

Epistemic authority and hybrid integration in the view of language ideologies in classroom discourse

Erica Righard, Petra Svensson Källberg, Sara Amadasi, Shannon Damery, Krystyna Slany and Thomas Droessler

Introduction

This chapter is about language use in the view of agency and participation in multilingual classrooms. It responds to questions about how teachers relate to, make use of and strengthen children's production of knowledge, i.e. epistemic authority (Chapter 2), through language competences in the multilingual classroom, including in second language teaching. In line with Barwell (2009), a broad understanding of the multilingual classroom is applied; a classroom is considered to be multilingual if two or more languages are used overtly in the conduct of classroom activities. Classrooms are also considered to be multilingual if students *could* use two or more languages in the learning situation, even if this does not actually occur. As we will show, multilingualism in the classroom is not only manifest in varying ways, but also understood and related to by teachers in varying ways across our material, as the two quotes from Sweden below illustrate:

The important thing is to always try to get the students to speak, that's the most important thing, because they speak (..) We have students with us who speak very little Swedish, they mainly speak, for example, Arabic. So that it is only inside the classroom that they meet Swedish. And then I get (..) I think it's my job to make sure they actually speak Swedish.

(SWE_T4_F)

It is not obvious that the teaching needs to be 100 percent in Swedish, but I usually say that "but let the student write in the language he can, and then he can translate it into Swedish. But let him show his knowledge regardless of language." Language should not be an obstacle, but it should be an asset at this school.

(SWE_T6_F)

While the first quote illustrates how Swedish language is referred to as the baseline for classroom activities, the second exemplifies a more open attitude to how different languages can be used in classroom activities. This means that the first

example signals that the primary step is to learn the language of instruction, in this case Swedish; only when this is achieved can participation in other teaching and learning activities occur. Contrastingly, the second example provides a more flexible approach, where learning can occur in varying languages. In the research literature, these different approaches are discussed in terms of the monolingual vs. the bi-/multilingual ideology in education (e.g. Gogolin, 1997). While the monolingual norm typically produces a dichotomy between native and non-native speakers (Dewaele & Saito, 2022; Firth & Wagner, 1997), in which non-native speakers from a deficit perspective are viewed as incompetent to the extent that they do not speak the language of instruction, the bi- or multilingual norm questions this. This native speakerism ideology (Holliday, 2018) not only affects the learners; it also dominates the teaching profession, not least with regard to language teaching, where the idea that the best teacher to teach a language is a native speaker dominates, the so-called “native speaker fallacy” (Phillipson, 1992), which has been extensively critiqued in the research literature (e.g. Canagarajah, 1999; Holliday, 2005; Holliday & Aboshiha, 2009; Llorca & Calvet-Terré, 2022). In fact, the critique of the native–non-native speaker dichotomy goes back to at least the late 1990s, when Firth and Wagner (1997) published their influential article about Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research (see Gardner, 2019 for a review of the field). Of relevance for this chapter is not only that native and non-native speakers’ interactions are predefined as problematic, but also that diversity within each group is ignored. Importantly, aspects related to such identity categorisations of native and non-native speakers are assigned exogenously and might lack emic relevance, that is they may be irrelevant to the students categorised. In the view of this chapter, this is an important insight, since agency as choice of action (Chapter 2) is assumed to have a strong relation with personal identities and the opportunity to recognise and give space to hybrid forms of identity. Moreover, although for a long time neglected, language and cultural variation in the classroom also involves teachers with migration experiences (Kayi-Aydar, 2019), and, as our analysis will show, this has relevance for their roles as facilitators of dialogue in multilingual and multicultural classrooms.

This chapter contributes with reflections on how the use of different languages can constitute a resource for participation and learning in the multilingual classroom. Theoretically, the chapter builds on and extends the discussions in Chapter 2; we relate the theoretical framework of children’s participation, epistemic authority and hybrid integration in the classroom (Chapter 2) to what in research is discussed in terms of the monolingual vs. the bi- or multilingual ideology in education. The chapter primarily draws on two sets of data, data collected through interviews with teachers and video-recordings in second language teaching classrooms in selected localities in Belgium, Germany, Italy, Poland and Sweden, but data collected through surveys are to a limited extent also included (Chapter 1). Although the empirical analysis draws on material collected in five countries, they are to be read as exemplifying tendencies within the overall material. No claims are made about differences between countries, rather similar variations are found within each country.

Below we first discuss the overall theoretical concepts of the CHILD-UP project (Chapter 2) in relation to the literature on monolingual and bi- and multilingual ideologies in education. Next, we present our methods of data collection and analysis, and following on this the analysis of our data, which is divided into three parts. The first part sets focus on the reproduction of the deficit perspective. Drawing on interviews with teachers, we present how teachers focus on students not only as “problems”, but also as solutions to these. We aim to show how challenges in the multilingual classrooms tend to be disconnected from the teachers’ role, and reduced to the characteristics of the children. In the second part of the analysis, we focus on how teachers narrate their strategies to overcome challenges in the classroom, as regards language diversity. While these strategies overall are rooted in the monolingual norm, there is some variation and multilingual norms are also present. The third part of the analysis draws on video-recordings and considers the dynamics of mono- and bi-/multilingual norms in second language teaching classrooms. It illustrates variations of facilitation of dialogue and shows how teachers might overcome evaluations around children’s language competences in the second language teaching classroom, and instead create alternative spaces for dialogue and the promotion of children’s agency. The chapter is concluded with a discussion about the implications of the results.

Agency, facilitation of dialogue, and epistemic authority in the view of language use

The educational system is permeated by a narrative of children as incompetent and in need of competence from teachers who deliver relevant knowledge; it is in view of this that it has been described as a model of development where development is “naturally occurring” and something that can be observed and regulated (Walkerdine, 1984). In the case of children with migration backgrounds, this narrative is amplified due to discourses of these children as non-native, and in lack of (school country) language and cultural competences (Gitz-Johansen, 2004). Overall, this hinders their potential exercise of agency (Chapter 2). In the CHILD-UP project, children’s agency is defined as active participation based on children’s self-defined choices of action, for instance children’s personal trajectories of lived experiences (Holliday, 2013). This can enable children to gain epistemic authority, i.e. rights and obligations to access and produce knowledge. In the classroom, the traditional structure of epistemic authority is based on a hierarchical differentiation of roles between the teacher and students. While the teacher conveys knowledge to students, the latter must learn and will be evaluated on the basis of their learning outcomes. This traditional structure is reflected in classroom interactions, where the common and dominant form is based on the IRE (Initiate-Response-Evaluate) sequence (Baraldi, 2021; Margutti, 2010; Veronesi & Demo, 2020). In the IRE sequence, the actions of the student are generally confined to responses that are evaluated by the teacher.

Agency is not the outcome of individual ability but depends on interactions in the classroom as well as on the wider societal context. In the CHILD-UP

project, there is a strong and general attention to the possibility for the teacher to take on a central role in the enhancement of classroom dialogue (Chapter 2). Strengthening dialogue means to enrich interactions with a wider variety of personal narratives which, when interlaced with each other, amplifies expressions of diversity and, in turn, hybrid integration. There is a fundamental difference between facilitation of dialogue as a method to enhance learning and to enhance agency. While participatory approaches can be understood as strategies to improve learning of predefined learning goals, agency as choice of action is focussed on the amplification of complexity which is generated by children's personal narratives. Overall, participatory approaches tend to involve losses of teacher control of content, and several studies have reflected on the relation between teacher control of learning content and student participation (Emanuelsson & Sahlström, 2008; Pollard, 1982; Waterhouse, 1991). For instance, in a comparison of two mathematics classrooms, Emanuelsson and Sahlström (2008) point to a dilemma: when consistency of content is dominant, participation is scarified, and vice versa. In the view of these results, the authors discuss the role of the educational system to foster critical and engaged citizens, stressing the relevance of participatory approaches, even when it is at the cost of teacher control over learning contents. While Emanuelsson and Sahlström discuss student participation and (loss of) teacher control in relation to mathematics content, in our empirical material student participation and teacher (loss of) control regards participation more generally in the view of language and cultural diversity in the classroom and, in a longer perspective, options for hybrid integration. While our data, as much previous research, tend to reproduce a distinction between native and non-native students as a given dichotomy as well as discourses of (so-called) non-native children as in lack of (school country) language and cultural competences, the data also contain alternatives to this. These alternatives present teacher narratives of students' language variation as a resource instead of a deficit, and one which can enhance student agency as choice of action and possibly pave the way for hybrid integration. It is in relation to these empirical findings that we have found the literature on mono- and bi-/multilingual ideologies helpful.

The monolingual ideology in education has been critiqued for a long time. More than three decades ago, Jim Cummins introduced the notion of "deficit vision", to describe situations when a student's knowledge, both theoretical and experiential, encoded in other languages than the language of instruction is ignored or degraded. This focus on deficits entails that attention is focused on the student's limitations of the language of instruction and ability to learn through this specific language, instead of the language capabilities the student actually has and how these can be used for learning (Cummins, 1984, see also Firth & Wagner, 1997). In response to this critique, and to the view of (national) languages as separated entities in multilingual persons' linguistic repertoires, theories of *translanguaging* have entered educational research more recently (Creese & Blackledge, 2015; Otheguy, García, & Reid, 2015). From a translanguaging perspective, (national) languages as bounded entities are irrelevant, including first and second languages;

language systems are not separated in multilingual persons' linguistic repertoires. This approach aims to disrupt monolingual ideologies and language hierarchies; it views multilingualism as a resource in which language systems are synthesised. From a translanguaging perspective, all words, grammatical structures, idioms etcetera that are available to the speaker constitute the full range of the speaker's language repertoire (García & Wei, 2014), which is used dynamically and flexibly in continuous flows that are restricted only by their interlocutors' language resources. Further, translanguaging as pedagogy, in which multilinguals' fluid use of their full ranges of language resources are valued, for example by encouraging multilinguals to use all available languages and by using semiotic resources that display several languages, has recently entered the educational arena. This contributes to the strengthening of multilingual learners' agency and epistemic authority in the multilingual classroom.

Building on these insights, a large number of studies have shown how ideologies of monolingualism and multilingualism play out in a variety of contexts. For example, Chronaki, Planas and Svensson Källberg (2022) showed how certain dialogues in translanguaging practices have the potential to create "cracks" in the authoritative status of monolingual and monologic mathematics curricula and subvert epistemic violence and enable agency from "below". Altogether, this line of research points to a strong agreement as to what concerns the role of students' home languages in the learning process: "bi/multilingualism facilitates the acquisition of additional languages and improves cognitive functioning in individuals" (De Angelis, 2011, p. 218). In this chapter, we aim to take this discussion one step further, and consider both how it impacts on agency as choice of action and how it relates to teachers' actions of facilitation in classroom interaction.

Research methodology: data collection and analysis

The analysis presented in this chapter is based on interviews with teachers and video-recordings of class-room activities in five countries. Hence, it is based on a selection of all data collected within the CHILD-UP project. In total, our data consists of 105 interviews with teachers (10 individual interviews in Belgium, 8 individual and 14 group interviews in Germany, 43 individual interviews in Italy, 17 individual and 1 group interview in Poland, and 12 individual interviews in Sweden) and three video-recordings (one from Germany, one from Italy and one from Sweden). The teachers work at varying levels of education (ISCED 1–3). The collection and analysis of data followed the same procedure across all countries, but the sampling strategy varied depending on the local context. It was qualitative, resembling what is usually described as convenience sampling (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). Hence, in our analysis we make no claims of generalisation within or between countries. Instead, the contribution lies in understandings of varying dynamics and comparisons between teachers' different approaches to language use *per se* in classrooms. Nevertheless, and as indicated in the final

discussion, while we make no claims, the material points to some cross-country variation. This can be due to varying national and local educational and migration contexts, as well as to our sampling.

The interviews followed a semi-structured guide which was translated into national languages and adapted to local contexts by each country team of the CHILD-UP project, who also conducted the interviews and first analysis. The interview guide was broad in its scope, and in this chapter we analyse answers that depict various aspects of teachers' narratives about language use in the classroom. The interviews were conducted in 2020 and 2021, and severely impacted by restrictions implemented due to the ongoing coronavirus pandemic, though in varying ways in each country. Overall, with only a few exceptions, interviews were conducted via online communication platforms. Moreover, while the target number as stipulated in the project plan varied between the countries, in several countries the achieved number of interviews were below this. All interviews were recorded and transcribed. In the analysis, interview quotes were organised into a grid with fixed questions, and in each country a report was written responding to the same set of questions (the reports are unpublished working materials). All reports were written in English, and the analysis in this chapter, builds on the preliminary analyses presented in these.

Video-recording were collected in all country cases in 2021 and 2022. In most countries, it was possible to pursue recording in real classrooms, but in some cases it was managed via online communication platforms. The recordings were translated to English and a report with analysis of all video-recordings was written by the work-package leader. For this chapter, we have made a qualitative selection of three excerpts, aiming to illustrate how varying modes of language use in terms of monolingual and bi-/multilingual ideologies as manifested in second language teaching activities. This means that the analysis is qualitative, aiming at deeper understanding of the dynamics of these phenomena.

Teachers' perceptions of children as problem and solution for learning and classroom participation

The monolingual norm is strong throughout our empirical material. This is in line with previous research and unsurprising. In this section, we have a prime interest in how this is reproduced in teachers' narratives; nevertheless, it is noteworthy that this is also confirmed by data collected through questionnaires, which indicates that only just under 14% of teachers resort to children's native language while teaching and a little less than 9% use several languages in teaching. In the interviews with teachers, there is a widespread understanding of non-native children as deviant to sometimes implicit but overall strong norms about which languages to use and what cultures that are relevant frames of reference. It should also be noted that the material is not all unitary, but contains variations, as is attested to by one teacher interviewed in Belgium. Instead of forcing students to speak Dutch all the

time, she points to the role of the teacher. She felt that in her school the teachers “focus a lot on the individual, like the lack of knowledge of the students, and less on ‘what can I do as a teacher?’ But I think that’s quite general for every school” (BE_T8_F).

Narratives of the “language barrier” refer to deficits of migrant children as regards proficiency in the language of instruction. Limitations on communicating in the language of instruction (or even a complete inability to do so) means that they cannot follow the teaching or communicate with the teacher and classmates. In the interviews, it is repeatedly claimed that the first need is for the children of migrant background (CMB) to learn the language of instruction as a means of communication and to build social relations.

They lack the technical language and that is a big problem. A very big problem, because if they are eleven or twelve years old and can’t understand a scientific text, even if it’s very simple and they can’t read it.

(G_T4_F)

Strengthening their language is an absolute need, language as a vehicle of coexistence, not so much to learn about literature and poetry, but precisely language as a means of establishing social relationships.

(IT_T7_F)

Significant for these narratives is that the problem is defined with the child, not the classroom discourse, i.e. the inability of the teacher to involve all children in classroom interactions. In contexts where migrant children speak native languages from the same language family as the host country, and in effect learn the language of instruction at a fast pace, these children are problematised to a lesser extent compared to migrant children from other countries. In our study this is evident in the case of Poland, where children who speak languages from the Slavic language family (Russian, Ukrainian) learn Polish faster than students who, for instance, speak English. On the other hand, in the Swedish case, which was conducted in an immigrant-dense and poor neighbourhood, connected with negative discourses in politics and media, all children are lumped together as having problems with their language, independently on whether they have migrant background or not. While it is not clearly stated in the interview, the underlying meaning is that this depends on the characteristics of the residents of the school neighbourhood as an “immigrant neighbourhood”.

As for the boys and girls from Ukraine and the east of us, it’s actually easy because these children learn Polish very quickly.

(PL_T7_F)

The largest challenge is that our students have a very weak language. As a large majority, the vast majority have a really weak language. And then we talk

about all ethnic backgrounds. It does not really matter. I have students with an ethnic background other than Swedish who have better languages than those with a Swedish background, or ethnic Swedish background. So, it really does not matter. But I think it's a big, big problem that students come here and have such weak language.

(SWE_4_F)

In view of the critique by Firth and Wagner (1997) discussed above, the hierarchical order between native and non-native students is blatant in our material; however, additional categorisations are also at play. In the first case the hierarchical order is tuned-in between different migrant groups, and in the second the non-native category is extended to all students, plausibly because the school is categorised as an "immigrant school". Nevertheless, in both cases the "problem" is defined with the children, though in varying ways.

Teachers often recognise that students, also with migrant background, aspire towards good achievements in school. However, it is just that the language barrier is in the way, and the only way to overcome this barrier is for the student to learn the language of instruction. Once the language barrier is overcome, they can achieve good results, as the following quotes illustrate.

They are very motivated to study, but I think that Swedish itself is an obstacle, because they do not have the vocabulary and so on. But they do their best, I really think.

(SWE_T5_F)

As soon as the language problem is somehow solved, these children are very resourceful, willing to learn but, above all, highly skilful. Foreign children are often the most meta-cognitive children.

(IT_T13_F)

The sister of the girl from Turkey has already left school, she went to high school. She learned Polish very quickly. The brother overcame barriers very quickly, they participated in math, English competitions.

(PL_T3_F)

It is in the view of this that we have entitled this section as teachers' perception of students as problems *and* solutions. That is, while the deficit perspective is strong, and problems are defined with the CMB, so are the solutions. It is the child that is expected to learn the language of instruction, and when this is done, he or she can participate in classroom interactions and learn the expected. Both the problematisation and the problem solution are disconnected from the teacher and his/her practice. We shall now turn to the role of the teacher as manifest in our material.

Multilingualism, student participation and the teachers' roles as facilitators of dialogue

In view of the fact that the deficit perspective is so dominant, it is relevant to investigate the role of teachers as facilitators of dialogue, here with a particular focus on language use. While our empirical material is dominated by the monolingual norm, it also contains examples of bi-/multilingual approaches and facilitative approaches which try to empower dialogue by overcoming any forms of evaluation on second language fluency. The presented analysis is not focused on how these different approaches are balanced in the material, but on the dynamics between these, and what we can draw from this in order to improve practice in the sense of strengthened student participation for all students.

An understanding of learning as occurring in sequential steps, in the sense that the language of instruction must first be mastered, before learning and/or agency can occur, emerged as a dominant narrative in the teacher interviews. This sequentiality subordinates migrant children's agency to second language learning, and is, in the view of translanguaging as a theoretical perspective (García & Wei, 2014), invalid and unjust, leading to inequality among students, both as regards learning as well as power hierarchies (Cummins, 1984). Overall, in the interviews it is claimed that the way to overcome the "language barrier" is that the migrant child/student learn to speak the language of instruction. The strategies to achieve this outcome varies, depending on various factors. On a general level, the quantitative survey showed that 42% of teachers declared to resort to language and cultural mediation and 26% to resources for learning native language. Moreover, according to the survey almost 57% of the teachers declared to have received training in multicultural issues. This stands in stark contrast to what comes out from the interviews. Instead, in the interviews, there is a narrative claiming that teachers do not have relevant training for this, and that while organisational support is varied it is also overall weak; indeed, sometimes it even encounters resistance. Hence, what strategies that are employed depends on the local context, but also on the creativity of the individual teacher. In practice, this can involve ad hoc translation interventions, as the quote below illustrates.

We often have to deal with a situation [that the child does not speak Polish or Russian]. For example, we had a girl in the third grade, from Mongolia. She grew up to be a wonderful girl, but she could not speak Polish [or Russian]. The teachers who taught her used to run to me or to the English teacher [for help]. Now she speaks excellent Polish, writes excellent Polish, passed the exam very well, so it's possible.

(PL_T5_M)

This strategy is enmeshed in a monolingual norm, in the sense that teachers try to find strategies that can "compensate" for the language deficit of students. It is not a strategy that has developed from insights valuing each students' full ranges of language

resources. Teachers who are multilingual themselves can use this as a resource in their teaching. This means that students can participate in, if not their native language, then at least a language they master. This participation impacts on learning and agency.

An important factor which helps children adapt and function in the school environment is the flexibility of a teacher. I use active methods, communicate with them in Russian as well.

(PL_T13_F)

Sometimes translation strategies actively involve multilingual students in the class as well. Teachers might, for instance, turn to the class and ask how a specific word or expression is said in Arabic or any other language present among the students. This is both a way to engage students' native language resources and connect these with the learning content, and a way to reach out to students who do not have enough proficiency in the language of instruction. Further, this is also a way of recognising and valuing the home languages of students, also when they do not master these well. Overall, this is a strategy to strengthen students' positions/identities as multilingual knowledgeable students and to foster epistemic authority in that sense. This strategy does also, at least to a certain extent, entail a loss of control for the teacher:

I also had a student today who did not (...) it was a math task and no, we could not (...) I could not explain well enough to her. So, then I got a boy who speaks her language and yes, I thought it still seemed like she understood better when he explained to her. Or he just said the answer, I do not know.

(SWE_T11_F)

However, the material also indicates that this sometimes becomes more challenging when students have reached high proficiency in the language of instruction. Once this is achieved, students might be reluctant to use their native language in class. It is unclear whether this is due to the fact that students, as one teacher expresses it, "really already think in the language of instruction" (G_T2_F) or whether native languages are not recognised as valuable and, in effect, students try to "erase" it:

One of the most important things we don't do is to value the fact that they are bilingual because it is very much a part of them, something that, when they enter school, they erase. Even those who, in some way, maintain a partial knowledge or relative use of their language of origin, perhaps through their grandparents, are ashamed, they don't talk about it, they don't bring it up. It is just as if the school says, 'we will do our best to fill you with English, but please get the other languages out of here'.

(IT_T13_F)

Working with concepts and expressions as well as students' narratives in several languages takes time. In the view of this, but not limited to this aspect, all translating activities are a matter of allocated resources from the school management.

I can think a bit that, as I said, language again rules because we need a little more time to go through concepts, different concepts, put them in different contexts and then work on. And sometimes it can actually be about very (??) simple concepts, that is, if you can now say so, which many may not know about. But I think it's also something that does not slow down, but it is also something that is important. And then it kind of takes maybe a little longer to get to where we should, because we have to take care of the foundational first, before we move on.

(SWE_T5_F)

This openness towards using various languages in the classroom discourse is also present with regard to examinations. As in the case of classroom interactions, also here can it reflect both monolingual and bi-/multilingual ideology. For instance, in order to minimise the impact of low proficiency in the language of instruction, along with curricular problems, in one case described in an interview, CMB are given adapted examination sheets with, among other things, shorter and simpler instructions. Moreover, they are also given more time for the examination and are allowed to use bilingual dictionaries. Nevertheless, and as critiqued by the teacher in the quote below, the instructions on the worksheet are presented in the language of instruction.

The regulations do not foresee it being that difficult (...) She will only have a dictionary, but it is a different vocabulary for example in math. And the examination sheet for foreigners is based on the readings that are supposed to be read in all European nations, but the African context is not taken into account. We would like the assistant to be present during the examination, but there is no chance for that. P. would have to have a certificate of special education, but she is a very intelligent girl, so there is not a chance for that.

(PL_T7_F)

Hence, this strategy is more characterised by an attempt to compensate for students' deficits, than to value and make use of the resources and knowledge they actually possess, which may impact on their results and their future possibilities in education. Our material also contains examples that stretches further, and comes closer to a bi-/multilingual ideology. Here students are allowed to do exams in their native language, which are translated to the language of instruction in order for the teacher to do the evaluation. Naturally, this option depends on the resources in teaching, but not solely, it is also a matter of attitude towards language use in education.

It is not obvious that the teaching needs to be one hundred percent in Swedish, but I usually say that 'but let the student write in the language he can, and then he can translate it into Swedish. But let him show his knowledge regardless of language'. Language should not be an obstacle, but it should be an asset at this school.

(SWE_T6_F)

What comes out strongly from the interviews is the lack of training among teachers as well as the lack of relevant teaching materials and tools. Many teachers invent their own strategies in reaching out to non-native speakers. One strategy described in interviews, is to “spread out” the CMB in different classes, as the quote below illustrates. In this approach, the full ranges of language resources migrant children possess are not valued at all.

I also had a class with five migrant pupils for a short time. These were children from Chechnya, one girl from Crimea, two children from Ukraine. It is very hard to work then. For what methods do we use? In group work, we try to make sure that there is a foreign child in each group, so that they learn something from a Polish child. But if there are many children, it is difficult.

(PL_T12_F)

An alternative to placing the CMB in different groups could be to group the children who speak the same languages in the same group so that they potentially can use these for learning and agency. Such lack of teachers’ training in how to act in the classroom is emphasised across our interviews. This means that much depends on the individual teacher, and his or her innovative approach. Further, there is also a lack of relevant teaching materials and tools:

If they don’t understand Polish, how can I get them interested in another language? What methods should I use? I needed more materials, experience, cultural knowledge, and help. We tried to learn to respond to the needs of all groups: so that our [Polish] children would not lose, and the new children would learn, too. Now, it’s good that there is the Internet, you can look for things.

(PL_T13_F)

While this is a dominating narrative across our material, it also contains examples of more structured methodologies; however, these strategies also tend to depend on the individual teacher. In this chapter we are interested in approaches that have potential to strengthen children’s agency; these include the use of synonyms and visual aids. Online translation tools for translating certain words, but also discussions in class about the meaning of what the teachers call difficult words, are also mentioned. One teacher says that she reads the texts beforehand and picks out what she thinks are difficult words for the students. She then prepares herself for working with them in class. Another method mentioned is to work with wordlists, in which you have columns of the different languages presented in the class.

I actually try to start a lot from translanguaging, so that many times when we create wordlists, I put a column with (...) where we have words in English or Swedish in one and then I add mother tongue and Swedish.

(SWE_T2_F)

According to this teacher, some students reacted negatively when she started to add a column for the mother tongue: “In the beginning they reacted, thought ‘what mother tongue, I do not know what (..) huh’. No, then it is nothing for *you*. But for some students, it is very crucial whether they have that column or not.” Some teachers use the teaching and learning cycle (Gibbons, 2002) in their work with scaffolding. The cycle consists of four phases in which a specific text genre is (1) introduced, (2) modelled, (3) practiced together and, finally, (4) individually performed by the students.

Then you end up with that they shall produce a whole text on their own in the last step. So, it’s a way to scaffold. And really, you could say that it pretty much permeates my way. Because every time I do something, I show it like this, I become a model for the students.

(SWE_T2_F)

We work a lot with writing joint texts, we work a lot according to the circle model, that we start in the joint and then we break it down to finally be able to do it ourselves. So that, yes (...) And then there is very, very much visual support, very much

(SWE_T11_F)

However, the scaffolding in line with the teaching and learning cycle per se does not recognise or make use of languages other than the language of instruction. Instead, scaffolding focuses on developing students’ subject specific language and/or academic language of instruction. However, while students’ native language resources are not encouraged and employed by scaffolding per se, sometimes teachers combine this with other methods to do so. In this way, students are enabled to engage with their different language resources when they feel it is appropriate; it stimulates them to connect the teaching content with their native languages.

As we will see in the next section, while these activities are meaningful examples of how the monolingual ideology overall is still dominant in schools, they also represent a potential context where personal expression is promoted and thus, the sequentiality of language learning as necessary to children’s agency is contested and overcome.

Teachers’ facilitation of participation in action

In this section, we present three excerpts from interactions that were video-recorded during second language learning activities in schools or refugee centres. They are selected to illustrate varying modes of language use in terms of monolingual and bi-/multilingual ideologies as manifested in second language teaching activities.

The first excerpt was collected in Italy during an activity with unaccompanied adolescents who do not yet speak Italian fluently (SPAC). Two migrant adolescents, coming from Albania, participated in this lesson. In this excerpt, the facilitator adopts

what can be defined as a very simplified classroom context mode. The classroom context mode is one of the prevalent modes of teaching second language (Walsh, 2011), which promotes clear linguistic expressions while empowering oral communicative fluidity. The classroom context mode is the most facilitative one. In the interactions, it presents short turns, minimal repairs, feedback on contents, questions about themes with the purpose to clarify certain aspects, and scaffolding. In the classroom context mode, children are encouraged to produce extended turns. However, in the context of second language classes the difference between facilitating dialogue as choice of actions and doing it to improve learning becomes evident through the teaching goals. The adoption of a monolingual approach represents the clearest proof that the main goal of the teacher is not children's agency, but language learning.

The first excerpt, although showing an interaction enabling the production of children's narratives through facilitation, it represents a monolingual approach, which therefore does not give children the possibility to choose what language to adopt in the interaction.

Excerpt 1

- 01 FACf: and what do you usually eat M2 for breakfast?
 02 M2: for breakfast croissants, biscuits?
 03 FACf: a? ((making the gesture with his finger)) a brioche?
 04 M2: not one (0.2) [I don't know
 05 FACf: [three? ((making the gesture with his fingers)) four?
 ((with gesture))
 06 M2: (four) hhh
 07 M1: I don't eat anything
 08 FACf: you don't eat anything?
 09 M1: ((shakes head))
 10 M2: why [(??)
 11 FACf: [but are you having a drink? Do you drink coffee?
 12 M1: no coffee because I stay in bed
 13 FACf: ah!
 14 M1: only when there is SPAC I have coffee
 15 FACf: well all days then
 16 M1: when there is no SPAC I stay in bed
 17 M2: (??)
 18 FACf: when there is no SPAC you stay in bed
 19 M1: yes and when there is SPAC (??)
 20 FACf: so Monday Tuesday ok yesterday you didn't come, Tuesday
 [Wednesday Thursday ((counting on fingers))
 21 M1: [yesterday (always wake up to go to CPIA)
 22 FACf: fine but what time did you go to CPIA
 23 M1: nine
 24 FACf: nine? Eh then that is why you couldn't come
 25 M2: (??)

- 26 M1: (??) CPIA twice
 27 FACf: two two days a week no to CPIA? ((gesturing with his fingers))
 28 M1: three days a week
 29 FACf: three days
 30 M1: yes
 31 FACf: fine good
 32 M2: CPIA two (...) you smart ((pointing at M1))
 33 M1: hhh (what you say)
 34 M2: (?) he goes CPIA two

In Excerpt 1, the conversation revolves around a question about the children's breakfast. In turn 1, the facilitator asks a simple question. In turns 3 and 5, after M2's hesitancy, the facilitator proposes possible answers with the help of gestures as a form of scaffolding. It is interesting how hand gestures are a preferred option over the request on behalf of the facilitator to resort to another language (Albanian in this case) that might help M2 to express himself. In turn 6, M2 answers with a laugh and M1 takes the floor (turn 7) to say that he does not eat anything for breakfast. In turn 8, the facilitator asks for confirmation, obtaining a non-verbal answer. The facilitator's next question overlaps with M2's question about the reasons for lack of breakfast. M1's answer is acknowledged by the facilitator with a manifestation of surprise and M1's clarification is implicitly contradicted by the facilitator. Turn 15 does not represent a way to evaluate M1's previous turn; rather it encourages him to go on, clarifying his point about going to the refugee centre to learn Italian as a second language (CPIA). In turn 18, the facilitator repeats what M1 has said and in turn 20 she again adopts body language to check the days in which days M1 was having or not having breakfast. In turn 19, M1 makes a clarification, which is not very audible, which is followed by the facilitator's encouragement of further clarification. M2 takes the floor again in turns 32 and 34 to comment on M1's presence in the refugee centre. Clearly, the lower fluency or confidence of M2 represented an element which prevented him to participate in the interaction.

Another example of the effect of the monolingual approach – and a glimpse of the possible and positive ones of a multilingual approach – is visible in Excerpt 2, which was collected during a lesson in an introductory class in Sweden. The nine participating students are all newly arrived in Sweden with limited Swedish language skills. They have different language and cultural backgrounds; six of them are boys and three are girls. The students' home languages are Bengali, Urdu, Dari, Serbian, Arabic, Albanian and English (since the student had lived and gone to school in London; however, her home language is also Arabic). Two of the boys and one of the girls are fluent in English. The female teacher has Swedish as her mother tongue and communicates in mainly Swedish with the students. However, she also uses English and body gestures in her communication.

The theme of the lesson how to talk about weather and climate conditions, exemplified by, among others, floods in India. The lesson built on the "IPA-method"

(Individually–Pairs–All, authors' translation from Swedish *EPA, Enskilt–Par–Alla*). The students first worked on finding words (in Swedish) in pictures that related to the theme individually (I), thereafter sharing the identified words in groups (P), which was followed up by a whole-class conversation (A) about the words. One group consisted of the three girls (group 1); one group consisted of the two boys who were fluent in English and another boy (group 2); and a third group consisted of three boys (group 3). It means that the students in the groups did not share home language with everyone in the group. Here we provide an English translation of the original interaction in Swedish. The words in bold were originally pronounced in English.

Excerpt 2

- 01 Tf: this, you talked about it ((points to one of the pictures)), what is this?
What do you do on it? Someone was asking if it is a rocket. But it is
not
- 02 M1: oil
- 03 M2: **ship**
- 04 M1: oil rig
- 05 Tf: oil rig it says in the article. You can also call it oil platform ((writes the
word on whiteboard next to the picture))
- 06 Tf: what do you do here? Do you know M2? ((points at M2))
- 07 M2: I know but I cannot explain it in Swedish
- 08 Tf: no, M2 eh sorry, M1 ((points at M1)). What can you do? What do
you do?
- 09 M1: **in English or Swedish?**
- 10 Tf: **whatever you want**
- 11 M1: **oil rig, which is the**
- 12 M3: oil drill
- 13 Tf: what do you do down here? ((points at the picture))
- 14 M1: **ah, oil**
- 15 Tf: oil
- 16 M1: oil
- 17 Tf: oil
- 18 M1: oil
- 19 Tf: oil, you want oil so they
- 20 M3: drill
- 21 Tf: drills
- 22 M1: hm
- 23 Tf: so they drill, rmmm ((sounds like a drill)), down there, very far down
and then they can take up oil
- 24 M1: mm
- 25 M3: **nice**
- 26 Tf: what will they do with the oil?
- 27 M3: M2
- 28 M1: **car use, use in cars**

- 29 Tf: we use it in the cars
 30 M3: bus
 31 Tf: yes, bus
 32 M1: **and I just**
 33 M4: we sell it
 34 Tf: we sell, yes
 35 F1: boat
 36 Tf: boat, yes you must have
 37 M3: **airplane**
 38 Tf: oil for many things
 39 M?: **cannot hear**
 40 Tf: many things need oil

In this interaction the teacher applies a materials mode (Walsh, 2011), which implies the use of materials to display linguistic practices. This is done through the promotion of answers about the materials, which will be then checked, clarified and evaluated. This mode therefore grounds on the IRE scheme, which implies focused questions, feedback on linguistic forms and scaffolding.

Excerpt 2 opens with a question from the teacher asked to start an evaluation of language skills of children. In turns two, three and four there are several answers, two of them in Swedish and one in English. In turn 6, there is another question from the teacher, to which M2 would be able to answer, but, he specifies, not in Swedish. Interestingly, his implicit request to reply in another language, which is not Swedish, is denied by the teacher. The participation of M2 is compromised and he will not intervene any longer in this excerpt.

As in Excerpt 1, the choice of the teacher not to invite M2 to share it in his mother tongue has therefore a negative effect on his participation. Even M3's invitation to M2 to answer, in turn 27, does not lead to any intervention from M2. However, when M1 (turn nine) asks whether he must reply in English or in Swedish, the teacher gives him the opportunity to choose. This opens the possibility for M1's contributions, both in English (turns 11, 14, 28, 32) and in Swedish (turns 37, 25), even if in Swedish he just repeats the word "*olja*". Following M1, M3 also intervenes by speaking in English (turns 25, 37). Although, the teacher adopts a directive form of facilitation (Chapter 6), oriented to language skills teaching and evaluation – without supporting dialogue and children's personal expression – it is interesting to notice how, when she leaves open the possibility for children to choose what language to adopt, this promotes their participation. However, this choice is made possible only when the alternative option is represented by a dominant language, still thus overlooking the possibility to resort to less widespread languages.

Excerpt 3 was recorded in Germany, with the participation of three ISCED2 girls with migrant background in lower secondary school. The three girls sit side by side, and the teacher, seated in front of them, is talking about a book about a specific wish of an Arabic girl (Wadjda), thus starting with a material mode (Walsh, 2011).

In turn 1, after referring to Wadjda's wish, the teacher introduces the classroom context mode, by asking the children if having a bicycle is their biggest wish. F2 and F3 reply that it is not. However, these answers set the conditions for the teacher's new question about wishing a bicycle. In turn 5, F2 refers implicitly to the societal conditions for her reply, which the teacher tries to explore through a new question, in turn 6. In turns 7 and 9, F2 explains what she was referring to, supported by the teacher's active listening in turns 8 and 10, where she provides minimal feedback, repeats F2's answer and asks a more specific question about the content of the book. Here the teacher turns to a material mode and this reveals that her last questions intended to check children's learning. In turn 12, the teacher's minimal feedback enables F3's articulated answer. In these turns, however, the teacher evaluates the children's language skills, only proposing her view about the story of the book.

Excerpt 3

- 01 Tf: well (.) and (.), it should not necessarily be about Wadjda's bicycle ((stands up and leaves the scene toward the chalkboard)) and because of this I said at the beginning (.) A bicycle. my biggest wish. (.) ((teacher comes back and takes her place)) You all have a bicycle yet. You probably need a new one. Is a bicycle your biggest wish? ((referring to the biggest wish of the protagonist figure of the book))
- 02 F2: no
- 03 F3: no
- 04 Tf: why could be a bicycle a biggest wish?
- 05 F2: because, in some countries it is not so easy to get a bicycle?
- 06 Tf: because there aren't bicycles or why?
- 07 F2: no. (?) it is too expensive, isn't it-
- 08 Tf: mhm
- 09 F2: there is no money for that
- 10 Tf: ok, there is no money (..) Well, you know something from the book, right? What is her problem?
- 11 F3: well, first she was not allowed, so girls in her country were not allowed to have a bicycle ((teacher nods frequently))
- 12 Tf: mhm
- 13 F3: however, she did not care. She also had less money (.) She had to- well, work for that. For the bicycle
- 14 Tf: it still was her biggest wish, wasn't it. She managed to get it in a way ((Stands up from her chair)) Ok

Conclusion

The overall aim of the chapter is to contribute to the discussion on how teachers' facilitation of classroom activities can be understood in view of mono- and bi-/

multilingual norms. For this purpose, the chapter connects literature on children's agency as choice of action and hybrid integration (Chapter 2), with literature on monolingual and bi-/multilingual ideologies in education. The analysis draws on two sets of data: interviews with teachers and video-recordings of classroom activities. The analysis of interviews presents what problems and solutions teachers experience concerning teaching and learning in the multilingual classroom, and how their role as facilitator of dialogue and promoter of agency and hybrid integration in the classroom can be understood. The analysis of video-recordings of classroom activities, describes teachers' varying modes of facilitation of dialogue, and how these in different ways relate to language competences present in the classroom and function to promote or hinder hybrid integration. In the following, we shall expand on the results of the analysis and discuss its implications in a wider perspective.

The analysis shows how teachers relate to multilingualism as deficits, for example in narratives of migrant students' "language barriers" as regards proficiency in the language of instruction as a problem. Further, it shows how teachers' perceptions of challenges in the multilingual classrooms tend to be disconnected from the role of the teacher and reduced to the characteristics of the children. That is, putting both the problem and the solution with the migrant children. More specifically, the analysis shows how teachers perceive an adoption of the language of instruction as a necessary precondition to learning and exercise of agency. In contrast to this, the analysis also shows how teachers provide contrasting narratives in that they regard all languages as resources and central to children's epistemic authority, for example when letting the migrant students take tests in their native languages and when jointly working with wordlists and concepts in different languages in the classroom. This can be seen as traces of translanguaging practices which have the potential to create "cracks" in the monolingual norm (Chronaki et al., 2022) as well as to strengthen agency and promote hybrid integration beyond language learning. While we see the same tendency across all of our cases, it also gives some kind of a hint that the extent to which such "cracks" can be found is not evenly distributed in our material. Nevertheless, whether this is due to national and local variation in the educational setting or to migration experiences, and to what extent it is due to our sampling, is not possible to estimate in a solid way.

Further, the analysis also shows how teachers must face and manage multilingualism individually without institutional support. This lack of institutional support structures must be understood in addition to the lack of control that teachers experience in relation to strengthen student agency, not least in the multilingual classroom. Data on interaction in second language learning classroom illustrates how ambivalences underlined in the interviews with teachers are manifest in classroom activities. The monolingual ideology permeates the educational environments of the European countries involved in the CHILD-UP project. This is not least obvious through all video-recorded activities within the project, where only a few examples of interactions involved different languages. Our field research

shows that teachers and facilitators rarely encourage students to use different languages to express their views or ideas beyond the language of instruction. In addition, when they occasionally do, it was typically in a dominant language such as English instead of students' home languages. However, in our data, there are glimpses of "cracks" where spaces for alternative practices can be developed. This is evident in several of the quotes included, but also in the second excerpt of video-recorded activities, where a weak acceptance of another language (English) is manifest, and in the third excerpt, where facilitation enables children's knowledge co-construction and thus the expression of different views. In our interpretation, such practices strengthen students' participation in classroom interactions. However, and importantly, this connects to another aspect highlighted in the interviews and the interactions: the monolingual ideology does not only manifest on practices and narratives which devalue multi-language competencies, feeding the dichotomy between native and non-native pupils. It also fosters narratives and practices which define a hierarchy between languages, in which the use of some languages is considered more appropriate than others. Consequently, students' multilingual resources are not recognised and valued, and their possibilities of acting in an agentic manner and having epistemic authority are hindered. This calls for further research and development in practice on how teachers' facilitation of participation and dialogue can include multilingual approaches to enable agency for all students. Further, the chapter theoretically argues that children's language competences should be integral to understandings of their epistemic authority. Empirically, it shows that while this is not a widespread understanding among our research participants, there are examples of teachers who provide practical insights to the meaning of this. This begs for further research into how such strategies can be developed and transferred across classrooms and localities, with the purpose to strengthen all children's epistemic authority in education.

Note

- 1 SPAC and CPIA are two different services which provide Italian language courses to people with a migration background and unaccompanied minors who have different fluency levels in Italian.

References

- Baraldi, C. (2021). Structural variations of classroom interaction: Implications for the education system. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09620214.2021.1902371>
- Barwell, R. (2009). Multilingualism in mathematics classrooms: An introductory discussion. In R. Barwell (Ed.), *Multilingualism in mathematics classrooms. Global perspectives* (pp. 1–13). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Canagarajah, S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Chronaki, A., Planas, N., & Svensson Källberg, P. (2022). Onto/epistemic violence and dialogicality in translanguaging practices across multilingual mathematics classrooms. *Teachers College Record*, 124(5), 108–126.

- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*, sixth ed. London: Routledge.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 20–35.
- Cummins, J. (1984). Wanted: A theoretical framework for relating language proficiency to academic achievement among bilingual students. In C. Rivera (Ed.), *Multilingual matters 10: Language proficiency and academic achievement* (pp. 2–19). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- De Angelis, G. (2011). Teachers' beliefs about the role of prior language knowledge in learning and how these influence teaching practices. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 8(3), 216–234.
- Dewaele, J.M., & Saito, K. (2022). Positive psychology can help overcome the pernicious native speaker ideology. *The European Educational Researcher*, 5(2), 225–234.
- Emanuelsson, J., & Sahlström, F. (2008). The price of participation: Teacher control versus student participation in classroom interaction. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 52(2), 205–223.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 285–300.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Gardner, R. (2019). Classroom interaction research: The state of the art. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 52(3), 212–226.
- Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Gitz-Johansen, T. (2004). The incompetent child: representations of ethnic minority children. In H. Brembeck, B. Johansson, & J. Kampmann (Eds.), *Beyond the competent child. Exploring contemporary childhoods in the Nordic welfare societies* (pp. 199–228). Roskilde: Roskilde University Press.
- Gogolin, I. (1997). The “monolingual habitus” as the common feature in teaching in the language of the majority in different countries. *Per Linguam*, 13(2), 38–49.
- Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holliday, A. (2013). *Understanding intercultural communication: Negotiating a grammar of culture*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.
- Holliday, A. (2018). Native-speakerism. In J.I. Lontas (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching, Volume 1*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Holliday, A., & Aboshiha, P. (2009). The denial of ideology in perceptions of ‘nonnative speaker’ teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(4), 669–689.
- Kayi-Aydar, H. (2019). Language teacher identity. *Language Teaching*, 52(3), 281–295.
- Llurda, E., & Calvet-Terré, J. (2022). Native-speakerism and non-native second language teachers: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444822000271>
- Margutti, P. (2010). On designedly incomplete utterances: What counts as learning for teachers and students in primary classroom interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43(4), 315–345.
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281–307.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Veronesi, D., & Demo, H. (2020). Whole-class interaction and inclusion in primary school: A case study. *Italian Journal of Special Education for Inclusion*, 8(1), 274–290.
- Walkerdine, V. (1984). Developmental psychology and the child centred pedagogy. In J. Henriques, W. Hollway, C. Urwin, C. Venn, & V. Walkerdine (Eds.), *Changing the subject: Psychology, social regulation and subjectivity* (pp. 148–198). Abingdon & New York: Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.