Constructing Students' Identities in a Multilingual Greek Classroom: A Discourse Analysis of Teaching Practices and the Use of Digital Tools

Anastasia Paspali

In-Text Citation: (Paspali, 2025).
To Cite this Article: Paspali, A. (2025). Constructing Students' Identities in a Multilingual Greek Classroom: A Discourse Analysis of Teaching Practices and the Use of Digital Tools. *Multilingual Academic Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, *13*(1), 16–33.

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://kwpublications.com/pages/detail/publication-ethics

Constructing Students' Identities in a Multilingual Greek Classroom: A Discourse Analysis of Teaching Practices and the Use of Digital Tools

Anastasia Paspali

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Faculty of Philosophy, School of Philology, Department of Linguistics

Abstract

This study investigates how a Greek language teacher in a culturally and linguistically diverse high school classroom constructs student identities, enacts authority, and manages multilingualism through everyday discourse. By employing classroom discourse analysis, the study analyzes and discusses four excerpts involving (non-)migrant students, the latter of whom have Greek as a second language. The analysis is based on two frameworks proposed by Koutsogiannis: the rhombus of language education (2012) and the three circles of ICT (Information and Communication Technology) use in education (2011). In this way, the present study explores the teacher's language ideologies, pedagogical practices, and the use of digital tools. The findings reveal that the teacher's discourse privileges fluent and highly proficient speakers of Greek, reinforcing normative literacies and monolingual participation structures and ideologies. Multilingualism appears informally, through student-initiated translation or peer validation, but does not fundamentally transform instruction. The use of ICT ranges from supportive to partially transformative, particularly in collaborative activities, enhancing critical digital literacy. Students are primarily positioned as academic writers and editors for the instruction of Greek only, although moments of collaborative authorship and digital inquiry suggest the potential for more inclusive practices, identities, and multilingual constructions. The present study highlights the need for greater pedagogical recognition of students' linguistic resources and a shift toward more inclusive, dialogic, and critically oriented language teaching practices in Greek public schools.

Keywords: Student Identities, Multilingual Education, Classroom Discourse Analysis, Digital Literacies

Introduction

Over the last two decades, Greek public education has undergone significant sociolinguistic changes, particularly in urban areas where classrooms increasingly consist of students from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. The presence of migrant and refugee students has introduced new challenges and opportunities for language education in Greece, a traditionally monolingual and monocultural school system (Fotiadou & Mattheoudakis, 2019;

Koutsogiannis, 2017). Classrooms in several districts are now multilingual spaces, where Greek is often a second or third language for many students.

This shift challenges educators' teaching practices and ideologies since they need to navigate complex instructional realities, i.e., how to teach Greek as both a subject and a medium of instruction, how to foster inclusion without erasing linguistic and cultural difference, and how to support learners with differing degrees of exposure to schooling, literacy, and the Greek language (Lytrivi & Papadopoulou, 2025; García & Wei, 2014). In such classrooms, language acts not only as a pedagogical medium but also as a site of power, negotiation, and identity construction (Rymes, 2015; Walsh, 2011; Wodak, 2012).

While policy documents and protocols promote inclusion and digital literacy (e.g., Gottschalk & Weise, 2023; OECD, 2015; 2024), classroom practices remain uneven. Teachers often operate within rigid curricula and assessments that prioritize formal written Greek, while they often struggle to understand and respond to students' language and cultural needs (OECD, 2015; 2024). This creates tensions between institutional expectations and classroom realities, particularly with respect to language use, participation, and authority. Furthermore, the application of digital tools in language teaching adds new dimensions to how knowledge is distributed and how student voices are shaped (Koutsogiannis, 2012; 2020; Walsh, 2011).

The present study employs classroom discourse analysis to examine how a Greek language teacher constructs student identities, negotiates authority, and manages linguistic diversity in a multicultural and multilingual high school classroom. Through the analysis of four excerpts and of the data from the teachers' interview, the present study explores how everyday discourse, including digital and multilingual practices, reveals deeper pedagogical ideologies and institutional norms (Bergroth et al., 2021; Koutsogiannis, 2012; Mercer, 2004; Rogers et al., 2005; Uysal & Sal, 2024).

To our knowledge, this is one of the limited numbers of recent studies that analyzes teachers' discourse with respect to migrant students' identities within the Greek multilingual and multicultural classroom. Thus, the study aims to provide education stakeholders with valuable knowledge of the way teachers' discourse stems from and contributes to certain practices, norms, and (institutional) ideologies that shape migrant students' literate identities.

Literature Review

Discourse in education is never neutral. Within the classroom, it shapes the construction of knowledge, regulates participation, and mediates power relations between teachers and students. Focusing on multilingual classrooms, teacher discourse acts as a key space in which inclusion, authority, and ideologies are shaped and reflected. The present study draws on a rich interdisciplinary body of work in classroom discourse analysis and language education in migration contexts, with a specific focus on Greek schools.

The language course holds significant research interest due to its dual function. First, language is the object of instruction; second, it serves as a medium for constructing students' literate identities. In language education, the distinction between the "what" and the "how" is often blurred, as language as subject (curriculum) is taught through language as medium

(pedagogy) (Kress, 2005; Christie, 2002). Within the classroom, all activity is mediated through language. Drawing on Bernstein's theory (2000) on pedagogic discourse, Christie (2002) argues that educational discourse comprises two interrelated dimensions: the regulative and the instructional. In the language course, language simultaneously functions as both regulative and instructional discourse, i.e., it is both the means and the product of teaching. Consequently, it becomes evident that the pedagogical discourses one adopts in language education directly shape both the content ("what" is taught) and the method ("how" it is taught).

In addition, research in classroom discourse analysis (e.g., Mercer, 2004; Rymes, 2015; Walsh, 2011) has focused on the ways in which classroom discourse organizes learning, constructs roles, and distributes authority. Rymes (2015) highlights how patterns of revoicing, uptake, and silence can subtly shape whose voices are recognized, whose knowledge is taken up, and how power is enacted through everyday interaction. Walsh (2011) further distinguishes between different modes of interaction (e.g., managerial, scaffolding, dialogic) and calls attention to how teachers' choices, including timing, feedback, and control, influence students' engagement and agency.

Furthermore, multilingual classrooms provide opportunities for translanguaging and inclusive pedagogies, yet these are often underutilized or remain informal (Garcia & Wei, 2014). In Greece, while policies increasingly refer to language support and inclusion, implementation often remains superficial. Teachers may accept other languages informally in the classroom, but they rarely systematically and intentionally integrate them into instruction or consistently recognize them as educational resources.

Digital tools have also contributed significantly to the changes occurring in the Greek classroom during the last decade. For example, the increasing presence of interactive whiteboards has created novel ways for students to access, produce, and assess information. According to Koutsogiannis (2011), ICT use in education can be mapped through three concentric circles: The first circle treats the computer as support for existing teaching, the second circle introduces new literacies, transforming classroom practices, and the third one connects digital literacies to ideological and global discourses, repositioning students as critical agents. Most classrooms remain in the first or second circle, though a sporadic move toward the third circle occurs, especially when students take initiative, evaluate credibility, or use ICT to navigate multilingual resources.

The current study also draws on Koutsogiannis' framework (2012) on the role of language education in building students' identities. There are four interconnected axes: knowledge about language, knowledge about the world, literacies, and teaching practices. This model offers a powerful tool for analyzing how teaching practices, including classroom discourse, shape the kinds of knowledge prioritized, inclusion, and eventually, students' identities. Importantly, while Greek language instruction often emphasizes grammar and formal writing, less room is devoted to exploring real-world challenges and topics, collaborative text (re-)construction, or diverse literacies.

Discourses

Discourses represent positions on literacy and align with specific approaches to language teaching. Each discourse reflects and sustains a particular ideology, influencing the roles of all participants, the texts that emerge in instructional settings, and the types of literate identities constructed (Koutsogiannis, 2012). In the Greek context, four main discourses have been identified (Koutsogiannis, 2012).

The first one is the traditional or structural discourse, which emphasizes the morphosyntactic aspects of language. It does not engage with knowledge about the world, and its teaching practices focus primarily on achieving school-based success, particularly in reading and writing (Hasan, 2006). In this context, common practices include spelling exercises, writing isolated paragraphs without communicative purpose, and completing gap-filling tasks centered on morphosyntactic features.

The second discourse is the communicative or holistic discourse, which centers on language use within communicative contexts (Hasan, 2006). In the Greek educational setting, this is reflected in the incorporation of communicative purposes/aims into traditional instructional formats, increased emphasis on oral speech and its features, and the use of texts that align with students' interests.

The third discourse is the discourse of genres, which also aims to develop learners' communicative competence. However, the focus shifts to the level of the text, consisting of different genres, based on the communicative situation and the purpose they serve. In this discourse, students are expected to recognize the structural and functional characteristics of each genre and engage in both the deconstruction and reproduction processes. In Greece, less emphasis has been placed on the systematic deconstruction and re-creation of these genres by the students themselves.

The fourth discourse draws on the theory of Multiliteracies (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000). Here, language is viewed as a socio-cultural phenomenon that shapes specific types of literate subjects. Multiliteracies are associated with the multiplicity of communication and information media and with multimodality, i.e., the idea that meaning is constructed not only through language but also through other semiotic modes (visual, auditory, spatial, gestural, etc.). At the same time, Multiliteracies recognize and respond to growing social and linguistic diversity. This framework proposes a different kind of pedagogy, in which language and other meaning-making modes are treated as dynamic and culturally situated resources, which learners adapt and reconfigure for their own purposes. In contexts of cultural and linguistic pluralism, the nature of language learning itself transforms. These shifts can fundamentally alter the pedagogy of literacy in the classroom. In this framework, students are designers, equipped to effectively navigate and engage in an emerging social, cultural, and educational landscape.

Classroom Discourse Analysis

Until the 1970s, models of discourse analysis aimed to understand classroom discourse and suggest ways to improve teaching practices. One of the most influential models is that of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), who draw on categories from Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG). Their Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) pattern is a recurring feature in educational

discourse. Sinclair and Coulthard categorize this structure as part of a traditional teacher-centered model. However, it has been reported that it can also act as meaningful feedback for students, thus expanding beyond the boundaries of traditional discourse (Cazden, 2001; Rymes, 2009).

This shift signals a broader transformation in approaches to classroom discourse analysis since the 1970s. Increasingly, language is recognized as central to the construction of social experience. This is significant because schooling itself is constructed through language and acknowledging language as a social semiotic resource opens new avenues for research, eventually leading to the analysis of other semiotic systems (Kress et al., 2005).

This focus sheds light on key aspects of classroom reality, such as the role of language in constructing literate identities, addressing inequality, and shaping the very nature of language instruction. Three primary perspectives on the role of language can be identified. First, some researchers focus on how language is used within a specific context, a view closely aligned with the notion of "discourse" as context-bound language use. Cazden (2001) and Rymes (2009) adopt this approach, emphasizing issues of equity, identity, and pedagogy. In this context, the situationally communicative function of language is highlighted. In contrast, Christie (2002) views language in relation to the structured demands of school discourse. She emphasizes the distinctiveness of school-based language and the necessity of mastering it through a process called *logogenesis*, which contributes to the formation of literate identities. According to Christie, academic success is closely tied to mastery of school discourse. A third perspective is offered by Kress (2005), who sees language as a social semiotic system. Along with other semiotic resources, language serves as a tool for creating, representing, and changing educational realities.

The present study draws on these perspectives described above. In this way, the analysis can trace emerging shifts and contradictions within the classroom. In addition, the study emphasizes the teacher's intentions with respect to constructing (non-)migrant students' identity. Consequently, interactional structures such as IRF patterns, emotional discourse, and other discourse features will be analyzed.

The Present Study
Research Questions (RQs)
RQ1. How does the teacher's discourse construct students' identities in the multilingual classroom? This explores how the teacher positions students via discourse (i.e., who speaks, who is seen, whose language is accepted etc.).

RQ2. How are migrant students' first languages used in a Greek-dominant educational context (i.e., the Greek mainstream classroom)? This question explores how and to what extent translanguaging is permitted and utilized, and how students' linguistic and cultural resources are perceived and positioned in teaching and learning.

RQ3. How is the teacher's authority discursively enacted in classroom interaction? To what extent is this authority negotiated or shared? How does the teacher manage control, distribute responsibility, and acknowledge and validate (non-)migrant students' contributions?

RQ4. How do digital tools influence power dynamics within the classroom and shape classroom discourse? Do these tools impact migrant students' inclusion, comprehension, engagement, and the distribution of knowledge and control? If so, to what extent?

RQ5. How are institutional and ideological norms instantiated through the teacher's discourse with respect? In other words, how does everyday classroom language reflect and reinforce implicit school expectations, curricular standards, and societal ideologies related to language and migration?

The Data
The dataset included four hours of classroom recordings transcribed by the researcher. Four representative excerpts were selected for analysis, highlighting translanguaging practices, technology integration, peer collaboration, and collaborative written production in small groups. Complementary data comprised field notes from all four consecutive classroom visits and a semi-structured interview with the teacher, which explored perspectives on multilingualism, student inclusion, and pedagogical practices.

Participants
In this classroom, there were 16 students aged 15-16. Most of the students had a migration background. The mean years of stay in Greece were 6 years (range: 1-11). For the purposes of the present study, students' parents/guardians gave written informed consent, and all students gave oral consent according to the Declaration of Helsinki.

Research Design and Analysis
The present study is qualitative and employs Classroom Discourse Analysis to explore how identities, ideologies, and participation are discursively constructed in school contexts (e.g., Rymes, 2015; Walsh, 2011). Drawing on the broader principles of Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough, 1995; Rogers et al., 2005), the study explores how multilingualism, inclusion, and authority are mediated through discourse in a multilingual mainstream class of a high school (Grade A) in the western part of Thessaloniki, Greece.

Results
In the first excerpt (see Excerpt 1 below), the teacher starts a new language unit and introduces the word "bullying". A student, with a beginner level of Greek proficiency and only two years of exposure to Greek asks for clarification. Recognizing the comprehension barrier, the teacher uses Google Translate projected on the interactive whiteboard, inserts the word, and chooses the Chinese (simplified) translation. The student reads the Chinese translation and visibly shows recognition, reflecting that he understands the meaning of the word. The teacher then turns to another student with a Chinese background who is highly proficient in Greek to confirm the accuracy of the translation. This student verifies that the translation is correct. The teacher then draws collective attention to the moment, emphasizing: "You, see? We can use our languages here.").

Excerpt 1
Teacher: So, today we're starting the next unit. The topic is *"bullying."* Have you heard this word before? Does anyone know what it means?
Student 7: ((quietly)) I don't understand… what does it mean?

Teacher: ((nods supportively)) Alright. Let's look at it together. We'll check it in Google Translate.

((She walks to the interactive whiteboard. Teacher types "bullying" (εκφοβισμός) into Google Translate and selects Simplified Chinese. The translated word appears on the board.))

Teacher: Can you read this for us?

Student 7: ((reads the Chinese aloud)). Ah, now I understand.

Teacher: Great! (She turns to Student 10; another student of Chinese background who is highly proficient in Greek) Is the translation correct?

Student 10: Yes, it is. That's how we say it in Chinese.

Teacher: Excellent. (turns to the whole class) You, see? We can use our languages here.

((Some student's nod; a few whisper among themselves in agreement.))

The teacher responds to the vocabulary gap not by paraphrasing in Greek, but by bringing in a multilingual digital tool. Thus, she creates space for student-initiated negotiation of meaning, which can be perceived as a sign of high interactional competence (Walsh, 2011). This is dialogic in nature since she does not impose meaning but confirms it through another student. Her final utterance explicitly reframes the linguistic boundaries in the classroom (Rymes, 2009), allowing and enhancing the use of students' languages.

This excerpt occurs outside a formal task, reflecting spontaneous flexibility in the teacher's instructional discourse. Furthermore, while the tool is digital, the teacher still mediates both authority and access, confirming that the tool is integrated at a supportive level, as in Koutsogiannis' first circle (2011). Importantly, peer validation enhances horizontal knowledge-sharing even though it is still embedded in teacher-led discourse.

Greek remains the language of curricular authority and outcome. The teacher's comment illustrates a moment of symbolic inclusion, but the institutional structure of school and assessment likely does not support continued multilingual participation, which is also highlighted in the teachers' interview. Crucially, the teacher's decision to request the linguistic contribution of a migrant student to confirm the translation of the word aligns with a more student-centered approach and view of the teaching practices, downgrading her role as the primary source of knowledge in the classroom. Consequently, classroom dynamics change, and more space is constructed for mutual co-construction of meaning. Thus, by recognizing the student as an acceptable source of knowledge, especially in a context where the teacher herself does not know the answer, the teacher enacts a pedagogy of reciprocity. Even more, the students' migrant background further disrupts monolingual and hierarchical norms in the classroom. This, in turn, leads to increasing student agency. Consequently, migrant students' linguistic knowledge here provides the whole classroom with an answer and validates what was provided as given information from Google Translate. Thus, the student who was asked to confirm the meaning of the word acts as an editor, drawing on his own language knowledge, and was asked to make a language decision after thinking critically and exploiting his metalinguistic knowledge. Furthermore, the teacher's choice to ask another student to verify the meaning of the word introduces an element of critical literacy. It reflects the importance of questioning, cross-checking, and not taking digital content at face value. Within the context of a democratic and dialogic education, the teachers' actions here reflect that knowledge is situated and can be doubted and further researched.

In this excerpt, traditional language norms are suspended to allow for comprehension, yet not for full multilingual expression. Still, the teacher's utterance ("We can use our languages here") is ideologically significant. It constitutes what Rymes (2009) would call a framing act: she momentarily repositions classroom norms, highlighting that multilingualism is accepted and welcome. While Google Translate initially functions as an instrumental scaffold for understanding, the teacher's choice to confirm meaning by asking another student introduces a transformative element: it redistributes authority, recognizes first-language knowledge, and momentarily expands what counts as legitimate participation in the classroom. The above findings support knowledge construction and comprehension. However, literacy and knowledge about language (Koutsogiannis, 2012) remain Greek-dominant.

In Excerpt 2 (see Excerpt 2), the teacher starts a brainstorming task on school bullying. She divides the board into three columns, and she writes a question in each column: *What types of bullying are you aware of? Have you seen/heard about bullying in the news/on social media/school? Why do you think bullying happens?* Students are asked to contribute orally, while the teacher writes selected key words and phrases based on students' oral responses for each column/question. She reformulates or expands answers, adding more formal vocabulary without directly correcting students in terms of vocabulary and grammar.

Excerpt 2
Teacher: Ok, let's start. What types of bullying do you know? Just give me short phrases or examples and I'll write them up.
Student 6: bullying like hitting, pushing.
Teacher: Good. This is called physical bullying ((writes)) "Physical: hitting, pushing."
Student 9: When they call you names, verbal bullying.
Teacher: Yes, verbal. ((writes)) "Verbal: name-calling, insults." =
Student 1: ((hesitantly)) Uh… when student… not take… not consider… uh… ((says something in Arabic)) //
Student 6: ((quickly)) When they ignore someone or leave them out.
Teacher: (nods) Yes, social exclusion. That's an important one. ((she writes)) "Social: exclusion, ignoring others."
((The teacher continues gathering answers. Student 1 remains silent for the rest of the task.))

Most contributions come from non-migrant Greek students and migrant students with advanced Greek proficiency (as also reported by the teacher during the interview). However, a student with Arabic as a first language tries to contribute during the first question. The student starts speaking in Greek but with pauses and hesitation. He also uses an Arabic phrase in his effort to explain his point. Then, another student interrupts him and completes the response in fluent Greek, though it is far from clear that this accurately represents what the first student was trying to say. The teacher accepts this new answer, writes it on the board, and proceeds without responding to the first student or confirming whether the latter student correctly expresses the former student's initial idea/point. Notably, Student 1 remained silent for the rest of the brainstorming task. Thus, the discursive result is Student 1's silence, while Student 6's contribution becomes official classroom knowledge.

The structure of the task promotes students' oral contributions but not written co-construction. The teacher acts as the sole writer and editor; students only speak, and writing is "filtered" through the teacher's uptake. This privileges fluent and/or highly proficient speakers, who can offer quick and polished ideas, and Greek, which becomes the only language visually present in the knowledge space. Student 1's use of Arabic, though contextually relevant, is ignored and rendered invisible. It is not rejected explicitly, but it does not receive recognition. Thus, despite the teacher's surface openness, only those who speak confidently in Greek are discursively rewarded. The physical setup also aligns with this observation, i.e., the teacher is positioned at the board, writing with her back turned, which hinders her from monitoring non-verbal cues or scaffolding the students who experience language issues or difficulties in comprehension.

This excerpt reinforces an ideology of fluency and linguistic conformity. Although the topic is socially relevant and inclusive on the surface, the conditions for actual inclusion seem to be narrow. Multilingualism is allowed only passively, and Arabic is neither rejected nor acknowledged, which is a classic case of erasure through silence (Rymes, 2015).

Furthermore, the contrast with Excerpt 1 is striking: In Excerpt 1, a student's L1 is publicly displayed (via Google Translate), another student validates it, and the teacher frames this as legitimate multilingual practice. Here, by contrast, a spontaneous multilingual moment is overridden by a more fluent student, an incident which is initiated by the teacher. Thus, languages enjoy different hierarchical positions in both teacher discourse and the classroom. There is a clear hierarchy of the languages employed as well as of their speakers in the sense that any language is mediated through and targets correct Greek. At the same time, students' contributions are filtered and controlled by more fluent students, whose contributions are publicly recognized and valued. Thus, the student's silence reflects his resignation, given that his own language resource was not accepted or valued. Overall, Excerpt 2 shows how a pedagogically inclusive space becomes exclusive when the teacher's discourse filters contributions based on fluency, completeness, and accurate form. Thus, the whiteboard is employed to represent only one type of knowledge: fluent standard Greek, validated by the teacher. This, in turn, produces an erasure of both the student's voice as well as of his first language as a legitimate classroom resource. This leads to a missed opportunity not only for learning but also for building a safe space where migrant students feel secure and empowered. Such classroom spaces are marked by symbolic inclusion where diversity is tolerated, even celebrated, but not allowed to reshape the dominant discourse practices.

In the next excerpt, which occurred the following day, after reading and discussing a text on bullying, the teacher divides the students into four mixed groups. Each group takes turns using the interactive board to find an article on bullying to compare with the classroom text. Students explore articles online using simple searches, while the teacher helps guide selection.

Excerpt 3
((Group 1 steps up.))
((Student 10 types "Bullying articles" in Greek into Google search))
Student 13: This one says "6 signs of bullying." From this website. ((he points to the interactive board))
Teacher: Hmm, okay. Can you tell who wrote it? Is it from a school, a psychologist/scientist, or just a blog?
Student 13: I can't find the author's name. It just says, "Posted by this user."
Teacher: Alright, then keep looking. Try to find something that tells you who the author is or where it comes from. That helps us trust the information more.
Student 16: This one is from this site here. It looks more serious. And here is the author.
Teacher: Yes, that's a good one. Can you check if it's not too long and if it is relatively easy to read?
Student 10: It's not too hard or too long.
Teacher: Can you also Google the author so that you learn who this is?
((students google the name of the author))
Student 16: I see here that he is a university professor. Here is the information about him.
Student 10: Good, because this is the university website. Oh, yes. (She is reading aloud…) He is a social psychologist.
Teacher: Great! Save the link and I'll print this for you.

Students use their skills in searching for online content. The teacher assists them and is now in the background. The rest of the classroom observes the group that is searching online content. The teacher poses questions and clarifications to guide them and provides them with scaffolding when needed. Her questions guide the students to think critically and reflectively. Students actively engage in this digital activity, including online search for credible/verified authorship, marking an important step in the development of their critical digital literacy. The interaction style reflects high interactional competence (Walsh, 2011): the teacher adapts her feedback to balance guidance and autonomy. Students are given control over the board and the task, and their answers shape the course of the activity.

This task is structured as a guided research project: groups search, evaluate, and select material, while the teacher acts as a mentor. The learning focus has moved from finding the correct/accurate answer to developing criteria for evaluating and filtering information. Students are learning to ask where knowledge comes from and why it should be trusted. Thus, students are given time and space to negotiate, validate, and reflect on each step. The interactive board itself has shifted function, i.e., from mirroring a teacher-centered practice (Excerpt 1) to a student-operated tool here. Students are literally and symbolically in front of the class, guiding the information search.

This excerpt supports a form of activity that enhances critical digital literacy. This also reflects a shift in pedagogical ideology: the teacher is no longer the sole source of knowledge. She is now facilitating shared authority, a key element of critical pedagogy. The discourse here is collaborative rather than hierarchical. Even though students were not very fluent in search skills, they were trusted as capable digital learners, and the teacher scaffolds rather than controls their search and discovery process.

Excerpt 3 reflects how digital tasks can redistribute classroom authority. This excerpt highlights students as agents of their own research. They engage in meaningful acts of evaluation, learning to move beyond "first click" consumption into a more reflective and collaborative decision-making. The teacher's questions support a slow and scaffolded shift toward critical literacy practices. In a class of diverse linguistic backgrounds, this also offers an equitable learning opportunity: it is not Greek proficiency but digital reasoning that becomes the central learning objective and target skill.

In excerpt 4 (see Excerpt 4 below), occurring the day after the online article search, the teacher delivers each group a printed copy of their selected article as well as the original classroom article about bullying. Each group is asked to write a 300-word assignment in which they compare the two articles (i.e., similarities and differences in content, language, register and tone etc.). Group 1 is writing together, drawing from the notes on the board and the two articles. The teacher offers scaffolding by providing students with support when needed and answering questions. However, she does not lead the discussion or writing during the collaborative writing process.

Excerpt 4
Student 5: Alright… first, we say what is similar between the two texts?
Student 7: Yes… Both talk about bullying… ((he looks at the board)) … about various types of bullying. We can use the words from the board physical, verbal… ((he points to the board)) ((They write this down))
Student 11: ((hesitantly, in Chinese)) And... the reason for bullying, maybe? ((to Student 14, who also speaks Chinese, and she is more fluent in Greek))
Student 14: ((in Greek)) Yes, both articles say that some students bully to feel strong. We can write that.
Student 5: And a difference is… Our article is not so formal and creates more feelings when you read it.
Teacher: ((she is approaching the group and is listening)) So, it has a more emotional tone? ((The students nod and write this down)).
Student 7: And ours has a real story with this student.
Student 11: Right. Now the differences… "there is an example of…"
Student 14: … Personal story?
Teacher: Great! These all sound solid. Do you have any questions?
Student 5: Can we say the article advises students?
Teacher: Yes! Or better, "offers suggestions" … It sounds more formal. Do you want to use that?
Student 5: Yes. "Offers suggestions."
Teacher: Very well. Keep going! You're structuring the text really well.

The interaction includes negotiation and collaboration. Students discuss ideas, refer to the teacher's notes on the board, and co-construct their text meaningfully. Student 11 uses Chinese to express a new idea, reflecting trust and agency within the group. Student 14 is supportive. He replies in Greek, confirming and acknowledging what Student 11 proposed. The teacher is responsive but does not direct students' attention, preferences, or ideas. She affirms agency and offers scaffolding in terms of register and vocabulary choices.

This collaborative writing activity transforms the classroom into a collaborative literacy space. The use of the words from the board indicates knowledge sharing, i.e., what was created and owned as knowledge by the teacher (Excerpt 2) is now used by the students. Furthermore, translanguaging is functional and organic here. The classroom and this group allow L1s (here, Chinese) to play a role in conceptual scaffolding without becoming the object of correction or exclusion. The collaborative writing task here, which employs real sources and builds from previous activities/tasks, indicates a process-based approach to writing. This is in contrast with earlier top-down practices, reflecting at the same time how students' voices and their collective reasoning shape the outcome.

This excerpt reveals an ideological shift taking place within the classroom, i.e., moving from a teacher-centered control and knowledge (Excerpt 2) to a student-centered shared authorship including negotiation, teacher and peer scaffolding. Furthermore, the inclusion of Chinese marks a shift from the Greek monolingual norm to multilingual legitimacy. This aligns with critical multilingual pedagogy (García & Lin, 2017), where migrant students' home/first languages become tools of learning, not obstacles. This activity of critical literacy reflects that students are not just writing to show comprehension, but to analyze, discuss, and produce meaning. The role of the teacher here is that of a facilitator who provides scaffolds in this student-driven, dialogic, and multimodal collaborative writing task.

This collaborative writing activity reflects pedagogical transformation. Although it does not cancel out earlier asymmetries, it reflects that those asymmetries can be mitigated under certain supportive conditions (i.e., students as main authors and contributors, migrant students' first languages in the foreground as tools of generating meaning/ideas, the facilitatory and collaborative role of the teacher instead of being the gatekeeper and the only source of knowledge in the classroom).

Whiteboard vs. Interactive Board: Two Boards, Two Pedagogies
In the present study, two tools symbolically and functionally stand out in classroom discourse: the traditional whiteboard and the interactive board. Each one of them becomes a site of pedagogical ideology and practice as well as social meaning.

The way the teacher uses the whiteboard aligns with a teacher-centered ideology and teaching practice, structured participation, and thus, centralized authority. In Excerpt 2, while the activity includes students' oral participation, the teacher maintains strict control over the procedure and over what classroom knowledge is. She filters students' responses and language, reformulating vocabulary, and inscribes only what she considers linguistically accurate and complete. Writing is in monolingual Greek mode. The teacher is the only author. The board is planned and aligns with the traditional curriculum. This use of the board reflects that knowledge is built top-down through teacher-mediated discourse (Koutsogiannis, 2012). As seen in Excerpt 2, the interaction often marginalizes less fluent students from diverse/migrant backgrounds.

On the contrary, the way the teacher uses the interactive board creates a shared space, and knowledge is now under negotiation. The interactive board here seems to function as a more flexible and dialogic tool compared to the traditional whiteboard, especially in Excerpts 1 and 3. It promotes the inclusion of migrant students, even of those who face

language difficulties (Excerpt 1). Furthermore, all students share responsibility and action in searching, finding, and critically evaluating articles online (Excerpt 3). Thus, the interactive board enables multilingual resources and enhances digital and critical literacy, rather than simple content search, reading, and recall. Finally, its control is shared between the students and the teacher. Rather than merely presenting information, the interactive board becomes a platform for participatory literacy.

These two diverse applications of the two boards reflect two different pedagogical orientations: The whiteboard reflects a traditional curriculum-aligned approach, where knowledge is structured, given, and validated by the teacher. Even when it becomes ideologically inclusive (Excerpt 2), it reproduces monolingual hierarchies and "sees" only fluent students. On the other hand, the interactive board enables critical, dialogic, and situated pedagogy. It enhances multilingual scaffolding (Excerpt 1), engagement with technology and/or media (Excerpt 3) in a critical way, and student-driven knowledge co-construction (Excerpt 3). The fact that both boards exist within the same classroom reveals the layered and contradictory nature of school discourse. The teacher has different and conflicting roles (i.e., gatekeeper, revoicer, and co-constructor). These contradictions reveal the tensions occurring in the teaching practice within a multilingual and multicultural classroom.

Overall, the present findings reflect that the two boards are not just simply two different pedagogical tools but symbolic representations of inclusion, knowledge, and language in the classroom. They reveal that technology itself does not determine pedagogy; rather, the way the teacher uses these tools frames participation and navigates linguistic diversity that shapes the learning experience. The present study highlights how digital and physical classroom spaces can become sites of authentic participation and meaningful learning.

Teacher's Interview
In her interview, the teacher described her class as highly linguistically and culturally diverse and complex, with students of varying Greek proficiency and with varying literacy skills. She reported that some migrant students experienced severe literacy difficulties in both Greek (their second language) and their first language. She highlighted the importance of inclusion, acceptance, and responsiveness to students' diverse needs. She also highlighted important issues relevant to the students' well-being and the development of their social and affective capital, i.e., recognizing the need to promote collaboration and empathy, especially in relation to classroom dynamics. She also thinks that the use of digital tools can be helpful in the classroom and promote students' engagement in various ways (e.g., help them understand more easily, find and use materials from the migrant students' language and cultural resources).

While some of the teacher's beliefs are also reflected in her classroom practice, some conflicting cues also emerge. For example, although she values all student voices, multilingual contributions were not always acknowledged, and students' participation was often filtered through other students with a higher level of proficiency in Greek, restricting the learning and engagement opportunities of the former. In addition, while she seems to embrace and attempts to promote critical digital literacy practices, she also maintains several traditional,

teacher-centered practices. This opposition between her beliefs as stated in the interview and her discourse is a common observation in classroom discourse analysis.

Discussion

This section discusses the present findings within the context of classroom discourse and broader pedagogical ideologies. The discussion integrates the analysis about students' identity construction in language education (Koutsogiannis, 2012) and the three Circles of ICT application (Koutsogiannis, 2011) to evaluate the pedagogical function of the digital tools employed by the teacher in her language teaching.

RQ1 explored how the teacher's discourse constructs students' identities in the multilingual classroom, i.e., how she positions her students in her discourse. The excerpts of the present study reveal that the teacher's discourse positions her students based on their ability to speak fluently in Greek, their willingness/ability to speak up, and how well their contributions align with the teacher's or curricular expectations. In contrast with hesitant and less fluent students, fluent students' contributions are more likely to be acknowledged, written on the board, or revoiced by the teacher. These students are discursively positioned as competent and central participants. This dynamic also regulates the degree to which a student's voice is treated as educationally valuable. Through these patterns, the teacher's discourse subtly reinforces hierarchies of visibility and belonging within the classroom.

In terms of the identity construction framework in language education (Koutsogiannis, 2012), the teacher's practices emphasize knowledge about language (e.g., reformulations, vocabulary expansion) and literacies (e.g., text comparison, tasks enhancing critical digital literacy), with less consistent engagement in teaching practices that promote distributed authority (i.e., contrast between Excerpt 2 and Excerpt 4), and relatively limited activation of knowledge about the world, even though the theme of bullying provides ample opportunities for it. The result is that student identities are shaped primarily as Greek-language learners aiming at linguistic competence, with only partial recognition of their multilingual and experiential backgrounds.

RQ2 explored whether migrant students' first languages were used in a Greek-dominant educational context. Students' first languages are present occasionally and are student-initiated. Thus, translanguaging moments occurred; they are not (explicitly) rejected, but they are not embedded and exploited in the instructional design. This aligns with what Koutsogiannis (2012) identifies as a classroom that focuses on literacy and language knowledge but does not fully exploit all students' language/multilingual resources. The students' languages function as hidden scaffolds, i.e., supportive, yet not institutionally recognized.

RQ3 explored the teacher's authority in classroom interaction. The teacher's authority fluctuates between structured control and dialogic facilitation (contrast between Excerpt 1 and Excerpt 3). Thus, she shifts from revoicing to advising and from transmitting knowledge to scaffolding it. Looking at the teaching practices level in the framework in Koutsogiannis (2012), this movement reflects a variation in her teaching practices, i.e., from teacher-centered correction to collaborative meaning-making. However, such shifts are not

consistent: digital literacy tasks tend to promote more symmetrical discourse, while tasks on the whiteboard promote more hierarchical structure.

RQ4 explored the influence of digital tools on power dynamics and classroom discourse. The use of ICTs reveals different levels of engagement across the Three Interconnected Circles (Koutsogiannis, 2011): In Excerpt 1, Google Translate is used to assist comprehension, aligned with the first circle, where the computer supports traditional teaching goals (i.e., explaining a word's meaning). However, the event is student-initiated and includes peer validation, leading to linguistic inclusion. Thus, it moves toward the second circle, where new roles, literacies, and identities emerge. In Excerpt 3, students search, evaluate, and select texts using Google, evaluating authorship and the reliability of the source. This event clearly moves into the second circle and slightly approaches the third circle, as students engage with public discourse and develop critical digital literacy. Thus, ICT application is not static: it switches from supportive to transformative, and slightly to critical/ideological engagement, especially when digital tools allow students to be active, evaluate sources, and co-construct knowledge.

RQ5 explored the norms evident in the teacher's discourse. Although her intentions and a significant part of her efforts and teaching practices were to promote migrant students' inclusion, her discourse aligns with broader institutional norms. These norms are reflected in practices such as prioritizing curriculum-based knowledge, formal register, and academic Greek. Unless they adhere to these norms, the contributions of migrant students are partially validated. Thus, while knowledge about the language and literacies (Koutsogiannis, 2012) is highly present, knowledge about the world (i.e., the students' sociocultural and linguistic realities, the connection between bullying and students' experiences), as well as teaching practices that accommodate diversity, remain underdeveloped. Language hierarchies are thus reproduced not through exclusion, but through silence, revoicing, and structural habits that favor fluency and conformity.

Overall, students' identities are primarily constructed around the role of the academic Greek writer and speaker. However, when collaboration, peer scaffolding, and ICT are present, students become critical readers, (co-)authors, informed (re)searchers, and classroom citizens, all of which could be further enhanced through more intentional support.

Conclusions

This study explored how a language teacher in a linguistically diverse Greek high school classroom negotiates authority, navigates inclusion through everyday teaching practices, and discursively constructs student identities. Employing classroom discourse analysis, four excerpts were examined, focusing on how the teacher uses language, digital tools, literacies, and knowledge for the world, and how she positions students with varying levels of Greek proficiency.

The findings demonstrate that the teacher's discourse both reflects and reinforces the dominant language ideologies of the Greek mainstream classroom. Students who speak fluently and confidently in Greek are consistently legitimized, while less fluent, multilingual students are at times marginalized, not through overt exclusion, but through silence, revoicing, and lack of uptake. The teacher's scaffolding practices reflect an emphasis on

knowledge about language and literacies but offer limited connection with students' life experiences. Similarly, digital tools are used meaningfully, though their critical and transformative potential is realized only partially. The study shows that even within inclusive environments, deeper structural norms, monolingualism, curriculum rigidity, and standardized discourse continue to shape teachers' practices.

The present study highlights the need for more intentional integration of multilingual pedagogies and critical digital literacies in classrooms in which linguistic diversity is the norm. Finally, if classrooms are to become genuinely inclusive, both teaching practices and institutional ideologies must embrace the full linguistic and cultural resources of all students.

References

Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique.* Taylor and Francis.

Bergroth, M., Llompart, J., Pepiot, N., van der Worp, K., Dražnik, T., & Sierens, S. (2021). Identifying space for mainstreaming multilingual pedagogies in European initial teacher education policies. *European Educational Research Journal*, *21*(5), 801–821. https://doi.org/10.1177/14749041211012500

Cazden, C. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning.* Heinemann.

Christie, F. (2002). *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Functional Perspective.* Continuum.

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2000). *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures.* Routledge.

Fotiadou, G. & Mattheoudakis, M. (2019). A quasi-monolingual tertiary education in Greece: Baby steps to internationalization. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *32*, 42–65.

García, O., and Lin, A. (2017). Translanguaging in Bilingual Education. In García, A.L. & May, S. (Eds.), *Bilingual and Multilingual Education* (pp. 117–130). Springer.

Garcia, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism, and Education.* Palgrave MacMillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765

Gottschalk, F. and Weise, C. (2023). Digital equity and inclusion in education: An overview of practice and policy in OECD countries, *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 299, OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/7cb15030-en.

Hasan, R. (2006). Literacy, everyday speech and society. In A. Charalampopoulos (Ed.), *Literacy, society and education* [in Greek] (pp. 134–189). Thessaloniki, Institute of Modern Hellenic Studies.

Koutsogiannis, D. (2020). Towards a critical analysis of digital educational discourse. In: Bessie Mitsikopoulou and Evdokia Karava (Eds.), *Political and pedagogical discourse in foreign language education* (pp. 321–346) [in Greek]. Pedio.

Koutsogiannis, D. (2017). Language education yesterday, today, tomorrow: a political approach [in Greek]. Thessaloniki: Institute of Modern Greek Studies.

Koutsogiannis, D. (2012). The rhombus of language education [in Greek]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* (Proceedings of the 32nd meeting of the Department of Linguistics), Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (pp. 208–222). Institute of Modern Greek Studies.

Koutsogiannis, D. (2011). ICTs and language teaching: The missing third circle. In Stickel G., Vradi T. (Eds.), *Language, Languages and New Technologies. ICT in the Service of Languages* (pp. 43-59). Peter Lang Verlag.

Kress, G., Jewitt, C., Bourne, J., Franks, A., Hardcastle, J., Jones, K., & Reid, E. (2005). English in urban classrooms: A multimodal perspective on teaching and learning. RoutledgeFalmer.

Lytrivi, F. & Papadopoulou, M. (2025). Teaching Greek as a second language to multilingual students: Teachers' challenges, goals and practices in mainstream and reception classes. In S. Karpava (Ed.), *Multilingualism and Multiculturalism in Language Education* (pp. 191–211). Springer. DOI:10.1007/978-3-031-76043-3.

Mercer, N. (2004). Sociocultural discourse analysis: analyzing classroom talk as a social mode of thinking. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1,* 137–168. http://dx.doi.org/10.1558/japl.2004.1.2.137

OECD. (2024). *Curriculum flexibility and autonomy: Promoting a thriving learning environment.* OECD Publishing, Paris: OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/eccbbac2-en.

OECD. (2015). *Immigrant Students at School: easing the journey towards integration* (OECD Reviews of Migrant Education). Paris: OECD Publishing. doi:10.1787/9789264249509-en.

Rogers, R., Malancharuvil-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., Hui, D., & Joseph, G. O. (2005). Critical discourse analysis in education: A Review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, *75*(3), 365–416. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543075003365

Rymes, B. (2015). *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Tool for Critical Reflection,* Second Edition (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315775630

Rymes, B. (2009). *Classroom discourse analysis: A tool for critical reflection.* Hampton Press.

Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. Oxford University Press.

Uysal, H., & Sah, P. K. (2024). Language ideologies and language teaching in the global world: An introduction to the special issue. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *28*(4), 611–617. https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069241240964

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203827826

Wodak, R. (2012). Language, power, and identity. *Language Teaching, 45*(2), 215–233. doi:10.1017/S0261444811000048