Journal of Education, Language, and Ideology
volume 3 | issue 2 | 2025
pp. 271–304

Research Article

Language Ideologies in Norwegian Teachers' Narratives of Practice: Orientations to Translanguaging and Socially Just Education

Elena Tkachenko *
Oslo Metropolitan University

Mona Evelyn Flognfeldt
Oslo Metropolitan University

Received: December 11, 2024
Accepted: September 11, 2025
Published: October 7, 2025
doi: 10.5281/zenodo.17284284

The core curriculum for Norwegian schools mandates that all students have the opportunity to experience that being proficient in a number of languages is an asset. In addition, scholars call for a multilingual turn in education. However, current research still demonstrates that monolingual ideologies prevail in educational practice. This study explores how language ideologies shape teachers' orientations to multilingualism, translanguaging, and social justice in Norwegian multilingual classrooms. We have conducted a qualitative analysis of teachers' self-reported practices documented in written narratives of practice. These narratives describe teachers' work addressing the linguistic and cultural diversity in their classrooms and the extent to which multilingualism is used as a resource in students' learning and development. Our analysis focuses on the ways in which the teachers position their students and how they present activities and classroom interactions. Our findings suggest that teachers' narratives of practice reveal ambivalent ideologies. While teachers often express heteroglossic ideologies highlighting positive effects of translanguaging in their descriptions of multilingual activities, their descriptions of students frequently reveal monoglossic ideologies. These findings emphasize the need to integrate critical discussions of language ideologies into teacher education programs to better support implementation of equitable and inclusive practices and socially just education.

Keywords: language ideologies; Norwegian teachers; orientations to multilingualism and translanguaging; socially just education; teachers' narratives of practice

1. INTRODUCTION

Socially just education aims to ensure equitable access to learning opportunities for all students regardless of their socio-economic, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009; Kavanagh & Danielson, 2020). Multilingualism and translanguaging are important perspectives on the social justice agenda, as learning environments and educational spaces should acknowledge and value students' life experiences, cultures, languages, and identities. Socially just education should also challenge traditional monolingual norms and promote the use of multiple languages as resources for learning. A key step forward in realizing socially just multilingual education is to create space to draw on students' full linguistic repertoires through

* Elena Tkachenko, Department of Primary and Secondary Teacher Education, Oslo Metropolitan University, P. O. Box 4, St. Olavs plass., NO-0130, Oslo, Norway, elena.tkachenko@oslomet.no

translanguaging or plurilanguaging (i.e., recruiting their “integrated competence with resources from different named languages”) (Mendoza, 2023, p. 14).

Research over the past fifty years highlights students' linguistic repertoires as valuable assets (Cummins, 2021; García & Kleyn, 2016). In response to researchers’ call for recognition of multilingual resources, teachers have started including multilingual activities in their classrooms – for instance, inviting children to contribute with their multilingual repertoires, singing songs or counting in different languages, exploring similarities and differences between languages, or using translation and bilingual resources (Duarte & Günther-van der Meij, 2018). However, implementing socially just and linguistically sustainable education remains challenging because these policy ideas collide with entrenched monoglossic ideologies, which are still dominant in national school systems and continue to marginalize multilingual students (Alisaari et al., 2019a; García & Kleyn, 2016; Sah & Uysal, 2022; Young, 2014).

This tension between policy and practice is also evident in Norway. Despite policy shifts towards recognizing multilingualism and calls for the disruption of deficit ideologies, changes in teaching practices remain limited (Anderson et al., 2024; Iversen, 2019; Tishakov & Haukås, 2025; Uysal & Sah, 2024). This gap raises a central question: How can education move beyond symbolic recognition of multilingualism to enact inclusive and socially just practices? New language-political mandates may conflict with established pedagogical traditions, such as the emphasis on maximum target language exposure in communicative language teaching (Cummins, 2021). Addressing this gap requires close attention to how teachers enact language policy in their instructional practice and to the language ideologies that guide their pedagogical decisions.

Following Spolsky (2004), we consider language policy, language ideologies, and language practices as influencing and reflecting each other. Three interconnected elements in his model of language policy include language management, language beliefs, and language practices. We also draw on the concept of *practiced language policy*, which refers to the implicit norms and language choices made in classrooms (Bonacina-Pugh, 2012). Official school policies, teachers’ everyday language choices in their teaching, and underlying language ideologies interact, revealing the complex relationship that exists between what is prescribed, what attitudes and beliefs teachers have to these prescriptions, and what they actually do in their teaching (Bonacina-Pugh, 2012; Shohamy, 2006). The concept of *practiced language policy* may be helpful to understand how language practices enact language policy. Teachers’ beliefs about language, learning, and multilingualism, rooted in societal norms and their professional experience, influence how they interpret and enact language policy in their classrooms. Since language ideologies influence teachers’ instructional decisions (Kroskrity, 2010), understanding teachers’ beliefs and ideological positions is crucial for transforming practice towards more socially just education and for addressing these issues in teacher education. As Young (2014) points out, "we cannot move towards plurilingual, inclusive

education without fully understanding the obstacles which are preventing its implementation" (p. 168).

Teachers are often considered as agents of change in educational systems; through their own teaching practices they can initiate instructional innovation, create new knowledge, and negotiate institutional and national policies (Cummins, 2022). By positioning themselves in relation to different ideological stances, they can either align with or oppose the larger societal and political discourses. Therefore, teachers' identity and ideological beliefs have been of interest in research on multilingual practices in schools in recent years. Our study contributes to this field of research, exploring how language ideologies, social justice perspectives, and orientations to multilingualism and translanguaging are described in Norwegian in-service teachers' narratives of practice, i.e. their written self-reported accounts of pedagogical work in Norwegian multilingual classrooms.

Our study aims to address the following research questions: 1) What aspects of socially just education and which language ideologies do we detect in teachers' narratives of practice? 2) How do teachers position themselves with respect to multilingual activities and translanguaging in their narratives? Through our analysis of teachers' narratives of practice, we wish to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of how language ideologies and teachers' orientations to multilingualism and translanguaging can impact their practical enactment of multilingual pedagogies, thereby exploring their transformative potential.

Following this introduction, we situate our study by briefly describing the Norwegian linguistic and educational setting. We then present the theoretical and conceptual framework of our study with a focus on central aspects of social justice in education and language ideologies. Next, we describe our methodology, present and discuss our findings. In the conclusion, we highlight implications for teacher education.

2. CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

Our research was conducted in Norway, which has been a multilingual and multicultural country for centuries. The country's linguistic landscape reflects the diversity of its population. Norwegian is designated by law as the main and administrative language, with two written forms: "bokmål" and "nynorsk". There is no one standard oral variety of Norwegian; numerous regional dialects are used at all levels in society, including education, media, official communication, and people's daily lives. Norway also has several national minority languages, including Sami languages, Kven, Forest Finn, Romani, Romanes, and Norwegian sign language, which are officially acknowledged and protected. 16.8% of Norway's population are immigrants or children of immigrants from various countries (Statistics Norway, 2024).

English is influential in Norwegian society and is taught as the first foreign language in schools from the first grade. It has its own subject curriculum, in contrast to language subjects like German, French, and Spanish, which have a shared curriculum, entitled "Foreign Languages" (MER, 2019d). Children and youth in Norway are also exposed to English outside the classroom through films, videos, music, social media, streaming platforms, and gaming. Many scholars and public figures today deplore what they see as young people increasingly mixing English words and phrases into their Norwegian utterances. These translanguaging practices are mostly described in deficit terms and as threatening to the purity of the Norwegian language (Sarromaa, 2024; Villalobos, 2022). At the national language policy level, efforts are also made to maintain the status of Norwegian against the influence of English: In accordance with the Language Act 2021, "a public body cannot implement measures leading to the displacement of Norwegian by English in any of its areas" [our translation] (Language Council, n.d.).

In Norway, children begin school at the age of six, progressing through primary (1st-7th grade) and lower secondary education (8th-10th grade) by age 16. This 10-year education is compulsory and free. Students then have the right to attend upper secondary school (11th-13th grade). Norwegian is the primary medium of instruction in Norwegian mainstream schools, but the Education Act also guarantees education rights in Sami and Kven/Finnish languages. Students with other first languages (L1s) are also entitled to receive additional support in Norwegian, and, if deemed necessary, bilingual subject support and mother-tongue instruction (Opplæringslova, 2023). These rights apply until students are proficient enough in Norwegian to follow instruction in the mainstream classroom. Newly arrived students usually receive an offer to attend an induction class for one year before entering mainstream classrooms (Opplæringslova, 2023).

A renewed national curriculum for schools came into force in 2020. The core curriculum states that "all pupils shall experience that being proficient in a number of languages is a resource, both in school and society at large" (MER, 2019a, p. 7). The English language curriculum highlights multilingualism as an asset (MER, 2019b), and the Norwegian language curriculum encourages students to be confident language users aware of their linguistic and cultural identity "within an inclusive community where multilingualism is valued as a resource" [our translation] (MER, 2019c, p. 1). Despite this clear multilingualism-as-resource orientation (Ruiz, 1984) at the policy level, many teachers struggle to implement multilingual pedagogies effectively (Bakken et al., 2022; Dahl & Krulatz, 2016; Haukås, 2016; Tishakov & Haukås, 2025). Some of the reasons mentioned by teachers are their fear of losing control due to their own lack of competence in students' L1s and concern that the promotion of multilingualism could disrupt further language learning (Bakken et al., 2022). They claim they need teaching strategies for the multilingual classroom and access to resources for adapted instruction (Dahl & Krulatz, 2016; Haukås, 2016). This study grapples with an attempt to disclose how and to what extent teachers' practices in multilingual classrooms afford equitable and just education for all students.

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Our theoretical and conceptual framework is developed based on conceptualizations articulated in research into aspects of socially just education and language ideologies. A central concept is *translanguaging*. Mendoza et al. (2024) are concerned with researching translanguaging *in context*, and to do that, they chose to draw on the transdisciplinary framework proposed by the Douglas Fir Group (2016) for language acquisition. Their framework is in turn based on Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological model with three interrelated levels. When applied to define dimensions of context, distinctions were made between a *macro-political/ideological context* in which language ideologies belong and policies in society at large; a *meso-institutional context* of schools and classrooms, where teachers' agency plays out; and a *micro-interactional context*, which has to do with "moment-to-moment interactions including semiotic resources: linguistic, nonverbal, and pictorial" (Mendoza et al., 2024, p. 4). This framework has served as a tool to place our micro-level analysis in a complex educational ecology. Sections 3.1 and 3.2 present aspects of socially just education, and sections 3.3 and 3.4 address language ideologies.

3.1 Social Justice in Education

Equity and social justice have been widely studied and critiqued in various societal and global contexts (Fraser, 1997; North, 2006). Central issues are, among others, the rights and needs of historically marginalized social groups and the inequitable distribution of wealth and power. Our immediate concern is exploring how social justice issues play out at the level of interaction in multilingual classrooms in Norway and what pedagogical choices teachers make to meet their learners' needs. We have therefore turned to language-pedagogical literature about aspects of social justice to help ground our analysis.

Different teacher educators and researchers have conceptualized the construct *socially just education* in various ways (e.g., Cochran-Smith et al., 2009; Kavanagh & Danielson, 2020; Klette et al., 2018; Mendoza et al., 2024; North, 2006). An opposition has sometimes been framed between socially just educational practice, one the one hand, and expectations of knowledge-promoting instruction, on the other. Cochran-Smith et al. (2009) argue strongly that the core commitment of a social justice agenda in teacher education is to enhance students' learning (p. 349).

In their studies, both Cochran-Smith et al. (2009) and Kavanagh and Danielson (2020) examined how instruction in teacher education about the social justice dimension of teaching translated into practical action in novice teachers' classrooms. They also conducted interviews and explored these teachers' written reflections to understand their perceptions of social justice. Cochran-Smith et al. (2009) found that their

candidates expressed clear insights into central themes such as accommodating and differentiating needs-based instruction and holding all students to high expectations; building relationships with learners and their families; developing a culture of respect and care; recognizing inequities; and taking on the role of agent in transformative processes. The authors concluded that these teachers took curricular responsibilities seriously and included opportunities for critical thinking. Structural critique, however, was not highlighted.

Using North's (2006) conceptual framework for the study of social justice and sociocultural theories of learning, Kavanagh and Danielsom (2020) examined to what extent educators recognized the rights and needs of all the students by validating and respecting them, and to what extent they were concerned with ensuring access to valued content and resources for all. Kavanagh and Danielson's central aim was to compare the preparation pre-service teachers were given as part of their university coursework with respect to supporting students' literacy development, on the one hand, and the social justice agenda, on the other. They concluded that teaching strategies for socially just education were not modelled, exemplary teaching activities were not decomposed for practical enactment, and candidates lacked opportunities to practise instruction with social justice as its main content. Social justice was mostly addressed at the stage of *planning* instruction, but not in the moment-to-moment interactions in actual teaching.

In the Norwegian context, Klette et al. (2018) approached questions regarding justice and equality in education by studying learner engagement in two classrooms in secondary education. In their study, central aspects of educational justice were *participation* and *access to content*. The authors refer to the societal expectations shared by Norway, Sweden, and Finland that students have equal opportunities in education, and that whole-class teaching is a tool to secure justice and equality. Their conclusion is that students' engagement and participation depend on teachers' ability to provide explicit conceptual explanations and adapted presentations of curricular content. Another factor is teachers' dialogic approach to students' emergent competence. According to the authors, Norwegian classrooms are characterized as giving "ample support and room for student participation" (p. 72). Other reported elements are the provision of access to valued content, quality instruction, and teachers keeping their learners to high expectations (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009; Kavanagh & Danielson, 2020). The factors of socially just education presented in this section have informed our analysis of Norwegian teachers' narratives of practice. The following section highlights the role that *translanguaging* can play to enhance students' learning.

3.2 Translanguaging as a Strategy for Deep Learning

To illustrate the importance of opportunities to access and develop valued knowledge and skills, *deep* (or *in-depth*) *learning* is a central issue in Norwegian education across all subjects, as explicitly stated in the core curriculum (MER, 2019a). A precondition for

deep learning is that students can make connections in their minds between new information and prior knowledge and skills. Language-minoritized learners will have constructed this knowledge at least partly through a language other than Norwegian. A socially just way of teaching therefore means letting every learner use all their semiotic resources and develop their metalinguistic awareness by comparing languages that are used in the classroom. This is a call for welcoming *translanguaging* practices in the classroom across all subjects. In our view, a strong focus on Norwegian (and English in English lessons) as the only legitimate medium of instruction and not facilitating translanguaging aligns with monolingual ideologies and is not conducive to ensuring deep learning for all students.

With respect to a social justice agenda, teachers position themselves philosophically and ideologically through their discourse and choice of educational content; their identity work as professional multilingualism-aware teachers emerges partly through the way they position their learners, their instructional practices, and interactions with learners in the classroom. For instance, one scaffolding strategy that has proven facilitative for language-minoritized students in connection with reading development has been *elaborative* rather than *simplified* discourse (Oh, 2001). Elaborative modification of input is intended to clarify meaning by means of strategies to increase redundancy, such as paraphrasing, using synonyms and restatements, or emphatic stress. By contrast, simplified discourse typically involves short sentences and limited vocabulary.

Encouraging translanguaging is indeed a strategy promoting deeper learning (Lewis et al., 2012). It is also a concrete signal that learners' identity and whole linguistic repertoire is welcome in classroom interactions. In addition to how a teacher's identity is mediated through instructional content, it is also negotiated in the way they express their *relationality*, i.e., the kind of relation they establish between themselves as teachers and their students in the classroom, by sharing the privilege of agentive action when it comes to teaching/being taught (Canagarajah, 2025; Li Wei & Lee, 2024).

A salient factor in discussions about socially just education is building relationships of respect and caring (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009). One way of committing to a more inclusive pedagogy is disrupting the vertical relation between teachers and learners by encouraging translanguaging or plurilanguaging in the classroom. When teachers and learners have different linguistic repertoires, they have a unique opportunity to invite collaboration and co-learning. In this situation, co-learning can become a salient part of the learning environment; co-*teaching* of linguistic and cultural features among the students can also occur. These possibilities of levelling the playing field can also have a positive effect on individual learners who will feel valorized and included.

Teachers' co-learning is one aspect of Li Wei and Lee's (2024) reconceptualization of the construct *transpositioning*. They explain it as "a *processual and iterative shifting* of the identity position of an actor-in-communication" (italics in the original, Li Wei & Lee, 2024, p. 5). It captures the quality of relationality and the potential to step outside

default roles and relative positionings. Transpositioning is thus an enabling factor when it comes to learner participation.

Before we move on to address aspects of language ideologies, it may be useful to summarize the main characteristics of socially just education highlighted in these last two sections. They include validation and respect, access to valued content and resources, and social inclusion. These aspects cover rights to participation, engagement, support, scaffolding, and relationship-building.

3.3 Language Ideologies and Pedagogical Practices in Teaching Multilingual Students

As mentioned above, the micro-interactional context and moment-to-moment interactions in the classroom, which constitute language practices in schools, are influenced by various ideological regimes at the macro- and meso-levels (Mendoza et al., 2024). These may include language ideologies that underpin the educational policies of nation-states and those at more local levels (Uysal & Sah, 2024). Language ideologies are defined as "beliefs, feelings, and conceptions about language structure and use, which often index the political economic interests of individual speakers, ethnic and other interest groups, and nation-states" (Kroskrity, 2010, p. 192). Since language ideologies are usually rooted in socio-cultural contexts, they are culturally learned and shared, so that individuals' language ideologies are often tightly linked to societal and/or institutional factors.

Being central to all national educational systems, schools serve as sites for the implementation of language policy regulations, which are grounded in certain ideological positions and function as arenas where language ideologies are formed and negotiated through specific language practices (Bonacina-Pugh, 2012). Teachers are central actors in these processes, as their teaching methods enact language policy regulations and may represent their own ideological beliefs and positions, influencing language practices in the classrooms and shaping students' ideological orientations (Bokhorst-Heng & Marshall, 2024).

Scholars argue that monolingual/monoglossic ideologies still prevail in many classrooms (Bhasin et al., 2023; García, 2020). Monoglossic ideologies position monolingualism as the norm or the ideal, assuming that languages are separate entities that should not be mixed (García & Kleyn, 2016). The teaching methods associated with monoglossic ideologies are based on the idea that the nation-state dominant language(s) only should be used in the language education of emergent multilingual students, as this maximizes their exposure to the target language and time on task. Following this ideological position, multilingual competence is often devalued, and multilingual students are discouraged from using their minoritized language(s), as it may hinder their academic success (Flognfeldt et al., 2020). Such beliefs can marginalize

multilingual students, confronting them with deficit views that position their knowledge and language skills as in need of remediation, which can lead to low expectations and limited opportunities (Cushing, 2023; Flores & Rosa, 2015). Deficit discourses can often result in subtractive multilingualism (Lambert, 1974), where learning the dominant language comes at the expense of learners' L1s (Cenoz, 2013). A one nation, one language principle, tied to the notions of national identity and unity and implying that each national state should have a common language, is also usually associated with a monoglossic ideology (García & Kleyn, 2016).

Monoglossic ideologies may be linked to raciolinguistic ideologies, which include certain assumptions about the relationship between race and language. Raciolinguistic ideologies position "idealized monolingualism in a standardized national language as the norm to which all national subjects should aspire" (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 151). Certain linguistic features are associated with specific racial and ethnic groups, who are perceived as deficient, accompanied by underpinning biases, stereotypes, and discriminatory practices. The effect is that these groups' language use is racialized based on their users' perceived racial or ethnic identity. For instance, Cushing (2023) discusses how the 'word gap' discourse in education reflects raciolinguistic ideologies because the practices of racialized multilingual learners are characterized as deficient and as never reaching the standards set by the white listening subject (Flores & Rosa, 2015).

Language ideologies related to multilingualism in education have gained considerable attention recently (Alisaari et al., 2019a; Bartolomé, 2008; Bernstein et al., 2023; Cushing, 2023; Uysal & Sah, 2024). This increased focus is related to researchers' calls for changes in educational approaches to teaching multilingual students. The aim is to make education more socially just by valuing students' multilingualism as a resource for learning (Bhasin et al., 2023; García & Leiva, 2014; García, 2020; Li Wei, 2023). A number of pedagogical approaches (e.g., translanguaging pedagogy (Li Wei, 2023), pedagogical translanguaging (García & Kleyn, 2016; Cenoz & Gorter, 2021), crosslinguistic pedagogy, multilingual teaching, teaching through a multilingual lens (Cummins, 2019), culturally and linguistically responsive teaching (Lucas & Villegas, 2010), culturally and linguistically sustaining pedagogy (Paris & Alim, 2017), humanizing pedagogy (Salazar, 2013), plurilingualism and plurilingual pedagogy (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021; Chen et al., 2022; Piccardo, 2019) have been suggested during the past 20 years. They take an asset-oriented perspective on teaching multilingual learners, which is rooted in heteroglossic language ideology and aims to disrupt monoglossic ideological regimes. These different approaches and concepts bring with them varying epistemological positions, socio-political groundings, and implications for pedagogical practice (see e.g., Cummins, 2021; García & Otheguy, 2020; MacSwan & Rolstad, 2024). However, for the purposes of our study, we will not delve deeper into these theoretical discussions.

Heteroglossic language ideology, originating in Bakhtin's term *heteroglossia*, referring to the diversity of a single language, is based on the idea that speakers' language competencies are fluid and dynamic. Teaching approaches rooted in heteroglossic ideology value linguistic diversity and view all students' multilingual repertoires as valuable resources for communication and learning. Such pedagogical approaches therefore acknowledge translanguaging as an integral and natural part of classroom instruction (García, 2009; García & Otheguy, 2020; MacSwan & Rolstad, 2024).

In this study, we focus on how teachers express what García et al. (2016) describe as a *stance* for pedagogical translanguaging, i.e. their beliefs about and attitudes to minoritized students and their linguistic repertoires, including the view that students' knowledge and skills, or funds of knowledge, are valuable resources for learning (Moll et al., 1992). García & Kleyn (2016) point out that some teachers might adopt a *scaffolding stance*, viewing students' multilingual repertoires as temporary support for learning a new language. Others take a *transformative stance*, believing that utilizing the students' entire language repertoires can disrupt and reshape the existing language hierarchies in schools. As beliefs and attitudes are often not immediately apparent, we examine how a translanguaging stance is reflected in teachers' descriptions of their planned and spontaneous actions.

In response to the multilingual turn in education (May, 2014) and researchers' calls for transformation in pedagogical approaches, some Northern European countries (e.g., Norway, Finland, Sweden) have enacted policy changes that explicitly incorporate a multilingualism-as-resource approach (Ruiz, 1984) into the curricula (Alisaari et al., 2019b; Myklevold & Speitz, 2021; Paulsrud et al., 2020). However, the relation between the policy and its implementation is not straightforward. Research shows that despite supportive policies, many teachers continue to follow monolingual approaches (Alisaari et al., 2019a; Myklevold & Speitz, 2021; Tishakov & Tsagari, 2022). The opposite is also evident: Even within monolingual policy in the curriculum, some teachers manage to create multilingual learning spaces in their classrooms and promote positive views of multilingualism (Mary & Young, 2017; Menken & Sánchez, 2019).

3.4 Research on Language Ideologies and Teachers' Beliefs

Previous research highlights the multiplicity, complexity, controversies, and tensions in both pre- and in-service teachers' ideological beliefs (see e.g., Bernstein et al., 2023; Bokhorst-Heng & Marshall, 2024; Elshafie et al., 2023). Several studies show that teachers often hold ambivalent views and may express contradictory language ideologies. For instance, they can express positive attitudes to linguistic diversity and multilingual competence in general, but at the same time insist on the use of only the dominant national language in the classroom, as a means of developing the students' proficiency in this language (Bokhorst-Heng & Marshall, 2024; Elshafie et al., 2023).

To explore these controversies in teachers' beliefs, Anderson et al. (2024) analysed teachers' written linguistic autobiographical metareflections, focusing on "Yes, BUT" constructions. They recognized that "Yes" constructions were often connected to ideological stances of celebrating diversity, making room for students' different languages and questioning unjust structures in education and society. "BUT" constructions, on the other hand, revealed concerns about students' future success and appropriateness of multilingual students' language use. Their study clearly highlights how teachers often have to navigate complex and sometimes conflicting ideological pressures and must align their own ideological beliefs with dominant ideological norms.

It is important to address these ideological tensions in teacher education and continuing professional development (CPD) courses, using them as a starting point for critical reflection on how one can advocate for change and dismantle monolingual ideologies. Bartolomé (2008) points out that while teacher education often focuses on providing teachers with tools to deal with diversity and on increasing teachers' knowledge about culturally and linguistically responsive teaching, it tends to overlook the ideological dimensions of implementing multilingual pedagogies. Alfaro (2019) calls for developing *ideological clarity* in teacher education, which requires that "teachers' individual beliefs and values be repeatedly juxtaposed with the systems of belief of the dominant society" (p. 195).

In our study, we explore how Norwegian teachers articulate their beliefs about multilingualism and what language ideologies come to light in their narratives of practice about allowing translanguaging and using other multilingual strategies in their classrooms. This may provide useful insights into their underlying ideological stances and help identify potential ideological tensions that can further be addressed in teacher education and CPD courses.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 Participants

In order to provide a clear presentation of our research participants, a brief introduction to Norwegian teacher education is in order. To qualify as a teacher in Norwegian schools, two options are available: degree-based discipline studies followed by a one-year practical-pedagogical course or a five-year integrated teacher education master's program. Earlier teacher education programs in Norway certified generalist teachers, resulting in teacher qualification challenges. For example, a teacher could be assigned to teach English without formal qualifications in that subject. The "Competence for Quality" program was launched in 2009 to address these challenges by offering continuing professional development (CPD) courses for in-service teachers. Participants in our study were in-service teachers who attended CPD courses in "Norwegian as an Additional Language" or "English for Primary School Teachers" (English 1, grades 1–7).

Geographically, the majority of the teachers in this study were working in Eastern Norway. Most of them had more than 6 years of teaching experience, mostly at the primary level (grades 1-7) (see Table 1).

Table 1. Characteristics of the Teachers who Participated in the Study

Teacher Characteristics	Norwegian As a Second Language Course	English for Primary School
Total number	17	13
Geographical distribution	Eastern Norway (11) 64% Western Norway (3) 18% Northern Norway (3) 18%	Eastern Norway (12) 92% Northern Norway (1) 8%
Teaching experience	0–3 years (2) 12% 3–6 years (5) 29% More than 6 years (10) 59%	3–6 years (5) 38% More than 6 years (8) 62%
Teaching level	Primary (grades 1–7) (12) 71% Lower secondary (grades 8– 10) (4) 24% Upper secondary (1) 5%	Primary (grades 1–7) 100%

Both courses were one-year 30 ECTS blended courses with three two-day face-to-face meetings per semester, covering a wide range of topics related to second language learning and teaching, general linguistic and cultural content. “Multilingualism” was one of the topics in both courses. Our positionality as researchers in this project is identical: We had the main responsibility for our respective CPD courses and also taught the topic “Multilingualism” in our own course. The teachers were already familiar with this topic from their initial teacher education. In the CPD courses we addressed practical implications of the recognition of multilingualism as a resource in the renewed curriculum and the increasing diversity of many classrooms. In the Norwegian as an Additional Language course, teachers worked primarily with minoritized students; in English 1, 1–7, they mostly taught mainstream classes with varying degrees of linguistic diversity. As part of their work with the topic, the teachers were asked to write narratives of their own practice describing situations where multiple languages were or could be used (See Appendices A and B).

4.2 Data Collection

In this study, we collected 30 of these narratives of practice written by in-service teachers. While these narratives were primarily used in their class work as preparation

for the sessions related to multilingualism, the teachers were also invited to share their narratives in the research project initiated by us. Those who gave their consent submitted their narratives separately and anonymously through another digital platform than the one used in their CPD course, to ensure that participation in the research project was separated from the coursework. The principle of voluntary participation was followed. The teachers had given their informed consent to the use of their narratives in our research. In addition, they were asked to fill in some background information about their classes and teaching context (see Table 1 above, summarizing some of this information).

Teachers' narratives of practice refer to the stories and descriptions of the teachers' professional experiences and instructional practices. They offer a framework for documenting, structuring, and interpreting teachers' professional experiences (Harbon & Moloney, 2014). Due to the subjectivity of the narrative as a genre, such narratives do not necessarily describe the events exactly as they happened (events-as-lived), but they reconstruct events with a focus on how the author sees and interprets the event (event-as-told) (Cortazzi, 2002; Jørgensen et al., 2019). This subjectivity makes narratives of practice an interesting data source for research because they may capture the teachers' perspectives on their practices, their beliefs, identities, and professional reflections, both through the stories they have chosen to describe in the narratives, but also through the very act of telling that story. This double-layered act allows narrators to express their attitudes, beliefs, and identities as they re-construct past events as part of their professional practice (Harbon & Moloney, 2014).

As the research participants composed their practice narratives as coursework assignments, it needs to be acknowledged that the originally intended audience for these narratives were co-students and professors in their CPD courses. This may have influenced how the teachers chose to portray their experiences and what stories they chose to tell. Taking this into account, the narratives may embody a more positive representation of their realities, mirroring what teachers intended to highlight about their professional practice in the context of the CPD courses. Given the context and focus of the assignments in the CPD courses, the collected narratives may not necessarily be representative of the teachers' usual practices. For some, specific incidents were perhaps their initial attempts at integrating multilingual approaches in their teaching. Our data set comprises 17 narratives in Norwegian (N1–N17) and 13 in English (E1–E13). Illustrative quotations of Norwegian entries have been translated by us. The English items are quoted verbatim. No corrections have been made.

4.3 Data Analysis

In our exploration of the perspectives on multilingualism, translanguaging, and socially just education expressed in the participants' narratives, we followed the phases of the thematic analysis procedure suggested by Braun and Clarke (2006). First, each author

thoroughly read the narratives to become familiar with the data set as a whole and the individual narratives. In the next phase, we independently coded the data to highlight key features that we found relevant in the data set to answer our research questions. We adopted a coding approach combining inductive and deductive strategies. Language ideologies (e.g., monolingual vs. multilingual ideology, deficit vs. asset orientation) described in the literature guided our coding in the deductive approach, while inductively, we created codes flexibly from what we identified in the empirical data. The independent coding performed by each of the authors represented our initial thoughts and interpretations, which we discussed and reflected upon in the next phases to create more general categories in our search for patterns in the data.

At the next stage, we related these categories and codes to structural elements found in the narratives of practice. Our interpretations are inspired by narrative analysis (Bamberg, 2020), as we focused not just on *what* is described in the narratives, but also *how* it is described. The narratives typically included (1) positionings of the students and the setting, (2) the activities or situations related to the use of multiple languages, including their effects. Attention to (3) formulations and linguistic choices made in the narratives helped us to interpret teachers' attitudes to the described activities, and (4) teachers' positioning of themselves, either as monolingual or multilingual speakers in the described situation. These structural elements in the narratives of practice are used in the presentation of our findings in the next section.

5. FINDINGS

5.1 Positioning of the Students

In the narratives of practice, the informants described both their classes as a whole and one or several specific students. Usually, the specific students mentioned were either newly arrived students, or students whom they perceived as multilingual, or in need of extra language support. There are varying degrees of detail in the descriptions of the students' linguistic backgrounds; some narratives provide minimal information, while others are quite detailed. On the one hand, the level of detail in the teachers' descriptions could be considered as an indicator of their knowledge about their students' backgrounds. On the other hand, a lack of details in descriptions of the students' backgrounds might also be a deliberate strategy to ensure anonymity.

Analysing the data, we explored the participants' choice of terms for describing specific (groups of) students, what aspects they included in the descriptions, and how the specific students described were positioned in relation to the whole class. Across all narratives, the following terms were used (frequencies indicated in parenthesis): "multilingual student(s)" (in 10 narratives), students with "another language/mother tongue (than Norwegian and/or English)" (6), "student(s) with Norwegian as a second language" (5), "newly arrived students" (5), "foreign-language-speaking" [Norwegian:

“fremmedspråklig”] (3), “bilingual” (2), “speakers of minority languages” (1), and “refugee student” (1). Some of the terms used in the narratives are rooted in negative and deficit orientations, which may contribute to the “othering” of these students in relation to students who have Norwegian as their L1. The use of different terms that we observed may indicate that «multilingualism» among students is not used neutrally denoting plurilingualism, i.e., competence in multiple languages, but is quite often associated with a specific group of students, which a teacher in Olaussen and Kjelaas (2020) refers to as students that “require some effort” (p. 53). Flognfeldt (2019) reported a primary school teacher characterizing language-minoritized learners as “poor when it comes to language” (p. 240). Haukås (2022) points out that such an immigrant-focused perspective on multilingualism may impede the implementation of multilingual pedagogical approaches that benefit all students and contribute to the development of students’ multilingual identities.

Only a few narratives in our study stress that all the students in the classroom are multilingual. In one case, this statement is applied to all students in an ordinary mainstream class; in other cases, the teachers highlight their students’ multilingual identities, as they teach induction classes for newly arrived students. Students are frequently characterized by their "mother tongue", "first language", or "home language", usually contrasted either explicitly or implicitly with Norwegian, assumed to be the mother tongue/first language for other students in the class:

> A boy in the class has another mother tongue than Norwegian. He uses his mother tongue only very little at home. (N5)
>
> I know at least three of my students have Polish as their mother tongue. (E3)
>
> There are only two pupils who have the same first language who are not Norwegian. (E10)[1]

Interestingly, most of the narratives refer to students' “mother tongue”, “first language”, or “home language” in singular form, carrying an assumption that students have only one such language. In all cases where the students’ languages are mentioned, they are referred to as named languages (e.g., Urdu, Arabic, English, Russian, Polish, Ukrainian, and Somali). Only two of the narratives in our data explicitly stress that students can have several mother tongues/first languages.

> 11 different languages are spoken in the group, in addition to Norwegian. (several some students have two mother tongues, it may be that they speak even more languages – since we haven’t really managed to get the full overview of all the different African languages) (N12)

[1] We use the term *L1* when referring to the language students learnt at home. In our analysis and discussion of teachers’ narratives here, we also make use of *mother tongue* and the full phrase *first language* rather than the analytical term *L1*, since *mother tongue* is the literal translation of Norwegian “morsmål”.

> Three of the pupils have two first languages because their parents have a different language than their first language. (E10)

This indirectly indicates the presence of the one nation, one language ideology. This ideological position can also be attributed to descriptions where students are identified in relation to the country they or their parents come from: e.g., “girl from Lithuania” (N10), “two 1st graders with Polish parents” (E6). Sometimes the descriptions include adjectives linked to the student's nationality or country of origin (e.g., “the Polish student,” “the Afghani student”), or even a continent (“the African students”), disregarding the existing linguistic diversity there.

In the descriptions of students, we found many expressions rooted in deficit discourse. For instance, quite often the focus is on the perceived deficiency in Norwegian, or English:

> He knows very little Norwegian, and struggles to follow teaching in the whole class and to understand play and social life in the breaks. (N2)

> I have several little groups of two and three pupils. These small groups have Norwegian class with me to become more fluent in the language. […] One of them do have paperwork showing the need for extra tutoring of English and other subjects. (E3)

These deficit-oriented perspectives frame multilingual students’ linguistic competence in terms of what they lack in the languages that are highly valued in school and society at large, i.e., Norwegian and English, rather than what skills and potential the students bring with them to the classroom (Moll et al., 1992). On the one hand, this is an indication that students’ competence in Norwegian (and English) is perceived as more important, as often commented upon. This indicates that Norwegian/English language skills have a higher status compared to other languages (Beiler, 2021). On the other hand, this might merely express teachers’ professional positioning as language teachers in these respective languages. However, implicitly, such a focus in descriptions of students can reinforce monolingual norms, devalue students' multilingual assets, and be a hindrance in developing multilingual identities (Flognfeldt et al., 2020). Some of the narratives also highlight deficits in the students' L1 competence or use:

> One boy has a Polish mother, but they never use Polish at home. He cannot understand more than a few words when he visits his family in Poland, but he understands some songs. (E11)

In this example, the teacher frames the situation in terms of what is missing or insufficient (the lack of Polish use at home, limited understanding) rather than acknowledging the student’s multilingual background or the value of partial language knowledge. Such cases can be seen as instantiating a subtractive view of multilingualism (Cenoz, 2013).

Although we pointed out above that a lack of details in descriptions does not necessarily mean that the teachers do not have enough information about the students’ linguistic repertoires, we have also found indications that some teachers admit to not knowing the

breadth of their multilingual students' linguistic repertoires. For instance, in one of the narratives (N12), a teacher acknowledges that some students may speak more languages than the educators are aware of: "some of the students have two mother tongues, it may even be the case that they really speak more languages." In another narrative (E3), the teacher is unsure about the specific languages spoken by the students: "Two of them have Afghanistan as country of origin, but I'm not sure if they speak Pashto or Dari." These utterances may reflect that teachers do not always have detailed knowledge about their students' multilingual competencies and the specific languages they use in their everyday lives. Lack of such knowledge can, on the one hand, point to the challenges teachers face in keeping track of the diverse linguistic repertoires of their students in multilingual classrooms. On the other hand, lack of such knowledge may be a hindrance in implementing multilingual teaching approaches. Without knowledge of which languages students use and are familiar with, it may be challenging for teachers to engage meaningfully in pedagogical translanguaging or to draw on students' full linguistic resources in classroom activities.

Limited awareness of students' linguistic repertoires may also provide an explanation for why Norwegian and English (in English lessons) tend to be positioned as teachers' priorities. Two factors appear to contribute to this dominance of English and Norwegian in the descriptions: teachers' lack of information about the students, or less than effective routines for dialogue with the parents about their children's language development.

Only a few narratives in our sample provide detailed descriptions of the multilingual children's language repertoires and language use, thus demonstrating a more flexible and heteroglossic view of multilingualism:

> I have a girl from Ukraine who speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, some Norwegian and a little Chinese. (E3)

> Felix´ mother speaks Filipino, Norwegian and English. She speaks Norwegian with her four children, English with her husband and Filipino with other members of her family. Felix´ father speaks Dagomba (from Togo), English and Norwegian. He speaks Norwegian with his children, English with his wife and Dagomba with other members of his family. Felix has some receptive knowledge in Filipino and Dagomba. He has some productive knowledge in English, and his first language is Norwegian. (E12)

> "V" comes from Albania. She speaks Albanian and Greek at home, and sometimes a little English with her father. When she talks to her brother, she speaks Norwegian. But when her parents are present, she speaks Albanian and Greek. She has attended school from the 1st grade and does not receive additional support in Norwegian. She speaks Norwegian well, has Norwegian friends and has an OK everyday language. When we work with more advanced texts/subject-specific texts, her vocabulary is often limited, and for that reason her score on screening tests is low. Therefore, she has attended a reading course in a small group, where they have spent a lot of time on reading strategies and conversation. This autumn she will be attending Albanian classes at the weekends and learn how to write in Greek. She has been looking forward to this but thinks it will be a bit difficult since the letters are so different from ours. (N8)

Summing up, we have seen signs of monoglossic ideologies and deficit discourses, positioning monolingualism in the dominant/high status language(s) of the society as an implicit norm in the descriptions of the students in the narratives of practice. Using "multilingual" as a label for those students who "require some effort" and paying attention to the multilingual students' deficient proficiency in the dominant language(s) while disregarding their rich linguistic repertoires may potentially deprive these students of equal educational opportunities. The lack of a more nuanced understanding of multilingual competence and insights into the complexities associated with being multilingual can also limit the teachers' good intentions to effectively leverage students' multilingual resources in the classroom. However, we also observed in our data that such ideological positions appear to co-exist with asset-oriented and multilingualism-as-resource views expressed in the descriptions of the activities, which we analyse in the next section.

5.2 Exploration of Social Justice Issues in the Narratives of Practice

In the section about social justice in education, we summarized our three main concepts as validation and respect, access to valued content and resources, and social inclusion. Moreover, we broke these down to rights to participation, engagement, support, scaffolding, and relationship-building. In their narratives of practice, teachers recounted a variety of activities they enacted in their classrooms as well as activities involving students during playtime and elsewhere in the school environment. Some descriptions simply highlighted the linguacultural diversity of their educational context, offering short vignettes about language-minoritized students' interactions among themselves or with others. Other narratives, however, are rich presentations of activities that were designed to afford multilingual learning spaces and facilitate translanguaging. Based on our data set, teachers did not explicitly forbid their learners to use other languages than the majority language in their lessons. However, in one narrative, the teacher clearly stated her agenda: "Before they started on their drawing task, I told them that I wished they would try to speak Norwegian while they worked together. I also reminded them about this during the process." (N6)

This teacher presented her performance requirement as a wish, although an insistent one. This action resonates with the dominant-language-only ideology. However, her use of the hypothetical modal *would* in expressing her wish is an indication of her awareness of her professional responsibility to help her students develop their Norwegian proficiency (Iversen, 2019). As discussed in section 2, Norwegian teachers are expected to promote multilingualism as a resource. This tension can understandably be perceived as a challenge for teachers.

The activities described are varied, ranging from staple classroom routines to playtime fun, including language awareness tasks such as exploring similarities and differences

between languages in the classroom. Still other activities are culturally relevant: learning songs, greetings, other politeness expressions, and celebratory uses in connection with birthdays and festivals. The fact that teachers take an engaged part in translanguaging and learning sounds, words and expressions in various languages adds to the function of validation of students' multilingual identities, as well as demonstrating the teachers' own multilingual orientation:

> When the class had Christmas graduation with parents this Christmas, we had a session where we used the different languages. The way we solved it was that the students with a different language, got to teach the others "Merry Christmas and a happy new year!" in their language. After we had sung the song Feliz Navidad, all the students said "Merry Christmas and a happy new year" in French, Spanish, Albanian, Vietnamese, Swedish, and Hungarian. (E9)

> After that he has asked us adults several times what the word was for 'hi' in his mother tongue. Then he uses it, and we adults use it, and the other children use it. (N5)

In sum, these activities serve the social justice purpose of validating students with different backgrounds, respecting their cultural traditions, as well as creating a sense of inclusion through encouraging translanguaging. Moreover, the students received praise for their multilingual skills:

> Every other sentence was in Polish and Norwegian, and it was really fascinating to observe how the two boys juggled the two languages, very engaged, and at fast speed, while running around, kicking the ball, having their best time. (E6)

> There were several languages, and it was obvious that the multilingual students were proud telling the others about something they knew (which the others did not). (N2)

In addition to sharing language-pedagogical experiences, many teachers made a point about how they explicitly shared with their students that knowing languages is a gift and a resource. They did not always state why, but they were ready to confirm the symbolic value of multilingualism:

> [...] we talked about language, what a great resource it is to be able to know more languages, and all the students got to say a little about what languages they spoke at home or knew a little. (N2)

> I always emphasize the advantages of knowing languages [...] This way the speakers of both minority- and majority languages hopefully want to try out different languages and doing this contributes to developing language awareness as well as building their self-esteem. (E2)

Teacher E2 has included reflections about the possible merits of viewing multilingual competence and translanguaging as a resource. An asset-based and heteroglossic orientation to multilingualism is evident here.

Teachers described how students learn from each other, but many teachers also demonstrated a willingness to learn from their students. In some of the instances, the teachers exhibited a multilingual orientation in trying out how to say things in various

languages: “I always emphasize the advantages of knowing languages and encourage the students to great me in whatever language they want to use and let them teach me how to respond.” (E2)

This kind of co-learning can be positively linked to students’ opportunities to translanguage and participate as themselves, with their whole linguistic repertoires in action. Transpositioning is, as we saw at the end of section 3.2, a way of disrupting the traditional hierarchical relationship between teachers and students (Li Wei & Lee, 2024). Here the teacher was anxious to let students demonstrate polite language use and take the role of teacher. Balancing this relationship means empowering and motivating students to play a more active part in their own education. Participation is also a strong indicator of a more socially just and equitable learning environment (Klette et al., 2018).

In the context of education, access to valued knowledge and skills is an essential right. Just and equitable conditions for deep learning is an aspect aligned with curricular aims in the Norwegian educational context. Supporting students’ translanguaging proved to be a way of easing their learning situation:

> The student confirms that she knows something about antiquity. I suggest that she can tell me what she knows in Polish. She tries but is very uncertain. I point to her iPad and explain that she can search there. The student becomes engaged and finds a Polish textbook. (N1)

The teacher in N1 encouraged her student to access digital tools in her L1. This teacher demonstrated their professional expertise in allowing their student to make use of relevant information and tools to construct required knowledge. Allowing students to translanguage, make links to their L1, and make use of their multisemiotic repertoires all contributes to deeper learning and demonstrate a heteroglossic orientation to teaching and learning.

The narrative describes how the teacher provides scaffolding and support for their student. The use of various semiotic resources in addition to linguistic clues is an added value. A final example is a teacher’s reported use of elaborative input modification rather than simplification, thereby holding her students to high expectations (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009):

> I talk about pictures with the children, activate their pre-knowledge with questions about the current topic, explaining the meaning of the words in the text, using synonyms and antonyms, and explaining the content by using different words and sentences. (E2)

We found several instances of teachers reporting how students experienced a welcome change from a marginalized situation to a sense of inclusion. The effect of others’ interest in their life, language, or country of origin plays a role here, as does the way students build new relationships through translanguaging. We see this clearly in the narrative about two boys who had started learning the language of a Ukrainian newcomer to give him a warm welcome:

> A pupil from Ukraine started in the class this autumn. He knows very little Norwegian and has a hard time following the instruction in full class and understanding play and social life in the breaks. He often walks alone, withdrawing from the other pupils [...] After this lesson he has sought out the two boys outside too, and is more easily persuaded to join in ... (N2)

When the new student realized that the two boys had done this for him, his face had lit up and he had thanked them. The example shows how this incidence had a strong affective effect on him and served to make him feel included. Another narrative describes how when the teacher invites the newcomers to this classroom to evaluate their situation, one of the students points out the relational value of friendship:

> When asked what it was like to be in a classroom where they didn't speak their language. One of the pupils mentioned it was hard at first but that it became good because he became friends. (E13)

In many of the activities, the teachers encouraged the use of translanguaging in the sense of including more than the dominant language of instruction, Norwegian. Since the teachers did not have the same linguistic repertoire as their students in many cases, they sometimes reverted to English as a lingua franca in order to avoid giving students a sense of being marginalized due to their lack of proficiency in Norwegian.

In one of the narratives, (N1), the teacher and the student communicated through a digital translation tool, where the teacher also asked the student to explain some salient concepts in her L1, thus evaluating the student's comprehension through translation:

> Later, we talk about the concept of democracy, and she seems unsure of what it means. I type it into Google Translate. She understands the word, but it seems like she doesn't know what it is. I then get her iPad and point and explain that she should search for the Polish word for democracy. The student goes to a Polish Wikipedia page and reads about what democracy is. Afterwards, we use Google Translate to have her explain what democracy is in Polish. I hear her explanation in Norwegian. It is a bit unclear due to the translation, but I understand that she has understood what democracy is. (N1)

We also detected other examples of how teachers accommodated communication and used their available semiotic resources in the negotiation of meaning, even when they did not share linguistic repertoires with their students (e.g., through using gestures and body language), responding to the students' visual expressions, grasping some words the students had said in their languages that sounded similar to the words the teachers knew, or through positioning themselves as multilingual users. They created translanguaging spaces (Li Wei, 2018) and modelled how a whole range of semiotic repertoires can be used for making meaning in communication.

Only a selection of salient findings has been included here against numerous other interesting points exemplifying how teachers have addressed various aspects of socially just education, referring to the three themes discussed in section 3.2 above: validation and respect, access to valued content, and social inclusion.

6. DISCUSSION

In this study, we have explored the interplay of language ideologies, aspects of social justice (research question 1), and orientation to translanguaging and multilingual activities (research question 2) emergent in the narratives of practice written by Norwegian teachers taking CPD courses. In their narratives of practice, the teachers were asked to write about situations when multiple languages were used in their classrooms.

6.1 Language Ideologies and Social Justice in the Teachers' Narratives

Our analysis revealed both monoglossic and heteroglossic language ideologies in the narratives. Monoglossic ideologies were particularly salient in the teachers' descriptions of multilingual students. Here we saw that the term "multilingual" often took on a narrow and deficiency-oriented interpretation, rather than a broader understanding of multilingual students as those who have competence in or use several languages. We also found traces of normative discourse, where one-nation, one-language ideology, and the superior status of Norwegian and English as the dominant and highly valued languages in society became evident and contributed to descriptions of the multilingual students in terms of deficiency- and remediation-oriented discourse (Beiler, 2021; Flognfeldt et al., 2020; Vikøy & Haukås, 2023).

By contrast, many activities described in the narratives leaned more towards an asset-oriented perspective. We observed traces of various aspects of socially just education, suggesting that teachers made pedagogical decisions and demonstrated an ethical disposition in line with social justice perspectives. Positive effects of the teachers' attempt to include different linguistic repertoires in their planned pedagogical activities were mentioned in the narratives. The teachers planned actions to meet students' multilingual needs, which appeared to increase engagement and participation, a sense of pride and served as a contribution towards social inclusion.

However, not all aspects of social justice were equally prominent in our data. For instance, aspects related to critical consciousness to combat deficient linguistic ideologies and practices and to disrupt language separation practices were less evident in the narratives. These aspects of social justice are closely linked to ideological positions, suggesting that even if teachers initiate learning activities involving multiple languages, it does not necessarily impact their *translanguaging stance* or their attitudes and language ideologies. Many of the multilingual activities described in the narratives can also be related to remediation discourse, i.e., attempts to provide multilingual students with extra support for language skills in the dominant and high-status languages Norwegian or English. This instantiates a *scaffolding stance* (Cushing, 2023; García & Kleyn, 2016), rather than a proper transformative stance which could lead to

transpositioning and transformation. Therefore, this focus on translanguaging as scaffolding might turn out to be a hindrance to teachers and teacher educators in their work to disrupt and reshape existing monoglossic language ideologies (Mendoza et al., 2024).

6.2 Teachers' Orientation to Translanguaging and Multilingual Activities

Based on our findings, it is interesting to discuss teachers' positioning with respect to multilingualism and translanguaging practices in their classrooms. Considering the mixed findings in our data regarding language ideologies and aspects of social justice, our study is in line with previous research, showing that teachers' positioning towards multilingualism and translanguaging in their classrooms is complex and multifaceted (Bernstein et al., 2023; Bokhorst-Heng & Marshall, 2024; Elshafie et al., 2023). On the one hand, the prevalence of monoglossic ideologies in society at large may have affected teachers' views of their students through deficit discourse. From the perspective of social justice, such views may have limitations for how teachers will manage to integrate students' diverse linguistic backgrounds in their teaching and provide equal opportunities to succeed for all students. Deficit-oriented language ideologies serve to perpetuate existing inequalities and hinder the promotion of inclusion and social justice in education. By contrast, the presence of heteroglossic ideologies and positive experiences with the enactment of translanguaging and multilingual activities described in the narratives suggests that many teachers see the value of students' linguistic repertoires and are more open to dealing with multilingualism and translanguaging in their classrooms.

When teachers position themselves with respect to multilingualism, they express positive attitudes to knowing several languages in general and encourage the students to translanguage and use their L1s irrespective of the status of these languages. Teachers make serious efforts to accommodate multilingual learners' needs for additional support. Still, it is difficult to argue that the teachers view multilingualism as the normal state of affairs; communicative ability in Norwegian and English is regarded as a more valuable competence than proficiency in other languages learners are familiar with. As professionals, these educators see their primary duty as helping their students to succeed at school and in society – hence their tendency to revert to remediation discourse. As regards teachers' self-perception as language users, many of them position themselves as multilingual speakers by using English as a lingua franca and translanguaging by picking up and using phrases in their students' languages.

These complexities and contradictory orientations in the teachers' positionings can be linked to ideological tensions in the institutional discourses and in society at large. Celebrating diversity vs. neoliberal discourses related to language learning and immigration is a tension that is manifest in the Norwegian educational context as it is in

many other countries (Flognfeldt, 2019; Myklevold & Speitz, 2021). In the Norwegian school context, Beiler (2021) shows, for example, that translanguaging involving English and Norwegian is perceived more positively than other languages, also revealing raciolinguistic and monoglossic ideologies that privilege certain languages and speakers. The complexity described in our study may stem from the teachers' "double mission", which may be perceived as insolvable: They are mandated to teach the majority language (as far as Norwegian is concerned) and the prestigious global contact language English, and at the same time help learners maintain and develop their multilingual identity by allowing them to use their full multisemiotic repertoires.

We have pointed out the close connection between a translanguaging stance and deep learning as an example of how the study of language ideologies and the social justice agenda come together. A question of central concern for educators is whether increased experience with pedagogical translanguaging can lead to a positive shift, and also in the long run, influence and even transform language ideologies. Our analysis of teachers' narratives of practice has enabled us to recognize persistent language ideologies at work but also valuable steps taken by teachers to enact translanguaging and more equitable multilingual pedagogies in their classrooms. What is needed is creating spaces for pre- and in-service teachers where they can engage reflexively and critically with their own language ideologies.

7. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Despite the recognized importance of multilingualism in the education policy, there has been little transformation to support inclusive and equitable education (Tishakov & Haukås, 2025). This gap raises critical questions about how multilingualism is understood, valued, and implemented in educational settings. To further support positive changes towards a more inclusive, culturally and linguistically responsive, and socially just education, teacher education programs should adopt several key strategies. First, teacher education programs should provide examples of good practices and tools involving translanguaging that can help teachers leverage students' multilingualism as a pedagogical resource in their classrooms and create spaces where all students can actively participate and where their multilingual resources are valued and actively used for learning. By incorporating these examples and tools in their program, teacher education can help future educators to foster learning environments that recognize and utilize the linguistic diversity of their students, ultimately leading to more equitable and effective educational outcomes.

Teaching to a social justice agenda aligns well with generally accepted pedagogical principles. For this agenda to be truly transformative, however, teachers need to reflexively address their own beliefs and attitudes when it comes to the central role of language and the social implications of language choice. In line with Bartolomé (2008)

and Alfaro's (2019) suggestions, we argue that teacher education programs should devote more attention to discussing language ideologies and challenge destructive ideologies. As we see it, ideological clarity (Alfaro, 2019) will promote critical reflection and critical multilingual language awareness (García, 2017), which are essential tools in challenging monoglossic language ideologies that still prevail.

Enactment of transformative pedagogy necessarily takes time. We concur with Costley & Leung's (2020) conclusion that "policy rhetoric without the support of informed professional practice is unlikely to lead to any change" (p. 11). Work remains to be done in creating spaces for pre- and in-service teachers where they can reflectively and critically engage with their own language ideologies as another step towards inclusive and socially just education for all students.

THE AUTHORS

Elena Tkachenko is a Professor at the Department of Primary and Secondary Teacher Education at Oslo Metropolitan University. Her research interests are multilingualism, language acquisition, second language teaching and learning, and literacy development in multilingual contexts. She has been involved in several research projects on multilingual practices in education and is actively engaged in continuing professional development for in-service teachers.

Mona Evelyn Flognfeldt is a Professor Emerita in the Department of Primary and Secondary Teacher Education at Oslo Metropolitan University. Her specialization lies in educational linguistics and English language pedagogy. She has taught a variety of English-pedagogical courses in initial teacher education and continuing professional development in English for in-service teachers in primary and lower secondary schools. Her research interests include teacher learning and continuing professional development, multilingualism with English, and developing awareness of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF).

REFERENCES

Alfaro, C. (2019). Preparing critically conscious dual-language teachers: Recognizing and interrupting dominant ideologies. *Theory into Practice*, *58*(2), 194–203. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1569400

Alisaari, J., Heikkola, L. M., Commins, N., & Acquah, E. O. (2019a). Monolingual ideologies confronting multilingual realities. Finnish teachers' beliefs about linguistic diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *80*, 48–58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.01.003

Alisaari, J., Vigren, H., & Mäkelä, M. L. (2019b). Multilingualism as a resource: Policy changes in Finnish education. In S. Hammer, K. M. Viesca & N. L. Commins (Eds.), *Teaching content and language in the multilingual classroom* (pp. 29–50). Routledge.

Anderson, K. T., Chang-Bacon, C., & Antelo, M. G. (2024). Navigating monolingual language ideologies: Educators' "Yes, BUT" objections to linguistically sustaining pedagogies in the classroom. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *28*(4), 618–634. https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069241236682

Bakken, A. S., Hundal, A. K., & Sakshaug, L. L. (2022). Når minoritet blir majoritet: En kasusstudie av flerspråklighet og språklæring ved en skole med ett stort minoritetsspråk [When minority becomes majority: A case study of multilingualism and language learning at a school with one major minority language]. *Nordand*, *17*(2), 98–114. https://doi.org/10.18261/nordand.17.2.3

Bamberg, M. (2020). Narrative analysis: An integrative approach. In M. Järvinen & N. Mik-Meyer (Eds.), *Qualitative analysis: Eight approaches for the social sciences* (pp. 243–264). Sage.

Bartolomé, L. I. (Ed.). (2008). *Ideologies in education: Unmasking the trap of teacher neutrality*. Peter Lang.

Beiler, I. R. (2021). Marked and unmarked translanguaging in accelerated, mainstream, and sheltered English classrooms. *Multilingua*, *40*(1), 107–138. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2020-0022

Bernstein, K., Anderson, K., Close, K., & Rodriguez Martinez, S. (2023). Teacher beliefs about multilingual learners: How language ideologies shape teachers' hypothetical policymaking. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *17*(3), 191–219. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2023.2182094

Bhasin, A., Castro, M., & Román, D. (2023). Translanguaging through the lens of social justice: Unpacking educators' understanding and practices. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *17*(4), 304–317. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2023.2208510

Bokhorst-Heng, W. D., & Marshall, K. (2024). 'Being bilingual will open doors for them': Ideologies informing French immersion educators' perspectives on bilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *28*(4), 668–684. https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069241236702

Bonacina-Pugh, F. (2012). Researching 'practiced language policies': Insights from conversation analysis. *Language Policy*, *11*(3), 213–234. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-012-9243-x

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2025). Diversifying 'English' at the decolonial turn. *TESOL Quarterly*, *59*(1), 378–389. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3306

Cenoz J., & Gorter D. (2021). *Pedagogical translanguaging*. Cambridge University Press.

Cenoz, J. (2013). Defining multilingualism. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *33*, 3–18. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051300007X

Chen, L., Karas, M., Shalizar, M., & Piccardo, E. (2022). From "promising controversies" to negotiated practices: A research synthesis of plurilingual pedagogy in global contexts. *TESL Canada Journal*, *38*(2), 1–35. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v38i2.1354

Cochran-Smith, M., Shakman, K., Jong, C., Terrell, D. G., Barnatt, J., & McQuillan, P. (2009). Good and just teaching: The case for social justice in teacher education. *American Journal of Education*, *115*(3), 347–377. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/597493

Cortazzi, M. (2002). Analysing narratives and documents. In M. Coleman & A. R. J. Briggs (Eds.), *Research methods in educational leadership and management* (pp. 196–212). Sage.

Costley, T., & Leung, C. (2020). Putting translanguaging into practice: A view from England. *System*, *92*, Article 102270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102270

Cummins, J. (2019). The emergence of translanguaging pedagogy: A dialogue between theory and practice. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*, *9*, Article 13. https://research.library.fordham.edu/jmer/vol9/iss1/13

Cummins, J. (2021). *Rethinking the education of multilingual learners: A critical analysis of theoretical concepts*. Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2022). Evaluating theoretical constructs underlying plurilingual pedagogies: The role of teachers as knowledge-generators and agents of language policy. In E. Picardo, A. Germain-Rutherford, & G. Lawrence (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of plurilingual language education* (pp. 112–129). Routledge.

Cushing, I. (2023). Word rich or word poor? Deficit discourses, raciolinguistic ideologies and the resurgence of the 'word gap' in England's education policy. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *20*(4), 305–331. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2022.2102014

Dahl, A., & Krulatz, A. (2016). Engelsk som tredjespråk: Har lærere kompetanse til å støtte flerspråklighet? [English as a third language: Do teachers have the competence to

support multilingualism?] *Acta Didactica Norge*, *10*(1), Article 4. https://doi.org/10.5617/adno.2397

Duarte, J., & Günther-van der Meij, M. (2018). A holistic model for multilingualism in education. *Euro American Journal of Applied Linguistics and Languages*, *5*(2), 24–43. https://doi.org/10.21283/2376905X.9.153

Elshafie, M., Cole, M., & Zhang, J. (2023). "We want them all to speak in English… So no Spanish": Preservice teachers' language ideologies towards emergent bilinguals. *Journal of Education, Language, and Ideology*, *1*(1), 56–85. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8365030

Flognfeldt, M. E. (2019). Teaching and learning English in multilingual primary classrooms. In K. Palm & E. Michaelsen (Eds.), *Den viktige begynneropplæringen: En forskningsbasert tilnærming* [The important initial education: A research-based approach] (pp. 229–238). Universitetsforlaget.

Flognfeldt, M. E., Tsagari, D., Šurkalović, D., & Tishakov, T. (2020). The practice of assessing Norwegian and English language proficiency in multilingual elementary school classrooms in Norway. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *17*(5), 519–540. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2020.1827409

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, *85*(2), 149–171. https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149

Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the "postsocialist" condition*. Routledge.

García, O. (2017). Critical multilingual language awareness and teacher education. In J. Cenoz, D. Gorter, & S. May (Eds.), *Language awareness and multilingualism* (3rd ed., pp. 263–280). Springer.

García, O. (2020). Singularity, complexities and contradictions: A commentary about translanguaging, social justice, and education. In J. A. Panagiotopoulou, L. Rosen, & J. Strzykala (Eds.), *Inclusion, education and translanguaging: How to promote social justice in (teacher) education?* (pp. 11–20). Springer.

García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). Translanguaging theory in education. In O. García & T. Kleyn (Eds.), *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments* (pp. 9–33). Routledge.

García, O., & Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 199–216). Springer.

García, O., & Otheguy, R. (2020). Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Commonalities and divergences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *23*(1), 17–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1598932

García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2016). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Caslon Publishing.

Harbon, L., & Moloney, R. (Eds.). (2014). *Language teachers' narratives of practice*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Haukås, Å. (2016). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *13*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2015.1041960

Haukås, Å. (2022). Who are the multilinguals? Pupils' definitions, self-perceptions and the public debate. In W. Ayres-Bennett & L. Fisher (Eds.), *Multilingualism and identity: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 281–298). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108780469.014

Iversen, J. Y. (2019). Negotiating language ideologies: pre-service teachers' perspectives on multilingual practices in mainstream education. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *18*(3), 421–434. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1612903

Jørgensen, H. H., Rothuizen, J. J. E., & Togsverd, L. (2019). *Pædagogik og fortælling: At fortolke, forstå og forny pædagogisk praksis*. Samfundslitteratur.

Kavanagh, S. S., & Danielson, K. A. (2020). Practicing justice, justifying practice: Toward critical practice teacher education. *American Educational Research Journal*, *57*(1), 69–105. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831219848691

Klette, K., Sahlström, F., Blikstad-Balas, M., Luoto, J., Tanner, M., Tengberg, M., Roe, A., & Slotte, A. (2018). Justice through participation: Student engagement in Nordic classrooms. *Education Inquiry*, *9*(1), 57–77. https://doi.org/10.1080/20004508.2018.1428036

Kroskrity, P. V. (2010). Language ideologies – Evolving perspectives. In J. Jaspers, J.-O. Östman, & J. Verschuren (Eds.), *Society and language use* (pp. 192–211). John Benjamins.

Lambert, W. E. (1974). Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In F. E. Aboud & R. D. Meade (Eds.), *Cultural factors in learning and education* (pp. 91–122). Western Washington State College.

Language Council. (n.d.). *Norsk – hovudspråket i Noreg* [Norwegian – the main language in Norway]. Språkrådet. https://sprakradet.no/spraklova/norsk-sprak/

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, *18*(7), 655–670. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718490

Li Wei, & Lee, T. K. (2024). Transpositioning: Translanguaging and the liquidity of identity. *Applied Linguistics*, *45*(5), 873–888. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amad065

Li Wei. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, *39*(1), 9–30. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039

Li Wei. (2023). Transformative pedagogy for inclusion and social justice through translanguaging, co-learning, and transpositioning. *Language Teaching: Surveys and Studies*, *57*(2), 203–214. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000186

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2010). A framework for preparing linguistically responsive teachers. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms* (pp. 75–92). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203843239

MacSwan, J., & Rolstad, K. (2024). (Un)grounded language ideologies: A brief history of translanguaging theory. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *28*(4), 719–743. https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069241236703

Mary, L., & Young, A. S. (2017). From silencing to translanguaging: Turning the tide to support emergent bilinguals in transition from home to pre-school. In B. A. Paulsrud, J. Rosén, B. Straszer, & Å. Wedin (Eds.), *New perspectives on translanguaging and education* (pp. 108–128). Multilingual Matters.

May, S. (Ed.). (2014). *The multilingual turn. Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education*. Routledge.

Mendoza, A. (2023). *Translanguaging and English as a lingua franca in the plurilingual classroom*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800413443

Mendoza, A., Hamman-Ortiz, L., Tian, Z., Rajendram, S., Tai, K. W. H., Ho, W. Y. J., & Sah, P. K. (2024). Sustaining critical approaches to translanguaging in education: A contextual framework. *TESOL Quarterly*, *58*(2), 664–692. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3240

Menken, K., & Sánchez, M. T. (2019). Translanguaging in English-only schools: From pedagogy to stance in the disruption of monolingual policies and practices. *TESOL Quarterly*, *53*(3), 741–767. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.513

MER [Ministry of Education and Research]. (2019a). *Core curriculum – values and principles for primary and secondary education*. Government.no. https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/verdier-og-prinsipper-for-grunnopplaringen---overordnet-del-av-lareplanverket/id2570003/

MER [Ministry of Education and Research]. (2019b). *Curriculum in English (ENG01-04)*. Government.no. https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04?lang=eng

MER [Ministry of Education and Research]. (2019c). *Curriculum for Norwegian (NOR01-06)*. Government.no. https://www.udir.no/lk20/nor01-06?lang=eng

MER [Ministry of Education and Research]. (2019d). *Curriculum for foreign languages (FSP01-03)*. Government.no. https://www.udir.no/lk20/fsp01-03?lang=eng

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, *31*(2), 132–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849209543534

Myklevold, G.-A., & Speitz, H. (2021). Multilingualism in curriculum reform (LK20) and teachers' perceptions: Mind the gap? *Nordic Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, *9*(2), 25–50. https://doi.org/10.46364/njltl.v9i2.947

North, C. (2006). More than words? Delving into the substantive meaning(s) of "social justice" in education. *Review of Educational Research*, *76*(4), 507–535. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543076004507

Oh, S.-Y. (2001). Two types of input modification and EFL reading comprehension: Simplification versus elaboration. *TESOL Quarterly*, *35*(1), 69–96. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587860

Olaussen, A. H., & Kjelaas, I. (2020). "De det er jobb med og som ikke har kommet noen vei": Norsklæreres forestillinger om flerspråklighet i skolen ["Those who require work and haven't made progress": Norwegian teachers' perceptions of multilingualism in schools]. *Målbryting*, *11*, 53–80. https://doi.org/10.7557/17.5589

Opplæringslova. [Education Act]. (2023). *Lov om grunnskoleopplæringa og den vidaregåande opplæringa (LOV-2023-06-09-30)*. Lovdata. https://lovdata.no/dokument/LTI/lov/2023-06-09-30

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*. Teachers College Press.

Paulsrud, B., Zilliacus, H., & Ekberg, L. (2020). Spaces for multilingual education: Language orientations in the national curricula of Sweden and Finland. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *14*(4), 304–318. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2020.1714158

Piccardo, D. (2019) "We are all (potential) plurilinguals": Plurilingualism as an overarching, holistic concept. *OLBI Working Papers*. https://doi.org/10.18192/OLBIWP.V10I0.3825

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, *8*(2), 15–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464

Sah, P. K., & Uysal, H. (2022). Unbiased but ideologically unclear: Teacher beliefs about language practices of emergent bilingual students in the U.S. *Linguistics and Education*, *72*, Article 101126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2022.101126

Salazar, M. D. C. (2013). A humanizing pedagogy: Reinventing the principles and practice of education as a journey toward liberation. *Review of Research in Education*, *37*(1), 121–148. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X12464032

Sarromaa, S. (2024, October 23). *Blir norsk et ustilig språk som ingen respekterer? Språkviteren og forfatteren Helene Uri er bekymret*. [Is Norwegian becoming an uncool language that nobody respects? Linguist and author Helene Uri is worried.]. minerva. https://www.minerva.no/norsk-sprak-sprak/blir-norsk-et-ustilig-sprak-som-ingen-respekterer/458707

Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203387962

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511615245

Statistics Norway. (2024, 29 November). *Immigrants and Norwegian-born to immigrant parents*. Statistics Norway's Information Centre. https://www.ssb.no/en/befolkning/innvandrere/statistikk/innvandrere-og-norskfodte-med-innvandrerforeldre

The Douglas Fir Group. (2016). A transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. *The Modern Language Journal*, *100*(S1), 19–47. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12301

Tishakov, T., & Haukås, Å. (2025). Highlighting spaces for enacting multilingualism as a resource: An appreciative inquiry approach. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2025.2465888

Tishakov, T., & Tsagari, D. (2022). Language beliefs of English teachers in Norway: Trajectories in transition? *Languages*, *7*(2), Article 141. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7020141

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

Vikøy, A., & Haukås, Å. (2023). Norwegian L1 teachers' beliefs about a multilingual approach in increasingly diverse classrooms. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *20*(3), 912–931. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2021.1961779

Villalobos, R. I. (2022, March 1). *15-åringer snakker heller engelsk enn norsk* [15-year-olds speak English rather than Norwegian]. NRK. https://www.nrk.no/rogaland/norsk-ungdom-snakker-engelsk-med-hverandre-1.15845434

Young, A. S. (2014). Unpacking teachers' language ideologies: Attitudes, beliefs, and practiced language policies in schools in Alsace, France. *Language Awareness*, *23*(1-2), 157–171. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2013.863902

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire and Narrative-of-Practice Task

(translated from Norwegian by the authors)

1. Study Task as Preparation for the Second Face-to-Face Meeting: Explore Multilingualism in Your Classroom

As preparation for the second face-to-face meeting, we wish that you explore the use of a variety of languages in your own classrooms. This implies: 1) mapping multilingual resources in your class; 2) observing some situations when other languages than Norwegian are used and writing a narrative of practice where you describe this.

2. Questionnaire to Map Multilingual Resources in Your Classroom

The questionnaire can help you get a better impression of multilingual resources in your class. It contains questions about learners and teachers' language competence, about different situations when more languages are used and how frequently various languages are used in different situations, and about activities and working methods where multilingual resources are used. You may download the questionnaire and print it out when you work on your study task.

3. Narrative of Practice about the Use of Various Languages

Observe whether other languages than Norwegian are used in your classroom, and how. Write a narrative of practice (1/2 to 1 page) where you describe as accurately as possible a situation where other languages than Norwegian were used by the teacher or the learners.

This is a study task and not a course requirement. However, this study task may serve as a good starting point when you plan your teaching program as part of course requirement 1.

APPENDIX B

Preparation Task for Our First Meeting in Module 2

Now, you will explore multilingualism in your own classroom! In connection with our session on multilingualism and English during our first face-to-face gathering in Module 2, we would like you to:

1. Explore the situation in your own classroom as regards multilingualism, especially whether other languages than English and Norwegian are involved. This implies that you map and simply get and share an overview of whatever multilingual resources you have in your particular class, i.e. the various languages your learners hear, know, and possibly use in their surroundings. We interpret "know a language" in a very wide sense here; it is enough to be able to use words, phrases, songs, or make a simple sentence in a given language.

2. Observe or recall a situation where other languages than Norwegian are used and write a brief story ("praksisfortelling") of ½–1 page about it where you as precisely as possible describe such a situation with you as a teacher or any of your learners using another language than Norwegian or English. For instance, in what kind of activities were other languages used (for instance, during play?), and what kind of teaching strategies were you engaged in when other languages than Norwegian and English were involved (teacher-led tasks, collaboration with learning partners, groups work, role play, etc.)?

If, by any chance, no other languages are in fact used, please write a short reflection about when and how you think other languages *COULD* have been included. And please make sure you include information about which year/grade you are reporting from. Please post your practice story in Canvas by 21 January, 2024 as the first entry under Assignments.

Note: This is a preparatory task, not a course requirement. The task will help you get as much as possible out of your readings about multilingualism and our session on multilingualism. It will also serve as useful preparation for your development project in Module 2.