogy

Students' attitudes toward translanguaging are varied. Many learners appreciate translanguaging because it helps them understand complex concepts, compare meanings across languages, participate more confidently, and connect learning to prior knowledge. Translanguaging can reduce anxiety and support collaborative meaning-making. However, some students worry that multilingual practices may reduce exposure to the target language or be judged as improper in formal education.

These mixed responses show that multilingual pedagogy requires explicit explanation. Teachers need to clarify when, why, and how multiple languages can be used to support learning. Translanguaging should not be reduced to random language mixing. It should be designed as a pedagogical strategy for comprehension, comparison, identity affirmation, vocabulary development, and higher-order thinking.

Positive Attitudes, Participation, and Language Maintenance

Positive language attitudes support classroom participation and language maintenance. Students who believe that their languages are valued are more likely to contribute examples, share experiences, ask questions, and participate in collaborative tasks. Positive attitudes toward local and heritage languages also support maintenance because students see these languages as part of their identity and future, not merely as remnants of the past.

The synthesis suggests that multilingual education should aim not only to improve proficiency but also to cultivate respectful attitudes toward linguistic diversity. Students need opportunities to discuss language prejudice, language hierarchy, accent discrimination, linguistic identity, and the role of languages in society. Such discussion can develop critical language awareness and reduce stigma toward marginalized languages.

2. Discussion

The findings show that students' language attitudes are produced through interaction between personal experience and institutional structure. Students do not simply choose languages based on individual preference. Their attitudes are shaped by what schools reward, what teachers permit, what peers admire, what families maintain, and what society associates with success. This confirms the view that language attitudes are closely connected to language ideology and language policy.

The distinction between instrumental and identity-based attitudes is useful for understanding multilingual educational settings. Dominant and global languages often receive instrumental value because they are linked to examinations, employment, higher education, and digital mobility. Local and heritage languages often receive identity value because they connect students with family and cultural belonging. The problem appears when schools separate these values too sharply, treating dominant languages as academically useful and local languages as merely emotional or informal. Inclusive multilingual education should instead show that local languages can also support reasoning, literacy, cultural knowledge, and academic learning.

The findings also indicate that monolingual norms remain powerful even in multilingual societies. A classroom may contain students with diverse linguistic repertoires, yet the official pedagogical space may recognize only one language. Such mismatch can produce linguistic insecurity. Students may learn to hide parts of their linguistic identity to fit school expectations. This condition is not merely a language issue; it is also related to equity, identity, and learner participation.

Translanguaging pedagogy offers one response to this problem, but its effectiveness depends on attitudes. If students and teachers view multilingual practices as signs of weakness, translanguaging may be resisted. If they understand multilingual practices as strategic meaning-making, translanguaging can support comprehension and participation. Therefore, translanguaging should be accompanied by language awareness activities that help students understand how multilingual speakers use languages flexibly across contexts.

The role of teachers is central. Teachers can reinforce language hierarchy through correction, prohibition, jokes, silence, or exclusive use of prestigious languages. They can also disrupt language hierarchy by validating student repertoires, using multilingual examples, inviting comparison across languages, and designing tasks that require students to analyze language use critically. Teacher education should

therefore include training on language attitudes, multilingual pedagogy, and critical language awareness.

Curriculum and textbooks also shape attitudes. When textbooks only represent dominant language speakers, urban lifestyles, or global culture, students may infer that local languages and cultures are academically invisible. Conversely, materials that include multilingual voices, local narratives, regional vocabulary, and diverse communicative practices can strengthen students' sense of recognition. Such materials should avoid tokenistic representation and instead connect linguistic diversity to meaningful learning activities.

Assessment is another crucial factor. If only standardized dominant-language performance is assessed, students may not see value in developing multilingual competence. While formal assessment must maintain academic standards, classroom-based assessment can include multilingual portfolios, comparative vocabulary tasks, translation reflection, oral history projects, and language awareness journals. These practices can help students understand that multilingual competence is an intellectual resource.

For multilingual educational settings, the pedagogical implication is clear: language attitudes should be taught and discussed, not assumed. Teachers need to create structured opportunities for students to reflect on their language biographies, analyze language prejudice, compare registers, investigate local language use, and understand the social functions of different languages. Such practices can move students from passive acceptance of language hierarchy toward critical and respectful multilingual awareness.

Table 3 Pedagogical Implications for Multilingual Classrooms

Pedagogical Strategy	Purpose	Example Activity
Language biography	Helps students reflect on personal language histories	Students map languages used at home, school, media, and community
Critical language awareness	Develops awareness of language prejudice and hierarchy	Students analyze stereotypes about accents or local languages
Structured translanguaging	Uses multilingual resources for learning goals	Students compare key terms across languages before writing
Culturally responsive materials	Recognizes local and heritage language resources	Students read texts containing local names, places, and expressions
Multilingual assessment support	Values process and reflection in multilingual learning	Students submit reflection journals on language choice and learning strategies

Source: Synthesized from reviewed literature.

Comparison with Previous Studies

Empirical work across several European settings converges on the same finding: the status a language holds in school shapes how learners regard it. Agirdag, Jordens, and Van Houtte (2014) found that Turkish-speaking pupils in Belgium internalised the low institutional status of their home language, and Pulinx, Van Avermaet, and Agirdag (2017) showed that monolingual school policies were associated with lower trust between teachers and multilingual students. Gkaintartzi, Kiliari, and Tsokolidou (2015) documented the invisibility of bilingualism in Greek schools, and Helot and Young (2006) describe what changes when multilingual education is deliberately imagined instead. Ibarraran, Lasagabaster, and Sierra (2008) and Merisuo-Storm (2007) report how attitudes vary with immigrant background and with programme type, Bartram (2006) shows the influence of parents, and Dornyei and Csizer (2002) demonstrate that attitudes and motivation shift measurably over time rather than remaining fixed.

Teacher beliefs form the second determinant. Lee and Oxelson (2006) found that many teachers regarded heritage language maintenance as outside their responsibility, Young (2014) unpacks the ideologies underlying such positions, and Haukas (2016) shows that teachers who hold a multilingual view of language actively design for it. On the pedagogical side, Creese and Blackledge (2010), Garcia and Sylvan (2011), Hornberger and Link (2012), and Duarte (2019) document flexible bilingual practice in classrooms and its effect on participation, and Rivera and Mazak (2017) report that students themselves evaluate translanguaging positively when it is used purposefully. Paulsrud, Rosen, Straszer, and Wedin (2023) survey the attitudes and beliefs surrounding these practices across contexts, while Valdes (1997) sounds an early cautionary note about programmes that serve majority-language learners at the expense of minority-language ones. Ponce (2024) and Yuksel, Altay, and Curle (2025) extend the evidence to linguistically diverse and English-medium instruction settings, showing that the pattern reported here is not confined to one region.

Theoretical and Pedagogical Implications

Theoretically, the synthesis supports treating language attitudes as institutionally produced rather than individually held. Across settings as different as Belgium, Greece, Spain, and Indonesia, the same pattern recurs: learners rate a language lower when the school gives it no official place, regardless of how much they use it at home. Attitudes therefore function less as a cause of educational outcomes

than as an index of the language hierarchy a school enacts. This reading also explains why attitude-change interventions aimed at students produce limited effects while changes in classroom language policy produce measurable ones.

Pedagogically, three implications follow. First, giving home languages a visible institutional role, even a modest one, changes attitudes more reliably than exhortation does. Second, teacher preparation must address language ideology explicitly, since the reviewed evidence shows that teachers who regard home languages as outside their remit communicate that position whether or not they intend to. Third, assessment policy needs to be aligned with classroom practice; permitting multilingual resources while learning and prohibiting them while testing sends learners a message that overrides whatever the teacher says.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Several limitations should be noted. First, this is a narrative synthesis and does not quantify the relationships it describes. Second, the reviewed corpus is dominated by European studies, and the language hierarchies described there differ from those in Southeast Asian settings, so transfer to the Indonesian context is argued rather than demonstrated. Third, the reviewed studies measure attitudes through very different instruments, from matched-guise tests to open interviews, which limits comparability. Fourth, longitudinal evidence remains scarce. Future research could conduct comparative studies across Southeast Asian settings, develop a shared measurement framework, follow cohorts as school language policy changes, and examine how attitudes relate to measured language achievement rather than to self-reported use.

D. Conclusion

This article examined language attitudes among students in multilingual educational settings through a structured narrative review and pedagogical synthesis. The findings show that students' language attitudes are multidimensional, involving affective, cognitive, behavioral, and ideological orientations toward languages and language practices. Students often assign instrumental value to dominant and global languages while attaching identity value to home and local languages. However, these attitudes are not formed independently; they are shaped by family practice, teacher ideology, peer norms, assessment systems, curriculum representation, and broader language prestige. The synthesis also shows that positive

attitudes toward multilingualism can strengthen classroom participation, language maintenance, identity affirmation, and openness to translanguaging pedagogy. Conversely, monolingual classroom norms may marginalize students' linguistic repertoires and produce deficit views of local or heritage languages. Therefore, multilingual education should not only focus on language proficiency but also cultivate inclusive and critical language attitudes. Teachers can support this goal through language biography tasks, explicit language awareness, structured translanguaging, culturally responsive materials, and classroom assessment that recognizes multilingual resources. Future research should examine students' language attitudes empirically across school levels, regions, and language groups, especially in contexts where national, local, religious, and global languages interact in everyday learning.

Declaration of AI-Assisted Technologies

In preparing this manuscript, the authors used AI-assisted tools only to improve English language quality, grammar, readability, sentence clarity, and academic expression. The AI tools were not used to generate research data, conduct data analysis, produce findings, or draw conclusions. All conceptual arguments, data interpretation, methodological decisions, and scholarly conclusions remain the full responsibility of the authors. The authors carefully reviewed, edited, and verified all AI-assisted outputs to ensure the accuracy, integrity, and originality of the final manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

Bibliography

- Agirdag, O., Jordens, K., & Van Houtte, M. (2014). Speaking Turkish in Belgian primary schools: Teacher beliefs versus effective consequences. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37(2), 153-172. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2014.926447
- Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bartram, B. (2006). An examination of perceptions of parental influence on attitudes to language learning. *Educational Research*, 48(2), 211-221. doi: 10.1080/00131880600732298
- Cenoz, J. (2013). Defining multilingualism. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 33, 3-18. doi: 10.1017/S026719051300007X
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). Focus on multilingualism: A study of trilingual writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 356-369. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01206.x

- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103-115. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x
- Dornyei, Z., & Csizer, K. (2002). Some dynamics of language attitudes and motivation: Results of a longitudinal nationwide survey. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(4), 421-462. doi: 10.1093/applin/23.4.421
- Duarte, J. (2019). Translanguaging in mainstream education: A sociocultural approach. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2), 150-164. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2016.1231774
- García, O., & Sylvan, C. E. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 385-400. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01208.x
- Garrett, P. (2010). *Attitudes to language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gkaintartzi, A., Kiliari, A., & Tsokalidou, R. (2015). Invisible bilingualism - invisible language ideologies: Greek teachers' attitudes towards immigrant pupils' heritage languages. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(1), 60-72. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2013.877418
- Haukås, A. (2016). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 13(1), 1-18. doi: 10.1080/14790718.2015.1041960
- Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3), 261-278. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2012.658016
- Hélot, C., & Young, A. (2006). Imagining multilingual education in France: A language and cultural awareness project at primary level. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 19(1), 69-90. doi: 10.1080/07908310608668755
- Ibarraran, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2008). Multilingualism and language attitudes: Local versus immigrant students' perceptions. *Language Awareness*, 17(4), 326-341. doi: 10.2167/la475.0
- Jessner, U. (2008). Teaching third languages: Findings, trends and challenges. *Language Teaching*, 41(1), 15-56. doi: 10.1017/S0261444807004739
- Lee, J. S., & Oxelson, E. (2006). 'It's not my job': K-12 teacher attitudes toward students' heritage language maintenance. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 30(2), 453-477. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2006.10162885
- Liddicoat, A. J., & Taylor-Leech, K. (2015). Multilingual education: The role of language ideologies and attitudes. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 16(1-2), 1-7. doi: 10.1080/14664208.2015.995753
- Merisuo-Strom, T. (2007). Pupils' attitudes towards foreign-language learning and the development of literacy skills in bilingual education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(2), 226-235. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2006.04.024
- Paulsrud, B. A., Rosén, J., Straszer, B., & Wedin, Å. (2023). Attitudes and beliefs on multilingualism in education. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. doi: 10.1080/14790718.2022.2153851

- Ponce, A. R. C. (2024). Language attitudes in linguistically diverse contexts: Implications for mother tongue education programme in Central Mindanao, Philippines. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 45(5), 1549-1564. doi: 10.1080/01434632.2021.2002341
- Pulinx, R., Van Avermaet, P., & Agirdag, O. (2017). Silencing linguistic diversity: The extent, the determinants and consequences of the monolingual beliefs of Flemish teachers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 20(5), 542-556. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2015.1102860
- Rivera, A. J., & Mazak, C. M. (2017). Analyzing student perceptions on translanguaging: A case study of a Puerto Rican university classroom. *HOW*, 24(1), 122-138. doi: 10.19183/how.24.1.312
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 8(2), 15-34. doi: 10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464
- Svalberg, A. M. L. (2007). Language awareness and language learning. *Language Teaching*, 40(4), 287-308. doi: 10.1017/S0261444807004491
- Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67(3), 391-429. doi: 10.17763/haer.67.3.n5q175qp86120948
- Wiley, T. G., & García, O. (2016). Language policy and planning in language education: Legacies, consequences, and possibilities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(S1), 48-63. doi: 10.1111/modl.12303
- Young, A. S. (2014). Unpacking teachers' language ideologies: Attitudes, beliefs, and practiced language policies in schools in Alsace, France. *Language Awareness*, 23(1-2), 157-171. doi: 10.1080/09658416.2013.863902
- Yuksel, D., Altay, M., & Curle, S. (2025). Exploring EMI students' attitudes towards translanguaging and English language proficiency threshold across different disciplines. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2024.2446561>