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Abstract: Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has grown in popularity due to the idea that it may aid students in enhancing their foreign language proficiency. Previous studies have found that teaching a foreign language in a bilingual setting creates obstacles since students have fewer linguistic features in learning and teaching. While they investigated the significance of various perspectives in this process, this study explores language ideologies and practices in the multilingual background. It seeks the lecturer's voice who taught preparation courses for international students about his language ideologies and CLIL practices using different parameters of CLIL. This narrative study engaged guided...
dialogues and observations. We adopted Barkhuizen et al.’s (2014) thematic analysis for analyzing the data. It indicated that language ideologies emerged after framing the courses within the students' more comprehensive language ideological contexts, followed by a discussion of its relevance to classroom practice. English is used to address gaps between individuals who might not share a common native language or a shared (domestic) identity and with whom English was the favored foreign language of communication. While he created a humanist course for students to use their broad vocabulary and grammar classes were nevertheless immersed in transitory language ideologies.

Keywords: CLIL, Language Ideologies, Multilingual class, Narrative Inquiry

INTRODUCTION

Education that emphasizes the visible and physical components of pedagogy, such as curriculum and instruction, disregards other factors that contribute to the improvement of university research and education. Content knowledge is an integral part of educational practice and central to teachers' curriculum decisions (Goris et al., 2019).

Educators' concealed, covert, and sometimes unconscious behavior, judgments, and practices offer an additional element of instruction that is sometimes hard to discern without extra effort. Yet, representations of these invisible elements may influence what all educators do, such as how they do research, create and implement curriculum, analyze student learning, and ultimately seek the most effective methods for educating kids (Kirkpatrick, 2011). Since these educational activities and endeavors are transmitted to students through the educators' lenses, the most effective curricula, contemporary teaching methods, and supportive policies are insufficient. Understandings, judgments, and attitudes of the educator
are critical in providing students with a quality education. Governmental entities which have been pushing multilingual instruction have made learning another language an important policy subject (Byram & Wagner, 2018; Pun & Macaro, 2019). The significance of language resides in its function as an instrument for incorporation and shared awareness, as well as a determinant of occupation and accessibility for inhabitants. CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) is a method for enhancing Foreign Language Instruction. This strategy tries to provide a more natural setting for communicative competence by integrating language education with the instruction of some other curriculum area (e.g. Science) (Coyle, 2018). CLIL gives a practical issue to science background because science-related subjects are frequently the subject matter in CLIL classes.

Yet, very little research has linked language ideology and practice development in a way that was clear and backed up by evidence. Valdés-Sánchez and Espinet (2020) gave one example in which educator stories were used to show how their voices were made and changed in a CLIL class. Writers want to keep searching for proof that shows a link between the development of language ideology and transitional practices. Writers also want to offer a new way of looking at language ideology research that is based on higher education in CLIL classrooms as interpretative results of educator professional growth in practical application.

This paper is based on the experience of a state university that put CLIL into practice in a multilingual class by having multiple lecturers teach in pairs. They work together inside and outside of the classroom to plan, teach, and evaluate. This way of teaching has been looked at in the field of language ideology, and it has been found to be a good way for professionals to grow and build their professional identities (Mahan, 2022).

Our study's purpose is to explore how a lecturer's language ideology shifted as a result of working in a multilingual setting and how these shifts contributed to the formation of the lecturer's professionalism. In order to accomplish this goal, a conceptual analysis
framework will be established. This paradigm will conceptualize the interrelationship between linguistic ideology and practice. In order to acknowledge the subtleties of this concept, language ideology is deconstructed into three sub-identities: English teacher, science teacher, and CLIL instructor. In addition to this, connections are made between the enactment of these sub-identities and the three discursive interaction patterns that were utilized to dissect the teacher's discussion in the CLIL field (Content, Communication, Cognition, and Culture).

There is a multidirectional relationship between an individual's attitude and motivation, the social context of language acquisition, and language learning success (Gilmetdinova, 2015). She argues that the availability of educational opportunities, attitudes of peers, instructors, and parents, and societal and governmental language regulations may all contribute to favorable attitudes toward languages. Yet, teachers are the decision-makers most directly associated with these ideologies; they manage links between home and universities, among peers in universities, and cooperate with strategic language choices in their classrooms and universities.

Researchers have explored language ideology within bilingual education in institutions of higher learning. Nevertheless, hardly any study has considered the language ideologies of Indonesian teachers in multilingual classrooms in the university degree. The influence of language ideologies on the success of bilingual education, heritage language education, and foreign language education has been well established. The study of language ideologies is a branch of discourse analysis that was formed to explain cultural concepts of language and to analyze collective linguistic behavior (Fitriati, 2015). The perspective held there had been a propensity to equate language and people, such as equating national and regional groups with their linguistic behavior.

Kroskritty’s (2010) theoretical conceptions of language ideologies had an impact, for example, on the research that Agustin (2021), Fitriati (2015), and Zindler (2013) conducted on language choice and language ideologies in the context of English as a foreign language (EFL).
Language ideologies emerged as a distinct subfield of cultural theory during the tenth and final decades of the 20th century. The primary focus of language ideologies is the relationship between language and culture. Every choice that users of a language make is influenced by their views regarding that language. The identification of language ideologies is possible through the analysis of (1) people's linguistic practice, often known as their use of language; (2) people's talk about language; and (3) people's implicit ideas about language (Woolard, 2010).

Content and Language Integrated Learning comes in a variety of shapes and sizes, as well as a variety of names (Coyle, 2007). The word CLIL has been embraced widely and in the English language because it appears to capture the method more properly than terminology like bilingualism, as it places language and content on a continuum without privilege. These diverse descriptive phrases share the core principle of teaching content through a foreign language. If it concerns the real how, where, and when of CLIL, there is disagreement on how strictly the term should be defined. This concept regards CLIL as occurring beyond the language classes during the instruction of a non-language issue. It offers the significant benefit of boosting the students' actual interaction time with the foreign language within a curriculum that is already congested.

CLIL is a potential concept that could be implemented in numerous ways. To assure high-quality CLIL instruction, CLIL must adhere to specific guidelines (Monbec, 2020). CLIL is characterized by the blending of language acquisition and subject instruction. Clarity has emerged that CLIL is first and principally a content-driven method (Coyle, 2007); hence, he identifies Content as the initial basic foundation comprising the existing subject matter that has been instructed. Communication highlights the acquisition and application of language, whereas Cognition emphasizes the significance of learning and thought processes. CLIL's final pillar, Culture, should always be firmly rooted in a rich cultural foundation.
A significant proportion of work in the domain focuses on CLIL in general, examining in-depth attributes such as language learning, content learning, and cultural learning, as well as more specific issues such as forms of assessment and motivation, taking into consideration that the study results are related to a precise academic setting. Positive preconceptions are frequently conveyed not just from one educational context to another and even from one discipline to the other, including physics, art, literature, and practical fields like imprint printing or electronics. Although there are general CLIL features that address a variety of subjects, each topic has its unique features and procedures that must be examined in detail to shortly the full CLIL potential and the difficulties within the processes.

We could not locate a single study that did so. Indonesia has ignored linguistic ideals in its attempt to introduce English-only multicultural education. This study explored the language ideologies of lecturers and the extent to which their language ideologies of CLIL were manifested in their multilingual classrooms. This study reveals how the language ideologies of teachers, the policy implementers at the grassroots level, were crucial to the success or failure of using English in actual university contexts. Furthermore, this paper clarifies the importance of language ideologies in the potential development of English bilingual education practices in Indonesian institutions in the eyes of necessary parties. This report provided significant problems about language ideologies, as this topic has earned scant praise and been neglected in sociolinguistic studies, foreign language education policy, and educational language policy in Indonesia.

METHOD

This study focused on a narrative inquiry into the research design, featuring an interpretation of the stories upon which researchers collaborated for six months with a university lecturer who had performed CLIL in the multilingual class. International students attended the class as a preparation class. We conducted observations and interviews before and following his lecture. All narratives have
already existed and were not created only for the sake of the study. Therefore, they qualified as real-life contexts. They were integrating diverse methodological approaches, and the insights of multiple groups, such as instructors and students, yielded many perspectives. Our research aimed to comprehend what was occurring in these narratives to acquire language ideologies around CLIL in multilingual classrooms.

The participant was a stated lecturer. The same state university granted him a bachelor's degree and a master's degree in Indonesian language education. He has taught at the institution for ten years. In 2015, when the university started the preparation course for international students, he was one of the instructors for this course. He had not received particular instruction in an English bilingual education program during his university studies, although he was required to take one semester of English. Some major English lecturers from the university assisted the lecturers in enhancing their English language skills and guided them in preparing English curricula and teaching aids.

According to Barkhuizen et al. (2014), some experts emphasize that narrative inquiry's greatest strength lies in its emphasis on how people use narratives to construct meaning in fields of investigation where it is imperative to know experiences from the standpoints of all those who encounter them. The objective is to develop a detailed account of thoughts and feelings and comprehension of the entity (the "theme") through examining the connections among subject lecturers' language ideologies, classroom practices, and the circumstances that affect them. We utilized the concept of CLIL viewed from language ideologies as the conceptual foundation for our study, derived from Coyle (2007) and Kroskryt (2010). In the setting of multilingual classrooms, CLIL practice was heavily influenced by language ideologies or views about language.

In this study, the researcher engaged thematic analysis to evaluate the narrative data. Barkhuizen et al. (2014) stipulated a thematic analysis model that comprises main processes: 1) repetitively
reading the data, 2) coding and categorizing the data extracts, and 3) recognizing thematic headings. Thematic analysis of narrative inquiry was used to evaluate the transcriptions. The data collection and analysis procedures were also carried out systematically. The core of the data is interview data, which is used to learn about the participants' experiences. The secondary data were classroom observations.

FINDINGS

Shifting language ideology and teaching practice in multilingual class can be deconstructed thought content is constructing integrated content and substantive related skills, communication is co-constructing and negotiating meaning, cognition is articulating language, content, and learning skills, and culture is presenting alternative meaning and sharing understanding

Content: Constructing Integrated Content and Substantive Related Skills

Andy confessed that preparing teaching materials and teaching in classrooms made him feel like teaching was a chore. One or two English subject lecturers (out of five English lecturers at the universities) provided some support, but only when the subject lecturers requested to fix the grammar or translate from Indonesian to English or from English to Indonesian. He stated:

"You couldn't have a regular Indonesian language lecturer giving anything like this course because I don't think they'd get the same out of it, so it would be impossible. And in the same way, an English lecturer couldn't possibly instruct an Indonesian language class in their native tongue. Therefore, you need to find someone who is knowledgeable in both fields." (Andy. Interview 2)

He noted that learning English while utilizing the language to teach substantive areas was difficult for most instructors since they were still challenged to use English for regular interaction. Learning to converse in English for everyday purposes was not the same as learning to teach in English. It was well acknowledged that proficiency
in a second or foreign language did not come relatively quickly. High cognitive levels of understanding were required for language competency and the type of language used in subject matter instruction.

He asserted that language proficiency was divided into two main categories: basic interpersonal communication skills and cognitive academic language proficiency. Communicative language, or interaction skills, were included in fundamental interpersonal communication skills. Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency, on the other hand, varied from daily language usage because it involved utilizing language to instruct subject matter. He verified that it required at least two semesters to catch up to native speakers in academic parts of the second language to employ English as the instructional language in the subject matter.

Furthermore, English classes at the university were handled in a disjointed and contradictory manner. To put it another way, the English training courses were only held briefly and ended. The English training did not foster the long-term growth of his English skills, nor did it offer bilingual education differentiated instruction. As a result, instructors only learned to communicate in English at a fundamental level, not how to impart deep topic knowledge in English.

Last, it was proved that the content aspect was applied based on observations and interviews with the instructor and student. The exercises connected the curriculum both within and outside the course, with some of them referring to real-life situations. Yet, it was still relevant and appropriate for the syllabus's needed competency. The students could integrate the topic they were learning with their own life experiences and profit from prior information learned in previous classes.

**Communication: Co-constructing and Negotiating Meaning**

Andy’s opinion on multilingual classes was very favorable and encouraging of English and Indonesian language acquisition. He reiterated various language techniques, such as instilling a passion for
studying English through the teaching and learning and extracurricular activities, emphasizing the necessity of early English language classes, and chances to reinforce the value of intercultural communication through cross-linguistic linkages. He stated that his colleague learned English at university and that his language knowledge was only required for his job needs. He also discovered problems with English language instruction. He said that when the English language was first presented as a medium, there were significant differences of opinion on issues such as pronunciation and word choice.

He believed that interaction was the most crucial purpose of learning any language, and he gave the illustration of one of his native college students' languages. The student did not speak Indonesian well and was ashamed to do so, so he tried to converse with her in English, and she was much more ready to interact with him after that. However, in her comparison of Indonesian, native, and English languages, she gave the Indonesian language the most importance, portrayed the native language as the language of their native that should be maintained, and English as the world language that should be mastered for visits.

During lectures, students and Andy had an efficient manner of communicating. When the students did not comprehend anything or the interaction was not working, the lecturer might work for them to co-create and negotiate meaning. When teaching the content, he used alternative words/phrases, used different paraphrases, employed trans language, and offered them some clues or the missing words. When students asked questions or made comments, they would do the same way. He stated:

"This class's activities encourage greater engagement and dialogue. Discussion aids in the completion of tasks. While we were unable to meet in person, we connected via social media. For example, using WhatsApp video calls or a chat forum for a WA group. Perhaps the discussion and sharing did not go as well as when we meet in person, but technology was a huge assistance." (Andy. Interview 8)
Cognition: Articulating Language, Content, and Learning Skills

Andy described the use of English in multilingual classes at the senior high school as a difficult task. He struggled to be qualified to instruct in English, acknowledging that their performance was insufficient to meet the bilingual challenge, as English was not widely used at the university where he worked. He discussed at least three complementary features that underlie the language ideology that when using English was a liability. These features included the issues of difficulties and problems teachers encountered when attempting to teach in English, the time-consuming nature of teaching disciplines in English, and lecturers' lack of self-confidence in using English. In interviews and informal conversations, he discussed at least three complementary features that underlie the language ideology that when using English is a liability. There would be a discussion of the biggest worries undergirding the ideology that Using English is a liability.

When he discussed the principles associated with the English language, he took a contrasting approach, and they appeared to equate English with globalization and development. He implied an overview of the value system that English was the international language, based on his perceptions of the multiple values embedded in English as a global language. CLIL frequently attempts consciously to foster learners' positive perception of cultural diversity (Jose Goris, et al.2019). He stated:

“It is unusual to encounter spectacular encouraging moments in educational contexts, particularly ones that 4.0 generation is identical with how you master English remodel the mindsets of the students from one instant to the next. Rather, it is often a sequence of nuances that could finally culminate in an effect that lasts for a lengthy period of time.” (Andy. Interview 7)

International students from different countries who spoke other languages viewed English as the most prevalent means of communication. He viewed English as the international language for the advancement and disclosure of science and information and communication technologies. English skills were viewed as necessary
for keeping up with the most recent information, technology, and science. According to him, no computer programs were available in Indonesian now. It appeared that English was the international language for information and communication technology.

The international students were also instructed to take notes on the new vocabulary they received, as these would be utilized in the learning process. The instructor then provided students with comments on their work to support their language and content learning. This activity was successful in capturing the students' attention. They were able to identify their errors and areas for development, and as a result, they were very motivated to complete the work.

**Culture: presenting alternative Meaning and Sharing Understanding**

Andy's assertion that English was a strain stemmed primarily from his experiences studying and utilizing the language to teach their respective disciplines. It was a response to his perception of the status of English in society outside of school. He described the position of English as a foreign language in Indonesia by discussing his feelings, opinions, and encounters while using English in a classroom setting. This concept pertained to his background, which included the neighborhood and society of which he and the institution were apart, his perceived identity, and the opportunities to speak English outside of the university.

The interpretation of our interview data and informal talks with him agreed with previous of our observations at universities, which indicated that English was not widely used by university community members. He meant that English was not widely spoken in his neighborhood and society. Thus, he believed it would be odd to talk about the language while others did not.

Andy asserted that the multilingual vocabularies contained a greater variety of words that might express specific intended meanings that were not conceivable in his English lexical items. As indicated by Andy, he occasionally believed that there were no English counterparts
for exact Indonesian words due to his limited English proficiency. In one lecture, Andy attempted to translate the Indonesian words "beras" and "nasi" into English. He questioned his class. Some international students noted that "beras" and "nasi" both translate to "rice" in English. However, he felt that the word did not convey the required complexity of interpretation. As it appeared that Indonesian was his native language and was widely spoken, it was much more straightforward for him to communicate himself in this instance. It was due to his lack of proficiency in English. He stated:

“There's a possibility that not all of them understood the words that I was saying, but I could tell that they were all following the instructions that I gave them... You will ultimately become accustomed to the system and how it operates. You are aware of what is meant by phrases such as "well, that means that and that means that" and "that means that." (Andy. Interview 5)

Then, becoming a part of a learning community was one strategy they could use to enhance their communication abilities. Standards that were developed by the community for how students should conduct themselves, how effectively they should communicate with one another, and how efficiently they should work together as a team. the culture of those standards. In other words, they will become more proficient in their use of language. A significant number of students were active members of their respective campus communities. In general, students who were active members of communities had higher levels of knowledge and self-assurance when participating in various learning activities.

DISCUSSION

This paper offered interpretations of a lecturer's voice based on the teaching and learning of multiple languages when a second or third language serves as the primary teaching medium for some courses. It provided a study of the instructional themes and techniques used in the multilingual CLIL courses that the university then ran and that offered core curriculum subjects. In the world of education, "second
language immersion programs" were sometimes referred to as "content and language integrated learning," or CLIL. The research results discussed above have been determined by a variety of works carried out from the participant, who acted in CLIL programs as an educator, and which were oriented on narrative data collection.

First, it was discovered that a significantly higher level of cognitive comprehension was necessary for language proficiency and the sort of language utilized in subject-matter training. Andy stated that there were two broad kinds of language competency: basic interpersonal communication competence and cognitive academic language competence. It was relevant with previous research. Teachers' views about English in higher education in EFL, according to Zhunussova et al (2022), are linked to prevalent language ideologies. He defined Communication abilities and Verbal language as essential interpersonal communication skills.

Agustin (2021) asserted that English language instructors' ideological positions, perceived reasons influencing the establishment and development of ideological stances, and the impact of moral stances in the course were all investigated. It implied Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency differed from everyday language use since it required the use of language to train subjects. He confirmed that it typically takes two semesters to adapt to native speakers in aspects of education of a foreign language when English is used as the medium of teaching in CLIL class. CLIL was beneficial to instructors since it helped students acquire content and language (McDougald, 2015).

Next, Andy was supportive of English and Indonesian language learning in bilingual classes. He highlighted numerous language strategies, such as fostering an enthusiasm for studying English through teaching, learning, and extracurricular activities, emphasizing the need for early English language classes, and promoting intercultural dialogue through cross-linguistic links. His colleague studied English at college, and he simply needed it for work. This lack of professional ethics and subject matter expertise was seen
as an intrinsic weakness of the English language instead due to a lack of systematic and thorough linguistic training, curriculum planning, and other factors (Pladevall-Ballester, 2018).

He found issues in English instruction. When English was initially given as a medium, there were different opinions on pronunciation and word choice. He believed interaction was the most important part of learning a language and used one of his students' languages as an example. In her comparison of Indonesian, native, and English languages, she awarded Indonesian the most priority, the native language as the language of their native, and English as the world language to master for visits. According to Fallas-Escobar (2020), critical dialogues played a crucial role in giving instructors opportunities to question the ideologies that underpinned their teaching methods and the amount to which their pedagogical decisions are impacted by circulating language ideologies.

He emphasized three complementary characteristics of the linguistic ideology that English was a liability. In interviews and casual interactions, he emphasized three aspects of the language notion that English is a burden. This contradicted previous research. CLIL enhanced practitioners' intrinsic motivation while participating in classroom behaviors, which helped explain the positive effects of CLIL programs on foreign language proficiency (Jose Goris, et al., 2019). Based on his understanding of English's numerous values, he implied that it was the international language. International students from various nations considered English the most common language. He saw English as the international language for science and ICTs. English seemed to be the language of ICT. CLIL instructors' new roles influenced the success of CLIL implementation (Monbec, 2020; Pérez-Cañado, 2018).

The interpretation of the data from our interviews and the informal conversations we had with him was in agreement with our earlier observations made at universities, which suggested that English was not commonly utilized by members of the academic community. It contradicted the previous finding that international students were
provided with several opportunities to speak, and the lecturer regularly elaborated on the students' points of view, as stated by Mahan (2022). He meant that people in his community and society did not speak English very frequently; hence, he considered that it would be unusual to talk about the language while other people did not. As Andy has noted, due to his weak English proficiency, he occasionally assumed that there were no English counterparts for specific Indonesian words. This was due to the fact that he did not speak Indonesian. A sizeable percentage of students were engaged participants in the communities that comprised their respective campuses. Worza (2020) added that these literacy sponsors and ideologies operating in near and distant environments significantly influenced the participants' literacy experiences in ways that worked for and/or against the participants' identity-forming interests.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to delve into the lecturer's story about language ideology and the practice of CLIL in multilingual classes. The results of this analysis revealed that the participant's language ideology (content, communication, cognition, and culture) was relatively consistent with his practice. He consciously adopted the term CLIL for his courses or planned to do a CLIL project in the multilingual class. It appeared that there had been a minor difference that he could practice differently based on their language ideologies. Based on the research findings, we asserted for greater emphasis on the findings that were based on our understandings of the data, whereas the data itself should be viewed as constructed. This bias might be viewed as a limitation of our study, though we perceive it as an outcome of our ontological and epistemological position rather than a weakness. Whereas our study has looked into the language ideologies and practices of CLIL in multilingual classrooms, it was not a comprehensive collection, but there are many other avenues for further CLIL investigation. The need, in our opinion, is not to restrict CLIL studies to broad particular topic disclosures, but to investigate what
the various topics can yield and how CLIL can be realized within a wide range of areas of academic.
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