

Obstacles to bilingual education: A case study of policy appropriation in a lower secondary school

Osa Lundberg, University of Gothenburg

The purpose of this paper is to present some of the main findings from my thesis (Lundberg, 2015) that concern the policy formulation and implementation of bilingual education in a multi-ethnic lower secondary school in an urban suburb in Gothenburg, Sweden. This school was strategically chosen for its pedagogical approach towards social and linguistic diversity¹. This article examines the formulation and appropriation of a bilingual and bicultural education program and what obstacles exist with regards to implementation of bilingual education in the realization arena. The theoretical impetus comes from the sociology of knowledge which examines how social policy connects to social practice by applying the concepts of formulation, realization and transformation (Lindensjö & Lundgren, 2000). Data was derived from interviews and participant observations between 2006 and 2009 with three different ninth grade classes from same school. The results show that in the formulation arena the policy was in favor of active bilingualism (a holistic and comprehensive approach throughout the curriculum), strong support for mother tongue education, and creating in students a bicultural identity. However, in the realization arena, the bilingual education program was reduced to the employment of bilingual teachers who provided mother tongue tuition. Support for the bicultural and multilingual development of students' language and culture was never fully incorporated into the ordinary teaching and instruction. This was due in part to obstacles in the formulation and realization arenas (Lindensjö & Lundgren, 2000). Five types of obstacles to the appropriation of bilingual education were observed. Two primary obstacles in the formulation arena were 1) a strong separation of languages, and 2) bilingual teachers as representatives of diversity. In the realization arena the following three obstacles were observed: 1) teacher resistance to polylingual education, 2) insufficient study support for mother tongue tuition, and 3) a monolingual norm. In sum, the overriding obstacle is an overall lack of consensus about the aim and purpose of bilingual education. The discussion develops issues concerning the gap between what should be versus what could be in both the formulation and realization arenas (Lundberg, 2015).

Keywords: bilingual education, policy implementation in education, formulation, realization and transformation arenas

Corresponding author's email: osa.lundberg@gu.se

ISSN: 1457-9863

Publisher: Centre for Applied Language Studies

University of Jyväskylä

© 2017: The authors

<http://apples.jyu.fi>

<http://dx.doi.org/10.17011/apples/urn.201712104583>

1 Introduction

Bilingual education policy and implementation is a growing concern for liberal social-democratic nation states such as Sweden that advocate equality and human rights. On the macro-level, the Language Act (2009:600) states in section 14 that Swedish is the principal language in Sweden and that all residents of Sweden should be given the opportunity to learn, develop and use Swedish. This is a right that is also extended to the official minority languages. In Sweden, there are five official minority languages: Finnish, Yiddish, Meänkieli (Tornedal Finnish), Romany Chib and Sami. The Language Act serves to protect and maintain access to official minority languages and to ensure the rights of minorities to learn, develop and use the minority language. Furthermore, Section 14 of the Language Act also states that those, whose mother tongue is neither Swedish, nor an official minority language, can be given the opportunity to develop and use their mother tongue (Language Act 2009:600, section 14).

Learning, development and use of minority and mother tongue languages other than Swedish are safeguarded, on the macro-policy level, by legislation such as the Language Act (Language Act 2009:600; Hyltenstam, Lindberg, & Axelsson, 2012) and through the national curriculum for compulsory education (Skolverket, 2011). Compulsory education should promote the continued learning and development of students' individual backgrounds, prior experiences, languages and knowledge (*ibid.*, p. 3). Lofty laws and legislation on the macro-policy level do not guarantee policy appropriation on the micro-level of schools, classrooms, subjects, teachers and students.

Language policies in education are created to strengthen individuals' knowledge and competence as citizens in a political and historical context. Yet, the individuals' language rights and the interests of the nation state are not always congruent and compatible. Language can be seen as an important social identity marker for the individual and for the nation state (Milani, 2008). In this study, language and race² (Leonardo, 2009) are viewed as conjoined factors in the social construction of difference and disadvantage (see also Blackledge, 2006; van Dijk, 1987). Bilingual education can be a means of constructing racial and social boundaries as well as diminishing social and cultural differences between groups. Although Sweden has come far on the macro-level to secure the linguistic rights of minorities and learning of mother tongue languages there are many levels of resistance and contention to bilingual education. Old-fashioned and persistent belief systems of one nation, one language and one culture continue to resonate and come into contention with late modern multicultural nation states. Schooling is therefore an arena in which these old and new belief systems meet.

This study takes an ethnographic approach to examine how the school leaders, teachers and students participate in formulating and enacting the bilingual education program at Woodbridge School³. The analytical concepts, formulation, realization and transformation, are taken from a sociological perspective of knowledge in order to examine how ideological and social interests regarding language policies construct and convey difference and disadvantage for urban youth of color⁴ in the pedagogical discourse, that is to say, where instruction and learning take place (Lundberg, 2015)⁵. The formulation and realization arenas are spaces where national, social and ideological interests regarding language, identity and rights are played out. The transformation arena is a gap or space of opportunity between what is and what could be. In other words, the

transformation arena is where change can occur. All three arenas are spaces of ideological contradictions, collaboration, compromise and change.

The purpose of this article is to present the main findings of my thesis work concerning the formulation and realization of the bilingual⁶ education program at Woodbridge School. An ethnographic approach was used to examine how the policy on the ground-level was formulated and realized.

In the following sections of this article I will provide a presentation of previous research concerning language policy formulation and realization from an interdisciplinary perspective in relation to identity, racialization, and schooling. I will also discuss different kinds of obstacles and resistance that are both ideological and pragmatic. The theoretical impetus comes from sociology of knowledge in which the aforementioned concepts of formulation, realization and transformation arenas (Lindensjö & Lundgren, 2000) will be presented and discussed in relation to a polylingual perspective of language and ‘*linguaging*’ (Jørgensen, 2008). Thereafter, I will present my methodology and results which include the main findings of my thesis work. The discussion section will develop the conclusions concerning some of the obstacles of bilingual education.

2 Previous research

Language studies are an interdisciplinary interest. Studies in socio-linguistics, bilingualism, social and educational sciences use schooling as a critical focal point for examining language policy formation, implementation and evaluation. This is of interest in understanding who and why particular social groups are positioned, in the formulation arena, as disadvantaged and what kinds of measures are taken to create equality.

Policy formulation and urban intervention programs emphasize language skills and acquisition as a means of civic assimilation (Axelsson & Bunar, 2006; Borevi, 2002; Lindberg, 2009). Policy formulation with regards to language skills and acquisition is an ongoing heated debate (Milani, 2008). Debates center on minimum requirements for citizenship and preserving Swedish as the dominant language. These debates express struggles between ideologies, a linguistic order, a social order, and social positions that language speakers occupy (Milani, 2008).

As mentioned above, language is an identity marker of race and place and a key criterion in the construction of the ‘*Other*’ in Sweden (Carlson, 2003; Pred, 2000; Sawyer, 2000). Linguistic ‘*Othering*’ is a means of racializing bodies through language in educational and political discourse (Blackledge, 2006, 2009; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). Labeling practices and binaries such as “*Swedish*” and “*immigrant*” connote difference not only in terms of culture and nationality, but also an unspoken norm of whiteness (Hübinette & Lundström, 2011; Runfors, 2009).

There are two separate issues related to racialization of language. The first is that language is used to construct and maintain binary categories of black/white, Swedish/non-Swedish in political and educational discourses. The second issue concerns the fluency with which a person speaks Swedish. Spoken Swedish is itself a racialized attribute (Runfors, 2009). Hence, language then becomes the tool with which racialized categories are constructed (symbolic power) and the spoken language becomes a criterion for assessment (evaluation).

Language studies in schooling concern much more than language skills, proficiency and school achievement. The educational system is the arena in which

language policy implementation is realized and put into practice in local documents, hiring of bilingual teachers, school profiling, bilingual education and more (Axelsson, 2013). In the realization arena, language policy with regards to bilingual education is implemented. It is also the arena in which debates and discursive struggles over the linguistic order, Swedish as the official school language, and Sweden as a multi-lingual nation state become acute (Milani, 2008).

With regards to implementation, research indicates that schooling is an arena in which language diversity is often viewed from a deficiency discourse that requires remediation and compensatory measures (Gitz-Johansen, 2006; Holme, 2008; Pihl, 2010). Similarly, language studies in education address monolingualism and mono-culturalism in the pedagogical discourse and discuss how the ideal kind of student and ideal type of knower is expressed through cultural and linguistic normativity (Haglund, 2005; Sjögren, 1996, 2001). Runfors (2009) examines the relationship between language and social relations in which ideals of Swedishness, and positioning oneself as Swedish, are limited by underlying norms of whiteness and un-broken Swedish.

Previous research reveals many different types of obstacles and resistance to bilingual education. As already mentioned, the monolingual norm (Ag & Jørgensen, 2012; Jørgensen, 2008, 2013) is an ideology that is embedded in the hidden curriculum (Apple, 2004). Jørgensen's studies on modern urban youths show how students are competent at languaging, that is to say, able to apply multiple features of language simultaneously for communicative purposes; yet, refrain when it is necessary to abide to the monolingual norm. This kind of compliance can be seen as an individual concession and acquiescence to hegemonic power of monolingual normativity.

The hidden curriculum impedes the implementation of mother tongue tuition in Swedish schools (Reath Warren, 2013). Reath Warren examines the underlying attitudes, organizational structure and impediments to implementation of mother tongue tuition. Mother tongue teachers must work and move between several different locations (Skolverket, 2008). The subject is not integrated into the ordinary school curriculum and lacks definition (Lindberg, 2009). Reath Warren's study affirms these previous observations and that despite national guidelines to implement mother tongue tuition in schools there remains considerable structural obstacles, negative attitudes amongst school employees and parents, as well as, lack of materials, motivation and teacher collaboration.

In another study on language policy implementation in Arizona and Washington states, researchers Johnson and Johnson (2015) found that the recontextualization of policy is situated and reliant upon individual teachers' interpretation of bilingual education. Strong resistance, negative attitudes and a deficiency discourse of Spanish in Arizona was due to a dominant discourse that English was the necessary language for socioeconomic and educational advancement; whereas, students in Washington state held "bilanguage" up as a social and cultural benefit (*ibid.*, p. 107). Variations in implementation of policy for bilingual education between schools were due to individuals' interpretation of policy and the influence of the dominant language policy discourses (*ibid.*). Similarly, Valdiviezo (2009) made similar findings in a study of teachers' interpretation and implementation of bilingual language policy in rural Peruvian schools. Teachers both resisted and furthered the bilingual education of Quechua language and culture in Peru in their interpretation of policy and dominant language discourses.

From an international perspective, Eisenclas, Schalley and Guillemín (2015) discuss the social and political tensions between policies in support of bilingual education and the actual attitudes towards the minority languages of native minorities, migrants and refugees. The dominant language discourse, as mentioned above, is a primary obstacle to implementation. Eisenclas et al. discuss how multilingualism is often a result of displacement, colonization and migration. In multilingual contexts, linguistic colonization is a strategy yielded by the politically dominant group to gain control (Eisenclas et al., 2015). To complicate matters even more, tensions between social groups in bilingual education are often suppressed by ideologies of color-blindness and equality. Instead of addressing racial and social inequalities, bilingual education is conceptualized as apolitical and neutral; further ignoring and marginalizing the minority language groups it is intended to help (Valdiviezo, 2009).

In contrast, Koyama and Bartlett (2011) argue that bilingual education is a highly political activity. Their study of Latino immigrant youth in a New York City school demonstrates the necessity of creating a bilingual speech community in order to counteract social, political, economic and material inequalities. The economic and material pre-conditions needed for education of Latino immigrant youth were connected to the unequal distribution of symbolic power. Symbolic power was developed through political activism and the implementation of bilingual education as "...a speech community model of education, in which educators focus on language acquisition as a social process that involves an entire speech community..." (Koyama & Bartlett, 2011, p. 176).

Obstacle to bilingual education policy and implementation practices occur on many different bureaucratic and administrative levels: from the ground floor level of classroom instruction, at the institutional and organizational level of schooling, on the community and societal level, as well as, the level of political and symbolic power. In sum, previous research indicates that obstacles to bilingual education include many different dimensions of the educational system, such as: monolingual normativity, the hidden curriculum, hegemonic and nationalistic ideologies, the dominant language discourse, political tensions and struggles between the ruling majority and minority groups due to migration and refugees. Although, individual teachers play an important role in their interpretation of bilingual education policy their resistance and/or affirmation must be understood in a socio-political, historical and economic context.

3 Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework of my thesis comes from the sociology of knowledge and critical race theory perspectives. The sociology of knowledge perspective enables an analysis of the organization of schooling. The organization of schooling is analyzed in relation to symbolic control and the reproduction of social inequalities. In conjunction to this, critical race theory allows for examination of racialization of students subjectivities in the formulation and realization of bilingual education⁷. Below, I will briefly present a definition of bilingual education and, in addition to this, my theoretical standpoint with the concepts of *polylingualism* and *translanguaging*. The primary analytical tools of interpretation come from the sociology of knowledge and include: the pedagogical discourse, classification and framing, and the formulation, realization, and transformation arenas (Bernstein, 2000).

3.1 Bilingual education

Colin Baker (2011) defines bilingual education as education in more than one language, often encompassing more than two languages in which the aim and outcome is bilingualism and biliteracy. A common misconception about bilingual education is that it is only intended for minority and migrant students who need to learn the dominant language. However bilingual education should not be reduced to second language acquisition and learning of the official school language. Bilingual education goes beyond language learning to using more than one language as the medium of instruction in the core curriculum. Bilingual education can be defined as learning and constructing knowledge through the active use and application of more than one language (García, 2011, pp. 21–22). The aim and purpose of bilingual education and biliteracy is to communicate and function socially within different cultural contexts. This description given here is applied analytically to the formulation of policy and intentions of the school in this study. In my own usage of bilingual education I also extend it to include the concepts polylingualism and translanguaging.

Polylingualism (Jørgensen, 2008) and *translanguaging* (Creese & Blackledge, 2010) are sociolinguistic concepts that frame my understanding and perspective on bilingual education. Polylingualism opposes the idea of distinct and separate languages that are clearly delimited from one another. Polylingualism asserts the idea that people use different sets of features of language, bits and pieces, in combination with one another, without having full command of each language (Jørgensen, 2008). Jørgensen defines polylingualism norm as:

Language users employ whatever linguistic features are at their disposal to achieve their communicative aims as best they can, regardless of how well they know the involved languages; this entails that the language users may know – and use – the fact that some of the features are perceived by some speakers as not belonging together. (Jørgensen, 2008, p 163)

Theoretically, Jørgensen asserts that language is primarily social, as opposed to cognitive, nativistic, or constructionistic perspectives. Jørgensen has studied how late-modern urban youth communicate in their daily life and interactions with one another. Jørgensen asserts that urban youth today are skilled and proficient at utilizing multiple features and sources of language simultaneously, not arbitrarily, but for communicative purposes. The underlying question of “What is language?” is very relevant to the presuppositions and rationales of bilingual education policy formulation and the divergent ways bilingual education policies are appropriated.

Translanguaging (Creese & Blackledge, 2010) is another term used for the practice of using features or different signs in language simultaneously. Creese and Blackledge’s (2010) study of bilingual education in the United Kingdom examined bilingual education programs where translanguaging was an accepted practice and integrated part of the language education programs. Their study views translanguaging as the fluidity and movement with which teachers and students integrated for example Mandarin and English. Translanguaging is a concept used to describe learning practices in which traditional boundaries between languages become permeable and less distinct (see also García & Wei, 2013).

3.2 Formulation arena

There are three superordinate arenas which frame the results of this study. These three arenas are: the *formulation*, *realization*, and *transformation arenas* (Lindensjö & Lundgren, 2000). In the first arena, the formulation arena, the goals of education are formulated through local and national guidelines. The *formulation arena* includes an array of interest groups within the political, economic, societal and educational fields. These interest groups can be seen as agents, vying for control over the educational system. These agents use their voice to gain symbolic control over the formulation arena, an arena in which political goals and aims of education are created (Lindensjö & Lundgren, 2000, p. 172). The bilingual education program is but one aspect of the pedagogical initiatives taken at Woodbridge School to realize the renewal of urban schools.

3.3 Realization arena

The second arena, the *realization arena*, is the space in which educators or the street level bureaucrats implement school reform initiatives (ibid.). This includes *the field of recontextualization*, in which academic knowledge is transmitted and acquired (Bernstein, 2000). As mentioned above, this is an important site of symbolic control over the social base, the regulative discourse, which is superordinate to the transmission and acquisition of knowledge. The realization arena is the arena in which policy and pedagogical guidelines are implemented.

3.4 Transformation arena

The third arena, the *transformation arena*, affords the opportunity for change in the formation of consciousness and control over the social base. The transformation arena refers to the arena in which bilingual education is recontextualized, as well as, spaces where 'gaps', or interruptions, are possible. An *interruption* is an opportunity to recontextualize the formation of consciousness in new ways. It is a space in which symbolic control can be *interrupted* (Moore, 2013).

4 Method

Ethnography provides a means to link human agency to social structures (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). I chose ethnography because it is a form of qualitative research based on long term participation and experience within a specific social group (Beach, 2008). The purpose of ethnography is to provide a first person account and insider's view of people's everyday life (emic perspective) and to interpret or explain observed phenomena through a theoretical frame that can in turn lead to generating new theory (etic perspective).

I chose to observe and participate in the everyday life of teachers and students. I interviewed and talked to the school leaders and teachers in formal and informal conversations about bilingual education policy and some of the obstacles I observed with regards to implementation. For the most part, I conducted participant observations with students and teachers in classroom interactions in the ordinary core curriculum, not language education per se, but rather the focus was on appropriation of bilingual education in core subjects.

4.1 Woodbridge School

The data production for my study was carried out at a school I refer to as Woodbridge School, during a three year period from 2006 to 2009. Woodbridge School was selected as part of another study called *School, community and culture. A multidisciplinary study of youth and learning in a context of social and ethnic segregation* which was funded by the Swedish Research Council (Omvärlden och Skolan: Vetenskapsrådet 2005–3440). This school was specifically selected because the study focused on how schools in urban suburbs dealt with multidimensional poverty and ethnic segregation⁸.

Woodbridge School is in a community that is characterized by ethnic segregation, high unemployment, and livelihood support (Borelius, 2010). Woodbridge has approximately 8,000 inhabitants, of whom the majority (59 percent) are immigrants, many born outside of Europe. Many of the inhabitants are young, about 40 percent are younger than 24 years-old. Unemployment is at 7 percent and 22 percent need financial support for their livelihood (ibid.). These statistics are high in comparison to other suburbs within the same municipality where for example only 20 percent are foreign born, unemployment is 3 percent, and 6 percent need financial support (ibid.)⁹. These statistics are relevant to the role of schooling in relation to its surroundings, and challenges related to segregation and integration.

This social diversity is reflected in the student population. Woodbridge School is a multi-ethnic school with 359 students ranging in ages from 6 to 15 years-old. Of these students only 1 percent had both parents born and raised in Sweden. Two-thirds of the student populations were registered for mother tongue education classes in 25 different languages. The multi-lingual environment and the polylingual use of language created a contentious setting for the formulation and realization of bilingual education at Woodbridge School.

The fieldwork for this study ended in June 2009. Since then there have been radical changes made to the organization and structure of the school. The major changes concern new leadership, new teaching staff, and reduction of economic support. The termination of project funding and economic cutbacks within the municipality had a severe negative impact on the leadership and staff to implement the goals outlined in the school development plan and to achieve the aims of the urban renewal initiative titled “Storstadssatsningen¹⁰”.

4.2 Time and duration of the study

The empirical data was produced during three years of fieldwork in three successive ninth grade classes and one semester in a fifth grade class. During those years I spent on average four days per week, six weeks in the fall and six weeks in the spring for a total of 36 weeks producing data on site. I included a fifth-grade class because this was the first teacher I observed who first taught a ninth-grade class 2006–2007, but later became the head teacher of a fifth grade class in the fall 2007. I subsequently followed this teacher to the fifth-grade after the first group of ninth-graders graduated. I observed the fifth-grade class and the same head teacher for six weeks, but then later decided to limit my study to grade nine, the last year of compulsory education in Sweden.

4.3 Data production

The empirical data produced comes primarily from direct observations of classroom activities. However, I did conduct interviews with students in each class, school leaders, and class teachers (see Appendices 4, 5 & 6). Many informal conversations were carried out with teachers and students during and after lessons in the classroom, as well as, in the corridors, offices and staff only areas. Many follow-up conversations occurred in conjunction with a lesson. I spoke with students and teachers during and after a lesson. These follow-up conversations were written down in my fieldnotes as I followed the class to their next lesson, or stayed behind to write. For the most part, I did not record and transcribe informal conversations. Under each excerpt I have indicated if the excerpts are fieldnotes or transcripts of recorded conversations. I made written transcriptions in my fieldnotes of informal conversations from memory immediately after talking to teachers and students. The informal conversations are reconstructions of conversation documented in near time.

In practice, participant observation meant alternating between observing, taking notes, and writing more expanded detailed description. I would carry on a conversation, or make an observation of a place and people for about 30–45 minutes, then write a more thick description as soon as possible afterwards, or continue with a new observation. The informal conversations are reconstructed from memory directly after, or as soon as possible, after the conversation took place.

4.4 Analysis of data production

After writing-up the fieldnotes and expanding the fieldnotes into thick descriptions (Geertz, 1973), different themes began to emerge. I coded my fieldnotes and categorized observations that corroborated my themes. That is not to say I only chose observations in support of my analysis. I have sought to include ‘discrepant cases’ (Cohen et al., 2007) which problematize discourses about race and racism, the construction of school knowledge, and the ideal kind of knower. The discrepant cases are variations of discourses about race and racism that evolved throughout the study. For example, ‘color-blindness’ and ‘deficiency perspectives’ are two dominant discourses which are contested and contradicted by my informants.

Although I claim to use a naturalist qualitative research method, this is not to be confused with realism. It is important to understand that the analysis is not a portrait, a static picture, of real life. I have tried to construct a composite picture contrived of many voices and glimpses into a socially complex and irreducible social life.

4.5 Ethical considerations

In this study I have observed the codex and ethical guidelines by the Swedish Research Council for humanities and social sciences (Vetenskapsrådet, 2014). I have provided the research participants with verbal and written information before acquiring their informed consent. Students over age 15 signed the consent forms themselves; children under 15 required a signature of a parent or guardian. I respected students who did not want to take part in my study by not including them in my documents, fieldnotes, and transcripts of class recordings or interviews. Only four girls in Class 1 declined. Participation was voluntary and

my informants were aware that they could discontinue their participation at any time. None of the students, or teachers withdrew from my study at a later date.

Pseudonyms have been used for all people and place names. However, this does not guarantee full anonymity of the informants. I am aware that it is my ethical responsibility to protect my informants and that participation in my study should in no way be detrimental to their well-being. I am also aware that it is my responsibility to protect my informants from any kind of harm and to honor their dignity and privacy. In practicality, this meant receiving ongoing consent by asking permission for interviews and recordings and reminding informants of my purpose in casual conversations and classroom observations when necessary (Miller & Bell, 2002). I could not assume the will of my respondents, but neither could I ask for their consent and remind them of my purpose there in every situation¹¹.

5 Results

In this section, the analysis focuses on some of the tensions between formulation and realization of bilingual education. The school development plan is a key agent within the formulation arena that is in favor of bilingual education. Yet, it is met with resistance and obstacles in its implementation. As we shall see, the school development plan is a document that exerts symbolic control over the “shaping, evaluating, regulating and distributing forms of consciousness, disposition, desire and relation” (Bernstein, 2001, p. 30).

5.1 Obstacles to bilingual education in the formulation arena

In this section I will present and discuss the results of two main obstacles I observed in the formulation arena. The first obstacle to implementation is the strong dualistic separation of languages and the second concerns the bilingual education teachers as the representatives of diversity.

5.1.1 Strong dualistic separation of languages

In the school development plan, two of the goals to strive towards were to:

Create equal opportunities for all children, regardless of social or ethnic background to achieve the learning goals.

Create the conditions for children and pupils that do not have Swedish as their mother tongue to develop active multilingualism and bicultural identity.

[School development plan for 2008/2009, p. 5, school document, my translation, ([Principal], 2009)]

The development plan goes on to outline the pedagogical and curricular approaches to aid and support language development for bilingual students and the importance for the individual to maintain a bicultural identity. Under the theoretical section for bicultural and multilingual (Sw: *flerspråkig*) development the plan states:

Not being able to develop a mother tongue means not just an identity loss for the child, but also being deprived the opportunity to choose to keep in contact with his/her origins.

[School development plan for 2008/2009, p. 6, my translation]

The school development plan also lifts the concept of *active bilingualism*.

Active bilingualism [emphasis in the text] is a high goal to strive for. Simply put, this means using different languages with native speakers in all of the different situations and places that arise, i.e. at home, in school, in the workplace and in society at large. It is natural to master different areas of life more effectively in either one language or the other. For bilingual pupils to succeed with their studies demands well adapted school teaching that is in Swedish as well as the mother tongue throughout their schooling¹².

[ibid., s. 6]

It is argued throughout the school development plan that “strong language skills and solid knowledge” are necessary to achieve the learning goals and to “participate in the Swedish society” (ibid., p. 4). Both Swedish *and* the mother tongue are viewed as necessary in order to succeed in school and in social life outside of school. On a macro-level, mother tongue tuition is supported nationally by the steering documents in education¹³, the Education Act¹⁴, and the Language Act¹⁵.

These documents ensure the right for minorities to have access to mother tongue tuition and guard the rights of polylingual students to develop their mother tongue in languages other than Swedish and official minority languages (Language Act 2009:600, section 14). The school development plan is in agreement with the Swedish national curriculum to uphold the individual’s rights to maintain his/her own language and culture (Education Act, 2010:800; Skolverket, 1998 revised 2016). Bilingual education supports development of mother tongue while maintaining the necessity of the Swedish language as the primary tool for integration (see Language Act). The argument put forth in the development plan and the steering documents is that supporting the mother tongue language will also benefit the development of the Swedish language. The multilingual and bicultural pedagogy formulated in the school development plan is intended to build a bridge between the students’ mother tongue and the Swedish language and culture.

It is mainly for the benefit of the individual to develop their mother tongue, identity and academic knowledge. Bridging the divide in this sense also contributes to maintaining a strong boundary between Swedish and the non-dominant language ‘Other’. The concepts ‘bicultural’ and ‘bilingual’ denote a strong linguistic separation and dualism. The bilingual ‘Other’ and the monolingual Swedish language are kept apart and separate. Creese and Blackledge’s (2010) study examines different premises and rationales for different forms of bilingual education. Creese and Blackledge discuss how bilingual education programs often uphold a ridged separation of languages; thereby constructing *parallel monolingualism*. That is to say, a strict compartmentalization of languages and language use in which each language adheres to prescriptive norms (Heller, 1999).

A strict compartmentalization of language is consistent with strong classification and framing of the instructional and regulative discourse in which the mode and object of learning are highly insulated. Language is the mode of the pedagogic

communication (regulative discourse) that also works to insulate (separate) the object of learning (instructional discourse).

The school development document emphasizes the development of the individual. With regards to knowledge construction in the pedagogical discourse, in the realization arena, the distribution of knowledge is controlled by a monolingual norm. Development and use of linguistic diversity is useful for the individual, but is not incorporated into the pedagogic communication in the construction and reproduction of school knowledge. The recontextualization of school knowledge constructs a space, or gap, that can interrupt the monolingual norm by allowing polylingual students to utilize their knowledge and construct knowledge in other languages in all subject areas (Axelsson, 2013; Bunar, 2010; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Holme, 2009).

5.1.2 Bilingual teachers as representatives of diversity

The Finnish speaking teachers and the multilingual teachers employed more recently were the physical and organizational manifestation of the multilingual and bicultural pedagogy.

I asked Marie, the school principal, if multilingual and bicultural are the same thing.

Yes. They are the same./ ... / The bilingual teachers have, well there are many teachers at the school that have another linguistic and cultural background, but do not teach in their mother tongue. The Finnish teachers taught the Finnish classes at the school before. Now we do not have a single Finnish speaking student, but the teachers are still here. They have their experience of that. But they cannot teach in their mother tongue in school. But they have an understanding of what it means. They know what it means to learn another language and to learn in another language.

But when the *Storstadssatsningen* ended, the funding disappeared, then we received "Bylan" funding. This was the governmental funding to increase the goal achievement in core subjects. This was directed towards just that. It was very controlled, what goals, and what human resources were needed to attain learning goals in core subjects in year 9. We then employed bilingual teachers./... / My goal was, aside from Swedish as a second language, teachers who could work with the subject Swedish, was to employ bilingual teachers./ ... / This was from my perspective, and the development plan, a very conscientious decision. Now, when we know that the "Bylan" financing will be discontinued we must also remove these teachers who were employed because we no longer have the means in the budget any longer.

[Interview, 2009-01-14, Marie, principal, transcribed digital recording]

During the time of this study, the government financing for the "*Storstadssatsningen*" ended and new funding was introduced. It was the so called "Bylan"-funding that enabled the employment of bilingual teachers. "Bylan" financing aimed at improving academic achievement and learning outcomes for polylingual students. Teachers with language skills in Arabic, Somalian and Kurdish were employed in 2006. However, these teachers were forced to leave their positions due to cut-backs in government funding and within the municipality. Although the "Bylan" funding was ear-marked, funding for mother tongue tuition is not. It is up to the municipality to provide for mother tongue tuition.

From the school year 2009/2010, the whole school will change. Thirteen positions will have to be drawn in. There is no longer any space from the school development plan on an organizational level./.../ Those who will not be allowed to stay are those that were hired last which is by and large the multilingual teachers.

[Interview, 2009-01-14, Marie, principal, transcribed digital recording]

The forced lay-offs of bilingual teachers meant for the most part a stop to the implementation of the bilingual and bi-cultural program. Marie, the school principal, interjected that the only tools left to work with now were supportive and constructive attitudes towards students' multilingual ability.

Now if we cannot have a an optimal model with bilingual education then, without bilingual teachers, we can at least have a positive attitude towards students' origins and have a supportive attitude of students' experiences and knowledge, instead of a deficiency perspective that they arrive here with a lack knowledge of Swedish, and that they lack knowledge that other Swedish students have who have gone to school; we can support their competencies, provide positive and high expectations and not neglect their experiences and their culture and their language; even though we cannot provide more than mother tongue classes and study support in their mother tongue. We know that in research in Sweden, in many different contexts, and internationally that the monolingual majority teacher's attitude and approach plays a very important role for their self-perception. This, in turn, plays an important role in their [students] motivation and driving force to succeed in school. That is what we are left with right now you can say.

[Interview, 2009-01-14, Marie, principal, transcribed digital recording]

Marie's arguments in favor of bilingual education are reflective of socially supportive environments (Axelsson, 2013). Axelsson (2013) confirms that constructing a socially supportive environment for polylingual students, as opposed to prescriptive monolingual standards, provides means of managing diversity that promote equity and social justice. Axelsson (2013) describes three over-arching arenas that influence academic success for non-dominant language students: 1) power relationships in society, at school and between individuals, 2) the pedagogical profile or philosophy of the school, and 3) the development of language and literacy in learning. The formulation in the development plan takes an inclusive approach to polylingual students and changes in the instructional discourse. Linguistic studies also indicate a positive correlation between mother tongue and Swedish as a second language tuition and overall educational outcomes for non-dominant language students (Lindberg, 2011). The realization of the bilingual education program is, according to the principal, truncated by the lack of bilingual teachers.

Marie is aware of "the monolingual majority teacher's attitude and approach". However, a dualistic approach places the responsibility for change primarily on the bilingual teachers who are the representatives of linguistic and cultural diversity. In this sense, the bilingual and bicultural approach to diversity is essentialized in the embodiment of teachers, not in the use of language, variety of languages and the construction of knowledge in languages other than Swedish in the core curriculum.

The potential threat of lay-offs created an obstacle to implementing the school reform program initiated by the "Storstadssatsning" and outlined in the

development plan. Because of the dependency on bilingual teachers, the monolingual, dominant language teachers never really actualized the intentions of the school development plan in the ordinary curriculum. Swedish research confirms that changes to the dominant curriculum are few (Lindberg, 2011). Despite a tremendous increase in linguistic diversity, the dominant curriculum has remained relatively unchanged (Hyltenstam & Lindberg, 2013).

There is a gap, a potential for change, in the realization arena in which the responsibility for implementation of the school development plan can be a shared responsibility of all the teachers, not just the so-called bicultural or bilingual teachers. All teachers share a responsibility in making their subject knowledge visible, help students construct consciousness about the knowledge field, provide language unique for that field and to help students how to realize knowledge within different pedagogical modes.

5.2 Obstacles to bilingual education in the realization arena

In the section above, I have discussed two limitations of the bilingual education program. First, how the school development plan formulates a dualistic approach to linguistic diversity as a both/and solution that is primarily beneficial to the individual student. Second, the bilingual teachers are the representatives of the bilingual education program who provide mother tongue tuition. In conjunction to these limitations, I would like to continue to discuss three more obstacles to the implementation of bilingual education on an institutional level within the realization arenas: 1) teacher resistance, 2) insufficient study support, and 3) a monolingual norm.

5.2.1 Teacher resistance

Monocultural and monolingual beliefs and values remained unchallenged. I questioned Marie, the school principal, what lay behind teachers' resistance to the bilingual education program.

Me: There is still a strong emphasis on Swedish, Swedish culture and Swedish traditions and competencies. I find it difficult to see this bicultural belonging and support for linguistic diversity. In policy it exists, but it is not always expressed in the instruction.

Marie: I am aware of this and it is a long process to get all to "join the train". This is something that needs to be worked on constantly. We have been forced to focus on other issues/.../ This is something that must be worked on long-term with as I usually say with "a fool's stubbornness". Slowly but surely, turn the ship in another direction./.../ We are simply not in that phase where we have a focus on that. It doesn't work like that. I have worked with the development of the municipal schooling for over 20 years and if there is something that I have learned is that sometimes it is necessary to reverse or at least cease./.../ There are great changes underway, redundancies, in which people are deeply affected. It is very difficult to get attention for school reform work.

[Interview, 2009-01-14, Marie, principal, transcribed digital recording]

Marie describes the process implementation as a journey. She uses the metaphors "join the train" and "turn the ship" as descriptive expressions in which teachers' attitudes and perceptions are running parallel to, but not in sync with the school

development plan. According to Marie, the teachers could not focus on school reform when their positions were threatened. The implementation of the school development plan had been put on hold. This meant that work on changing teachers' values and attitudes in support of bilingual education were discontinued. Although the threat of being made redundant was a real and concrete argument, there seemed to be an avoidance of school reform on an institutional level.

Educational research in Scandinavia indicates a pervasive institutional resistance to incorporating linguistic and social diversity into the dominant curriculum. Bunar (2001) describes in his thesis the social and economic disparities of schools in urban suburbs in Sweden. Language is but one aspect of the cultural reproduction of the social hierarchy reproduced in the structure of the educational system and the ideological and pedagogical base of the school (Bunar, 2001, p. 266). Because of the continued lack of integration, cultural difference is not yet regarded as a positive attribute. Bunar (2001) explains attitudes towards social and linguistic difference in education will change when diversity in the labor market and housing sectors is acknowledged. However, since 2001 these disparities have increased rather than decreased (Andersson, BråmÅ & Hogdal, 2009).

Political and ideological contentions surrounding linguistic diversity in education is well documented. Ethnographies which observe ideological conflicts and opposition towards linguistic diversity in education include Gitz-Johansen (2006), Gruber (2007), Haglund (2005), Runfors (2003) and Sjögren (1996). Runfors (2004) has observed pedagogical efforts to promote integration through linguistic and social homogenization. Monolingualism as the norm in the structure of the educational system stands firm despite growing linguistic diversity of the student population (Lindberg, 2009, 2011; Ronström, Runfors, & Wahlström, 1998; Runfors, 2009). The "Swedish only" rule tends to have a negative impact on students' identity and school performance (Parszyk, 1999; Runfors, 2009). In light of this research, teacher resistance is not necessarily symptomatic of individual teachers' attitudes, values and beliefs towards bilingual and bicultural education. Rather, resistance to diversification and inclusion of linguistic and social diversity can be seen from an institutional, societal and symbolic perspectives that necessitates restructuring in all three arenas - the formulation, realization and transformation arenas - of the pedagogical device (Bunar, 2001; Lindensjö & Lundgren, 2000).

The school development plan only pays lip-service to the dynamic, hybrid, polylingual student body. It is an inadequate formulation, or fabrication (Ball, 2004), that appeals to a feel-good ideology about multiculturalism (Möller, 2010). It constructs a consensus that affirms a bilingual and bicultural duality, or parallel monolingualism (Heller, 1999), while Swedish as the dominant language of transmission and acquisition of knowledge is maintained. It does not adequately address changes to the social structure of the pedagogical device, or challenge monolingual normativity. In the following sections, I will discuss two more institutional obstacles to the formulation and implementation of bilingual education: 1) insufficient study support and 2) monolingual normativity.

5.2.2 Insufficient study support

In a report from the Swedish school authorities (The Swedish School Inspectorate), states that Woodbridge school does not provide study support to the extent required to meet the needs of the students. In all, 256 students at Woodbridge received instruction in their mother tongue in 25 different languages at the time of the study¹⁶.

The instruction for new arrivals at Woodbridge varies depending upon what kind of organizational solution the students are placed, [Project class or the Workshop group]. To a limited degree the students received individualized instruction. This is offered, for example to students that have had English as their school language and are offered English in a regular class; however, their competence in English is not utilized because of their lack of Swedish is a hinder. The students' knowledge in subjects other than Swedish, mathematics and English are seldom examined and they have limited access to the schools' subjects. Their prior school knowledge is not utilized fully.

(Document from the Swedish School Inspectorate [Skolinspektionen] 2009, p. 13, my translation).

According to the Swedish School Inspectorate, new arrivals that start at Woodbridge feel that the instruction is one-sided and mainly focused on Swedish as a second language and that their knowledge in other subjects is ignored. The Inspectorate's assessment observed that the instruction of new arrivals "is not based on students' collective knowledge, needs, preconditions or experiences" (Skolinspektionen, 2009, Dnr: 00-2008:474 13, my translation).

According to the report, instruction in Swedish as a second language is not adequately tied to the learning and teaching in other subjects.

Research and previous inspections show that education for new arrivals is not always adapted to the individual's needs and prior knowledge. New arrivals often one-sidedly receive learning in Swedish as a second language while access to other subjects is limited. The experiences of the inspection also show that students are not adequately offered mother tongue tuition or study support in their mother tongue to a necessary extent.

(Document from the Swedish School Inspectorate [Skolinspektionen] 2009, p. 2, my translation).

The School inspectorates report confirms research, already mentioned previously, that implementation of Swedish as a second language and mother tongue tuition are marginalized subjects within educational institutions (Bunar, 2010; Lindberg, 2011; Skolverket, 2008). Previous inspection reports have found that implementation of Swedish as a second language has been a disappointment (Skolverket, 2003). Many schools have not been able to provide instruction in Swedish as a second language in accordance to the intentions of the regulations (Lindberg, 2011).

Access to study support is a political issue that needs to be addressed by the local government and municipality (Axelsson, 2013; Hyltenstam & Lindberg, 2013). It is up to the politicians, not the school, to take measures to amend these issues according to the Inspectorate. The school still has a majority of students with another mother tongue language than Swedish and there is a great need for further education in Swedish as a second language for all teachers.

The findings made by the school inspectorate are not surprising. The distribution of Swedish as a second language is concentrated to new arrivals. Yet, the overwhelming majority of the students at Woodbridge are polylingual students with immigrant backgrounds with one or both parents born abroad. All of the ordinary classes include students in need of study support and tuition of Swedish as a second language, not just the classes for new arrivals. This stands in stark contrast to the aims formulated in the school development plan to support

bilingual and bicultural education in the ordinary core curriculum, not just classes for new arrivals or mother tongue tuition separate from the regular classes.

The lack of study support and mother tongue tuition is a complex problem that transpires the formulation, realization and transformation arenas. Lindberg (2011), for instance, explains that language policies and support for mother tongue tuition varies from school to school. There is great confusion and ignorance amongst school leadership and teachers about the purpose, function and curriculum of Swedish as a second language (Lindberg, 2011). Similarly, Bunar (2010) in a research overview of new arrivals discusses the confusion, ambiguity and ambivalence about the content and purpose of Swedish as a second language. Studies indicate that Swedish as a second language has low social status as a school subject and often strengthens an 'Us' versus 'Them' dichotomy (Bunar, 2010). Despite critique of 'Othering', stigmatization and remediation, Swedish as a second language is supported by students and seen as necessary subject that should be integrated into all subjects. Hyltensam and Lindberg (2013) observe that because of the negative associations to Swedish as a second language many students choose "mother tongue" Swedish even though it is not adapted to the needs of second language learners.

Hyltenstam and Lindberg (2013) and Axelsson (2013) confirm that there is much contention and dissonance in the formulation arena about the curriculum goals, who it is intended for, and how the selection processes are carried out. Hyltenstam and Lindberg (2013) suggest integration with other subjects and better assessment and selection practices. Axelsson (2013) points to the social and political ramifications of policy and regulations for polylingual students. Children and families are sensitive to the signals from their surroundings with regards to language and culture. In connection to minding the gap, Axelsson (2013) writes that policy regulations indicate what is possible in society, or in Bernstein's words *the not yet thought*. Incorporation of Swedish as a second language into the ordinary curriculum is an ideological and pragmatic concern that requires further education of *all* subject matter teachers.

On one level, the lack of study support and mother tongue tuition appear to be the main obstacles to the implementation of the bilingual education program at Woodbridge. However, on further analysis with the use of Bernstein concepts, strong classification of Swedish as a second language for new arrivals creates a problem of distribution of Swedish as a second language throughout the curriculum. Research indicates that there is a lack of clarity in the formulation arena which creates confusion and ambivalence about the content and purpose of Swedish as a second language in other subjects as well (Hyltenstam & Lindberg, 2013). The bilingual and bicultural education program, as it is formulated in the School development plan, can also be a reason why Swedish as a second language has not been fully implemented. The bilingual education program as it is formulated promotes both Swedish and mother tongue tuition. These are seen as parallel monolingualism (Heller, 1999). The bilingual education does not specifically promote the need for *Swedish as a second language* designed for the needs of polylingual students. Lack of study support and distribution of Swedish as a second language is a human and economic resource issue that is dependent upon the institutional organization of Swedish as a second language, how it is formulated in policy texts, and how it is realized in the pedagogical discourse; that is to say, the distribution, recontextualization and evaluation of school knowledge in relation to the needs of the students and a polylingual social reality.

5.2.3 Monolingual norm

Linguistic diversity is a cornerstone in the school development plan in which the students' mother tongue requires room to develop alongside Swedish. The school's intercultural approach to diversity is intended to support bilingualism and bicultural identity by all of the staff.

Affirm and support the children's bilingual and bicultural development. Highlight and build upon the child's experiences, knowledge, needs and interests, as well as, focus upon what the child *knows* and strengthen and support a positive self-image. The physical environment, materials and teaching aids should reflect the cultural and ethnic diversity and provide opportunities for positive identification. Greet children and parents first and foremost as individuals with different personalities, values and experiences, not as just representatives of a culture. The pedagogy should have its starting point in the diversity of languages and cultures.

(School development plan, p. 9, cursive in the original document).

However, Swedish is the primary language used in the ordinary subject matter instruction. The students are aware of the "Swedish only" rule and transgress from it occasionally. It is when students transgress this rule that it becomes visible. The "Swedish only" norm is made visible in teacher situations in which the teacher is instructing and the students are focusing on the teacher's instructions. The following is an example from a science demonstration.

The teacher, Linda, demonstrates how she holds the transformer to the PID reader. She takes a glass tube and connects it. Jamal whispers to his friend in Arabic.

Linda: You must speak Swedish. I am curious. I also want to know.
Jamal: I said we're going to town tonight.
Linda: That doesn't have anything to do with this.

[Fieldnotes, participant observation, 2008-05-27, Jamal, boy 15 years, Linda, science teacher]

The teacher's curiosity is used to call attention to the lecture. It is also an indirect means of indicating that the instructional language is Swedish. During a lesson in music class, I observed a more direct order given to a girl speaking Arabic.

The teacher, Julia, is going through each of the music instruments the students have accomplished according to the criteria and what they have left to learn. After the teacher explained what each student is to work on the students get their instruments and begin practicing.

Julia: Let's see where we are. Ava, can you put your feet down. Then we have Diyana, you are practicing the drums [...] Lakecia, you are working on the gitarr. Sabiya isn't here. Can you stop speaking and especially Arabic because I don't know what you are saying.
Roro: Ok.

[Fieldnotes, participant observation, 2008-11-17, Julia, music teacher, Diyana, Lakecia and Roro, girls, 15 years]

In this example the teacher is reading and thinking aloud, and assigning individual assignments for the girls in Class 4 to get started on. She is irritated with Roro who is also speaking out of turn and asks her to be quiet. In addition to this the teacher requests that Roro stops “speaking and especially Arabic”. The girls comply with the teacher’s request for the remainder of the lesson and adapt their language accordingly. This is a frequent occurrence. At the time of the study, when observations were made, the teacher requested that the students not speak in their mother tongue, and then the students refrained without protest. Despite the recommendations in the school policy that all staff should support bilingual education and bicultural identity, it becomes apparent that the teachers in ordinary subjects have different degrees of tolerance for use of mother tongue depending on the context. A Somali speaking girl in Class 2 explained:

- Me: Do you speak the same mother tongue (as her friend)?
 Saadia: Yes, we all speak Somali, but at home I speak Swedish 24/7.
 Me: Are you allowed to speak your mother tongue during lessons?
 Saadia: Yes, as long as we don’t bother anyone.
 Me: I heard you speaking during Art class, but you spoke Swedish to one another.
 Saadia: Only curious teachers tell us to speak Swedish. They want to know what we are saying and ask us to speak Swedish.

[Informal conversation, 2008-05-22, Saadia, 15 year old girl]

It is not only on account of talking and noisiness that students are reprimanded, also it is their mother tongue that is subject to rebuke. Talkative students and the classroom noise are thwarted with orders from the teacher. Students object to the social rules on silence and ban on speaking in their mother tongue. However, the students adapt their language to the teachers’ preference preemptively. There is a problem between affirming and supporting the students’ mother tongue in the ordinary subjects and, at the same time for the teacher to uphold the social order in the classroom.

The regulative discourse controls the social order and supersedes, according to Bernstein (2000), the instructional discourse. In other words, mother tongue language use is marginalized and subordinated by the regulative discourse.

Upholding Swedish as the norm can also be seen as a means of acculturation and as subordination to the social order. Swedish as a norm is taken for granted by the teachers and students. It is given that the students must master the Swedish language to attain learning targets and facilitate social interaction in “Swedish” society. On the one hand, the instructional language is Swedish. On the other hand the ordinary instruction is to: “Affirm and support the child’s bilingual and bicultural development”, and “The pedagogy should have its starting point in the diversity of languages and cultures”.

Students have seen through the fabricated feel-good about diversity philosophy with regards to language use. As the Somali speaking girl, Saadia, said, “At home I speak Swedish 24/7”. The students realize that their mother tongue is included in the feel-good about diversity rhetoric, but is at odds with the “Swedish only” rule in the instructional and regulative discourse. The solution to managing linguistic diversity and a complex polylingual reality, as it is formulated in the school development plan, is directed more towards the students’ identity cross-over and dual language acquisition, or parallel

monolingualism, rather than creating socially supportive environments (Axelsson, 2013) for mother tongue languages in the pedagogical discourse.

Bilingualism can be seen as a *no win* situation for the students. They lose out if they choose to use their mother tongue, which can be interpreted as being against integration. But, on the other hand, when student adopt the dominant hegemonic culture as Saadia says, “I speak Swedish 24/7”, it can be interpreted as rejection or distancing from biculturalism; and, therefore, deviating from the apolitical and neutral feel-good diversity discourse. This means a loss of identity without the opportunity to retain contact with one’s origins according to the school policy.

6 Discussion

The purpose of this article is not to provide a complete conceptual analysis about the policy formulation of the school development plan, but rather to understand some of the obstacles, and gaps or *interruptions* that are possible in the implementation of bilingual education on an institutional, societal and symbolic level.

The pedagogical discourse in everyday practice makes the dissonance and opposition of the language policy visible. Support for the bicultural and multilingual development of students’ language and culture was never fully incorporated into the ordinary teaching and instruction. The lack of support was seen as a lack of teachers who represented diversity, yet it was also put forth that values and attitudes to social diversity could not be addressed because of the current unrest amongst the teachers.

In practice, the bilingual education is reduced to the employment of bilingual teachers and a fixation on Swedish in the ordinary subjects. The bilingual education is mainly a remediation program for students with a mother tongue other than Swedish to achieve learning targets and to integrate into the dominant Swedish society.

Even though bilingualism has a value for the individual, the mother tongue is an indicator of non-Swedishness, someone who is an ‘Other’. The mother tongue is not valued as highly as Swedish and is seldom the starting-point for instruction in ordinary subject matter. Paradoxically, the feel-good about diversity approach, that is to say linguistic diversity as a resource for the individual, is in direct opposition to the official school language in which learning occurs within a monolingual norm and Swedish imperative. Students are sensitive to the cultural norms regarding language (Axelsson, 2013). Swedish as a second language tuition is viewed with skepticism (Bunar, 2010; Lindberg, 2011) by students, even though it is supposed to be tailored to the needs of non-native speakers of Swedish.

In practice the bicultural and bilingual education is based on language development that has encountered several stumbling blocks. First, the teachers are in need of further teacher education in Swedish as second language tuition. Second, bilingual education has been omitted because of resources to employ bilingual teachers has been withdrawn. Third, the resources at the school are not enough to supply study support to all of the new arrivals to the extent they are entitled to.

The school development plan is a fabrication (Ball, 2004) of a feel-good-about-diversity-approach to social and linguistic diversity (Möller, 2010). It constructs consensus around non-controversial or less controversial ideas, such as

transforming the individual into a bicultural person who can navigate two separate cultures, i.e. the Swedish culture and the non-dominant culture through codeswitching (Creese & Blackledge, 2010). The plan focuses on changing the knower structure to a competent bilingual speaker of Swedish. This idea constructs consensus necessary to maintain Swedish as the dominant language of instruction.

Less popular is the idea of changing the knowledge structure from monolingual to polylingual. In the above examples, the art, science and music teachers, along with other core subject teachers, did not strive to incorporate other languages into their teaching. Changing the instructional and regulative discourse to a polylingual norm would require changing the language of transmission and acquisition. To do so would also require changing the distributive, recontextualization and evaluation rules of the pedagogical discourse. That is to say, how knowledge is selected, distributed, recontextualized and evaluated.

Polylingualism is not a criterion for evaluation. There is little incentive to incorporate polylingual education practices into the instructional and regulative discourses when evaluation and assessment practices only put a premium on Swedish. If Swedish is the only valid language of transmission of knowledge and the only valid linguistic criteria in the process of evaluation, then bilingualism is null and void. Languages, dialects and sociolects can only become a valid currency in the realization arena if they are also included in the criteria of assessment. Along with ambiguity in the formulation arena, resistance in the realization arena, I argue that bilingual and mother tongue tuition can only gain legitimacy when the evaluation rules are changed.

The institutional transformation needed requires a paradigmatic shift from a monolingual Swedish norm to a polylingual norm in the dominant curriculum and a strengthening of Swedish as a second language tuition in all subjects. The realization of the bilingual education program is not dependent upon individual teachers per se; it requires an institutional transformation to the social structure of the pedagogical device and in all three of the overarching arenas of education, i.e. the formulation, realization and transformation arenas.

Endnotes

¹ Parts of these results have been previously published in (Lundberg, 2015). I have changed my name from Åsa Möller to Osa Lundberg.

² According to Leonardo (2009), race is defined as a socially constructed concept that no longer has any signification biological legitimacy, but is an important social marker of social differences, disadvantages/privileges. From a perspective of critical race theory, race, as a social construct, continues to have important social, economic and political impact.

³ All place names and people are pseudonyms.

⁴ Language and race are examined as conjoined factors in the social construction of difference and disadvantage.

⁵ This article is based on the main findings of my thesis in Chapter 8: Formulation of and obstacles to bilingual education.

⁶ The term “bilingual” is my translation for “flerspråkig” which is commonly translated as “multilingual”. I have chosen the term bilingual to refer to the learning, development and use of more than one language.

⁷ Bilingual education is my translation for “flerspråkig arbete” in the school’s policy document. The literal translation of “flerspråkig arbete” is “multilingual work”. I argue that the document and guidelines described are a form of bilingual education in which the development and use of more than one language is used (García, 2011, p. 22).

⁸ My contribution to the study is included and expanded upon in Part One of my thesis (Lundberg, 2015). I examined the way agents of control formulate and realize ‘Otherness’ and how ‘Othering’ is fabricated in a liberal and democratic view by way of a feel-good approach to diversity.

⁹ These are official statistics from the region in 2009 (Borelius, 2010).

¹⁰ Woodbridge school and the community of Woodbridge were one out of three major metropolitan areas targeted by an urban renewal project called “Storstadssatsning” carried out between 2000–2005. “Storstadssatsning” was a municipally and nationally funded project directed towards the improvement of work, education, language skills and living conditions in areas with large immigrant populations.

¹¹ For a more detailed account of ethical considerations, analysis and methodology please refer to Chapter 5 of my thesis (Lundberg, 2015).

¹² The school development plan cites the following research in conjunction with the theoretical outline (Axelsson, Gröning, & Hagberg-Persson, 2001; Gröning, 2006).

¹³ Curriculum for the Pre-school (Skolverket, 1998 revised 2016). National Agency for Education homepage: www.skolverket.se

¹⁴ Education Act 1985: 1100. Website: <http://www.sweden.gov.se/>

¹⁵ Language Act 2009:600. Website: www.regeringen.se/informationsmaterial/2009/05/spraklag-pa-engelska/

¹⁶ Document from the language center collected 2009-01-02.

References

- Ag, A., & Jørgensen, J. N. (2012). Ideologies, norms, and practices in youth poly-languaging. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 17(4), 525–539.
- Andersson, R., Bråmås, Å., & Hogdal, J. (2009). *Fattiga och rika – segregation ökar. Flyttningsmönster och boendesegregation i Göteborg 1990–2006* (S2020) [Rich and Poor – segregation increases Patterns of moving and housing segregation in Gothenburg 1990–2006]. Göteborg: Göteborgs stad. Retrieved from [http://www4.goteborg.se/prod/storstad/dalis2.nsf/vyfilarkiv/prel.rapport.rogera.pdf/\\$file/prel.rapport.rogera.pdf](http://www4.goteborg.se/prod/storstad/dalis2.nsf/vyfilarkiv/prel.rapport.rogera.pdf/$file/prel.rapport.rogera.pdf)
- Apple, M. (2004). *Ideology and Curriculum*. New York and London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Axelsson, M. (2013). Flerspråkighet och lärande [Multilingualism and learning]. In K. Hyltenstam & I. Lindberg (Eds.), *Svenska som andraspråk – i forskning, undervisning och samhället* [Swedish as a second language – in research, education and society] (pp. 547–577). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Axelsson, M., & Bunar, N. (2006). Inledning. In M. Axelsson & N. Bunar (Eds.), *Skola, språk och storstad. En antologi om språkutveckling och skolans villkor i det mångkulturella urbana rummet* [Schooling, language and cities. An anthology about language development and educational provisions in urban multicultural settings] (pp. 7–36). Stockholm: Pocky.
- Axelsson, M., Gröning, I., & Hagberg-Persson, B. (2001). *Organisation, lärande och elevsamarbete i skolor med språklig och kulturell mångfald: rapport 2 inom forskningsområdet Mångetnicitet, tvåspråkighet och utbildning, Institutionen för lärarutbildning* [The organisation, learning and student cooperation in schools with linguistic and cultural diversity: report 2 within the research field of Multiethnic, bilingualism and education, Department of Education]. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet.
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (Vol. 79). Clevedon: Multilingual matters.
- Ball, S. J. (2004). Performativities and fabrications in the education economy: towards the performative society. In S. J. Ball (Ed.), *The RoutledgeFalmer Reader in the in Sociology of Education* (pp. 143–148). London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Beach, D. (2008). Ethnography and representation: About representations for criticism and change through ethnography. In G. Walford (Ed.), *How to do Educational Ethnography* (pp. 165–182). London: the Tufnell Press.
- Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Bernstein, B. (2001). Symbolic control: Issues of empirical description of agencies and agents. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 4(1), 21–33.
- Blackledge, A. (2006). The racialization of language in British political discourse. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 3(1), 61–79.
- Blackledge, A. (2009). Imagining a monocultural community: Racialization of cultural practice in educational discourse. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 2(4), 331–347.
- Borelius, U. (2010). Två förorter [Two urban suburbs]. *Utbildning & Demokrati*, 19(1), 11–24.
- Borevi, K. (2002). *Välfärdsstaten i den mångkulturella samhället* [The Welfare State in a Multicultural Society]. (Doctoral dissertation). Department of Government, Uppsala University.
- Bunar, N. (2001). *Skolan mitt i förorten* [The school in the urban suburb]. (Doctoral dissertation). Department of Social Sciences, Linneaus University. Stockholm: Brutus Östlings Bokförlag Symposium AB.
- Bunar, N. (2010). *Nyanlända och lärande – en forskningsöversikt om nyanlända elever i den svenska skolan* [Migrants and learning – a research review of recent arrivals in the Swedish school]. Rapportnummer 6:2010. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.
- Carlson, M. (2003). *Svenska för invandrare – brygga eller gräns? Syn på kunskap och lärande inom SFI-undervisningen* [Swedish for migrants – a bridge or boarder? Views of knowledge and learning in Swedish for immigrants education]. (Doctoral dissertation).

- Department of Sociology, University of Gothenburg. Available from https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/15725/3/gupea_2077_15725_3.pdf
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). New York and Oxon: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103–115.
- Eisenchlas, S. A., Schalley, A. C., & Guillemin, D. (2015). Multilingualism and literacy: attitudes and policies. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 12(2), 151–161.
- García, O. (2011). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*: New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2013). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*: New York: Springer.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretations of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gitz-Johansen, T. (2006). *Den multikulturelle skole – integration og sortering* [The multicultural school – integration and sorting]. (Doctoral dissertation). Department of Education, Roskilde University. Frederiksberg C: Roskilde Universitetsforlag.
- Gruber, S. (2007). *Skolan gör skillnad. Etnicitet och institutionell praktik* [The school makes a difference: Ethnicity and institutional practice]. (Doctoral dissertation). Linköping Studies in Arts and Sciences, University of Linköping.
- Gröning, I. (2006). *Språk, interaktion och lärande i mångfaldens skola* [Language, interaction and learning in diverse school]. (Doctoral dissertation). Department of Scandinavian Languages, Uppsala University. Available from <https://uu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:168130/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Haglund, C. (2005). *Social interaction and identification among adolescents in multilingual suburban Sweden*. (Doctoral dissertation). Centre for Research on Bilingualism, Stockholm University.
- Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: a sociolinguistic ethnography*. London: Longman.
- Holme, A. (2008). Dansk som andetsprog i den flerkulturelle skole [Danish as a second language in the multicultural school]. *Cursiv*, 2, 59–76.
- Holme, A. (2009). Multilingualism in education – In favor of dynamic view of languages. In O. K. Kjörven, B.-K. Ringen & A. Gagné (Eds.), *Teacher Diversity in Diverse Schools – Challenges and Opportunities for Teacher Education*. Vallset: Oplandske Bokforlag.
- Hübinette, T., & Lundström, C. (2011). Sweden after the recent election: The double-binding power of Swedish whiteness through the mourning of the loss of "Old Sweden" and the passing of "Good Sweden". *NORA – Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 19(1), 42–52.
- Hyltenstam, K., & Lindberg, I. (2013). Förord. In K. Hyltenstam & I. Lindberg (Eds.), *Svenska som andra språk – i forskning, undervisning och samhälle* [Swedish as a second language] (pp. 7–20). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Hyltenstam, K., Lindberg, I., & Axelsson, M. (2012). *Flerspråkighet – En forskningsöversikt* [Multilingualism – a research summary]. Available from <http://www.vr.se/download/18.7257118313b2995b0f2167d/1355394138219/Flerspr%C3%A5kighet+-+En+forsknings%C3%B6versikt.pdf>
- Johnson, E. J., & Johnson, D. C. (2015). Language policy and bilingual education in Arizona and Washington state. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(1), 92–112.
- Jørgensen, J. N. (2008). Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5(3), 161–176.
- Jørgensen, J. N. (2013). Kodeskift i interaktionel perspektiv. In K. Hyltenstam & I. Lindberg (Eds.), *Svenska som andraspråk – I forskning, undervisning och samhälle* [Swedish as a second language – In research, education and society] (pp. 415–435). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Koyama, J. P., & Bartlett, L. (2011). Bilingual education policy as political spectacle: educating Latino immigrant youth in New York City. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14(2), 171–185.

- Language Act 2009:600. Available from <http://www.regeringen.se/contentassets/9e56b0c78cb5447b968a29dd14a68358/spraklag-pa-engelska>
- Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race, whiteness, and education*. New York: Routledge.
- Lindberg, I. (2009). I det nya mångspråkiga Sverige [In the new multilingual Sweden]. *Utbildning och Demokrati*, 18(2), 9-27.
- Lindberg, I. (2011). Fostering multilingualism in Swedish schools - intentions and realities. In R. Källström & I. Lindberg (Eds.), *Young urban Swedish. Variation and change in multilingual settings* (pp. 149-172). Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg, Department of Swedish Language.
- Lindensjö, B., & Lundgren, U. P. (2000). *Utbildningsreformer och politisk styrning* [Educational reforms and political governance]. Stockholm: HLS.
- Lundberg, O. (2015). *Mind the Gap - Ethnography about cultural reproduction of difference and disadvantage in urban education*. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Gothenburg. Available from <http://hdl.handle.net/2077/40715>
- Milani, T. M. (2008). Language testing and citizenship: A language ideological debate in Sweden. *Language in Society*, 37(1), 27-59.
- Miller, T., & Bell, L. (2002). Consenting to what? Issues of access, gate-keeping and 'informed' consent. In M. Mauthner, M. Birch, J. Jessop & T. Miller (Eds.), *Ethics in qualitative research* (pp. 53-69). London: Sage.
- Moore, R. (2013). *Basil Bernstein. The thinker and the field*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Möller, Å. (2010). Den "goda" mångfalden. Fabrikation av skolans mångfald i policy och praktik [Feelgood multiculturalism. The fabrication of diversity in educational policy and practice]. *Utbildning och Demokrati*, 19(1), 85-106.
- Parszyk, I.-M. (1999). *En skola för andra* [A school for others]. Stockholm: HLS Förlag.
- Pavlenko, A., & Blackledge, A. (2004). Introduction: New theoretical approaches to the study of negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. In A. Pavlenko, & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 1-33). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pihl, J. (2010). *Etnisk mangfold i skolen. Det sakkyndige blikket, 2 ed.* [Ethnic diversity in education. The factual view, 2nd ed.]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Pred, A. (2000). *Even in Sweden. Racisms, racialized spaces, and the popular geographical imagination*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.
- Principal. (2009). *Interkulturellt och flerspråkigt arbete i [Woodbridge]. Utvecklingsplan för förskola och skola. Läsåret 2008/2009*. [Development plan for preschool and school Schoolyear 2008/2009 revised 2009].
- Reath Warren, A. (2013). Mother tongue tuition in Sweden - curriculum analysis and classroom experience. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 6(1), 95-116.
- Ronström, O., Runfors, A., & Wahlström, K. (1998). "Det här är ett svenskt dagis" *En etnologisk studie av dagiskultur och kulturmöten i norra Botkyrka* ["This is a Swedish daycare" An ethnological study of pre-school culture and cultural meetings in northern Botkyrka]. Tumba: Mångkulturellt centrum.
- Runfors, A. (2003). *Mångfald, motsägelser och marginaliseringar: en studie av hur invandrarskap formas i skolan* [Diversity, Contradictions and Marginalisation : A study of how immigrant status is formed in school]. (Doctoral dissertation). Faculty of Humanities, Department of Ethnology, History of Religions and Gender Studies, Stockholm University. Stockholm: Prisma.
- Runfors, A. (2004). "När blir man svensk?" - om hur skilda möjligheter skapas i skolvardagens samspel [When do you become Swedish? About different opportunities are created in everyday school interactions]. In K. Borevi & P. Strömblad (Eds.), *SOU 2004:33, Kunskap för integration. Om makt i skola och utbildning i mångfaldens Sverige* [Knowledge for integration. About power in school and education in the diversified Sweden] (pp. 29-54). Stockholm: Fritzes.
- Runfors, A. (2009). Modersmållssvenskar och vi andra - ungas språk och indentifikationer i ljust av nynationalism [Mother tongue Swedes and us - young people's language and identifiers in light of neonationalism]. *Utbildning och Demokrati*, 2(2), 105-126.

- Sawyer, L. (2000). *Black and Swedish: Racialization and the cultural politics of belonging in Stockholm, Sweden*. University of Michigan: Department of Cultural Anthropology.
- Sjögren, A. (1996). *En "bra" svenska? Om språk, kultur och makt* [A "good" Swedish? About language, culture and power]. Tumba: Mångkulturellt centrum.
- Sjögren, A. (2001). Introduktion. In A. Bigenstans (Ed.), *Lyssna: interkulturella perspektiv på multietniska skolmiljöer* [Listen: intercultural perspective of multiethnic school environments] (pp. 5-11). Tumba: Mångkulturellt centrum.
- Skolinspektionen. (2009, Dnr: 00-2008:474). *Utbildning för nyanlända elever* [Education for newly arrived pupils]. Stadsdelsnämnd [municipality]. Göteborg.
- Skolverket. (1998 revised 2016). *Curriculum for the Preschool*. Stockholm: The Swedish National Agency for Education.
- Skolverket. (2003). *Elever med utländsk bakgrund* [Students with foreign backgrounds] (Fritzes Ed.). Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Skolverket. (2008). *With another mother tongue – students in compulsory school and the organization of teaching and learning*. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Skolverket. (2011). *Curriculum for the compulsory school system, the pre-school class and the leisure-time centre*: Stockholm: The Swedish National Agency for Education.
- Valdiviezo, L. (2009). Bilingual intercultural education in indigenous schools: an ethnography of teacher interpretations of government policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(1), 61–79.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1987). *Communicating Racism: Ethnic Prejudice in Talk and Thought*. London: Sage.
- Vetenskapsrådet. (2014). *Forskningsetikaprinciper inom humanistisk-samhällsvetenskaplig forskning* [Research Ethics and Principles in Humanities and Social Sciences]. Retrieved from <http://www.codex.vr.se/texts/HSFR.pdf>