

**Teachers' perspectives on the role of home cultures in Dutch international
transition classes (ISK)**

by

Katharina Koidl, BA BA

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in
Intercultural Communication of the Utrecht University, 2020

Utrecht, The Netherlands

Masters Committee:

Dr. Sergio Baauw
Dr. Marie Steffens



Universiteit Utrecht

EDINA

Abstract

Purpose The purpose of this study was to investigate the teachers' perspective on the use of students' home cultures in international transition classes within the Dutch secondary education system. The research explored the teaching methods and practices, as well as benefits and obstacles related to *transculturing*.

Methodology 33 teachers of ISK classes (international transition classes) in the Netherlands were surveyed about the use of their students' home cultures in class. The five dimensions concluded from the survey data were geared towards method content and approaches, obstacles, and benefits. Open-ended questions aimed at teacher's satisfaction with *transculturing* in the classroom and additional needs for its implementation.

Results The results indicate that all participants use elements and aspects of the home cultures in their classes moderately frequently. The topics of *food* and *festivities* were used most often. Additionally, respondents experienced benefits from *transculturing*. The findings pertaining to obstacles were linked to lack of knowledge and lack of time. Results further indicated that the teachers wished for more implementation of home cultures and overall needed more home-culture related training, information and guidance.

Conclusion Overall, the findings concord with the literature about dealing with interculturality in diverse classrooms. The moderately frequent use of *transculturing* may be rooted in a rather positive attitude towards the use of home cultures. In addition, the aforementioned frequency of incorporation corroborates with the teachers' need for more training, information and guidance.

Key words: Home cultures, newcomer students, ISK classes, transculturing

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Sergio Baauw, for the valuable supervision, guidance and feedback throughout the writing process. I would also like to thank him and Dr. Marie Steffens for granting me the opportunity to conduct research within the EDINA¹ project they coordinate. My passion for integration and my interest in language teaching and learning fit well with the purpose of EDINA, facilitating integration in high schools. I am also very grateful to Laura Peters, the student I co-authored the questionnaire with. Thank you very much for translating my questions into Dutch and managing the email correspondences with our contact persons. I am very appreciative of you and your help in any questions and doubts I had throughout the process.

I would also like to thank all my friends and flatmates in Utrecht, who were part of this project, from early conversations about my ideas until the finished product. Thank you for being there, from moments of venting to moments of celebrating the small and big wins with me. Lastly, I would like to thank my boyfriend and family for their endless support and encouraging words. Thank you for pooling my ideas with me and offering me outsider's as well as insider's perspectives on the topic of teachers dealing with cultural diversity in the classroom. Most of all, thank you for providing me with the invaluable quality time during these challenging weeks of quarantine that helped me recharge my batteries.

¹ EDINA, Education of International Newly Arrived migrant pupils. supports municipalities, schools, and teachers in the reception integration of newcomer students. <http://edinaplatform.eu>

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	5
2. Context: Multilingual Education in The Netherlands	6
3. Academic discussion	8
4. Research questions and hypotheses	15
4.1. Research questions	15
4.2. Research hypotheses	15
5. Methodology	16
5.1. Instruments	16
5.2. Respondents	17
5.3. Procedure.....	18
5.4. Scoring	19
6. Results	20
6.1. Closed-ended items	20
6.2. Open-ended items.....	25
6.3. Correlations	26
7. Discussion	28
7.1. Research questions	28
7.2. Open-ended questions	32
7.3. Correlations	33
8. Conclusion.....	34
8.1. Limitations	35
8.2. Suggestions	35
9. Bibliography.....	36
10. Appendix	39
Appendix I: Survey	39
Appendix II: Approval of FETC-GW	65

1. Introduction

With the growing presence of migrant/newcomer children in Europe's education systems, there has been much discussion about their successful integration. In the past decade, many thousands of families have migrated to Europe in search of a stable and safe place to rebuild and continue their lives. The Netherlands is no exception in this case. For this reason, the country has established specific international transition classes (ISK-klassen), which cater for newcomer children and function as reception classes, embedded in the Dutch secondary school system. In these classes, the migrant students receive intensive language training and education in core subjects, to prepare them for their integration into the regular school system. In general, the students, aged 12 to 18, attend classes of approximately 15 students, for an average of two years. There, the children do not only learn the host country's language, but also adapt to the host culture. Both of these processes are guided and promoted by their teachers (N.n., IWCN, 2020).

With regard to the academic discussion, much has been investigated and theorised about foreign language teaching and learning, the role of culture in the language acquisition process as well as the difficulties newcomers encounter when adapting to the host country's institutions and culture. Recently, scholars have published about the intercultural learning potential that lies in the multicultural composition of classrooms. However, this paper is intended to investigate intercultural interaction in diverse educational environments from a teacher's perspective. Therefore, the leading question of this investigation is how teachers incorporate the students' home cultures into the ISK-classes to promote successful foreign language learning.

First, the paper provides an overview of multilingual education in the Netherlands, as well as a theoretical framework comprising recent research in the fields of *diversity in foreign language learning and teaching*, *integration of migrant pupils into the school system*, *culture in education*, and *intercultural competence*. Secondly, the method of this research will be explained. The third part will present the results. The final two parts will discuss them in relation to the aforementioned scholarly work and conclude the key findings of the paper.

2. Context: Multilingual Education in The Netherlands

Garconius (2014) gives an overview of the development of multilingual education in the Netherlands and bases it on works by *stichting Lize*² (1995) and Driessen (1990 & 1996). She provides a timeline for education in the student's mother tongue in The Netherlands, starting with OETC (Onderwijs in de Eigen Taal en Cultuur³) in the 1970s. The model emerged from Spanish and Italian immigrant parents' desire to preserve their children's connection to their cultural and linguistic background. From its conception, the implementation caused difficulties, such as finding apt teachers and educational material. Moreover, the societal shift towards a more personal view of culture caused the scrapping of the *C* of culture. Simultaneously, the model questioned in its entirety, because the acquisition of Dutch was prioritized, and uncertainties arose around the need for education in the students' mother tongues. In 1998, the approach was updated to OALT (Onderwijs in Allochtone Levende Talen⁴). However, the issues concerning implementation, external challenges, and the poor foundation of education in the mother tongue remained. Nortier (2009: 111 as cited in Garconius, 2014: 30) presented a view from within by relaying the regular teacher' view. They expected OET and OALT educators to solve all issues concerning newcomer students. However, communication was difficult, since their multiple workplaces prevented them from merging with the teaching staff. Finally, the OET and OALT students' home cultures were regarded as an obstacle to integration, resulting in pushback from the regular teachers. Education in the students' mother tongues was officially abolished in 2004.

A parallel development regarding newcomer education is the ISK class to support the children's adjustment to a new language and education system. Within the framework of the EDINA project, Le Pichon, Erning, and Baauw published a country report for the Netherlands about education in ISK classes, in 2016. ISK classes are transition classes for newly arrived migrant teenagers. (Le Pichon et al., 2016: 8) Generally, ISK classes are linked to regular secondary schools and the entry requirements are low Dutch language proficiency and recent relocation to the Netherlands (Le Pichon et. al., 2016: 13-14). Pupils attend these classes in their region, according to which student numbers range from 15 to 500 students per school. (Le Pichon et al., 2016: 14) On the whole, the authors affirm that education for newcomer students is rather decentralized, with the decision-making power lying with municipalities and school boards. The nature of this sector of Dutch education seems to reflect the dynamic

² *Stichting LIZE* was a foundation that researches relevant knowledge regarding European migrants in the Netherlands. (N.n, Stichting Lize LinkedIn, 2020)

³ "Education in the own language and culture" (translated by the author)

⁴ "Education in immigrants' living languages" (translated by the author)

characteristic of their student population. This in turn affects the requirements for the respective teachers, who ought to dispose of greater aptitude to teach (Le Pichon et. al., 2016: 5). Lastly, there are no guidelines for additional teacher training (Le Pichon et. al., 2016: 5), or a general policy for ISK, which makes it impossible to paint a uniform picture of national newcomer education (Le Pichon et. al., 2016: 10).

3. Academic discussion

The academic discussion presented in this chapter serves as a theoretical and conceptual basis for the role of students' home cultures in education, as well as the foundation of the questionnaire. For this purpose, it draws from scholarly work about *interculturality*, *case studies of minority students in educational systems*, *different models of language learning and teaching related to cultural elements*, *the traditional and innovative conceptions of the role of culture in language classes*, *factors of intercultural learning*, *the development of intercultural competences in the classroom*, and *practical approaches to teaching in diverse educational contexts*.

Concerning the conceptualization of *interculturality*, several scholars have impacted the academic discussion about encounters between individuals from different cultural backgrounds. Within the framework of education, Paulo Freire is one of the most influential scholars to have developed an ideologically founded model for didactics. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1993) is rooted in power dynamics and the intention to establish educational discourse that is based on equality between the powerful and the powerless. He departs from the idea that dialogue in education presupposes the presence of topics, problems, and challenges, as well as active individuals engaging in discourse and reflection (Reyes Muñoz, 2006: 47). Furthermore, central to his approach is that both student and teacher learn from one another. Thus, the student has agency in the content selection. Freire (1993: 159) further proposed the use of themes that unite the educator and student by seeking out challenges and images in the student's way of living.

Furthermore, Narcy-Combes (2018: 53) reflects upon elements that trigger *translanguaging*⁵ and proposes the term *transculturating*⁶ outside of the literary domain, as coined by Baena (2006). The scholar captures the complex and dynamic nature with the addition of the English grammatical form *-ing* (Narcy-Combes, 2018: 62). In principle, the diverse discursive exchange gives the individual participants the opportunity to talk about objects or constructs and reflect collectively. This leads to an action that holds contextually, socio-culturally, historically and personally marked characteristics. Thus, Narcy-Combes

⁵ The term describes instructional practices in which the students' second language is the school language, but their different home languages are welcome in the classroom and used as a bridge for learning the second language and other subjects (Kambel, Kester, Pichon-Vorstman & Schmeitz, 2018).

⁶ In "Transculturating Auto/biography", Baena (2006: 212) employs the term *transcultural* broadly for a "series of interrelated dynamics of the formal negotiation of cultural perspectives" within the framework of literary studies. To the scholar, the crucial element in her analysis is dynamism that is rooted in cross cultural engagement.

observes that *transculturing* takes place when the cultural meets the personal. In this understanding, the term is used in reference to complex life experiences that imply plurilingual realities. Thus, *transculturing* can take place in a monolingual discourse and reflect characteristics of plurality. (Narcy-Combes, 2018: 57-60)

Homi K. Bhabha (2004), a critical and postcolonial theorist and literary scholar also contributes to the theoretical discussion around the multi- or intercultural developments of our time. Key terms relevant for this research are *hybridity*, *cultural difference* and *the third space*. The development of new cultural forms in the contact of different cultures is *hybridity*. Furthermore, Bhabha coined *cultural difference* as the substitute term for *cultural diversity*, adding that it describes a process of identification that is discursively co-constructed. *Hybridity* takes place and *cultural difference* is developed in the *third space*, an ambiguous location where cultures and individuals interact.

Alongside the theoretical discussion, other scholars have studied the position and role of minority students in the educational context. Liddicoat (2011: 200) in his article on “Language-in-education policies as discourse of the intercultural” compares the policies of three countries on their conception of interculturality in educational policies and highlights the question of who is supposed to engage with whom. All countries in question—Italy, Colombia, and Japan—have a unidirectional perspective. Colombia defines *interculturality* as the accommodation to or understanding of the majority culture by its indigenous people (Liddicoat, 2011: 205). In the Italian policy documents, the immigrant student becomes an object of study rather than an agent (Liddicoat, 2011: 207). In the process of host-cultural accommodation, they provide a learning opportunity of intercultural education for domestic pupils (Liddicoat, 2011: 208). The unidirectionality is again echoed in the Japanese policies: Interculturality becomes a mechanism for others to engage with the self; a process that is not reciprocal. (Liddicoat, 2011: 215)

Moreover, others have focused their attention on migrant children’s needs in learning the host country’s language in relation to culture. Banki (2014) approaches the topic by looking at the potential for positive impact in general terms. By doing this, the scholar goes against the prior mainstream focus on difficulties and barriers. When the relational closeness to refugee students within the classroom is emphasised, multicultural education promotes acknowledgement and acceptance of diversity. Sengupta and Blessinger (2019: 7) in turn specifically highlights the growing need for an adequate education of refugee children, since learning the host country’s language is crucial in their integration process. They further state that these students need positive learning experiences in the form of teacher support for

language learning.

Regarding the role of *culture* in foreign language learning, many publications underscore the target culture and its role in foreign language acquisition. Byram and Grundy (2003: 1) affirm this by highlighting that, in this context, *culture* usually refers to the culture of the language being learnt. Bruela Fresno (2017: 19) also emphasizes the cultural component in language teaching, since language and culture are closely connected. The scholar defines clear objectives for foreign culture learning, such as the awareness that one's own culture is not universal and of cultural representations as well as being conscious of different perspectives on the foreign culture and establishing bridges between one's own culture and the foreign one in the act of comparison (Bruela Fresno, 2017: 23-24). Franco-Gaméz and González-Cantalapiedra (2015:15), however, point out the importance of cultural and historic identity expression for migrant students in FLL. They define orality as an immediate means of representing and transmitting cultural and historic heritage. Furthermore, they identify culture as being of integral value in the foreign language curriculum due to the importance of context, and authentic cultural and linguistic stimuli. (Franco-Gaméz & González-Cantalapiedra, 2015: 20-21)

The diversification of educational environments has led to scholars dedicating more attention to the research of foreign language teaching and learning and its relation to culture. However, this has mostly been done in order to investigate how effective innovative models of foreign language teaching and learning are, such as CLIL⁷, CBLI⁸, and LIP⁹. Genzuk (2011) developed the SDAIE model (Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English for minority students). This approach requires the educators to have cultural awareness (Genzuk, 2011: 3) since its focus is on the integration of the student's home culture into the content serving as the basis for language learning (García & Calderón, 2017: 10). The underlying idea of SDAIE is that language is learned most efficiently when the input is the focus; the scholar thus defines the best language lessons to be interesting conversations, engaging activities, books and films (Genzuk 2011: 7). Thus, "language is viewed as the vehicle for content instruction and content instruction as the vehicle for language instruction" (Genzuk, 2011: 9). In addition, SDAIE in practice builds on strategies like cooperative learning and meaningful and relevant input (Genzuk, 2011: 13), as well as the students' prior knowledge. Most importantly, this model incorporates the students' home languages and cultures into the classes as part of the subject (Genzuk, 2011: 17). By integrating multicultural elements—such

⁷ Content- and Language Integrated Learning (Marsh, 1994)

⁸ Content-Based Language Instruction (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989)

⁹ Language Immersion Programmes

as pictures, poems, dances or games—the students’ attention to lessons is increased and the status of the minority group is elevated (2011: 16&20).

Communicative language teaching and learning in culturally diverse classrooms is a model that puts meaningful communication at the centre of language learning and theorises that the collaborative creation of meaningful interaction aids in it. (Richards, 2006: 3-4) Crucial for this approach is content, which is personalised by the students, and that connects to the students’ lives and interests. In its implementation, the language learning tasks elicit a need for communication to solve them collaboratively. (Richards, 2006: 23) The tasks might be role-plays, group-work activities and project work (Richards, 2006: 4). Finally, the model is based on key factors such as: authenticity of activities, learner autonomy, the social nature of learning, and the role of teachers as co-learners (Richards, 2006: 20-26).

A different approach to multilingual education in schools is the model of Effective Practices for English Language Learners (ELL). Rivera et al. (2010) provide an overview of different practical ways to teach ELLs. Firstly, there is a dichotomy between monolingual or “English only” and bilingual education, which transpire in varying degrees of language use and intentions. (Rivera et al., 2010: 1) The scholars consider evidence-based instructional practices such as interactive and collaborative learning environments and student engagement by means of culturally appropriate lessons and materials that resonate with the students to be very successful. (Rivera et al, 2010: 5) The article also introduces specific models such as the *newcomer programme* by Short and Boyson (2004), which echoes the structure and nature of ISK classes. It provides intense and specialized instruction in an environment in proximity to regular schooling institutions, for limited time with regard to linguistic, social and cultural integration into American society (Rivera et al., 2010: 5). Furthermore, it offers individualized instruction aiming at meaningful connections between the school and students’ lives and cultures. (Rivera et al., 2010: 6) Li (2012-3) also researches principles of effective English language pedagogy, of which one is especially relevant for this paper: *offering explicit and culturally relevant instruction*. The scholar considers taking students cultures into account and foregrounding related elements effective in language learning (Li, 2012-3: 3). On the basis of prior findings by Rivera et al. (2010) and Short and Fitzsimmons (2007), she iterates that teachers should aim to activate their students’ cultural background knowledge (Li, 2012-3: 8). Furthermore, she echoes the results by the Alliance for Excellent Education (2005) and Melther and Hamann (2004) that students are more motivated and tend to learn more when they connect learning input to their real lives and cultural backgrounds (Li, 2012-3: 8).

Similarly, Mannion (2017) compiled and analyzes the most frequently used successful teaching strategies and methods in Somerville, Massachusetts, United States. Teachers of English language learners listed, among others, “plan with colleagues and being intentional”, “use students’ prior knowledge and background information” (Mannion, 2017: 146) as well as “incorporate everyday-life concepts (i.e. economics, employment, consumer habits, of various ethnic groups, “use project based and cooperative learning models to help ELLs learn content” (Mannion, 2017: 147) and “use songs, poetry, tongue twisters” (Mannion, 2017: 148). Furthermore, the scholar’s main findings were “[t]he need to take into consideration students and families’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds [and t]he need to build meaningful bridges between the home and school cultures.” (Mannion, 2017: 8) Another model the author refers to is Exemplary Learning Environments by Berman et al. (1995) which builds on cooperative learning embracing the students’ cultural backgrounds and experiences (Rivera et al., 2010: 7). Furthermore, they present instructional strategies that have shown to be successful such as small-group instruction and cooperative teaching and learning (Rivera et al., 2010: 16). However, they also highlight challenges, such as motivation, funding, administration and policy, cultural diversity, resources, language barriers and students’ background knowledge and skills (Rivera et al., 2010: 18). Other demanding factors are language differences and teacher mindset and capacity (Rivera et al., 2010: 22).

Other aspects investigated by different studies are aspects of interculturality in education, such as non-verbal communication, the notion of reflexivity, and the concept of context. Firstly, non-verbal signs are the subject of analysis of Cabañas Martínez (2005). The scholar advocates these culturally conditioned communicative devices to be part of the language learning process. However, she cautions educators to create awareness around non-verbal communication and its additional idiosyncratic nature and emphasises the importance of teaching cultural variations when it comes to non-verbal signs (Cabañas Martínez, 2005: 227-232). Secondly, Frame (2014) emphasises the importance of reflexivity in intercultural education, which takes place in and impacts on interpersonal communication. The term refers to the capacity of people to reflect on what is said and done. The process is especially present in multicultural encounters and should play a role in diverse educational contexts (Frame, 2014: 83-84). Thirdly, Najar (2016: 155) elaborates on the concept of *context* and criticises the common understanding as too broad and obscure, and therefore proposes the term *intercultural field*. She presents different views of the notion affirming that intercultural learning goes beyond the curriculum’s use of the everyday material world (Najar, 2016: 149). She bases her theoretical exploration on Van Lier’s (1997) ecological perspective on context,

which identifies the learning environment to be a complex adaptive system in which the individual learns from the interplay between accessible environments and meaningful activities (Van Lier, 1997: 783; as cited in Najar, 2016: 154).

Furthermore, the Arabski and Wojtaszek (2011) identifies the socio-cultural context of language learning to be of interest in SLA (Second Language Acquisition) research. The connection of culture and language in the field gives way to the development of *intercultural competences* (ICC¹⁰), a new concept in the face of multicultural learning settings. The concept of ICC has also been related to TESOL teacher intercultural identity and not only to students (Yang, 2018). Their identity is co-constructed in the contact with different cultural stakeholder groups, such as students. Thereby, intercultural communication and adaptation between the two parties in the classroom play a crucial role in the improvement of teaching and learning outcomes. Yang (2018: 531-534) introduced three constructive strategies in order for teachers to develop their intercultural identity: learning an additional language, undertaking cultural immersion and promoting multicultural education in- and outside of classroom settings. Dervin, (2016: 82), in his work on interculturality in education proposes a *realistic (liquid) approach* to intercultural competence. He sets his elaboration apart from traditional conceptions of how intercultural competences are developed. He criticises the tool of *othering* in educational discourse, since it is ideologically driven. *Othering* emerges when educators highlighted cultural differences rather than similarities, set artificial boundaries and compare the inferior unknown other to the self. (Dervin, 2016: 49) Dervin's *realistic (liquid) approach* defines the phenomenon of intercultural competences as comprised of "contradictions, instabilities, and discontinuities" in relation to which "fixed terms of attachment for thought and existence" should be avoided (Dervin, 2016: 82). Lastly, he centres his model for developing IC¹¹ in the dialogue between individuals (Dervin, 2016: 83).

With regard to practical approaches to language teaching in diverse educational contexts, García Sanz (2019) conducted research on the teacher education and training and its effects on the subject of Spanish as a second language (ESL). For this purpose, she developed a questionnaire to explore teachers' methods and activities. The questions relevant to the scholar's research are: "What goals do you have in your language classes for immigrant students? What content do you cover in class? What pedagogical methodologies to you

¹⁰ Arabski and Wojtaszek (2011) employ the initialism ICC for *intercultural competence*. Here it is important to note that there is no scholarly consensus on the initialism for the term.

¹¹ Dervin (2016) uses the initialism IC. Due to the lack of consensus on the initialism for *intercultural competence*, Dervin (2016) differs in his terminology from the aforementioned Arabski and Wojtaszek (2011).

employ? What activities do you implement most frequently? What types of learning environments do you create for the activities? What didactic material do you make use of? Is it specifically designed for learners from a migration background?” “How do you cover diversity and multiculturalism in the classroom?”. (García Sanz, 2019: 74-75, translated by the author) The scholar found that 78% affirm that the course materials they use are specifically designed for immigrant students. Additionally, the most popular classroom activities are dialogues, role-plays, oral questions and answers, games, descriptions of images and audiovisual material. The scholar also inquired about extracurricular activities and found that 89% of her sample conducted excursions with their students (2019: 39). Furthermore, 26% compare and contrast the Spanish culture with the students' home cultures; however, in many cases students initiate this activity. Lastly, 29% of her sample implement student narration of experiences, saying that by creating space for the students' individual stories, they feel valued and motivated, which leads to better language acquisition and integration. (García Sanz, 2019: 43-45). This is also echoed by Cummins (2001), who affirms that using home languages and cultures in class allows the pupils to feel valued and accepted. If they fail to create an instructional climate where the child's linguistic and cultural identity is validated, it leads to the rejection of the child as a whole (Cummins, 2001: n.p.).

Moreover, Ziebka (2011) researched the pragmatic aspects of culture in FLL and found that authentic cultural materials and textbooks are frequently used to teach about language. Equally focusing on refugee students, Milk (1994: 105) found that cooperative learning and two-way interaction in the culturally diverse classroom help foster a fertile environment for successful learning. Lastly, Leufkens (2018: 18) shed light on the practicality and the respective issues of teaching in relation to knowledge. The scholar states that teachers do not have time to prepare adequately for every linguistic and potentially cultural element of their newcomer students.

4. Research questions and hypotheses

4.1. Research questions

1. To what extent do ISK-teachers incorporate their students' home cultures into ISK classes?
 - 1.1. What methods do they use?
 - 1.2. What are the obstacles they encounter with incorporating elements of their students' home cultures into their ISK-classes?
 - 1.3. What benefits do teachers see with incorporating elements of their students' home cultures into their ISK-classes?

4.2. Research hypotheses

It is hypothesised that

- (1) All teachers incorporate their students' home cultures into their ISK classes.
- (2) There is a significant positive correlation between teachers' experience abroad and a positive attitude towards the implementation of home cultures.
- (3) There is a significant negative correlation between age and a positive attitude towards the implementation of home cultures.
- (4) There is a significant positive correlation between home culture-related teacher training and a positive attitude towards the implementation of home cultures.
- (5) There is significant positive correlation between ISK teaching tenure and a positive attitude towards the implementation of home cultures.

5. Methodology

5.1. Instruments

For the purpose of this report, a quantitative method in the form of a questionnaire was selected, which provides the research with numerical data (Dörnyei, 2016, 30-34). Firstly, the research questions were analysed to develop the independent variables (the teachers) and dependent variables (use of *transculturing*, methods, and attitudes by the teachers). The questions were first developed in English and then translated into Dutch for the participants' convenience. The questions relevant to this research were predominantly of closed nature, with the option of adding further comments to some items and two open-ended questions. The questionnaire was comprised of four parts. The first block of questions was about the participants' demographic information such as age, spoken languages, experience abroad, teaching experience, class size, students' cultural and linguistic background. The second part was dedicated to the research of another student of the MA Intercultural Communication, Laura Peters, who investigated the use of *translanguaging* in ISK classes. The third part was made up of two questions by a researcher of Utrecht University, Sterre Leufkens, who developed a tool for multilingual classrooms. Both the second and the third part were excluded from this study. The fourth block was comprised of the questions on the basis of which the present research was conducted. The items cluster according to the following dimensions: *I Transculturing*, *II Method Content*, *III Method Approach*, *IV Obstacles*, and *V Benefits*.

All questions are based on peer-reviewed literature. The questions pertaining to *Methods Content* and *Methods Approach* were extracted from García Sanz (2019), Genzük (2011), Milk (1994), Richards (2006), and Ziebka (2011). The dimension *Transculturing* was based on works by Bruela Fresno (2017), Cabañas Martínez (2005), Dervin (2016), Frame (2014), Franco-Gámez & González-Cantalapiedra (2017), García Sanz (2019), and Najjar (2016). The item about *Benefits* is comprised of results and analyses by Arabski & Wojtaszek (2011), Banki (2014), Dervin (2016), Freire (1993), García Sanz (2019), Genzük (2011), Najjar (2016), Richards (2006), and Yang (2018); while the items inquiring about *Obstacles* were extracted from Cummins (2001), Franco-Gámez & González-Cantalapiedra (2017), Leufkens (2018), Van Vijfeijken & Van Schilt-Mol (2012). All questions used a 5-point Likert scale with response options on two paradigms, frequency and agreement. The frequency ranged from *nooit* 'never' to *heel vaak* 'very frequently'. The positive extreme on the scale was adapted from *always* to *very frequently* upon the discussion that *always* might not occur with regards to use of cultural elements and activities in the classroom. The Likert

scale of agreement ranged from *helemaal mee oneens* ‘strongly disagree’ to *helemaal mee eens* ‘strongly agree’. All items that offered a range of methods, as well as benefits and obstacles to choose from offered an open-ended option beginning with *Anders, namelijk*, ‘Other, that is’. Moreover, positively as well as negatively worded items were included in the survey to avoid respondents only marking one side of the rating scale (Dörnyei, 2016: 109). The negatively worded questions were questions *1 Benefits of Dutch culture*, *6 Lack of importance*, and *16 Obstacles*. All other questions were positively worded.

Satiation control (Dörnyei, 2016: 104) was aimed for by multiple questions addressing each dimensions. The number of questions targeting one content area ranged from two to six. Furthermore, multi-item scale items ensured satiation control, with respondents answering to 5-point Likert scales with multiple options pertaining to one item.

Reliability was calculated using the internal consistency coefficient, Cronbach’s alpha. The scores for all dimensions were sufficient, with scores above $\alpha=.77$. The reliability of the dimension *Transculturing*, consisting of all questions, was high, measuring at $\alpha=.9$. The reliability of the dimension *Method: Content*, which comprised three questions, was high: $\alpha=.86$, as well as the reliability for the dimension *Method: Approach*, consisting of seven questions, $\alpha=.82$. The reliability for the dimension *Benefits*, including two questions, measured high with $\alpha=.8$. Lastly, the reliability for the dimension *Obstacles*, which consisted of three questions, was sufficient at $\alpha=.77$. Considering all Cronbach’s alpha scores, it can be confirmed that there is internal consistency among the dimensions.

Table 1 Cronbach’s alpha

	Transculturing	Method	Obstacles	Benefits	
Cronbach’s α	0.9	Content 0.86	Approach 0.82	0.77	0.8

5.2. Respondents

Table 2 Overview of the distribution of survey respondents (total number of participants, grade level, age range, mean age, standard deviation and mother tongues)

Participants	<i>n</i>	Age R	Age <i>M</i>	Age <i>SD</i>
ISK Teachers	33	21 - 64	42;8	13;22

The participants of the survey were recruited through a convenience sample via contact persons at Dutch high schools teaching ISK classes as well as via contact persons of the

EDINA project. The sample size of this study was 35, 2 of which were eliminated due to their incompleteness of the survey. The 33 remaining respondents were an average age of 42.8 years with a range of 21-64 ($M= 42.8$; $SD=13.22$). In response to the question if they had lived abroad for more than six months, eight respondents (24.2%) indicated “yes”, of which six (75%) had lived in Latin America, three (37.5%) each in Northern or Western Europe and Southern Europe, two (25%) in Eastern Europe and one each in Oceania and the Middle East.

Concerning teaching tenure, 63% stated that they had more than 10 years of teaching experience in general, and 18% had less than 5 years. 51% said that they had less than 5 years of ISK teaching experience; 25% stated they had more than 5 years, and 24% had more than 10. To the question concerning specific training geared towards cultural diversity in the classroom, 20 (60.6%) replied with “yes”; 12 of which specified further. The most common answers were NT2¹² trainings (4 respondents). Others named culture specific trainings, and training providers, such as EDINA. Four participants said they had received training on multiple occasions, but failed to specify them. Finally, further demographic questions about teachers’ mother tongue(s), languages they have good command over, class composition, class size, students’ proficiency levels, student age range, and students’ cultural backgrounds will not be discussed due to minimal relevancy to this specific study.

5.3. Procedure

In order to inquire about the role of students’ home cultures in classes, an online version of the survey was used. The questions were first developed in English and merged with the respective parts of the other Intercultural Communication master’s student, who translated the questions into Dutch, and the Utrecht University professor to create the survey in *Qualtrics*. The questionnaire was then submitted to the Ethical Committee of Utrecht University to seek approval, with the objective of publishing the results in a peer-reviewed journal. After receiving approval, an email with the link to the survey was sent out to the contact people of the EDINA project and other schools offering transition classes. The average response time was 34.6 minutes ($M=34.6$; $SD=49.7$) and the response range was 12.98 – 243.3 minutes.

Table 3 Overview of the distribution of the survey (total number of participants, time range, mean and standard deviation)

Participants	<i>n</i>	Range (in mins)	<i>M</i> (in mins)	<i>SD</i> (in mins)
ISK Teachers	33	12;98 – 253;3	34;6	49;7

¹² *Nederlands als Tweede Taal* ‘Dutch as a second language’

5.4. Scoring

In order to score the questions and calculate the results questions *1 Benefits of Dutch culture*, question *6 Lack of importance*, and question *16 Obstacles* were corrected, since they were the only questions worded negatively. The respective scores were turned from positive to negative, according to 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1. The survey items were collapsed into dimensions and used to calculate the Cronbach's Alpha scores as well as mean and standard deviation scores. Additionally, the mean and standard deviation scores were calculated for all closed questions independently of the dimensions. On the basis of these scores, the items with the highest and lowest means were selected to be correlated with the independent variables *teachers' age*, *job tenure*, *ISK teacher tenure*, *experience abroad* and *specific teacher training*. For the correlations, the *p*-value and the *r*-value were calculated. The data from the open-ended questions was analysed qualitatively and separately.

6. Results

6.1. Closed-ended items

The results calculated for the different dimensions are displayed below. All mean scores are above $M=3.0$. This translates into a relatively neutral mean response on the agreement scale and a moderate frequency of use, with the mean score being just above “sometimes”. All standard deviations cluster around $SD=1.0$, which indicates a deviation of around one scoring point on the 5-point Likert scales in all dimensions.

I Transculturating: Dimension I, *Transculturating*, was tested with questions pertaining to frequency of use of home cultures and attitude towards the concept of *transculturating*. The respective mean score is 3.199 and the standard deviation is .99. The numbers show and overall moderately frequent use and neutral agreement in favour of the implementation of home cultures in ISK classes across all questions. The mean and standard deviation scores for question 2 were $M=3.48$ and $SD=.80$, indicating that home cultures play a role in the teachers’ classes between “sometimes“ and “frequently“.

II Method Content: Dimension II, was comprised of three questions with a frequency of use scale format. Question 4 was about the materials the teachers use to prepare classes, question 8 about the activities the teachers use in class to teach cultural aspects, and question 9 asked about home-cultural elements that the teachers use in class. The dimension *Method Content* shows the second highest mean score ($M=3.213$) and the highest standard deviation ($SD=1.05$). Firstly, mean scores for the individual items of question 4 were low (Course material $M=2.06$ $SD=.86$, Authentic material $M=2.30$ $SD=.92$, Textbooks $M=1.94$ $SD=.96$). The standard deviation for all was between .85 and .96. Secondly, the means for question 8, inquiring about different activities—such as role-plays, presentations, pair/small group-work, opinion-sharing, information gathering, project work—ranged from $M=1.94$ for role-plays to $M=3.06$ for pair work or small group work. This indicates a frequency of use between “very rarely” and “sometimes” for all closed items. The standard deviations for all activities were considerably high with scores between $SD=.93$ and $SD=1.10$. The open-ended question-item asked about possible other activities the teachers implement to teach cultural aspects. Three respondents stated discussions and debates; and one respondent each named *vlogs*¹³, excursions, music, art, and a „food club“ four times a year where students bring food from their own country. One teacher said that his or her students’ command of Dutch was not

¹³ Vlogs (video logs) are YouTube videos about a person’s everyday life.

sufficient and that culture was dealt with in-between other topics. Another stated that the exchange about culture comes more naturally in other classes.

With regard to question 9 inquiring about home-cultural elements used by teachers in class, mean scores ranged from $M=2.87$ for *Nonverbal communication and body language* and *Music and dance*, to $M=3.48$ for *Festivities*. The former two showed least frequent use, with the mean score calculated to be between “rarely” and “sometimes”. Their respective standard deviation scores were the highest in the list, $SD=.82$. *Festivities* and *Food* obtained the highest mean scores with $M=3.48$ and $M=3.42$ respectively. Their standard deviation scores are $SD=.67$ and $SD=.79$. The other cultural elements, *Traditions* ($M=3.24$, $SD=.61$), had the lowest standard deviation suggesting a more homogenous response from respondents, and *Geography* ($M=3.15$, $SD=.71$). The open-ended question item dealt with other aspects of the students’ home cultures that are incorporated into the lessons. Three respondents listed *school and education systems*, two stated *(visual) arts*, and another two named *habits*. Other responses that occurred once were *clothes, manners, norms and values* and *greetings*.

III Method Approach: Dimension III, *Method Approach*, was made up of six questions aimed at the pedagogical and ideological approaches that teachers take on a frequency scales. Question 3 geared towards the learning settings for cultural activities. Question 7 asked about whether and how cultures are compared and contrasted. Question 10 asked about who initiates conversation about home cultures in class. Question 11 asked about the extent to which home cultures are incorporated into the lessons. Question 12 and 13 were linked to investigate the extent to and the way in which reflection is implemented after intercultural activities. The mean and standard deviation of dimension III, *Method Approach*, were $M=3.16$, which is the lowest, and $SD=1.01$. Regarding question 3, *learning settings*, *Individual* ($M=3$, $SD=.71$) had the lowest mean score and *Small groups* ($M=3.57$, $SD=.79$) the highest. *Pairs* ($M=3.51$, $SD=.62$) and *Plenary sessions* ($M=3.39$, $SD=.66$) showed similar mean scores and indicated the highest degree of homogeneity within the sample. Regarding question 7, *comparison*, all mean scores lie between $M=3.03$ and $M=3.39$, indicating a moderately frequent use of all. The standard deviation scores of all five items were also close, between $SD=.61$ and $SD=.68$. The scores of the individual items are as follows: *Comparison* $M=3.24$ and $SD=.61$, *Comparison to Dutch culture* $M=3.39$ and $SD=.66$, *Compare home cultures among each other* $M=3.15$ and $SD=.66$, *Similarities* $M=3.03$ and $SD=.68$, *Differences* $M=3.15$ and $SD=.66$.

Regarding question 10, *who initiates?*, both means and standard deviations for the teacher and students asking about other cultures were $M=3.48$ and $SD=.83$. Students sharing

about their own culture obtained a mean of $M=3$ and a standard deviation of $SD=.56$. Mean scores showed more variance with the question about the extent of incorporation of home-cultural elements, question 11. The mean score for *Whole lesson* was the lowest with $M=2.12$ and $SD=.74$. The mean score for *Part of the lesson* was also considerably low with $M=2.63$ and $SD=.65$. However, *Incorporating into activities* obtained a higher mean with $M=3.54$ and $SD=.75$ indicating a more frequent use. With regard to questions 12 and 13 about reflection, respondents indicated that they use reflection sometimes after intercultural activities, $M=3.21$ and $SD=.93$. Concerning specific reflection strategies the mean score for small groups is rather low, $M=2.91$, and the standard deviation score is considerably high $SD=.93$. *Plenary sessions* obtained a mean score of $M=3.06$ and a standard deviation score of $SD=.76$, indicating a moderately frequent use. In response to the option “Other“, two stated they did feedback sessions in the form of “tips and tops“. Another two respondents said their students reflect individually on the input in class and on other students’ work. One participant each brought up emails that the students could send as reflection, written work, daily information sharing, and the teacher him- or herself sharing findings he or she overheard.

IV Obstacles: Dimension IV was comprised of three questions measuring the perception of obstacles on an agreement scale. Questions 6, 14 and 16 required responses on the Likert scale of agreement. Question 6 explored the attitudes of teachers with respect to the lack of importance of using home-cultural elements in class and the reasons why, question 14 was about their degree of satisfaction with the implementation of home-cultures, and question 16 about the obstacles that may impede their incorporation in lessons. Dimension IV, *Obstacles*, shows a mean of $M=3.09$ and a standard deviation of $SD=1.002$. This dimension shows the lowest standard deviation score. Question 6, about the lack of importance of using home-cultural elements, was comprised of three items, *it is not part of the curriculum* ($M=4.0$, $SD=1.09$), *I don’t see the benefits* ($M=4.21$, $SD=.65$), and *it obstructs integration into Dutch culture* ($M=4.24$, $SD=.75$). The means and standard deviations indicate that the participants disagree with all statements and therefore do not perceive them as hindrances. It is worth mentioning that the standard deviation of the first item is rather high, above $SD=1.0$. The mean and standard deviation of question 14, pertaining to the teachers’ satisfaction with the use of home cultures in class, were $M=3.09$ and $SD=.76$. With question 16, the teachers were asked about possible obstacles the experience when dealing with home cultures, such as lack of knowledge, uncertainties in how to approach it, lack of time, lack of support from their colleagues and lack of support from their schools. The lowest means and highest standard deviations were observed with the items *Lack of knowledge*, $M=2.90$ and $SD=1.01$, and *Lack*

of time $M= 2.87$ and $SD=.93$. Respondents felt neutral about uncertainties in how to approach the topic, $M=3.21$ and $SD=.93$. The highest mean was calculated for both items pertaining to support, $M=3.87$ and $SD=.82$.

V Benefits: Concerning *Benefits*, dimension V, was comprised of the attitudinal questions 1 and 5. Question 1 investigated the teachers' agreement to their perception that students learn the most when only Dutch culture is taught. Question 5 asked about their agreement that home cultural input is important because of various reasons. The calculated mean score for the dimension is the highest of all dimensions with $M=3.43$, $SD=.96$. This indicated that, on average, the respondents chose "neutral" leaning towards "agree" on the Likert scale for the specific benefits they experience. Question 1 about the benefits they perceive with only teaching Dutch culture showed a mean of $M= 3.73$ and a standard deviation of $SD=.80$. However, the standard deviation score is rather high. The mean and standard deviation scores for closed items regarding the importance of integrating home cultures into lessons were $M=3.81$ $SD=.53$ for general benefits, $M=3.63$ $SD=.69$ for *positive effects on their language proficiency in Dutch*, $M=3.39$ $SD=.49$ for *intercultural sensitivity*, $M=4$ $SD=.5$, for *students showing more interest*, $M=4.06$, $SD=.49$ for *students being more motivated*, $M=4.14$, $SD=.51$ for *students feeling valued*, $M=3.60$, $SD=.66$ for *it aids in the students' integration*, and $M=4.09$, $SD=.58$ for *the teacher him/herself can learn from the students*. It is also worth mentioning that the standard deviation for all items is moderately low.

Table 4 **Descriptive statistics: Dimensions**
(score range, mean score, and standard deviation scores observed in the statistical analysis of the five dimensions)

Dimensions	M	SD
I Transculturing	3.199	.99
II Method Content	3.213	1.05
III Method Approach	3.16	1.01
IV Obstacles	3.09	1.002
V Benefits	3.43	.96

Note: The individual questions were clustered into five dimensions. *Transculturing* was made up of all closed questions with special consideration of question 2; *Method Content* was comprised of questions 4, 8 and 9. Dimension *Method Approach* was gained by clustering questions 3, 7, 10, 11, 12, and 13. *Obstacles* emerged out of questions 6, 14, and 16 and *V Benefits* was comprised of questions 1 and 5.

Table 5 **Descriptive statistics: Individual items**
(score range, mean score, standard deviation score)

Questions		Range	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1.	Dutch culture in ISK classes	2-5	3.73	.80
2.	Role of home cultures	3-5	3.48	.56
3.	Learning settings	3.1. Individual	2-4	3
	for cultural tasks	3.2. Groups of two	2-5	3.51
		3.3. Small groups	1-5	3.57
		3.4. Plenary sessions	2-4	3.39
4.	Materials used	4.1. Course material	1-4	2.06
	for cultural tasks	4.2. Authentic material	1-4	2.30
		4.3. Textbooks	1-4	1.94
5.	Importance	5.1. I see the benefits	3-5	3.81
		5.2. Positive effect	1-5	3.64
		5.3. Intercultural awareness	3-5	3.94
		5.4. More interest	3-5	4
		5.5. More motivation	3-5	4.06
		5.6. Feel valued	3-5	4.15
		5.7. Aids integration	2-5	3.61
		5.8. Teacher can learn	3-5	4.09
6.	Lack of	6.1. Not part of curriculum	1-5	4
	importance	6.2. I don't see the benefits	3-5	4.21
		6.3. Obstructs integration	3-5	4.24
7.	Comparison	7.1. I compare cultures	2-4	3.24
		7.2. Comparison with Dutch culture	2-5	3.39
		7.3. Compare home cultures	2-5	3.15
		7.4. Similarities	2-5	3.03
		7.5. Differences	2-4	3.15
8.	Activities to	8.1. Role-plays	1-4	1.94
	cultural aspects	8.2. Presentations	1-5	3.03
		8.3. Pairs/Small groups	1-5	3.06
		8.4. Opinion-sharing	1-5	2.97
		8.5. Information gathering	1-4	2.81
		8.6. Projects	1-4	2.42
		8.7. Other	1-5	2.21
9.	Cultural elements	9.1. Traditions	2-4	3.24
	used in class	9.2. Festivities	2-5	3.48
		9.3. Geography	2-4	3.15
		9.4. Music and dance	1-5	2.87
		9.5. Food	1-5	3.42
		9.6. Nonverbal comm./body language	1-4	2.87
		9.7. Other	1-4	2.21
10.	Who initiates?	10.1. Teacher	1-4	3
		10.2. Students about own cultures	2-4	3.48
		10.3. Students ask about other cultures	2-5	3
11.	Implementation	11.1. Whole lessons	1-3	2.12
		11.2. Part of lessons	1-4	2.63
		11.3. Incorporate into activities	2-5	3.54

12. Reflection		1-5	3.21	.93
13. Reflection strategies	13.1. Small groups questions	1-4	2.91	.98
	13.2. Plenary sessions	1-5	3.06	.76
	13.3. Other	1-5	2.18	1.15
14. Satisfaction		2-5	3.09	.76
16. Obstacles	16.1. Lack of knowledge	1-5	2.90	1.01
	16.2. Unsure how to approach	1-5	3.21	.93
	16.3. Lack of time	1-5	2.87	.92
	16.4. Lack of support from colleagues	1-5	3.87	.82
	16.5. Lack of support from schools	1-5	3.87	.82

6.2. Open-ended items

The two open-ended questions, question 15 and 17, explored the reasons why teachers are (dis)satisfied with the role that home cultures play in their classes, and what they would need to incorporate the home cultures of students more into their classes. On the one hand, in response to question 15, 9 participants mentioned that they were dissatisfied because the home cultures could play a bigger role in the lessons. Two mentioned that there is always room for improvement. Another two teachers claimed to be dissatisfied because they would wish for a more conscious implementation of the topic. Moreover, two respondents voiced lack of cultural knowledge. Other respondents mentioned that they were dissatisfied because the home cultures do not play a big role, even if they are present in class; because the implementation could be more structured; because the teacher does not have enough material; and because too little attention is paid to this within the school. On the other hand, many were satisfied with the role that home cultures play in their class. Two teachers noticed that their students learn a lot from each other, have more understanding as well as respect for each other. One stated that he or she is satisfied because the students become more aware of cultural norms and differences, while another said it leaves room for discussion and the students feel free to talk about it. One teacher affirmed that he or she notices that the students enjoy talking about their cultural differences and similarities. Three participants mentioned that they were satisfied with the extent to which they integrated the home cultures. One teacher affirmed that he or she is satisfied because he or she uses it to teach the Dutch language, while another mentioned that the *Zebra method*¹⁴ and the *Welkom method*¹⁵ work really well.

Responses for question 17 answered the query of what the teachers would need to incorporate the students' home cultures more into their classes. The most frequent responses (9 respondents) were "more knowledge about different cultures", including one requiring it

¹⁴ *Zebra* is a course material used in NT2 education.

¹⁵ *Welkom in Nederland*, course material used in NT2 education.

for the Eritrean culture specifically. Five respondents said they required more material, while four teachers wished for more time, since the primary focus was currently the Dutch language. Other remarks were the need for more ideas, model classes, and a manual with an overview of cultures and differences per country, mentioned by each two respondents. Other needs that were mentioned once were further training, more guidance and advice, more information and peer consultation¹⁶. One participant required “the conviction that allocating of home cultures a bigger role in the lessons has a positive impact on the students’ learning curve”¹⁷. Lastly, four respondents seemed satisfied with the work they perform. One said that he or she thinks enough attention is paid to the classroom; another mentioned that the *Zebra method* works well. Two teachers specified how they approach the topic: one by Internet research and the other by letting the students present their country of origin.

6.3. Correlations

A correlation coefficient analysis was conducted for the most prominent items of the dimensions IV Obstacles and V Benefits, in order to test the study’s hypotheses:

- (1) *All teachers incorporate their students’ home cultures into their ISK classes.*
- (2) *There is a significant positive correlation between teachers’ experience abroad and a positive attitude towards the implementation of home cultures.*
- (3) *There is a significant negative correlation between age and a positive attitude towards the implementation of home cultures.*
- (4) *There is a significant positive correlation between home culture-related teacher training and a positive attitude towards the implementation of home cultures.*
- (5) *There is significant positive correlation between ISK teaching tenure and a positive attitude towards the implementation of home cultures.*

The statistical analysis was only applied to questions pertaining to attitudes; since they yielded the highest mean scores and therefore the most promising results in correlation with the teacher’s demographic data. Moderate evidence was found between the teachers’ ISK teaching tenure and their perception of the benefits with regards to the students’ increase in motivation through the use of elements of their home cultures in class, as well as a weak relationship revealing a negative correlation between the two variables, $p=.0075$ and $r=-.314$. Moderately weak evidence was found for the correlation between the teachers’ not seeing the benefits of incorporating elements of their students’ home cultures and their having lived

¹⁶ “Collegiaal overleg” (Translated by the author)

¹⁷ “De overtuiging dat een grotere rol in de lessituatie een positieve impuls geeft voor de leercurve van de leerlingen.” (Translated by the author)

abroad, as well as a weak relationship between the two variables, $p=.037$ and $r=.365$. Furthermore, moderately weak evidence was found for the correlation of teachers' experience abroad and the use of home cultures obstructing the students' integration into Dutch culture, as well as a weak relationship between the two variables, $p=.026$ and $r=.388$. Regarding the correlation of the variables of teachers' home culture-related training and the implementation not being important because it is not part of the curriculum, very weak evidence was found as well as a weak relationship, $p=.051$ and $r=.343$. Lastly, the two variables teachers' home culture-related training and lack of knowledge indicated weak evidence for correlation and a weak relationship, $p=.044$ and $r=.353$. The rest of the correlations observed showed no evidence and no relationship between the remaining variables.

Table 6 Inferential statistics: Correlation coefficient

Correlation coefficient (r) and significance value (p) for the attitudinal items with the highest mean scores and the scores of the teachers' demographic data, age, teaching tenure, ISK teaching tenure, experience abroad and home culture related teacher training.

Questions	Age	ISK	Abroad	Training
5.4. Importance <i>More interest</i>	$p=.158$ $r=.252$	$p=1$ $r=0$	$p=.105$ $r=-0.287$	$p=1$ $r=0$
5.5. Importance <i>More motivation</i>	$p=.8$ $r=.046$	$p=.0075$ $r=-.314$	$p=.68$ $r=-.075$	$p=.422$ $r=.144$
5.6. Importance <i>Feel valued</i>	$p=.643$ $r=-.084$	$p=.1$ $r=-.291$	$p=.868$ $r=-.03$	$p=.197$ $r=.23$
5.7. Importance <i>Teacher can learn</i>	$p=.561$ $r=-.105$	$p=.165$ $r=-.247$	$p=.852$ $r=-.034$	$p=.871$ $r=-.029$
6.1. Lack of importance <i>Not part of curriculum</i>	$p=.188$ $r=.253$	$p=.538$ $r=.111$	$p=.061$ $r=-.0329$	$p=.050$ $r=-.343$
6.2. Lack of importance: <i>I don't see the benefits</i>	$p=.735$ $r=.061$	$p=.611$ $r=.092$	$p=.037$ $r=-.365$	$p=.987$ $r=.003$
6.3. Lack of importance <i>Obstructs integration</i>	$p=.651$ $r=.082$	$p=.756$ $r=.056$	$p=.026$ $r=-.388$	$p=.781$ $r=.05$
16.1. Obstacles <i>Lack of knowledge</i>	$p=.866$ $r=.031$	$p=.432$ $r=.142$	$p=.137$ $r=-.265$	$p=.044$ $r=-.353$
16.3. Obstacles <i>No time</i>	$p=.786$ $r=-.049$	$p=.503$ $r=-.121$	$p=.678$ $r=-.075$	$p=.911$ $r=-.02$
16.4. Obstacles <i>Lack of support from colleagues</i>	$p=.781$ $r=.05$	$p=.581$ $r=-.1$	$p=.322$ $r=.178$	$p=.33$ $r=-.175$
16.5. Obstacles <i>Lack of support from school</i>	$p=.781$ $r=.05$	$p=.581$ $r=-.1$	$p=.322$ $r=.178$	$p=.33$ $r=-.175$

7. Discussion

7.1. Research questions

This study answered the following research question: *To what extent do ISK-teachers incorporate their students' home cultures into their ISK classes?* The mean score obtained for all questions measuring the use of *transculturing* in ISK classes suggests a moderately frequent use and a neutral attitude towards the concept. The individual consideration of question 2 inquiring about the frequency of the incorporation of home-cultural elements in the teachers' classes yielded a higher average of *considerably frequent*. These results confirm hypothesis 1 that all teachers incorporate their students' home cultures into their ISK classes, which opens up discussion about a possible paradigm shift away from Byram and Grundy's (2003) assumption that culture in foreign language learning usually refers to the culture of the language being learnt. It furthermore illustrates that the ISK classroom functions as a *third space*, a term conceived by Bhabha (2004), in which *hybridity* (or diversity) and *cultural difference* (or cultural diversity) are foregrounded and developed.

Based on the results of this study, the respondents use a variety of methods for incorporating their students' home cultures into the classes. In order to answer sub-question 1.1. *What methods do they use?* the relevant questions were clustered into two dimensions, *II Method Content* and *III Method Approach*. First, the mean and standard deviation score for the second dimension indicate that, on average, the respondents use the suggested content-related methods moderately frequently, but with a considerable degree of variation in the sample. Regarding the sources teachers use for pedagogical material, all means are low, which translates into rare use of course material, authentic material and textbooks for home culture-related content. This finding does not support Richards' (2006) and Ziebka's (2011) findings that authentic cultural materials and textbooks are frequently used and beneficial materials in language teaching and learning. Furthermore, the findings do not confirm the results by García Sanz (2019), who found a majority of his sample teaching by means of course materials. The means for the different home culture-related activities are equally low. The very rare use of role-play found in this study contradicts findings by García Sanz (2019) and suggestions by Richards (2006) for communicative language teaching and learning in culturally diverse classrooms. Furthermore, this conclusion also applies to the rare use of information gathering, opinion sharing, and projects. The findings do not concord with the literature of Franco Gámez and González-Cantalapiedra (2017), García Sanz (2019), Mannion (2017), and Richards (2006), who list these activities for diverse classrooms. This discrepancy

might be due to factors such as diverging teaching cultures, since the Dutch approach is compared to findings in the United States and Spain.

Additionally, the findings pertaining to specific cultural elements indicated moderately frequent use for all items—*Traditions, Festivities, Geography, Music and dance, Food, and Non-verbal communication and body language*. The highest means were obtained from *Festivities* and *Food*. The findings concerning festivities is in partial accordance with Genzük (2011), who proposes the element's benefits in language learning, and García Sanz (2019), who observed its implementation. The item *Food* seems to have produced a novel result, since it is not specifically mentioned in the reviewed literature.

Concerning the results of the open-ended component of questions 8 and 9, about other cultural elements, such as discussion and debates, music, (visual) arts, vlogs, concurred with Genzük's (2011) mentioning of cooperative learning and multicultural elements as well as with García Sanz' (2019) findings of popular activities pertaining to oral interaction and audiovisual components. Franco Gámez and González-Cantalapiedra (2017) conclusions about orality and the importance of expressing cultural identity could also be confirmed. The finding of one respondent organising excursions confirms García Sanz (2019), who concluded the same about a large majority of her sample. A striking finding was a respondent explaining the activity of a "food club", in which students bring their home culture's food to class and share it with their peers. In relation to the item *Food*, this seems to be a novel concept since the finding could not be supported by academic literature reviewed in this research paper. Other cultural elements that surfaced in response to question 9, such as *different educational systems, habits, manners, norms and values, greetings and clothing* concurred with Mannion's (2017) findings about the incorporation of everyday-life concepts, Richards (2006) advocacy of incorporating elements geared towards the students' lives, García Sanz (2019) conclusion about the use of comparison between host and home culture, Franco Gámez and González-Cantalapiedra (2017) findings about the importance of the representation of cultural heritage, and Cabañas Martínez (2005) work about non-verbal communication and body language. Concerning challenges, Mannion's (2017) finding about language barriers was confirmed by one respondent mentioning minimal use of home cultures because of her students' insufficient language command.

Second, the score results for dimension III, *Method Approach*, indicate a moderately frequent average use of all items listed in the survey. Regarding learning settings, question 3, the results for all items lie between moderately frequent use and considerably frequent use, which supports the results and suggestions by García Sanz (2019), Milk (1994), and Rivera et.

al. (2010) regarding cooperative learning environments. The mean scores for the question geared towards the comparison of cultures in class, indicate a moderately frequent use of all items, *comparison of cultures in general*, *comparison with the Dutch culture*, *comparison between home cultures*, *focus on similarities*, and *focus on differences*. The results conform to the findings by Bruela Fresno (2017), García Sanz (2019). Bruela Fresno (2017), Freire (1993), and Mannion (2017) see value in the comparison of cultures; because it creates bridges between cultures, while García Sanz (2019) observe a frequent use of comparison among her sample. Dervin (2016) opposes “differentialist bias” in the classroom, a notion that cannot be supported nor objected to by the findings of this study. The results for the question of who initiates the use of home cultures in class show a moderately frequent use of $M=3$ for the teacher initiating and students asking about other students’ home cultures. These findings concur with the literature by Franco Gámez and González-Cantalapiedra (2017), Freire (1993), and García Sanz (2019), who respectively observe and advocate for equality among teachers and students, and students sharing their culture. Students sharing about their own culture showed a moderately frequent use leaning towards frequent. This result confirms the findings of García Sanz (2019) that students predominantly initiate comparisons between home culture and host culture. The results of question 11, dealing with the nature of home culture integration into the classes, support the SDAIE model by Genzuk (2011), in which multicultural elements are the vehicle for language learning and vice versa. The incorporation of home culture-related elements into regular activities suggests moderately frequent to frequent respective use. Lastly questions 12 and 13, inquiring about reflection strategies after cultural activities partially confirmed literature by Frame (2014), Freire (1993), and Narcy-Combes (2018), who see (collective) reflection as an important part of intercultural encounters. The mean scores for reflection activities in general and plenary reflection sessions indicate a moderately frequent use.

The open-ended component of question 13 sheds light on others reflection practices the teachers use. The most common answer is “tips and tops” as well as individual reflection. The latter result does not support Frame’s (2014) and Narcy-Combes’ (2018) arguments that reflection (collectively) takes place in multicultural encounters, however it partially confirms the scholars’ argument in favour of reflection in diverse educational contexts.

The results for dimension IV, *Obstacles*, provide a response for subquestion 1.2. *What are the obstacles they encounter with incorporating elements from their students’ home cultures into their ISK-classes?* The results indicate a neutral response. However, the biggest obstacles are *lack of knowledge* and *lack of time*. These findings concur with Leufkens (2018),

who voices the issue of lack of time for culturally adequate class preparation. They also partially confirm Rivera (2010), who acknowledges teacher mindset and capacity as challenges for teaching in culturally diverse contexts. However, lack of knowledge might be a novel findings, since, as such, it is not covered in the academic discussion presented in this study.

Lastly, results provide a response to question 1.3. *What benefits do teachers see with incorporating elements from their students' home cultures into their ISK-classes?* Findings confirm an overall positive attitude towards the benefits of the use of home cultures in ISK. This indicates bidirectionality of interculturality, according to Liddicoat (2011), in which newcomer students as well as teachers can learn from each other and experience personal perks in integration. Respondents tend to disagree with question 1 inquiring about their impression that students learn the most when the focus is on Dutch culture. This confirms findings by Genzük (2011), García Sanz (2019), Milk (1994), and Li (2012), who see learning benefits with intercultural encounters. Furthermore, the individual items of the question regarding benefits, *positive effects on progress in Dutch*, partially confirm García Sanz (2019), Li (2012), and Yang (2018) who agree that students acquire a language more effectively when the learning input is connected to their lives and cultural background. Results pertaining to *Intercultural awareness* also concur with findings by Arabski and Wojtaszek (2011), Bruela Fresno (2017), and Dervin (2016), who affirm that students become culturally aware by interacting in diverse classrooms. This can manifest in the consciousness that one's own culture is not universal, the awareness of different perspectives (Bruela Fresno, 2017), and intercultural competences developing by connecting language and culture (Arabski & Wojtaszek, 2011). It also underpins Najar's (2016) finding that context and meaningful activities are part of the intercultural experience. Moreover, the result of item *Aids integration* partially confirms findings by Banki (2014), who perceives relational closeness to have a positive impact on acceptance of diversity in multicultural education, and Yang (2018), who emphasises the importance of intercultural communication and adaptation between students. With regards to the item *Increase in interest*, this study's results support Richards' (2006) statement that language learning should be centred in meaningful communicative tasks related to the students' lives and interests. Moreover, the finding concurs with Genzük (2011), who theorise that the use of multicultural elements increases students' attention. Additionally, findings by García Sanz (2019) about the students feeling more motivated when there is space for their personal interests are confirmed by the high mean obtained from the item *Increase in motivation*. The high mean of item *Students feel*

valued also support research by Banki (2014), Cummins (2001) and García Sanz (2019) who affirmed that the incorporation of students' home cultures in class makes them feel accepted and valued. Lastly, the findings of *Teacher can learn from students*, confirm Paulo Freire's (1993) approach to education, in which discourse is based on equality, where both teacher and student learn from each other. It also supports Liddicoat's (2011) work about the importance of bidirectionality in integration.

7.2. Open-ended questions

The results from the open-ended questions partially confirm the academic literature presented. Firstly, respondents are split between being satisfied and dissatisfied with the use of home culture in their classes. The most frequent responses with regards to dissatisfaction are related to the wish to incorporate cultural elements more frequently and to grant home cultures a bigger role. This finding may be rooted in the respondents seeing the value and benefit of the incorporation of home cultures into class as illustrated by Freire (1993), García Sanz (2019), Genzük (2011), Milk (1994), Li (2012), with regards to learning benefits, Sengupta and Blessinger (2019) in relation to positive learning experience for migrant children, Arabski & Wojtaszek (2011) and Bruela Fresno (2017) about intercultural awareness; and Banki (2014), Cummins (2001), García Sanz (2019), Richards (2006), and Yang (2018), concerning acceptance of diversity and adaptation between individuals. Other respondents wish for a more conscious implementation, which concurs with Mannion's (2017) finding about teachers' intentionality as a successful teaching strategy. The finding of respondents naming lack of knowledge and material as a reason for their dissatisfaction indicates importance of training and adequate material, as affirmed by García Sanz (2019). Furthermore, findings by Van Vijfeijken and Van Schilt-Mol (2012) about practical factors that affect language instruction concur with the finding of this study that too little attention is paid to home cultures within the school, as mentioned by one respondent. Secondly, many respondents are satisfied with the use of home cultures in their classes, with particular mention of *students learning from each other and gaining more understanding and respect for each other, students' increase in cultural awareness, room for discussion and students' ability to talk freely, and students enjoyment of talking about cultural similarities and differences*. These results confirm findings by Banki (2014), Bruela Fresno (2017), Franco Gámez and González-Cantalapiedra (2017), García Sanz (2019), Genzük (2011), Mannion (2017), Li (2012), and Richards (2006) with regards to interpersonal benefits in educational settings.

Lastly, results obtained from question 17, geared towards teachers' needs, partially confirm Mannion's (2017) conclusions about the importance of successful teaching practices

and García Sanz (2019) findings about teacher training being valuable. The most frequent responses that concur with the scholar's results are *need for more material, training and guidance, more knowledge and information*. Other frequent requirements are more time, which confirm Leufkens' (2018) identification of lack of time being a challenge to teachers. One also mentions peer consultation, which supports Mannion's (2017) listing of *planning with colleagues* as a successful teaching practice. Lastly, the finding of a respondent stating that he or she is satisfied with letting students present about their country of origin, confirms the effectiveness of students sharing about their own culture as advocated for by Franco Gámez and González-Cantalapiedra (2017).

7.3. Correlations

The results obtained from the correlation coefficient analyses overall do not confirm hypotheses (2) to (5). Firstly, hypothesis (2) *There is a significant positive correlation between teachers' experience abroad and a positive attitude towards the implementation of home cultures*. can not be confirmed, since there are no significant positive correlations. There is a significant yet weak negative correlation with the dependent variable *I don't see the benefits*, suggesting a weak inverse relationship, i.e. teachers who have lived abroad have a less favourable attitude and do not see the benefits. The same applies for the dependent variable *Obstructs integration*. Secondly, no correlation was found between age and the dependent variables tested; therefore, hypothesis (3) that there is a significant negative correlation between age and a positive attitude towards the implementation of home cultures cannot be confirmed. Thirdly, results obtained from the correlation coefficient analyses can not confirm hypothesis (4) *There is a significant positive correlation between home culture-related teacher training and a positive attitude towards the implementation of home cultures*. Results indicate a significant yet weak negative relationship between the independent variable *teacher training* and the item *Not part of curriculum* as well as between *teacher training* and *Lack of knowledge*. This suggests that there is weak evidence for the teachers who have received home culture-related teacher training tend to perceive the topics absence in the curriculum and lack of knowledge as obstacles. Lastly, hypothesis (5) could not be confirmed either, since the correlation coefficient analysis reveals weak evidence for a weak negative relationship between ISK teaching tenure and a positive attitude towards the implementation of home cultures into classes. Therefore, results suggest that more experienced ISK teachers do not perceive their students to be more motivated due to the incorporation of home-cultural elements.

8. Conclusion

This research was designed to answer the following research question: *To what extent do ISK-teachers incorporate their students' home cultures into their ISK classes?* The results confirm hypothesis (1) that ISK teachers use home-cultural elements in their classes. In order to inquire further into the topic, four more dimensions were developed with regards to specific aspects of the concept, such as *II Method Content*, *III Method Approach*, *IV Obstacles*, and *V Benefits*. Firstly, the sample makes use of home culture-related content to varying extent, with *Festivities* and *Food* revealing to be the most frequently covered. *Food*, as well as the mentioned of the “food club” transpired to be novel findings in this research. Furthermore, it could be concluded that the focus was on cooperative learning and multicultural elements. Secondly, with regard to the approach the teachers use, many different strategies and methods in order to create cooperative learning environments and establish comparison. Findings also revealed that students mostly initiate home culture-related activities and those are predominantly incorporated into regular teaching tasks. Reflection was implemented in the form of plenary sessions, such as “tips and tops” or individual exercises. Thirdly, the main obstacles perceived by the ISK teachers were lack of knowledge and lack of time. Lastly, the dimension *Benefits* offered valuable insight into the participants disposing of an overall favourable attitude towards *transculturing*. This was apparent with items pertaining to *language learning benefits*, *intercultural awareness*, *student interest* and *student motivation*, *students feeling valued*, as well as the *teacher's possibility to learn from the students*.

The results obtained from the correlation coefficient analyses did not provide significant strong correlations between the tested variables; therefore, the four hypotheses posed could not be confirmed. However, the data suggests significant weak negative correlations between *teachers' abroad experience* and the perception of benefits, as well as of the obstruction to integration; between the variables *teacher training* and the obstacles *lack of knowledge* and *not part of the curriculum*; and between *ISK teaching tenure* and a positive attitude towards the implementation of home cultures in class. No correlation was found in relation to *age*.

The open-ended questions offered insight into the (dis)satisfaction of teachers with their current use of home cultures, as well as their needs for more respective incorporation. Firstly, the teachers were split in relation to satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The participants who voiced dissatisfaction said they wished to incorporate *transculturing* more into their classes. Moreover, *lack of time* presented itself as an obstacle and in fact a novel result. The respondents who mentioned satisfaction in relation to the benefits they perceived such as

language learning related and (inter)-personal development related aspects. Secondly, the sample overall stated the need for more home-culture related teacher training and information available to them.

In conclusion, the corroboration of the key findings suggest that the moderately frequent use of *transculturing* may be rooted in a rather positive attitude towards the use of home cultures, and in the teachers' need for more training, information and guidance.

8.1. Limitations

The limitations of this research concern multiple aspects. Firstly, there is a lack of a qualitative component, such as interviews, which would have added more detailed and personal accounts to the study (Dörnyei, 2016, 39-40). Furthermore, although the number is sufficient to conduct statistical testing, the sample size is rather small. Generalisability would be improved by more participants. In addition, the survey lacked a pilot-testing phase, which would have ensured even more consistency among the items and even more apt items. All limitations are rooted in the lack of time to conduct the research. Firstly, the intended timeframe was ten weeks. Secondly, the approval of the Ethical Committee underwent a delay; and thirdly, the global pandemic of Covid-19 resulted in a slower recruitment of participants; therefore, the aforementioned challenges were inevitable.

8.2. Suggestions

Considering the results of this study, future research could test the weak correlation of variables to potentially confirm or reject the hypotheses formulated for the purpose of this study. Additionally, future research could give more insight into the specific dimensions with regard to the use of home cultures in diverse classrooms. Moreover, a more holistic perspective of the concept could be conceived of by investigating the students' perspectives towards it, as well as by incorporating classroom observation as a methodological component in order to obtain a different and immediate vantage point regarding *transculturing*. Lastly, the questionnaire used in this study could be translated into English and consequently implemented to research the topic internationally.

9. Bibliography

- Arabski, J., & Wojtaszek, A. (2011). *Aspects of culture in second language acquisition and foreign language learning* (Second language learning and teaching). Berlin: Springer.
- Baena, R. (2006). "Transculturating auto/biography". *Prose Studies*, 27(3), pp. 211-216.
- Banki, S. (2014) "Refugees as educators: The potential for positive impact on educational systems." in McCarthy F.E., Vickers M.H. (Eds.) *Refugee and Immigrant Students: Achieving Equity in Education*. Information Age Publishing, pp. 70-91.
- Bhabha, H. (2004). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Brinton, D. M., Snow, M. A., & Wesche, M. B. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction*. New York: Newbury House.
- Bruela Fresno, I., (2017) *El componente cultural en la enseñanza/aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras*. Master's Thesis. University of Valladolid.
- Byram, P. M., & Grundy, D. P. (Eds.). (2003). "Introduction: Context and culture in language teaching and learning." *Languages for intercultural communication and education*, 6, 1-3
- Cabañas Martínez (2005) "Comunicación no verbal y enseñanza de español como segunda lengua y inmigrantes en contextos escolares." In *Interlingüística*. pp. 225-236.
- Cummins, J. (2001). *Bilingual children's mother tongue: Why is it important for education*. *Sprogforum*, 7(15), pp. 15-20.
- Dervin, F. (2016). *Interculturality in education : A theoretical and methodological toolbox* (Palgrave pivot). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2016) *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. New York: Oxford UP.
- Frame (2014). "Reflexivity and Self-Presentation in Multicultural Encounters: Making Sense of Self and Other." In Clark, J. S. B., & Dervin, F. (Eds.). (2014). *Reflexivity in language and intercultural education : Rethinking multilingualism and interculturality*.
- Franco-Gaméz L. & González-Cantalapiedra Z., (2017). El discurso del inmigrante: Una mirada a la identidad histórico- cultural y al aprendizaje del inglés como segunda lengua. *Edusol*, 15(53), pp. 4-22.
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- García, G. & Calderón, Q., (2017). *Interculturalidad en el aula: El enfoque SDAIE*. University of Valladolid (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).
- García Sanz (2019) La enseñanza del español como L2 a inmigrantes en centros de formación de personas adultas de la provincia de Valencia. Evolución y realidad de un modelo educativo e integrador. Masters Thesis. University of Alicante.

- Garconius, D. (2014). *Onderwijs in de eigen taal: voorbeelden van de huidige invulling van moedertaalonderwijs in Nederland*. Masterscriptie: Universiteit Utrecht.
- Genzuk, M. (2011). "Specially designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE) for language minority students." *Center for Multilingual, Multicultural Research Digital Papers Series*. Center for Multilingual, Multicultural Research, University of Southern California.
- Kambel, E. R., Kester, P. M., Pichon-Vorstman, L., & Schmeitz, M. (2018). *Omgaan met diversiteit en meertaligheid in het basisonderwijs: Expertisebevordering van de lerarenopleiding*.
- Leufkens, S., Smit, J., & Mol, M. (2018). Taalverschillen in de klas: Hoe besteed je als leraar aandacht aan de moedertaal van leerlingen in de klas?. *Tijdschrift Taal*, 9(13), pp. 18-21.
- Li, J. (2012). *Principles of Effective English Language Learner Pedagogy*. Research in Review 2012-3. *College Board*.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2011) "Language-in-Education Policies as Discourse of the Intercultural" in Dervin, F., Gajardo, A., & Lavanchy, A. (Eds.). *Politics of interculturality*. Cambridge Scholar.
- Mannion, A. R. (2017). *Towards understanding the nature of English language learners and the experiences of their educators*. Doctoral dissertation, Northeastern University.
- Milk, R. D. (1994). "Responding Successfully to Cultural Diversity in Our Schools: The Teacher Connection." in DeVillar, R. A., Faltis, C. J., & Cummins, J. P. (Eds.). *Cultural diversity in schools : From rhetoric to practice*. State University of New York, pp. 101-115.
- Najar, U. (2016). The 'intercultural field': Interrogating context in intercultural education. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 16(2), pp. 148-163.
- Narcy-Combes J.-P., (2018) "Le transculturing: un construit pour découvrir les ressorts du translanguaging." In: *Language Education and Multilingualism (LEM)* 1, pp. 52-65.
- N.n. (2020, April 28) *EDINA*. *EDucation of International Newly Arrived migrant pupils*. <http://edinaplatform.eu>
- N.n. (2020, April 28) *ICWN website*. *International Welcome Center North*. "ISK - International Transition Class." <https://iwcen.nl/newcomers/settling-in/education/international-schools-2/>
- N.n (2020, April 28) *Stichting Lize*. <https://www.linkedin.com/company/lize/about/>
- Reyes Muñoz, E. (2006) *Inmigración y lenguaje. Para una Didáctica de la hospitalidad. Estrategias de enseñanza y aprendizaje utilizadas por una inmigrante marroquí*.

- Doctoral Thesis. Autonomous University of Barcelona.
- Richards, Jack (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. USA: Cambridge University Press. pp. 14–21.
- Rivera, M. O., Francis, D. J., Fernandez, M., Moughamian, A. C., Jergensen, J., & Lesaux, N. K. (2010). *Effective Practices for English Language Learners: Principals from Five States Speak*. Center on Instruction.
- Sengupta, E. & Blessinger, P. (2019), "Introduction to Language, Teaching, and Pedagogy for Refugee Education", in *Language, Teaching, and Pedagogy for Refugee Education (Innovations in Higher Education Teaching and Learning, Vol. 15)*, Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 3-15.
- Van Vijfeijken, M.M., & Van Schilt-Mol, T. (2012). *Nieuwkomers in het basisonderwijs: Onderzoek naar benodigde competenties van leerkrachten, intern begeleiders en schoolleiders die werken met nieuwkomers. Kortlopend Onderwijsonderzoek (KLOO)*, IVA: Tilburg.
- Yang P. (2018) "Developing TESOL teacher intercultural identity: An intercultural communication competence approach." *TESOL Journal*, pp. 525-541.
- Ziebka J. (2011). "Pragmatic Aspects of Culture in Foreign Language Learning." in J. Arabski and A. Wojtaszek (eds.), *Aspects of Culture in Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Learning*, Second Language Learning and Teaching, pp. 263-272.

10. Appendix

Appendix I: Survey

Thuis taal en thuiscultuur in ISK-klassen

Beste deelnemer,

Hartelijk dank voor uw deelname aan ons onderzoek naar de thuishalen en thuisculturen van leerlingen in ISK-klassen.

Dit onderzoek wordt uitgevoerd namens de Universiteit Utrecht, in samenwerking met het Edina project. We hopen met dit onderzoek praktische tips en aanbevelingen te verzamelen voor het positief inzetten van thuishalen en thuisculturen in ISK-klassen, zodat leerkrachten van elkaars ervaring kunnen leren.

Duur van de vragenlijst: ongeveer 20 minuten

In dit onderzoek wordt gevraagd naar uw persoonlijke mening en ervaring. Er zijn daarom geen goede en foute antwoorden op de onderstaande vragen. Deelname aan dit onderzoek is vrijwillig. Uw antwoorden worden vertrouwelijk en anoniem behandeld. De data wordt alleen gedeeld met de coördinatoren van het Edina project, en voor tien jaar bewaard op een beveiligde server van de Universiteit Utrecht. De resultaten die dit onderzoek voortbrengt worden verwerkt in de masterscripties van onderstaande studenten. De uitkomsten hiervan zullen enkel worden gebruikt voor wetenschappelijke doeleinden, en om aanbevelingen voor docenten, beleidsmakers en onderzoekers op te stellen. De Facultaire Ethische ToetsingsCommissie van de faculteit Geesteswetenschappen heeft toestemming gegeven om dit onderzoek uit te voeren.

Als u vragen of klachten heeft kunt u deze voor, tijdens of na het onderzoek stellen door te mailen of bellen naar:

Katharina Koidl: k.koidl@students.uu.nl / +436504810949

Laura Peters: l.l.peters@students.uu.nl / +611055753

Ook de begeleider die vanuit de Universiteit Utrecht is gekoppeld aan dit onderzoek, blijft tijdens en na het onderzoek benaderbaar. Dit is: Segio Baauw, s.baauw@uu.nl

Bedankt voor u deelname!

Katharina Koidl en Laura Peters

- Ik ben goed geïnformeerd over dit onderzoek en geef toestemming voor het gebruik van mijn antwoorden voor wetenschappelijk onderzoek**

Het eerste deel van de vragenlijst gaat over de kenmerken van u en uw leerlingen.

1. Hoe oud bent u?

2. Wat is/zijn uw moedertaal/moedertalen? (meerdere antwoorden mogelijk)

Nederlands (1)

Anders, namelijk... (2) _____

3. Welke talen beheerst u voldoende om te gebruiken bij het lesgeven? (meerdere antwoorden mogelijk)

Nederlands (1)

Engels (2)

Frans (3)

Berbers (4)

Arabisch (5)

Farsi (6)

Turks (7)

Spaans (8)

Duits (9)

Anders, namelijk... (10) _____

4. Hoe lang werkt u al als docent (lesgeven in het regulier onderwijs ook meegerekend)?

Minder dan 2 jaar (1)

2 - 5 jaar (2)

5 - 10 jaar (3)

Meer dan 10 jaar (4)

5. Hoe lang geeft u al les aan nieuwkomers?

- Minder dan 2 jaar (1)
- 2 - 5 jaar (2)
- 5 - 10 jaar (3)
- Meer dan 10 jaar (4)

6. Hoe zijn de klassen op uw school samengesteld? (meerdere antwoorden mogelijk)

- Op basis van leeftijd (1)
- Op basis van Nederlandse taalvaardigheid (2)
- Op basis van schoolniveau (VMBO, HAVO, VWO) (3)
- Anders, namelijk (4) _____

7. Wat zijn de culturele achtergronden van de leerlingen in uw klas(sen)? (meerdere antwoorden mogelijk)

- Noord-/West-Europa (1)
- Zuid-Europa (2)
- Oost-Europa (3)
- Australië (4)
- Midden-Oosten / Arabische landen (5)
- Azië (6)
- Noord-Afrika (7)
- Afrika ten zuiden van de Sahara (8)
- Noord Amerika (9)
- Latijns Amerika (10)

8. Hoe veel leerlingen heeft u (gemiddeld) per klas?

- Minder dan 5 (1)
- 6 - 10 (2)
- 11 - 15 (3)
- 16 - 20 (4)
- Meer dan 20 (5)

9. Wat is het niveau waarop uw leerlingen het Nederlands beheersen? (meerdere antwoorden mogelijk)

- Alfa A (nog niet (geheel) gealfabetiseerd in het Latijnse alfabet, eerste niveau) (1)
- Alfa B (nog niet (geheel) gealfabetiseerd in het Latijnse alfabet, tweede niveau) (2)
- Alfa C (nog niet (geheel) gealfabetiseerd in het Latijnse alfabet, derde niveau) (3)
- A1 (basisgebruiker, eerste niveau) (4)
- A2 (basisgebruiker, tweede niveau) (5)
- B1 (onafhankelijke gebruiker, eerste niveau) (6)
- B2 (onafhankelijke gebruiker, tweede niveau) (7)

10. Wat zijn de leeftijden van uw leerlingen?

11. Heeft u ooit langer dan 6 maanden buiten Nederland gewoond voor uw werk of opleiding?

- Ja (1)
- Nee (2)

Display This Question: If 11. Heeft u ooit langer dan 6 maanden buiten Nederland gewoond voor uw werk of opleiding? = Ja

12. Waar heeft u gewoond? (meerdere antwoorden mogelijk)

- Noord-/West-Europa (1)
- Zuid-Europa (9)
- Oost-Europa (10)
- Australië (2)
- Midden-Oosten / Arabische landen (3)
- Azië (4)
- Noord Afrika (5)
- Afrika ten zuiden van de Sahara (6)
- Noord Amerika (7)
- Latijns Amerika (8)

13. Heeft u training of scholing gehad, gericht op de omgang met talige diversiteit in de klas?

- Ja, namelijk... (1) _____
- Nee (2)

14. Heeft u training of scholing gehad, gericht op de omgang met culturele diversiteit in de klas?

- Ja, namelijk... (1) _____
- Nee (2)

Dit was het eerste deel van de vragenlijst.

Het middelste deel van de vragenlijst gaat over de thuis taal/-talen van leerlingen, en hoe deze worden gebruikt om een brug te vormen naar het Nederlands of naar andere lesstof.

1. Ik heb het gevoel dat mijn leerlingen het meeste leren als er in de les alleen Nederlands wordt gebruikt.

- Helemaal mee oneens (1)
- Mee oneens (2)
- Neutraal (3)
- Mee eens (4)
- Helemaal mee eens (5)

2. Thuis talen spelen een rol in mijn les.

- Nooit (1)
- Niet vaak (2)
- Soms (3)
- Vaak (4)
- Heel vaak (5)

3. Gebruik van thuistaal ter ondersteuning

	Nooit (1)	Niet vaak (2)	Soms (3)	Vaak (4)	Heel vaak (5)
Ik laat leerlingen hun thuistaal gebruiken bij het individueel werken (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik laat leerlingen die dezelfde taal spreken met elkaar discussiëren in hun eigen taal of elkaar helpen met het maken van opdrachten in het Nederlands. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik maak gebruik van de thuistaal van leerlingen bij de klassikale uitleg (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. Wie initieert het gebruik van de thuistalen van leerlingen in mijn les?

	Nooit (1)	Niet vaak (2)	Soms (3)	Vaak (4)	Heel vaak (5)
Ik initieer het gebruik van de thuistalen van leerlingen in mijn les. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Leerlingen initiëren het gebruik van hun eigen thuistalen in mijn les. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Leerlingen initiëren het gebruik van elkaars thuistalen in mijn les. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. Ik vind het belangrijk om de thuistalen van mijn leerlingen te gebruiken in mijn lessen omdat

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Mee oneens (2)	Neutraal (3)	Mee eens (4)	Helemaal mee eens (5)
... ik de voordelen inzie van het gebruiken van de thuistalen van leerlingen. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... ik denk dat een positief effect heeft op hun vooruitgang in het Nederlands. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... ik denk dat een positief effect heeft op hun vooruitgang bij andere schoolvakken. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...ik denk dat het de interesse van leerlingen vergroot. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...ik denk dat het de motivatie van leerlingen vergroot. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...ik denk dat het ervoor zorgt dat leerlingen zich gewaardeerd voelen. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

...ik denk dat het de leerlingen helpt bij hun integratie. (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...ik hier zelf van leer. (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. Ik vind het NIET belangrijk om de thuistalen van mijn leerlingen te gebruiken in mijn lessen omdat

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Mee oneens (2)	Neutraal (3)	Mee eens (4)	Helemaal mee eens (5)
...dit geen onderdeel is van het lespakket. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...ik het voordeel hier niet van inzie. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...ik het gevoel heb dat dit het leren van het Nederlands in de weg staat. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. Meertalige materialen en activiteiten

	Nooit (1)	Niet vaak (2)	Soms (3)	Vaak (4)	Heel vaak (5)
In mijn klas zijn boeken of tijdschriften in de thuistalen van leerlingen aanwezig, waarover ik ze in het Nederlands laat vertellen. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik maak meertalige boeken met leerlingen. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik maak gebruik van een meertalige muur in de klas (afbeeldingen en sleutelwoorden uit de verschillende talen die in de klas aanwezig zijn). (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik laat leerlingen het internet gebruiken om dingen op te zoeken in of over hun eigen taal. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Andere materialen of activiteiten, namelijk (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Carry Forward All Answers - Displayed & Hidden from "7. Meertalige materialen en activiteiten"

8. Vergelijkingen tussen talen

	Nooit (1)	Niet vaak (2)	Soms (3)	Vaak (4)	Heel vaak (5)
Ik vergelijk elementen (woorden, grammatica, etc.) uit de thuistalen van leerlingen met elementen uit de Nederlandse taal (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik vergelijk elementen (woorden, grammatica, etc.) uit de verschillende thuistalen van leerlingen onderling met elkaar (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik wijs leerlingen op de overeenkomsten tussen talen (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik wijs leerlingen op de verschillen tussen talen (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. Ik maak op andere manieren gebruik van de thuistalen van leerlingen om een brug te vormen naar het Nederlands of naar andere lesstof.

- Ja, namelijk... (1) _____
- Nee (2)

10. Ik ben tevreden met de rol die de thuishalen van leerlingen spelen in mijn lessen.

- Helemaal mee oneens (1)
- Mee oneens (2)
- Neutraal (3)
- Mee eens (4)
- Helemaal mee eens (5)

11. Waarom bent u (on)tevreden met de rol die de thuishalen van leerlingen spelen in uw lessen?

12. Ik ervaar obstakels bij het gebruiken van de thuistalen van leerlingen in mijn lessen omdat

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Mee oneens (2)	Neutraal (3)	Mee eens (4)	Helemaal mee eens (5)
...ik niet weet hoe ik dit moet aanpakken. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...ik hier onvoldoende tijd voor heb. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...ik hierin niet wordt gesteund door mijn collega's. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...ik hierin niet wordt gesteund door de school/het schoolbestuur. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...ik zelf onvoldoende kennis heb van de thuistalen van de leerlingen (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. Wat zou u ervoor nodig hebben om de thuistalen van leerlingen meer in te zetten in uw lessen?

14. Heeft u behoefte aan meer kennis over de thuistalen van de leerlingen? Zo ja: wat voor kennis? Grammatica, uitspraak, woordenschat etc. of meer algemeen (waar wordt de taal gesproken, culturele aspecten, etc.)?

Ja, namelijk... (1) _____

Nee (2)

15. Er bestaan kant-en-klare lesactiviteiten om kinderen bewust te maken van meertaligheid en de verschillen/overeenkomsten tussen talen. Zou u dit soort lesactiviteiten gebruiken?

- Ja (1)
- Nee, omdat... (2) _____

Dit was het tweede deel van de vragenlijst. Het laatste deel gaat over het besteden van aandacht aan de thuiscultuur/-culturen van leerlingen.

1. Ik heb het gevoel dat mijn leerlingen het meeste leren wanneer ik mij in mijn lessen voornamelijk op de Nederlandse cultuur richt.

- Helemaal mee oneens (1)
- Mee oneens (2)
- Neutraal (3)
- Mee eens (4)
- Helemaal mee eens (5)

2. Thuisculturen spelen een rol in mijn les.

- Nooit (1)
- Niet vaak (2)
- Soms (3)
- Vaak (4)
- Heel vaak (5)

3. Welke werkvormen gebruikt u bij cultuur-gerelateerde activiteiten?

	Nooit (1)	Niet vaak (2)	Soms (3)	Vaak (4)	Heel vaak (5)
Ik laat leerlingen individueel werken. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik laat leerlingen in tweetallen werken. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik laat leerlingen in groepjes werken. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik werk klassikaal (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. Lesmaterialen over thuisculturen

	Nooit (1)	Niet vaak (2)	Soms (3)	Vaak (4)	Heel vaak (5)
Ik maak gebruik van lesmaterialen over thuisculturen van leerlingen. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik maak gebruik van authentiek materiaal (bijv. filmpjes, liedjes, teksten) om les te geven over de thuisculturen van leerlingen. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik maak gebruik van lesmateriaal (bijv. schoolboeken) om les te geven over de thuisculturen van leerlingen. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. Ik vind het belangrijk om de elementen van de thuisculturen van mijn leerlingen te gebruiken in mijn lessen omdat

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Mee oneens (2)	Neutraal (3)	Mee eens (4)	Helemaal mee eens (5)
... ik de voordelen inzie van het gebruiken van elementen van de	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

thuisculturen
van
leerlingen.
(1)

... ik denk dat
een positief
effect heeft
op hun
voortgang
in het
Nederlands.
(2)

... ik denk dat
de leerlingen
hierdoor meer
intercultureel
begrip en
bewustzijn
krijgen. (3)

... ik denk dat
het de
interesse van
leerlingen
vergroot. (4)

... ik denk dat
het de
motivatie van
leerlingen
vergroot. (5)

... ik denk dat
het ervoor
zorgt dat
leerlingen
zich
gewaardeerd
voelen. (6)

... ik denk dat
het de
leerlingen
helpt bij hun
integratie. (7)

... ik denk dat
het ervoor
zorgt ervoor
dat ik kan
leren van hun
ervaring en

culturele
achtergrond.
(8)

6. Ik vind het NIET belangrijk om elementen van de thuisculturen van mijn leerlingen te gebruiken in mijn lessen omdat

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Mee oneens (2)	Neutraal (3)	Mee eens (4)	Helemaal mee eens (5)
...dit geen onderdeel is van het lespakket. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...ik het voordeel hier niet van inzie. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...ik het gevoel heb dat dit de integratie in de Nederlandse cultuur in de weg staat. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. Vergelijkingen tussen culturen in mijn lessen

	Nooit (1)	Niet vaak (2)	Soms (3)	Vaak (4)	Heel vaak (5)
Ik maak vergelijkingen tussen culturen bij het lesgeven. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik vergelijk elementen uit de thuisculturen van leerlingen met elementen uit de Nederlandse cultuur. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik vergelijk elementen uit de verschillende thuisculturen van leerlingen onderling met elkaar. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik wijs leerlingen op de overeenkomsten tussen culturen. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik wijs leerlingen op de verschillen tussen culturen. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. Welke activiteiten gebruikt u voor het leren van culturele aspecten?

	Nooit (1)	Niet vaak (2)	Soms (3)	Vaak (4)	Heel vaak (5)
Ik werk met rollenspellen. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik werk met presentaties. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik laat leerlingen in tweetallen of kleine groepjes activiteiten doen om kennis over te brengen. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik laat leerlingen in tweetallen of kleine groepjes activiteiten doen om hun mening te delen. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik doe activiteiten om informatie te verzamelen. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik werk met projecten. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Andere activiteiten, namelijk... (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. Welke aspecten van de thuisculturen van leerlingen gebruikt u in de klas?

	Nooit (1)	Niet vaak (2)	Soms (3)	Vaak (4)	Heel vaak (5)
Tradities (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feesten (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Geografische informatie over landen (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Muziek en dans (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Eten (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lichaamstaal en non-verbale communicatie (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Andere aspecten, namelijk... (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10. Wie initieert het gebruik van de thuisculturen van leerlingen in mijn les?

	Nooit (1)	Niet vaak (2)	Soms (3)	Vaak (4)	Heel vaak (5)
Ik initieer activiteiten of onderwerpen met betrekking tot de thuiscultuur van leerlingen. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Leerlingen delen zelf dingen over hun eigen culturen. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Leerlingen delen zelf dingen over elkaars culturen. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

11. Hoe verwerkt u culturele elementen in uw lessen?

	Nooit (1)	Niet vaak (2)	Soms (3)	Vaak (4)	Heel vaak (5)
Ik wijt een hele les aan culturele activiteiten. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik wijt een deel van een les aan culturele activiteiten. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik verwerk ze in 'gewone' activiteiten of taken. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12. Na culturele activiteiten of taken neem ik de tijd om hierop te reflecteren met mijn leerlingen.

- Nooit (1)
- Niet vaak (2)
- Soms (3)
- Vaak (4)
- Heel vaak (5)

Display This Question: If 12. Na culturele activiteiten of taken neem ik de tijd om hierop te reflecteren met mijn leerlingen. != Nooit

13. Reflectie

	Nooit (1)	Niet vaak (2)	Soms (3)	Vaak (4)	Heel vaak (5)
Ik laat mijn leerlingen in tweetallen of kleine groepjes vragen bespreken. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik laat mijn leerlingen hun indruk van de les klassikaal delen. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Anders, namelijk... (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

14. Ik ben tevreden met de rol die de thuisculturen van leerlingen spelen in mijn lessen.

- Helemaal mee oneens (1)
- Mee oneens (2)
- Neutraal (3)
- Mee eens (4)
- Helemaal mee eens (5)

15. Waarom bent u (on)tevreden met de rol die de thuisculturen van leerlingen spelen in uw lessen?

16. Ik ervaar obstakels bij het gebruiken van de elementen van de thuisculturen van leerlingen in mijn lessen omdat

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Mee oneens (2)	Neutraal (3)	Mee eens (4)	Helemaal mee eens (5)
...ik niet/onvoldoende bekend ben met hun culturen. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...ik niet weet hoe ik dit moet aanpakken. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...ik hier onvoldoende tijd voor heb. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...ik hierin niet wordt gesteund door mijn collega's. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...ik hierin niet wordt gesteund door de school/het schoolbestuur. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

17. Wat zou u ervoor nodig hebben om de thuisculturen van leerlingen meer te gebruiken in uw lessen?

Hartelijk dank voor het invullen van onze vragenlijst! We hopen met dit onderzoek praktische tips en aanbevelingen te verzamelen voor het positief inzetten van thuistalen en thuisculturen in ISK-klassen, zodat leerkrachten van elkaars ervaring kunnen leren. Wilt u de resultaten van dit onderzoek ontvangen?

- Ja (1)
- Nee (2)

Display This Question:

If Hartelijk dank voor het invullen van onze vragenlijst! We hopen met dit onderzoek praktische t... = Ja

Via welk e-mailadres kunnen wij u deze toesturen?

Appendix II: Approval of FETC-GW



Faculty Ethics Assessment Committee Linguistics Chamber

Prof. Dr. H. Quené (c)
Dr. D. Capel (s)
Prof. Dr. H. van den Bergh
Dr. A. Pinget
Dr. M. Struiksma

Faculty of Humanities, Utrecht University,
Trans 10, 3512 JK Utrecht, The Netherlands

Registrar's office:
Desiree Capel
fetc-gw@uu.nl
+31 30 253 8472

To: Sergio Baauw

FETC reference number: baauw101-01-04-2020

20 March 2020

Dear colleague,

This is to let you know that the Faculty Ethics assessment Committee of the Faculty of Humanities (FETC-H) has reviewed your research proposal *Inzet van thuistalen in het onderwijs aan recente migrantenleerlingen*, as part of the project *EDINA GoPro*, and hereby formally approves the intended study.

Please note that the FETC-H should be notified immediately of any FETC-H relevant change in the intended procedures, and that substantial modifications will require a new review. Please use the above case number in all correspondence.

We wish you good luck with the research!

Sincerely,

H. Quené, chair