

Article

A Multi-Method Profiling of Adult Refugees and Migrants in an L2 Non-Formal Educational Setting: Language Needs Analysis, Linguistic Portraits, and Identity Texts

Argyro Kyrlikitsi ¹  and Anna Mouti ^{1,2,*}
¹ Language Education for Refugees and Migrants Programme, Hellenic Open University, 263 35 Patras, Greece; irokirligitsi@hotmail.com

² School of Italian Language and Literature, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 541 24 Thessaloniki, Greece

* Correspondence: mouti@itl.auth.gr

Abstract: This paper will attempt to visualize adult refugees and migrants, as well as a specific multilingual and multicultural educational setting in Greece. This study aspires to depict/present the plurilingual profiles, language needs, and challenges of L2 Greek students through a variety of tools/methods, e.g., questionnaires, portraits, narratives, needs analysis, and assessment tools. In a complementary way, this research focuses on highlighting the value of language portraits, identity texts, and translanguaging in L2 Greek classrooms. Conditions regarding the educational process in the specific educational setting will also be discussed. This was a case study conducted in an open school for migrants in Greece. Eight volunteer teachers at the school and twenty students participated in this research through a multimethod research design. Multilingual profiles and learners' needs and goals became visible, and the teachers managed to "hear" the multilingual voices of their students and understand their multilingual profiles. Overall, it is clear that these findings pave the way for large-scale research to investigate in depth everything presented in this research. Using language portraits and identity texts as group activities helps to conduct a productive discussion in the classroom, through which students gain access to the use of concepts such as "multilingualism", "multiculturalism", and "diversity".

Keywords: multilingual needs; diversity; language portraits; identity texts; translanguaging; migrant and refugee adult learners



Citation: Kyrlikitsi, A.; Mouti, A. A Multi-Method Profiling of Adult Refugees and Migrants in an L2 Non-Formal Educational Setting: Language Needs Analysis, Linguistic Portraits, and Identity Texts. *Societies* **2023**, *13*, 186. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc13080186>

Academic Editor: Gregor Wolbring

Received: 15 May 2023

Revised: 2 August 2023

Accepted: 3 August 2023

Published: 10 August 2023



Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Since 1990, Greece has become a host country for countless refugees and migrants [1–4]. The situation peaked between August 2015 and March 2016, when it was estimated that 817,175 people crossed the Greek–Turkish border and emigrated to Greece [5,6]. Since then, the influx of refugees and migrants has not ceased. Lots of young and old people who have fled war, persecution, financial hopelessness, or combinations of thereof have applied for asylum in Greece. In the great refugee crisis that broke out in the period of 2015–2016, Greece was a key transit country for migrants. As many people decided to stay in Greece for a long time or even permanently, Greece began to deal with the education of refugees more effectively and with greater interest [7]. The Ministry of Education created a specialized program for the education of refugee children aged 4 to 15, which was implemented with the support of major humanitarian NGOs. However, as reported by the Greek Council for Refugees [8], although the education program for refugees and migrants implemented by the Ministry of Education was welcomed, it was implemented at a very slow pace and with several difficulties. In addition, the provision of preschool education was inadequate, and the provision of upper secondary education (over 15 years old), tertiary education, and vocational training for refugees was also limited and degraded.

There is apparently a lack of a more general and unified approach at the national level for language teaching of adult refugees and migrants, as the field of language education provided to migrants and refugees is fragmented, mainly depending on the initiatives taken by individuals, NGOs, or institutions operating on a local level [7]. As far as L2 Greek language learning opportunities for adult refugees and migrants are concerned, there are a variety of different options, as officially presented on the Ministry of Migration and Asylum's website [9]: the Migrant Integration Centers (M.I.C.), which operate as branches of community centers in municipalities; the Integration Training Centers of Project HELIOS, implemented by the International Organization of Migration; and the Lifelong Learning Centers of the Youth and Lifelong Learning Foundation, which provides education to adults, as do non-governmental organizations and/or other bodies, foreign organizations, entities representing third countries, and solidarity schools offering language support for L2 Greek in various settings across Greece.

Language classrooms are extremely diversified and multicultural. Diversity challenges traditional teaching strategies and methods, imposing the need to successfully manage a common context for all students through innovative solutions. However, both governments and educators tend to be "willingly blind", as they do not consider the language needs of migrants and do not try to find ways in which they can help them. Adult migrants are characterized by a great diversity of repertoires and educational backgrounds when they begin learning the majority language; therefore, there can be no universal solution concerning the language programs addressed to them. Extended research has been conducted by several scholars [10,11], especially in the field of needs analysis. First of all, migrants try to improve their socioeconomic and professional status [12], and usually, they want to learn the dominant language to take exams and receive citizenship of their place of residence, as well as socialize and find a job [12,13]. They focus on acquiring the L2 to find accommodation and take advantage of public services [12,13]. They want to have easier access to health services and political resources [12,14], and they need to communicate with healthcare providers [12], cope with everyday life in their host country properly [15], and cultivate their communication skills, which are essential for social inclusion, for entering the labor market, and for improving their career prospects [15]. Additionally, they want to be able to complete their CVs, search the internet for jobs successfully, and communicate with their employers during interviews [16,17], and they want to be educated so as to have the opportunity to enrich their professional profile [14,18]. Furthermore, if they are parents, they need to cope properly with their children's schoolwork and communicate with their children's teachers successfully about their progress [12,16,17,19], or to be able to inform the teachers if their children are sick, and generally be able to participate in the informative meetings at their children's schools [14,16,17].

If the 20th century was the age of migration, the 21st century will be the age of superdiversity. Greece has slowly ceased to be a monolingual and monocultural country [7]. Thus, the L1s and cultures of these people had to be preserved and used in the classroom as useful tools for acquiring their L2. Consequently, the value of diversity needs to be "embraced" both in the school classroom and, by extension, in each host country [20]. Today, formal and non-formal educational settings need to help learners to develop the academic and social skills required for a better future in Greece, or in any other country that they choose. They should take into account learners' needs and "hear" students' voices. They also ought to endorse plurilingual approaches in second-language and literacy learning.

Specifically, teachers could include the use of learners' L1 in the target-language teaching process for the learners to feel welcomed and realize that their first language is an important tool for acquiring their L2. Translanguaging is a useful teaching method [21]. It is the coexistence of L1 and L2 during the teaching process. It is a scaffold of instruction for refugees and facilitates spontaneous shifting between languages according to the situation [22]. Thanks to this method, learners better understand their L2 and interpret their bilingual words. Through this powerful mechanism, bi/multilinguals "create" their second language and learn it in an active way [23].

Moving on, several tools help teachers to recognize learners' skills and "listen" to learners' voices and needs. Identity texts are a powerful teaching tool for marginalized students [24]. They are pedagogical practices and artifacts that learners produce. They are multilingual texts through which students show their full linguistic repertoires. These texts can be multi-modal (written, spoken, visual, and/or musical). Students share these texts with multiple audiences, and they tend to receive positive feedback and affirmation of self in interaction with these audiences [25]. Through these texts, students also build connections between their L1 and L2. Students use their first language to help them make sense of their multilingual world. Learners produce better literacy work in their L2 and connect new information to their background knowledge.

Furthermore, language portraits help multilingualism to become visible; students use colors to show their multilingual repertoires [26] and present their linguistic identity in a fun way. They bring forward the linguistic and cultural diversity of students. The relationship between people and the languages they know is observed through these portraits. The unique "place" that languages occupy in each person's personality is revealed, as well as how people have connected their languages and what they mean to them [27]. It is a powerful tool with which students can present their linguistic identity. At the same time, teachers thus manage to "hear" the multilingual voices of their students and understand their multilingual profiles without limiting them to focus on a specific language [28].

This paper will attempt to visualize adult refugees and migrants and a specific multilingual and multicultural educational setting in Greece. The primary purpose of this study was to depict/present the plurilingual profiles, language needs, and challenges of L2 Greek students through various tools/methods, e.g., questionnaires, portraits, narratives, needs analysis, and assessment tools. In a complementary way, this research highlighted the value of language portraits, identity texts, and the use of L1s in the L2 Greek language classroom. More specifically, the research questions posed are as follows: What are the plurilingual profiles of adult refugees and migrants in the L2 Greek language classroom? What are the language needs and challenges of L2 Greek students? Do language portraits, identity texts, and the use of L1s contribute to the L2 Greek learning process?

This whole process may have further pedagogical implications, apart from the research interest, by suggesting ways for teachers to embrace their learners' multilingual profiles and needs and include them in the second language teaching process. The teacher should contribute to the development of a positive sense of identity for each student, which must also be linked to self-esteem and respect for the student's diversity. Otherwise, second language education will be ineffective [29].

2. Materials and Methods

This research was a case study in a non-formal educational setting. In general, there were sequential multi-method procedures [30] utilized in the research as the researcher followed a qualitative multi-method approach using multiple forms of qualitative data: observation, field notes, questionnaires, language portraits, identity texts, and written and oral assessment criteria of students' language skills. This combination of various qualitative methods as a multimethod research design may strengthen the quality of the research, allowing different aspects of the research objectives to be visible and providing triangulation opportunities. It was also transformative as innovative ways and methods of learning and providing L2 language support to adult learners were promoted, too. Transformative research also combines theory with practice and reflection with action, and it also includes personal realities [31]. Triangulation in this research also dominated. Multiple datasets, methods, and theories were included to address the research questions.

2.1. The Educational and Research Setting

As an educational setting, the school in this study has been active in the field of solidarity education since 2005, while in 2006, it received the legal form of an association. The school aims to educate and develop the country's migrants and refugees culturally [32].

This school is surrounded by volunteers and sensitized citizens. Volunteers do not necessarily have to be teachers. The members of the school try to ensure that the refugees and migrants of the country have their human rights respected and protected. Among these rights are education, health, and work. The purpose of the school is the smooth integration of migrants and refugees who need the support and help of their fellow human beings, regardless of nationality, religion, or gender. The goal of the structure is for these people to develop spiritually and culturally and to become independent and autonomous citizens of Greece. The school's curriculum includes various Greek Level courses, i.e., A1, A2, B1, B2, and C1, with the aim of obtaining the corresponding language certificates, as well as teaching remedial classes in reading, writing, history, and culture. At the same time, foreign-language departments of different levels, cultural and artistic interest classes, as well as IT training are offered. For students interested in enrolling in the school, it is mandatory to be evaluated both through an interview-type discussion between them and a teacher of this school but also through his/her responses to the evaluation criteria that he/she must complete himself/herself, in order to be adequately placed in a class/learning group.

2.2. Participants

2.2.1. The Students/Learners

Four groups of learners participated in this study: two pre-A1 level classes, one A1 class, and one A2 class. It was the A levels and the basic user that we wanted to focus on so that the most urgent language needs could be revealed, but also, the CoE Toolkit and LLAT tools could be used for these basic levels. We also focused on three different levels of students (pre-A1, A1, and A2) because we wanted to compare how these students coped with learning the Greek language and what difficulties the learners faced based on their L2 level. These classes and groups were formulated based on an interview and a placement test evaluation criterion that was implemented during the registration/welcoming phase. The pre-A1 and A1 classes were L2 Greek classes, while the A2 class was an L2 Greek class, including teaching history and culture issues.

In the first pre-A1 class, there were 5 students, in the second pre-A1 class, there are 4 students, in the A1 class there were 5 students, and in the A2 class, there are 6 students. The students were male and female, and they were aged from 20 to 48 years old. They were from Albania, Lebanon, China, Pakistan, Undura, India, Venezuela, and Egypt. Apart from their L1s (Spanish, Arabic, Chinese, Urdu, Albanian, Hindi), English was present in the majority of the cases, making them plurilingual with more than one language in their repertoires (12/20 cases with 2 languages, and 1 case using 3 languages). Most of them had lived in Greece for more than 5 years. However, two students had recently arrived in the country (just a few months or even weeks previously). All students had completed their basic formal education in the L1 in their country of origin, so no one was completely illiterate. Regarding their jobs, some of them were unemployed, some were taxi drivers, some worked in the open market, some were English teachers, some did manual labor (they worked in carpentry, others as plumbers, others as cobblers), and some were students at universities. Therefore, their educational level varies, comprising a super-diverse learning population (see Table 1).

2.2.2. The Teachers

Eight (8) teachers, including those from the classes above, participated in the research. Some were also teachers in public schools (as history teachers or as philologists) or were retired teachers. In addition, one of the participants was not a teacher or a retired teacher but was involved in accompanying unaccompanied children in a structure for refugee and immigrant minors. Hence, he knew the difficulties that refugees and migrants faced both linguistically, socially, economically, and culturally. Also, there was a participant volunteer whose profession was unrelated to the education sector or refugee and immigrant sector. However, he had much teaching experience in the school, and his postgraduate studies were related to education. As mentioned above, the school accepted any volunteers willing

to help adult refugee and immigrant students through language teaching. These educator volunteers taught at A0, A1, and A2 levels. The teacher participants also ranged in age from 25 to 60 years old, and some had completed postgraduate and/or doctoral studies relating to education. Besides their L1 (Greek), the participant teachers knew English, and some of them could also speak French, German, or Spanish. In addition, regarding the languages of refugees and migrants, they only knew basic words and phrases from Urdu, Arabic, and Hindi, which were the main L1s of their students. They knew these languages because they had to communicate using their learners' L1s. By using their learners' L1s, their students could understand their tutors and acquire their L2 efficiently. Also, some of the participants had been teaching in the field from 1 to 5 years, while others had been teaching for more than 5 years (see Table 2).

Table 1. The students' profiles.

	Sex	Age	Country	L1–L2s	Education	L2 Greek	Years in GR	Job in GR
ST1	M	22	Undura	Spanish	S.E.	Pre-A1	3 Years	Carpentry
ST2	M	24	Undura	Spanish	S.E.	Pre-A1	4 years	Carpentry
ST3	F	21	Egypt	Arabic	P.E.	Pre-A1	1 month	No Job
ST4	Female	23	Lebanon	Arabic/ English	H.E	Pre-A1	5 Months	No Job
ST5	Female	28	Egypt	Arabic, English, German	P.E.	Pre-A1	6 years	Factory employee
ST6	Female	28	China	Chinese	H.E	Pre-A1	6 Years	Employee in a factory
ST7	Male	30	China	Chinese	H.E	Pre-A1	6 Years	Employee in a factory
ST8	Male	29	China	Chinese	H.E	Pre-A1	8 Years	Clerk in a clothing store
ST9	Male	36	Pakistan	Urdu, English	P.E	Pre-A1	12 Years	Plumber
ST10	Female	23	Albania	Albanian, English	H.E	A1	2 Years	No Job
ST11	Male	26	India	Hindi, English	S.E	A1	3 Years	Cobbler
ST12	Female	43	India	Hindi, English	PG.E	A1	12 Years	No Job
ST13	Male	48	India	Hindi, Bengali	S.E	A1	15 Years	Taxi Driver
ST14	Male	41	Albania	Albanian, English	P.E	A1	16 Years	Plumber
ST15	Male	46	Albania	Albanian, English	H.E	A2	14 Years	Clerk in a store
ST16	Male	44	Albania	Albanian, English	S.E	A2	13 Years	Employee in a factory
ST17	Male	30	Pakistan	Urdu	H.E	A2	4 Years	Employee in a factory
ST18	Female	27	Pakistan	Urdu, English	H.E	A2	2 Years	Student at a university
ST19	Male	26	Venezuela	Spanish, English	H.E	A2	3 Years	Student at a university
ST20	Female	35	Pakistan	Urdu, English	S.E	A2	11 Years	Employee in a factory

Table 2. The tutors' profiles.

	Sex	Age	Education	L1–L2s	Job
TU1	Female	26	Higher Education	Greek/English/French	Philologist
TU2	Male	62	Higher Education	Greek/English/Urdu	Retired (philologist in the past)
TU3	Male	50	Higher Education	Greek/English/German	Philologist
TU4	Male	54	Postgraduate Education	Greek/English	History teacher
TU5	Male	48	Doctoral Studies	Greek/English/Spanish	Nutritionist
TU6	Female	46	Higher Education	Greek/English	Teacher in a primary school
TU7	Female	51	Higher Education	Greek/English	Teacher in a primary school
TU8	Female	65	Postgraduate Education	Greek/English	Retired (math teacher in the past)

2.3. Tools and Research Procedure

A qualitative multi-method research was used featuring a variety of tools to address the multilingual needs and multilingual profiles of migrant and refugee adults according to level. The research tools were implemented in the order that will be presented below,

and the research was conducted during the two first months of course attendance (October–November 2022). Initially, the researcher used some non-formal observation in all the classes captured through field notes regarding the teaching methods, challenges, and the whole classroom reality. Open-ended questionnaires were distributed to the 8 teachers and the 20 students of the school to investigate the challenges in a multilingual classroom and the methods and techniques used by both sides (by teachers and students). LAMI-LASLLIAM Assessment Tools (LLAT) and the CoE Toolkit tools were also used to study the language profiles and the strengths and difficulties of the students both in their L1s and L2 Greek. Additionally, language portraits and identity texts were applied to analyze their multilingual profiles in depth and to “hear” their multilingual voices in a representative way.

The Council of Europe (CoE) Toolkit for Language Support for Adult Refugees has been produced as part of the project Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants (LIAM) of the Council of Europe’s major Programme on language policy. The toolkit comprises 57 tools and other resources contained in the various sections of its website. Tools can be downloaded and adapted to meet the needs of different contexts. In this study, tools 25–30 were used to reveal the plurilingual profiles and language needs of the students, following a similar research design followed by Mouti et al. [16,17]. These seven tools (see <https://www.coe.int/en/web/language-support-for-adult-refugees/needs-analysis> (accessed on 7 August 2023)) are designed and used to analyze the learners’ needs, difficulties, and the methods the students used during their second language learning process. In a complementary way, but also to support the linguistic needs of possible low-literate participants, LAMI-LASLLIAM Assessment Tools (LLAT) based on the LASLLIAM Reference Guide [33] were also used for needs analysis and placement purposes. The LAMI-LASLLIAM Assessment Tools is a collection of four assessment tools within learning environments, involving literacy and second language courses in the migration context.

Language portraits help multilingualism become visible and bring forward students’ linguistic and cultural diversity. Students use colors to show their multilingual repertoires [26] and present their linguistic identity in a fun way. Language portraits are body silhouettes in which learners have to put their languages in different parts of a body silhouette and color these parts by choosing colors that represent the different languages they know. In this study, we focused on multilingual individuals’ lived experiences and how the learners made sense of their language trajectories, language learning, practices, and use. Together with the teachers who have these students, they tried to explain the reasons that placed the languages in the specific point of the body. Also, based on the research of Tabaro Soares, Duarte, and Günther-van der Meij [27], we did try to analyze and explain what both the positions and the colors that the students used in their language portraits symbolized.

Last but not least, regarding the identity texts, a thematic analysis [34] was followed. Twenty participants were asked to create identity texts about either the languages they knew, their plans for the future, someone they loved very much, or a friend of theirs, or about their travels, or their homeland. The suggested topics were based on Gogonas and Gatsi [6]. The texts were written either online or in writing in class. The students were also free to express themselves in any language they wanted to. Linguistic openness was necessary for the learners to express themselves as well as possible and without being limited to using their L2 which would limit their way of thinking [6]. Identity texts are a powerful teaching tool for marginalized students [25]. They are pedagogical practices and artifacts that learners produce. They are multilingual texts through which students show their full linguistic repertoires. In our paper, identity texts were translated through dictionaries or with the help of other teachers and students, and meanings were traced relating to the adult learners’ views moving on to coding [35]. Based on Gatsi and Gogonas [6] and their analysis of identity texts, the themes arrived at after the analysis were as follows: (1) the usefulness of the host country’s language; (2) the value of languages for their studies, their job, and their daily and future needs. Based on these texts, the learners’ plurilingual profiles, language levels, and identities were identified.

3. Results

This paper aspires to visualize adult refugees and migrants' multilingual profiles, language needs, and a specific multilingual and multicultural educational setting in Greece. For this purpose, a variety of tools/methods were used, e.g., questionnaires, portraits, narratives, needs analysis, and assessment tools. We will present our findings according to the tools implemented as all attempted to answer the same research questions in a mixed-method way. Therefore, the results categorized according to the tool/method used provided data regarding the plurilingual profiles and language needs of adult refugees and migrants in the L2 Greek language classroom and the challenges of L2 Greek students and their teachers.

3.1. Students' and Teachers' Questionnaires

Students' and teachers' questionnaires were mainly used as an introductory instrument to collect some attitudes and practices used in the L2 classroom and information regarding the profiles and needs in the L2 language classroom. As Greece was a permanent destination for most students, adult refugees, and migrants primarily tried to learn Greek and were secondarily interested in other languages (e.g., English, German). Most students struggled in all Greek language skills except for A2 students, who coped better in Greek. The students considered that the fact that their L1 was different from Greek negatively affected the process of learning the Greek language. The students also aimed to master the Greek language for professional purposes, for personal development, socializing, obtaining Greek citizenship, and in general in order to integrate successfully and fully into their new host country. Furthermore, their L1 was considered by them to be a useful tool both when they used it in their efforts to learn the Greek language and when the teachers used it to explain the Greek language to them. The students could not recognize the value of identity texts and language portraits as they were not familiar with them. However, they considered it very important to use their L1, and they also felt that they had already developed thanks to their teachers and the educational methods they used to help them.

The teachers at that school had a lot of experience teaching adult migrant and refugee students. They used every possible way to pass on their knowledge to their students and develop them. Additionally, the fact that they worked at this school voluntarily proves their love for the work they do and that they really care about the development of their students.

The teachers had identified that their students needed help in all the Greek language skills, except for the A2-level teacher, who noticed that his students did not have difficulty learning Greek. Consequently, the problems students faced depended on the level they were at. Moreover, some tutors did not believe that the similarity or the non-similarity of the students' L1 and L2 could play a vital role in the ease or difficulty of learning Greek. Furthermore, the teachers considered that the successful acquisition of a second language depended on the background that each student brings, the years of their stay in Greece, and the student themselves and the effort they make to learn Greek. In addition, the professors recognized that their students wished to learn the Greek language because they wanted to integrate into Greek society fully and have equal rights with Greek citizens. The students wanted to be autonomous citizens of Greek society. Like students, most teachers did not use or recognize the value of language portraits and identity texts. With very few exceptions, however, the tutors recognized the value of translanguaging. Leveraging students' L1s helped the students understand and acquire their L2. However, the teachers only knew a few words and phrases from the L1s of their students. Thus, they made use of these phrases and words they knew together and they also utilized other teaching methods, such as the use of metaphorical expressions, the use of videos and images, the use of the English language, as well as dramatization activities.

3.2. LAMI-LASLLIAM Assessment Tools and CoE Toolkit

LLAT highlighted students' difficulties and skills in their L1 literacy but mainly in L2 competence. The school's assessment tools and the LLAT successfully highlighted

the students' weaknesses and strengths. More specifically, students of all levels were not non-literate in their L1, although some low-literate cases were having completed primary education. Both in the school and LLAT tools, all students held the pencil correctly and had no difficulty in writing and reading in their L1 what was asked of them. Age also did not act as a barrier at any level, nor did the different writing systems they had in their L1. However, especially for pre-A1 students, the knowledge of the Greek language, both orally and in writing, was quite limited [7]. On the contrary, something like this did not apply to A1 and A2 students because of their greater practice in Greek. The pre-A1 students could not quickly memorize words [33], in contrast to the next two levels where they knew words, and the students of A2 could also use articles in front of nouns. Also, for the A1 students, they did not have linguistic and orthographic awareness of Greek [33], and when they produced short texts, they made many grammatical and syntactic mistakes [36], something that was not observed in the A2 students who had a much more structured speech. The A2 students could write these texts, for they had to do so with familiar topics, and the learners knew the necessary high-frequency words and phrases to use.

The results of the LLAT confirmed the ones from the school assessment tools for these students. In both assessment processes, the pre-A1 students seemed shy and insecure due to their limited knowledge of Greek. However, when they knew something or were given a little help and could cope with the activities, their confidence seemed to rise. The A1 and A2 students appeared to be open to most evaluation criteria. They gained self-confidence as they realized they coped appropriately with the activities, understood the exercises' content, and could produce the Greek language in writing. An exception was the written interaction activities carried out by the A1 students, for due to their limited developed writing skills, their non-response to these exercises led them to frustration. Regarding the use of the CoE Toolkit, the results of the application of Tool 25 and Tool 26 showed that the students themselves recognized that they had difficulty in the Greek language. Pre-A1 students indicated that they had trouble with everything. In contrast, A1 students reported that they were at a moderate level in Greek and lagged mainly in reading and writing. The students of A2 said that they were at a reasonable level in the Greek language and could cope with daily needs and issues. However, they believed their writing and reading skills needed further improvement as they wanted to obtain, Greek citizenship as soon as possible. The A2 students were able to cope with all the activities successfully as their vocabulary was developed, and they did not make syntax and grammar mistakes, in contrast to the A1 students. Tool 28 confirmed the above findings, and through this tool, all students seemed to consider learning the Greek language valuable. However, they used different ways to master it. The A1 students used their L1 to acquire their L2, but less so than the pre-A1 students. The A2 learners did not use their L1 during their second language learning process. They tried to use the Greek language exclusively both inside and outside the classroom to support their second language acquisition. They believed that the more they practiced the target language, the more immediately they would improve and develop both in writing and speaking.

Tool 29 aimed to "hear" the voices of the students, and their language needs and take into account their L2 level. Pre-A1 students considered that they struggled in all aspects of the Greek language, while A1 students believed that they were at a moderate level in their oral skills and a moderate to low level in their written and reading skills. A2 students considered that they were quite good in oral skills but could have been better in written production, written comprehension, and interaction. Pre-A1 students prioritized the development of their speaking skills and not so much their writing and reading skills. They considered that knowledge of the Greek language was important in all areas of their lives. However, the primary goal for both them and the A1 students was to get a job and/or develop professionally. Both A1 and A2 students aimed to grow professionally but prioritized developing linguistically in Greek to take exams and obtain Greek citizenship. It was essential for them to have equal rights with Greek citizens. For this reason, they

prioritized the development of their writing and reading skills as they could communicate more comfortably in Greek with the pre-A1 students.

Moreover, through these tools, the practices used by the students in learning the Greek language were also highlighted. Pre-A1 and A1 students greatly used their L1 both outside and inside the classroom. On the contrary, A2 students tried to learn the Greek language exclusively through the use of the Greek language rather than through their L1. They also used Greek not only with their teacher and their non-speaking classmates but also with their classmates who had a common L1. They believed that this way they would develop more effectively and more immediately.

3.3. Language Portraits

This tool aimed to present the multilingual profiles of the students and their language needs, and it was applied to all 20 students. It became like group work in the classroom, and they seemed to find it quite amusing. While creating their language portraits, many laughed and felt awkward and strange at first. However, after they created the language portraits, a group discussion followed with everyone to share with the researcher and the rest of their classmates both their multilingual profiles and what value each language they knew had for them. The languages recorded were their L1s (Spanish, Urdu, Albanian, Arabic, Hindi, Bengali) as well as other languages they knew (Greek, English, German). The students placed the languages they knew on the head, hands and feet, and chest of the human silhouette. The placement of the languages in specific parts of the human shape reflected the value that the languages they knew had for them. The colors they heralded were connected exclusively to the colors of each country's flag where these languages are dominant. Colors were not associated with emotions. However, the analysis and the justification they gave regarding why they placed where they placed the languages they know to the researcher seemed to be connected to emotional reasons as well.

Regarding the language portraits, it was observed that all the students [26,27] put their L1 on the head. Talking with the students themselves but also with their teachers, the researcher concluded that they put it there as it was their first language with which the students thought and expressed themselves ("That's how I think. It's my language", "This is the language thanks to which I can speak and write"). It was their main language; it was the language that dominated among them. In addition, 19 people placed the Greek language on their hands, either right or left. Most of the students mentioned that it was a useful language for them, necessary for their daily life, and that is why they placed it in this point of their portrait. Only one student placed the Greek language in her heart and when asked why she put it there she said "It's a very beautiful language! I love it!".

Moreover, 14 people, put the English language in their portraits. Some put it in their hands (6 people) with the justification that they also needed it in their daily life and for their work. Others (8 people) placed the English language at the feet. Some of them (3 people) placed it there with the excuse that they did not need it immediately in their lives, while others (the remaining 5) placed it at the feet because they did not need it at the given moment and their priority was learning the Greek language. However, they referred that this language is essential for them because they need it to cope with their daily needs, survive, and even evolve as human being. The English language was necessary, as the students themselves mentioned, to get a job, develop their work, and be able to travel to other countries. Last but not least, the colors they used were directly related to the national flags of the countries where their languages are spoken (e.g., in Greek they put blue, in Chinese red, in English red or blue, in Urdu green, in Arabic red). In Table 3, an attempt was made to summarize the analysis of the language portraits provided.

Table 3. The analysis of all the language portraits.

L1s	Spanish, Urdu, Bengali, Albanian, Arabic, Chinese, Hindi
L2s	English, German, Greek
The color of their L1s	Red and yellow for Spanish, green for Bengali and Urdu, red for Arabic, Chinese and Albanian
The color of their L2s	Red and blue for English, red and black for German, blue for Greek
The parts of the body where they put their L1s	Head and arms
The parts of the body where they put their L2s	Chest (Greek), arms (Greek, English, German), and legs (English)

For all students, their L1s were the dominant languages, and it was pretty influential in all areas of their lives. However, since Greece was a permanent destination for many of them, as reflected in their language portraits, it was also a language that was necessary for them to survive in their host country, meet their daily needs, and develop. Also, they considered it very important to learn the English language (and some also mentioned German) to grow as people, to get a job or even a better career, and for travel reasons. The findings of the body language portraits are in alignment with the study of [27], which demonstrated that L1 was placed on the head or the body trunk.

3.4. Identity Texts

Twenty identity texts were collected. Of these, eleven were written in the L1 of the participants, while the rest (nine) were written in Greek. What was written in the L1 of the participants was translated either through dictionaries or online translation tools either with the help of the teachers or with the help of other students who knew the languages as they were their L1s and were able to translate the content of the texts to the researcher in Greek or English.

The topic that everyone analyzed was the languages they knew and wanted to learn. Their text analysis was thematic, specifically focusing the following: which languages they wanted to learn, their great need to acquire their L2 for work and study reasons, socialization reasons, their personal development, family reasons, and their reasons for integration in their host country. However, the texts could not be placed exclusively in one of these topics, as many were referred to and included in the same texts (e.g., many wrote that they wanted to learn their L2 for socialization and work reasons). Their texts were also short; the participants did not analyze their texts, as they wanted to directly refer to the reasons for learning Greek and other languages. Through these texts, we learned more about the students, their language needs, their plans for the future in Greece, and their goals. All the identity texts were dominated by the students' great need to learn Greek and secondarily English.

Most of them (10 students) said that they need the Greek language to get a job or for a better job in the future. They wanted to have equal rights with the Greek citizens. No one should exploit them in the workplace. They wanted to have equal job opportunities with the Greek citizens.

Student 1: Hi! I'm. . . and I'm from China. I just want to learn Greek because I need it in my daily life and in my work. (He wrote it in Chinese. He sent it to the researcher as an electronic message and it was translated.)

Student 2: My language is Urdu. However, I want to learn Greek in order to find another job. (He wrote it in Urdu. He sent it to the researcher as an electronic message and it was translated.)

One of them also referred to his great need to learn Greek for job reasons, and he also mentioned that he wanted to acquire English as he wanted to travel all over the world.

Student 3: Hello. I am. . . . I am from Pakistan. I know Urdu and I want to learn Greek because I live here and I need it for my daily life and for my job. Also, I want to learn English because I want to travel all over the world. (He wrote it in Urdu. He sent it to the researcher as an electronic message and it was translated.)

Also, four of them wrote that they needed Greek for their personal development. They also wanted to be able to communicate with others. Greece was also a permanent country for them, not a temporary destination. Thus, they needed to be integrated into Greek society as soon as possible.

Student 4: I know Hindi and English. I want to learn Greek to be able to communicate. (He wrote it in English. He sent it to the researcher as an electronic message.)

Student 5: I know Urdu and I want to learn Greek and English to develop myself and because I want to stay in Greece. (He wrote it in Urdu. He sent it to the researcher as an electronic message, and it was translated.)

One student referred to her family as well as her future plans in her text. She mainly focused on her great need to acquire the Greek language in order to find a job and raise her children successfully.

Student 6: Good morning! I am writing about my future plans. I created a family, of which I, my husband and my two daughters are a part. I plan when the girls grow up, they will go to kindergarten and then I can start working. But first I have to learn Greek because I've been here for 2–3 years and I still know very little. I want to learn Greek with the help of my teacher so that I can communicate freely! (She wrote it in Albanian. She sent it to the researcher as an electronic message, and it was translated.)

It is worth noting that several made the attempt to write their answer in Greek, wanting to show what they had managed to learn so far. Although there were orthographic and grammar mistakes, from this effort, it is also observed how intense is their need to learn the language and to learn to use it correctly and properly.

Student 7: I know Albanian, I know a little English and German. I want to learn Greek. (She wrote on a piece of paper and gave it to the researcher: Εγώ Ξέρω Αλβανικά. Ξέρω λιγώ Αγγλικά και Γερμανός. Θέλω να μαθίμα Ελληνικά.)

Student 8: Hi, I'm I know Chinese. I want to learn Greek. (She wrote it on a piece of paper and gave it to the researcher: Γεια, Είμαι η . . . Ξέρω Κινεζικά. Θέλω να μαθω Ελληνικά.)

Student 9: I'm from Lebanon. I just want to learn Greek. (She wrote it on a piece of paper and gave it to the researcher: Είμαι από το Λιβάνο. Θέλω απλά να μαθω Ελληνικά.)

In general, mastering the Greek language was an urgent goal for students as they wanted to fully integrate into Greek society and be able to cope with daily needs and obligations. Secondly, they reported that they needed other languages, such as English and German, to travel, develop as people and get a job and/or get a better job. These texts were also discussed in class, and the student's needs were analyzed. The learners felt more accepted and closer to the researcher and the rest of their classmates. They realized that their needs could be better understood thanks to these texts. These texts also gave them courage and confidence; they realized that their L1 could be connected to their L2 and could be used as a tool to acquire Greek and express their needs and goals to their classmates and to their tutors.

4. Discussion

Overall, this study aspires to contribute to relevant research, which is limited, especially regarding adult refugees and migrants, as similar studies have been conducted mainly addressing young learners/children with a migrant or/and refugee background. The dual purpose of this study aspires to provide research data regarding mapping learners' sociolinguistic and plurilingual profiles in the Greek context but also to provide insights for educators into visualizing their students' plurilingualism and helping them to understand their linguistic and literacy experiences as well as their needs.

In this case study, pre-A1, A1, and A2 language classrooms were observed and examined to recognize how learners cope with learning the Greek language and to identify and depict their language needs and profiles through questionnaires, the tools of Toolkit, and LLAT assessment tools. Learners' skills (in their L1 and L2), difficulties (in their

L2), and needs (in their L2(s)) by level were also investigated. Identity texts and language portraits were used to identify students' language needs and multilingual profiles in a complementary way, serving triangulation procedures and supporting a qualitative multi-method approach.

In these multilingual classes, the student's abilities and difficulties differed by level, and consequently, the goals they had for mastering the Greek language were also different. All classes were highly diverse regarding learners' language competence, literacy, and linguistic backgrounds, ranging from those without knowledge of the target language (mainly Greek) to A2-level students. They wanted (mostly the pre-A1 learners) to acquire Greek to get a job, or a better job, to socialize, develop, and cope with their daily needs in their host country. The A1 and A2 learners mostly wanted to learn Greek to apply for Greek citizenship and have equal rights with Greek citizens. Moreover, many wanted to learn other languages besides Greek (e.g., English, German) to develop and ensure better prospects for their future. These findings agree with the results of relevant studies in the Greek context [14,17,37]. Most students tried through their L1 to deal with the difficulties they faced with the Greek language and to acquire their L2 successfully. Some myths about language learning [38] emerged among the students (e.g., they believed that the more they practiced the target language, the more immediately they would improve and develop both in writing and speaking), and the implications of this could be further examined and discussed in future studies.

The teachers, on the other hand, reported using different ways (English, pictures, body language, video, metaphors, dramatization activities, etc.) to teach the students the Greek language as they did not always know the L1 of their students except for a few words and phrases. However, most of them recognized the great value of translanguaging, L1s use, but also English as a lingua franca in the L2 teaching process, and they tried to apply this teaching method even though the use of the few phrases and words they knew from their learners' L1s. On the other hand, teachers did not use identity texts and language portraits as most teachers did not consider them necessary or did not know them at all. This perspective of teachers not always applying multilingual strategies could be linked to results in Faneca et al. [39] but also in Haukås [40] and in Gkaintartzi et al. [41], despite the positive attitudes towards multilingualism. This result has important implications for possible training courses. As Gkaintartzi et al. [41] mention, teachers need more training and support to progress from multilingual awareness towards utilizing the students' languages in their everyday practices pedagogically. Nevertheless, there was sufficient data from research that had been conducted on the value of identity texts and language portraits in the language education of migrant children, while relevant research regarding adults was somewhat limited, especially in the Greek context. This could be considered as one of the reasons why many teachers of the school (if not all) did not recognize the value of these methods and how useful they were in identifying the needs and difficulties of their students. Another limitation of this study relating to identity texts could be that there was just a minimum of work conducted in class to prepare students for their writing (analysis of other identity texts, preparatory activities, etc.), thus resulting in such short texts which give very little information. It may be that providing specific prompts or an outline of what is expected could provide longer and more detailed biographies, as in Park [42], where the prompts were discussed and decided collectively.

However, this research has shed light on further research into how teachers can recognize their adult learners' strengths, weaknesses, and multilingual needs. Thanks to these tools, the researchers and the teachers could hear and discern the particular language needs of the students and how important the learners consider both their L1 and the Greek language. Thanks to plurilingualism, language portraits, and identity texts, teachers can get closer to their students, understand them, and help them more effectively in learning each L2. In general, teachers must embrace their students' multilingual profiles and needs through appropriate multilingual tools. Both language portraits and identity texts are powerful tools with which students have the opportunity to present their linguistic identity.

At the same time, teachers manage to “hear” the multilingual voices of their students and understand their multilingual profiles. Using language portraits and identity texts as group activities helps to have a productive discussion in the classroom, through which students gain access to use concepts such as “multilingualism”, “multiculturalism”, and “diversity”.

The findings of this case study could be considered preliminary, and undoubtedly, future studies need to be carried out in various formal and non-formal educational settings in Greece. This study’s findings may contribute to previous studies conducted in the Greek context around the language education for adult refugees and migrants [7,14,37,41], but basically, it points out the necessity for discussing pedagogical implications in basic dimensions of adult refugees’ education [43] through further research on plurilingual profiles in the migration context.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.K. and A.M.; Data curation, A.K.; Investigation, A.K.; Methodology, A.K. and A.M.; Supervision, A.M.; Writing—original draft, A.K.; Writing—review and editing, A.M. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and approved by a Supervision Committee for dissertations (11 February 2023) of the Hellenic Open University.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- GNCHR. Reference Report on the Refugee and Migrant Issue; Hellenic Republic. 2020. Available online: https://nchr.gr/images/English_Site/PROSFYGES/Reference_Report_Refugees.pdf (accessed on 1 August 2023).
- Saiti, A.; Chletsos, M. Opportunities and Barriers in Higher Education for Young Refugees in Greece. *High. Educ. Policy* **2020**, *33*, 287–304. [CrossRef]
- Mattheoudakis, M.; Griva, E.; Moumtzi, M. Migration and Language Education in Southern Europe. In *Practices and Challenges*; Cambridge Scholars Publishing: Newcastle upon Tyne, UK, 2021.
- Chatzina, P.; Mouti, A. Second Language Assessment Issues in Refugee and Migrant Children’s Integration and Education: Assessment Tools and Practices for Young Students with Refugee and Migrant Background in Greece. *Languages* **2022**, *7*, 82. [CrossRef]
- GNCHR. Annual Report; Hellenic Republic. 2015. Available online: https://www.nchr.gr/images/English_Site/Ektheseis/GNCHR%20Annual%20Report%202015.pdf (accessed on 1 August 2023).
- Gogonas, N.; Gatsi, G. Exploring Unaccompanied Minors’ Linguistic Repertoires Through Identity Texts: A Study in Northern Greece. In *Challenges and Initiatives in Refugee Education: The Case of Greece*; Chatzidaki, A., Tsokalidou, R., Eds.; Cambridge Scholars Publishing: Newcastle upon Tyne, UK, 2022; pp. 3–16.
- Kantzou, V.; Manoli, P.; Mouti, A.; Papadopoulou, M. Language Education for Refugees and Migrants: Multiple Case Studies from the Greek Context. *Διάλογοι! Θεωρία και πράξη στις επιστήμες αγωγής και εκπαίδευσης* **2017**, *3*, 18. [CrossRef]
- Greek Council for Refugees. Access to Education-Greece | Asylum Information Database. Available online: <https://asylumineurope.org/reports/country/greece/reception-conditions/employment-and-education/access-education/> (accessed on 1 August 2023).
- Ministry Migration Asylum. Available online: <https://migration.gov.gr> (accessed on 13 May 2023).
- Beacco, J.C.; Krumm, H.J.; Little, D. *L’intégration Linguistique des Migrants Adultes*; De Gruyter Mouton: Berlin/Boston, Germany, 2017.
- Krumm, H.J. Refugees need language—How can volunteers give support? *Eur. J. Lang. Policy* **2017**, *9*, 132–137.
- Ugurel Kamışlı, M. Language and Culture Learning Needs of Adult Refugees. *New Dir. Adult Contin. Educ.* **2022**, *2022*, 85–93. [CrossRef]
- Papapostolou, A.; Manoli, P.; Mouti, A. Challenges and Needs in the Context of Formal Language Education to Refugee Children and Adolescents in Greece. *J. Teach. Educ. Educ.* **2020**, *9*, 7–22.
- Androulakis, G.; Mastorodimou, E.; Van Boeschoten, R. Using qualitative methods for the analysis of adult migrants’ L2 needs: Findings from a research project in Greece focusing on school-parents Communication. *Ir. J. Cult. Arts Lit. Lang.* **2016**, *1*, 6.

15. Grünhage-Monetti, M.; Svet, A. "The fight against exclusion from the labour market begins in the workplace": Work-related second language development towards inclusion and participation. In *The Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants/L'intégration Linguistique des Migrants Adultes: Some Lessons from Research/Les Enseignements de la Recherche*; Beacco, J., Krumm, H., Little, D., Thalgott, P., Eds.; De Gruyter Mouton: Berlin, Germany; Boston, MA, USA, 2017; pp. 315–320.
16. Mouti, A.; Kantzou, V.; Manoli, P. Language Education to Refugee and Asylum-Seeking Children in Greece in Non-Formal Settings. In *Migration and Language Education in Southern Europe*; Cambridge Scholars Publishing: Newcastle upon Tyne, UK, 2021.
17. Mouti, A.; Maligkoudi, C.; Gogonas, N. Assessing language needs of adult refugees and migrants in the Greek context. In *Collected Papers for the ALTE (Association of Language Testers in Europe) for the 7th International Conference*; ALTE Publications: Cambridge, UK, 2021.
18. Van Avermaet, P.; Gysen, S. Council of Europe. Language Learning, Teaching and Assessment and the Integration of Adult Migrants. The Importance of Needs Analysis. 2008. Available online: <https://rm.coe.int/16802fc1d5> (accessed on 1 August 2023).
19. Androulakis, G.; Gkaintartzi, A.; Kitsiou, R.; Tsioli, S. Research-driven task-based L2 learning for adult migrants in times of humanitarian crisis: Results from two nationwide projects in Greece. In *Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants; Some Lessons from Research*; Beacco, J.C., Krumm, H.J., Little, D., Thalgott, P., Eds.; De Gruyter Mouton: Berlin/Boston, Germany, 2017; pp. 181–186.
20. Gardner-Cholors, P.; Gogonas, N.; McEntee-Atalianis, L. How can linguists contribute to the refugee crisis? Issues and responses. *Éducation Sociétés Plurilingues* **2016**, *40*, 95–101. [CrossRef]
21. Kirsch, C. Opening minds to translanguaging pedagogies. *System* **2020**, *92*, 102271. [CrossRef]
22. Cenoz, J.; Gorter, D. Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: Threat or opportunity? *J. Multiling. Multicult. Dev.* **2017**, *38*, 901–912. [CrossRef]
23. García, O. *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*; Wiley/Blackwell: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2009.
24. Manyak, P.C. "What Did She Say?": Translation in a Primary-Grade English Immersion Class. *Multicult. Perspect.* **2004**, *6*, 12–18. [CrossRef]
25. Cummins, J. Multiliteracies pedagogy and the role of identity texts. In *Teaching for Deep Understanding: What Every Educator Should Know*; Leithwood, K., McAdie, P., Bascia, N., Rodrigue, A., Eds.; CorwinPress: New York, NY, USA, 2006; pp. 85–93.
26. Busch, B. The Language Portrait in Multilingualism Research: Theoretical and Methodological Considerations. *Work. Pap. Urban Lang. Literacies* **2018**, *236*, 1–13.
27. Soares, C.T.; Duarte, J.; Günther-van der Meij, M. "Red Is the Colour of the Heart": Making Young Children's Multilingualism Visible through Language Portraits. *Lang. Educ.* **2020**, *35*, 22–41.
28. Prasad, G. Portraits of Plurilingualism in a French International School in Toronto: Exploring the Role of Visual Methods to Access Students' Representations of Their Linguistically Diverse Identities. *Can. J. Appl. Linguist.* **2014**, *17*, 51–77.
29. Gatsi, P.A. Étude Pluri Méthodologique de Pratiques D'enseignement-Apprentissage Développées et Expérimentées en École Primaire pour le Renforcement de L'identité des Élèves D'origine Migrante. Ph.D. Thesis, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece, 2022.
30. Creswell, J.W. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*; Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 2022.
31. Nel, K.A.; Govender, S. Dealing with Shame Using Appreciative Inquiry. In *The Bright Side of Shame*; Mayer, C.H., Vanderheiden, E., Eds.; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2019.
32. About A.S.M.P.—Open School of Migrants Piraeus. Available online: <https://asmpir.gr/about-asmp/> (accessed on 13 May 2023).
33. Council of Europe. Literacy and Second Language Learning for the Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants (Lasliam): Reference Guide. 2022. Available online: <https://rm.coe.int/prems-008922-eng-2518-literacy-and-second-language-learning-couv-texte/1680a70e18> (accessed on 1 August 2023).
34. Braun, V.; Clarke, V. Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qual. Res. Psychol.* **2006**, *3*, 77–101. [CrossRef]
35. Miles, M.B.; Huberman, A.M. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*; Sage Publications: California, CA, USA, 1994.
36. Mogli, M.; Papadopoulou, M. If I stay here, I will learn the language: Reflections from a case study of Afghan refugees learning Greek as a Second Language. *Res. Papers Lang. Teach. Learn.* **2018**, *9*, 181–194.
37. Mouti, A.; Maligkoudi, C.; Gogonas, N. Language needs analysis of adult refugees and migrants through the CoE-LIAM Toolkit: The context of language use in tailor-made L2 material design. *Sel. Pap. Theor. Appl. Linguist.* **2022**, *24*, 600–617. Available online: <https://ejournals.lib.auth.gr/thal/article/view/9210> (accessed on 13 May 2023).
38. McLaughlin, B. *Myths and Misconceptions about Second Language Learning: What Every Teacher Needs to Unlearn*; Educational Practice Report 5; National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning: Santa Cruz, CA, USA, 1992. Available online: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED352806> (accessed on 1 August 2023).
39. Faneca, M.; Araújo e Sá, M.H.; Melo-Pfeifer, S. Is there a place for heritage languages in the promotion of an intercultural and multilingual education in the Portuguese schools? *Lang. Intercult. Commun.* **2016**, *16*, 44–68. [CrossRef]
40. Haukås, Å. Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach. *Int. J. Multiling.* **2016**, *13*, 1–18. [CrossRef]
41. Gkaintartzi, A.; Mouti, A.; Skourtou, E.; Tsokalidou, R. Language teachers' perceptions of multilingualism and language teaching: The case of the postgraduate programme "LRM". *Lang. Learn. High. Educ.* **2019**, *9*, 33–54. [CrossRef]

42. Park, G. Adult English language learners constructing and sharing their stories and experiences: The cultural and linguistic autobiography writing project. *TESOL J.* **2011**, *2*, 156–172.
43. Karanikola, Z.; Palaiologou, N. Refugees and adult education: A Thematic Analysis on UNESCO's Latest Recommendations. *Stud. Inst. Pedagog.* **2021**, *1*, 57–74.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.