ADRIAN LUNDBERG

VIEWPOINTS ABOUT EDUCATIONAL LANGUAGE POLICIES

Multilingualism in Sweden and Switzerland

**VIEWPOINTS ABOUT
EDUCATIONAL LANGUAGE POLICIES**

Malmö Studies in Educational Sciences No. 90

© Copyright Adrian Lundberg, 2020

Cover illustration: Adrian Lundberg

ISBN 978-91-7877-076-2 (print)

ISBN 978-91-7877-077-9 (pdf)

ISSN (Malmö) 1651-4513

DOI 10.24834/isbn.9789178770779

Printed by Holmbergs, Malmö 2020

ADRIAN LUNDBERG
VIEWPOINTS ABOUT
EDUCATIONAL LANGUAGE
POLICIES

Multilingualism in Sweden and Switzerland

Malmö University, 2020
Faculty of Education and Society

The publication is available on DiVA

For my multilingual children,
Fabio, Viggo & Malia

CONTENTS

- ABSTRACT 11
- ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 13
- INCLUDED PUBLICATIONS 15
- INTRODUCTION 16
 - Aims and Research Questions..... 18
 - Significance and Contributions of Thesis 19
 - Outline of Thesis 20
- EDUCATIONAL POLICY ENACTMENT 21
 - Teacher Agency 23
 - Teacher Cognition..... 24
 - Projective Dimension 26
 - Evaluation and Decision-making..... 26
 - Teachers’ Performance..... 28
 - Development of Teacher Agency 29
- EDUCATIONAL LANGUAGE POLICY AND
MULTILINGUALISM 32
 - Language-in-education Planning 33
 - Language Management 34
 - Multilingualism..... 36
 - Multilingual Development..... 38
 - Language Orientations..... 40
- STUDY CONTEXTS 44
 - Sweden 45
 - Ethnic Nation State 45

Linguistic Ecology of Sweden.....	46
Swedish Educational Language Policy	47
Multilingualism in Swedish Teacher Education	50
Switzerland.....	51
Willensnation	51
The Principle of Territoriality.....	52
Swiss Educational Language Policy.....	53
Multilingualism in Swiss Teacher Education	55
Similarities regarding Societal Composition	56
METHODOLOGY	58
Comparative Case Study Research	59
Systematic Research Review.....	60
Identifying Research Discourses.....	60
Showcasing a Methodology's Potential.....	62
Q methodology	63
Introduction and Conceptual Framework	64
Rationale for Q in this Thesis	66
Research Design.....	68
Data Collection	73
Analysis and Interpretation.....	75
Criteria of Scientific Quality	78
Reliability and Validity	79
Ethical Considerations.....	79
Researcher's own Positionality	80
STUDIES' RESULTS	81
Article I	81
Article II	84
Article III	86
Article IV	87
CONCLUDING DISCUSSION.....	89
Multilingualism in Sweden and Switzerland	89
Regulating Linguistic Diversity	90
An Atomistic and a Holistic View of Multilingualism	90
Definition of Multilingualism and Multilingual Student	91
Multilingualism as a Theoretical Resource.....	92
English as a Hinderance or a Resource.....	94

Multilingualism as a Potential Practical Problem	95
Pupils' Multilingual Development	96
Q methodology in Educational Research	98
Q covering all Areas of SoLD	98
Flexibility of Q methodology	98
Q for Critical Reflection	99
Neither Right nor Wrong, but Relative	99
Time-consuming, Rare and Demanding	100
Contribution to Knowledge and Implications	101
Situated Teaching	101
Time and Trust	102
Teacher Education	103
Q as an Educational Tool	104
Q as a Mediational Tool	105
Multilingual Research Habitus	106
Delimitations and Limitations	106
Directions for Further Research	107
Final Words	108
SUMMARIES	109
English	109
Svenska	115
Deutsch	121
REFERENCES	129
APPENDIX	151
Consent Form (Swedish)	151
Questionnaire on Demographic Information (Swedish)	152
Sorting Help (Swedish)	153
Items in Component 1 <i>understanding</i> (Switzerland)	154
Items in Component 2 <i>pedagogy</i> (Switzerland)	156
ARTICLES I-IV	159

ABSTRACT

With multilingualism being regarded a vital issue to be addressed in tackling discrimination and inequality associated with language, the purpose of this doctoral dissertation is to comparatively investigate stakeholders' viewpoints about multilingualism to advance discussions about ways education and research may contribute to a change for greater social justice and betterment for all students. Consequently, separate studies included in this compilation thesis empirically investigate how language management in education takes shape in relation to socially situated discourses about multilingualism and (language) policy. The selected study contexts in Sweden and Switzerland share a similar societal composition and differ concerning their political organisation and language history.

A systematic research review about multilingual educational language policies in Sweden and Switzerland (article I) provides an overview of explicit and implicit research discourses relevant for the contexts under scrutiny. Grounded in a sociocultural understanding of educational policy enactment, this thesis' theoretical basis draws on an ecological framework of teacher agency, consisting of, among other aspects, the mediated collectivity of predominantly subjective elements in teachers' cognition. As a means to systematically and empirically study these so-called viewpoints, an innovative and inherently mixed method approach was selected. Q methodology's benefits and limitations in educational research are investigated through a systemic research review (article II), drawing on 74 publications since 2010. Q methodological studies, consisting of a Q sorting activity with 40 teachers in Sweden (article III) and 67 teachers in Switzerland (article IV) were conducted in 2017 in a face-to-face manner. A range of viewpoints in both study components (*understanding* and *pedagogy*) emerged through inverted factor analysis and were interpreted through abductive and iterative reasoning.

The results of this thesis show a mostly atomistic view of multilingualism in Sweden, standing in contrast to a more holistic one in Swit-

zerland. Particularly the term *multilingual student* is conceptualised differently, as it often excludes native Swedish speakers in the Scandinavian context, indicating a monolingual habitus. A national identity and an intense professional development course in Switzerland seem to have led to a striking consensus in favour of multilingualism as resource in the first study component. However, more critical findings in the second study component illustrates how large-scale innovations involving a paradigmatic shift in teachers' cognition demand long-term time frames and increased levels of trust, motivational conditions and recurrent input and feedback.

Especially Q methodology's flexibility concerning research design and study focus showcase why the approach is a valuable contribution to the educational researcher's methodological repertoire, despite its time-consuming and sophisticated preparation of data collection instruments. As an educational and mediational tool, Q methodology is considered a promising instrument leading to dialogues with participants from various stakeholder groups. Research in this thesis further contributes to knowledge by uncovering communities of practice and suggesting the term *situated teaching*. Additional support measures within the context of teachers' pre- and in-service education are needed to increase the enactment of educational policies regarding multilingual language management in the classroom.

Keywords: Educational language policy, language, Q methodology, multilingualism, teachers, subjectivity, systematic review, viewpoints

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Finalising my thesis in 2020 means sitting self-isolated in my basement in Malmö. Due to Covid-19, all professional contacts play out online, including my final seminar in March and my defence in September. I take breaks wandering through my garden, breathing fresh air and seeing nature come to life without any airplanes intruding this treasured tranquillity. At the same time, I am thoughtful of how and where this journey started and what adventures it entailed. It is self-evident that such a journey was only made possible by a large and diverse group of people.

First, I would like to thank Malmö University for providing funds for my many travels to conferences, summer schools or data collection activities. As PhD students in Sweden, we are truly privileged to have a PhD backpack at our disposal. Then, I would like to point out the exceptional job Malmö University library staff does. I have suggested more than fifteen books on educational language policy and was never turned down. Further, I wish to extend my gratitude to Catarina Christiansson, who has been very helpful with several administrative issues.

Academically, the biggest thanks goes out to Mona Holmqvist and Francis M. Hult. Mona, my main supervisor, has acted wonderfully as my *Doktormutter*, providing support when I required it and leaving me to figure things out by myself, when I needed that instead. Francis, my co-supervisor, did what the Swedish word *handledare* expresses. He led my hand in writing with his incredibly constructive and at times poetic comments. I am especially thankful to both of you for your openness towards my choice of methodology and having trust and confidence in my ideas. I look forward to future collaborations with you. Further, I

would like to thank Joe Lo Bianco, who accepted me as his visiting PhD researcher at Melbourne University. You are a source of inspiration and I feel incredibly fortunate to call you my friend. Grazie!

Article II in this thesis was co-authored with Renske de Leeuw and Renata Aliani. I thank you for collaborating with me and thereby improving my dissertation. We have more research plans together and I cannot wait to produce more publications with you. The scientific quality of this project was further enhanced by the external peer reviewers of the individual studies and members of the research environments at Malmö University, in particular at the department of School Development and Leadership and at Melbourne Graduate School of Education. In addition, Jonas Almqvist (25%), Simon Watts (50%) and Britt-Marie Apelgren (90%) have acted as valuable discussants during my three milestone seminars. Thank you!

Finally, worthy of most praise for my perseverance and the possibility to write a doctoral dissertation with three young children, belongs to my wife Lena. You are a superstar mother, teacher and discussion partner. Nobody could have done a better job at supporting me during this journey. Merci – Tack!

This thesis is written for Fabio, Viggo and Malia, three multilingual children with roots in two different countries and cultures. I truly believe it is our language(s) that make us feel rooted and at home, wherever we are. Let me finish by quoting a sentence from a 1648 letter by Descartes to Elisabeth of Bohemia, where he wrote “cependant, me tenant comme je fais, un pied en un pays, et l’autre en un autre, je trouve ma condition très heureuse, en ce qu’elle est libre” (Descartes, 1989).

Malmö, June 2020

Adrian Lundberg

INCLUDED PUBLICATIONS

This thesis is based on three international peer-reviewed publications and one submitted manuscript under review. The articles are appended to the thesis and will be referred to by the roman numerals.

Article I

Lundberg, Adrian (2018). Multilingual educational language policies in Switzerland and Sweden. A meta-analysis. *Language Problems and Language Planning*. 42:1, 45-69, <https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.00005.lun>

Article II

Lundberg, Adrian; de Leeuw, Renske R. & Renata Aliani (submitted 2020, under review) Q Methodology: A Mixed Method Approach to Subjectivity in Educational Research.

Article III

Lundberg, Adrian (2019). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism: findings from Q method research. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 20:3, 266-283, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2018.1495373>

Article IV

Lundberg, Adrian (2019). Teachers' viewpoints about an educational reform concerning multilingualism in German-speaking Switzerland *Learning and Instruction*, 64, 101244, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2019.101244>

INTRODUCTION

“Language is not a problem unless it is used as a basis for discrimination” (Haugen, 1973, p. 54).

Recent developments, often summarised under the umbrella term of globalisation, have raised the awareness of multilingualism, an ancient phenomenon that has long existed in many cultures (Douglas Fir Group, 2016), both as an individual and a social practice. Linguistically diverse student populations are a reality in contemporary European societies and academia appears to have replaced the monolingual yardstick with the bi- and multilingual norm in societal language use (Jessner & Kramsch, 2015, Aronin, 2015). European education policies however, seem to largely ignore children’s migrant languages by focusing on promoting the teaching and learning of national languages (Gogolin & Duarte, 2013). It is therefore hardly surprising that numerous national and regional educational settings continue to apply a monolingual understanding, suggesting “monolingualism as natural, normal and desirable” (Ellis, Gogolin & Clyne, 2010, p. 440). As a consequence of this discrepancy, this thesis is concerned with multilingualism as the issue that needs to be addressed in order to deal with discrimination and inequality associated with language (Salzburg Global Seminar, 2018), particularly in education, known as a key terrain where these struggles play out (Piller, 2016a).

Contemporary research in language policy and planning and especially in the field of educational linguistics has yielded a stronger focus on individuals in policy interpretation and implementation processes. Most prominently, teachers have been regarded as key policy arbiters

(Menken & García, 2010, Johnson, 2013a) in a situated form of language policy with the opportunity to shape the way a policy is enacted (see e.g. Hult, 2018a, Johnson & Pratt, 2014) in their “dynamic, daily practice of [language planning] that resides in concrete activities, especially teaching” (Lo Bianco, 2010b, p. 154).

This thesis draws on an ecological framework of teacher agency (Priestley, Biesta & Robinson, 2015), indicating that teachers make decisions based on different components of their cognition, including knowledge, beliefs and experience. By conceptualising agency as “a configuration of influences from the *past*, orientations towards the *future* and engagement with the *present*” (Biesta, Priestley & Robinson, 2015, p. 626; emphasis in original), it becomes apparent how acknowledging the full spectrum of multilingualism from the linguistic human rights of minorities to maintain one’s mother tongue to the opportunity to learn further languages in different educational settings “can enhance the quality, seriousness and equity for all learners, not just for those who were brought up multilingually” (Lo Bianco, 2014, p. xvi). de Jong (2016), in describing the particular challenge to create these more pluralist spaces for “scholars, policy makers, and educators of multilingual learners who operate within an assimilationist-oriented environment” (p. 380), indicates the need to comparatively investigate stakeholders’ viewpoints about multilingualism in different contexts. For the present thesis, two European countries with similar societal composition and noteworthy differences in terms of political organisation and their language history were selected. Sweden, a traditional nation-state with a current curriculum for compulsory schooling based on a predominantly monolingual orientation (Paulsrud, Zilliacus & Ekberg, 2020) is contrasted with federalist Switzerland, which is known for its long tradition of multilingualism and where a new curriculum with the declared aim “to break the monolingual habitus of the school” (Bertschy, Egli Cuenat & Stotz, 2015, p. 4) was introduced not long ago.

Grounded in the conceptualisation of multilingualism as a wicked language problem (Rubin, 1986), because different educational stakeholders’ symbolic and material interests are at stake (Lo Bianco, 2015), research in this thesis investigates how the issue is debated in research about multilingual educational language policies in Sweden and Switzerland and by especially foregrounding teachers’ viewpoints without

objecting them to researcher-imposed categories. Q methodology (Brown, 2019b), whose recent applications in educational research are reviewed in this thesis, has been selected as a fitting empirical basis for the investigation of multilingualism, due to its capacity to elucidate “dimensions, ideologies, and histories hidden within the way the problem is typically discussed or presented” (Lo Bianco, 2015, p. 70).

Aims and Research Questions

The overall purpose of the current investigation is to advance the discussion about the way education and research may contribute to the change for greater social justice and betterment for all students (United Nations, 2018). This is achieved by comparatively analysing stakeholders’ viewpoints about multilingualism in different socioculturally embedded contexts on the one hand and illustrating the potential of an unconventional and innovative research method (Brown & Rhoades, 2019) to identify participants’ subjectivity for educational research on the other hand. Due to the twofold nature of this thesis’ purpose, two overarching research questions guide the separate studies in this compilation thesis.

1. How does language management in education take shape in relation to socially situated discourses about multilingualism and (language) policy?
2. What are the benefits and limitations of using Q methodology in educational research?

The first overarching research question is exploratory. In order to achieve the purpose of this thesis, articles I, III and IV fulfil some of the spadework needed to move towards linking overt and covert policy to practice. Based on an ecological understanding of situated teacher agency, article I aims to provide an overview of teachers’ larger context by comparing research about multilingual educational policies in Sweden and Switzerland. It therefore responds to the following research question: *How do research results on multilingual educational policies in Sweden and Switzerland differ?* As teachers are assigned the key role of policy arbiters through their agency, articles III and IV aim to uncover the range of discourses about multilingualism in teachers’ cognition in the investigated contexts. These discourses form the ground for deci-

sion-making in teachers' daily practice. The following research question is posed to this end: *What characterises teachers' viewpoints about multilingualism in Sweden and Switzerland?*

The second overarching research question of this thesis, concerning the applicability of Q methodology in educational research, is the basis for a methodological research review. Article II provides an informative basis and investigates the application of Q methodology in educational research in the most recent decade and thereby responds to the question: *What characterises Q methodological studies published between 2010 and 2019 in compulsory education and in what way are their findings and implications relevant for the science of learning and development?* In addition, articles III and IV provide a valuable contribution in addressing the second overarching question on a meta level, as first-hand experience from these empirical studies was especially helpful in fully understanding the scope of Q methodology.

Significance and Contributions of Thesis

Education is inherently connected to language, most importantly through its role as the prime tool for mediational activities such as knowledge development (Vygotskij, 1978). Research that illustrates how the linguistic repertoire of multilingual minority pupils is not valorised for learning in mainstream classrooms (see e.g. Duarte, 2019) demonstrates the disadvantaged situation of many minority language speakers. Drawing on a multilingualism as resource orientation (Lo Bianco, 2017), even majority language speakers are expected to strive, if teachers make decisions in favour of the acknowledgment of the full and dynamic linguistic repertoire of their pupils. By investigating the grounds on which these decisions are taken, findings from the present thesis are of importance for any contemporary classroom.

In methodological terms, this research project seeks to answer the call for alternative means “by which we can better understand the complexity of the world around us, which is not reducible to some central or single essence” (Human, 2015, p. 422). In fact, the present thesis does not aim at reducing complexity to simplicity, but translating it into theory (Morin, 1994). Studying teachers' subjective viewpoints about multilingualism with an inherently mixed method and thereby adding to a more comprehensive representation of a timely topic by complementing so-

called objective science, the present thesis makes an original contribution. Moreover, with the ability to investigate not only overt, but also covert educational language policies and underlying ideologies, the results of this thesis prepare the ground for an intensified collaboration between various stakeholders and future language planning activities. By uncovering teachers' potential internal dilemmas concerning questions of language, in particular multilingualism in educational settings in Sweden and Switzerland, they are granted participation in a dialogue about opportunities and challenges of multilingualism (Jessner & Kramsch, 2015) through critical engagement and reflection (Lo Bianco, 2010b) upon their own viewpoints about the subject matter.

In the present thesis, teachers' pre- and in-service education is seen as an important site for the development of teacher agency. Since teacher agency in general and policy engagement in particular are not necessarily considered intuitive, educators at different stages of their career shall be encouraged by the findings of this thesis to increase the time spent on becoming critical practitioners (e.g. Hult, 2018a) and thereby realise the need to collaborate with other teachers across the curriculum, parents and the wider communities. Particularly the use of Q methodology as a suggested tool in educational settings will provide a starting point for activities in teachers' professional development.

Outline of Thesis

This compilation thesis consists of four separate articles and an introductory and synthesising essay (kappa). The first two chapters in this essay introduce the reader to the theoretical perspectives of the thesis. It follows a section providing contextual background information of Sweden and Switzerland. Methodological considerations and procedures are presented and discussed in the following chapter, before the results from the four articles are summarised. The final discussion, structured according to the overarching research questions and including a range of implications is concluded by the project's limitations, delimitations and suggestions for further research. In addition to the open access status of all included publications, summaries in three languages further enhance accessibility to the content of this compilation thesis.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY ENACTMENT

This chapter provides an introduction to the field of educational policy research grounded in a sociocultural framework. A particular focus will be placed on teachers' pivotal role as policy actors and their agency, consisting of individual and shared discourses.

Almost thirty years ago, Ball (1994) provided a definition of policy, which is still true for many guiding documents: "Policies do not normally tell you what to do, they create circumstances in which the range of options available in deciding what to do are narrowed or changed, or particular goals or outcomes are set" (p. 19). Accordingly, the enactment of a specific policy is much more challenging than the policy itself. More recently, Ball, Maguire and Braun (2012) rejected the superficial definition of policy as "an attempt to 'solve a problem'" (p. 2) and stressed the importance of seeing policy as a process of repeated interpretations within institutions and classrooms, with regard to the local context. As policies are usually written with the best possible and idealised school in mind, their envisioned form is not simply linearly *implemented*, but dynamically translated from text to practice respecting contextual possibilities and limitations. Hence their *enactment* can result in a range of outcomes far from their envisioned form, such as for example a "creative non-implementation" (Ball, 1994, p. 20) or the incorporation into school documentation for reasons of accountability (Ball, 2001). Causes of the policy-practice divide have been investigated by numerous scholars and are for example discussed in Schulte (2018). Commonly, a strong focus has been placed on school personnel, such as school principals and teachers, and their negotiation, adaptations and framing of

policies within their organisational context (Honig, 2006). A closely related and frequently discussed reason for a gap between policy and practice is the assumption of a temporal delay (Phillips & Ochs, 2003) and the expectation of witnessing changes in practice, generated by the policy, with sufficient time and patience.

As the localised nature and therefore socioculturally embedded context of policies plays a critical role in the shaping of the policy on the ground (Braun, Ball, Maguire & Hoskins, 2011), and because teaching is seen as “a complex interactive process of communication, interpretation and joint meaning making where teacher judgment and decision-making are crucial” (Priestley et al., 2015, p. 4) this thesis not only focuses on teachers’ individual, but also shared policymaking within an enactment framework. The applied understanding of policy enactment draws from the conceptualisation of teachers’ sense-making of policy as social action (Scollon & Scollon, 2004) within different scales moving in nonlinearly directions. This goes beyond a more traditional macro-meso-micro distinction of top-down and bottom-up practices and resonates well with seeing “the full spectrum of connections” (Hult, 2019b, p. 137). Moreover, it allows the researcher to investigate individuals with their agentic power in a continuously (re)created context.

The importance of teachers as “active, thinking decision-makers” (Borg, 2003, p. 81) or “historical, social, and culturally constituted subjects” (Cross, 2010, p. 434) is uncontested in the transformation process from curriculum to practical teaching (Alvunger, Sundberg & Wahlström, 2017) and the associated potential success of educational reforms (Dori & Herscovitz, 2005). Hand in hand with teachers’ pivotal role as policy enactors with their professional identities, is the importance of the particular organisational setting, they find themselves in. They are members of communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and teach in classrooms, which are described “as simultaneously physical, social, and symbolic environments in which students’ mental processes emerge in conjunction with opportunities to co-construct meaning using new forms and functions of language” (van Lier, 2008 as cited in Hult, 2013, p. 3).

With the development of the notion of *situated learning*, Lave and Wenger (1991) emphasised the importance of language and communication in collaboratively achieved learning processes. In sociocultural the-

ory, *language* inherits a particular function as a symbolic tool “to mediate and regulate our relationships with others and with ourselves and thus change the nature of these relationships” (Lantolf, 2000, p. 1) and eventually the human mind. According to Vygotskij (1978), all tools, both physical and symbolic ones, are culturally constructed artefacts, inherited from our ancestors. Inclusive in this view is the belief that artefacts, including language, are changed and developed over time in social contexts, mediated by the language choices and beliefs of individual speakers (Mufwene, 2001).

In summary, this thesis’ sociocultural theoretical basis lies in the assumption that teachers’ agency is not a power that individuals possess, but rather is something one achieves “in and through engagement with particular temporal-relation contexts-for-action” (Biesta & Tedder, 2007, p. 136) and should thus be regarded as mediated (Wertsch, Tulviste & Hagstrom, 1996). Lately, Biesta et al. (2015) have observed a tendency to have moved past an area with prescriptive curricula and oppressive regimes of testing and inspection that have de-professionalised teachers by withdrawing their agency and therefore their possibility to actively contribute to shape their work and its condition. Hence, it can be argued that this thesis is located within a time of “renewed emphasis on teacher agency” (Biesta et al., 2015, p. 625). To fully capture the theoretical foundation of this thesis, the ecological model of teacher agency will be enriched with a bi-directional continuum of teachers’ professional competence (Blömeke, Gustafsson & Shavelson, 2015, Santagata & Yeh, 2016).

Teacher Agency

The understanding of teacher agency in this thesis is based on an ecological model proposed by Priestley et al. (2015), drawing on work by Emirbayer and Mische (1998). Central to this conceptualisation of teacher agency is its position as an emergent phenomenon “through the interplay of personal capacities and the resources, affordances and constraints of the environment by means of which individuals act” (Priestley et al., 2015, p. 19). It is further suggested that agency is “a configuration of influences from the *past*, orientations towards the *future* and engagement with the *present*” (Biesta et al., 2015, p. 626; emphasis in original). What Emirbayer and Mische called the chordal

triad of agency, therefore consists of an iterational, a projective and a practical-evaluative dimension, respectively. The iterational dimension will be referred to as *teacher cognition* in this thesis to be consistent with publications included in this compilation thesis. The step that eventually leads to an observable behaviour, will be labelled *evaluation and decision-making* and represents the practical-evaluative dimension.

Teacher Cognition

This cognitive dimension consists of anything “teachers know, belief, and think” (Borg, 2003, p. 81), sorted as “accumulated patterns of thought and actions of the past” (Leijen, Pedaste & Lepp, 2019, p. 3). Before distinctions of constituent parts within this dimension are made, it should be marked explicitly that the usage of the term *cognition* does not imply processes exclusively carried out by individuals. Instead, cognition is understood as socially distributed (Hutchins, 1991) or socially shared (Wertsch, 1991) to the same amount as agency extends beyond the skin (Bateson, 1972) and is frequently a property of groups (Wertsch et al., 1996). Furthermore, the emergence of cognition at a collective level is crucially dependent on communication through human language (Lo Bianco, 2010a).

Even though it is often difficult or even impossible to clearly determine whether the teacher knows or beliefs something (Pajares, 1992) and because the two concepts might not be held distinctively separate in their minds (Borg, 2006), the two categories of teacher competence are often conceived independently. Since beliefs do not have to be consistent or justified when challenged, their epistemological statuses are different (Baumert & Kunter, 2013) than those of facets of knowledge.

Drawing on Baumert and Kunter (2013), knowledge, that is declarative, procedural or strategic, is regarded a key element in teachers’ competence. They present several domains of professional knowledge, following the initial classification by Shulman (1987):

1. Domain-specific knowledge, further differentiated into content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge
2. Generic pedagogical knowledge, including philosophical aspects and facets of lesson planning, classroom management and assessment
3. Counselling and organisational knowledge

Teachers' beliefs on the other hand are often characterised as the affective-motivational aspects of teacher cognition (Borg, 2011) and have been known as a messy construct (Pajares, 1992) of neither observable, nor entirely consciously accessible elements (Rokeach, 1968). These understandings or premises that are personally felt to be true (Richardson, 1996) are not only largely resistant to change (Borg, 2011), but might even be contradictory (Pajares, 1992). An important characteristic of individual beliefs is their subjective origin, which is of particular significance in sociocultural research, where subjective and intersubjective understandings constitute both the world and its experienced forms together with objective forms and systems of activity (Lave & Wenger, 1991). As the autonomy of an individual's cognition, subjectivity "can be seen as the epitome of a person's dispositions and capabilities" (Harteis, Gruber & Lehner, 2006, p. 125).

The origin of beliefs can be manifold as the review by Pajares (1992) shows. Of particular importance is the assumption that beliefs are formed early in life and are continuously tested in new situations. Especially schooling is a prime setting to introduce children to traditions. Biesta (2015) names this dimension of educational purpose *socialisation*, in which "education reproduces existing social structures, divisions and inequalities" (p. 77) and ultimately ensures the continuation of a given way of life, prone to reproducing existing power relations and social inequality (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). The result is what Bourdieu (1977) termed *habitus*, which works more effectively the less conscious teachers are about its existence.

Teacher viewpoints

With the intention to accentuate the predominantly subjective character of the mediated collectivity of elements in teachers' cognition, regardless of consciousness level, the term *viewpoint* will be used in the remainder of this thesis. Not only is this in line with the applied terminology in the second of the two empirical articles in this compilation thesis (article IV¹), but it also illustrates individual and shared cognition as a

¹ In article III, the theoretical framework of teachers' beliefs was used to discuss "teachers' understanding of and pedagogical thinking about multilingualism and multilingual students" LUNDBERG, A. 2019a. Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism: findings from Q method research. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 20, 266-283.

vantage point or way of seeing to analyse specific phenomena, in line with what Best and Kellner (1991) called a *perspective*. Because no outside criterion is applied to viewpoints investigated in this thesis, and because they are always selective, viewpoints reported in the articles of this thesis are “neither right nor wrong” (Brown, 1980, p. 4). It is however self-evident that viewpoints are in more or less agreement with the local policy documents in play or with the current state of research.

Projective Dimension

In order to apply a holistic view of agency, it is important to consider it as temporally situated. Not only does this include the dynamics of a person’s ongoing life history, but also their future goals, expectations and imaginations (Mercer, 2012). In the model by Priestley et al. (2015), future aspirations are further categorised according to their nature as short-term and long-term. Data in Biesta et al. (2015) suggest that most everyday situations requiring a teacher decision, such as student engagement or efficient classroom management, might be based on rather short-term purposes. These dominant decision-making situations and actions stand in contrast to non-dominant ones, often linked to the sustainability of innovations in school (Sannino, 2008). Nevertheless, these long-term aspirations, personal or professional ones, such as providing optimal circumstances for good education (Biesta, 2015) by “reproducing culture and social relations and providing students with tools to participate in society” (Nocon, 2008, p. 340), can as well influence teacher agency, especially under convenient circumstances.

Evaluation and Decision-making

The idea that teacher cognition, consisting of teachers’ beliefs and knowledge, informs teachers’ perceptions, judgements, decision making and guides their behaviour or in other words drives their pedagogical actions is relatively uncontested in research (see e.g. Richardson, 1996, Pajares, 1992, Skott, 2014, OECD, 2009). In order to understand how this is the case, the central dimension of the ecological model of agency is introduced. Essentially, teachers evaluate a particular situation in a cultural, structural and material context, drawing on their individual and shared cognition and relating it to the projective dimension described above. In order to illustrate this dimension, the concept of competence as a continu-

um (Blömeke et al., 2015) is proposed, which highlights the role of perceptual, interpretive and decision-making processes that mediate the transformation of what here is called teacher cognition into performance. The model aims to overcome an unnecessary dichotomy between cognitive and situated perspectives about teacher competence by combining them. As the final step before performance, teacher agency is best characterised as choosing between alternatives and thereby making decisions that eventually lead to “a relevant, inspiring and constructive environment for their pupils and themselves and their colleagues in changing professional contexts” (Toom, Pyhältö & O’Connell Rust, 2015, p. 615). In order to be able to do so, “teachers need to first perceive the enablers, constraints and resources specific to a temporal situation” (Leijen et al., 2019, p. 8). This part of the model describing teachers’ skills to identify noteworthy elements in the classroom is largely in line with research on noticing (see e.g. Meschede, Fiebranz, Möller & Steffensky, 2017, Santagata & Yeh, 2016). In terms of policy documents and interpretations thereof, sense-making theory (Spillane, Reiser & Reimer, 2002, Coburn, 2001) serves as the conceptual basis. What follows then, is their interpretation taking into account traits within the dimension of teacher cognition and purposes described under the projective dimension. The interpretation phase can vary in length, depending on a variety of factors, such as the perceived complexity of the situation, the teacher’s expertise and personal beliefs. In their revision of the concept of competence as a continuum, Santagata and Yeh (2016) stress the potential bi-directionality or even cyclicity of the described transformation processes. In other words, classroom practices are not only to be seen as a result, but can also lead to teachers’ knowledge development and adaptations in their beliefs through the perception and interpretation of them. The ecological model of teacher agency, which serves as a theoretical foundation for this thesis, only detects agency when there are alternatives to choose from and teachers are able to judge the appropriateness of them. Hence, “if the teacher simply follows routinized patterns of habitual behaviour with no consideration of alternatives” (Priestley et al., 2015, p. 141), or because no autonomy is assigned to teachers (Paulsrud & Wermke, 2019), no real agency is performed. With a mentioned (re)turn to teacher agency (Biesta et al., 2015) as “the socioculturally mediated capacity to act” (Ahearn, 2001, p. 112), teachers should not only be given permission to make use of their professional

competence, but also be situated in professional contexts where alternatives exist.

Teachers' Performance

Drawing on the conceptualisation of competence as a continuum (Blömeke et al., 2015), teachers' situated pedagogical actions are the observable results of their decision-making process, or in other words their performance. It is here, where potential enactment of policies or teachers' resistance to it becomes visible. It is also the site where successful learning processes for pupils are initiated. Generic approaches to instructional quality usually comprise classroom management, student support and cognitive activation (Blömeke, Kaiser, König & Jentsch, 2020). If applied to an ecological framework, the collectivity of teachers' performances in a school can be regarded as a basis of the context in and with which pupils' learning and development is shaped. Darling-Hammond, Flook, Cook-Harvey, Barron and Osher (2019) describe a deeply integrated approach to practice by drawing on the science of learning and development (SoLD), presented in a recent synthesis of research (Cantor, Osher, Berg, Steyer & Rose, 2019, Osher, Cantor, Berg, Steyer & Rose, 2020). Based on a whole child approach to education, four areas of SoLD principles of practice are outlined by Darling-Hammond et al. (2019):

1. Supportive environmental conditions that foster strong, positive and sustained relationships and community. As a result, relational trust, continuity and continuous structures contribute to a reduction of anxiety among pupils. Moreover, personalised learning in classroom communities that embrace supportive environments contributes to an increase in pupils' feeling of safety, belonging and purpose regarding their physique, emotions and identity.
2. Productive instructional strategies that support motivation, competence, and well-scaffolded self-directed learning. Characterised by taking pupils' prior knowledge into account and providing formative feedback, these strategies are best applied in connection with rich and engaging tasks. As a further component of this area, collaborative learning opportunities encourage pupils to act in a cooperative and communicative manner.

3. Social and emotional learning that fosters skills, habits, and mindsets that enable academic progress, efficacy, and productive behaviour. Pupils need guidance in developing perseverance, resilience, agency, and self-direction.
4. Systems of support that respond to pupils' needs, and address learning barriers. By granting them access to a range of services, from measures of prevention, on to selective or even intensive intervention in the form of special education, pupils' healthy development is enabled.

Locating teacher performance in the SoLD principles of practice clearly illustrates the cyclic and context-related nature of the central dimension of teacher agency called evaluation and decision-making in this thesis, where practice is described as a source of new information that leads to the adaptation of teacher viewpoints, consisting of knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, and experience.

Development of Teacher Agency

Teacher agency can be developed in many ways. Nevertheless, most advances will be located within the iterational dimension, or what is termed teacher cognition in this thesis, consisting of anything teachers know or believe concerning the subject matter. According to the conceptualisation of teacher agency and teacher beliefs here, professional development for teachers should encourage an innovative, critical and growth-oriented mindset. Due to the early onset of teachers' professional socialisation, including their beliefs, it is a paramount, yet challenging task of teacher education institution to develop teachers' capacity to interrupt their habitual way of thinking about schooling (Priestley et al., 2015). This resonates well with the described difficulty of reforming an educational system by Pajares (1992).

Most students who choose education as a career have had a positive identification with teaching, and this leads to continuity of conventional practice and reaffirmation, rather than challenge, of the past. It does not occur to most preservice teacher, for example, that one of

their future functions might be, should be, as agents for societal change. Students become teachers unable, and subconsciously unwilling, to affect a system in need to reform (p. 323).

A result of this is the resistance to enact new policies, even if they are drawing on up-to-date research and claim to improve education, for example as a form of protective mediation, based on teachers' conviction of their role to protect their pupils from what they consider to be damaging effects of new policies (Osborn, Croll, Broadfoot, Pollard, McNess & Triggs, 1997). This dynamic is particularly relevant for educational reforms consisting of policies that represent a paradigm shift, often characterised by a conglomeration of new approaches and methods. Frequently, these so-called complex and multilevel innovations (Century & Cassata, 2016), and their partial enactment are coupled with a considerable level of self-doubt and uncertainty among teachers (Geijsel, Slegers, van den Berg & Kelchtermans, 2001) as issues of normativity are inevitable (März & Kelchtermans, 2013). What follows from this is the need to raise teachers' awareness of an issue, include them in collaborative policy navigation activities and develop their capacity to act accordingly in the future. This is also, and maybe even more so, true for educators that might not recognise their agency, leaving policy to the domain of politicians and administrators (Hult, 2018a). In the words of Shohamy (2006), and with respect to language policies, uncritical teachers serve as "soldiers of the system" (p. 78).

Policy engagement and ultimately the ability to interpret and evaluate practical teaching situations is not necessarily intuitive and needs to be learned and facilitated. Thereby becoming more effective, confident and successful with students can be trained during initial teacher education (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Much needed guidance and opportunities to reflect on their awareness-raising as shown by Hélot (2010) or Hult (2018a) or with techniques such as dialogic inquiry (Wallen & Tormey, 2019) or learning rounds (Philpott & Oates, 2017) is set to increase opportunities for collective sense-making that eventually reduce teachers' confusion about or superficial and vague understanding of the subject matter (Biesta et al., 2015). In this sense, teacher education is understood as situated learning, where (new) policy and knowledge is discussed through individual and subjective viewpoints drawing on personal and professional

experience. It follows from the ecological understanding of teacher agency in this thesis that attention should not only be paid to the capacities of individuals, but also “the factors and dimensions that shape the ecologies of teachers’ work” (Priestley et al., 2015, p. 3). This could be achieved with further development courses for whole schools to foster their function as a professional learning community.

In this chapter, it was outlined how teacher agency in a general educational enactment framework is conceptualised. The following chapter will introduce the field of educational language policy as the chosen focal point to investigate how teacher agency is promoted or inhibited related to questions of language and multilingualism.

EDUCATIONAL LANGUAGE POLICY AND MULTILINGUALISM

Subsequent to the previous chapter's introduction to educational policy enactment, the present chapter will now explore the problematic issue education systems face when serving a linguistically diverse society with a traditional agenda to suppress the very same linguistic diversity. In the words of sociolinguist Dell Hymes (1996), schools' language-related hidden curriculum serves "a latent function of the educational system [...] to instill linguistic insecurity, to discriminate linguistically, to channel children in ways that have an integral linguistic component, while appearing open and fair to all" (p. 84). Gogolin (1994) coined the term *monolingual habitus*, and described it as "the deep-seated habit of assuming monolingualism as the norm in a nation" (Gogolin, 2013, p. 41). She was thereby inspired by Pierre Bourdieu's (1977) use of the term *habitus* as a deep structural disposition that is acquired in the course of social interaction for a modus which generates dynamic changes in human activity.

Consequently, it becomes apparent how language may reinforce disparities in educational outcomes and potentially jeopardise the quality of education received by linguistic minorities (Piller, 2016a). This present project sheds light on multilingualism in educational settings and therefore locates itself as a study within the wider field of educational language policy and planning. Language policy and planning (henceforth LPP) is an area within language studies with a wide range of "conceptual frameworks for understanding the policymaking process in various social contexts" (Tollefson, 2013, p. 25). Recent developments in LPP have yielded a stronger focus on individuals, such as teachers in educa-

tional settings, and made its research “more reflective and open to diverse kinds of socio-political activities” (Lo Bianco, 2017, p. 31) in what used to be a field traditionally dominated by the top-down planning and policymaking by the state to resolve problems of national construction (Fishman, 1972). It is valuable to clarify that the conceptualisation of the notion of *problems* has evolved in line with LPP as a field. While Fishman’s use of the word is connected to linguistic conflicts in the process of nation-building efforts (Ruíz, 1984), problems in contemporary LPP are simply to be understood “as issues or themes that emerge from practical needs and circumstances” (Hult & Hornberger, 2016, p. 34).

Through their agency within different scales, teachers as an important group of stakeholders in the discussion of wicked problems such as multilingualism, can allow anything between the creation of “areas in language policies that can be leveraged or exploited to promote multilingual education” (Hult, 2014b, p. 168) known as implementational spaces (Hornberger, 2002) and the implementation of a more traditional approach influenced by a monolingual habitus (Gogolin, 1994). In other words, teacher viewpoints are a key mechanism through which local policy discourses are shaped in schools and classrooms.

Language-in-education Planning

Due to the common existence of explicit national or regional educational language policies, language policy and planning is to a high degree often dependent upon state-owned education systems as the sites for powerful mechanisms in creating and imposing language behaviour (Shohamy, 2006). The expectancy of teachers to navigate these policies in light of their viewpoints, consisting of the various elements of teacher cognition described earlier, transforms educational contexts into powerful arenas of LPP. Within the theoretical orientation of LPP called *acquisition planning* (Cooper, 1989), which is also referred to as language-in-education planning (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997), educational language policy research has been established as a vibrant field “to expose and challenge hegemonic practices, to understand the historical and structural forces that influence LPP, and to work toward a social justice agenda, that has as its focus equal education opportunity for minority-language users” (Johnson & Pratt, 2014, p. 5). This also strongly resonates with

the definition of language planning provided by Mühlhäusler (2003) who applies the idea of language ecology to the field:

In an ecological approach language planning is seen as a process which is a part and closely interrelated with a large range of natural and cultural ecological factors. It is focused on the question of maintaining maximum diversity of languages by seeking to identify those ecological factors that sustain linguistic diversity. Linguistic diversity in turn is seen as a precondition of maintaining cultural and biological diversity. The ultimate aim of ecological language planning differs from most conventional approaches to language planning both in its aims (diversity rather than standardisation) and the aims required (community involvement rather than specialist management) (p. 306).

Ecology of language was set forth as “the study of interactions between any given language and its environment” (p. 325) by Einar Haugen in 1972 and has since then become an important conceptual orientation in language policy and planning for researchers focusing “on relationships among languages, on relationships among social contexts of language, on relationships among individual speakers and their languages, and on inter-relationships among these three dimensions” (Hornberger & Hult, 2008, p. 285). As a matter of course, drawing on language ecology, linguistic diversity and multilingualism are seen as the normal condition in human societies and the various relationships mentioned above “need to be understood and addressed in order to foster parity for all people in a polity, regardless of the language(s) they speak, particularly with respect to education” (Hult, 2013, p. 2).

Language Management

A useful understanding of language policy is its dichotomy of overt, explicit, *de jure* policies on the one hand side and covert, implicit, *de facto* policies on the other hand side. In other words, much of what would be regarded as language planning occurs informally and hidden and might be contradictory or at least challenging or subverting *de jure* policies (Schiffman, 1996). This holds of course true for educational settings as well, as only a few schools have explicit language policies. In fact, they

might be reacting to national or regional policies in their official language management strategies (Spolsky, 2009) and yet, “the real language policy of a community is more likely to be found in its practices” (Spolsky, 2004, p. 222). Spolsky’s suggestion of considering language policy from the point of view of practice highlights the close connection of language policy and the notion of policy enactment and enables investigations into the negotiations of contested ideas “in attempts to influence language behaviour in schools and classrooms” (Hult, 2018b, p. 39). His tripartite definition of language policy consists of “three interrelated but independently describable components—practice, beliefs, and management” (Spolsky, 2009, p. 4) and illustrates the vital role of teachers as language policy arbiters (Johnson, 2013a, Menken & García, 2010) and their influential viewpoints about language in general and named languages, varieties, and features in particular. For the conceptualisation of shared viewpoints, this thesis draws on the notion of linguistic culture, a term introduced by Schiffman (1996) to summarise the totality of a speech community’s beliefs about language in general and its language in particular. Beliefs in his usage of the term encompasses even “behaviours, assumptions, cultural forms, prejudices, folk belief systems, attitudes, stereotypes, ways of thinking about language, and religio-historical circumstances associated with a particular language” (p.5). It is self-explanatory that Schiffman’s notion of linguistic culture is made up of highly subjective elements, potentially far from objective truth and therefore similar to the aforementioned notion of cognition in terms of its epistemological nature.

The third component of Spolsky’s (2009) definition of language policy is “the explicit and observable effort by someone or some group that has or claims to have authority over the participants in the domain to modify their practices or beliefs” (p. 4). In the educational domain, any pedagogical actions by teachers concerning issues of multilingualism can be regarded as language management tools in their classrooms. According to Spolsky (2009), determining aspects of official language use by law in a polity is the most obvious form of organised language management. He continues by mentioning the “requirement to use a specific language as language of instruction in schools” (p. 5) as an example. The issue of medium-of-instruction is interesting for language classes and of even greater relevance for subject classes as it defines the access

to content for pupils with limited knowledge in the local school language. Depending on the totality of their teacher cognition, labelled teacher viewpoints, the local habits and traditions in the school and the wider ideological climate of the society, teachers will decide upon the situated language policy in line with anything between target-language-only and a translingual pedagogy that welcomes all the languages spoken by pupils at home. If these two outcomes are seen as the tail ends of the continuum, it can also be expected to find teachers opting for extenuated versions or combination. Their management of the situation is not only, but also based on the potential insecurity about the outcome of their decisions or discrepancies between their own preferences and eventual official recommendations.

Even if the issue of medium-of-instruction only serves as an example, it is in this context that the present thesis investigates teachers' viewpoints about multilingualism which is ultimately "associated with shared communication, social cohesion and economic and civic betterment" (Lo Bianco, 2017, p. 46).

Multilingualism

Language, whether spoken or written, is inseparably embedded in networks of sociocultural relations (Ahearn, 2001) and understood as the most important factor of educational success as it is used to organise knowledge and create meaning. However, neither languages nor their speakers do start out equal. Speakers of other languages than the dominant local school language are discriminated against because they have only limited access to resources (Blackledge, 2008).

Multilingualism has existed for as long as human societies (see e.g. Lo Bianco, 2010a, Douglas Fir Group, 2016), even if the phenomenon has taken different forms and popularity throughout history. As a consequence, there does not exist a unified theory of multilingualism (Coulmas, 2018) and the term and the concept behind it are far from being unequivocally understood (Melo-Pfeifer, 2018). While Laakso, Sarhimaa, Spiliopoulou Åkermark and Toivanen (2016) state that the default case of multilingualism is people with an assumedly monolingual background acquiring major European languages, a research overview about multilingualism by Hyltenstam, Axelsson and Lindberg (2012) mainly discusses migration-induced multilingualism. As the

phenomenon of multilingualism seems to become more complex, its terminological clarification is crucial (Bonnet & Siemund, 2018), especially during a time of a paradigmatic shift in the conceptualisation of language and multilingualism in education, which is sometimes referred to as *the multilingual turn* (May, 2014b, Conteh & Meier, 2014).

A first distinction in multilingualism can be drawn between its societal and individual dimension (Cenoz, 2013). The former is characterised by a sociolinguistic orientation of the study of language use in a social context, such as a country, but also a school or a classroom. Research about societal multilingualism traditionally focuses on assumingly monolingual speakers in the same social context. Individual multilingualism on the other hand, is also known as plurilingualism (Moore & Gajo, 2009). To ensure continuity with earlier research as much as respect the dominant use of the respective translations in the study's contexts (in German-speaking Switzerland: *Mehrsprachigkeit* and *mehrsprachig* and in Sweden: *flerspråkighet* and *flerspråkig*), the terms *multilingualism* and *multilingual* are used as umbrella terms including both dimensions of the concept supported by a wider understanding of societal multilingualism including every social context inhabited of multilingual individuals, as they automatically generate a multilingual context.

Despite the different levels of complexity of bilingualism and multilingualism (Aronin & Jessner, 2015), in the present thesis, the former is understood as a form of the latter (Cenoz, 2013). While illustrating the full complexity of multilingualism is not the aim here, the present description of multilingualism lays the foundation for the methodological choices outlined later.

Concerning individual multilingualism, the tensions between traditional understandings of language as a bounded entity in the individual and more recent discourses are evident and depict the shift from the monolingual stage to the multilingual stage regarding the awareness of language and languages (Aronin & Singleton, 2019). Central to the understanding of individual multilingualism is the notion of linguistic repertoire, which was developed by John Gumperz from an interactional perspective in the 1960s as the arsenal from where the speakers choose from “in accordance with the meanings they wish to convey” (Gumperz, 1964, p. 138). The original concept has been re-examined, explicitly used or implicitly referred to several times in more recent research

(Busch, 2012). Blommaert (2010) for example, uses it to argue in favour of a transition from immobile languages to mobile resources and Blackledge and Creese (2014) use it to illustrate language use as heteroglossic practice, which is connected to concepts such as translanguaging (García, 2009), codemeshing (Canagarajah, 2011), polylingual languaging (Jørgensen, 2008) or metrolingualism (Otsuji & Pennycook, 2010).

In the context of this thesis, the domain of individual multilingualism is further divided into two areas of multilingual development, which are presented in the following section.

Multilingual Development

The previously mentioned multilingual turn comprises a recommendation to include linguistic diversity among pupils in teaching practices (Hélot, 2012), creating a tension to the usual organisation of compulsory schools as monolingual spaces (Piller, 2016b). To do justice to individual linguistic repertoires, prevent the creation of a new form of linguistic homogeneity by stereotyping pupils as simply diverse (Melo-Pfeifer, 2018), and respect children's linguistic human rights (Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1994), it is vital to investigate the wide range of reasons and sources of individuals' multilingual repertoire. This in turn will allow teachers to respond accurately to pupils' needs, not only in language learning, but in general knowledge development and create a linguistically and culturally responsive classroom. The division of multilingualism into curricular and biographic domains is based on the continuum between "becoming multilingual" and "being multilingual" proposed by Cenoz and Gorter (2015) and a further development into a double-helixed continuum by Melo-Pfeifer (2018). The result is the reflection of a more complex sociolinguistic reality by recognising individuals' agency in language learning.

Curricular Multilingualism

In this thesis, any context of institutional language teaching and learning that "involves the introduction of a new language into an existing language ecology" (Mühlhäusler, 1994, p. 123) is part of what Krumm (2004) named curricular multilingualism. In his definition, the term represents a coordinated diversity, where "teachers of one language are informed of what the teachers of other languages do" (p. 71). The concept

of curricular multilingualism applied in this thesis is therefore also in line with the Council of Europe's (2009) holistic vision of language education and refers to three different groups of target audiences:

- Immigrant groups learning the local dominant language and medium of instruction of public education
- Indigenous or autochthonous populations receiving input in their language
- Foreign or modern language teaching, usually limited to a number of prestigious named languages

According to Krumm (2004), an integral part of curricular multilingualism is the recommendation for teachers to be “informed about the other languages of their students” (p. 71), which allows the transition to the second domain, that of biographic multilingualism.

Biographic Multilingualism

Origins of biographic multilingualism can be diverse and some of the most prevalent ones are presented here. First of all, individuals can be biographically multilingual as a result of growing up with more than one variety due to their guardians' different language varieties and the application of the one-parent-one-language approach. In cases without mutual understanding of the guardians, a family language is added, resulting in three different languages within the child's home. Growing up as an indigenous minority and speaking the dominant local variety along with the autochthonous language is a further origin of biographic multilingualism. The European Charter of Regional and Minority Languages provides a legal basis for the protection of national minorities. Especially migration-induced or allochthonous multilingualism has received much attention due to accelerated migration flows in recent decades. It has to be noted that fully capturing migration as a nuanced concept as e.g. illustrated by Gogolin and Pries (2004) is beyond the scope of the present thesis.

Further, language internal multilingualism (de Cillia, 2010) acknowledges the fact that even ‘monolinguals’ shuttle between codes, registers, and discourses. They can thus hardly be described as monolinguals. This is especially important in German-speaking regions and resonates with the diglossia-with-bilingualism situation (Fishman, 1967) in Swit-

zerland, as long as German and Swiss-German are classified as different languages (Bundesamt für Statistik, 2017). The notion of biographic multilingualism could even be extended to included dialectal variation due to increased level of educatedness or simply because of age.

In sum, the present outline of multilingualism as a phenomenon illustrates that nearly everybody is multilingual, albeit to different degrees and because of different circumstances, leading to a diverse perception among teachers as research shows.

Language Orientations

Research on teacher cognition about multilingualism has been described as surprisingly scarce (Haukås, 2016, Bravo Granström, 2019) in general and nearly inexistent if participants are not only teachers of language subjects. Some exceptions are studies by Portolés and Martí (2018) or Hammer, Viesca, Ehmke and Heinz (2018). A recent review study about the non-native speaker teacher as a proficient multilingual (Calafato, 2019) summarises that both positive and negative attitudes toward multilingualism are found in research. In sum, it can be acknowledged that the discrepancy between longstanding, often unquestioned monoglossic professional traditions and research promoting a more heteroglossic approach to learning and teaching are immense. The described tension has been discussed intensively, especially in contexts, such as Germany and Australia, where language and education policies are enacted within powerful national discourses that regard language as a key element in the process of national-building (Ellis et al., 2010) and monolingualism as the unmarked case (Ellis, 2006).

In a larger scheme, general tendencies in teacher cognition about multilingualism can be organised into three fundamental orientations, set forth by Ruíz (1984). Ruíz distinguished between a) language as problem, b) language as right and c) language as resource. (Pre)dispositions of these orientations are given in Hult and Hornberger (2016). While these orientations were meant to be ideological and underlying specific policies, they can also be interpreted as intrinsic elements of teachers' professional habitus and therefore be regarded as vital elements in teachers' language management situation concerning multilingualism.

Language as problem – monolingual habitus

The ultimate goal of a language as problem orientation is to limit or even remove societal multilingualism through a language shift towards the dominant majority language (Lo Bianco, 2017, Ruíz, 2010). Eliminating linguistic diversity, because it poses a threat to national unity as touched upon earlier is characteristic for an assimilationist mindset and has been termed *linguistic genocide* by Skutnabb-Kangas (2000). In the educational setting, such as the language teaching classroom, a language as problem orientation is seen by a target-language-only approach mentioned earlier, labelled as the *maximum exposure fallacy* by Skutnabb-Kangas (2000). Establishing monolingualism in the official national language in education is seen as “an imperative in a teacher’s professional ethos” (Gogolin, 2013, p. 42) and relegates multilingualism, in particular migration-induced forms, to illegitimate practices (Gogolin & Duarte, 2013). Considering biographic multilingualism as a burden and regarding learners as deficient if they do not speak the language of instruction (Benson, 2013), has also been labelled monolingual bias (Kachru, 1994) or monolingual mindset (Clyne, 2005, Clyne, 2008). The ideological position described by Clyne is especially prevailing in English speaking countries, where there is “a strong belief in the normality and sufficiency of monolingualism in English for both intranational and international communication” (Liddicoat, 2019, p. 159). Hélot (2007) coined the term *ignored bilingualism* to describe the failed acknowledgement of the fact that pupils are multilingual, with previous knowledge of other languages.

Gogolin (1994) calls it highly paradoxical that biographically multilingual children are forced to be monolingual in order to then become multilingual through language teaching and learning in schools and Cummins (2005) described it as a bizarre scenario in North American schools, when multilinguals are transformed into monolingual English speakers. It becomes apparent that varieties in the linguistic repertoire of pupils are implicitly and explicitly divided into two groups according to their perceived usefulness of certain languages in a particular context; high-status and low-status languages. Ellis et al. (2010) make use of the language hierarchy framework to illustrate how national languages are most prestigious, followed by foreign languages or in some contexts called modern languages. Languages of the community, which have

been discussed earlier in the section about biographic multilingualism find themselves at the bottom of the hierarchical structure.

Language as right – linguistic human rights

The second orientation described by Ruíz “seeks to address linguistically-based inequities using compensatory legal mechanisms” (Hult & Hornberger, 2016, p. 35), such as the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages as an illustrative example of setting forth rights for certain linguistic minorities in education by the government (Hult, 2014b). Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) outlines several language-in-education rights as fundamental enough to consider them as linguistic human rights. Notable examples are the right to identify, learn and develop one’s mother tongue and receive education through the medium of one’s mother tongue. Another one, which is of prime importance against the backdrop of increased international migration and a linguistically highly diverse student population is the right to benefit from education regardless of one’s mother tongue, and therefore directly linked to equal access to education and democracy (de Jong, 2016).

Language as resource – multilingualism as resource

In order to introduce the third orientation originally outlined by Ruíz (1984), the slightly different, but closely related concept of multilingualism as resource (Lo Bianco, 2017) is presented and enriched with findings from recent research. Multilingualism can be regarded as an intellectual resource, due to multilingual speakers’ increased mental control and cognitive flexibility (Bialystok, 2011), higher meta-linguistic awareness (Bialystok, 2001) and more efficient learning of additional languages due to a common underlying proficiency (Cummins, 1981), their strategic repertoire (Herdina & Jessner, 2002) or emotional and cognitive factors underlying multiple language learning (Hufeisen & Gibson, 2003).

If construed positively, multilingualism is seen as a cultural resource, as it not only increases “the number of cultural expressions and perspectives available to citizens” (Lo Bianco, 2017, p. 43), but also allows the speaker “to see the world through different lenses” (Fürst & Grin, 2018, p. 343). Maintaining a heritage family language has vital benefits for intergenerational ties and health issues. If, however, multilingualism is

based on monolingual orientations, pressure and anxiety not only cause linguistic, but also social and psychological costs for individuals, families and society (Sevinç, 2020). In terms of multilingualism as an economic resource, the benefits are selective along the line of high and low status languages. Nevertheless, being multilingual has positive effects on earnings (Grin, Sfreddo & Vaillancourt, 2010). Multilingualism can as well be regarded as a resource to additional rights that allow individuals to access “unique cultural traditions, identity, ways of life, stocks of knowledge and social traditions” (Lo Bianco, 2017, p. 45). In a more abstract way, multilingualism is perceived as a resource of active citizenship, as human encounters are ultimately communicative in nature.

STUDY CONTEXTS

Drawing on sociocultural theory and an ecological framework of teacher agency in a policy enactment setting, the notion of context is central in this thesis. As Lo Bianco (2007) points out, all educational practices are inextricably connected to the socio-political context in which they arise and the purposes they serve. Moreover, context is regarded to be “continuously (re)created by social actions” (Hult, 2019a, p. 138). Therefore, the complexities of the contexts in this comparative case study research need to be brought into a coherent framework, including information about the historical political formation, which led to their current structural composition. Furthermore, the societal composition of the contexts’ inhabitants navigating in-between the predominant national (language) identity and the official language policies needs to be addressed.

At first however, it has to be acknowledged that this thesis is written in a European context, a continent which has been characterised as linguistically highly diverse due to the large number of separate political entities, most of them defined by a common language as a unifying element and driver of national cohesion. At the same time, the formation of nation states has resulted in a substantial restriction of linguistic pluralism (Lo Bianco, 2017). Through immigration, from outside of Europe, but also within the continent based on the ideal of Europe-wide mobility, a new vibrancy in terms of multilingualism and language policy has been described (Castles & Miller, 2009). At the same time, European education policies have shown paradoxical elements in terms of multilingualism (Johnson, 2013b), celebrating linguistic diversity as a defining feature of the European Union on the one hand and privileging its official languages on the other hand (European Commission, 2004). De-

velopments towards a more inclusive approach are detectable in a more recent document, where member states are encouraged “to provide training in the local language(s) of the host country and show respect for [migrants’] mother tongues” (European Commission, 2015, p. 16). Drawing on an ecological understanding of language, this thesis investigates stakeholders’ viewpoints about multilingualism, closely connected to changed relationships among languages and speakers of these languages due to the aforementioned developments.

Some noteworthy differences between Sweden and Switzerland are to be found in the two countries’ political organisation and their language history (including ideologies and policies). History “occupies an important position in most work in language policy and planning, whether at the micro-level of interpersonal communication or the macro-level of state formation” (Ricento, 2006, p. 129). Given that “states typically license, authorize, fund, or certify educational practices” (Lo Bianco, 2008), differences in the political formation of states influence their educational systems and curricula, resulting in great diversity concerning the roles of various languages in education (Cenoz & Gorter, 2012). Taking into account the political underpinnings of language policy and planning in the studied contexts is also an important feature of ecological research in general (Hornberger & Hult, 2008).

In the remainder of this chapter the key differences of the contexts under scrutiny in this research project are presented, starting with Sweden, which is investigated in articles I and III, followed by Switzerland, chosen as the focal point in articles I and IV. The chapter concludes with an outline of the similar societal composition of the two contexts.

Sweden

Ethnic Nation State

Sweden is a prime example of an ethnic nation founded on *jus sanguinis* (‘blood right’) as an extension of an ethnic group (Oakes, 2001). The characteristics of a nation-state in Europe “provide the key organising discourse of identity in the 20th century, and the model for similar processes and institutions elsewhere” (Tollefson, 2013, p. 14). One of the central issues in the formation of national communities in the 17th and 18th centuries was the standardisation of state languages. A common

language was thereafter seen as the core element in a common culture to promote effective communication and access to state institutions and to create and reinforce a collective political identity (Tollefson, 2013). Sweden is an illustrative example of a nation-state, in which a national language is used for social cohesion and elevated to the role of safeguarding a national culture and identity (Cots, Lasagabaster & Garrett, 2012). As a result, public monolingualism in the national language is taken for granted by citizens of a specific nation-state (May, 2014a). To maintain cultural and linguistic pluralism, nation-states are requested to address their fear of losing national cohesion and related notions of social and political stability due to linguistic diversity, especially against the backdrop of an increasingly globalised world (May, 2017) and navigate towards social cohesion and common citizenship based on “shared forms of communication and comprehension, not monolingualism” (Lo Bianco, 2010a, p. 39).

Linguistic Ecology of Sweden

Between 1960-90, Swedish language learning politics was characterised by enthusiasm to offer immigrants the possibility to develop Swedish and maintain their mother tongues, establishing a pluralist perspective at the central political level (Hyltenstam et al., 2012) and earning the country the description as a “relatively well-developed policy infrastructure and a policy tradition of equity, which lay good foundations for policy action for migrant education” (OECD, 2015, p. 34). Since then and particularly since Sweden’s accession to the European Union in 1995, Sweden has promoted language policies that aimed at protecting the Swedish language, especially vis-à-vis English (Milani, 2008). Hornberger and Hult (2008) state that “the latest LPP challenge for Sweden, has been to balance a pluralistic orientation to linguistic diversity with strengthening the status of Swedish” (p. 286). The Language Council’s action programme and the recommendation report (SOU, 2002) leading to the Swedish Language Act² that officialised Swedish as the ‘principal’ language of the country in 2009 mainly focused on Swedish and English and was criticised for not adequately acknowledging the wider linguistic diversity in Sweden (Boyd & Huss, 1999). In fact,

² A more detailed description of the Swedish Language Act can be found in article 1.

the formation of one official national language not only suppresses its strongest rival, English in this case, but constrains multilingualism (Liddicoat & Taylor-Leech, 2015) and can be understood as an achievement of national hegemony (Blackledge, 2008, p. 31). Taking into account the official minority languages of Sweden; Finnish, Sámi, Meänkieli, Romani Chip, and Yiddish, language policy in the Scandinavian country could in fact be regarded as a multilingual one. Drawing on Heller (1999) however, ratifying the Council of Europe Framework convention for the Protection of National Minorities and the European Charter of Regional and Minority Languages can be interpreted as an exclusion of linguistic minorities by a monolingual stance based on nationalism.

The role of English in the linguistic ecology of Sweden is of particular interest, as the linguistic hierarchy of the country shows the global lingua franca elevated in comparison to languages other than Swedish (Josephson, 2004). As the role of English as neither a second, nor a foreign, but a transcultural language is continually negotiated (Hult, 2012), teachers' interpretation of educational language policy concerning English and other languages in relation to English is challenging.

Swedish Educational Language Policy

Swedish compulsory education comprises 10 years of schooling, starting in preschool class, also known as class 0, during the calendar year the child turns six. Generally, Swedish is used as the medium of instruction, with the exception of language subjects of languages other than Swedish. The current Swedish national curriculum (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2015) was published in 2015 and has since been revised yearly.

En skola för alla – One school for all, has been the motto for the Swedish education system since the 1980 version of the curriculum (Lgr 80) and describes a school system with a high degree of participation, integration and inclusion. Among the various potential factors of exclusion, this thesis obviously focuses on language and multilingualism. A recent study by Paulsrud et al. (2020) explored how multilingualism is represented in the Swedish national compulsory school curriculum, utilising the three language orientations (Ruiz, 1984) discussed above. Their conclusions are rather sobering, as a recognition of the full use of

linguistic resources for learning subject content, which would indicate a language as resource orientation, is largely missing. This is even more alarming when taking into consideration that the Swedish curriculum limits the use of the concept of multilingualism to minority language students, clearly showing a language as problem orientation.

What follows is an overview of language subjects in the Swedish curriculum for compulsory education, where they are treated as “separate units, each with specific goals and learning outcomes” (Rosén, 2017, pp. 44-45). The following descriptions represent the larger policy discourses that characterise the context in which teachers in Sweden work.

Dominant school language

According to the Swedish curriculum (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2015), “the school is responsible for ensuring that each pupil on completing compulsory school can use the Swedish language, both in speech and writing, in a rich and varied way” (p. 11). There exist two subjects to achieve this aim, namely Swedish and Swedish as a Second language, which is described below. In the introduction for both subjects, it is stated that “language is the primary tool human beings use for thinking, communicating and learning” (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2015, p. 87). As found by Paulsrud et al. (2020), the usage of the term *language* in the curriculum only refers to Swedish and therefore indicates a “reinforcement of the monolingual orientation” (p. 10).

First additional language teaching and learning

English was introduced as the first compulsory foreign language in 1962 and enjoys a high status in the Swedish national curriculum (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2015), where the aim is stated that pupils can “communicate in English, both in the spoken and the written language” (p. 11). It is the responsibility of individual schools to choose the age of onset of English teaching between school years 1 and 3.

Second additional language teaching and learning

The Swedish Language Act suggests the implementation of the European Union policy objective of *mother tongue plus two other languages* (European Commission, 2004), which says that all European citizens should have skills and knowledge in at least three languages. The sub-

ject of modern languages in Swedish compulsory education entails a language option, offering pupils a selection of languages to choose from. Even though pupils often show positive attitudes toward an additional language, such for example French, Spanish and German (Henry & Apelgren, 2008), they frequently opt for more lessons in Swedish and English, as Tholin (2012) shows. Not only does this lead to a non-implementation of the above mentioned objective of mother tongue plus two, but it also confirms the status as English as a transcultural language (Hult, 2012), which together with Swedish is considered to be sufficient for intranational and international communication and therefore hinders the development of linguistic diversity in Sweden (Cabau, 2014).

Measures to foster multilingual development

In line with the discourse of multilingualism being limited to pupils with other mother tongues than Swedish, there are three noteworthy efforts of the Swedish school system for the development of individual multilingualism. First of all, these pupils have the opportunity to study the majority language in a specifically tailored subject, which gained separate status as early as 1995. In terms of curricular content, goal and grading criteria, Swedish as a second language is largely similar to Swedish. However, Paulsrud et al. (2020) in their analysis of the current curriculum, found indications for a deficit orientation towards pupils studying Swedish as a second language. This is in line with a Siekkinen (2017) who states that second-language speakers are seen as deviant from the perceived norm in the Swedish education system.

As a second measure, mother tongue instruction was established in 1977 and has its own syllabus since the 2011 version of the Swedish curriculum and states that “teaching should give pupils the opportunities to develop their cultural identity and become multilingual” (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2015, p. 87). The organisation of mother tongue instruction lies in the municipalities’ responsibility, indicating a tension between official support for the development and use of one’s own mother tongue in the Swedish Language Act and a marginalisation of the actual practice by excluding it from official organisation of schooling. In the current Swedish curriculum, the term *multilingual* is only mentioned in the section about mother tongue instruction and the syllabi for minority languages. The conclusion can be drawn that ac-

cording to the official Swedish curriculum, only children with another mother tongue than Swedish can become multilingual and thereby affording “more space for the analysis and development of Swedish” (Hedman & Magnusson, 2019, p. 3).

The third effort to foster multilingual development in Sweden is study guidance in the mother tongue or sometimes referred to as multilingual study guidance, as there are often several languages used during involved interactions (Reath Warren, 2017). The aim of this measure is the support of often relatively recently arrived pupils to achieve the learning goals of the curriculum, as the subjects are usually taught in Swedish.

Multilingualism in Swedish Teacher Education

In Sweden, teachers are encouraged to interpret standardised national curricula directly (Selin & Holmqvist Olander, 2015, Helgøy & Homme, 2007) drawing “upon their training, experiences, beliefs and ideas” (Hult, 2014b, p. 168). The fact that the culture in Swedish schools has traditionally been based on trust (OECD, 2015) is as well supported by results from Paulsrud et al. (2020), who state that “the current curriculum places great responsibility on teacher agency to implement classroom practices which support the languages of all students” (p. 12). However, as indicated in Wermke and Forsberg (2017), an increased system of evaluation, as a consequence of the strongly criticised decentralisation of the Swedish school system (Carlgren, 2009), has restricted Swedish teachers’ autonomy in recent years. As shown earlier in the section about the development of teacher agency (p. 29), teachers are often dependent on guidance and support for a successful navigation of policies. According the OECD report from 2015, Swedish teachers generally receive little training on the curriculum by education providers. This is of particular relevance with a non-prescriptive curriculum as the Swedish one. More than a decade ago, Carlson (2009) noted the problematic issue of the missing multilingual perspective in Swedish teacher education. More recently, Paulsrud and Lundberg (2020, forthcoming) have analysed how pre-service teachers in Sweden are prepared to teach multilingual pupils at six universities in across the country and conclude that there still do not exist standard measures in teacher education focusing on multilingualism. They noted four themes emerging in their analy-

sis, which are, unsurprisingly largely in line with the description and analysis of the Swedish curriculum above:

1. The Swedish language is seen as synonymous with language
2. Issues of multilingualism are mainly found in language subjects
3. The English language maintains high status in the Swedish compulsory school
4. The concept of multilingualism is usually relegated to migration-induced multilingualism.

In essence, the context of Sweden shows a variety of welcoming and inclusive aspects on an overt policy level. In more covert terms, the portrayal of Sweden is largely in line with a typical nation state, where the idea of *One nation – One language* is still prevalent.

Switzerland

Willensnation

While most modern states around Switzerland followed the ideology of the unitary nation state in the 19th century, this central European country chose to continue following the principle of friendly co-existence. During a process of slow growth since 1291, when the first three cantons created an alliance against the imperialism of surrounding states, other languages than German were added in the 18th and 19th century. Switzerland had always preserved and propagated the particularism and autonomy of its different cantons and is not formed by common language or race, but a political thought and will. This *Willensnation* or ‘nation of the will’ was defined “by its linguistic diversity [...] not in spite of it” (Grin, 1999, p. 2, emphasis in original).

Today, Switzerland is a prime example of a starkly decentralised federation consisting of 26 mostly monolingual cantons. However, linguistic boundaries do not correspond with political intercantonal boundaries, resulting in three bilingual and one trilingual canton. In contrast to other multilingual countries, Swiss linguistic boundaries neither correspond with religious boundaries. The concept of linguistic boundaries is of prime importance for the Swiss context and will be discussed below in connection with the principle of territoriality in Swiss language policy.

The Principle of Territoriality

Official policies of multilingualism, such as in Switzerland do not automatically entail individual multilingualism. Swiss citizens are by no means proficient in all four official languages of the country (Werlen, Baumgartner & Rosenberger, 2009). One of the main features of Swiss language policy is territoriality, or the territorial solution to multilingualism (McRae, 1975, Spolsky, 2009), by which language rights are granted to all inhabitants of a specific territory in a specific national language spoken in this territory. While the principle of territoriality is often criticised for its inherent tendency to homogenise the linguistic map (Berthele & Wittlin, 2013), it also protects demographically weaker groups from the pressure of the majority culture, under the condition these groups live in a territory that is recognised as a historically legitimate one. By the application of the principle of territoriality, Switzerland preserves and praises the equality of (its national) languages and in that way promotes multilingualism. Nevertheless, the Swiss celebration of linguistic diversity has been criticised and described as selective (Berthele, 2020). Not only exist legitimate concerns in terms of Switzerland's handling of migration-induced multilingualism, but also the most common spoken mother tongue in Switzerland – Swiss-German.

The German-speaking region of Switzerland is often seen as a typical example of diglossia (Ferguson, 1991) and discrepancy between overt and covert language policy (Schiffman, 1996), because Swiss-German, the unmarked choice in everyday life, is not mentioned in the Swiss Federal Constitution. A recent analysis of a variety of teaching materials and policy documents from around 1950 until 2016 (Berthele, 2020) shows that while Swiss-German was previously seen “as a source of interference *and* national or local pride” (p. 7, emphasis in original), it has almost entirely disappeared on a pedagogical level in more recent years.

Within federal administration, the principle of territoriality has led to the implementation of receptive multilingualism, also known as the Swiss model of plurilingual communication (Lüdi, 2007). Representatives are expected to productively use the respective language of their territory and understand the others' languages. The model is mostly used in German-French interactions (Berthele & Wittlin, 2013).

Swiss Educational Language Policy

In Switzerland, the principle of subsidiarity ensures that all tasks that are not explicitly assigned to the federal level, fall within the remit of the cantons and the municipalities. This is also the case for the organisation of schools, which jeopardises smooth intercantonal mobility of families with school children due to potentially differing curricula (Stotz, 2006). The issue is counteracted through the intercantonal coordination by the Swiss Conference of Cantonal Ministers of Education (EDK) and a large-scale harmonisation process, known as HarmoS (EDK, 2007), has drastically reduced the number of curricula to three, one for each large language region. The present thesis focuses on *Lehrplan 21* (D-EDK, 2016) for German-speaking Switzerland. Swiss compulsory education comprises 11 years of schooling, including two years of kindergarten. Hence, year 5 equals two years of kindergarten and three years of primary school.

The specific context of article IV is located in the language boarder canton of Berne. Given the curricular difference in the order of foreign languages between the cantons along the German-French language boarder and German-speaking cantons farther away due to a range of discourses outlined in Stotz (2006), the so-called *Passepartout Curriculum* (Bertschy et al., 2015) is used as a reference for the description of the educational language policy situation concerning foreign languages in Switzerland. Even though separate languages are still taught in a chronological addition, *Passepartout*, following the EDK's *Strategy of Language Teaching* (EDK, 2004), represents a combined curriculum for French and English aiming to foster a dialogue between languages and the promotion of linguistic and cultural competence development. With various suggestions and recommendations of teaching methods and clearly stated desired outcomes, the curriculum can be regarded as prescriptive (Ellis, 2004) and an instrument in an input controlling governance regime (Wermke & Forsberg, 2017, Hopmann, 2003). With its foundation on the characteristics of the multilingual turn (May, 2014b), the leap from the previous curriculum to *Passepartout* represents a paradigmatic shift, forcing teachers to navigate between long standing codes, norms and conventions (Kramsch, 2014) and a new educational language policy.

The following presentation of language subjects, all grouped in a specialised area called *languages*, serves as a description of the current policy context of teachers in the German speaking part of the Canton of Berne. A common section describes the significance and aims, divided into “Languages in society” and “Languages in an educational context” (D-EDK, 2016, pp. 58-59). Vertical coordination of language teaching and learning is supported by the commitment to the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (Council of Europe, 2001) and its proficiency scales ranging from A1 to C2, which serve as a reference point in the description of learning objectives.

Dominant school language

Standard German is the predominant medium of instruction and taught from school year 3 on. The curriculum acknowledges children’s experience with diglossia and mentions the significance of language learning in all subjects. Moreover, it is stated that all teachers are supposed to support learners of German as a second language in an individualised manner and a list of strategies to do so is provided. Nevertheless, German as a second language is not included in the curriculum, as it is treated as a supplement to regular schooling.

First and second additional language teaching and learning

As a first foreign language, French is a compulsory school subject for all pupils from school year 5 on, while English is taught from year 7 on. It is noteworthy that all languages other than the local dominant language are considered to be foreign in the Swiss context. The focus in foreign language teaching in Switzerland is put on communicative skills and rich content culminating in functional multilingualism, which is characterised by situated language skills as opposed to a native-like competence (Bertschy et al., 2015). The declared aim here is “to break the monolingual habitus of the school” (p. 4). Focus on form, which was previously more prominent, has a subordinate priority.

In terms of target language in foreign language classrooms, the curriculum (D-EDK, 2016) recommends “as much foreign language as possible, as little German as necessary” (p. 64). In addition, it is noted that German, as a support, might eventually disappear completely from the foreign language classroom. Concepts such as pedagogical

translanguaging are not mentioned. However, in a separate section with didactical remarks, the so-called didactics of multilingualism suggest the formation and usage of the pupils' dynamic and multilingual repertoire.

Third additional language teaching and learning

Pupils in the Canton of Berne have the possibility to choose Italian when they enter year 9. It is recommended to follow the same pedagogical and didactical principles as for the other language subjects and take advantage of synergies between the various language subjects.

Instruction in home language and culture

Despite the encouragement by the curriculum to include pupils' different mother tongues in the classroom with various language awareness activities (James & Garrett, 1991), mother tongue instruction is not part of compulsory education system but organised by embassies and private funding bodies under the name of instruction in home language and culture.

Multilingualism in Swiss Teacher Education

The recent curriculum implementation process is characterised by an intense compulsory further development scheme for teachers. In terms of foreign language teaching, a course spanning over 18 months and consisting of 72 contact hours was chosen as the implementation strategy (Century & Cassata, 2016) for in-service primary school teachers. During the course, teachers' target language, methodological and didactical competence was addressed. Moreover new textbooks, specifically created to fit the new curriculum were introduced "in a sustained way consisting of a multitude of feedback cycles and collaborative learning opportunities" (Lundberg, 2019b, p. 3). Pre-service education was similarly adopted to make sure newly graduated teachers are prepared for the new curriculum and the new textbooks.

On the whole, Swiss educational language policy shows a striking consistency with a multilingualism as resource orientation, as echoed in the following passage in the curriculum (D-EDK, 2016, p. 58):

In der Schweiz hat die Mehrsprachigkeit eine identitätsstiftende Bedeutung. Der Umgang mit Mehrsprachigkeit und kultureller Vielfalt

auf kleinem Raum ist Bereicherung und Herausforderung zugleich, sowohl für das Sprachenlernen als auch für das Zusammenleben. [...] Zur vielsprachigen Schweiz gehören auch zahlreiche Mundarten, die vier Landessprachen und weitere Erstsprachen (Herkunftssprachen).

In Switzerland, multilingualism has an identity-creating meaning. Dealing with multilingualism and cultural diversity in a small space is both enriching and challenging, both for language learning and for living together. [...] Multilingual Switzerland also includes numerous dialects, the four national languages and other first languages (heritage languages) (author's own translation).

Similarities regarding Societal Composition

Despite their differences, the contexts of Sweden, especially the Southern Swedish region of Scania and the predominantly German-speaking Canton of Berne in Switzerland share sufficient key similarities to permit a meaningful comparison in terms of educational policy enactment processes with regard to multilingualism. Both European societies have been profoundly influenced by major transformations during the past decades. Globalisation is often used as an umbrella term for migration, urbanisation and an increased internationalisation, including a capitalist economy. Sweden and Switzerland are characterised by national (rural to urban) and international immigration, mostly in search of better opportunities for education and employment. The current population of Sweden is slightly over 10 million people (Statistics Sweden, 2020) and about 13% of them live in the southern-most region called Scania where the study in article III was conducted. While around 19,5% of the people living in Sweden were born abroad, the percentage is slightly higher for the bigger cities, including Malmö, Scania's main city. In recent years, most immigrants came from Syria, Finland, Iran and Iraq. There is no official source for language statistics in Sweden, as it is considered ethically wrong to map citizens' languages as it may reveal ethnic background. Nevertheless, the number of languages spoken as another tongue in Sweden is estimated to be between 150-200, with Arabic and Finnish as the most common (Parkvall, 2015).

Table 1. Population of the Swedish study context as of January 2020

	Sweden	Scania
Population	10 333 456	1 377 827
Born abroad	19,5%	24% in Malmö

Switzerland's population at the end of 2018 counted around 8,5 million people (Bundesamt für Statistik, 2019), whereas 29,9% were born abroad and often are not in possession of Swiss citizenship. The majority of these people come from European countries, such as Germany, Italy, France and Portugal. Slightly more than 12% of the current Swiss population live in the Canton of Berne. Unfortunately, there is no statistical data reporting the number of born abroad individuals in the Canton of Berne. However, given the lower number of non-Swiss citizens in Berne compared to the whole country and the fact that the majority of the born abroad population is not Swiss by citizenship, the missing number in Table 2 can be expected to be below 29,9%. Since 2010, people living in Switzerland can name up to three languages as their main languages in the census. 17% of the population did so and 90% of all people living in Switzerland have declared at least one national language as their main language (Bundesamt für Statistik, 2016).

Table 2. Population of the Swiss study context as of December 2018

	Switzerland	Canton of Berne
Population	8 544 527	1 034 997
Born abroad	29,9%	Not available

METHODOLOGY

In the previous chapters, teachers' pivotal role in the enactment process of educational policies in general and language-related issues in particular was discussed by focusing on their viewpoints as a basis for their agency. It was further argued that multilingualism as a phenomenon is a complex social construct, often based on contextual peculiarities. The presentation of the study contexts in Sweden and Switzerland then illustrated a variety of tensions and dilemmas. The rather assimilationist perspective at the grassroots in Swedish society (Hyltenstam et al., 2012), stands in a paradoxical relationship with the "attempt to recognize and accommodate cultural diversity and to construct Sweden as a multicultural and tolerant society" (Milani, 2008, p. 47). In multilingual Switzerland, clear distinctions between language regions through the principle of territoriality provide enough ground for a potential monolingual habitus of its citizens. In terms of policy enactment strategies and navigation of policies, regardless of their underlying orientation, teachers draw on both, their personal and professional stances. This thesis therefore aims at investigating overt, but also covert discourses in order to enable a dialogue between stakeholders, such as practitioners, policy makers and researchers.

In the present chapter, an overview of the methods and procedures chosen to investigate the research questions in this research project is provided. At first, it is described how a research review served as an important exploratory step to empirically develop an understanding of the topics that informed the analysis of teachers' viewpoints about multilingualism in the study contexts. Secondly, a rigorous methodological review delved into the nature and characteristics of Q methodology and its

applications in the field of educational research. As a final element, the application of Q methodology yielded findings of teachers' viewpoints about multilingualism based on underlying, often covert orientations of language in Sweden and Switzerland and thereby contributed to an increased embedment of research in the lived realities of practitioners (Uccelli & Snow, 2008).

The chapter concludes with a discussion on ethical issues concerning features of quality in quantitative and qualitative methodology. Moreover, the researcher's positionality is outlined.

Comparative Case Study Research

By empirically investigating the particular phenomenon of contemporary multilingualism within its real life context through multiple sources of evidence, this project follows a case study research process (Day Ashley, 2017, Yin, 2014). As a particular strength of case study research is to evaluate and explain a phenomenon, the present research project does not necessarily describe multilingualism, but investigates individual and shared understandings of it. By discussing these viewpoints against the backdrop of contextual particularities, findings in this project add to the knowledge base on a deeper level. Furthermore, in order to investigate the significance of context, a multiple case study design was selected for the present research project. As a matter of principle, the aim of comparative research is to identify similarities and differences between social entities in order to develop concepts and generalisations³ (Sasaki, 2011) and not to act reductively by merely confirming cultural stereotypes. By eventually becoming explanatory and reaching beyond describing a phenomenon in a certain context (Willig, 2013), comparative research achieves an enrichment of meaning. The comparative research approach in the present project follows the advice by Lo Bianco and Bal (2016) to “always locate comparative discussion of policy measures within the specific socio-legal, ideological, and political tradition and practices, as well as within the unequal distribution of power, privilege, and access to education” (p. 2). In this cross-cultural comparative research project, researchers and policy makers from both nations,

³ Refer to the section on criteria of scientific quality (p. 78) for a more detailed discussion of generalisations done with results from case study and Q methodological research.

and potentially other contexts as well, receive the opportunity to adapt and understand the perspectives of their counterparts in other nations, especially in an ever more globalised world (Sasaki, 2011).

In line with recommendations to triangulate methods and sources of data collection to increase construct validity in case study research (Day Ashley, 2017) and to enhance the strength of research findings (Biesta, 2017), the present research project relies on systematic research reviews and Q methodology. The chapter proceeds with an in-depth description of these methodological approaches.

Systematic Research Review

Two studies in this doctoral research project follow the procedures of systematic reviews (Hart, 1998, Eriksson Barajas, Forsberg & Wengström, 2013). Even though they respond to different research questions, the publications largely share the methodological process, which can be split into a number of interconnected stages (Newman & Gough, 2020):

1. Systematic Review Question and conceptual framework
2. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria
3. Search Strategy
4. Study Selection Process
5. Coding Studies
6. Synthesis of findings
7. Reporting

In the following section, the process is separately exemplified for article I and article II.

Identifying Research Discourses

In order to gain a solid overview of relevant literature about educational language policies in Switzerland and Sweden, a systematic research review was conducted in 2016. As a form of secondary level analysis to answer a research question by bringing together the findings of primary research (Newman & Gough, 2020), article I represented a fruitful initial step in this research project. In addition to descriptively synthesise the predominant foci in research results on Swedish and Swiss multilin-

gual educational policy documents, article I also investigated if these findings show a rather monolingual or pluralistic approach in the treatment of current educational language policies.

Given the fact that new language policy documents were introduced in both study contexts in 2009, only studies published after 2008 were considered by the review. Moreover, they had to focus on language policy and/or planning and be conducted in a mainstream mandatory educational setting in Switzerland or Sweden.

With two bibliographic databases as sources, a rather narrow search strategy was chosen for article I. ERIC (Education Research Information Center) via EBSCO was selected due to the focus on educational settings and LLBA (Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstract) was accessed because of the review’s focus on language policy and planning. In both databases, the keywords “language policy” and “language planning” were search in combination with one of the respective study contexts, “Sweden” or “Switzerland”.

The selection process was identical for both study contexts and resulted in 13 papers meeting all inclusion criteria of the systematic review.

Table 3. Study selection process

	Sweden	Switzerland
Initial search results	339 hits	431 hits
Automatic time frame filter	99 hits	74 hits
Manual screening for duplicates and application of inclusion/exclusion criteria	9 papers	4 papers

All 13 papers were coded according to their research aim and questions, theoretical framework and methodology. Of particular relevance was the coding of the research focus and indications of the application of a potential monolingual or pluralistic approach. With regard to the synthesis of the included articles, four different topics could be identified and were qualitatively discussed in article I. For a summary of the results, please refer to the chapter named *Studies’ Results* (page 81).

Showcasing a Methodology's Potential

The second systematic research review included in this compilation thesis has the aim of investigating characteristics of recent Q methodological studies in compulsory education and synthesise their implications for the field. While Q methodology is specifically explained in the next section, the methodological review process of article II is presented here.

In terms of selection criteria, only studies published after 2009 were included to receive a more contemporary picture of the methodological application. Moreover, studies had to follow the broader conceptual philosophical framework of Q methodology and investigate a compulsory education setting or primary or secondary teacher pre- or in-service education. Only research, including grey literature such as e.g. unpublished dissertations, reporting new empirical results met the inclusion criteria of this systematic review.

For the study selection process, a range of sources was used:

1. Bibliographic databases
 - a. ERIC (Education Research Information Center)
 - b. Web of Science
 - c. Scopus
2. Handsearching of specialist journals and online repositories
 - a. Operant Subjectivity
 - b. University of Sheffield digital repositories
 - c. ScholarWorks
3. Reference and citation checking

The database searches with the search parameters (Q method*) AND (Q-method*) resulted in 4587 hits, which was immediately reduced to 2991 publications by excluding research published before 2010 ($n_{\text{excluded}} = 1596$). To further narrow the search results, document type (academic journals, dissertations, books and book chapters) and subject area (Education, Social Sciences, Humanities, multidisciplinary) restrictions were added. The resulting 688 hits ($n_{\text{excluded}} = 2303$) were subjected to a title and abstract screening and an elimination of duplicates. 96 publications were forwarded to the full-text screening phase of the literature review. Each nine papers and doctoral dissertations were added from handsearching the archives of Operant Subjectivity, the official, but not

indexed Q methodology journal, and online repositories, where previously identified doctoral supervisors with an expertise in Q methodology are affiliated to. Reference and citation checking resulted in an additional 21 potential papers for this systematic review. Full-texts of 135 publications were then screened by a team of three researchers. Publications that met the inclusion criteria were marked as included papers, while the decision on potentially excluded papers were double-checked by the other researchers until discrepancies were resolved through consensus. Sixty-one papers were excluded in this phase, generating a total of 74 included publications in article II, which were then systematically analysed according to a codebook (Pigott & Polanin, 2020). The codebook was collectively created by all co-authors, piloted and improved. It eventually included the following categories of extracted data:

1. Participant set characteristics
2. Study focus
3. Q sampling characteristics
4. Q sorting characteristics
5. Q factor analysis
6. Results
7. Others

In addition, a narrative approach (Popay, Roberts, Sowden, Petticrew, Arai, Rodgers, Britten, Roen & Duffy, 2006, Snilstveit, Oliver & Vojtkova, 2012) was chosen to synthesise the findings and implications of the studies. Principles of practice from the science of learning and development (SoLD, Darling-Hammond et al., 2019) were then used as an analytical framework. A summary of the results reported in article II is provided in the chapter *Studies' Results* (page 84).

Q methodology

The second overarching research question of this doctoral dissertation regards the potential of Q methodology for educational research. What follows in this chapter is a detailed description and discussion of this particular methodology, enriched and illustrated with information from the current research project. The term Q methodology describes not only a broader conceptual and philosophical framework, which shall be explored with the discussion of Q methodology as opposed to R method-

ology and the general acceptance of Q methodology by the mixed methods community (Ramlo & Newman, 2011), but also Q sorting as a data gathering and Q factor analysis as a data condensation technique. In the remainder of this thesis, Q methodology may be abbreviated to its initial for reasons of readability.

Introduction and Conceptual Framework

Q was invented by a British psychologist and physicist named William Stephenson, who at the time of the first publication about this new methodology was employed as an assistant to Charles Spearman, a pioneer of factor analysis. The basic statistical principles of Q were introduced in a letter to *Nature* in the mid-1930s (Stephenson, 1935) and represented an addition to Spearman's method, who in regular factor analysis correlated and factored variables across persons. This procedure typically uses the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Pearson's r), for which reason these studies are to be located within R methodology. Traditional R methodological survey methods typically involve a large number of participants and a limited variety of variables, which are then correlated amongst each other in order to look for population differences, or in other words for individual differences concerning specific psychological traits or characteristics. For Stephenson, R factor analysis did however have two limitations. First, the standardisation of scores led to a disassociation of the score from the specific individuals who made them. Secondly, R methodology could not define individuals in a holistic fashion and was therefore considered insufficient for a "full and genuine comparison of individual differences" (Watts & Stenner, 2012, p. 12). As a consequence, Stephenson suggested to invert the factor analytical process and thereby shifted the analytical focus from the variables to the persons. However, in order to follow the broader conceptual philosophical framework to systematically and holistically identifying different types of people or different types of viewpoints, data gathered for Q methodology had to be different than the ones used in R methodology. As Q is interested in subjectivity, participants needed to be confronted with a heterogeneous set of items, representative for the complete range of communication about the issue under scrutiny, while *representative* in Q methodological item sampling has to

be understood in analogue terms as probabilistic person sampling in quantitative research (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018).

The active rank ordering of these self-referent notions (Stephenson, 1953) would allow participants to communicate and share their own point of view, advancing Q as the basis for a science of subjectivity (Brown, 2019b). In the words of Stephenson (2014), Q “stands for *discovery* in subjectivity, of reality in nature, made possible by technique” (p. 43, emphasis in original). Subjectivity in Q is not to be understood as opposed to objectivity in a dualistic worldview, but applies to everything respondents conspire (Stephenson, 2007), say share, about any matter of personal or social importance (McKeown & Thomas, 1988).

Q as mixed methods

For many years, Q has held a controversial position in social science research (Brown, 1980). Due not only to the combination of qualitative and quantitative ideas, but the “peculiarly hybrid qualities of Q” (Stenner, 2011, p. 192), the methodology’s philosophical underpinnings were described as qualiquantological (Stenner & Stainton Rogers, 2004). Only relatively recently, Q was established as an inherently mixed method (Ramlo, 2020, Ramlo, 2016, Newman & Ramlo, 2010). Despite the fact that Q has the ability to address both qualitative and quantitative research purposes as the interpretations of factors allow the researchers to possibly confirm theory deductively, but also develop theory in an inductive fashion (Ramlo & Newman, 2011), it is advantageous to discard the distinct qualitative-quantitative dichotomy and polarisation of research traditions and instead understand it as a continuum. Moreover, neither deduction nor induction are fully in line with the original conceptual framework of Q. Instead, Stephenson (1961) described Q factor analysis as fitting with the abductive form of logic. Abduction, first formalised by Charles S. Peirce, “seeks for explanations, and its reasoning process is not from general principles to specific consequences (deduction) or from specific observations to generalizations (induction), but from effects to causes” (Brown & Robyn, 2004, p. 111). How abductive reasoning is applied in the factor interpretation stage of this thesis is further explained in the respective section below.

Rationale for Q in this Thesis

This thesis was set out to investigate often covert and subconscious viewpoints that influence teachers' agency in their daily practice. The conceptual framework and technique Q provides, offers a methodology that allows to uncover those viewpoints, without "reducing school and teacher language policy to simply giving effect to mandates from outside, or reflections of existing social practices" (Lo Bianco, 2010b, p. 169). In other words, these viewpoints are not measured in relation to an operational and researcher-imposed definition, but pay great attention to implicit and explicit components of teachers' cognition and allow an investigation of the complex and multifaceted phenomenon of multilingualism in the most unbiased way possible (Aronin & Jessner, 2015). Q provides a means that condensates data by clustering viewpoints of high similarity (Stainton Rogers & Stainton Rogers, 1990) and enables the best estimate of socially shared cognition, in line with the conceptual framework of this thesis outlined earlier (see section *Teacher Cognition*, p. 24).

Moreover, unlike Likert scale surveys or other similar quantitative data gathering techniques, Q reveals the complexity of viewpoints within a group, as all items are sorted in relation to each other. This is linked to a further strength of Q, its potential for marginalised voices (Brown, 2006, Ellingsen, Arstad Thorsen & Størksen, 2014). Their viewpoints are not concealed by reporting averages across different demographic variables (Dryzek, 2005), but equally valued as more mainstream opinions. In addition, through the high level of task engagement during the sorting activity, the participants' ability to respond in a socially desirable way is generally reduced (Fluckinger, 2014).

Despite the impression that some of the components of Q's conceptual and philosophical framework may seem counter-intuitive to people more familiar with conventional research methods, there are indications that Q has a growing following (Ramlo, 2020). Articles III and IV in this thesis report results from the same Q methodological procedures conducted comparatively across the study contexts Sweden and Switzerland. Through the detailed illustration of the various interwoven stages of Q, the following part of the thesis, in conjunction with the sections discussing Q's methodological and philosophical underpinnings, functions as a guide to novice Q researchers. The presentation of the research process (table 4) serves as a point of reference.

Table 4. Research process for articles III and IV

Research design (2016-2017)	Research Question	What characterises teachers' viewpoints about multilingualism in Sweden and Switzerland?	
	Study components	1: understanding	2: pedagogy
	Condition of Instruction	What do multilingualism and multilingual students mean to you?	How should multilingualism and multilingual students be handled according to you?
	Concourse	113 items drawn from a literature review (incl. article I), popular science magazines, educational policy documents, discussions with teachers	
	Q-set	External experts and pilot studies resulted in the splitting and reduction of items	
		39 items	32 items
	Distribution grid	Symmetrical, near-normal, -4 (most disagree) to + 4 (most agree)	Symmetrical, near-normal, -4 (most disagree) to + 4 (most agree)
	Participants	Purposive sampling: Sweden: 40 primary school teachers Switzerland: 67 primary school teachers	
Data collection (2017)		Face-to-face, physical cards, written post-sorting information about items placed at extreme ends of the distribution.	
Analysis (2017-2018)	Software	PQ Method. Release 2.35	
	Extraction method	Sweden: PCA Switzerland: PCA	Sweden: Centroid Switzerland: PCA
	Rotation method	Sweden: Varimax Switzerland: Varimax	Sweden: Varimax Switzerland: Varimax
	Q sort flagging	Manual flagging according to significance level calculated with $p < 0.01$ level: $2.58(1/\sqrt{\text{no of items}})$	
	Significant loadings	Sweden: 26 Switzerland: 51	Sweden: 31 Switzerland: 47
Results (2017-2018)	Explained variance	Sweden: 56% Switzerland: 52%	Sweden: 55% Switzerland: 73%

	Number of factors	Sweden: 3 (1-U; 2-U; 3-U) Switzerland: 2 (A+; A-)	Sweden: 3 (1-P; 2-P; 3-P) Switzerland: 6 (1-6)
Interpretation (2018)		Within factor interpretation, across factor interpretation, Crib sheet method, enrichment of descriptions with demographic and qualitative data	
Publications (2019)		Sweden: Article III (Lundberg, 2019a) Switzerland: Article IV (Lundberg, 2019b)	

Research Design

Research questions, study components and conditions of instruction

As outlined in Watts and Stenner (2012), Q research questions can be categorised into three groups (Curt, 1994). According to this categorisation, studies aim to investigate either a) *representations* of a subject matter, where participants are asked for their perception of how something is typically understood, b) *understandings*, where a more personal focus is sought after, or c) *responses* to a subject matter. The aim of articles III and IV is the characterisation of teachers’ viewpoints about multilingualism, which draw on teachers’ cognition. Of special interest is the interlinkage of what teachers believe multilingualism is on the one hand and how they think the issue should be handled in schools on the other hand. Incorporating two study components allows the investigation of potential links between the two (Stainton Rogers & Stainton Rogers, 1990), which is expected to increase the complexity and richness of the results.

As each study component is treated as a separate study, participants are asked two central questions, called conditions of instruction in Q terminology. Study component 1, which is named *understanding*, for reasons of simplicity even though the participants’ understanding of the subject matter’s representation is investigated involves the following condition of instruction: *What do multilingualism and multilingual students mean to you?* Study component 2, investigating the participants suggested response to multilingualism will be referred to with the name *pedagogy* and allows the participants to provide their answer to the question: *How should multilingualism and multilingual students be handled according to you?*

Concourse and Q sample construction

Assuming that the research question and condition of instruction are clear, the first step in constructing a representative Q sample that will enable the participants to provide their subjective point of view, is establishing a large number of items. Most often these items take the form of statements about the particular subject matter (Watts & Stenner, 2012), but could also be pictures (e.g. de Leeuw, de Boer, Beckmann, van Exel & Minnaert, 2019), videos or audio files. Using a naturalistic approach (Sæbjørnsen, Ellingsen, Good & Ødegård, 2016) allows the researcher to collect statements without the application of a pre-existing theory. The great flexibility of this approach stands in contrast to a high number of overlapping statements and only “refers to the means by which the Q set is constructed [and] does not imply or condone an absence of structure in the final product” (Watts & Stenner, 2012, p. 60).

For the Q studies presented in this thesis, a total of 113 statements were gathered through an iterative and interpretive process (Yanow, 2000). Meaning carrying artefacts about multilingualism, the policy issue under scrutiny, were identified in a wide range of sources and clustered into larger themes. The meta-analysis of research results on multilingual educational language policies in Sweden and Switzerland (article I) served as a starting point. Not only did the findings of the publication allow the emergence of predominant discourses in the study context, but the 13 separate articles included in that research review were also scanned according to keywords in order to formulate additional statements. Furthermore, using a naturalistic approach allowed the creation statements based on the author’s situated knowledge as a (language) teacher, teacher trainer and multilingual individual. Other relevant types of literature, such as academic texts and homepages and discussions with different domain experts and teachers in both countries served as further sources. Even a methodological pilot study with a limited collection of statements in the beginning of the collection phase was used to gather more items in the Q sample until a sense of saturation was reached and no new items could be added. All statements were edited according to readability and clarity. The result of this process is called concourse in Q terminology and represents the broad range of communication on the topic.

With the aim of possessing a manageable Q sample, different techniques can be applied to reduce the number of items and select the final Q sample (see e.g. Sæbjørnsen et al., 2016, Paige & Morin, 2016). In articles III and IV, the item reduction approach was conducted through the expertise of external experts and included the content validation process of the research instrument, namely the final sets of Q items. A total of eight experts accepted the invitation to evaluate the statements in the exemplar study:

- Four domain experts (two in each context), working as lecturers in subjects related to multilingualism
- Two Q experts (one German and one Swedish speaking)
- Two translation experts (one native in Swedish and one native in German)

The process described here is based on three steps for content validation (Johnson & Christensen, 2008). First, domain experts received an information letter with details about Q and the exemplar study to make sure that they understood what and how the items were supposed to measure. Second, evaluation instructions were given, describing these four criteria:

Table 5. Criteria for external experts

Criteria	Description
Simplicity	The statement represents only one answer to the research question.
Clarity	The statement is clear and unambiguous.
Breadth and depth	The statement illustrates heterogeneity from other statements concerning multilingualism and multilingual students.
Wording	The statement is grammatically and orthographically correct and positively formulated.

The domain experts were asked to evaluate every single statement in a prepared excel sheet according to the criteria and rank them from 1 = *not at all* to 4 = *completely* as an answer to the respective description above. If the answer was not 4, a rationale for the decision was to be provided in the comment area. As a final task, the domain experts were asked to choose between 40 to 60 statements to give the researcher an

indication of the most adequate statements for the content domain and provide feedback in terms of missing statements. Only one domain expert realised gaps in the coverage of the concourse and added three statements at the end of the list. Q experts were given the same excel sheet and asked to evaluate the statements in terms of wording and appropriateness for a Q study. This step was particularly important as articles III and IV represent the author's first Q methodological studies.

Due to the comparative nature of the research project involving multiple languages, translation experts received the same information package as the domain experts. Their excel sheet consisted of all statements in German and Swedish plus a comment area. Their task was to check for inconsistencies in the translations and for correct terminology with the aim of two socioculturally tailored Q sets.

As a consequence of the content validation process in the preparation of the material, the first component's set was reduced from 71 to 46 statements, while 9 statements were eliminated for the second component. Several statements were edited according to the experts' feedback. To further validate the research instrument and to possess a well-designed, carefully constructed and comprehensive Q set that provides "a representative and balanced coverage in relation to [the] research question [and] through and onto which a participant can *impress* their own meanings and viewpoints" (Watts & Stenner, 2012, pp. 61-64, emphasis in original), and in line with "the cardinal rule in research [...] to find out whether [the instrument] operates properly *before* using it in a research study" (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 189, emphasis in original), pilot studies were conducted until no more changes to the Q set were proposed. The final Q sets about teachers' viewpoints about multilingualism consisted of 39 statements about the participants' conceptual understanding of multilingualism (component 1) and 32 items describing potential pedagogical actions concerning multilingualism in school (component 2). These items are best thought of as suggestions rather than statements with pre-determined meanings, with the intention to allow for varying interpretations by participants.

Distribution grid

With the final Q sets available, the next step is the preparation of an appropriate sorting distribution with as many empty slots as there are cards

in the Q set. The so called forced-choice distribution is not only considered “the most convenient and pragmatic means of facilitating the item ranking process” (Watts & Stenner, 2012, p. 78), but also an advantage over more traditional Likert scale surveys, as participants are obligated to indicate gradation and nuance in their response. Considering the form of distribution grids had been demonstrated to be “virtually nil” (Brown, 1980, p. 289), a rather standardised near-normal and symmetrical distribution with a negative value (-4) on the left pole and a positive value on the right pole (+4) was chosen for both components. The face-valid dimension among which the items had to be sorted was labelled as ‘most disagree to most agree’. With 39 items for component 1 and 32 items for component 2 on a nine-point distribution, a rather steep kurtosis was chosen in order to slightly reduce the number of decisions to be made. The documents had either *1 understanding* or *2 pedagogy* as a heading and stated the question (condition of instruction) to be answered in the respective rank-ordering process. Table 6 visualises the number of items to be allocated per ranking value in both components.

Table 6. Number of items per ranking value in both components

Ranking value	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
Number of items in component 1	2	3	5	6	7	6	5	3	2
Number of items in component 2	1	3	4	5	6	5	4	3	1

Participants

Participant sampling in Q is purposive and therefore in line with qualitative methodology (Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, 2014). The aim is to engage “enough subjects to establish the existence of a factor for the purpose of comparing one factor with another” (Brown, 1980, p. 192). It is therefore of importance to seek a sample that reflects the heterogeneity characteristic of the population. The strategy to invite individuals who “are expected to hold different perspectives on the central phenomenon” (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018, p. 176) is also referred to as maximal variation sampling. In order to achieve these aims, principals in both contexts were contacted via email and telephone. A total of three schools per context, reflecting different compositions of student populations, decided to participate. Among the focal institutions in each na-

tional context, there is at least one school with a high percentage of pupils speaking another language at home than the local school language. They are all located in urban settings, which can be regarded as a proving ground for “understanding social diversity and complexity” (King & Carson, 2017, p. 3). In addition, there is at least one school with a low percentage of pupils speaking another language at home than the local school language.

The educational setting of primary schools was chosen for different reasons. First of all, almost all children pass through this level of education. Moreover, foreign language teaching starts during these years. Neither the subject specialisation of the participating teachers nor the fact if they work part-time or full-time at the selected school was a selection criterion. In addition, given school principals’ crucial role in the shaping of education through their decision-making power regarding school policies (Menken & Solorza, 2015), their particular position did not disqualify them from participating. As long as the participants were in regular contact with pupils, it was assumed that they had a defined and pivotal viewpoint in relation to the subject at hand and were therefore asked to participate in this study. In studies III and IV and in this thesis, all participants are described as teachers.

Table 7. Participants in articles III and IV

	school	female	male	total
Sweden	Rural	5	2	7
	Rural	4	0	4
	Urban	23	6	29
total		32	8	40
Switzerland	Semi-urban	6	1	7
	Semi-urban	20	5	25
	urban	31	4	35
total		57	10	67

Data Collection

Data collection took place over several months, particularly because two different countries with each three focal institutions were involved. Re-

spondents in each participating school were gathered in a room to undertake the Q sorting activity simultaneously, albeit individually. The researcher laid out the necessary material on the tables and started the instruction with a short presentation of himself. Subsequently, the consent form (see appendix) was presented and potential questions by the participants about the research project as a whole were answered. Teachers were informed about the anonymity and voluntariness of their participation in written and oral form and gave their consent.

In a short questionnaire on demographic information (see appendix), the participants were asked about their gender, their year of birth, in what languages they could communicate, what languages their parents used to talk to them when they were children, if they had lived in other countries, what degrees they had and what subjects they taught. As it is “the spirit of Q methodology” (Watts & Stenner, 2012, p. 75), wherever possible the participants were allowed to self-categorise as they responded in order to apply an emic perspective and not impose pre-established categories and systems on the studied settings.

The participants received a sorting help with three provisional ranking categories (see appendix) and the sorting distribution for the first set of cards on understanding, printed on a green DIN A4-sheet of paper. Teachers further received an envelope with 39 items cards on understanding (see appendix). The envelope was labelled with *I understand-ing* and had a green strip on it to make the connection to the green sorting distribution obvious. The DIN A8-cards (72 mm x 54 mm) were printed on 160g paper and cut by the university’s print office. All cards had a statement and a number on it, which allowed the researcher to present the cards to every participant in the same order to minimise a potential instrumentation bias. Moreover, the numbers represent a useful way of securing the results, as participants were advised to transfer the numbers of the items onto the blank green sorting distribution, as soon as they indicated satisfaction with their completed Q sort. As a so-called post-sorting activity, the participants provided a written motivation for the items placed on the extremes of the distribution. Gallagher and Porock (2010) describe individual or group interviews as a common form of post-sorting interviews. Due to the large number of participants simultaneously sorting the items and the involvement of two separate

components, an immediate and written form to provide additional information about their thinking was chosen.

An envelope labelled with '*2 pedagogy*' and a yellow strip to make the connection to the yellow sorting distribution clear was handed out, containing 32 item cards (see appendix). The procedure was repeated with the material for the second study component on pedagogy.

Participants were advised to make rather fast decisions and complete each distribution in 25-30 minutes. The researcher was present and willing to answer questions throughout the sorting procedure, as long as they concerned methodological questions and did not involve any interpretation of terminology, as no "a priori meaning of the statements, based on the researcher's view of them" (Ramlo, 2016, p. 33) should be shared before or during the process. Both, the oral instructions and the written material were delivered in the local school language with the scope to blend in as a researcher and avoid any possible linguistic difficulties. The choice of language in this multilingual research project is reflected on in the section about the author's own positionality.

Analysis and Interpretation

As foreshadowed in the introductory section about Q methodology (see p. 63), the statistical aspects of Q are dominated by factor analysis as a data condensation technique (Miles et al., 2014), which helps to objectively group people based on their subjective data (Ramlo, 2016). There exist several dedicated software packages for Q. A commonly used programme is PQMethod (Schmolck, 2014), which is available as a free download. PQMethod was chosen for both Q articles in this thesis, as they were analysed when basic 32-bit applications were still supported by Apple's operation systems. As of MacOS Catalina, Q methodologists are advised to use more recent alternatives such as Ken-Q and KADE (Banasick, 2019). Regardless the software, the statistical process of factor extraction initiates with a correlation matrix, illustrating the relationship of each Q sort with every other sort in the study and thereby representing the total variability present in the study (Watts & Stenner, 2012). With the aim of accounting for as much study variance as possible and selecting the most informative solution, factors are extracted and rotated. Factor extractions are performed either through principal component analysis (PCA) or centroid factor analysis. While PCA is the more sta-

tistically precise, centroid extraction allows the exploration of all solutions without violating any statistical assumptions (Brown, 1980). Kline (1994) provides a point-by-point comparison between the two extraction methods. Factor rotation, which, in simplified terms, aims at suitably focusing the extracted factors in relation to the collected data, can be done with by-hand rotation or varimax rotation. All study components' unrotated factors in this thesis were rotated using the automatic varimax procedure to account for the maximum amount of study variance (Watts & Stenner, 2012) improving the visibility of the factors' viewpoint.

Several statistical measures and criteria can be used to assess factors' statistical strength and eventually eliminate them. Two of them shall be mentioned here. First, the Kaiser-Guttman criterion suggests an eigenvalue of 1.00 or above as a cut-off point for an extracted factor. This is reasonable for a data-condensation technique, as factors with eigenvalues below 1.00 statistically account for less study variance than a single Q sort (Watts & Stenner, 2005). A second parameter to determine the appropriate number of factors is Humphrey's rule, which "states that a factor is significant if the cross-product of its two highest loadings (ignoring the sign) exceeds twice the standard error" (Brown, 1980, p. 223).

The calculation of the standard error is also used for the determination of significant loadings. In all study components, $p < 0.01$ was chosen as the relevant significance level, resulting in the following equation outlined in Brown (1980, pp. 222-223):

$$\text{Significance at the 0.01 level} = 2.58(1/\sqrt{\text{no. of items in Q set}})$$

Consequently, all significantly loading Q sorts were manually flagged. Confounded sorts, loading significantly on more than one factor were not considered for the construction of the factor estimates, as their exclusion leads to a clearer presentation of the core of the respective viewpoints. Weighted averaging, based on how significantly the individual sorts load, is then used to prepare the array for each factor. This shared, distinct understanding of the issue at hand is a single ideal-typical Q sort and provides the basis for the narrative description of the viewpoints.

The abductive interpretation of factor arrays functions iteratively and largely in line with qualitative content analysis (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009), as different pieces of information are collected to eventually build “multiple, compounding layers of interpretation and meaning” (Sneegas, 2020, p. 83). The interpretation process applied in the individual studies of this thesis can be structured into three steps. First a within factor interpretation, based on the aforementioned factor arrays, guides the researcher’s attention to the most salient statements, often located in the top and bottom three to four items. Moreover, items located in between and especially the centre of the distribution could indicate insecurity about specific discourses. The following questions can be used to guide the logic of abduction in Q methodology:

1. What does the placement of this item mean?
2. What is it trying to tell me?
3. What does the ranking of this item add to the whole viewpoint?
4. Does it confirm or change anything?

Going back to the identified larger themes in the process of collecting potential items for the Q sample through interpretative policy analysis (Yanow, 2000), allows the emergence of additional particular and distinguishing features of the viewpoints.

The second step involves across factor interpretation, which was done using the crib sheet method, introduced in Watts and Stenner (2012). This systematic approach to factor interpretation allows a thorough and consistent process that accounts for the entire item configuration in line with Stephenson’s pursuit of holism (Stephenson, 1936). By guiding the researcher’s attention to items ranked higher or lower in a particular factor relative to others, the crib sheet method is especially useful to included items that are ranked at or close to the centre of the distribution grid. Examining distinguishing and consensus statements, which are provided in the output file of the dedicated Q software, allows a similar interpretation of the holistic configuration of the factor arrays. If the questions in line with abductive reasoning are answered, the description of the single viewpoints becomes richer with every potential clue detected during the interpretation process. As a final step of the interpreta-

tion process, qualitative information from post-sorting activities and demographic questionnaires help finalise the viewpoint descriptions.

Criteria of Scientific Quality

This section of the thesis addresses overarching principles of research quality relevant for the present research project, consisting of systematic research reviews and an inherently mixed method. The theoretical sections in this thesis are compiled with literature located via a range of databases (primarily LLBA, Scopus and ERIC via EBSCO) accessible via Malmö University's library and Google Scholar. Worthiness of the research topic is based on relevance, and timely significance (Tracy, 2010) and illustrated in the initial sections of this thesis. A further criterion of Tracy's model for quality in qualitative research is met through the triangulation of methods in this compilation thesis and the inherently multivocal character of Q methodology (article III and article IV).

In terms of the systematic reviews included in these studies (article I and article II), precise inclusion and exclusion criteria were the sole factor in terms of the final set of included studies. In both articles, any form of bias was carefully reduced (Suri, 2020), by e.g. including literature in different languages and publication form (including grey literature). Moreover, the collaborative sense-making together with the co-authors during the interpretation of results of the systematic review in article II, further enhanced the quality of the paper. In relation to this particular constellation for article II, feedback about any component of this thesis provided by experienced scholars of the field, such as the author's doctoral supervisors, members of the research environments at Malmö University and at Melbourne Graduate School of Education and the peer reviewers of the individual studies improved the scientific quality of this project.

Instead of aiming for generalisability, which is often seen as "the ultimate yardstick of the relevance and success of any piece of research" (Van Lier, 2004, p. 202), the objective of this research project is transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) of the present results and their implications to other contexts and situations. The replication logic described here, may lead to analytic generalisation (Yin, 2014), as neither case study research, nor Q methodological research aim to establish statistical generalisation to larger population from their findings.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability of Q methodology has been demonstrated through test-retest studies, involving studies where the same individuals sorted the same Q set at different points in time. These studies typically resulted in correlation coefficients of 0.80 or higher (Brown, 1980). However, these tests did not necessarily measure the method's reliability, but rather the participant's replicability of his or her viewpoint. Nevertheless, the robust procedure of creating a concourse from multiple sources and the evaluation of items by external experts and participants in pilot studies (see section *Concourse and Q sample construction*, p. 69), can be seen as a means to safeguarding the studies' reliability and content validity.

Moreover, despite the quantitative components of Q methodology, its validity is assessed in line with qualitative research as no outside criterion is applied to participants' interpretation of individual items. While methods using a scale need to make sure each item measures what it is to supposed to measure in the sense of an a priori meaning, Q methodology is interested "in learning how the subject, not the observer, understands and reacts to the items" (Brown, 1980, p. 191) and therefore applies an a posteriori interpretation. As a consequence, validity in Q methodology is not a consideration, as there is no right and wrong of participants' *subjective* point of view.

Ethical Considerations

This study has followed the Swedish Research Council's recommendations for good research practice (Stafström, 2017) and the AERA code of ethics (AERA, 2011). In studies with human subjects (article III and article IV), respondents were fully informed about the research project's aim and methodology in oral and written form. They were made aware of the anonymised reporting of the study's results in academic journals and in this thesis. Moreover, they knew about the opportunity to discontinue their participation at any given time. Participants gave their informed consent (Miles et al., 2014) by signing a form prior to the Q methodological sorting activity. In order to further protect confidentiality, the Q methodological result sheet and the demographic information of individual participants were encoded and no sensitive personal data was collected. The original hard paper copies of data material are currently stored in a locked office cupboard in a room only accessible with

a Malmö University staff card. If necessary for further analysis, all material is easily retrievable.

Researcher's own Positionality

One's positionality is relevant for any researcher and in particular for transnational and bicultural ones, as the shuttling between a, somewhat illusory (Hult, 2014a) insider/outsider dichotomy is made possible. Self-reflexivity is therefore of particular importance for this research project, as different parts of the research process are affected by the researcher's positionality and subjectivity (Mohr, 2020). During the data collection phase for articles III and IV, the author's strategic language choice of the local dominant language for the introduction and presentation of the project allowed the positioning as an insider and the minimisation of the observer's paradox (Labov, 1972). Then, the researcher's own subjectivity and reflexivity about its influence on research process proved to be particularly valuable during the interpretation phase of the project. Here, the fact that the author was also an outsider, *nota bene* in both study contexts, was the ground for a more comprehensive analysis, as objectivity is traditionally ascribed to the outsider researcher (Farahani, 2010). In other words and in line with the philosophical underpinning of Q, there is "no objectivity without subjectivity" (Watts & Stenner, 2012, p. 29). In addition to this in-between position, English as the prime language to disseminate the results of this project has been selected because of its neutrality with regard to the Swedish and Swiss context and for the scope of making this research available for a wider audience. Contributing to more transparency in multilingual data collection processes (Piller, 2016b), it needs to be noted that there exists an English version of all statements used in the Q study's sorting activities, despite the fact that they were only used in Swedish or German respectively.

As this research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors, no potential conflict of interest needs to be reported.

STUDIES' RESULTS

In the present chapter, results of four individual articles, serving as guideposts toward two overarching questions, are summarised. Findings from article I contributed to the investigation of explicit and implicit discourses about multilingualism in education in Sweden and Switzerland from the stance of academic scholars, while articles III and IV yielded different teachers' viewpoints about multilingualism from the two purposefully selected contexts by applying Q methodology.

The second overarching research question of this thesis, concerning the applicability of Q methodology in educational research to study subjective perspectives and lived experiences of different stakeholders, is answered with a comprehensive and systematic research review in article II and the author's first-hand experience from articles III and IV.

Article I

Multilingual educational language policies in Switzerland and Sweden: A meta-analysis (Lundberg, Adrian, 2018, *Language Problems and Language Planning*. 42(1), 45-69)

This meta-analysis examined how peer-review research studies on multilingual educational policy documents in Sweden and Switzerland, published between 2009 and 2016, differ concerning their research focus and the discourses about multilingualism. Through the use of two different databases (ERIC and LLBA) and the application of inclusion and exclusion criteria, a total of nine studies from the Swedish context and four studies from the Swiss context could be identified. The analysis yielded four different research foci. While studies about the Swedish context were focus-

ing on a national language policy (n=5) and the curriculum/syllabus (n=5), articles about Switzerland were keen to concentrate on the role of pupils (n=2) and the curriculum/syllabus (n=2). The topic of a national language policy is inexistent in included studies from the Swiss context.

The analysis of the content of the articles allowed the identification of four topics, which provided the foundation for a discussion about implicit and explicit discourses in the treatment of educational language policies. The topics were:

1. Awareness of plurilingualism

The included studies showcase a multifaceted awareness of plurilingualism. On a school curriculum level, Nordic countries seem to regard monolingualism as the norm. French-speaking Switzerland, adapts a new curriculum based on plurilingualism as the norm and objective of public schooling. Teachers, in the other hand, are reported to show more awareness of plurilingualism in Sweden. However, as a result of individual multilingualism, second-language learners are confronted with a restricted curriculum, still indicating a monolingual habitus in the Scandinavian context. This negative misconception is reported from Swiss teachers as well, especially in particular local contexts. Even if research from Switzerland also adds the benefits of multilingualism in language acquisition and there seems to exist a potential lack of teachers' awareness of these positive effects.

2. Third language acquisition

The previous topic goes hand in hand with the one of third language acquisition. Researchers from both contexts demonstrate a positive attitude towards the teaching and learning of a third language. The different policy situation in the chosen contexts however strongly influences the choice of research topic. In Switzerland, researchers mostly focus on effectiveness in third language acquisition, while researchers in Sweden concentrate on students' language option, which allows learners to opt out of third language acquisition.

3. English

The topic of third language acquisition is closely connected to the discussion about English. Research from the Swedish context is concerned about the importance and implicitness of English in Sweden and how the global lingua franca hinders the development of linguistic diversity in the Swedish school context. The discussion

in Switzerland is profoundly different and centres around the order of foreign languages in the curricula in German-speaking Switzerland and the interrelation of English and French language learning.

4. Discrepancy between language policy and language planning.

Research from Sweden and Switzerland discusses a substantial discrepancy between policy and planning. Regardless of the aspect of educational language policy, included studies seem to be in agreement about the existence of a gap between what a policy document aims to accomplish and what more local contexts manage to do in line with it.

The article concluded that, in line with the respective local curriculum, research in the Swedish contexts focused particularly on specific subjects and their role in the development of pupils' multilingualism, while research in the Swiss context showed a more holistic view of multilingualism where language subjects potentially interrelate.

A further conclusion of article I is the country specific variety in the conceptualisation of the terms *multilingualism* and *plurilingual student*. Except for one, all studies from Switzerland included all students in their research about multilingual educational language policies, regardless of their mother tongue. In Sweden, however, discourses about the plurilingual student often excluded native Swedish speakers, indicating a stronger monolingual habitus in the Scandinavian nation state.

The English language was found to be a topic in research from both countries. However, the Swedish contexts delivered a much greater level of detail about the role of the language in the local linguistic ecology. Moreover, English in Sweden was found to often be connected to a hindrance of the development of linguistic diversity, while English is seen as a part of linguistic diversity in Switzerland.

Similarities between the two contexts were found in the challenging implementation process of multilingual educational language policies and a particular focus was directed towards teachers as potential policy implementers. Educators in both contexts seem yet to be convinced of state-of-the-art multilingual language policy. However, it was noted that further research is needed to investigate the enactment of a new approach in language teaching, which usually lags its implementation.

Article II

Q Methodology: A Mixed Method Approach to Subjectivity in Educational Research (Lundberg, Adrian; de Leeuw, Renske & Renata Aliani, *submitted manuscript, under review*)

The point of departure for this article is the importance of studying subjectivity to complement so-called objective science with the aim of comprehensively represent educational issues. As Q methodology has been promoted as “the best-developed paradigm for the investigation of human subjectivity” (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002, p. 20), this paper systematically reviewed its applications in recent educational research (2010-2019). To represent the vast field of education and acknowledge its localised and interconnected nature, a framework for the science of learning and development (SoLD, Darling-Hammond et al., 2019) was introduced. SoLD consists of these four areas:

1. Supportive environmental conditions
2. Productive instructional strategies
3. Social and emotional development
4. Systems of support

As an inherently mixed method, Q methodology has been regarded as especially well-suited to explore often marginalised voices and allow a participatory research approach. The article presents six methodological steps from concourse development to factor interpretation, providing necessary background information for educational researchers to grasp the potential of Q methodology for their field.

The study selection process was initiated with a literature search in three bibliographic databases (ERIC, Web of Science and Scopus). Through the application of various inclusion and exclusion criteria, literature could be narrowed down to 74 studies. In order to answer the first research question concerning characteristics of Q methodological studies in educational research, information about a wide range of aspects was carefully and systematically extracted and analysed. For the second research question regarding a categorisation of implications of all included studies, a narrative approach was applied. Moreover, SoLD was used as an analytical framework.

Results show that Q methodology was mostly applied with participants located in the USA and UK. Moreover, the majority of papers were published since 2017, indicating a growing popularity of Q methodology in the field of compulsory education research. In terms of participant cohorts, teachers, especially in-service teachers, were employed most often (41% of all studies). However, pupils' voices were the second largest cohort and illustrate the methodology's potential for otherwise marginalised respondents (Brown, 2006, Ellingsen et al., 2014).

A categorisation of all studies' research focus, through the analysis of stated research questions, research aims and conditions of instructions yielded six different foci:

- A: Representation
- B: Attitudes & Values
- C: Critical reflection
- D: Evaluation
- E: Response
- F: Decision making

The average number of participants in all included studies was slightly higher than 37. An average of around 40 items were sorted by the participants of the studies. The majority of them did so with physical cards and a researcher present in the room. In terms of the most common factor analytical procedure, principal component analysis and Varimax rotation were chosen and most often executed in PQMethod. A three-factor-solution was most common. A range of 13 studies showed less conventional study designs by combining different conditions of instruction or Q sets. Moreover, two studies applied a pre/post study design. Eleven studies incorporated a participatory research approach in at least one step during the methodological process.

The analysis for the second research question showed that Q methodology was not only applied to investigate issues in all four areas of SoLD, but also for subjects regarding teacher characteristics and alternative uses of Q methodology in education.

The review clearly showcases the diversity and flexibility of Q methodology in educational research. The fact that Q methodology is applied to investigate research questions in six different categories and that in-

cluded studies employ participants in ten different cohorts, including young children, illustrates the methodology's potential for research in a wide range of directions. A continuous topic in included studies was the demand for a participatory approach to policy formulation and implementation. Not only was Q methodology found to be a fitting research approach for this specific topic, but the methodology was often suggested as part of the solution due to its strength in allowing participants to reflect and lead a discussion of their viewpoints.

Article III

Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism: findings from Q method research (Lundberg, Adrian, 2019, *Current Issues in Language Planning*. 20(3), 266-283)

This study explored teachers' beliefs about the underlying understanding of multilingualism and their suggested pedagogical actions regarding the subject matter through Q methodology. Forty participating teachers from three different schools in urban and rural areas in southern Sweden shared their implicit and explicit beliefs by rank ordering items in two separate study components named *understanding* and *pedagogy*.

Data was quantitatively analysed using a dedicated software package and yielded three factors for each component. Due to the compelling communality of significantly loading teachers, results from the study components were merged then into three different sets of teachers' beliefs. The first one (TBS1) is the consensus set, drawing from a common disciplinary socialisation and indicating a welcoming and inclusive understanding of multilingualism. Teachers represented by teachers' belief set 1 show a readiness to help multilingual students succeed in the Swedish education system and their ideology is largely in line with a language as right orientation.

The second teachers' belief set (TBS2) represents the antithesis to the first own and hardly sees any benefits of multilingualism. Multilingualism is considered a problem, not only for the students themselves, but also for the teachers, as it leads to an increased workload. Pedagogical strategies such as translanguaging are not encourage or even accepted by respondents in agreement with teachers' beliefs set 2, who are mostly male and work in rural schools.

Teachers' belief set 3 (TBS3) shares a relatively high correlation with the first one, which is illustrated in their similarities of communicated beliefs about the benefits of multilingualism. However, teachers loading on what can be considered the synthesis in this study also agree with underlying discourses typical for teachers' belief set 2 in terms of not needing to adapt their professional practice due to linguistic diversity.

Teachers from rural areas, with comparatively little contact with minority language speakers, were more likely to load significantly on teachers' belief set 2, allowing the conclusion that local context and school affiliation is a predictive factor in the Swedish context. Moreover, the clear connection between the two study components indicates how an affirmative understanding of multilingualism can lead to a more pluralistic proposed way of teaching and vice versa. A further conclusion can be drawn by contrasting the student-centred approach in TBS1 compared to the overwhelming teacher-centred approach in TBS2.

Finally, results in article III suggest a discrepancy between pluralistic language policies in Sweden and teachers' beliefs rooted in monolingual ideologies. As a prerequisite to change the status quo and close this gap, teachers are demanded to raise their awareness of the complexity of multilingualism, potentially through additional measures of pre- and in-service education.

Article IV

Teachers' viewpoints about an educational reform concerning multilingualism in German-speaking Switzerland (Lundberg, Adrian, 2019, *Learning and Instruction*. 64, 101244)

This Q methodological paper investigated teachers' viewpoints in the Canton of Berne, Switzerland. Even though the national context is considered to be a prime example of a multilingual entity, the local study context is predominantly German-speaking. Data collection was performed shortly after an intensive phase of professional development about multilingualism for foreign language teachers. The mandatory course was set out to effectively introduce a new pluralistic curriculum for foreign language subjects.

The first component of this study focused on the teachers' conceptual understanding of multilingualism by providing them 39 statements to

rank order according to their agreement. The inverted factor analytical process, including a correlation of all 67 individual Q sorts resulted in one consensus Viewpoint A, which showed large congruence with a multilingualism as resource orientation promoted in the current curriculum in the studied context. Under closer inspection, Viewpoint A could be split into Viewpoint A+ for foreign language teachers, considering their students' multilingualism as a result of their teaching and Viewpoint A-, predominantly populated by teachers of other subjects than foreign languages, thus also German. Notwithstanding their general acceptance of multilingualism's positive effects, their understanding was closer connected to a migration-induced phenomenon and a potential source of frustration.

The second study component, comprising 32 statements, investigated teachers' potential pedagogical actions concerning multilingualism. Here, Q methodology yielded a wide range of different viewpoints, although five viewpoints were statistically intercorrelated. It was concluded that the level of insecurity in connection with linguistic diversity and a potential lack of knowledge about multilingualism were decisive for the allocation of the teachers to the viewpoints.

In conclusion, all viewpoints can be regarded as being influenced by the intense mandatory further education about the paradigmatic shift in the teaching and learning of foreign languages in the Canton of Berne. Nevertheless, a distinction between a personal and a professional stance was drawn to further analyse the results. It seems as the participating teachers in Switzerland are technically aware of the advantages of multilingualism, hence the large consensus in component 1, but lack experience in teaching in line with the large-scale innovation of the new curriculum. As a result, they fall back on a more personal stance, potentially influenced by more traditional monolingual ideologies. It remains to be investigated, for example through classroom observations, how described teachers' viewpoints are practically enacted.

While viewpoints about multilingualism and its management in the classroom found in this study could not be assigned to local contexts, the distinction along the line of foreign language teaching and other subjects allows the call for even more involvement of the latter in awareness raising and knowledge development about multilingualism.

CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

To advance the discussion about a change for social justice and betterment for all students (United Nations, 2018) by filling the methodological niche of comparatively analysing stakeholders' viewpoints about multilingualism, the previously outlined results from the four independent articles are now discussed. The first part of the present chapter is structured according to the thesis' two overarching research questions:

1. How does language management in education take shape in relation to socially situated discourses about multilingualism and (language) policy?
2. What are the benefits and limitations of using Q methodology in educational research?

Subsequent to the discussion of the results, implications from the present research project are discussed and followed up with limitations, delimitations and suggestions for further research.

Multilingualism in Sweden and Switzerland

Article I provided an overview of teachers' larger context by comparing research about multilingual educational policies in Sweden and Switzerland. Together with articles III and IV, which uncovered the range of explicit and implicit discourses about multilingualism in teachers' cognition in the investigated contexts, these three studies respond to the first overarching research question. By drawing on teachers' role as policy arbiters (see section on *Language Management*, p. 34), based on their cognition as a conglomeration of knowledge, beliefs and experience (see

section on *Teacher Cognition*, p. 24), investigating stakeholders' predominant viewpoints in the chosen contexts allows a discussion about equity in education, regardless of linguistic background.

Regulating Linguistic Diversity

The systematic meta-analysis in article I revealed considerable differences in research about multilingualism and in particular multilingual educational language policy from the two contexts under scrutiny. Overall, the discourses identified in research results, reflect the predominant discourses in the respective context. At least in the seven years after the introduction of the Language Act in Sweden in 2009, multilingualism in Sweden was strongly connected to a national language policy. This is equally surprising, as understandable. The Language Act most prominently secured the position and development of Swedish and was named an assimilation policy (Winsa, 2005) as it was covertly concerned with immigration (Bolton & Meierkord, 2013) and therefore also a regulation of linguistic diversity. While this discourse, especially due to its culmination in the country's first official language policy, certainly can be connected with *multilingual educational language policies*, it is telling that the topic of a national language policy was not detected in studies from the Swiss context, albeit characterised by a national language policy, which was revised in 2007 to promote multilingualism.

An Atomistic and a Holistic View of Multilingualism

Research results from both contexts were in alignment with the respective local curriculum. This finding can therefore be seen as a confirmation of Schiffman's (1996) theory on linguistic culture, indicating that the researchers' choice of focus was strongly influenced by the local educational policy in use. In other words, not only does the Swedish educational system treat pupils from a monolingually focused perspective, but also researchers seem to focus on specific subjects and their role in the development of pupils' multilingualism. This does not mean that one necessarily need to impute a monolingual habitus to researchers from Sweden, but it does indicate the strong influence of official language policy on research from the same context and an atomistic view of multilingualism, which is nevertheless "the most widespread view adopted in multilingualism studies" (Cenoz, 2013, p. 10). In the Swiss results,

where the included studies in article I showed a more holistic view of multilingualism, potential interconnections between language subjects and their influence on pupils' individual multilingualism were a common theme of research. While this is in line with the pluralistic approach in the current local curriculum based on didactics of multilingualism, it does not automatically assign a multilingual habitus (Benson, 2013) to the researcher. With regard to the present thesis, the reader shall be referred to the description of the author's own positionality as an insider and outsider in both context.

Definition of Multilingualism and Multilingual Student

One of the most influential findings of article I for the continuation of the whole research project was the country specific variety in the conceptualisation of the terms *multilingualism* and *multilingual student*. Identical to the discussion of the chosen research focus above, article I describes how the understanding of the terms is generally in line with the underlying orientation in the respective local curriculum. In research results from Switzerland, students are generally considered multilingual "as soon as they have gained knowledge of more than one language" (Lundberg, 2018, p. 63), without making any distinction between migrants and others. This is potentially explained by the individual publications' focus on compulsory third language acquisition in the sense of learning two foreign languages in addition to the local school language. In the studies from Sweden, discourses about multilingual students often excluded native Swedish speakers, indicating a monolingual habitus. This discrepancy eventually became the focal point of the first study component in articles III and IV, where teachers sorted cards according to their viewpoint of what the terms *multilingualism* and *multilingual students* meant to them. Results from these two Q methodological studies largely confirmed the discourses found in the research results reviewed in article I. Especially in Switzerland (Lundberg, 2019b), a striking consensus with 65 of 67 participating teachers, significantly loading on Viewpoint A and largely in line with the curriculum, could be detected. As the applied methodology allows to paint a complex picture of the viewpoint, it can be mentioned here that the participating teachers in Switzerland reported to respect all pupils' full linguistic repertoire and that there is no native-like benchmark to be called a multilingual. By

separating two manifestations of that one consensus factor, article IV showed how Viewpoint A+, predominantly consisting of foreign language teachers with the experience of an intense professional development concerning the newly introduced Passepartout curriculum, understood multilingualism to a great extent as a result of their teaching. It can be concluded that they thereby connected their pupils' emergent multilingualism with their own successful teaching practice. Their colleagues loading significantly on Viewpoint A-, and generally without the additional institutional input about multilingualism, tended to connect the concept under scrutiny to a migration-induced phenomenon. Since these teachers predominantly use the local majority language as a medium of instruction, they were slightly more cautious about the benefits of multilingualism than Viewpoint A+ respondents.

Multilingualism as a Theoretical Resource

Even though respondents loading significantly on Viewpoint A- in Switzerland couple multilingualism with potentially frustrating situations in their teaching, they still held strong beliefs in line with a multilingualism as resource orientation (Lo Bianco, 2017). Influences of a Swiss national identity, where individual multilingualism is promoted, and the teachers' own multilingual repertoire can clearly be detected in Viewpoint A, and especially A+. While Swiss individuals in society find means to communicate in multilingual situations, e.g. through their productive or receptive use of a second language, multilingualism is not necessarily connected to a lack of social cohesion. In schooling however, a common language is generally desired in study component 2. It can therefore be concluded that respondents in article IV conceptually align with the idea of multilingualism as a resource, but need to develop further to also do so practically. A further explanation for the striking consensus in study component 1 in article IV directs the attention to the intense professional development course prior to the data collection. Despite the fact that only teachers of foreign languages were obligated to participate, all teachers were affected by it, by acting as substitute teachers for those engaged in the course or by simply participating in discussions about new textbooks for French and English in line with a new curriculum. Moreover, the topic has gained a lot of media coverage,

mostly reporting on potential risks of paradigmatically moving away from traditional language teaching.

A common socialisation of teachers about multilingualism, similar to the Swiss contexts, does not exist in Sweden. Moreover the curriculum implementation system is based on the teachers' own interpretation (Selin & Holmqvist Olander, 2015). It is therefore hardly surprising that results in article III, reporting the Swedish results, showed more variety in the first study component than article IV. A total of three factors were extracted, ranging from an overwhelmingly positive Factor 1-U to a critical Factor 2-U. Factor 3-U is interpreted as a synthesis of the two, and reported the belief "that children are either monolingual or multilingual and that it is impossible to become multilingual" (Lundberg, 2019a, p. 277). The local school context seemed to play a decisive role in the Swedish context, as teachers' belief set 2, consisting of Factors 2-U and 2-P was mainly populated by teachers from rural areas. Potential explanations for the importance of the local context are the experience with linguistic diversity or the lack thereof, and a common perspective towards the topic within the school, based on the theory of socially shared cognition (Wertsch, 1991). Another interpretation of the shared viewpoints in the rural context with a predominant homogenous Swedish student population is the conscious or unconscious cooperation among teachers in order to share responsibilities in area that creates insecurity (Paulsrud & Wermke, 2019). Valuing teacher collectivism in Sweden has been found particularly strong "when taking care of students who for some reason need extended help for their social functioning and learning problems" (Helgøy & Homme, 2007). With the knowledge of these teachers' understanding of the *multilingual student* as those who need support because of a lack of Swedish, one can effortlessly retrace the rationale. In addition to this variety of conceptual understandings reported in article III, where school affiliation seemed to be a predictive variable, several misconceptions, eventually based on insecurities, about the subject matter could be revealed. These finding call for a range of implications regarding teachers' professional development, which is discussed below.

English as a Hinderance or a Resource

A discourse about the role and position of English is present in the linguistic ecologies of both contexts. However, article I shows that it is much more prominent in the Scandinavian country, where the global lingua franca has gained the status of a transcultural language (Hult, 2012) and is regarded as the main driver in the process leading up to the national Language Act (Milani, 2008) and a hindrance of the development of linguistic diversity (Cabau, 2014). This because many pupils regard the combination of Swedish and English as sufficient for national and international communication, similar to English monolingualism in English dominant countries (Liddicoat, 2019). While pupils in Sweden often chose not to learn an additional language in grade 6 (Tholin, 2012), teachers loading on Factors 1-U and 2-U in article III both report their agreement with the necessity of competence in more than two languages. The apparent disagreement between reported student and teacher preferences can however be nullified, if one considers the aforementioned definition of multilingual students in Sweden, who come to school with a mother tongue other than Swedish (L1), are encouraged to acquire the dominant majority language (L2) and English (L3).

The discourse of English in Switzerland is fundamentally different, illustrating the situated nature of language planning for cultural and therefore also linguistic diversity (Lo Bianco, 2010a). In article I, it was concluded that English is simply seen as part of individuals' linguistic diversity. Nevertheless, Stotz (2006), in his description of multilingualism in Switzerland, illustrates how the English language caused fierce discussions in the central European country, in terms of which foreign language should be taught first in presumably harmonised German-speaking Switzerland. As mentioned earlier, no agreement could be reached and cantons along the German-French language boarder chose to teach first French and then English. In terms of viewpoints about third language acquisition found in article IV, teachers disclosed mixed preferences. A result which can be considered a deviation from the larger discourse about multilingualism in Switzerland and the overall aim of the curriculum in place, stating functional multilingualism of all pupils based on two compulsory foreign languages.

Multilingualism as a Potential Practical Problem

It was already touched upon earlier that significant room for improvement was detected in Swiss viewpoints about suggested pedagogical actions concerning multilingualism, if the aim is social justice in education through a welcoming atmosphere in the classroom, where teachers manage language in order to cater their pupils' needs on the one hand and fully tap the potential of multilinguals' individual linguistic repertoire on the other hand. In article IV, it was concluded that teachers' sorting in study component 2 was largely rooted in their personal stance as opposed to a professional one, which was more influential in study component 1. As research about teachers' beliefs shows, these often subconscious elements of teacher cognition are built early in their life (Pajares, 1992), and reproduced and passed on from generation to generation (Biesta, 2015, Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977) as an inherent part of their professional habitus. In order for education to reduce inequalities (United Nations, 2018, Salzburg Global Seminar, 2018) and not reproduce them in the course of maintaining and perpetuating the socioeconomic order (Piller, 2016a), it is not enough to break the monolingual habitus only in terms of the conceptual understanding of multilingualism (study component 1), but there also needs to occur a cognitive adaptation in terms of their suggested pedagogical actions (study component 2). The wide range of sceptical viewpoints for the second component outlined in article IV is further explained by an insecurity about more recent pedagogical approaches, such as translanguaging (García, 2009) or language awareness (James & Garrett, 1991). While they may sound especially attractive to teachers with a multilingual orientation, they too, have not yet had the opportunities to collect enough experience, which could confirm their well-intentioned effort. Moreover, they are constantly confronted with expectations of often impatient stakeholders, such as pupils, pupils' parents, researchers and society at large. Media coverage, focusing on inferior pupil performance with new textbooks and the new curriculum in Switzerland, nota bene assessed with traditional, atomistic native-like standards, has led to partial refusal of new material in Switzerland under the pretence of protective mediation (Osborn et al., 1997).

It needs to be noted again that in study component 2 of articles III and IV teachers' *intended* practical actions in the classroom were investigat-

ed. Their *actual* actions after the classroom doorsill can be expected to be even more influenced by their personal stance discussed above and therefore in less alignment with the current local educational policies.

Pupils' Multilingual Development

Findings in articles I, III and IV illustrated the complexity of multilingualism as a phenomenon. Especially the dichotomy between curricular and biographic multilingualism seems to distinguish viewpoints, even though this difference does not necessarily seem to be of importance for individuals' activation of linguistic resources. As summarised by Coulmas (2018), hardly any clear-cut categories in the definition of multilingualism exist, as "one multilingualism is not like all others" (p. 41). As a further development of the continuum between becoming and being multilingual (Cenoz & Gorter, 2015) and the double-helixed continuum by Melo-Pfeifer (2018), an adapted conceptual representation of individuals' linguistic repertoire is suggested here. Q methodological studies in the present thesis illustrated that this project is neither fully located in second language acquisition (curricular multilingualism), nor in sociolinguistics (biographic multilingualism), but rather investigates how the phenomenon is understood differently in specific sociocultural-ly embedded contexts, each with their own dominant discourses.

The proposed model does not aim to erase the abundant inequality between languages in terms of social power, opportunity, mobility and material advancements, but has as its purpose the portrayal of multilingual development of individuals. It is therefore in line with the multilingual turn (Conteh & Meier, 2014) and the increasing normalisation of multilingualism. Furthermore, it allows the recognition of the fluidity of boundaries between languages, which is a central characteristic of approaches focusing on pupils' heteroglossic practices, such as translanguaging (García, 2009) or codemeshing (Canagarajah, 2011).

Figure 1. Conceptualisation of individual's linguistic repertoire

By displaying biographic and curricular multilingualism as two axes, the origin of the chart (Figure 1), where the two axes have its source, represents the rare case of a monolingual individual without any engagement in curricular language learning. The arrows illustrate increasing multilingualism due to curricular *or* and in most cases *and* biographic reasons. If individuals have only been in one institutional language learning situation, the y axis represents the curriculum of this specific context. If individuals have been in one context first and then moved to another one, their curricular multilingualism consists of both contexts.

Figure 1 is especially useful to illustrate the importance of multilingualism for all teachers. If policy settings in general are adapted in line with a multilingualism as resource orientation, a monolingual habitus in classrooms can successfully be redressed with a culturally and linguistically responsive and sensitive one. In order to do so, Clyne (2008) suggested to increase the number of multilingual individuals in decision making roles to overcome the monolingual mindset. What is needed is a shift from a monolingual habitus, stemming from history to a multilingual habitus in line with contemporary research on learning and instruc-

tion in relation to acknowledging and giving value to individuals’ “existing linguistic and cultural resources” (Benson, 2013, p. 295).

Q methodology in Educational Research

The second overarching research question of this thesis concerns the applicability of Q methodology in educational research and is therefore mainly examined through article II, a methodological research review investigating Q methodological research on compulsory education in the most recent decade. In addition, articles III and IV provide a valuable contribution in answering the second overarching question in terms of the role of teacher agency.

Q covering all Areas of SoLD

Article II illustrates that researchers from a wide range of contexts have applied Q to investigate different principles of practice in the science of learning and development outlined in Darling-Hammond et al. (2019). As integral parts of article II, articles III and IV added to the review of Q methodology in educational research and illustrate the potential of the methodology to produce relevant research results that eventually improve instructional quality and pupil performance based on the science of learning development (SoLD). The SoLD area of social and emotional development of pupils was found to be underrepresented in Q methodological studies. This finding is rather surprising, as Q would be especially well-suited for the investigation of issues that concern sensitive topics and demand children to communicate their thoughts. Through the flexibility in terms of data gathering, for example with pictures instead of text and the fact that participants do not need to produce language in order to communicate their viewpoint, Q methodology has been considered especially practical for collecting otherwise marginalised voice (Brown, 2006, Ellingsen et al., 2014).

Flexibility of Q methodology

A wide range of characteristics of Q methodology was detected in the 74 included studies in article II. As discussed above, from 2010 until 2019, the methodology was applied in a way it touched upon all SoLD areas, with different study foci, ranging from examining stakeholders’

representations of issues to investigating attitudes and values about aspects of learning and development. Furthermore, the application of Q as a tool for critical reflection (see below), indicates additional function.

Article II further illustrates the variety of characteristics of Q applications in educational research. Even though most studies included in the research review reported “one batch of factors, stemming from one set of items, which participants, whether or not belonging to the same cohort, sorted according to one condition of instruction at one point in time” (Lundberg, de Leeuw & Aliani, under review), several studies, including articles III and IV, show less conventional study designs and thereby showcase the methodology’s flexibility.

Q for Critical Reflection

By uncovering teachers’ potential internal dilemmas concerning questions of language, in particular multilingualism in Sweden and Switzerland, they are granted participation in a dialogue about opportunities and challenges of multilingualism in education through critical engagement and reflection (Lo Bianco, 2010b). Even though *critical reflection* was not the main aim in the sense of the categorisation of study foci provided in article II, articles III and IV nevertheless illustrated how Q was used to provoke a further dialogue.

Concerning critical reflection as the study focus, article II shows that Q was used in 13 included publications to provide participants, predominantly teachers, but also pupils, a means to think carefully and critically about an issue. In order to do so, Q factor analysis is not necessarily required, which allows a less time-consuming and less complicate application of a part of Q methodology.

Neither Right nor Wrong, but Relative

One objective of the present study was to investigate teachers’ subjectivity in terms of multilingualism and thereby present this complex phenomenon in the most unbiased form possible (Aronin & Jessner, 2015). Q proved to be a fitting approach for that for two reasons. First, the construction of the Q set allowed the inclusion of items, which did not necessarily represent empirical facts about multilingualism, but discourses about the issue in general. Some of them could be regarded as myths from the point of research. Second, in Q, no outside criterion for a per-

son's own point of view is used (Brown, 1980). As a consequence, participants' sorting of items are neither considered right, nor wrong, but simply a presentation and communication of their subjectivity.

Individual Q items receive their meaning through the participant's sorting. This is not achieved by ranking them on a scale (similar to Likert), but by observing how each item compares with the value assigned to other items. As a result, an intense engagement with the issue under scrutiny, in the case of the present thesis, of multilingualism was necessary and led to the point, where participants wanted to ensure that their viewpoint is accurately represented by the holistic configuration of all items in front of them. The fact that participants thereby *see* their viewpoint, can be regarded as another advantage of Q. The combination of the two characteristics of Q described here, contributed strongly to a comprehensive presentation of teachers' viewpoints about multilingualism, including negative and more critical stances.

Time-consuming, Rare and Demanding

As any other research method, Q methodology has certain disadvantages and limitations. The main one relates to the time-consuming processes involved in Q methodological research. In constructing a well-balanced Q set, researchers are obliged to invest a significant amount of time into preparatory work. Moreover, as content validation of Q items is considered essential, finding external experts and/or pilot study participants can further decelerate the process. The combination of these aspects makes Q unsuitable for spontaneous research endeavours.

Even though the research review reported in article II demonstrates an increasing presence of Q methodology in educational research, which is in line with the methodology's growing popularity in other fields (Brown, 2019a), the approach is still fairly unknown. This has several consequences. First, participants might find it difficult to accept not to be provided with definitions of central terminology in Q items. Respondents might simply not be used to not being objected to researcher-imposed categories. Explaining the process and providing comprehensible instructions are therefore vital precautions to be taken when investigating subjective viewpoints with Q methodology. Secondly, publishing Q research provides some unique challenges (Watts & Stenner, 2012). The rather limited familiarity of journal editors and reviewers often re-

quires authors to spend a considerable amount of precious words on the method section of papers. The present thesis, and in particular article II, can serve as a guide in terms of fundamental information to include in article manuscripts.

Finally, similar to any other mixed method approach, Q requires researchers to have a considerable level of expertise in both, qualitative and quantitative methods. Moreover, the statistical elements of Q methodology are not in line with traditional R methodological procedures, requiring novice Q researcher to develop further specific knowledge.

Contribution to Knowledge and Implications

Situated Teaching

This thesis draws on an ecological approach to teacher agency (Priestley et al., 2015), where teacher cognition is strongly influenced by its situated nature. By outlining the contextual differences in the countries' educational policy documents and even research results about them (article I), similar trajectories could have been expected in teachers' viewpoints about multilingualism. However, assigning teachers the power of policy arbiters (Menken & García, 2010, Johnson, 2013a) within a situated form of language policy raises the complexity of the issue. By using Q methodology and investigating shared viewpoints about multilingualism, research in this thesis permits the uncovering of clusters and communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and shows the importance of further investigating teachers' role in policy enactment processes. The comparison of the results in Sweden and Switzerland clearly illustrates how teachers in a specific context, regardless if wider as in Switzerland or narrower as in Sweden, act with a similar conceptual understanding of multilingualism. As an implication of this analysis and a confirmation of teachers' salient individual and shared role as policy actors, the term *situated teaching* is suggested. Assuming educational policies in line with the aim of social justice and betterment for all pupils are in place, governments and regional agencies can foster a welcoming culture and positive development by providing basic conditions such as time, trust and the engagement of teachers in their professional development that reaches beyond the fences of single schools.

Time and Trust

The importance of time and especially the asynchronies of stakeholders' timescales has been outlined as a potential reason for the failure of change (Nocon, 2008). These processes are clearly visible in the current project as well, especially by investigating the Swiss context, where the implementation of the new curriculum is characterised as part of a large-scale innovation. Policy makers behind this innovation follow rapid timeframes, as they want *their* policy to be implemented as soon as possible. Community members, particularly parents of school children set their timeframe in relation to individual needs and preferences, but certainly do not want their children to be guinea pigs in an innovation implementation that might potentially fail. As a third group of stakeholders, teachers base their decision-making among other things on short- and long-term goals. As touched upon in the section on the projective dimension of teacher agency (see p. 26), educators might not necessarily prioritise the implementation of an innovation, especially if it is connected to a paradigmatic shift in their cognition or even goes against their existing preferences. The result is a delay in the implementation process (Phillips & Ochs, 2003) and a perceived policy-practice divide (Schulte, 2018). Moreover, as being part of their long-term goal setting, pedagogical actions in line with the innovation might, in teachers' views unnecessarily, complicate day-to-day teaching. Article IV in the present research project indicated a clear discrepancy between the teachers' theoretical understanding of multilingualism as resource and their reactions to suggested pedagogical actions. In other words, a pluralistic approach to teaching needs to become an inherent part of dominant teacher activity (Sannino, 2008), which ultimately involves a change in their professional habitus and in turn calls for changes in pre-service teacher education and in-service teachers' professional development. Consequently, teachers are to be given motivational conditions to experiment, especially when policies ask for adaptations of their cognition, their comfort zone and their perceptions of aspects of the linguistic culture they find themselves in.

Further, school principals are assigned a crucial role in the creation of trust and motivation, by providing opportunities for staff collaboration and planning teachers' growth and development (Darling-Hammond et al., 2019) and therefore also in supporting and potentially changing

teacher viewpoints. Moreover “unclear relationships and distrust between principals and employers” (p. 8) in the Swedish school system was detected as one of several aspects in the hindrance of nurturing excellence in the teaching profession (OECD, 2015). Participating principals in studies III and IV did not show any protruding viewpoint. It can therefore be assumed that they too would benefit from an intensified preparation, as the survival and success of pluralistic language policies seems to heavily depend on their judgement (Menken & Solorza, 2015) and leadership qualities during any policy implementation processes (Honig, 2006).

Teacher Education

Schools in Sweden and Switzerland are in many ways similar, as they both “safeguard the monolingual sphere and host, at the same time the linguistic diversity of their students” (Gogolin & Duarte, 2013, p. 10). Drawing on the weight of substantial evidence that teacher education matters (Darling-Hammond, 2000) regarding their cognitive knowledge development (Borg, 2003), a focus on multilingual development in teacher in- and pre-service education in both countries needs to be intensified and awareness and consciousness about any potential monolingual habitus should be further raised, in order for teachers to be better equipped to not only host linguistic diversity, but in fact foster it.

In the results from Sweden (article III), the dominant belief set 1 showed a generally well-meant viewpoint towards multilingual students with a migration background. However, there still remains a considerable number of teachers, particularly those loading significantly on belief set 2, that rather display a deficit-focused language as problem orientation than a multilingualism as resource one. Readers have to bear in mind that the Swedish teacher education is highly decentralised (OECD, 2015), despite its central reference to the national Higher Education Act’s specific requirements for teacher education (Swedish Ministry of Education and Research, 1992:1434). Compelling differences between higher education institutions regarding their efforts of preparing future teachers for multilingualism were detected in Paulsrud and Lundberg (2020, forthcoming).

In line with work done by the Swedish National Agency for Education (see e.g. 2018), it ought to be understood that multilingual students

do not automatically need help, but that each individual's situation asks for a different approach. In some cases, all that might be required is teachers encouraging students to use the full linguistic repertoire at their disposal for meaning making and knowledge development. Such teaching strategies in line with translanguaging have been well-described (see e.g. Duarte, 2019, García & Wei, 2014, Paulsrud, Rosén, Straszer & Wedin, 2017). As this implication is relevant for all teachers, Swedish schooling would further benefit from an advanced discussion about language education as coordinated horizontally across the curriculum and vertically from one education level to the next (Cenoz & Gorter, 2012).

In Switzerland (article IV), the vertical coordination of language education is mainly achieved by the use of the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (Council of Europe, 2001) and mandatory textbooks are obliged to make connection between language subjects to secure the horizontal coordination. Nevertheless, a need for more follow-up events for teachers in Switzerland was detected, as they are still insecure about the suitable pedagogical actions regarding multilingualism and the local curriculum.

In order to guide and support teachers' interpretation and navigation of language policy, Q methodology is suggested as a technique for individual and collective sense-making. The sorting activity itself, and the post-sorting discussion can serve to counteract the described confusion of teachers about their role regarding new curricular policy and their agency (Biesta et al., 2015). As a consequence, opportunities for dialogues about professional discourse will impact teachers' potential to exercise agency (Wallen & Tormey, 2019) and eventually transform teachers' situated learning into situated teaching described above.

Q as an Educational Tool

As stated in article II, a range of authors has detected Q methodology's potential as a tool in various educational settings. Many of them use Q as a means for participants' critical reflection or the evaluation of course programmes. Furthermore, the methodology can be used for teachers' sense-making of policies as described above. Applied in a more participatory fashion, Q methodology can serve to collect students' ideas about an issue and articulate their preferences and eventually allow marginalised voices to be heard in an inclusive setting.

A useful distinction should be made between Q methodology as consisting of the sorting activity as a data gathering device and inverted factor analysis. As an educational tool, applications of Q without the inverted factor analysis can be sufficient and even more appropriate as the purpose is not put on the investigation of shared viewpoints, but rather on advancing pupils' learning process or the quick assessment of the current state of pupils' knowledge development.

Q as a Mediational Tool

As long as local teachers and the local public at large disagree with an educational policy in place, contradictions about a subject matter, such as multilingualism, will continue to exist and lead to tensions among various stakeholders. As a further implication from this research project, Q methodology is proposed as a mediational tool in educational settings to uncover arguments, positions and underlying discourses about the issue to facilitate a dialogue in situations where stakeholders defend their own position. Q methodology has been used similarly in practical language policy advising (Lo Bianco, 2015, Lo Bianco, 2016). Especially Q's potential for critical reflection and the possibility to focus on participants' subjectivity through their engagement in the rank-ordering activity, indicate the methodology's suitability for collective problem-solving. Potentially supported by a researcher as a skilled facilitator, applying Q methodology as a mediational tool represents a future direction for researchers to engage in more feasible, robust, and mutually informative researcher-practitioner collaborations that are regarded essential for improving the quality of research and practice alike (Uccelli & Snow, 2008). In other words, Q methodology should be regarded a method to facilitate research-based practice in education (Minten, 2017), proposed in the Swedish Education Act (SFS, 2010:800).

Coupled with the advantage of being a non-verbal approach, facilitated dialogues drawing on Q methodology can also enable the inclusion of pupils to otherwise entirely adult conversations. Consequently, applying Q methodology in a participatory fashion by including any stakeholders' voices, will increase their accountability and remarkably stimulate policy creation processes. More accurately met expectations in such policies are expected to lead to a higher probability of their enactment. Article II

illustrates a range of ways how Q methodology has been applied to create such research-oriented, suitable policies for specific contexts.

Multilingual Research Habitus

Contemporary research on multilingual speakers and language groups cannot rely on often binary categories anymore. The suggested conceptualisation of the individual linguistic repertoire in this thesis can serve as a basis for research in line with a holistic view of multilingualism (Cenoz, 2013), focussing on measuring the actual linguistic repertoire of multilingual speakers called for in Gogolin and Duarte (2013). Similar to preventing teachers to acknowledge learners' linguistic resources for learning, a monolingual habitus of researchers hinders them to investigate these overlapping competencies (Benson, 2014).

Delimitations and Limitations

The limitations of the present research project concern the fact that the presented results are specific to the study contexts. Drawing on a sociocultural framework, the results are clearly influenced by the respective contexts. However, in the sense of transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), findings presented here are expected to be of relevance in other environments as well.

Furthermore, Q methodological studies in this thesis did not examine pupils' actual heteroglossic language use in the classrooms or teachers' actual pedagogical actions, but simply the educators' stated viewpoints about them. Even though the process of constructing the Q sample used in articles III and IV was robust and participants had the opportunity to add potentially missed items, it has to be acknowledged that nuances of what multilingualism means to teachers or how it should be handled in schools according to them might have been missed.

Methodologically, the inclusion of grey literature in the systematic review articles (I and II) was not handled consistently and therefore delimited the search procedures (Alexander, 2020). In article I, peer revision was chosen as an inclusion criterion, automatically excluding grey literature, such as dissertations. While the article and its findings could have been more comprehensive with the inclusion of such grey literature, the decision was made to limit the review to journal articles that passed the quality control generally associated with the peer review pro-

cess. In article II, grey literature was included and analysed the same way as peer reviewed publications. Despite the presumably lower quality of some included publications, their inclusion was considered to be important to comprehensively illustrate and represent how Q methodology has been used and limit any potential publication bias.

Further methodological delimitations and limitations exist concerning articles III and IV, which could have been treated as four separate studies, potentially resulting in a more detailed description of the viewpoints in each study component. Regarding the description of the viewpoints, post-sorting interviews with participants would have allowed the collection of even more qualitative data material, useful for the rich narrative result sections in articles III and IV.

In terms of the analytical procedure in articles III and IV, centroid factor analysis as an extraction method and by-hand rotation would have allowed to perform Q methodology factor analysis in a more qualitative fashion and therefore resulted in a better alignment with the philosophical underpinnings of the thesis. However, due to the novice position of the author at the time of data analysis, the statistically safer extraction and rotation methods were chosen.

Directions for Further Research

There are a number of trajectories for further research to be suggested. First of all, investigating teacher performance in relation to described viewpoints would allow a more comprehensive analysis of teacher agency. Bearing in mind the difference between the study components in article IV, observing teachers in the classroom with regards to how they handle multilingualism, would allow to analyse in what way the continuum of competence is functioning or not.

Interview studies with highly characteristic teachers from the various viewpoints to gain more insights about the viewpoints, could lead to a validation of the viewpoint description in articles III and IV. Moreover, this would allow a more participatory approach to Q methodology.

Teachers from rural Swedish schools showed viewpoints most strongly connected to a monolingual habitus. An intervention study with these teachers would allow the analysis of how viewpoints can develop over time. Moreover, such a study would be in line with the suggested implication above, to strengthen cooperation between researchers and practi-

tioners. As a matter of fact, Q methodology as a mediational tool could serve as an approach during the intervention.

All conducted studies should be replicated in a few years' time in order to monitor developments in the respective fields. Based on the discussion of time and trust above, a replication of articles III and IV in the same schools would be of particular interest. Conducting these studies in other contexts adds to the understanding of socially situated discourses and their influence on teachers' viewpoints about multilingualism. Furthermore, replicating them after a future period of change, for example due to a new policy initiative or some geopolitical shift, would certainly prove to be useful. A replication of the review studies will illustrate how the research field about educational language policies (article I) and the application of Q methodology in educational research (article II) evolve.

Finally, more empirical research is needed in order to describe how adequately Swiss and Swedish pre- and in-service teacher education programmes prepare teachers for linguistic diversity.

Final Words

The complexity of multilingualism, due to the many forms and uses of it, has led to a myriad possible ways of approaching the phenomenon, both in theory and in practice. At times perceived as an uncomfortable societal issue, multilingualism has grown into the new global norm. In order to tackle language discrimination, enable multilingual development and contribute to greater social justice for all pupils, the present research project explored how language management in education takes shape in relation to socially situated discourses about multilingualism and (language) policy. Through the application of Q methodology, this dissertation allowed seeing one of humans' greatest resource from individuals' subjective point of view.

SUMMARIES

English

Introduction

Multilingualism is regarded as a vital issue to be addressed in tackling discrimination and inequality associated with language (Salzburg Global Seminar, 2018). During a time of increased linguistic diversity among student populations in contemporary Europe, educational policies appear to continuously ignore children's migrant languages and instead focus on promoting the teaching and learning of national languages (Gogolin & Duarte, 2013). In addition, teachers, *nota bene* regarded as key policy arbiters (Menken & García, 2010, Johnson, 2013a) in a situated form of language policy (Hult, 2018a), may follow their "deep-seated habit of assuming monolingualism as the norm in a nation" (Gogolin, 2013, p. 41). Consequently, it becomes apparent how language, the prime tool for knowledge development (Vygotskij, 1978), may reinforce disparities in educational outcomes and potentially jeopardise the quality of education received by linguistic minorities (Piller, 2016a). This interdisciplinary project sheds light on multilingualism in educational settings and therefore locates itself as a study within the wider field of educational language policy and planning.

Aim and Research Questions

As educational practices are inextricably connected to the socio-political context in which they arise (Lo Bianco, 2007), this thesis is set out to comparatively investigate stakeholders' viewpoints about the wicked language problem (Rubin, 1986) of multilingualism to advance discussions about ways education and research may contribute to a change for

greater social justice and betterment for all students (United Nations, 2018).

Three separate studies (articles I, III and IV) are guided by a first exploratory research question aiming at linking overt and covert policy to practice: *How does language management in education take shape in relation to socially situated discourses about multilingualism and (language) policy?*

As a second focal point of this thesis, Q methodology (Brown, 2019b) was chosen as an alternative means to systematically and empirically investigate subjective teacher viewpoints and thereby contribute to a better understanding of the complexity of multilingualism in general and education in particular. Due to the methodology's status as an unconventional and innovative research method (Brown & Rhoades, 2019), its applications in educational research are reviewed and critically discussed in article II. The second overarching research question in this thesis therefore reads as follows: *What are the benefits and limitations of using Q methodology in educational research?*

Theoretical Frameworks

Grounded in a sociocultural understanding of educational policy enactment, this thesis' theoretical basis draws on an ecological framework of teacher agency (Priestley et al., 2015). Understood as something one achieves in and through the engagement of context in non-linear ways, teacher agency is "a configuration of influences from the *past*, orientations towards the *future* and engagement with the *present*" (Biesta et al., 2015, p. 626; emphasis in original). In addition, the emergence of cognition as a component of teacher agency, consisting of anything "teachers know, belief, and think" (Borg, 2003, p. 81), is considered to be shared among individuals and dependent on communication ultimately made possible through human language (Lo Bianco, 2010a). As individual agency in policy interpretation and implementation processes has received increased attention in contemporary research in educational linguistics, teachers are expected to navigate policies in light of their subjective viewpoints.

In this thesis, multilingualism is conceptualised as consisting of a societal and an individual dimension (Cenoz, 2013). The development of the latter is further subdivided into curricular multilingualism (Krumm,

2004) and biographic multilingualism. For the sake of operationalising viewpoints about multilingualism in this thesis, an adaptation of three fundamental orientations set forth by Ruiz (1984) was applied:

- Language as problem – monolingual habitus
- Language as right – linguistic human rights
- Language as resource – multilingualism as resource

Study Contexts

This thesis is located in a European context, a continent characterised as linguistically highly diverse due to the large number of separate political entities. The selected study contexts in Sweden and Switzerland illustrate a variety of tensions and dilemmas. The rather assimilationist perspective at the grassroots in Swedish society (Hyltenstam et al., 2012), stands in a paradoxical relationship with the “attempt to recognize and accommodate cultural diversity and to construct Sweden as a multicultural and tolerant society” (Milani, 2008, p. 47). In multilingual Switzerland, clear distinctions between language regions through the principle of territoriality provides enough ground for a potential monolingual habitus of its citizens. With regard to educational language policies, the traditional nation-state of Sweden predominantly shows a monolingual orientation in the curriculum for compulsory schooling (Paulsrud et al., 2020). In federalist Switzerland, the current curriculum aims “to break the monolingual habitus of the school” (Bertschy et al., 2015, p. 4). Despite their noteworthy differences concerning their political organisation and language history, the two European countries share a similar societal composition.

Methodological Considerations

Four separate articles constitute this comparative case study research project. Articles I and II followed the procedures of systematic reviews (Newman & Gough, 2020, Eriksson Barajas et al., 2013) and for articles III and IV, the inherently mixed method approach called Q methodology (henceforth Q) was chosen to investigate often covert and subconscious viewpoints that influence teachers’ agency in their daily practice.

The initial empirical step in this thesis reported in article I was to systematically investigate research discourses about Swedish and Swiss multilingual educational policy documents. The content analysis of thir-

teen studies published between 2009 and 2016 revealed important discourses to be taken into account in the continuation of the project, specifically in the preparation of data collection instruments for articles III and IV. By adopting standard procedure for Q research, two Q sets for two separate study components were created and piloted. Not only investigating what multilingualism means to teachers (*understanding*), but also how they believe multilingualism should be handled in schools (*pedagogy*), was considered vital for an improved understanding of competence as a cyclic continuum and the visualisation of language policy consisting of practice, beliefs and management (Spolsky, 2009).

In this compilation thesis, the results of Q factor analysis performed in studies III and IV are called *viewpoints* to accentuate the predominantly subjective character of the mediated collectivity of elements in teachers' cognition. They are therefore neither right nor wrong or claim to represent the entirety of possible viewpoints about the subject matter. However, they present a manageable amount of condensed data, visualising transformation processes in the minds of teachers.

Results

The results of this thesis are diverse and multilayered. In responding to the first overarching research question, the present thesis concludes that the view of multilingualism is mostly atomistic in Sweden, stemming from long traditions of monolingualism on an overt and covert policy level. In Switzerland on the other hand, both, research results reviewed in article I and teachers' viewpoints in article IV indicate a more holistic view of multilingualism. This stands in close connection to the country specific variety in the conceptualisation of the term *multilingual student*. While Swiss stakeholders seem to consider someone multilingual with competences in more than one language, discourses about multilingual students in Sweden often exclude native Swedish speakers, indicating a monolingual habitus (Gogolin, 1994) and a native-like benchmark regarding competency level. A great extent of this distinction can be understood by analysing individuals' linguistic repertoire along two continua, representing curricular and biographic multilingualism respectively. In addition, the English language is treated differently in the two contexts under scrutiny. In the Scandinavian country, the global lingua

franca is seen as a hinderance in developing linguistic diversity, while in the Swiss context, English is seen as an integral part of it.

Considering multilingual development a vital task of compulsory schooling for all pupils, majority and minority language speakers alike, the present thesis vividly illustrates how multilingualism is, to a great extent in Sweden and almost comprehensively in Switzerland, theoretically regarded a resource. Influenced by a national identity and a common disciplinary socialisation through an intense professional development course, participating Swiss teachers show a striking consensus in favour of a multilingualism as resource orientation (Lo Bianco, 2017). In Sweden, neither a national identity, nor any teacher education measures support teachers sufficiently in gaining a more pluralist view of multilingualism. The only origin of such viewpoints seems to be grounded in the extremely diverse student population in urban schools and teachers' positive experience with lived linguistic diversity. In terms of teachers' viewpoints about suggested pedagogical actions, the selected contexts are more similar. The rather critical perspectives of multilingualism in pedagogical terms emerged in both countries, allow the conclusion that large-scale innovations involving a paradigmatic shift in teachers' cognition demand long-term time frames and increased levels of trust, motivational conditions and recurrent input and feedback.

In responding to the second overarching research question, Q has been shown to be a valuable contribution to the educational researcher's methodological repertoire. The systematic research review of 74 included studies reported in article II illustrates how Q was applied successfully to produce relevant findings improving instructional quality and pupil performance based on the science of learning development (Darling-Hammond et al., 2019). Especially the methodology's flexibility concerning research design and study focus showcase the usability of this innovative approach. As a tool for critical reflection and mediation, Q's data collection procedure, a card ranking activity, is considered a promising instrument leading to dialogues with participants from various stakeholder groups. Limitations of Q are the time-consuming preparation of data collection instruments, its relative rarity in educational research and the fact that certain nuances of investigated phenomena might get missed despite the intense instrument validation process involved. Moreover, Q's inherently mixed method character requests re-

searchers to possess expertise in both, qualitative and quantitative research traditions.

Contribution to Knowledge and Implications

Nested at the crossroads of multilingualism, equity and policy in education, the present research project contributes to a discussion about language related discrimination and inequality in education. By investigating shared viewpoints about multilingualism with Q, research in this thesis permits the uncovering of clusters and communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Through the selected comparative approach, it becomes clear how teachers in a specific context, wider in Switzerland and narrower in Sweden, act with a similar conceptual understanding of multilingualism. As an implication of this analysis, the term *situated teaching* is suggested.

In terms of the enactment of educational policies, the current thesis proposes to provide teachers with motivational conditions to experiment, especially if policies ask for an adaptation of their cognition and comfort zone. This includes aspects such as time and trust. Closely connected is the call for additional support measures within the context of teachers' pre- and in-service education. Constructive feedback cycles and awareness-raising activities will eventually support the transformation from teachers situated learning into their situated teaching.

Regarding the second overarching research question, implications from the present thesis can be divided into two parts. Firstly, it was illustrated how Q is a successful approach in educational research, particularly due to its flexibility. Secondly, suggestions are made concerning additional applications of Q methodology or at least parts of. As an educational tool, Q sorting should be used more often for teachers' critical reflection, as a means for marginalised voices to be heard or to assess the current state of pupils' knowledge development. As a mediational tool, Q can help uncover arguments, positions and underlying discourses about an issue to facilitate a dialogue in situations where stakeholders defend their own position.

Directions for Further Research

In the current project, teachers' performance has not been investigated. Classroom observations with regard to how teachers handle multilin-

gualism would allow to analysis in what way the two study components, *understanding* and *pedagogy*, are in line with their practical representation. Further validation of described viewpoints in articles III and IV could be achieved by interviewing a selection of teachers loading significantly on these viewpoints. Finally, replications of the included studies in a few years' time would allow insights into developments in the respective fields.

Svenska

Inledning

Flerspråkighet anses vara en central fråga att ta i beaktande för att få bukt med diskriminering och ojämlikhet som kan förknippas med språk (Salzburg Global Seminar, 2018). I en tid av ökande språklig mångfald i elevpopulationen i dagens Europa tycks skolornas strategi fortsatt vara att ignorera barnens hemspråk för att i stället fokusera på att främja undervisning i och lärande av nationella språk. (Gogolin & Duarte, 2013). Dessutom kan lärare, som nota bene anses inneha rollen som suveräna skiljedomare (Menken & García, 2010, Johnson, 2013) i en situerad språkpolicy (Hult, 2018), följa sin ”djupt rotade vana att utgå från att enspråkighet är normen i en nation⁴” (Gogolin, 2013, s. 41). Följaktligen blir det uppenbart hur språket, kunskapsutvecklingens primära redskap (Vygotskij, 1978), kan förstärka skillnader i utbildningsresultat och potentiellt riskera kvaliteten i den undervisning som språkliga minoriteter erhåller (Piller, 2016). Detta tvärvetenskapliga arbete kastar ljus över flerspråkighet i olika utbildningsmiljöer och placerar sig därför som en undersökning i skolväsendets vidare fält rörande språkrelaterade riktlinjer och planering.

Syfte och forskningsfrågor

Eftersom utbildningspraxis är ofrånkomligen kopplad till den sociopolitiska kontext i vilken den uppstår (Lo Bianco, 2007), syftar denna avhandling till att på ett jämförande sätt undersöka berördas åsikter om det svårhanterade lingvistiska problem (Rubin, 1986) som flerspråkigheten utgör, och därmed föra diskussionen framåt rörande de sätt som utbildning och forskning kan bidra till en omställning mot

⁴ Alla citat på engelska i denna svenska sammanfattning har översatts av författaren.

större social rättvisa och förbättring för alla elever (United Nations, 2018).

Tre separata studier (artikel I, III och IV) har sin grund i en första undersökande forskningsfråga som syftar till att koppla öppen och förtäckt policy till praktik: *Hur tar språkhantering i utbildningen form i förhållande till socialt situerade diskurser om flerspråkighet och (språk)policy?*

Som ett andra fokus för avhandlingen valdes Q-metodologin (Brown, 2019), ett alternativt sätt att systematiskt och empiriskt undersöka subjektiva läraråsikter och därigenom bidra till att bättre förstå flerspråkighetens komplexitet i allmänhet och i utbildningssammanhang i synnerhet. På grund av metodologins status som en okonventionell och innovativ forskningsmetod (Brown & Rhoades, 2019) analyseras och problematiseras dess tillämpning inom utbildningsforskningen i artikel II. Avhandlingens andra övergripande forskningsfråga lyder därför som följer: *Vilka fördelar och begränsningar föreligger i användandet av Q-metodologin inom utbildningsforskningen?*

Teoretiska ramar

Med förankring i en sociokulturell förståelse av hur en utbildningspolicy genomförs har denna avhandling sin teoretiska utgångspunkt i det ekologiska ramverk som utgörs av lärares agentskap (Priestley, Biesta & Robinson, 2015). Lärares agentskap tolkas som något man uppnår i och genom att involvera kontext på icke-linjära sätt och är ”en konfigurerings av influenser från det förflutna, rörelser mot framtiden, samt involverandet av nuet” (Biesta, Priestley & Robinson, 2015, s. 626; betonat i originalet). Dessutom anses framträdandet av kognition, bestående av allt ”lärare vet, tror och tycker” (Borg, 2003, s. 81), som en komponent i lärares agentskap att delas mellan individer och möjliggöras genom mänskligt språk (Lo Bianco, 2010), då den i slutänden är beroende av kommunikation. Eftersom individens agentskap beträffande tolkning av riktlinjer och implementeringsprocesser har fått ökad uppmärksamhet när det gäller samtida forskning inom utbildningslingvistik kan lärare förväntas navigera riktlinjer i ljuset av sina egna subjektiva åsikter.

I den här avhandlingen konceptualiseras flerspråkighet som bestående av en samhällelig och en individuell dimension (Cenoz, 2013).

Utvecklingen av den senare delas upp i ytterligare underavdelningar som läroplansrelaterad flerspråkighet (Krumm, 2004) och biografisk flerspråkighet. I syfte att operationalisera uppfattningar om flerspråkighet i avhandlingen har tre grundläggande synsätt, presenterade av Ruiz (1984), tillämpats:

- ☐ Språket som ett problem – enspråkig habitus
- ☐ Språket som en rättighet – lingvistiska mänskliga rättigheter
- ☐ Språket som en resurs – flerspråkighet som en tillgång

Studiens kontexter

Den här avhandlingen är placerad i en europeisk kontext, en kontinent som lingvistiskt sett har karakteriserats som synnerligen diversifierad mot bakgrund av det stora antalet separata politiska enheter. De för studien valda kontexterna – Sverige och Schweiz – illustrerar en mångfald av spänningar och dilemman. Det relativt assimilationistiska perspektivet på gräsrotsnivå i det svenska samhället (Hyltenstam, Axelsson & Lindeberg, 2012) står i ett paradoxalt förhållande till ”försöket att bli medveten om och tillmötesgå kulturell mångfald och att konstruera Sverige som ett mångkulturellt och tolerant samhälle” (Milani, 2008, s. 47). I det flerspråkiga Schweiz tillhandahåller tydliga distinktioner mellan språkområden genom territoriella principer tillräcklig grund för medborgarnas potentiellt enspråkiga habitus. Vad beträffar utbildningssystemets språkpolicy uppvisar den traditionella nationalstaten Sverige företrädesvis ett monolingvistiskt förhållningssätt i den obligatoriska skolans läroplan (Paulsrud, Zilliacus & Ekberg, 2020). I det federala Schweiz syftar den gällande läroplanen till ”att bryta skolans monolingvistiska habitus” (Bertschy, Egli Cuenat & Stotz, 2015, s. 4). Trots ländernas anmärkningsvärda skillnader beträffande politisk organisation och språkhistoria delar de båda europeiska nationerna en likartad samhällelig sammansättning.

Metodologiska hänsynstaganden

Denna jämförande forskningsstudie utgörs av fyra separata artiklar. Artikel I och II följde tillvägagångssättet i systematisk granskning (Newman & Gough, 2020, Eriksson Barajas, Forsberg & Wengström, 2013) och för artikel III och IV valdes Q-metodologin, ett tillvägagångssätt som till sin inherent karaktär är en mixad metod, för

att utforska ofta dolda och omedvetna åsikter som påverkar lärares agentskap i deras dagliga yrkesutövning.

Avhandlingens initiala empiriska steg som redovisas i artikel I innebar att undersöka forskningsdiskurser rörande svenska och schweiziska riktlinjer för flerspråkighet i utbildningssystemet. Analysen av innehållet i tretton studier som publicerats mellan 2009 och 2016 blottade viktiga diskurser att ta i beaktande under projektets fortsättning, särskilt vid det förberedande arbetet med instrument för datainsamling till artikel III och IV. Genom att använda standardproceduren för Q-metodologisk forskning skapades och fördes två Q-set för två separata studiekomponenter. Att utforska vilken innebörd flerspråkighet har för lärare (förståelse), liksom att undersöka hur de anser att flerspråkighet ska hanteras i skolor (pedagogik) ansågs väsentligt för en förbättrad förståelse av begreppet kompetens som ett cykliskt kontinuum, samt för visualiseringen av en språkpolicy bestående av praktik, uppfattningar och hantering (Spolsky, 2009).

I denna sammanläggningsavhandling används beteckningen åsikter för resultaten av Q-metodologisk analys som utförts i studierna III och IV, i syfte att framhäva den förhärskande subjektiva karaktären i den förmedlade kollektiviteten i beståndsdelarna i lärares kognition. De är därför vare sig rätt eller fel eller gör anspråk på att fullständigt representera möjliga åsikter om ämnet. Däremot representerar de en hanterbar mängd kondenserad data som visualiserar processerna i lärarnas tankebanor.

Resultat

Avhandlingens resultat är diversifierade och företer flera lager. Som svar på den första övergripande forskningsfrågan konkluderar den föreliggande avhandlingen att synen på flerspråkighet i Sverige är till större delen atomistisk, vilket härrör ur en lång tradition av enspråkighet på policynivå, både uttalat och outtalat. I Schweiz, å andra sidan, tyder såväl forskningsresultat redovisade i artikel I som lärares åsikter i artikel IV på en mer holistisk syn på flerspråkighet. Detta resultat står i nära relation till en landsspecifik skillnad i uppfattningen av begreppet flerspråkig elev. Medan schweiziska berörda tycks anse personer vara flerspråkiga om de innehar kompetens på mer än ett språk så utesluts i diskurser om flerspråkiga elever i Sverige ofta personer med svenska

som modersmål, vilket tyder på en monolingvistisk habitus (Gogolin, 1994) och inhemsk benchmarking beträffande kompetensnivå. Distinktionen kan till stor del förstås genom att analysera individers lingvistiska repertoar längs två kontinua som respektive representerar läroplansrelaterad och biografisk flerspråkighet. Vid en djupare analys konstateras att engelskan behandlas totalt olika i de båda kontexterna. I det skandinaviska landet ses världens lingua franca som ett hinder när det gäller att utveckla en lingvistisk mångfald, medan engelskan i den schweiziska kontexten ses som en integrerad del.

Med utgångspunkten att en utveckling av flerspråkighet är en väsentlig uppgift i den obligatoriska skolan gällande alla elever, för majoritetsspråk likaväl som för minoritetsspråk, illustrerar tydligt den föreliggande avhandlingen hur flerspråkighet, i stor utsträckning i Sverige och nästan helt och hållet i Schweiz, teoretiskt betraktas som en tillgång. Påverkade av en nationell identitet och en gemensam disciplinär socialisering i form av en intensiv yrkesutveckling uppvisar de deltagande schweiziska lärarna en påfallande konsensus till förmån för flerspråkighet som en resursorientering (Lo Bianco, 2017). I Sverige får lärarna inte tillräckligt stöd av vare sig någon nationell identitet eller åtgärder under lärarutbildningen så att de tillägnar sig en mer pluralistisk syn på flerspråkighet. Den enda källan till dylika åsikter tycks återfinnas i extremt diversifierade elevpopulationer i urbana miljöer och i lärares positiva erfarenheter av egenupplevd lingvistisk mångfald. Vad gäller lärares åsikter om föreslagna pedagogiska åtgärder är de valda kontexterna mer likartade. De relativt kritiska perspektiv på flerspråkighet i pedagogiska termer som framkom i båda länder tillåter slutsatsen att innovationer i stor skala, som inbegriper ett paradigmskifte i lärares kognition, kräver långsiktiga ramar och höjda nivåer av tillit, motiverande förutsättningar och återkommande input och återkoppling.

Som svar på den andra övergripande forskningsfrågan har Q-metodologin visat sig utgöra ett värdefullt bidrag till utbildningsforskarens metodologiska repertoar. Den systematiska forskningsgenomgången av 74 inkluderade studier som redovisas i artikel II illustrerade hur Q-metodologin framgångsrikt tillämpats för att producera relevanta fynd som förbättrar undervisningskvalitet och elevresultat baserat på vetenskapen om utvecklat lärande (Darling-Hammond, Flook, Cook-Harvey, Barron & Osher, 2019). Särskilt

metodologins flexibilitet när det gäller forskningsdesign och undersökningsfokus framhäver användbarheten i detta innovativa angreppssätt. Som ett redskap för kritisk reflektion och mediation anses Q-metodologins datainsamlingsmetod, en korttrankningsaktivitet, vara ett lovande instrument som leder till dialog med deltagare från olika berörda grupper. Q-metodologins begränsningar är det tidsödande förberedelsearbetet med datainsamlingsinstrument, dess relativt sällsynta förekomst inom utbildningsforskningen och det faktum att vissa nyanser i undersökta fenomen kan missas trots den intensiva valideringsprocessen av instrument som involveras. Dessutom kräver Q-metodologins inherenta blandmetodskaraktär att forskare besitter expertis i både kvalitativ och kvantitativ forskningstradition.

Bidrag till kunskap och slutsatser

Det föreliggande forskningsprojektet som vilar i flerspråkighetens korsväg, kapital och policy i skolvärlden, bidrar till en diskussion om språkrelaterad diskriminering och ojämlikhet i skolan. Genom att med Q-metodologin undersöka åsikter som delgivits i fråga om flerspråkighet låter avhandlingens forskning blottlägga praktikens kluster och gemenskaper (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Genom det valda komparativa angreppssättet tydliggörs hur lärare i en specifik kontext, vidare i Schweiz och trängre i Sverige, undervisar med ett likartat tänkesätt. Som en slutsats av denna analys föreslås termen *situerad undervisning*.

Vad beträffar förverkligandet av utbildningssystemets riktlinjer föreslår den aktuella avhandlingen att lärare ges motiverande förutsättningar att experimentera, i synnerhet då riktlinjerna föreskriver en anpassning av lärares kognition och bekvämlighetszon. Detta inkluderar aspekter som tid och tillit. Nära förbundet härmed är efterfrågan på ytterligare stödåtgärder inom lärares utbildning och fortbildning. Konstruktiva återkopplingscykler och medvetandehöjande aktiviteter kommer till slut att främja transformeringen från situerat lärande till situerad undervisning för lärare.

Beträffande den andra övergripande forskningsfrågan kan slutsatser från den föreliggande avhandlingen delas in i två delar. För det första illustrerades Q-metodologin som en framgångsrik metod i utbildningsforskningen, särskilt tack vare dess flexibilitet. För det andra

framkastas förslag gällande ytterligare tillämpning av Q-metodologin, eller åtminstone delar av den. Som ett verktyg i skolvärlden bör Q-sortering användas mer frekvent för lärares kritiska reflekterande, som ett sätt för marginaliserade röster att bli hörda eller skatta elevers aktuella kunskapsutveckling. Som ett mediationsverktyg kan Q-metodologin bidra till att synliggöra argument, positioner och underliggande diskurser rörande en viss fråga och underlätta en dialog i lägen då berörda försvarar sin egen hållning.

Anvisningar för vidare forskning

I det aktuella projektet har lärares agerande inte undersökts. Klassrumsobservationer med hänsyn till hur lärare hanterar flerspråkighet skulle möjliggöra en analys av hur de båda komponenterna i studien, förståelse och pedagogik, ligger i linje med den praktiska representationen. Ytterligare validering av beskrivna åsikter i artikel III och IV skulle kunna uppnås genom att intervjua ett urval av lärare med signifikant hög laddning på dessa åsikter. Slutligen skulle en upprepning om ett par år av de inkluderade undersökningarna kunna ge information om utvecklingen inom de respektive fälten.

Deutsch

Einführung

Mehrsprachigkeit wird als ein wichtiges Thema bei der Bekämpfung von Diskriminierung und Ungleichheit im Zusammenhang mit Sprache angesehen (Salzburg Global Seminar, 2018). In einer Zeit zunehmender sprachlicher Vielfalt der Schülerschaft im heutigen Europa, scheint die Bildungspolitik die Migrantensprachen von Kindern kontinuierlich zu ignorieren und sich stattdessen auf die Förderung des Lehrens und Lernens von Nationalsprachen zu konzentrieren (Gogolin & Duarte, 2013). Darüber hinaus können Lehrpersonen, nota bene als wichtige politische Schiedsrichter (Menken & García, 2010, Johnson, 2013) in einer situierten Form der Sprachpolitik (Hult, 2018) bezeichnet, ihrer „tiefsitzenden Gewohnheit folgen, Monolingualismus als Norm in einer Nation anzunehmen“⁵ (Gogolin, 2013, S. 41). Infolgedessen wird deutlich, wie Sprache als wichtigstes Instrument für die Wissensentwick-

⁵ Alle englischsprachigen Zitate in dieser deutschen Zusammenfassung wurden vom Autor übersetzt.

lung (Vygotskij, 1978), Unterschiede in den Bildungsergebnissen verstärken und möglicherweise die Qualität der Bildung von sprachlichen Minderheiten (Piller, 2016) gefährden kann. Dieses interdisziplinäre Forschungsprojekt beleuchtet die Mehrsprachigkeit im Bildungsumfeld und positioniert sich daher als Studie im weiteren Bereich der Bildungssprachenpolitik und -planung.

Ziel und Forschungsfragen

Das Ziel dieser Doktorarbeit ist es, Diskussionen in Bezug auf mehr soziale Gerechtigkeit und Besserstellung für alle Studierenden zu fördern (UN, 2018), indem Standpunkte verschiedener Interessengruppen über das vertrackte Sprachproblem (Rubin, 1986) der Mehrsprachigkeit untersucht werden. Da Bildungspraktiken untrennbar mit dem gesellschaftspolitischen Kontext, in dem sie entstehen, verbunden sind (Lo Bianco, 2007), wurde für dieses Projekt ein komparativer Ansatz gewählt.

Drei getrennte Studien (Artikel I, III und IV) werden von einer ersten explorativen Forschungsfrage geleitet. Diese zielt darauf ab, offene und verdeckte politische Entscheidungen mit der Praxis zu verbinden: *Wie gestaltet sich das Sprachmanagement in der Bildung in Bezug auf sozial situierte Diskurse über Mehrsprachigkeit und (Sprach-)Politik?*

Als zweiten Schwerpunkt dieser Arbeit wurde die Q Methodologie (Brown, 2019) als alternatives Mittel gewählt, um subjektive Standpunkte von Lehrpersonen systematisch und empirisch zu untersuchen. Damit trägt diese Doktorarbeit zu einem besseren Verständnis der Komplexität der Mehrsprachigkeit im Allgemeinen und in der Bildung im Besonderen bei. Aufgrund des Status der Methodologie als unkonventionelle und innovative Forschungsmethode (Brown & Rhoades, 2019) werden ihre Anwendungen in der Bildungsforschung in Artikel II reviewed und kritisch diskutiert. Die zweite übergeordnete Forschungsfrage in dieser Arbeit lautet daher wie folgt: *Welche Vor- und Nachteile hat die Verwendung der Q Methodologie in der Bildungsforschung?*

Theoretische Rahmenbedingungen

Die theoretische Grundlage dieser Arbeit basiert auf einem soziokulturellen Verständnis der Umsetzung der Bildungspolitik und einem ökologischen Rahmen der *Teacher Agency* (Priestley, Biesta & Robinson,

2015). Teacher Agency wird als etwas verstanden, das in und durch die Auseinandersetzung mit dem Kontext auf nichtlineare Weise erreicht wird, also „eine Konfiguration von Einflüssen aus der *Vergangenheit*, Orientierungen an der *Zukunft* und Auseinandersetzung mit der *Gegenwart*“ (Biesta, Priestley & Robinson, 2015, S. 626; Hervorhebung im Original). Darüber hinaus wird die Kognition, eine Komponente der Teacher Agency bestehend aus allem was „Lehrpersonen wissen, glauben und denken“ (Borg, 2003, S. 81), mit Einzelpersonen geteilt und ist letztendlich von Kommunikation durch die menschliche Sprache abhängig (Lo Bianco, 2010). Während Agency von Individuen in der Auslegung und Umsetzung der bildungspolitischen Entscheidungen in der zeitgenössischen Forschung der pädagogischen Linguistik zunehmend Beachtung gefunden hat, wird angenommen, dass sich Lehrpersonen von subjektiven Standpunkten steuern lassen.

In dieser Arbeit wird Mehrsprachigkeit aus einer gesellschaftlichen und einer individuellen Dimension zusammengesetzt (Cenoz, 2013). Die Entwicklung Letzteren ist weiter unterteilt in schulische/curriculare Mehrsprachigkeit (Krumm, 2004) und biografische Mehrsprachigkeit. Um Standpunkte zu Mehrsprachigkeit in dieser Arbeit zu operationalisieren, wurde eine Anpassung der von Ruíz (1984) entwickelten drei grundlegenden Orientierungen angewendet:

- ☐ Sprache als Problem - monolingualer Habitus
- ☐ Sprache als Recht - sprachliche Menschenrechte
- ☐ Sprache als Ressource - Mehrsprachigkeit als Ressource

Kontextuelle Hintergründe

Diese Doktorarbeit wurde in einem europäischen Kontext verfasst. Europa als Kontinent, wird aufgrund der großen Anzahl getrennter politischer Einheiten als sprachlich sehr vielfältig charakterisiert und die ausgewählten Studienkontexte in Schweden und der Schweiz veranschaulichen eine Vielzahl von Spannungen und Dilemmas. Die eher assimilatorische Perspektive an der Basis der schwedischen Gesellschaft (Hyltenstam, Axelsson & Lindberg, 2012) steht in einem paradoxen Verhältnis zu dem „Versuch, kulturelle Vielfalt zu erkennen und zu berücksichtigen und Schweden als multikulturelle und tolerante Gesellschaft aufzubauen“ (Milani, 2008, S. 47). In der mehrsprachigen Schweiz bietet die klare Unterscheidung zwischen Sprachregionen, ge-

schaffen durch das Territorialitätsprinzip, genügend Grund für einen möglichen monolingualen Habitus ihrer Bürger. In Bezug auf die Bildungssprachenpolitik zeigt der traditionelle schwedische Nationalstaat überwiegend eine einsprachige Ausrichtung im Lehrplan für die obligatorische Schule (Paulsrud, Zilliacus & Ekberg, 2020). In der föderalistischen Schweiz zielt der aktuelle Lehrplan darauf ab, den einsprachigen Habitus der Schule zu brechen (Bertschy, Egli Cuenat & Stotz, 2015). Trotz ihrer bemerkenswerten Unterschiede in Bezug auf ihre politische Organisation und Sprachgeschichte teilen die beiden europäischen Länder eine ähnliche gesellschaftliche Zusammensetzung.

Methodische Überlegungen

Vier separate Artikel bilden den empirischen Schwerpunkt dieses vergleichenden Fallstudien-Forschungsprojekts. Artikel I und II folgen dem Verfahren systematischer Reviews (Newman & Gough, 2020, Eriksson Barajas, Forsberg & Wengström, 2013). Um die häufig verdeckten und unbewussten Standpunkte, welche die Teacher Agency der Lehrpersonen in ihrer täglichen Praxis beeinflussen, zu untersuchen, wurde der inhärent gemischte Methodenansatz namens Q Methodologie (fortan Q) für Artikel III und IV gewählt.

Der erste empirische Schritt in diesem Projekt ist in Artikel I beschrieben und bestand darin, Forschungsdiskurse über mehrsprachige schwedische und schweizerische bildungspolitische Dokumente systematisch zu untersuchen. Die inhaltliche Analyse von dreizehn zwischen 2009 und 2016 veröffentlichten Studien ergab wichtige Diskurse, die bei der Fortsetzung des Projekts berücksichtigt wurden. Insbesondere bei der Vorbereitung von Datenerfassungsinstrumenten für Artikel III und IV waren diese entscheidend. In Übereinstimmung mit dem Standardverfahren für Q Forschung wurden zwei Q Sets für zwei separate Studienkomponenten erstellt und pilotiert. Einerseits wurde untersucht, was Mehrsprachigkeit für Lehrpersonen bedeutet (*Verständnis*), andererseits wurde erforscht, wie sich Lehrpersonen die Handhabung von Mehrsprachigkeit in Schulen vorstellen können (*Pädagogik*). Diese konzeptuelle Unterscheidung wurde als ausschlaggebend für ein besseres Verständnis von Kompetenz als zyklisches Kontinuum und die Visualisierung der Sprachpolitik, bestehend aus Praxis, Überzeugungen und Management (Spolsky, 2009), eingeschätzt.

In dieser kumulativen Dissertation werden die Ergebnisse der in den Studien III und IV durchgeführten Q Faktoranalyse als *Standpunkte* (*Viewpoints*) bezeichnet, um den überwiegend subjektiven Charakter der vermittelten Kollektivität von Elementen in der Kognition der Lehrpersonen hervorzuheben. Sie sind daher weder richtig noch falsch. Auch wird kein Anspruch erhoben, die Gesamtheit möglicher Standpunkte zum Thema zu vertreten. Sie präsentieren jedoch eine überschaubare Menge an komprimierten Daten und visualisieren Transformationsprozesse in den Köpfen der Lehrpersonen.

Ergebnisse

Die Ergebnisse dieser Doktorarbeit sind vielfältig und vielschichtig. In Bezug auf die erste übergeordnete Forschungsfrage kommt die vorliegende Arbeit zu dem Schluss, dass das Verständnis von Mehrsprachigkeit in Schweden meist atomistisch ist. Dies ist auf eine lange Tradition von Einsprachigkeit sowohl auf einer offenen als auch auf einer verdeckten politischen Ebene zurückzuführen. In der Schweiz hingegen weisen sowohl die in Artikel I besprochenen Forschungsergebnisse als auch die Ansichten der Lehrpersonen in Artikel IV auf eine ganzheitlichere Sichtweise der Mehrsprachigkeit hin. Dies steht in engem Zusammenhang mit der länderspezifischen Vielfalt bei der Konzeptualisierung des Begriffs *mehrsprachige SchülerInnen*. Während Schweizer Vertreter jemanden als mehrsprachig bezeichnen, der oder die Kompetenzen in mehr als einer Sprache aufweist, schliessen Diskurse über mehrsprachige SchülerInnen in Schweden häufig schwedische MuttersprachlerInnen aus. Dies weist auf einen monolingualen Habitus (Gogolin, 1994) und einen muttersprachlichen Vergleichspunkt hinsichtlich des Kompetenzniveaus hin. Ein grosser Teil dieser Unterscheidung kann durch die Analyse des sprachlichen Repertoires von Personen entlang zweier Kontinua verstanden werden, die der schulischen bzw. der biografischen Mehrsprachigkeit. Darüber hinaus wird in den beiden Kontexten die englische Sprache unterschiedlich behandelt. Im skandinavischen Land wird die globale lingua franca als Hindernis für die Entwicklung der sprachlichen Vielfalt angesehen, während im schweizerischen Kontext Englisch als integraler Bestandteil davon angesehen wird.

In Anbetracht der mehrsprachigen Entwicklung, die für alle SchüleInnen, ungeachtet ob einer Mehrheit oder einer Minderheit angehörend, eine wichtige Aufgabe der Schulpflicht darstellt, zeigt die vorliegende Arbeit anschaulich, wie die Mehrsprachigkeit in Schweden weitgehend und in der Schweiz fast umfassend als theoretische Ressource angesehen wird. Beeinflusst von einer nationalen Identität und einer gemeinsamen disziplinarischen Sozialisierung durch einen intensiven Fortbildungskurs, zeigen die teilnehmenden Schweizer Lehrkräfte einen bemerkenswerten Konsens zugunsten einer Mehrsprachigkeit als Resource-Orientierung (Lo Bianco, 2017). In Schweden unterstützen weder eine nationale Identität noch Massnahmen in der Lehrerbildung die Lehrpersonen ausreichend, um eine pluralistischere Sichtweise der Mehrsprachigkeit zu erlangen. Der einzige Ursprung solcher Standpunkte scheint in der äusserst unterschiedlichen Schülerbevölkerung in städtischen Schulen und den positiven Erfahrungen der Lehrkräfte mit gelebter sprachlicher Vielfalt zu liegen. In Bezug auf die Standpunkte der Lehrpersonen zu vorgeschlagenen pädagogischen Massnahmen, sind die ausgewählten Kontexte ähnlicher. Die in beiden Ländern eher kritischen Perspektiven zur Mehrsprachigkeit in pädagogischer Hinsicht lassen den Schluss zu, dass gross angelegte Innovationen, die einen paradigmatischen Wandel in der Wahrnehmung der Lehrer beinhalten, langfristige Zeiträume und ein höheres Mass an Vertrauen, Motivationsbedingungen sowie wiederkehrenden Input und Feedback erfordern.

Bei der Beantwortung der zweiten übergreifenden Forschungsfrage hat sich gezeigt, dass Q einen wertvollen Beitrag zum methodischen Repertoire des Bildungsforschers leistet. Das systematische Review von 74 eingeschlossenen Studien in Artikel II illustriert, wie Q erfolgreich angewendet wurde um relevante Erkenntnisse für die Verbesserung der Unterrichtsqualität und der Schülerleistungen (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2019) zu produzieren. Insbesondere die Flexibilität der Methode in Bezug auf Forschungsdesign und Studienschwerpunkt zeigt die Verwendbarkeit dieses innovativen Ansatzes. Als Instrument zur kritischen Reflexion und Mediation wird das Datenerfassungsverfahren von Q, eine Kartenranking-Aktivität (*Q sorting*), als vielversprechendes Instrument angesehen, welches zu Dialogen mit Teilnehmern aus verschiedenen Interessengruppen führen kann. Einschränkungen von Q sind die zeitaufwändige Vorbereitung von Datenerfassungsinstrumenten, die relative

Seltenheit der Methodologie in der Bildungsforschung und die Tatsache, dass bestimmte Nuancen der untersuchten Phänomene trotz des intensiven Instrumentenvalidierungsprozesses möglicherweise übersehen werden. Darüber hinaus verlangt Q als Mixed Method Forschungsansatz Expertise in sowohl qualitativer wie auch quantitativer Forschungstradition.

Beitrag zu Wissen und Implikationen

Das vorliegende Forschungsprojekt befindet sich an der Schnittstelle von Mehrsprachigkeit, Gerechtigkeit und Bildungspolitik und trägt zu einer Diskussion über sprachbedingte Diskriminierung und Ungleichheit in der Bildung bei. Durch die Untersuchung gemeinsamer Sichtweisen zur Mehrsprachigkeit mit Q ermöglicht die Forschung in dieser Doktorarbeit die Aufdeckung von praxisbezogenen Communities (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Durch den gewählten vergleichenden Ansatz wird deutlich, wie Lehrpersonen in einem bestimmten Kontext, der in der Schweiz breiter und in Schweden enger ist, mit einer ähnlichen Denkweise unterrichten. Als Implikation dieser Analyse wird der Begriff *situierter Unterricht* vorgeschlagen.

In Bezug auf die Umsetzung bildungspolitischer Maßnahmen empfiehlt die aktuelle Arbeit, Lehrpersonen motivierende Bedingungen zum Experimentieren zu bieten. Dies beinhaltet Aspekte wie Zeit und Vertrauen und ist umso wichtiger, wenn politische Entscheidungen eine Anpassung der Kognition und Komfortzone von Lehrpersonen erfordern. Eng damit verbunden ist die Forderung nach zusätzlichen Unterstützungsmassnahmen im Rahmen der Aus- und Weiterbildung von Lehrkräften. Konstruktive Feedbackzyklen und Sensibilisierungsmassnahmen werden letztendlich die Umwandlung von situiertem Lernen in situiertes Unterrichten unterstützen.

In Bezug auf die zweite übergeordnete Forschungsfrage lassen sich die Implikationen der vorliegenden Arbeit in zwei Teile unterteilen. Zunächst wurde gezeigt, wie erfolgreich Q in der Bildungsforschung ist, insbesondere aufgrund ihrer Flexibilität. Zweitens können Vorschläge bezüglich zusätzlicher Anwendungen von Q oder zumindest Teilen davon gemacht werden. Als pädagogisches Instrument sollte Q sorting häufiger zur kritischen Reflexion von Lehrpersonen verwendet werden, um marginalisierte Stimmen zu hören oder den aktuellen Stand

der Wissensentwicklung der SchülerInnen zu bewerten. Als Mediationsinstrument kann Q dabei helfen, Argumente, Positionen und zugrunde liegende Diskurse zu einem Thema aufzudecken, um einen Dialog in Situationen zu ermöglichen, in denen Interessenvertreter ihre eigene Position verteidigen.

Anweisungen für die weitere Forschung

Die Performanz der Lehrpersonen wurde im aktuellen Projekt nicht untersucht. Beobachtungen im Klassenzimmer im Hinblick darauf, wie Lehrpersonen mit Mehrsprachigkeit tatsächlich umgehen, würden eine Analyse ermöglichen, inwiefern die beiden Studienkomponenten *Verständnis* und *Pädagogik* mit ihrer praktischen Darstellung übereinstimmen. Eine weitere Validierung der in den Artikeln III und IV beschriebenen Standpunkte könnte erreicht werden, indem eine Auswahl von Lehrpersonen befragt wird, die diese Standpunkte deutlich darstellen. Schliesslich würden Replikationen aller vier eingeschlossenen Studien in einigen Jahren Einblicke in die Entwicklungen in den jeweiligen Bereichen ermöglichen.

REFERENCES

- AERA 2011. Code of ethics (Approved by American Educational Research Association Council February 2011). *Educational Researcher*, 40, 145-156.
- AHEARN, L. M. 2001. Language and agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30, 109-137.
- ALEXANDER, P. A. 2020. Methodological Guidance Paper: The Art and Science of Quality Systematic Reviews. *Review of Educational Research*, 90, 6-23.
- ALVUNGER, D., SUNDBERG, D. & WAHLSTRÖM, N. 2017. Teachers matter - but how? *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 49, 1-6.
- ARONIN, L. 2015. Current multilingualism and new developments in multilingual research. In: SAFONT-JORDÀ, M. P. & FALOMIR, L. P. (eds.) *Learning and Using Multiple Languages : Current Findings from Research on Multilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- ARONIN, L. & JESSNER, U. 2015. Understanding current multilingualism: what can the butterfly tell us? In: JESSNER, U. & KRAMSCH, C. (eds.) *The Multilingual Challenge: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- ARONIN, L. & SINGLETON, D. 2019. Introduction. In: SINGLETON, D. & ARONIN, L. (eds.) *Twelve Lectures on Multilingualism*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- BALL, S. J. 1994. *Education Reform: A Critical and Post-structural Approach*, Philadelphia, Open University Press.
- BALL, S. J., MAGUIRE, M. & BRAUN, A. 2012. *How Schools Do Policy: Policy Enactments in Secondary Schools*, Oxon, Routledge.
- BANASICK, S. 2019. KADE: A desktop application for Q methodology. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 4, 1-4.
- BATESON, G. 1972. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind: A Revolutionary Approach to Man's Understanding of Himself*, New York, Ballantine.

- BAUMERT, J. & KUNTER, M. 2013. The COACTIV Model of Teachers' Professional Competence. In: KUNTER, M., BAUMERT, J., BLUM, W., KLUSMANN, U., KRAUSS, S. & NEUBRAND, M. (eds.) *Cognitive Activation in the Mathematics Classroom and Professional Competence of Teachers*. New York: Springer.
- BENSON, C. 2013. Towards Adopting a Multilingual Habitus in Educational Development. In: KOSONEN, K. & BENSON, C. J. (eds.) *Language Issues in Comparative Education: Inclusive Teaching and Learning in Non-dominant Languages and Cultures*. Sense Publishers.
- BENSON, C. 2014. Adopting a Multilingual Habitus: What North and South Can Learn from Each Other About the Essential Role of Non-dominant Languages in Education. In: ZENOTZ, V., GORTER, D. & CENOZ, J. (eds.) *Minority Languages & Multilingual Education*. the Netherlands: Springer.
- BERTHELE, R. 2020. The selective celebration of linguistic diversity: evidence from the Swiss language policy discourse. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*.
- BERTHELE, R. & WITTLIN, G. 2013. Receptive multilingualism in the Swiss Army. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 10, 181-195.
- BERTSCHY, I., EGLI CUENAT, M. & STOTZ, D. 2015. *Lehrplan Französisch und Englisch [Curriculum French and English]*, Basel/Pratteln, Gremper AG.
- BEST, S. & KELLNER, D. 1991. *Postmodern theory: Critical interrogations*, New York, NY, Guilford Press.
- BIALYSTOK, E. 2001. *Bilingualism in development, language, literacy and cognition*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- BIALYSTOK, E. 2011. Reshaping the mind: The benefits of bilingualism. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 65, 229-235.
- BIESTA, G. 2015. What is Education For? On Good Education, Teacher Judgement, and Educational Professionalism. *European Journal of Education*, 50, 75-87.
- BIESTA, G. 2017. Mixing methods in educational research. In: COE, R., WARING, M., HEDGES, L. V. & ARTHUR, J. (eds.) *Research Methods & Methodologies in Education*. London, UK: SAGE.
- BIESTA, G., PRIESTLEY, M. & ROBINSON, S. 2015. The role of beliefs in teacher agency. *Teachers and Teaching*, 21, 624-640.
- BIESTA, G. & TEDDER, M. 2007. Agency and learning in the lifecourse: Towards an ecological perspective. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 39, 132-149.
- BLACKLEDGE, A. 2008. Language Ecology and Language Ideology. In: CREESE, A., MARTIN, P. & HORNBERGER, N. H. (eds.)

- Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Springer Science+Business Media LLC.
- BLACKLEDGE, A. & CREESE, A. (eds.) 2014. *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy*, London: Springer.
- BLÖMEKE, S., GUSTAFSSON, J.-E. & SHAVELSON, R. J. 2015. Beyond dichotomies: Viewing competence as a continuum. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*, 223, 3-13.
- BLÖMEKE, S., KAISER, G., KÖNIG, J. & JENTSCH, A. 2020. Profiles of mathematics teachers' competence and their relation to instructional quality. *ZDM Mathematics Education*.
- BLOMMAERT, J. 2010. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- BOLTON, K. & MEIERKORD, C. 2013. English in contemporary Sweden: Perceptions, policies, and narrated practices. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 17, 93-117.
- BONNET, A. & SIEMUND, P. (eds.) 2018. *Foreign Language Education in Multilingual Classroom*: John Benjamins.
- BORG, S. 2003. Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36, 81-109.
- BORG, S. 2006. *Teacher Cognition and Language Education : Research and Practice*, London, Continuum.
- BORG, S. 2011. The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs. *System*, 39, 370-380.
- BOURDIEU, P. 1977. *Outline of a theory of practice*, London, Cambridge University Press.
- BOURDIEU, P. & PASSERON, J.-C. 1977. *Reproduction in Education Society and Culture*, Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press.
- BOYD, S. & HUSS, L. 1999. Det behövs en helhetssyn på språket i Sverige! [A comprehensive view of languages in Sweden is needed!]. *Språkvård*, 3, 5-9.
- BRAUN, A., BALL, S. J., MAGUIRE, M. & HOSKINS, K. 2011. Taking context seriously: towards explaining policy enactments in the secondary school. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 32, 585-596.
- BRAVO GRANSTRÖM, M. 2019. *Teachers' Beliefs and Strategies when Teaching Reading in Multilingual Settings: Case Studies in German, Swedish and Chilean Grade 4 Classrooms*, Berlin, Logos Verlag.
- BROWN, S. R. 1980. *Political Subjectivity*, New Haven, CT, Yale University Press.

- BROWN, S. R. 2006. A match made in heaven: A marginalized methodology for studying the marginalized. *Quality & Quantity*, 40, 361-382.
- BROWN, S. R. 2019a. Q Methodology in Research on Political Decision Making. In: REDLAWSK, D. P. (ed.) *Oxford encyclopedia of political decision making*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- BROWN, S. R. 2019b. Subjectivity in the Human Sciences. *The Psychological Record*, 69, 565-579.
- BROWN, S. R. & ROBYN, R. 2004. Reserving a Key Place for Reality: Philosophical Foundations of Theoretical Rotation. *Operant Subjectivity*, 27, 104-124.
- BROWN, Z. & RHOADES, G. 2019. Q-methodology: seeking communalities in perspectives of young children and practitioners. In: BROWN, Z. & PERKINS, H. (eds.) *Using Innovative Methods in Early Years Research: Beyond the Conventional*. New York: Routledge.
- BUNDESAMT FÜR STATISTIK, B. 2016. Sprachliche Praktiken in der Schweiz: Erste Ergebnisse der Erhebung zur Sprache, Religion und Kultur 2014. Neuchâtel.
- BUNDESAMT FÜR STATISTIK, B. 2017. Schweizerdeutsch und Hochdeutsch in der Schweiz. analyse von Daten aus der Erhebung zur Sprache, Religion und Kultur 2014. *Statistik der Schweiz*. Neuchâtel.
- BUNDESAMT FÜR STATISTIK, B. 2019. *Die Bevölkerung der Schweiz 2018* [Online]. Neuchâtel, Switzerland. Available: <https://www.bfs.admin.ch/asset/de/348-1800> [Accessed 01 April 2020].
- BUSCH, B. 2012. The Linguistic Repertoire Revisited. *Applied Linguistics*, 1-22.
- CABAU, B. 2014. Minority Language Education Policy and Planning in Sweden. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 15, 409-425.
- CALAFATO, R. 2019. The non-native speaker teacher as proficient multilingual: A critical review of research from 2009--2018. *Lingua*, 227.
- CANAGARAJAH, A. S. 2011. Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 401-417.
- CANTOR, P., OSHER, D., BERG, J., STEYER, L. & ROSE, G. 2019. Malleability, plasticity, and individuality: How children learn and develop in context. *Applied Developmental Science*, 23, 307-337.
- CARLGREN, I. 2009. The Swedish comprehensive school - lost in transition. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 12, 633-649.

- CARLSON, M. 2009. Flerspråkighet inom lärarutbildningen. Ett perspektiv som saknas. *Utbildning & Demokrati*, 18, 39-66.
- CASTLES, S. & MILLER, M. J. 2009. *The Age of Migration; International Population Movements in the Modern World*, Houndmills, Palgrave Macmillan.
- CENOZ, J. 2013. Defining Multilingualism. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 33, 3-18.
- CENOZ, J. & GORTER, D. 2012. Language policy in education: additional languages. In: SPOLSKY, B. (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- CENOZ, J. & GORTER, D. (eds.) 2015. *Multilingual Education: Between language learning and translanguaging*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CENTURY, J. & CASSATA, A. 2016. Implementation Research: Finding Common Ground on What, How, Why, Where, and Who. *Review of Research in Education*, 40, 169-215.
- CLYNE, M. 2005. *Australia's language potential*, Sydney, UNSW Press.
- CLYNE, M. 2008. The monolingual mindset as an impediment to the development of plurilingual potential in Australia. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 2, 347-365.
- COBURN, C. E. 2001. Collective sensemaking about reading: How teachers mediate reading policy in their professional communities. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 23, 145-170.
- CONTEH, J. & MEIER, G. (eds.) 2014. *The multilingual turn in languages education: opportunities and challenges*, Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- COOPER, R. L. 1989. *Language planning and social change*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- COTS, J. M., LASAGABASTER, D. & GARRETT, P. 2012. Multilingual policies and practices of universities in three bilingual regions in Europe. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 216, 7-32.
- COULMAS, F. 2018. *An Introduction to Multilingualism: Language in a Changing World*, Oxford, UK, Oxford University Press.
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE 2001. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE 2009. *Language Education Policy Profiles: A Transversal Analysis: Trends and Issues*, Strasbourg, Language Policy Division.
- CRESWELL, J. W. & PLANO CLARK, V. L. 2018. *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*, Los Angeles, SAGE Publications.

- CROSS, R. 2010. Language Teaching as Sociocultural Activity: Rethinking Language Teacher Practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94, 434-452.
- CUMMINS, J. 1981. The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In: EDUCATION, C. S. D. O. (ed.) *Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework*. Los Angeles: National Dissemination Center.
- CUMMINS, J. 2005. A Proposal for Action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89, 582-617.
- CURT, B. 1994. *Textuality and Tetonics: Troubling Social and Psychological Science*, Buckingham, Open University Press.
- D-EDK. 2016. *Lehrplan 21. Gesamtausgabe* [Online]. Luzern: Deutschschweizer Erziehungsdirektoren-Konferenz. Available: https://v-ef.lehrplan.ch/container/V_EF_DE_Gesamtausgabe.pdf [Accessed 21 February 2020].
- DARLING-HAMMOND, L. 2000. How Teacher Education Matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51, 166-173.
- DARLING-HAMMOND, L., FLOOK, L., COOK-HARVEY, C., BARRON, B. & OSHER, D. 2019. Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*.
- DAY ASHLEY, L. 2017. Case Study Research. In: COE, R., WARING, M., HEDGES, L. V. & ARTHUR, J. (eds.) *Research Methods & Methodologies in Education*. 2nd ed. London, UK: SAGE.
- DE CILLIA, R. 2010. Mehrsprachigkeit statt Zweisprachigkeit - Argumente und Konzepte für eine Neuorientierung der Sprachenpolitik an den Schulen. In: DE CILLIA, R., GRUBER, H., KRZYZANOWSKI, M. & MENZ, F. (eds.) *Discourse - Politics - Identity. Diskurs - Politik - Identität. Festschrift für Ruth Wodak*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- DE JONG, E. 2016. Afterword: Toward pluralist policies, practices, and research. *Language and Education*, 30, 378-382.
- DE LEEUW, R. R., DE BOER, A. A., BECKMANN, E. J., VAN EXEL, J. & MINNAERT, A. E. M. G. 2019. Young children's perspectives on resolving social exclusion within inclusive classrooms. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 98, 324-335.
- DESCARTES, R. 1989. *Correspondance avec Élisabeth et autres Lettres*, Paris, Garnier-Flammarion.

- DORI, Y. J. & HERSCOVITZ, O. 2005. Case-based Long-term Professional Development of Science Teachers. *International Journal of Science Education*, 27, 1413-1446.
- DOUGLAS FIR GROUP 2016. A transdisciplinary frame- work for SLA in a multilingual world. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100 (Supplement 2016), 19-47.
- DRYZEK, J. S. 2005. Handle with care: The deadly hermeneutics of deliberative instrumentation. *Acta Politica*, 40, 197-211.
- DRYZEK, J. S. & HOLMES, L. 2002. *Post-Communist Democratization: Political Discourses Across Thirteen Countries*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- DUARTE, J. 2019. Translanguaging in mainstream education: a sociocultural approach. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22, 150-164.
- EDK 2004. Sparchenunterricht in der obligatorischen Schule: Strategie der EDK und Arbeitsplan für die Gesamtschweizerische Koordination.
- EDK 2007. Interkantonale Vereinbarung über die Harmonisierung der obligatorischen Schule (HarmoS-Konkordat).
- ELLINGSEN, I. T., ARSTAD THORSEN, A. & STØRKSEN, I. 2014. Revealing Children's Experiences and Emotions through Q Methodology. *Child Development Research*, 1-9.
- ELLIS, A. K. 2004. *Exemplars of Curriculum Theory*, New York, NY, Routledge.
- ELLIS, E. 2006. Monolingualism: The unmarked case. *Estudios de Sociolingüística*, 7, 173-196.
- ELLIS, E., GOGOLIN, I. & CLYNE, M. 2010. The Janus face of monolingualism: a comparison of German and Australian language education policies. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 11, 439-460.
- ERIKSSON BARAJAS, K., FORSBERG, C. & WENGSTRÖM, Y. 2013. *Systematiska litteraturstudier i utbildningsvetenskap: vägledning vid examensarbeten och vetenskapliga artiklar*, Stockholm, Natur & Kultur.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION 2004. Promoting language learning and linguistic diversity. An action plan 2004-2006. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION 2015. Language teaching and learning in multilingual classrooms. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- FARAHANI, F. 2010. On Being an Insider and/or an Outsider: A Diasporic Researcher's Catch-22. In: NAIDOO, L. (ed.) *Education Without Borders*. Nova Science Publishers.

- FERGUSON, C. A. 1991. Diglossia Revisited. *Southwest Journal Linguistics*, 10, 214-234.
- FISHMAN, J. A. 1967. Bilingualism With and Without Diglossia; Diglossia With and Without Bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 23, 29-38.
- FISHMAN, J. A. 1972. *Language and Nationalism: Two Integrative Essays*, Rowley, MA, Newbury House.
- FLUCKINGER, C. D. 2014. Big Five Measurement via Q-Sort: An Alternative Method for Constraining Socially Desirable Responding. *SAGE Open*, 4, 1-8.
- FÜRST, G. & GRIN, F. 2018. Multilingualism and creativity: a multivariate approach. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 39, 341-355.
- GALLAGHER, K. & POROCK, D. 2010. The Use of Interviews in Q Methodology. *Nursing Research*, 59, 295-300.
- GARCÍA, O. 2009. *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*, Malden, MA, Blackwell/Wiley.
- GARCÍA, O. & WEI, L. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*, Palgrave Macmillan.
- GEIJSEL, F., SLEEGERS, P., VAN DEN BERG, R. & KELCHTERMANS, G. 2001. Conditions Fostering the Implementation of Large-Scale Innovation Programs in Schools: Teachers' Perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37, 130-166.
- GOGOLIN, I. 1994. *Der monolinguale Habitus der multilingualen Schule*, Münster/New York, Waxmann.
- GOGOLIN, I. 2013. The "monolingual habitus" as the common feature in teaching in the language of the majority in different countries. *Per Linguam: A Journal of Language Learning*, 38-49.
- GOGOLIN, I. & DUARTE, J. 2013. *Linguistic Superdiversity in Urban Areas: Research Approaches*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- GOGOLIN, I. & PRIES, L. 2004. Stichwort: Transmigration und Bildung. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 7, 5-19.
- GRIN, F. 1999. Language Policy in Multilingual Switzerland: Overview and Recent Developments. *ECMI Brief*
- GRIN, F., SFREDDO, C. & VAILLANCOURT, F. 2010. *The economics of the multilingual workplace*, New York, Routledge.
- GUMPERZ, J. J. 1964. Linguistic and social interaction in two communities. *American Anthropologist*, 66, 137-153.
- HAMMER, S., VIESCA, K., EHMKE, T. & HEINZ, B. E. 2018. Teachers' beliefs concerning teaching multilingual learners: a cross-cultural

- comparison between the US and Germany. *Faculty Publications: Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education*, 329.
- HART, C. 1998. *Doing a literature review: releasing the social science research imagination*, London, SAGE [in association with] The Open University.
- HARTEIS, C., GRUBER, H. & LEHNER, F. 2006. Epistemological Beliefs and Their Impact on Work, Subjectivity and Learning. In: BILLETT, S., FENWICK, T. & SOMERVILLE, M. (eds.) *Work, Subjectivity and Learning*. Springer.
- HAUGEN, E. 1972. The Ecology of Language. In: DIL, A. S. (ed.) *The Ecology of Language: Essays by Einar Haugen*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- HAUGEN, E. 1973. The Curse of Babel. *Daedalus*, 102, 47-57.
- HAUKÅS, Å. 2016. Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 13, 1-18.
- HEDMAN, C. & MAGNUSSON, U. 2019. Performative functions of multilingual policy in second language education in Sweden. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*.
- HELGØY, I. & HOMME, A. 2007. Towards a New Professionalism in School? A Comparative Study of Teacher Autonomy in Norway and Sweden. *European Educational Research Journal*, 6, 232-249.
- HELLER, M. 1999. *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity*, London, Longman.
- HÉLOT, C. 2007. *Du bilinguisme en famille au plurilinguisme à l'école*, Paris, L'Harmattan.
- HÉLOT, C. 2010. "Tu sais bien parler maîtresse!": negotiating languages other than French in the primary classroom in France. In: MENKEN, K. & GARCÍA, O. (eds.) *Negotiating Language Policies in Schools: Educators as Policymakers*. London: Routledge.
- HÉLOT, C. 2012. Linguistic diversity and education. In: MARTIN-JONES, M., BLACKLEDGE, A. & CREESE, A. (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism*. Oxon: Routledge.
- HENRY, A. & APELGREN, B. M. 2008. Young learners and multilingualism: A study of learner attitudes before and after the introduction of a second foreign language to the curriculum. *System*, 36, 607-623.
- HERDINA, P. & JESSNER, U. 2002. *A Dynamic Model of Multilingualism: Perspectives of Change in Psycholinguistics. Multilingual Matters 121*.

- HONIG, M. I. (ed.) 2006. *New directions in education policy implementation. Confronting complexity*, New York: State University of New York Press.
- HOPMANN, S. T. 2003. On the evaluation of curriculum reforms. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 35, 459-478.
- HORNBERGER, N. H. 2002. Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. *Language Policy*, 1, 27-51.
- HORNBERGER, N. H. & HULT, F. M. 2008. Ecological language education policy. In: SPOLSKY, B. & HULT, F. M. (eds.) *Handbook of educational linguistics*. Oxford, England: Wiley-Blackwell.
- HUFEISEN, B. & GIBSON, M. 2003. Zur Interdependenz emotionaler und kognitiver Faktoren im Rahmen eines Modells zur Beschreibung sukzessiven multiplen Sprachlernens. *Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquee*, 78, 13-33.
- HULT, F. M. 2012. English as a Transcultural Language in Swedish Policy and Practice. *TESOL Quarterly: A Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages and of Standard English as a Second Dialect*, 46, 230-257.
- HULT, F. M. 2013. Ecology and Multilingual Education. In: CHAPPELLE, C. A. (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- HULT, F. M. 2014a. Cover Bilingualism and Symbolic Competence: Analytical Reflections on Negotiating Insider/Outsider Positionality in Swedish Speech Situations. *Applied Linguistics*, 35, 63-81.
- HULT, F. M. 2014b. How does policy influence language in education? In: SILVER, R. E. & LWIN, S. M. (eds.) *Language in education: Social implications*. London: Continuum.
- HULT, F. M. 2018a. Engaging pre-service English teachers with language policy. *ELT Journal*, 72, 249-259.
- HULT, F. M. 2018b. Foreign language education policy on the horizon. *Foreign Language Annals*, 51, 35-45.
- HULT, F. M. 2019a. Towards a Unified Theory of Language Development: The Transdisciplinary Nexus of Cognitive and Sociocultural Perspectives on Social Activity. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103.
- HULT, F. M. 2019b. Towards a Unified Theory of Language Development: The Transdisciplinary Nexus of Cognitive and Sociocultural Perspectives on Social Activity. *Modern Language Journal*, 103.
- HULT, F. M. & HORNBERGER, N. H. 2016. Revisiting orientations in language planning: Problem, right, and resource as an analytical heuristic. *Bilingual Review/Revista Bilingüe*, 33, 30-49.

- HUMAN, O. 2015. Complexity: E-Special Introduction. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 33, 421-440.
- HUTCHINS, E. 1991. The social organization of distributed cognition. In: RESNICK, L. A., LEVINE, R. & TEASLEY, S. (eds.) *Perspectives on socially shared cognition*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- HYLTENSTAM, K., AXELSSON, M. & LINDBERG, I. 2012. *Flerspråkighet – en forskningsöversikt*, Stockholm, Vetenskapsrådet rapportserie.
- HYMES, D. 1996. *Ethnography, Linguistics, Narrative Inequality: Toward an Understanding of Voice*, London, Taylor & Francis.
- JAMES, C. & GARRETT, P. 1991. *Language Awareness in the Classroom*, London, Longman.
- JESSNER, U. & KRAMSCH, C. 2015. Introduction: The multilingual challenge. In: JESSNER, U. & KRAMSCH, C. (eds.) *The Multilingual Challenge: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- JOHNSON, B. & CHRISTENSEN, L. 2008. *Educational Research: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Approaches*, Thousand Oaks, CA., Sage Publications.
- JOHNSON, D. C. 2013a. *Language Policy*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- JOHNSON, D. C. & PRATT, K. L. 2014. Educational Language Policy and Planning. In: CHAPELLE, C. A. (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- JOHNSON, F. L. 2013b. Underlying Paradox in the European Union's Multilingualism Policies. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 10, 288-310.
- JØRGENSEN, J. N. 2008. Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5, 161-176.
- JOSEPHSON, O. 2004. *Ju : ifrågasatta självklarheter om svenskan, engelskan och alla andra språk i Sverige*, Stockholm : Norstedts akademiska förlag.
- KACHRU, Y. 1994. Monolingual Bias in SLA Research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 795-800.
- KAPLAN, R. B. & BALDAUF, R. B. 1997. *Language planning from practice to theory*, Clevedon, UK, Multilingual Matters.
- KING, L. & CARSON, L. (eds.) 2017. *Multilingual Identities: A study of attitudes towards multilingualism in three European cities*, London: The Languages Company.
- KLINE, P. 1994. *An Easy Guide to Factor Analysis*, London, Routledge.

- KRAMSCH, C. 2014. Teaching foreign languages in an era of globalization: Introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98, 296-311.
- KRUMM, H.-J. 2004. Heterogeneity: multilingualism and democracy. *Utbildning och Demokrati*, 13, 61-77.
- LAAKSO, J., SARHIMAA, A., SPILIOPOULOU ÅKERMARK, A. & TOIVANEN, R. 2016. *Towards openly multilingual policies and practices: assessing minority language maintenance across Europe*, Bristol, Multilingual Matters.
- LABOV, W. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania.
- LANTOLF, J. P. (ed.) 2000. *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LAVE, J. & WENGER, E. 1991. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- LEIJEN, Ä., PEDASTE, M. & LEPP, L. 2019. Teachers agency following the ecological model: how it is achieved and how it could be strengthened by different types of reflection. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 1-16.
- LIDDICOAT, A. J. 2019. Constraints on Agency in Micro Language Policy and Planning in Schools. In: BOUCHARD, J. & GLASGOW, G. P. (eds.) *Agency in Language Policy and Planning: Critical Inquiries*. New York: Routledge.
- LIDDICOAT, A. J. & TAYLOR-LEECH, K. 2015. Multilingual education: the role of language ideologies and attitudes. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 16, 1-7.
- LINCOLN, Y. S. & GUBA, E. G. 1985. *Naturalistic inquiry*, Beverly Hills, CA, SAGE.
- LO BIANCO, J. 2007. Bilingual education and socio-political issues. In: CUMMINS, J. & HORNBERGER, N. H. (eds.) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. New York: Springer.
- LO BIANCO, J. 2008. Educational Linguistics and Education Systems. In: SPOLSKY, B. & HULT, F. M. (eds.) *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics*. Oxford, England: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- LO BIANCO, J. 2010a. The importance of language policies and multilingualism for cultural diversity. *International Social Science Journal*, 61, 37-67.
- LO BIANCO, J. 2010b. Language Policy and Planning. In: HORNBERGER, N. H. & MCKAY, S. L. (eds.) *Sociolinguistics and Language Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- LO BIANCO, J. 2014. Naturalising the Multilingual Turn. In: CONTEH, J. & MEIER, G. (eds.) *The Multilingual Turn in Languages*

- Education: Opportunities and Challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- LO BIANCO, J. 2015. Exploring language problems through Q-sorting. In: HULT, F. M. & JOHNSON, D. C. (eds.) *Research methods in language policy and planning: A practice guide*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- LO BIANCO, J. 2016. Ethical Dilemmas and Language Policy (LP) Advising. In: DE COSTA, P. I. (ed.) *Ethics in applied linguistics research: language researcher narratives*. New York: Routledge.
- LO BIANCO, J. 2017. Accent on the positive: Revisiting the 'Language as Resource' orientation for bolstering multilingualism in contemporary urban Europe. In: PEUKERT, H. & GOGOLIN, I. (eds.) *Dynamics of Linguistic Diversity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- LO BIANCO, J. & BAL, A. 2016. *Learning from Difference*, Cham, Springer International Publishing.
- LÜDI, G. 2007. The Swiss model of plurilingual communication. In: TEN THIJE, J. D. & ZEEVAERT, L. (eds.) *Receptive multilingualism: Linguistic analysis, language policies and didactic concepts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- LUNDBERG, A. 2018. Multilingual Educational Language Policies in Switzerland and Sweden: A Meta-Analysis. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 42, 45-69.
- LUNDBERG, A. 2019a. Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism: findings from Q method research. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 20, 266-283.
- LUNDBERG, A. 2019b. Teachers' viewpoints about an educational reform concerning multilingualism in German-speaking Switzerland. *Learning and Instruction*, 64.
- LUNDBERG, A., DE LEEUW, R. R. & ALIANI, R. under review. Q Methodology: A Mixed Method Approach to Subjectivity in Educational Research.
- MÄRZ, V. & KELCHTERMANS, G. 2013. Sense-making and structure in teachers' reception of educational reform. A case study on statistics in the mathematics curriculum. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 29, 13-24.
- MAY, S. 2014a. Contesting public monolingualism and diglossia: rethinking political theory and language policy for a multilingual world. *Language Policy*, 371-393.
- MAY, S. (ed.) 2014b. *The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and Bilingual Education*, New York and London: Taylor and Francis.

- MAY, S. 2017. Language Education, Pluralism, and Citizenship. In: MCCARTY, T. L. & MAY, S. (eds.) *Language Policy and Political Issues in Education*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- MCKEOWN, B. & THOMAS, D. B. 1988. *Q Methodology*, Thousand Oaks, California, SAGE Publications.
- MCRAE, K. D. 1975. The principle of territoriality and the principle of personality in multilingual states. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 1975, 33.
- MELO-PFEIFER, S. 2018. The multilingual turn in foreign language education. In: SIEMUND, P. & BONNET, A. (eds.) *Foreign Language Education in Multilingual Classrooms*. John Benjamins.
- MENKEN, K. & GARCÍA, O. 2010. *Negotiating language policies in schools: educators as policymakers*, New York; London, Routledge.
- MENKEN, K. & SOLORZA, C. 2015. Principals as linchpins in bilingual education: the need for prepared school leaders. *International Journal of Bi-lingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18, 676-697.
- MERCER, S. 2012. The Complexity of Learner Agency. *Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 6, 41-59.
- MESCHEDE, N., FIEBRANZ, A., MÖLLER, K. & STEFFENSKY, M. 2017. Teachers' professional vision, pedagogical content knowledge and beliefs: On its relation and differences between pre-service and in-service teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 66, 158-170.
- MILANI, T. M. 2008. Language testing and citizenship: A language ideological debate in Sweden. *Language in Society*, 37, 27-59.
- MILES, M. B., HUBERMAN, A. M. & SALDAÑA, J. 2014. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*, Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE Publications.
- MINTEN, E. 2017. Forskningsbaserad för god skolutveckling. *Vetenskap och Beprövad Erfarenhet Skola*. Lund: Lunds universitet.
- MOHR, S. 2020. The "I" in sociolinguistics: The role of subjectivity in ethnographic fieldwork. *The Mouth: Critical Studies on Language, Culture and Society*, 6, 101-118.
- MOORE, D. & GAJO, L. 2009. Introduction – French voices on plurilingualism and pluriculturalism: theory, significance and perspectives. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 6, 137-153.
- MORIN, E. 1994. *La complexité humaine*, Paris, Flammarion.
- MUFWENE, S. S. 2001. *The Ecology of Language Evolution*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- MÜHLHÄUSLER, P. 1994. Language teaching = Linguistic imperialism? *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 17, 121-130.

- MÜHLHÄUSLER, P. 2003. *Language of environment - environment of language. A course in ecolinguistics*, London, Battlebridge Publications.
- NEWMAN, I. & RAMLO, S. 2010. Using Q methodology and Q factor analysis to facilitate mixed methods research. In: TASHAKKORI, A. & TEDDLIE, C. (eds.) *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research*. Second ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- NEWMAN, M. & GOUGH, D. 2020. Systematic Reviews in Educational Research: Methodology, Perspectives and Application. In: ZAWACKI-RICHTER, O., KERRES, M., BEDENLIER, S., BOND, M. & BUNTINS, K. (eds.) *Systematic Reviews in Educational Research: Methodology, Perspectives and Application*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- NOCON, H. 2008. Contradictions of time in collaborative school research. *Journal of Educational Change*, 9, 339-347.
- OAKES, L. 2001. *Language and national identity: comparing France and Sweden*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- OECD 2009. Creating Effective Teaching and Learning Environments. First Results from TALIS.
- OECD. 2015. *Improving Schools in Sweden: An OECD Perspective* [Online]. Available: <http://www.oecd.org/edu/school/Improving-Schools-in-Sweden.pdf> [Accessed 21 February 2020].
- OSBORN, M., CROLL, P., BROADFOOT, P., POLLARD, A., MCNESS, E. & TRIGGS, P. 1997. Policy into practice and practice into policy: Creative mediation in the primary classroom. In: HELSBY, G. & MCCULLOCH, G. (eds.) *Teachers and the National Curriculum*. London: Cassell.
- OSHER, D., CANTOR, P., BERG, J., STEYER, L. & ROSE, T. 2020. Drivers of human development: How relationships and context shape learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24, 6-36.
- OTSUJI, E. & PENNYCOOK, A. 2010. Metrolingualism: Fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 7, 240-254.
- PAIGE, J. B. & MORIN, K. H. 2016. Q-Sample Construction: A Critical Step for a Q-Methodological Study. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 38, 96-110.
- PAJARES, M. F. 1992. Teachers' Beliefs and Educational Research: Cleaning up a Messy Construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62, 307-332.
- PARKVALL, M. 2015. *Sveriges språk i siffror: vilka språk talas och av hur många?*, Stockholm, Språkrådet: Morfem.

- PAULSRUD, B. & LUNDBERG, A. 2020, forthcoming. One school for all? Multilingualism in teacher education in Sweden. In: WERNICKE, M., HAMMER, S., HANSEN, A. & SCHROEDLER, T. (eds.) *Preparing Teachers to work with multilingual learners: International approaches in teacher education programs*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- PAULSRUD, B., ROSÉN, J., STRASZER, B. & WEDIN, Å. 2017. *New Perspectives on Translanguaging and Education*, Bristol, Multilingual Matters.
- 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*.
- PAULSRUD, D. & WERMKE, W. 2019. Decision-making in Context: Swedish and Finnish Teachers' Perceptions of Autonomy. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 1-22.
- PHILLIPS, D. & OCHS, K. 2003. Processes of policy borrowing in education: Some explanatory and analytical devices. *Comparative Education*, 39, 451-461.
- PHILPOTT, C. & OATES, C. 2017. Teacher agency and professional learning communities; what can Learning Rounds in Scotland teach us? *Professional Development in Education*, 43, 318-333.
- PIGOTT, T. D. & POLANIN, J. R. 2020. Methodological Guidance Paper: High-Quality Meta-Analysis in a Systematic Review. *Review of Educational Research*, 90, 24-46.
- PILLER, I. 2016a. Linguistic Diversity in Education. In: PILLER, I. (ed.) *Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice: An Introduction to Applied Sociolinguistics*. Oxford, UK; New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- PILLER, I. 2016b. Monolingual ways of seeing multilingualism. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 11, 25-33.
- POPAY, J., ROBERTS, H., SOWDEN, A., PETTICREW, M., ARAI, L., RODGERS, M., BRITTEN, N., ROEN, K. & DUFFY, S. 2006. *Guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews*, University of Lancaster, UK.
- PORTOLÉS, L. & MARTÍ, O. 2018. Teachers' beliefs about multilingual pedagogies and the role of initial training. *International Journal of Multilingualism*.
- PRIESTLEY, M., BIESTA, G. & ROBINSON, S. 2015. *Teacher Agency: An Ecological Approach*, London, Bloomsbury Academic.
- RAMLO, S. 2016. Mixed Method Lessons Learned From 80 Years of Q Methodology. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 10, 28-45.

- RAMLO, S. 2020. Divergent viewpoints about the statistical stage of a mixed method: qualitative versus quantitative orientations. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 43, 93-111.
- RAMLO, S. & NEWMAN, I. 2011. Q Methodology and It Position in the Mixed-Methods continuum. *Operant Subjectivity*, 34, 172-191.
- REATH WARREN, A. 2017. *Developing multilingual literacies in Sweden and Australia: Opportunities and challenges in mother tongue instruction and multilingual study guidance in Sweden and community language education in Australia* PhD, Stockholms universitet.
- RICENTO, T. 2006. *An introduction to language policy: theory and method*, Malden, MA, Blackwell Pub.
- RICHARDSON, V. 1996. The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In: SIKULA, J. (ed.) *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan.
- ROKEACH, M. 1968. *Beliefs, attitudes, and values: A theory of organization and change.*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- ROSÉN, J. 2017. Spaces for Translanguaging in Swedish Education Policy. In: PAULSRUD, B., ROSÉN, J., STRASZER, B. & WEDIN, Å. (eds.) *New Perspectives on Translanguaging and Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- RUBIN, J. 1986. City planning and language planning. In: ANNAMALAI, E., JERNUDD, B. H. & RUBIN, J. (eds.) *Language Planning: Proceedings of an Institute*. Honolulu: East-West Center.
- RUIZ, R. 1984. Orientations in Language Planning. *NABE Journal*, 8, 15-34.
- RUIZ, R. 2010. Reorienting language-as-resource. In: PETROVIC, J. E. (ed.) *International perspectives on bilingual education: Policy, practice, and controversy*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- SÆBJØRNSSEN, S. E. N., ELLINGSEN, I. T., GOOD, J. M. M. & ØDEGÅRD, A. 2016. Combining a Naturalistic and Theoretical Q Sample Approach: An Empirical Research Illustration. *Operant Subjectivity*, 38, 15-32.
- SALZBURG GLOBAL SEMINAR. 2018. *The Salzburg Statement for a Multilingual World* [Online]. Available: https://www.salzburgglobal.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Documents/2010-2019/2017/Session_586/EN_SalzburgGlobal_Statement_586_-_Multilingual_World_English.pdf [Accessed 21 February 2020].
- SANNINO, A. 2008. Sustaining a non-dominant activity in school: Only a utopia? *Journal of Educational Change*, 9, 329-338.

- SANTAGATA, R. & YEH, C. 2016. The role of perception, interpretation, and decision making in the development of beginning teachers' competence. *ZDM Mathematics Education*, 48, 153-165.
- SASAKI, M. 2011. Comparative Research. In: LEWIS-BECK, M. S., BRYMAN, A. & LIAO, T. F. (eds.) *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- SCHIFFMAN, H. F. 1996. *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*, London, Routledge.
- SCHMOLCK, P. 2014. *PQMethod* [Online]. Available: <http://schmolck.userweb.mwn.de/qmethod/downpqmac.htm> [Accessed 20 November 2017].
- SCHULTE, B. 2018. Envisioned and enacted practices: educational policies and the 'politics of use' in schools. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 50, 624-237.
- SCOLLON, R. & SCOLLON, S. B. K. 2004. *Nexus analysis : discourse and the emerging Internet*, London ; New York : Routledge, 2004.
- SELIN, P. & HOLMQVIST OLANDER, M. 2015. Transforming new curriculum objectives into classroom instruction with the aid of learning studies. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies*, 4, 401-415.
- SEVINÇ, Y. 2020. Mindsets and family language pressure: Language or anxiety transmission across generations? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*.
- SFS 2010:800. Education Act. In: UTBILDNINGSDEPARTEMENTET (ed.). Stockholm.
- SHOHAMY, E. G. 2006. *Language policy: hidden agendas and new approaches*, London, Routledge.
- SHULMAN, L. 1987. Knowledge and teaching. Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard educational review*, 57, 1-22.
- SIEKKINEN, F. 2017. Flerspråkiga elever in en enspråkig elevnorm [Multilingual students in a monolingual norm]. *Educare*, 1, 27-49.
- SKOTT, J. 2014. The promises, problems, and prospects of research on teachers' beliefs. In: FIVES, H. & GILL, M. G. (eds.) *International Handbook of Research on Teachers' Beliefs*. Routledge.
- SKUTNABB-KANGAS, T. 2000. *Linguistic genocide in education or worldwide diversity and human rights?* , Mahwah, Lawrence Erlbaum.
- SKUTNABB-KANGAS, T. & PHILLIPSON, R. 1994. *Linguistic Human Rights. Overcoming linguistic discrimination*, Berlin and New York, Mouton de Gruyter.
- SNEEGAS, G. 2020. Making the Case for Critical Q Methodology. *The Professional Geographer*, 72, 78-87.

- SNILSTVEIT, B., OLIVER, S. & VOJTKOVA, M. 2012. Narrative approaches to systematic review and synthesis of evidence for international development policy and practice. *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, 4, 409-429.
- SOU, S. O. U. 2002. Mål i mun. Draft action programme for the Swedish language.
- SPILLANE, J. P., REISER, B. J. & REIMER, T. 2002. Policy implementation and cognition: Reframing and refocusing implementation research. *Review of Educational Research*, 72, 387-431.
- SPOLSKY, B. 2004. *Language policy*.
- SPOLSKY, B. 2009. *Language Management*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- STAFSTRÖM, S. 2017. *Good Research Practice*, Stockholm, Swedish Research Council.
- STANTON ROGERS, R. & STANTON ROGERS, W. 1990. What the Brits got out of the Q: And why their work may not line up with the American way of getting into it! *Electronic Journal of Communication*, 1, 1-11.
- STATISTICS SWEDEN, S. 2020. *Population statistics* [Online]. Available: https://www.scb.se/en/finding-statistics/statistics-by-subject-area/population/population-composition/population-statistics/#_Statisticalnews [Accessed 01 April 2020].
- STENNER, P. 2011. Q Methodology as qualiquantology: Comment on "Q methodology and its position in the mixed methods continuum". *Operant Subjectivity*, 34, 192-208.
- STENNER, P. & STANTON ROGERS, R. 2004. Q methodology and qualiquantology: The example of discriminating between emotions. In: TODD, Z., NERLICH, B., CLARKE, D. D. & MCKEOWN, S. (eds.) *Mixing Methods in Psychology: The Integration of Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Theory and Practice*.: Psychology Press Taylor & Francis Group.
- STEPHENSON, W. 1935. Technique of factor analysis. *Nature*, 136, 297.
- STEPHENSON, W. 1936. The inverted factor technique. *British Journal of Psychology*, 26, 344-361.
- STEPHENSON, W. 1953. *The Study of Behavior: Q Technique and its Methodology*, Chicago, Chicago University Press.
- STEPHENSON, W. 1961. Scientific creed, 1961: Philosophical credo. Abductory principles. The centrality of self. *The Psychological Record*, 11, 1-26.
- STEPHENSON, W. 2007. Consciring: A General Theory of Subjective Communicability. *Operant Subjectivity*, 30, 89-136.

- STEPHENSON, W. 2014. General Theory of Communication. *Operant Subjectivity*, 37, 38-56.
- STOTZ, D. 2006. Breaching the peace: Struggles around multilingualism in Switzerland. *Language Policy*, 5, 247-265.
- SURI, H. 2020. Ethical Considerations of Conducting Systematic Reviews in Educational Research. In: ZAWACKI-RICHTER, O., KERRES, M., BEDENLIER, S., BOND, M. & BUNTINS, K. (eds.) *Systematic Reviews in Educational Research: Methodology, Perspectives and Application*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- SWEDISH MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND RESEARCH 1992:1434. The Swedish Higher Education Act.
- SWEDISH NATIONAL AGENCY FOR EDUCATION 2015. *Läroplan för grundskolan, förskoleklassen och fritidshemmet 2011, Reviderad 2019 [Curriculum for the compulsory school, preschool class and the recreation centre 2011, Revised 2019]*, Stockholm, Sweden, Skolverket.
- SWEDISH NATIONAL AGENCY FOR EDUCATION 2018. *Greppa flerspråkighet. En resurs i lärande och undervisning*, Stockholm.
- THOLIN, J. 2012. If You Get Double the Time: Teaching practices in the "Swedish/English" language subject option in Swedish nine-year compulsory schooling. *Apples - Applied Language Studies*, 6, 69-91.
- TOLLEFSON, J. W. 2013. *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues*, New York, Routledge.
- TOOM, A., PYHÄLTÖ, K. & O'CONNELL RUST, F. 2015. Teachers' professional agency in contradictory times. *Teachers and Teaching*, 21, 615-623.
- TRACY, S. J. 2010. Qualitative Quality: Eight "Big-Tent" Criteria for Excellent Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16, 837-851.
- UCCELLI, P. & SNOW, C. 2008. A Research Agenda for Educational Linguistics. In: SPOLSKY, B. & HULT, F. M. (eds.) *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics*. Oxford, England: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- UNITED NATIONS. 2018. Quality Education - Why It Matters. Available: <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Goal-4.pdf> (accessed 21 February 2020) [Accessed (accessed 21 February 2020)].
- VAN LIER, L. 2004. *The Ecology and Semiotics of Language Learning: A Sociocultural Perspective*, Boston, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- VYGOTSKIJ, L. S. 1978. *Mind in society*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- WALLEN, M. & TORMEY, R. 2019. Developing teacher agency through dialogue. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 82, 129-139.

- WATTS, S. & STENNER, P. 2005. Doing Q methodology: theory, method and interpretation. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 2, 67-91.
- WATTS, S. & STENNER, P. 2012. *Doing Q methodological research: theory, method and interpretation*, Los Angeles; London, SAGE Publications.
- WERLEN, I., BAUMGARTNER, J. & ROSENBERGER, L. 2009. *Sprachkompetenzen der erwachsenen Bevölkerung in der Schweiz [Language proficiency in the adult Swiss population]*, Zürich, Seismo.
- WERMKE, W. & FORSBERG, E. 2017. The changing nature of autonomy: Transformations of the late Swedish teaching profession. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 61, 155-168.
- WERTSCH, J. V. 1991. A sociocultural approach to socially shared cognition. In: RESNICK, L. A., LEVINE, R. & TEASLEY, S. (eds.) *Perspectives on socially shared cognition*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- WERTSCH, J. V., TULVISTE, P. & HAGSTROM, F. 1996. A Sociocultural Approach to Agency. In: FORMAN, E., MINICK, N. & STONE, C. A. (eds.) *Contexts for Learning: Sociocultural Dynamics in Children's Development*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- WILLIG, C. 2013. *Introducing Qualitative Research in Psychology*, Maidenhead, Open University Press.
- WINSA, B. 2005. Language Planning in Sweden. In: KAPLAN, R. B. & BALDAUF, R. B. (eds.) *Language planning and policy in Europe: Vol. 1, Hungary, Finland and Sweden*. Buffalo, NY; Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- YANOW, D. 2000. *Conducting Interpretive Policy Analysis*, Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE.
- YIN, R. K. 2014. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, Thousand Oaks, SAGE.
- ZHANG, Y. & WILDEMUTH, B. M. 2009. Qualitative Analysis of Content. In: WILDEMUTH, B. M. (ed.) *Applications of social research methods to questions in information and library science*. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.

APPENDIX

Consent Form (Swedish)

Forskningsprojektet

The teachers' social construction of multilingualism - a comparative case study analysis in Sweden and Switzerland

Forskningsledare

Adrian Lundberg, adrian.lundberg@mah.se

Information före studiens genomförande

Syftet med min forskning är att jämföra lärares uppfattning av flerspråkighet i Sverige och Schweiz.

Metoden jag använder är *Q-methodology* och innebär att en grupp lärare får ett antal påståenden om flerspråkighet att rangordna inbördes. Det finns inga 'rätt' eller 'fel' utan studien bygger på att se på vilket sätt flerspråkighet i skolan uppfattas i Sverige respektive Schweiz.

Studien är anonym och det kommer inte att framgå vilka personer som deltagit eller vilken skola de arbetar på. Allt deltagande är frivilligt.

Genom att skriva under det här dokumentet lämnar du ditt medgivande till att:

- Du har givits full insyn i syftet med studien. Forskningsledaren har rätt att använda din data tills akademiska publikationer och presentationer.
- Du förstår att data rapporteras anonymt, men att studiens data genom svensk lagstiftning under sällsynta omständigheter kan tvingas att presentera till andra forskare som vill undersöka eventuella avvikelser.
- Du förstår att du kan välja att avbryta deltagandet när som helst under studiens genomförande om du så skulle önska.

Datum	Ort	Namnteckning
-------	-----	--------------

Namnförtydligande

Questionnaire on Demographic Information (Swedish)

Demografisk information

Kön

Födelseår

På vilka språk kan du kommunicera? Markera din nivå genom ett kryss i skalan.

Exempel: Spanska grundläggande |-----X-----| avancerad

1. grundläggande |-----| avancerad

2. grundläggande |-----| avancerad

3. grundläggande |-----| avancerad

4. grundläggande |-----| avancerad

5. grundläggande |-----| avancerad

Vilka språk pratade dina föräldrar med dig som barn?

Har du bott utomlands? Var och hur länge?

Vad har du för utbildning/ar? Fyll i examensår.

examensår	utbildning	Kommentar
	Grundskollärare	
	Förskolelärare	
	Speciallärare	
	Specialpedagog	
	Rektor	

Vilka ämnen undervisar du i?

Tack för att du är med i undersökningen!

Sorting Help (Swedish)

+	håller med →
<div>+ - /</div>	osäker
-	← håller inte med

Items in Component 1 *understanding* (Switzerland)

Item no.	Item
1	Multilingualism is a resource when learning a new language.
2	Multilingualism develops verbal skills.
3	Multilingualism increases the capacity to use effective reading strategies.
4	Multilingualism is the key to effective communication.
5	Multilingualism produces cognitive advantages.
6	Multilingualism allows new perspectives on surroundings.
7	Multilingualism provides possibilities for contacts.
8	Multilingual students are more flexible in their thoughts.
9	Multilingual students have better chances to get employed.
10	Multilingual students are weaker in their mother tongue than monolingual students.
11	Multilingual students have problems with (Swiss-)German.
12	Multilingual students have a bigger vocabulary.
13	One that can communicate in more than two languages is multilingual.
14	Multilingual students are a valuable source for society.
15	Multilingual students show greater acceptance for other cultures.
16	Multilingual students can support monolingual students in language classes.
17	Multilingual students can speak all their languages fluently.
18	Multilingual students have another mother tongue than (Swiss-)German.
19	Multilingual students often have problems at school.
20	Multilingual students can observe their own culture from different perspectives.
21	Multilingualism provides possibilities to partake in an international study and work context.
22	Multilingualism can be frustrating.
23	Multilingualism is more than just verbal language use.

24	Monolingually raised children can become multilingual.
25	The multilingual students' parents' (Swiss-)German competence is crucial for a successful collaboration between school and parents.
26	Multilingual students benefit from the mother tongue spoken at home.
27	Multilingualism leads to negative changes in school.
28	The examination with multilingualism broadens my personal horizon as a teacher.
29	Multilingualism hinders the communication of social values.
30	Multilingualism has too much significance in the discussion about school.
31	Multilingualism is a consequence of massimmigration.
32	Multilingual language use leads to fuzzy lines between separate languages.
33	Multilingual students are ashamed of using their mother tongue.
34	Multilingualism's potential is not exhausted in school.
35	The school is heavily shaped by the students' multilingualism.
36	The acquisition of two foreign languages negatively influences our school language.
37	A student with mother tongue like skills in (Swiss-)German is considered monolingual even though s/he speaks another language at home.
38	Students taking mother tongue instruction feel more secure in their identity.
39	When multilingual students switch between languages, they switch between different independent language systems.

Items in Component 2 *pedagogy* (Switzerland)

Item no.	Item
1	It is important that students with low motivation can be dispensed from foreign language classes.
2	Multilingualism is an important topic for school.
3	A common language is important.
4	Multilingual students need additional support to learn German.
5	Multilingual students should not learn additional languages, but focus on the ones they already know.
6	Everybody should be functionally trilingual.
7	Multilingual students need special education support.
8	Multilingual and monolingual students should learn German separately.
9	Multilingualism is a right at school.
10	Multilingual students should be evaluated in their mother tongue.
11	Schools should have access to multilingual material.
12	Competencies in more than two languages are unnecessary. One foreign language is enough.
13	The cooperation with the multilingual students' parents is vital for the students' success.
14	Teaching materials should include multilingualism as a topic.
15	A common attitude of towards multilingualism is important within the teaching staff.
16	Schools ought to change their way of teaching due to the society's increased multilingualism.
17	Separate languages should be taught separately.
18	Students should be encouraged to use their full linguistic repertoire.
19	The school needs more concrete guidelines concerning multilingualism.

20	I treat every student the same, regardless of their mother tongue.
21	Here, German is the norm and not the students' multilingualism.
22	Students with a migration background should be dispensed from foreign language classes.
23	Multilingualism should be a part of teachers' education.
24	Multilingual students should take a preparatory course before they take part in regular classes.
25	Multilingual students often need reduced individual learning objectives.
26	Multilingual students have the right to receive individual support in their mother tongue.
27	Teaching staff should receive information about multilingualism to hand out to parents and students.
28	Being allowed to use all their languages during lessons helps multilingual students in their learning.
29	We need a "German-only policy" in our public schools here.
30	I don't understand the students' mother tongue, so I don't want them to use them.
31	Teachers of different language subjects should collaborate closely.
32	A central task of the teacher is the systematic support of the students' multilingual self-perception.

ARTICLES I-IV

I

Multilingual educational language policies in Switzerland and Sweden

A meta-analysis

Adrian Lundberg

Malmö University

Multilingualism represents a global challenge and a goal of education in European states. This meta-analysis examines how research studies on multilingual educational policy documents on a macro-level (national/regional) in Sweden and Switzerland differ in terms of foci and how the discourses in the articles represent different treatments of multilingual educational language policies. These countries were selected because of their similarities regarding the societal context, but they are different in regard to language policy issues and political formation. The articles were systematically identified via two databases, ERIC and LLBA, and in order to examine the latest developments after the introduction of a new language act in Sweden and the harmonization of public education in Switzerland in 2009, only research articles published between 2009 and 2016 were included. The results of the study suggest that a monolingual habitus exists in the Swedish nation state context compared to a more pluralistic approach in Switzerland. The most noteworthy result is the diverging definitions of *multilingualism* and *plurilingual students* and how this understanding influences the treatment of educational policies in these two linguistically and culturally superdiverse European countries.

Keywords: language policy, European Union, multilingualism, plurilingualism, Sweden, Switzerland, educational language policy, curriculum

In 2009, Sweden introduced a new *Language Act* (2009, p.600) to protect the Swedish language by making it the official principal language in the country. The *Act's* different provisions to ensure that an individual is given access to language was aimed at finding strategies for balanced multilingualism. In the same year, Switzerland agreed on the harmonization of compulsory education, including the introduction of a new language curriculum based on multilingualism. The sys-

tematic meta-analysis offered in this article therefore synthesizes research results on multilingual educational language policies from the two countries in order to identify and describe the predominant research topics during the implementation process in the years after the policy changed.

As Daryai-Hansen et al. (2015, p. 110) note, “while the idea of plurilingual competence is well accepted in research on language education and promoted in language policies, it is not established in education in general.” A related conclusion is arrived at by Gogolin and Duarte (2013, p. 6) who state that the notion “of a ‘language’ as a homogeneous and clearly defined or definable object, which can be linked to a likewise identifiable ‘people’ [...] may no longer be reflected in state of the art research on language phenomena.” However, it prevails in the political sphere, educational practice, and as a common belief in European societies. In contrast to this ideology, sociolinguistic research shows that hundreds of millions use two or more languages without any particular difficulties, and “multilingualism is increasingly frequently seen as an emblem of identity – an essential component of European culture” (Lüdi & Py, 2009, p. 156). According to Jessner (2008, p. 27), “The application of monolingual norms to multilingual contexts is still predominant, despite the efforts of the European Union to foster plurilingualism.” Gogolin’s hypothesis concerning the teachers’ monolingual orientation in European schools “is an intrinsic element of their professional ‘habitus’ as members of the nation state school system” (2013, p. 42). She uses the term ‘monolingual habitus’ as “the deep-seated habit of assuming monolingualism as the norm in a nation” (2013, p. 41). As a consequence, for these rather traditional classrooms, language subjects are often kept totally apart. Teachers with a monolingual habitus would therefore “keep knowledge about other languages, including the L1 [the students’ first language], out of the classroom in order not to confuse students” (Jessner, 2008, p. 39). Also, according to Busch (2011, p. 545), “Most of the European education systems are still under the heavy influence of monolingual and homoglossic ideologies.” While education systems continue to apply the construct of the monolingual habitus “displaying monolingual self conceptions in their constitutions, structures and practical arrangements” (Gogolin & Duarte, 2013, p. 1), we live in a superdiverse society (Vertovec, 2007). The large number of refugees making their way to Europe since 2015 is only the latest development of a process that has already been in existence for several decades. Moreover, multiculturalism and multilingualism in Europe is by no means limited to refugees but “is affected by the now ubiquitous process of economic globalization and transnational activities of population mobility, wars, activism, and networking and communication technologies” (Lo Bianco & Bal, 2016, pp. 4–5).

By synthesizing research results on multilingual educational policy documents on a macro-level (national/regional) in the nation states of Sweden and

federalist Switzerland, it is possible to contrast the predominant foci and identify the similarities and differences of these countries. The comparison is relevant, as members of the Swiss educational arena are expected to be less guided by a monolingual habitus due to the country's political and multilingual origins. While Switzerland and Sweden are different in terms of their political organization and language policy issues, their societal contexts are similar, with 8 to respectively 10 million inhabitants and around 200 languages used on a daily basis by many immigrants in both countries. Also, their Life Satisfaction Index by the OECD's Better Life Index, which measures the well-being of societies is on a comparable level with 7.3 for Sweden and 7.6 for Switzerland out of 10 (OECD, 2017).

The aims of this meta-analysis are to identify and describe published research results on multilingual educational policy documents and how the findings differ between Switzerland and Sweden regarding the treatment of these policy documents. Two research questions have been formulated in order to achieve these aims:

1. What are the predominant foci in research results on Swedish and Swiss multilingual educational policy documents?
2. Do these findings show a rather monolingual or pluralistic approach in the treatment of current educational language policies?

Sufficient information about the sociolinguistic context of the two countries and the topic of multilingualism and multiculturalism in Europe provides a clear understanding of the situation in the two selected countries. After the section on the methodology used in this article, the results of the studies are discussed. Thus, this article seeks to contribute to the understanding of different educational policy contexts connected to multicultural and multilinguistic issues.

Sociolinguistic and policy context

In terms of research on multilingual education, Busch (2011) describes two shifting paradigms in Europe. First, a more sociolinguistic approach has been taken into consideration, which views schools from the perspective of a historical-critical analysis by emphasizing the school's social functions, criticizing its monolingual habitus, and advocating for an approach that relates teaching and learning practices to the specific social contexts. Moreover, the growing interest in bilingual or multilingual situations influences this. Second, in a more speaker-centered perspective, languages are no longer regarded as segmented, autonomous entities but rather, as holistic conceptions of plurilingual competences which are multiple, dynamic, integrated, contextualized, and individualized is used (Lüdi & Py, 2009).

Thus, access to different forms of multilingual education is increasingly seen as a necessary right for all learners, as it represents a resource on both the individual and societal levels (Lo Bianco, 2001).

This meta-analysis compares the development of the adjustments in European Union (EU) educational language policy based on the shifts described above in two European countries: Sweden, a EU member state since 1995, and Switzerland, one of the few countries in Western Europe that is not a member of the European Union but nevertheless adapts EU language policy recommendations like the “mother tongue plus 2” objective.

During the 2002 European Council in Barcelona, the Heads of State or Government of the EU called for at least two foreign languages to be taught from a very early age (European Commission, 2005). This eventually resulted in the policy objective, “Mother tongue plus two other languages,” already described in the European Commission’s action plan (European Commission, 2004). This usually means that English is one of the two other languages to be learned if English is not the mother tongue. For immigrants, the European Commission (2009) suggests that “Non-native speakers should therefore include the host-country language in their ‘one-plus-two’ combination.”

Some noteworthy differences between Sweden and Switzerland are to be found in the two countries’ political organization and their language history (including ideologies and policies). Given that “states typically license, authorize, fund, or certify educational practices” (Lo Bianco, 2008), differences in the political formation of states influence their educational systems and curricula. History in general “occupies an important position in most work in language policy and planning, whether at the micro-level of interpersonal communication or the macro-level of state formation” (Ricento, 2006, p.129). From a historical-structural standpoint in language policy and planning, where “historical processes are linked with language policies that contribute to (or undermine) language-related hierarchies” (Tollefson, 2015, p. 141), it is therefore inevitable to take a closer look at the two countries’ history and central concepts in a historical-structural analysis, such as *power* and *hierarchy* in the two selected contexts.

Sweden

Because Swedish is officially used by the Church and the State, Sweden appears to be unproblematically monolingual (Boyd, 2011). As Hult (2004, p. 181) writes, the country “might best be characterized as a multilingual polity with a monolingual image.” He continues, stating that “the Swedish language has been, and still is, central in shaping what it means to be Swedish.” This is a characteristic trademark of nation states that, according to Busch (2011, p.545), remain the major players

in language and education policy. While trying to adapt education plans to the European requirements of multilingual education, the political discourse in many countries “foregrounds proficiency in the official national language(s) as exclusive means and as the proof of successful ‘integration’ into ‘majority culture.’” In respect to Sweden, Milani (2007) claims that a nation state experiencing an increased linguistic heterogeneity will also experience conflicting language ideologies as the people construct a new sociolinguistic landscape.

According to Andersson and Lundström (2010), the percentage of people who live in Sweden but were born outside of Sweden rose from about 11% in the year 2000 to about 14% in 2008. In 2015, the number had reached 17% (Statistics Sweden, 2015). However, societal multilingualism is not only determined by the number of people immigrating to a country but also by the number of people born where the national language is not their mother tongue. According to Statistics Sweden, by 2015, 22.2% of the inhabitants in Sweden had a foreign background.¹ This heterogeneity has also had an impact on the education system and policy:

Society itself has changed rather dramatically during the last 10 years. Sweden is no longer a homogenate society with small differences between various groups and classes. Sweden is now a multicultural society, and class differences are increasing. These differences tend to effect variations within the education system. Variations or inequalities [...] in the education system are not necessarily effects of education reform; they could be the result of societal change.

(Wildt-Persson & Rosengren, 2002, p. 318)

Sweden is no exception in terms of having a history of multilingualism, especially when one considers that the Sami and Finnish-speaking minorities have inhabited Sweden for a long time. If the Swedish empire of the late seventeenth century is taken into consideration, 14 different languages and many varieties show proof of a multilingual nation even then (Winsa, 2005). Nevertheless, the Swedish-speaking majority had never felt challenged in a way that language policy had to be made more overt until the 1990s, when the Swedish Language Council initiated the endeavor of developing a new language act. These shifts in Swedish language policy are well-described by Boyd and Huss (2001), who mainly focus on the relation of the Swedish language to English and other minority languages. Also, according to the recent analysis by Halonen, Ihalainen, and Saarinen (2015), given the presumed unproblematic monolingual nature of Sweden, language policy has become explicitly problematized at the governmental level only since the beginning of the twenty-first century.

1. People of foreign background are per definition born abroad or born in Sweden to two parents born abroad.

Faced with the recognition of Swedish as an official and working language of EU institutions due to the accession of Sweden to the EU in 1995, and coupled with rising immigration and a further diversification of the linguistic landscape, an ambitious policy report entitled “Mål i mun” (SOU, 2002) was published by the parliamentary Committee on the Swedish Language. The document consists of nearly six hundred pages of proposals related to the promotion of the Swedish language. Nevertheless, it was only in the *Language Act* of 2009, in accordance with the language planning goals that were adopted in 2005² (“Bästa språket – en samlad svensk språkpolitik,” 2005/06:2), that Swedish was officially defined as the ‘main language’ of Swedish society as well as the language of administration. The new language law was the answer to an imbalance in terms of language rights. In 1999, Sweden ratified the Council of Europe Framework convention for the Protection of National Minorities and the European Charter of Regional and Minority Languages, by which Finnish, Sámi, Meänkieli, the Romani chib, and Yiddish maintained their status as minority languages (Lindberg, 2007). This meant that for some years, in contrast to the five minority languages, Swedish itself had no legally recognized status. While the minority languages’ official status (see also Hult, 2004; Hyltenstam & Milani, 2005) was confirmed, the *Language Act* was mainly about securing the development of Swedish, its constant use in international contexts, and the right of every inhabitant of the country to have access to learning the language (Halonen et al., 2015). This last aim can be viewed as an attempt at implementing the EU goal of the mastery of three languages (mother tongue plus two) mentioned earlier in this article (Norrby, 2008).

A special focus was placed on the relationship between Swedish and English in addition to the societal multilingualism due to almost 200 ‘immigrant’ minority languages with no official status, although their speech communities far outnumber at least four of the five official minority languages. This is especially the case with English,³ which is widespread in many societal domains like culture, higher education, and internationally oriented companies and seen as a threat to Swedish. The following quotation is taken from the English version of the website of the Language Council of Sweden (Institutet för språk och folkminne, 2016):

-
2. There are four national language planning goals:
 1. Swedish shall be the principal language of Sweden.
 2. Swedish shall be a complete language in the sense that it shall function as a vehicle of communication in all areas of society.
 3. Swedish in official and public use shall be correct but also simple and easy to understand.
 4. Everyone has the right to languages – to Swedish, their mother tongue and foreign languages.
 3. According to estimates, 75% of the Swedish adult population is able to read an English newspaper or manage an ordinary conversation (Josephson, 2003).

During the last decades, English has started to compete with Swedish in a growing number of fields in Swedish society – in large, international companies, in the educational system and in the media industry. This poses a threat to democratic values as many Swedes have insufficient knowledge of English.

However, viewing English as a threat is only true for a limited circle of language professionals. English enjoys a good reputation with the rest of the population, while immigrant languages are regarded with suspicion and considered a threat to the Swedish language (Lindberg, 2007). According to Hyltenstam (1999), the strong presence of English in high-status domains might create a diglossic situation with Swedish being the low-status variant. People with limited or no English proficiency could be excluded from important and powerful social discussions and decisions. However, other experts claim that no research confirms a domain-by-domain language shift (Boyd & Dahl, 2006). Sundberg (2013, p. 212) states that the policy “attempts to ‘protect’ the Swedish language in a situation in which English is becoming too powerful in certain areas while at the same time recognizing its importance and supporting a balanced bilingualism by promoting parallel proficiencies in the two languages.” Generally, these contrasting opinions are interesting when bearing in mind Tollefson’s (2006, p. 42) comparison of traditional research and a critical approach in language policy research. He states that “traditional research [...] is characterized by the assumption that language policies are usually adopted to solve problems of communication in multilingual settings and to increase social and economic opportunities for linguistic minorities” while “a critical approach acknowledges that policies often create and sustain various forms of social inequality, and that policy-makers usually promote the interests of dominant social groups.”

According to Norrby (2008, p. 73), the result of the most recent Swedish language politics is “societal monolingualism with Swedish being used for interaction in public life, whereas multiculturalism and multilingualism remain a question for the individual to pursue in private life.” This indicates that in order to achieve the language policy objective of the European Union (mother tongue plus two), the majority population whose first language is Swedish has to do more than expected by the Swedish Language Act. Winsa (2005, p. 320) calls this development an assimilation policy with a nationalistic attitude, which is “a natural part of the Swedish monolingual identity, not one derived from a long tradition of language planning.” In contrast to Winsa’s statement, Hyltenstam, Axelsson, and Lindberg (2012) mention the tension in society between a pluralist ideology, established at the central political level since the 1960s (as is evinced by political documents) and an assimilationist perspective, which is strong in large segments of the population.

Switzerland

In contrast to the Swedish case, Switzerland is known as the multilingual country *par excellence*. According to Secretary General Schwab of the Federal Assembly of the Swiss Confederation (2014), “plurilingualism is an integral part of Switzerland’s identity and is a key element of the national culture. It is a result of the way in which the Confederation has developed historically.” However, due to the federalist system of this central European country, or to use Kymlicka’s (2011) term, “multination federalism,”⁴ one can be cautious about the Swiss individual plurilingualism. Switzerland is used as an example of multiple, monolingually oriented school systems in a state with a multilingual composition (Busch, 2011) due to the strong territorial autonomy of the various linguistic groups. Therefore, in contrast to the Swedish nation state, it is common for Switzerland not to have a national curriculum.

Currently, around 33% of the people living in Switzerland are not Swiss citizens (Bundesamt für Statistik, 2016b). This rather high percentage is the result of several factors: the bilateral agreement on the free movement of persons between the European Union and Switzerland, Switzerland’s restrictive immigration policy, and the high birth rate and low death rate of the non-Swiss population. In a previous press release (Bundesamt für Statistik, 2015), it is stated that about a fifth of the foreign population in Switzerland was born in Switzerland, and half of those who were born abroad have been living in Switzerland for more than 10 years.

According to the latest statistics, 60% of all people living in Switzerland use⁵ more than one language at least once per week. Furthermore, 40% of all people living in Switzerland use English at least once per week (Bundesamt für Statistik, 2016a). Compared to the long history of a plurilingual and pluricultural aggregation of states known as *cantons*, plurilingualism was introduced rather late into the Federal Constitution of 1848. Due to immigration and professional mobility, the diversity of languages in Switzerland has greatly increased.

In order to coordinate and optimize language teaching and learning in compulsory education, the Swiss conference of Cantonal Ministers of Education (EDK, Schweizerische Konferenz der kantonalen Erziehungsdirektion) adopted a national strategy of language teaching (EDK, 2004) primarily consisting of several general objectives, including the following:

4. Kymlicka’s model of multinational federalism has two key features: (1) minority groups form local majorities and (2) minority groups have a distinct language which is typically an official state language.

5. Productively or receptively.

- The reinforcement of the language of schooling
- The compulsory study of two foreign languages⁶ at primary school level and of another (national) language as an option from the ninth school year
- The development of the pupils' skills in their first language (if different from the language of schooling)

In 2007, a new Federal act (Sprachengesetz, 2007) aimed at promoting plurilingualism was introduced, and in 2010, a new article in the Federal Constitution of the Swiss Confederation (Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft, 1999 (2016)) went into effect stating the following:

1. The official languages of the Confederation are German, French, and Italian. Romansh is also an official language of the Confederation when communicating with persons who speak Romansh.
2. The Cantons shall decide on their official languages. In order to preserve harmony between linguistic communities, the Cantons shall respect the traditional territorial distribution of languages and take into account the indigenous linguistic minorities.
3. The Confederation and the Cantons shall encourage understanding and exchange between the linguistic communities.
4. The Confederation shall support the plurilingual Cantons in the fulfillment of their special duties.
5. The Confederation shall support measures by the Cantons of Graubünden and Ticino to preserve and promote the Romansh and Italian languages.

In 2009, an agreement on the harmonization of compulsory education (EDK, 2007) between the cantons came into effect. This agreement is relevant to the topic because it asked for new multilingual educational policy documents covering the 2004 national strategy for language teaching and the new Federal act mentioned above. Due to the federalist nature of the country, educational curricula for foreign language instruction are a matter of the cantons and their affiliation to a linguistic region. Therefore, Switzerland currently knows three curricula, one for each large linguistic area: *Le plan d'études romand*, *Lehrplan 21*, and *Il piano di studio per la scuola dell'obbligo ticinese*. The curriculum for the German speaking region of Switzerland consisted of different project curricula during the implementation period, resulting in foreign languages being taught in different orders in the Germanic area of the country, contradicting the intention of harmonization in educational policy.

6. In the Swiss educational system, all languages, including official national languages, are termed "foreign languages" if they are not the same as the schooling language of the corresponding region.

Methodology

Retrieval of studies

To compile the literature for the systematic review, a comprehensive search for relevant articles was conducted, and as suggested by certain authors (see Hart, 1998; Machi, 2012), the articles were selected utilizing in a multiple step process. Many resources were accessed in order to locate appropriate information to substantiate this research study. The databases that were accessed for full-text resources ranged from Summon (the Malmö University library database/search engine application) to education databases such as the Education Research Information Center (ERIC) via EBSCO and the Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstract database (LLBA). In these online journal databases, the keywords “language policy” or “language planning” in combination with the respective country, “Sweden” or “Switzerland,” were searched. The results provided a rich supply of literature that enabled reaching saturation for the meta-analysis. Because this study focuses on the latest developments in multilingual educational language policy, the results were narrowed down by only looking at research results between 2009–2016. The starting year of this time frame filter seemed fitting due to the introduction of the *Language Act* in Sweden and the agreement on the harmonization of compulsory education in Switzerland, which both took place in 2009.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Before the time frame filter was applied, a total of 339 hits for the Swedish context and 431 hits for the Swiss context were identified. The application of the filter substantially reduced the results to 99 hits for the Swedish context and 74 hits for the Swiss context. The abstracts of all the articles in these results were read and including and excluding factors were applied.

Inclusion Criteria

1. The study was published between 2009 and 2016.
2. The study focused on language policy and/or planning.
3. The study was conducted in a mainstream mandatory educational setting in order to include a wide range of student performances.
4. The study focused either on Switzerland or Sweden.

Exclusion Criteria

1. The study was published earlier than 2009.
2. The study addressed questions in non-educational settings.

3. The study focused on issues regarding sign language with deaf pupils. Unfortunately, this research review is unable to cover the vast field of special education.
4. The study focused on multilingual policies in higher education.
5. The study did not address issues in Sweden or Switzerland.

Table 1. Search results for the Swedish context

Database	Keywords	Filter	Hits
ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) via EBSCOhost	Sweden, language policy	– 2009–2016	40 17
ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) via EBSCOhost	Sweden, language planning	– 2009–2016	31 10
LLBA (Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstract)	Sweden, language policy	– 2009–2016	147 48
LLBA (Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstract)	Sweden, language planning	– 2009–2016	121 24

Table 2. Search results for the Swiss context

Database	Keywords	Filter	Hits
ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) via EBSCOhost	Switzerland, language policy	– 2009–2016	28 5
ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) via EBSCOhost	Switzerland, language planning	– 2009–2016	26 4
LLBA (Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstract)	Switzerland, language policy	– 2009–2016	177 34
LLBA (Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstract)	Switzerland, language planning	– 2009–2016	200 31

The identified articles were exported and organized in the reference system program, *EndNote*. In order to analyze the articles, they were illustrated in a chart containing information about the research aim and questions, the theoretical framework, and the methodology for each study. Moreover, the results of the studies were noted. To answer the second research question of the meta-analysis and make visible similarities and differences in Swiss and Swedish research results, the identified studies were then analyzed according to the predominant topics discussed in the articles.

Results

This study aims to illustrate and compare the predominant foci in research results on Swiss and Swedish educational language policy. As a first step, the identified articles from both contexts are listed below.

Identified articles

For the Swedish context, a total of nine articles fit the inclusion criteria and were selected for this meta-analysis:

- Cabau (2009a). The Irresistible Rise and Hegemony of a Linguistic Fortress: English Teaching in Sweden.
- Cabau (2009b). Language-in-Education Policy and Planning in Sweden.
- Wedin (2010). A restricted curriculum for second language learners – a self-fulfilling teacher strategy?
- Hult (2012). English as a Transcultural Language in Swedish Policy and Practice.
- Tholin (2012). If you get double the time: Teaching practices in the “Swedish/English” language subject option in Swedish nine-year compulsory schooling.
- Björklund, Björklund, and Sjöholm (2013). Multilingual Policies and Multilingual Education in the Nordic Countries.
- Bolton and Meierkord (2013). English in contemporary Sweden.
- Amir and Musk (2014). Pupils doing Language Policy: Micro-interactional insights from the English as a foreign language classroom.
- Cabau (2014). Minority Language Education Policy and Planning in Sweden.

Four articles matched all the inclusion criteria for the Swiss context and were thus selected for this meta-analysis.

- Stotz, Bossart, and Fischli (2009). Learning Languages at School in the Interplay of Society and Identity.
- Haenni Hoti (2009). Research Results on Factors Influencing Elementary School Students’ English Skill, with Special Attention to Immigration Background.
- Heinzmann (2010). Has the Introduction of “Early English” in Primary School Had an Influence on Primary School Students’ Motivation to Learn French?
- Daryai-Hansen et al. (2015). Pluralistic approaches to languages in the curriculum: the case of French-speaking Switzerland, Spain and Austria.

While all the articles for the Swedish context were written in English, three out of four for the Swiss context were published in German, indicating a smaller target group for their research results. An interesting difference between the two countries' research results is the missing focus on national language policy and approach to language learning in Switzerland. More than half of the Swedish research projects included a discussion on this topic. A probable explanation for this characteristic could be the introduction of the new Swedish Language Act in 2009, which according to Bolton and Meierkord (2013, p. 111), is the culmination of "successive moves towards nationally-oriented language policies [motivated] by covert concerns about immigration and the changing ethnic profile of Swedish society." A similar discussion in Switzerland could not be identified.

Table 3. Research focus ^{*} of the included studies

Research focus	Sweden	Switzerland
National language policy	5	0
Curriculum/syllabus	5	2
Role of the teachers	1	1
Role of the pupils	1	2

^{*} Due to studies where there were more than one research focus identified, the total number of foci are greater than the number studies ($N=13$) included in the meta-analysis.

With regard to content, four different topics could be identified for the comparison of the Swiss and the Swedish context. First, the articles show different degrees of awareness of plurilingual pupils. Then the subject of the second foreign language is greatly discussed in several articles. Moreover, the English language and its role in society and the educational arena can be classified as an important topic for this meta-analysis. Last, but not least, is the gap between language policy and language planning – a common topic found in the results for Swiss and Swedish educational policy research. These four topics provide the foundation to answer the second research question about a possible monolingual or pluralistic approach in the treatment of educational language policies.

Awareness of plurilingualism

Björklund et al. (2013, p. 12) report that the school curricula in most Nordic countries are based on monolingual assumptions. As a consequence of this "monolingual and – cultural bias," language students tend to be treated from the perspective of the language of the school rather than from the perspective of their individual plurilingualism. This research result is much in line with Goglin's concept of

the monolingual habitus mentioned earlier and stands in conflict with ecological/holistic theories of language teaching that are, for instance, an integrated part of Swiss curricula, as Daryai-Hansen et al. (2015) show. Their aim is to illustrate and discuss how the development of plurilingual competences is implemented in some European countries, including French-speaking Switzerland with its new curriculum. To do so, the authors analyzed the curriculum according to the Framework of Reference for Pluralistic Approaches to Languages and Cultures FREPA (Candelier et al., 2012), and therefore, in terms of which languages⁷ and pluralistic approaches⁸ that were integrated and to what extent the transversal dimension of *learning to learn* is part of the curriculum. Moreover, they discuss barriers and challenges to overcome for plurilingualism to become the standard for all pupils.

As Daryai-Hansen et al. (2015, p. 113) found out, in the new curriculum for compulsory education in French-speaking Switzerland, the *Plan d'études romand*, all languages are grouped in one domain, so as to aim at the "integrated development of languages, French as the language of schooling, and German (L2) and English (L3) as foreign languages" (CIIP, 2010) and to foster "the development of a plurilingual repertoire, in which all linguistic competences are included – L1, L2, L3 – and other languages, such as the first languages of bi- or trilingual students in particular, can find their place." Daryai-Hansen and her colleagues therefore conclude that the curriculum "is consistent with the concept of plurilingualism as promoted by the Council of Europe" (p. 113).

Although the results by Björklund et al. (2013) might point to a lack of awareness of plurilingual pupils in the Swedish context, other research results show the opposite. However, this awareness might lead to a restricted curriculum for second-language learners as examined by Wedin (2010). She studies the relations between second language development and subject learning among L2 learners by conducting a longitudinal study (3.5 years) in two primary school classes. Wedin comes to the conclusion that L2 learners are often offered a restricted curriculum with low-demanding tasks. Creating this safety zone for students is the equivalent of a self-fulfilling prophecy, and therefore, mean limited opportunities for school success. According to Wedin, it is crucial that all students (L1 and L2 students) are "involved in interactions using both the specific and the reflexive registers early on in schooling to enable them to meet the demands of later years of schooling" (2010, p. 181). Wedin concludes with a demand for a more reflexive and critical

7. Language of schooling, regional, minority and migration languages, modern and classic foreign languages or linguistic varieties, registers, styles, and genres.

8. Integrated didactic approach, intercomprehension, *Éveil aux langues*/Awakening to languages approach

approach by teachers in how language is used in the classrooms and the possibility to use other languages mastered by students in the class as a resource.

The same negative misconception of pupils' plurilingualism can also be found in the Swiss context and is touched upon in the study by Haenni Hoti (2009). The first aspect of her study analyzes the effectiveness of learning an L2 (English) and an L3 (French) in primary school, which is a direct consequence of the harmonization agreement and its new curriculum. The second aspect examines the influence of the pupils' migratory background and (bi)national identification. The results of the study are multifaceted and show, among other things, that binational and bicultural identification seems to be a marker for significant better results. Therefore, the author suggests uncoupling binationality and overstraining, and instead, focus on individualizing and differentiating in the classroom.

Another study from the Swiss context advocates generalizing less about the attitude towards pupils' plurilingualism in one political country. The two case studies described in the article by Stotz et al. (2009) show different stereotypes of plurilinguals held by teachers in different societal contexts. The notion of the monolingual habitus cannot only be based on the political format of the country, but also the local circumstances. This result is of special interest as the two contexts are both located in the same linguistic area of Switzerland.

In addition, the fourth article for the Swiss context shows a high awareness of plurilingualism, mentioning the curriculum's didactics of multilingualism and its national educational objective of functional plurilingualism for all pupils. A study by Heinzmann (2010) investigates the possible motivational effects of the learning of first foreign language (in this case, English) on the learning of the second foreign language (French). She concludes that English teachers may not yet be adequately aware of how much their focus on multilingualism and other cultures might positively influence the further study of the foreign languages of all pupils.

Third language acquisition

The teaching and learning of a third language is highly prominent in both policy contexts under scrutiny. However, their orientation could not be more diverse. While Swiss research focuses on the effectiveness of the first foreign language on the second foreign language (Haenni Hoti, 2009; Heinzmann, 2010) and discusses the newly mandatory subject of the second foreign language for all pupils⁹ as an addition to a more pluralistic teaching and learning (Daryai-Hansen et al.,

9. Prior to the new curriculum, learning a second foreign language was only mandatory for the stronger pupils.

2015; Stotz et al., 2009), the concept of the freedom of choice is ubiquitous in the Swedish results.

In 1992, a Swedish government bill discussed the students' responsibility to choose a language study option. This neoliberal shift from state responsibility to individual responsibility (Cabau, 2009b, p.386) was established when a new curriculum was introduced two years later and did not undergo a modification after the Language Act of 2009 in the curriculum introduced in 2011. As Tholin (2012, p.72) describes it in detail, instead of choosing an additional language like French, Spanish, or German and thereby fulfilling the European Union's objective of 'mother tongue plus two,' "a great many students did not want to or could not study an additional language." However, they did opt for more lessons in Swedish, Swedish as a Second Language, English, or their mother tongue.

In her articles, Cabau (2009a, 2009b, 2014) describes the language option as a crisis for second language¹⁰ and mother tongue teachers because the interest in learning these languages is declining due to the general public's conviction that it is too demanding, too time-consuming, and not really necessary to be proficient in another language than Swedish (for national issues) and English (for international issues).

The topic of third language acquisition is closely linked to the position of the English language in the two countries.

English

Three of nine articles for the Swedish context mainly focus on the position of English. Hult (2012) investigates how discourses about English and multilingualism are framed in Swedish national educational policy and how educators make sense of these discourses. He employs an ethnographic and discourse analytic approach when analyzing the text of Sweden's national syllabi for language education as well as the interpretations of pre-service English language teachers. The data analysis is guided by the methodology of nexus analysis, connecting the languages policy texts and the individuals who negotiate policy discourses through their lived experiences as educators implanting policy in practice. Hult comes to the conclusion that the status of the English language in Sweden is still undergoing a dynamic process of transculturation in which the local position of English continues to be negotiated. According to his study, English is considered neither a second nor a foreign language in Sweden, but rather a transcultural language. Clearly, in Swedish policy texts, English is treated differently than other modern languages

10. In this case, the term *second language* includes the learning of all foreign languages.

indicating that it has a different position in the linguistic hierarchy (Josephson, 2004) of the Scandinavian country.

Hult's stand on the topic is supported by Cabau (2009a, p. 140), who states that "English knowledge seems to be part of the (young) Swedes' cultural and linguistic identity." At the same time, Cabau (2014) describes the position of English as a hindering factor in the development of the linguistic diversity in the Swedish school context.

As described above (2. Sociolinguistic and policy context) the position of English in Sweden is often used as the explanation for the Language Act introduced in 2009. However, Bolton and Meierkord (2013) propose an alternative explanation and refer to Rojas (2005) and the new realities of a multiculturally diverse society which are "very different from the earlier ideal of the Social Democratic *folkhemmet* ('The People's Home')". A cross-relation to the earlier discussed individual plurilingualism of the pupils can be made at this point.

The third article from the Swedish context focusing on English has a slightly different orientation. Amir and Musk (2014, p.106) examine *language policing* as the pupils' "corrective act to rectify what they perceive as talk by others in the 'wrong' medium in accordance with the normatively prescribed medium of instruction." Trying to construct this monolingual classroom is a sign of the absence of a pluralistic approach to language learning.

In the Swiss context, the position of English is also lively discussed; however, the core of the discussion is different. Stotz et al. (2009) focus on the adapted order of foreign languages instructed in Swiss school due to the 2009 agreement on the harmonization of compulsory education in Switzerland. The agreement recommended French as a first foreign language in German-speaking cantons, mainly due to its status as an official language of the country; however, two German-speaking cantons chose English. In the first part of the article, the results of critical discourse analyses of more than 100 policy and planning documents, meeting minutes, and media reports illustrate the legitimization of the prioritization in the order of foreign languages taught in the region under scrutiny. Stotz et al. (2009) report that the pillars of legitimization were transformed several times during the implementation process, and Haenni Hoti (2009) and Heinzmann (2010) each examine the interrelation of English and French language learning.

Discrepancy between language policy and language planning

Research results in both contexts locate a substantial discrepancy between policy and planning. Daryai-Hansen et al. (2015) state that plurilingual competence is not established in education in general, instead *separate plurilingualism*, consisting of pure and separate languages is a widespread ideology in educational

practices. The main concern of the study by Cabau (2014) was the gap between language-in-education policy and planning for minority languages in Sweden. She investigated the various challenges facing mother tongue teaching and the impact of the introduction of a national language policy. The conclusion of her discursive contextual analysis is the mismatch of the principles of equity in education and uniformity at compulsory Swedish schools with the objective of bilingualism for minority children. She also concludes that “it is not so much the languages that need to be valued, but the richness of human resources represented in Swedish society” (Cabau, 2014, p.422). Hence, the author demands the acknowledgment of knowing a minority language outside the school arena that is in higher education and professional development. This could solve the problem of status, which interferes with the existing mother tongue teaching opportunities in Sweden, where pupils are reluctant to enroll in these courses because of the low status of their heritage language in Swedish society.

Tholin (2012, p.87) uses different dimensions of a curriculum (Goodson, 1995) to explain the discrepancy between the curriculum and the pupils’ choices in terms of their language study options:

The *ideological curriculum* with the idea that all, or almost all, students should study an additional foreign language, the *formal curriculum* in which SvEn¹¹ is offered as an alternative without appearing as an equivalent to the foreign languages, and the *understood curriculum* in which SvEn is the alternative that most students choose. Schools, students, and parents did not perceive a ‘soft compulsion’, as a quarter of the students do not study foreign languages.

As a final result for this factor, it needs to be added that the actual implementation of multilingual educational language policies is not guaranteed even with the availability of a curriculum with a focus on interlinguistic approaches. Daryai-Hansen et al. (2015, p.115) remind the reader that actual implementation “will certainly take time and necessitate further training and coordination (both horizontal and vertical) at a more local level.”

Conclusions

The meta-analysis clearly shows different approaches toward multilingual educational policy applied in Sweden and Switzerland. While the Swedish context focuses more on specific subjects that fulfill a role in the development of a mul-

11. This is the most common term for the language option of more lessons in Swedish or English. (Tholin, 2012, p.72)

tilingual repertoire, research in Switzerland applies a more holistic view of multilingualism (interrelations of language subjects). This conclusion can be explained by the different approaches in the curricula in the two countries. The Swiss curricula all include a holistic approach toward language teaching which fosters separate plurilingualism, whereas the Swedish one does not. Therefore, it is not surprising to see that the research results in these two contexts differ along the same line. For a more detailed meta-analysis on this topic, *curriculum* and *syllabi* could have been added as keywords in the search process. Based on the discussion on shifting paradigms in language teaching, the Swiss context seems to be closer to the current state of the art. Given that educators in Sweden are encouraged to interpret national curricula directly (Hult, 2014), some kind of further education for teachers or input by the Swedish Schools Inspectorate could advance their understanding of pluralistic approaches to language teaching.

The different outcomes of the research results search might, to a considerable degree, be due to the various understanding of the terms *multilingualism* and *plurilingual student*. Three out of four articles from the Swiss context focusing on multilingual educational policies include all students and not only those with a mother tongue other than that of the local language. Therefore, it can be concluded that students in Switzerland are considered to be plurilingual as soon as they have gained knowledge of more than one language, disregarding whether one is the language of a parent or the first foreign language instructed in school. This understanding is also portrayed in the current Swiss curriculum. In contrast, in Sweden, discourses of plurilingual students often refer to those children with a migratory background and another mother tongue than Swedish thus discriminating them as different. Generally, finding a definition of multilingualism is a challenging task. Even among scholars, there does not appear to be any agreement. While Jessner (2008, p.20) writes that the “monolingual perspective of multilingualism is still prevalent in traditional research on language acquisition,” this meta-analysis is able to show a stronger monolingual habitus in the Swedish nation state perception than in Switzerland.

An intriguing aspect is the position of English in the two countries’ research results. While the English language is present in both contexts, it receives much more attention in Sweden. Articles by Cabau (2009b), and Hult (2012) in particular, discuss the position of English in the Swedish linguistic hierarchy and its role as a factor in the hindrance of the development of linguistic diversity in the Swedish educational arena. In the Swiss research results, English is only mentioned as a positive aspect of linguistic diversity.

The Swiss context provides pluralistic approaches in the curriculum, while the Swedish curriculum is still based on the assumption of monolingualism as the norm (Björklund et al., 2013). Moreover, as mentioned, the definition of plurilin-

gual students in Switzerland includes all pupils, making multilingual educational language policy an affair of everyone. However, despite these approaches and understandings, both countries struggle during the implementation process. It seems as the teachers as the last social scale where policies become action (Hult, 2014) are similarly difficult to convince of state-of-art multilingual language policy in both countries, indicating an underlying language policy and planning effect regardless of the differences in the political and/or linguistic conditions of a country.

In general, it is important to note that little research is internationally published on the multilingual educational language policies of Sweden and Switzerland. The varying definitions of plurilingual pupils and how they influence the implementation of multilingual educational language policies is certainly an interesting topic to examine further. Thus, given that the implementation process of the new curriculum in Switzerland began only a few years ago, it is suggested that more research be conducted in Switzerland in a few years to examine the outcome of this new approach in language teaching.

References

- Amir, A., & Musk, N. (2014). Pupils doing language policy: Micro-interactional insights from the English as a foreign language classroom. *Apples – Applied Language Studies*, 8(2), 93–113.
- Andersson, J., & Lundström, K. E. (2010). *Arbetsmarknad och integration*. Stockholm: Svenskt Näringsliv/Sveriges Akademikers centralorganisation.
- Bästa språket – en samlad svensk språkpolitik, (2005/06:2).
- Björklund, M., Björklund, S., & Sjöholm, K. (2013). Multilingual policies and multilingual education in the Nordic Countries. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 6(1), 1–22.
- Bolton, K., & Meierkord, C. (2013). English in contemporary Sweden: Perceptions, policies, and narrated practices. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 17(1), 93–117.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12014>
- Boyd, S. (2011). Do national languages need support and protection in legislation? The case of Swedish as the 'principle language' in Sweden. In C. Norrby and J. Hajek (Eds.), *Uniformity and diversity in language policy* (pp. 22–25). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Boyd, S., & Dahl, Ö. (2006). Grundlöst om språkdöd. *Språkvård*, 4, 36–40.
- Boyd, S., & Huss, L. (2001). *Managing multilingualism in a European nation-state: Challenges for Sweden*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bundesamt für Statistik, B. (2015). Wanderungssaldo sinkt leicht gegenüber 2013 [Press release]
- Bundesamt für Statistik, B. (2016a). *Sprachliche Praktiken in der Schweiz Erste Ergebnisse der Erhebung zur Sprache, Religion und Kultur 2014*. Retrieved from Neuchâtel:

- Bundesamt für Statistik, B. (2016b). Ständige Wohnbevölkerung. Retrieved 9 February 2016 from http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/de/index/themen/01/01/new/nip_detail.html?gnpID=2016-559
- Busch, B. (2011). Trends and innovative practices in multilingual education in Europe: An overview. *International Review of Education*, 57(5–6), 541–549. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-011-9257-1>
- Cabau, B. (2009a). The irresistible rise and hegemony of a linguistic fortress: English teaching in Sweden. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 3(2), 134–152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313150903073786>
- Cabau, B. (2009b). Language-in-education issues: Sweden as a case study. *Educational Studies*, 35(4), 379–389. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055690802648366>
- Cabau, B. (2014). Minority language education policy and planning in Sweden. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 15(4), 409–425. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2014.927086>
- Candelier, M., de Pietro, J. -F., R. Faccioli, I. Lőrincz, X. Pascual, and A. Schröder-Sura. (2012). *FREPA – A Framework of Reference for Pluralistic Approaches to Languages and Cultures – Competences and resources* Retrieved 13 February 2016 from <http://carap.ecml.at>
- CIIP. (2010). Plan d'études romand. Retrieved 14 February 2016 from <http://www.plandetudes.ch>
- Daryai-Hansen, P., Gerber, B., Lőrincz, I., Haller, M., Ivanova, O., Krumm, H. -J., & Reich, H. H. (2015). Pluralistic approaches to languages in the curriculum: The case of French-speaking Switzerland, Spain and Austria. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 12(1), 109–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2014.948877>
- European Commission. (2004). *Promoting language learning and linguistic diversity. An action plan 2004–2006*. Retrieved from Luxembourg: Luxembourg.
- European Commission. (2005). *A new framework strategy for multilingualism*. Retrieved from Brussels: CoEC:
- European Commission. (2009). *Multilingualism: An asset for Europe and a shared commitment*. Retrieved from Brussels: CoEC:
- Gogolin, I. (2013). The “monolingual habitus” as the common feature in teaching in the language of the majority in different countries. *Per Linguam: A Journal of Language Learning*, 2, 38–49.
- Gogolin, I., & Duarte, J. (2013). *Linguistic superdiversity in urban areas: Research approaches*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Goodson, I. (1995). *Making of curriculum: Collected essays* (2nd ed.). London: Falmer.
- Haenni Hoti, A. (2009). Research results on factors influencing elementary school students' English skills, with special attention to immigration background. [Forschungsergebnisse zu Einflussfaktoren auf die Englischfertigkeiten von Primarschülerinnen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Migrationshintergrunds]. *Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquée*, 89(Spring), 5–14.
- Halonon, M., Ihalainen, P., & Saarinen, T. (2015). *Language policies in Finland and Sweden: Interdisciplinary and multi-sited comparisons*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Hart, C. (1998). *Doing a literature review: Releasing the social science research imagination*. London: SAGE, in association with The Open University.

- Heinzmann, S. (2010). Has the introduction of “early English” in primary school Hhad an influence on primary school students’ motivation to learn French? [Hat die Einfuhrung von ‘Fruehenglisch’ in der Primarschule einen Einfluss auf die Motivation der Primarschulkinder Franzosisch zu lernen?]. *Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquee*, 91(Summer), 7–27.
- Hult, F. M. (2004). Planning for multilingualism and minority language rights in Sweden. *Language Policy*, 3(2), 181–201. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:LPOL.0000036182.40797.23>
- Hult, F. M. (2012). English as a transcultural language in Swedish policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly: A Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages and of Standard English as a Second Dialect*, 46(2), 230–257. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.19>
- Hult, F. M. (2014). How does policy influence language in education? In R. E. Silver & S. M. Lwin (Eds.), *Language in education: Social implications* (pp. 159–175). London: Continuum.
- Hyldenstam, K. (1999). *Sveriges sju inhemska språk: ett minoritetsspråksperspektiv*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Interkantonale Vereinbarung über die Harmonisierung der obligatorischen Schule (HarmoS-Konkordat), (2007).
- Hyldenstam, K., Axelsson, M., & Lindberg, I. (2012). *Flerspråkighet – en forskningsöversikt*. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet rapportserie.
- Hyldenstam, K., & Milani, T. M. (2005). Nationella minoriteter och minoritetsspråk. Uppföljning av Sveriges efterlevnad av Europarådets konventioner på nationell nivå: ett minoritetsspråksperspektiv. In Konstitutionsutskottet (Ed.), *Nationella minoriteter och minoritetsspråk* (pp. 23–74). Stockholm: Sveriges riksdag.
- Institutet för språk och folkminne. (2016). Welcome to the Language Council of Sweden – the official language cultivation body of Sweden. Retrieved 28 November 2016 from <http://www.sprakochfolkminnen.se/om-oss/kontakt/sprakradet/om-sprakradet/in-english.html>
- Jessner, U. (2008). Teaching third languages: Findings trends and challenges. *Language Teaching*, 41(1), 15–56. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004739>
- Josephson, O. (2003, 2016–02–01). Sweden on the threshold to multilingualism – a new Swedish language policy. Retrieved 1 February 2016 from <http://www.efnil.org/conferences/archives/stockholm-2003/speeches/josephson-svenska>
- Josephson, O. (2004). *Ju: ifrågasatta självklarheter om svenskan, engelskan och alla andra språk i Sverige*. Stockholm: Norstedts akademiska förlag.
- Kymlicka, W. (2011). Multicultural citizenship within multination states. *Ethnicities*, 11(3), 281–302. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796811407813>
- Lindberg, I. (2007). Multilingual Education: a Swedish Perspective. In M. Carlson, A. Rabo, and F. Gök (Eds.), *Education in ‘multicultural’ societies: Turkish and Swedish perspectives*. London.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2001). *Language and literacy policy in Scotland*. Retrieved 20 November 2016 from Stirling: http://www.scilt.org.uk/Portals/24/Library/publications/languageandliteracy/LanguageandliteracypolicyinScotland_fulldocument.pdf
- Lo Bianco, J. (2008). Educational linguistics and education systems. In B. Spolsky and F. M. Hult (Eds.), *The Handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 113–126). Oxford and Boston: Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470694138.ch9>

- Lo Bianco, J., & Bal, A. (2016). *Learning from difference*. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-26880-4_11
- Lüdi, G., & Py, B. (2009). To be or not to be ... a plurilingual speaker. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 6(2), 154–167. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710902846715>
- Machi, L. A. (2012). *The literature review: six steps to success*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Corwin Press.
- Milani, T. M. (2007). *Debating Swedish: Language politics and ideology in contemporary Sweden*. Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Norrby, C. (2008). Swedish language policy: Multilingual paradise or utopian dream? In J. Warren and H. M. Benbow (Eds.), *Multilingual Europe: Reflections on language and identity* (pp. 63–76). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- OECD. (2017). Better Life Index. Retrieved 2 February 2017 from <http://www.oecdbetterlifeindex.org>
- Ricento, T. (2006). *An introduction to language policy: theory and method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.
- Rojas, M. (2005). *Sweden after the Swedish model: From tutorial state to enabling state* Retrieved from <http://timbro.se/bokhandel/pdf/9175665891.pdf>
- Schwab, P. (2014). *The Swiss parliament as a plurilingual forum*. Retrieved from Bern: Bundesverfassung der Schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft, (1999 (2016)). Mål i mun. Draft action programme for the Swedish language, (2002). Bundesgesetz über die Landessprachen und die Verständigung zwischen den Sprachgemeinschaften, (2007). Sprachenunterricht in der obligatorischen Schule: Strategie der EDK und Arbeitsplan für die Gesamtschweizerische Koordination, (2004).
- Statistics Sweden. (2015). *People born outside of Sweden*. Retrieved 2 February 2017 from <http://www.scb.se>
- Stotz, D., Bossart, M. -N., & Fischli, P. (2009). Learning languages at school in the interplay of society and identity. [Schulisches Sprachenlernen im Wechselspiel von Gesellschaft und Identität]. *Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquee*, 89(Spring), 41–59.
- Sundberg, G. (2013). Language policy and multilingual identity in Sweden through the lens of Generation Y. *Scandinavian Studies*, 85(2), 205–232. <https://doi.org/10.1353/scd.2013.0018>
- Swedish Ministry of Culture. (2009:600). *Language Act* (2009:600).
- Tholin, J. (2012). If you get double the time: Teaching practices in the “Swedish/English” language subject option in Swedish nine-year compulsory schooling. *Apples – Applied Language Studies*, 6(1), 69–91.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2006). Critical theory in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 42–59). Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2015). Historical-structural analysis. In F. M. Hult and D. C. Johnson (Eds.), *Research methods in language policy and planning: A practical guide* (pp. 140–151). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024–1054. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701599465>
- Wedin, A. (2010). A restricted curriculum for second language learners – a self-fulfilling teacher strategy? *Language and Education*, 24(3), 171–183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780903026352>

- Wildt-Persson, A., & Rosengren, G. P. (2002). Equity and equivalence in the Swedish school system. In W. Hutmacher (Ed.), *In pursuit of equity in education: Using international indicators to compare equity policies* (pp. 299–321). London: Kluwer Academic Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-306-47579-0_14
- Winsa, B. (2005). Language planning in Sweden. In R. B. Kaplan and R. B. Baldauf (Eds.), *Language planning and policy in Europe: Vol. 1, Hungary, Finland and Sweden* (pp. 233–330). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Mehrsprachige Sprach- und Sprachenpolitik in der schweizerischen und schwedischen Bildung: Eine Meta-Analyse

Zusammenfassung

Mehrsprachigkeit ist eine globale Herausforderung und ein Bildungsziel europäischer Staaten. Diese Meta-Analyse untersucht, wie sich die Resultate von Forschungsprojekten über mehrsprachige Sprach- und Sprachenpolitik in der schweizerischen und der schwedischen Bildung auf einer Makroebene (national/regional) unterscheiden. Beschrieben werden die unterschiedlichen Schwerpunkte und Handhabungen von Diskursen in den jeweiligen Artikeln. Die Länder wurden aufgrund ihrer Ähnlichkeit in Bezug auf den gesellschaftlichen Kontext und ihrer Unterscheidung betreffend der Sprach- und Sprachenpolitik und der politischen Entstehung des jeweiligen Landes ausgewählt. Die Artikel wurden systematisch via zwei Datenbasen, ERIC und LLBA identifiziert und um die jüngsten Entwicklungen nach der Einführung des neuen Sprachgesetzes in Schweden und der Harmonisierung der öffentlichen Schule in der Schweiz 2009 zu erfassen, wurden nur Forschungsprojekte einbezogen, welche zwischen 2009 und 2016 publiziert wurden. Die Resultate der vorliegenden Meta-analyse weisen auf einen monolingualen Habitus im schwedischen Nationalstaat und einer eher pluralistischen Herangehensweise in der Schweiz hin. Ein nennenswertes Resultat ist die unterschiedliche Definition von *Mehrsprachigkeit und mehrsprachigen Schülerinnen und Schülern* und wie dieses Verständnis die Betrachtung von bildungspolitischen Steuerdokumenten in den zwei sprachliche und kulturell vielfältigen europäischen Ländern beeinflusst.

Multlingvaj edukaj politikoj en Svislando kaj Svedio: Meta-analizo

Resumo

Multlingvismo prezentas tutmondan defion kaj edukan celon en eŭropaj ŝtatoj. La nuna meta-analizo ekzamenas kiel esplorstudoj de dokumentoj pri multlingva eduka politiko je makro-nivelo (nacia/regiona) en Svedio kaj Svislando malsamas rilate fokusopunktojn kaj kiel la diskursoj en la esploroj reprezentas malsamajn pritraktojn de multlingvaj edukaj lingvopolitikoj. Oni selektis tiujn ĉi landojn pro iliaj similecoj de socia kunteksto, sed ili malsamas rilate lingvopolitikajn demandojn kaj politika formiĝo. La ekzamenita esplora literaturo estis sisteme identigita pere de du datenbazoj, ERIC kaj LLBA, kaj, por ekzameni la plej lastajn evoluojn post enkonduko de la nova lingvoleĝo en Svedio kaj la harmoniigo de publika edukado en Svislando

en 2009, nur esplorartikoloj publikigitaj inter la jaroj 2009 kaj 2016 estis inkluzivitaj. La rezultoj de la studo sugestas, ke unulingva *habitus* ekzistas en la kunteksto de la sveda naciŝtato kompare kun pli pluralisma aliro en Svislando. La plej notinda rezulto estas la diverĝaj difinoj de *multlingvismo* kaj *plurlingvaj studentoj* kaj la maniero laŭ kiu tiu kompreno influas la traktadon de edukaj politikoj en tiuj du lingve kaj kulture superdiversaj eŭropaj landoj.

Address for correspondence

Adrian Lundberg
Faculty of Education and Society, Department of School Development and Leadership
Malmö University
205 06 Malmö
Sweden
Adrian.lundberg@mau.se

Biographical notes

Adrian Lundberg is a Ph.D. candidate in pedagogy at Malmö University, Sweden. His current research focuses on language policy and multilingualism in the Nordic countries and Switzerland.

II

Q Methodology: A Mixed Method Approach to Subjectivity in Educational Research*

**This is the author's version of a paper that is under peer review (June, 2020).*

ADRIAN LUNDBERG
Malmö University, Sweden

RENSKE DE LEEUW
University of Groningen, the Netherlands

RENATA ALIANI
University of Melbourne, Australia

ABSTRACT *Understanding subjective perspectives and lived experiences of different stakeholders can improve pupils' learning environment in compulsory school settings. Q methodology is an inherently mixed method approach and regarded as the basis for the science of subjectivity. The present paper systematically reviewed recent Q methodological publications in compulsory education research. Seventy-four studies reporting from context in twenty countries met the inclusion criteria and showed a wide-ranging and diverse application of the research methodology. The subjectivity of teachers, pupils and others were explored on topics related to the science of learning and development and teacher characteristics. This review showcases how Q methodology is applied to access subjectivity in educational research and provides an overview of Q methodological findings and implications for the field. The wide range of the application of Q studies in compulsory education attests to the flexibility and suitability of this research method in educational research.*

KEYWORDS *Q methodology; subjectivity; marginalized voices; systematic literature review; participatory research*

In education, characterized by dynamic, complex and ever-changing contexts due to a myriad of social interactions, researchers perennially face difficulties of local conditions limiting generalizations and theory building (Berliner, 2002). As a complement to so-called objective science, studying subjectivity to gather reliable evidence is crucial. Implying a dualistic worldview, *subjective* has long been understood as “unreliable, undependable and unpredictable” (Good, 2010, p. 232) as opposed to *objective* being its testable and reliable counterpart. While objective implies something existing “beyond the inner experiences of any single person” (Good, 2010, p. 232) and potentially being “observed by others” (Stephenson, 1953, p. 22), subjective represents an inner experience and is much harder to observe. Notwithstanding, because “human actions depend on what humans think they are doing” (Eisenhart & DeHaan, 2005, p. 5), subjectivity in research is both powerful and important for a comprehensive representation of educational issues. Educational institutions have to adapt their structures to respond to linguistic and ethnic minorities. Equitable access to education is a major issue of concern (OECD, 2012). Simultaneously, educational researchers increasingly need to possess a repertoire of methodologies that provides equitable access to research participation. Through the current systematic review, the potential of Q methodology (henceforth Q) to identify participants’ subjectivity for educational research is showcased.

1. Introduction

To fully acknowledge the localized and interconnected nature of educational settings and the importance of subjective perspectives of stakeholders, we found the deeply integrated approach proposed by Darling-Hammond et al. (2019) to be fitting. Based on a comprehensive research synthesis (Cantor et al., 2019; Osher et al., 2020), the framework to support pupils’ learning and development, brings together four interactive and interrelated areas, each consisting of a range of principles of practice in the science of learning and development (henceforth SoLD).

- a) *Supportive Environments*, are characterized by relational trust, continuous and consistent structures reduce anxiety among pupils. Strong, positive and sustained relationships between different actors in educational contexts are central. Furthermore, classroom communities that permit personalized learning contribute to pupils’ increased feeling of safety, belonging and purpose.
- b) *Productive Instructional Strategies* encompass motivated and self-directed learning well scaffolded by the teacher. Taking pupils’ prior knowledge into account and providing formative feedback in rich and engaging tasks are equally essential as collaborative learning opportunities that encourage pupils to share ideas and develop knowledge cooperatively.
- c) *Social and Emotional Development* is advanced by an appropriate environment, where pupils develop habits that foster perseverance, resilience, agency, and self-direction. A growth mindset will further support pupils’ learning and development.
- d) *Systems of Support* grant pupils access to a range of services that enable their healthy development. Extending learning opportunities for some, others need more extensive support. Sometimes learning barriers are best broken down by multi-tiered systems of support, ranging from measures of prevention to selective or intensive intervention applied as special education.

1.1 Subjectivity and Q methodology

Despite its 80-year history, Q was recently framed as an unconventional, innovative research method (Brown & Rhoades, 2019). Proclaimed as “the best-developed paradigm for the investigation of human subjectivity” (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002, p. 20), Q is regarded the basis for a science of subjectivity (Brown, 2019). William Stephenson introduced the principles of Q in a letter to *Nature* in 1935 and claimed the methodology to be “especially valuable in experimental aesthetics and in educational psychology, no less than in pure psychology” (Stephenson, 1935, p. 297). Gooding and Wilbur (1971) promisingly concluded that Q “can become an increasingly valuable tool in the educational researcher’s repertoire” (p. 46). Recently, Montgomery (2010) claimed that Q in educational research “is our window to learning about subjective reactions or responses to the issues confronting professionals daily” (p. 1) and most recently, the use of Q in education and educational psychology has been growing (Irie et al., 2018, p. 581). Subjectivity in Q is not employed in the sense of an opposition to presumed scientific objectivity, but in line with individual “self-referent notions” (Stephenson, 1953, p. 248), and where subjectivity applies to everything individuals say about any matter of personal or social importance (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Certain principles, presented below, facilitate the understanding of subjectivity in line with Q methodology.

1.2 Q methodological Principles and Terminology

One of the methodology’s pivotal strengths, is its established status as an inherently mixed method (Ramlo, 2020; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). Furthermore, Q allows the exploration of minority voices (Pike et al., 2015) and offers an avenue for participatory research (Militello et al., 2016). Whereas purely quantitative methods tend to conceal marginalized viewpoints (Dryzek, 2005) by reporting averages across different demographic variables, Q increases the likelihood of the emergence of any participant’s actual thinking (Brown, 2006) and ensures that all potentially relevant voices are heard (Howe, 2004). Figure 1 illustrates six methodological steps of Q.

Figure 1. Suggested process of Q methodological research

1.2.1 From Concourse to Q set

Initially a Q set, consisting of items to be ranked by participants, is constructed. Researchers collect the concourse of communicability (step 1), which is all that can be said about the subject matter, and shared with members of the same culture or society (Brown, 2019). Subjectivity in Q is to be understood as highly contextual. Then, items are culled to present a balanced and representative sample, equal to the sample of persons in an R methodological study (step 2). Crucial to understanding Q is the self-reference of these statement, as they are subjected to participants’ feelings (Watts & Stenner, 2012).

1.2.2 Q Sorting and Post-Sorting Activities

A typical Q study involves participants in a sorting activity (step 3) that allows them to communicate their subjectivity towards a specific topic (Brown, 1980; Watts & Stenner, 2012) without the need to produce language in written or spoken form. Instead of written statements, pictures, objects, audio or video files can be ranked by the respondents, allowing the participation of many otherwise marginalized groups of people (Kelly, 2007). Young participants have expressed their appreciation towards the rather playful Q sorting activity (de Leeuw et al., 2019) and the methodology has been termed as ethical, critical, respectful and person-centered (Hughes, 2016).

During the sorting process, guided by a condition of instruction derived from the research question, participants a posteriori assign meaning to items in the Q set. These items are sorted relative to each other into a predominantly predetermined quasi-normal distribution, providing a holistic configuration of the participants' view, with minimal influence and bias from the researcher (Stephenson, 2014), representing an alternative approach to participants' emic perspectives.

It is recommended to instruct participants to elaborate on the items placed towards the extremes of the sorting continuum in a post-sorting activity (step 4) in the form of interviews (Gallagher & Porock, 2010) or written responses (Watts & Stenner, 2012). Additional information will eventually enrich the qualitative description of factor arrays and can be collected in different ways.

1.2.3 From Q Factor Analysis to Factor Interpretation

With dedicated software packages and informed decisions of the researcher, the by-person factor analysis compares and groups all participants' sorts (step 5). This data condensation technique yields a few representative shared factors. These are rotated until the researcher symbolically views the subject matter through the eyes of the participants and receives a clear and interpretable structure (Zabala et al., 2018). The qualitative interpretation of factors (step 6) is done in a holistic manner, accounting for the entire item configuration captured by particular factors.

1.3 Present Study

Despite Q's existence for over 80 years, people are still widely unaware of it. The present systematic review is considered to be an important awareness-raising contribution and aims to illustrate why Q had been labelled as valuable for educational research (Montgomery, 2010). With the current review we intend to showcase the methodology's potential for educational research, by responding to the following research questions:

1. What are the characteristics of Q methodological studies in compulsory education research?
2. What findings and implications for educational settings can be summarized from the included studies?

2. Method

A systematic approach (Newman & Gough, 2020) was followed during the selection process and data extraction phase. Based on the PRISMA flow diagram (Moher et al., 2009), Figure 2 illustrates the literature search and processing of records. A narrative approach (Popay et al., 2006; Snilstveit et al., 2012) was chosen to synthesize the findings and implications of included studies due to the predominantly descriptive nature of Q methodological results.

Figure 2. Flow diagram of literature search and processing of records

2.1 Study Selection Process

Three bibliographic databases were consulted on January 10 2020, to retrieve the widest range of educational research conducted with Q: 1) ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) via EBSCO, 2) Web of Science, and 3) Scopus. The following search parameters were used in titles, abstracts and keywords: (Q method*) AND (Q-method*). A time period restriction was applied to finding records published after 2009, to ensure a more contemporary

review of research. Examining 10 years of research conducted with Q was considered to provide a thorough understanding of its applications in educational research. To minimize publication bias and report the most comprehensive result possible, considering gray literature could be justified (Alexander, 2020). The search results were limited to certain document types (academic journal papers, dissertations, books and book chapters) and subject areas (education, social sciences, humanities and multidisciplinary research), 688 publications were forwarded to the screening phase.

In addition to a publication date after 2009, the following inclusion criteria were used:

- Studies investigate a compulsory educational setting and/or teacher education for compulsory education.
- Studies follow the broader conceptual philosophical framework of Q: including Q sorting and Q factor analysis.
- Studies report new empirical results.

Thirty-nine studies were added through snowballing (Wohlin, 2014), including hand-searching Q's official, but not indexed journal *Operant Subjectivity*, and universities' online repositories. Next, 135 records were assessed for eligibility by applying the inclusion criteria. If a record was not accessible via one of the three authors' library system, the corresponding author was contacted to obtain the manuscript. Two records had to be excluded because the full text was not available. To establish a reliable screening, any potentially excluded studies were screened by a second author. Discrepancies were resolved through consensus. Resulting in the inclusion of 74 studies.

2.2 Data Extraction and Analysis

To respond to the first research question, a codebook (Pigott & Polanin, 2020) was collectively created. The codebook was piloted, by independently extracting data from a random sample of 15 papers. A comparison of the coded information yielded some necessary adaptations to the codebook. All included papers were then systematically coded accordingly:

1. Participant set characteristics (educational setting, role, size)
2. Study focus (research question, condition of instruction)
3. Q sampling characteristics (approach, sources, instrument validation, size of final Q set)
4. Q sorting characteristics (distribution grid, items, post-sorting activities)
5. Q factor analysis (software, extraction method, rotation method)
6. Results (number of factors, labelling of factors)
7. Others (rationale for Q, aspects of participatory research approach)

Ambiguous information was discussed until a joint decision.

To respond to the second research question, SoLD principles of practice (Darling-Hammond et al., 2019) were applied as an analytical framework. Due to the tight interrelatedness of various principles of practice, studies could be assigned to more than one area. Studies that fitted multiple principles were coded with the predominant principle. Studies with a focus on anything other than pupils' learning and developmental needs were clustered into additional areas.

3. Results

3.1 Characteristics of *Q* methodological studies in compulsory education research

After applying the inclusion criteria, 74 studies from 50 different sources were included. Apart from one book, 15 doctoral dissertations from eight different universities, met the inclusion criteria. The noticeable majority of the 74 included studies was published towards the end of the decade (see Fig. 3), illustrating the continuation of *Q*'s growing popularity in educational research (Irie et al., 2018). Participants were mostly located in the USA ($n = 36$) and the UK ($n = 13$). With Australia ($n = 5$) and South Korea ($n = 4$), only two more countries were represented more than twice. Twelve study contexts were located in Europe, two in Africa and two in South America. Three multicultural studies were included, with two investigating contexts in the USA and South Korea, and one compared results from Bulgaria and Croatia.

Figure 3. Number of included studies per year

3.1.1 Explored Voices with *Q* methodological Studies

With compulsory education settings as an inclusion criterion, only voices connected to elementary ($n = 15$) and secondary ($n = 29$) schooling were represented. Twenty-seven studies included participants representing both settings. Three studies did not mention the setting they investigated but made clear that it was concerning compulsory education.

Table 1 presents an overview of the participants whose voices and perspectives were explored. The total number of studies exceeds 74, because 13 studies combined different cohorts and are counted several times. The most explored voices are those of teachers. When in- and pre-service teachers are combined, this cohort covers 41% of all the included studies. The second-largest cohort is the pupils' voices (23%). Voices of school staff members with a leading role, such as principals or school administrators were subsumed into the principal class, equal 14% of all included publications ($n = 13$). There were additional single cohort studies with members of special education, school counselors and teaching assistants. The voices of academics, committee members or teacher educators were only investigated in conjunction with other cohorts.

Table 1. Participants' Cohorts and Study Foci

#	Cohort	Studies per cohort	A: Represen- tation	B: Attitudes & values	C: Critical reflection	D: Evaluation	E: Response	F: Decision making
1	Teachers							
1a	- In service	27	13	7	5	2	3	-
1b	- Pre-service	11	3	3	2	2	1	-
2	Pupils	21	9	4	2	4	2	-
3	Principal class	13	7	4	2	-	-	-
4	Special education							
4a	- teachers	6	-	2	2	1	1	-
4b	- coordinators	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
5	Parents	5	3	-	1	-	-	1
6	School counsellors	3	1	2	-	-	-	-
7	Teaching assistants	2	-	-	1	1	-	-
8	Academics	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
9	Committee members	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
10	Teacher educators	1	-	1	-	-	-	-

Note: In the study focus categories, in-service teachers are represented 30 times, because three studies (Lundberg, 2019a/b and Wirth, 2014) have two components with different study foci.

3.1.2 Categorization of Study Focus

A qualitative interpretation of stated research questions, research aims and conditions of instructions allowed clustering the studies into six different categories:

A. Representation

One third of all studies ($n = 27$) investigated participants' representation of a subject matter, asking them how the issue under scrutiny is typically understood.

B. Attitudes and Values

Research questions ($n = 21$) that focused more on a personal preference towards a topic were categorized as attitudes and values. Typically, asking participants to investigate what they think and like/dislike about the subject matter.

C. Critical reflection

Thirteen studies used Q as a tool to allow participants to critically reflect about their situation or characteristics.

D. Evaluation

In nine studies, Q was chosen to evaluate an educational issue.

E. Response

Six studies investigated participants' preferences in terms of how to respond to a certain subject matter.

F. Decision making

One study used Q to describe and analyze the process of making decisions.

A total number of 77 studies are represented, as the publications by Lundberg (2019a, 2019b) and Wirth (2014) consisted of two components with separate research questions and conditions of instructions, falling within different categories. Table 1 illustrates the distribution of study foci according to individual participant cohorts. Especially pupils are often asked to evaluate an issue, while in-service teachers are the participant cohort most often asked to critically reflect.

3.1.3 Characteristics of Research Design and Analysis

In terms of the research design (Fig. 4), the average p(participant)-set in all the included studies consist of slightly more than 37 participants. Four studies conducted a Q study with 10 or fewer participants and two publications were conducted with more than 90. The number of Q items in the Q-sets was somewhat higher with an average of 40.3. In 28 studies, authors list a combination of sources for their Q-set. In studies with only one source, literature was found to be the most common origin, with participant-generated Q sets a close second, indicating aspects of a participatory approach. While 26 publications state external experts as a validation procedure to create Q sets, pilot studies to validate Q sets were mentioned 25 times.

Figure 4. Characteristics of research design

Figure 5. Characteristics of factor analytical procedures

The majority of authors ($n = 55$) used physical cards and were present during the sorting activity. Sixty-one studies mention post-sorting activity, whereof most aimed at collecting participants' rationale for their decisions about the extreme value choices. The factor analytical procedure was mostly ($n = 55$) performed using a version of PQMethod (Schmolck, 2014). The most common analytical choices were principal components analysis (PCA; $n = 30$) as an extraction method and Varimax rotation ($n = 38$). Studies not clearly stating their statistical procedure were common for both, the extraction and the rotation method (Fig. 5).

The majority of studies retained and described three factors, followed by four-factor-solutions and two-factor-solutions (Fig. 5). If the studies are broken up into their respective components, especially three-factor-solutions and four-factor-solutions gain in count.

3.1.4 Less conventional Study Designs

Most studies in this review report one group of factors, stemming from one set of items, which participants, sorted according to one condition of instruction at one point in time. However, 13 studies reported factor solutions from multiple study components (see Fig. 5). In three studies, participants were instructed to sort the same Q set according to two different research questions (Cooper, 2018; de Leeuw et al., 2019; Wirth, 2014). Lundberg (2019a, 2019b) constructed individual Q sets for each condition of instruction. Lo Bianco and Aliani (2013) used the same condition of instruction with different Q sets and individually analyzed separate cohorts of participants, just like five other studies with one Q set and only one condition of instruction (Burke O'Connell et al., 2019; Jelizakova, 2015; Kemp, 2014; Militello, Bass, et al., 2013; Sklarwitz, 2017). Additionally, two studies applied a pre/post research design (Baron et al., 2019; Ramlo, 2019).

3.1.5 Studies with a Participatory Approach

Eleven studies incorporated a participatory approach in at least one step of the research process. Mostly, that included participants' contribution to the Q sampling, as experts during the culling process or as pilot study participants (Atkinson & Rowley, 2019; Baltrinic et al., 2016; Beck, 2017; DeVore-Wedding et al., 2018; Heasley, 2017; McLain, 2018). Studies using items based on previous interview or questionnaire studies were not coded as participatory approach, because this does not actively involve participants. Other applications of participatory approach in Q are gathering the input of participants on the factor descriptions and interpretations, including participants in the factor interpretation to validate the results (Barnes et al., 2015; Brown & Militello, 2016; Duncan & Owens, 2011; Frearson, 2013) or asking participants to interpret the factors (Pruslow & Red Owl, 2012).

3.2 Synthesis of Implications for Educational Settings

The studies were clustered according to the SoLD principles of practice put forward by Darling-Hammond et al. (2019). The categorization is visible in Table 2. As Q was also applied in studies that did not concentrate on SoLD's central focal point, the pupil, an additional category consisting of implications relevant for teacher characteristics was created.

Table 2. Summary of Compulsory Education Studies using Q methodology 2010-2019

SoLD	Authors, (year)	Participant cohort (location)	Education setting	P-set size (N)	Study focus	Q-set size (N)	Part. appr.	Type of extraction	Type of rotation	Factor (N)
SEC	Bang & Montgomery (2010)	1a, 4a (USA / South Korea)	Ele. & Sec.	24	C	47		C	BH	4
	Beek (2017)	2 (USA)	Elementary	48	B	42	yes	ns	ns	4
	Berry et al. (2012)	1b (USA)	Ele. & Sec.	77	A	29		C	Va	4
	Brown & Miliello (2016)	3 (USA)	Ele. & Sec.	34	B	34	yes	PCA	Va	3
	Coladonato (2013)	1a, 3 (USA)	Ele. & Sec.	43	B	54		PCA	Va	5
	Davis (2018)	3 (USA)	Elementary	16	B	35		ns	ns	5
	Dhillon et al. (2019)	3, 8 (UK)	Elementary	14	A	23		PCA	ns	4
	Duncan & Owens (2011)	2 (UK)	Secondary	28	A	35	yes	PCA	ns	2
	Frearson (2013)	2 (UK)	Secondary	25	E	64	yes	C	Com	5
	Goodrich (2017)	6 (USA)	Secondary	91	B	21		PCA	Va	5
	Hobbs (2011)	1a (USA)	Secondary	100	B	40		PCA	Va	3
	Kemp (2014)	1a, 2, 3, 5, 9 (Australia)	Secondary	26	A	64		C	Va	3 / 3
	Kim & Bang (2017)	5 (South Korea)	Ele. & Sec.	36	C	47		C	Va	4
	Levine (2013)	4a (USA)	Ele. & Sec.	25	C	40		PCA	Va	3
	Lo Bianco & Aliani (2013)	2 (Australia)	Secondary	48	B	25		ns	ns	3 / 3
	Lundberg (2019b)	1a (Switzerland)	Elementary	67	A, E	39 / 32		PCA	Va	2 / 6
	Lundberg (2019a)	1a (Sweden)	Elementary	40	A, E	39 / 32		PCA / C	Va	3 / 3
	Miliello & Janson (2014)	6 (USA)	Ele. & Sec.	61	B	33		PCA	Va	3
	Miliello et al. (2013)	3 (USA)	Ele. & Sec.	79	C	43		PCA	Va	1
	Nzahwanayo et al. (2019)	1a (Rwanda)	Secondary	58	A	50		PCA	Va	4
	Parker (2015)	5 (USA)	Elementary	35	F	36		PCA	Va	3
	Provost et al. (2010)	3 (USA)	Ele. & Sec.	30	A	21		ns	ns	1
	Slaughter et al. (2020)	3 (Australia)	Elementary	6	B	48		ns	ns	3
	Stekl Haugen et al. (2019)	2 (USA)	Secondary	43	A	39		C	N	3
	Stollery (2013)	2 (UK)	Secondary	30	D	46		C	Com	4
	Swenham (2010)	2 (USA)	Secondary	32	A	32		PCA	Va	3
	Xi et al. (2016)	2 (China)	Secondary	53	A	40		PCA	Com	1
	Yang & Montgomery (2013)	1b, 10 (USA)	Elementary	43	B	47		PCA	Va	2
	Yeboah et al. (2017)	2, 5 (Ghana)	Secondary	72	A	34		PCA	Va	2

PIS

Anderson & Jacobson (2018)	1a (Ecuador)	Ele. & Sec.	25	A	25	ns	3
Baltrinic et al. (2016)	1a (USA)	Secondary	15	A	31	PCA	3
Bang & Kim (2016)	4a (USA / South Korea)	Ele. & Sec.	38	B	47	C	5
Barnes et al. (2015)	1a, 1b (USA)	Ele. & Sec.	40	E	40	ns	3
Baron et al. (2019)	4a (USA)	Ele. & Sec.	29	D	60	C	4/4
Bonar (2018)	2 (Australia)	Secondary	52	B	36	PCA	5
Burke O'Connell et al. (2019)	2 (Ireland)	Secondary	24	B	48	PCA	2/3
Çirak Kurt & Yildirim (2018)	1b (Turkey)	Elementary	31	A	18	PCA	1
Everman (2016)	1b (Turkey)	Elementary	38	B	43	ns	6
Hock et al. (2015)	2 (Malaysia)	Elementary	30	A	34	ns	2
Jeliazkova (2015)	1a (Bulgaria / Croatia)	Secondary	34	A	41	ns	5/4
Kotuláková (2019)	1a (Slovakia)	Secondary	34	B	51	C	3
Levitt & Red Owl (2013)	1a (USA)	Ele. & Sec.	21	B	53	PAF	3
McLain (2018)	1a (UK)	Secondary	7	B	62	ns	1
Militello et al. (2013)	1a, 3 (USA)	Ele. & Sec.	62	C	23	ns	1/1
Nauman et al. (2011)	1a, 1b (USA)	Ele. & Sec.	60	A	31	ns	3
Ramlo (2019)	2 (USA)	Secondary	46	D	40	ns	3/3
Sklarwitz (2017)	2 (USA)	Secondary	55	C	25	PCA	3/4/4
Vandeyar (2014)	1a (South Africa)	Elementary	23	B	78	PCA	3
Atkinson & Rowley (2019)	2 (UK)	Ele. & Sec.	9	D	37	ns	3
Heffernan (2017)	2 (UK)	Secondary	38	A	52	C	4
Kim & Oh (2017)	1a, 2, 3, 5, 6 (South Korea)	Secondary	56	A	36	PCA	4
Atkin (2019)	7 (UK)	Ele. & Sec.	30	D	39	C	3
Berry (2010)	4a (USA)	Ele. & Sec.	60	B	24	C	3
Boscardin et al. (2018)	3 (USA)	ns	43	A	58	PCA	2
Brown (2016)	1a (UK)	Elementary	26	B	48	C	2
de Leeuw et al. (2019)	2 (the Netherlands)	Elementary	45	E	15	C	4/4
Heasley (2017)	2 (UK)	Secondary	21	C	47	C	6
Ramsay et al. (2018)	4b (UK)	Secondary	20	A	40	ns	4
Sabo et al. (2018)	1a, 3 (Slovakia)	Elementary	32	A	57	ns	5
Subba et al. (2016)	2 (Norway)	Ele. & Sec.	26	D	30	C	3
Subba et al. (2017)	4a (Norway)	Ele. & Sec.	25	E	30	ns	3
Tudryn (2012)	3 (USA)	Ele. & Sec.	30	A	40	PCA	2

SED

SoS

Collins & Liang (2014)	1a (USA)	Ele. & Sec.	13	D	36	PCA	Va	2
Cooper (2018)	7 (UK)	Ele. & Sec.	38	C	64	C	Com	2 / 5
Demir (2016)	1b (Turkey)	ns	40	B	65	ns	ns	3
DeVore-Wedding et al. (2018)	1a (USA)	Ele. & Sec.	29	A	47	yes	PCA / C	3
Dobrica-Tudor & Théorêt (2017)	1a (Canada)	Secondary	13	C	14	PCA	ns	4
Irie et al. (2018)	1b (Austria)	ns	51	C	56	ns	ns	3
Levine & VanSlyke-Briggs (2014)	1a (USA)	Ele. & Sec.	26	C	44	C	BH	2
Pruslow & Red Owl (2012)	1a, 1b (USA)	Ele. & Sec.	ns	D	45	PCA	Va	7
Ramlo (2012)	1a (USA)	Secondary	20	A	30	ns	ns	1
Ramlo (2017)	1b (USA)	Secondary	15	D	48	PCA	Va	2
Spendlove et al. (2012)	1b (UK)	Secondary	59	C	39	ns	Va	3
Wirth (2014)	1a (USA)	Secondary	18	A, C	41	PCA	Va	3 / 3

Note: With the aim of encapsulating the review "into a more readable and easily analyzed form" (Alexander, 2020, p. 17), several data in this table is abbreviated. The table is structured by SoLD area: SEC: Supportive environmental conditions, PIS: Productive instructional strategies, SED: Social and Emotional Development, SoS: Systems of Support, TC: Teacher characteristics.

Cohort legend: 1a: in-service teachers, 1b: pre-service teachers, 2: pupils, 3: principal class, 4a: special education teachers, 4b: special education coordinators, 5: parents, 6: school counsellors, 7: teaching assistants, 8: academics, 9: committee members, 10: teacher educators.

Education setting legend: Ele. & Sec.: Elementary and Secondary

Study focus legend: A: Representation, B: Attitudes & Values, C: Critical reflection, D: Evaluation, E: Response, F: Decision making

Part. appr.: Participatory Research Approach

Type of extraction legend: PCA: Principal Component Analysis C: Centroid Analysis, PAF: Principal Axis Factoring, ns: not stated.

Type of rotation legend: Va: Varimax Rotations, BH: By-hand or Judgmental rotations, Com: Varimax and By-hand, N: none.

Slaughter et al. (2020) was (in press 2019) when the search was conducted.

3.2.1 Supportive Environmental Conditions

Several included studies are located within the SoLD principle of practice to offer a safe and personalized setting for learning. For example, by asking teachers to foster democratic and participatory skills among students to socialize them for their role as community members (Pruslow & Red Owl, 2012) or by investigating how teachers' emotional intensity influences the classroom climate (Bang & Montgomery, 2010). A multifaceted sense of belonging and its connection to safety is researched in Stickl Haugen et al. (2019) and Goodrich (2017). Furthermore, a sense of compulsory heteronormativity is found among girls' construction of popularity (Duncan & Owens, 2011). Xi et al. (2016) add the notion of cultural differences in terms of how popularity among (Western and Asian) girls is perceived. In support of strong attachments and positive relationships, SoLD suggests longer grade spans and a reduction of different teachers which can be connected to the challenging transition from one education segment to the next (Lo Bianco & Aliani, 2013).

Implications for a culturally responsive pedagogy are found in studies focusing on teachers' views about multilingualism (Lundberg, 2019a, 2019b), pupil's use of their first language (Stollery, 2013), the suggestion of a prayer room at schools for Muslim girls (Frearson, 2013) or the use of works of art to engage and motivate culturally disadvantaged students (Beck, 2017). The creation of a secure learning environment for pre-service teachers to explore and discuss linguistic diversity is suggested after the detection of consensual, but somewhat insecure attitudes towards more support for linguistic minority students in Yang and Montgomery (2013). Finally, teachers' self-perception of their cultural competence is studied by Hobbs (2011), who concludes with the call for an improved definition of the concept.

A range of studies are assigned to the SoLD principle of practice to strengthen relational trust and family engagement. In addition to the importance of a climate of hope to create a supportive administration-faculty relationship and eventually minimize teacher attrition (Levine, 2013), skillful school leaders are a comparatively well-researched topic with Q methodology. Leadership styles are suggested to be adapted to the realities in actual practice (Militello, Fusarelli, et al., 2013) and embedded in more in-school on-site learning opportunities for principals (Davis, 2018). Furthermore, Provost et al. (2010) conclude that effective principal leadership, was found to be characterized by high expectations for staff performance, communicating instructional goals, developing school goals, and systematically observing teachers' instructional methods. A finding largely in line with one by Dhillon et al. (2019), describing the importance of taking decisive action to address the poor performance of staff. Related to that, Brown and Militello (2016) suggest an increase in principals' ambition to take an active role in teachers' development, especially regarding sustainability and collaboration.

Family engagement is regarded as an important topic by parents during their process of choosing a school (Parker, 2015) and school-family interaction could be increased through on-campus family resource centers (Swetnam, 2010). Engaging parents to promote trust, safety, and belonging crucial for students' successful educational career is supported by Yeboah et al. (2017), indicating parents' strong influence on their children's desirable job after schooling and Kim and Bang (2017) on parents' educational aspiration for their children.

3.2.2 Productive Instructional Strategies

To teach pupils in the zone of proximal development and provide scaffolding as suggested by Darling-Hammond et al. (2019), teacher demonstration, including modelling and explaining (McLain, 2018) and the creation of a rich learning environment and collaboration through field trips (Ramlo, 2019) are suggested. Baron et al. (2019) conclude that teachers' PD programs difficulty to acknowledge participants' various historical identities, perspectives and epistemological positions can easily be transported into compulsory education. In search of a definition of excellent teaching practices, Baltrinic et al. (2016) show teachers' views are informed by their experiences in multiple roles, such as counselors, liaisons and guides to pupils and families.

Various studies were assigned to the SoLD area of learning opportunities. Everman (2016) illustrates how literature can make science more approachable, build excitement, and encourage pupils to become more engaged. Levitt and Red Owl (2013) focus on the importance of early home and school literacy environments for reading competence and attitudes toward reading activities in school. The application of digital technologies in compulsory education (Burke O'Connell et al., 2019; Çirak Kurt & Yildirim, 2018) and inclusive dialogues about interest-based learning opportunities (Bonar, 2018; Lo Bianco & Aliani, 2013) are addressed. Other studies provide findings relevant to conceptual understanding, engagement and motivation in science (Barnes et al., 2015), citizenship education in post-communist European countries (Jelizakova, 2015) and geometry (Hock et al., 2015).

Four studies focus on the importance of thoughtful feedback, which is uncontested for the success of pupils' learning and development: Nauman et al. (2011) about pupil writing, Bang and Kim (2016) about practices of praising in the USA and Korea, Kotul'áková (2019) about global citizenship and Militello, Bass, et al. (2013) analyze how schools use and misuse data and provide implications to improve school leadership, teacher pedagogy and equitable pupil learning.

3.2.3 Social and Emotional Development

Three studies provide implications most relevant for the area of social and emotional development. Heffernan (2017) reports that resilience among young women is understood differently and that there might be an even larger difference between teachers and pupils. In terms of offering educative and restorative behavior support, Atkinson and Rowley (2019) suggest a person-centered approach to pupils' reintegration into mainstream education and list generally accepted strategies. Kim and Oh (2017) investigate different stakeholders' perceptions of a zero-tolerance policy for school violence in South Korea and conclude with a need for educational interventions instead of punishments for a positive transformation via self-reflection.

3.2.4 Systems of Support

The holistic SoLD framework also includes addressing pupils' individual needs to overcome learning and development barriers. De Leeuw et al. (2019) investigate pupils' perspectives on resolving social exclusion. Subba et al. (2016, 2017) find that teachers attach comparatively less significance in their practices, to autonomy support for pupils with learning difficulties. Individual needs is a controversial issue, as teachers opposed to inclusion practices believe they

have to focus their attention on the majority of the class (Brown, 2016), while special education teachers regard inclusion as a natural quality of schooling (Sabo et al., 2018). As a consequence of lacking teacher self-efficacy regarding teaching in inclusive classrooms, Berry (2010) demands more opportunities for teacher education that meet the needs of a wide range of pupils and how to access and effectively manage resources.

Two different special education leadership models were proposed in the included studies. Firstly, a distributed leadership continuum (Tudryn, 2012) focusing on collaboration and secondly, a transitional action model (Boscardin et al., 2018) that allows special education leaders to use facilitation to cultivate relationships, empower others, understand multiple perspectives and navigate complex, dynamic, organizational systems. Ramsay et al. (2018) reinforce the importance of collaboration among school staff regarding interventions. Heasley (2017) suggests incorporating educational psychologists in regular school routines, to support pupils to have a voice and prevent burnout among teaching staff (Atkin, 2019). Militello and Janson (2014) illustrate that there exists a dissonance between the ideal practice and the current practice of school counselors, often grounded in organizational constraints.

3.2.5 Teacher Characteristics

Four out of the 74 included studies focus on teachers' professional identity: Levine and VanSlyke-Briggs (2014) on being a renegade teacher, Wirth (2014) about the existence of pluralistic ignorance amongst secondary teachers in terms of influences on their teaching practices, Demir (2016) about Turkish pre-service teachers overall satisfaction with their choice of education and Dobrica-Tudor and Théorêt (2017) instruct teachers to critically reflect on their well-being and conclude with the importance of conditions and constraints inherent to the workplace.

Included studies also focused on teachers' role as policy arbiters in discussion about the use of digital technologies in schools (Vandeyar, 2014) and local language planning processes (Kemp, 2014; Slaughter et al., 2020). Ramlo illustrates how Q can be used for pupils' evaluation of teaching (2017) or the determination of in-service teachers views about learning during their professional development (2012).

4. Discussion

The present paper aimed to systematically review Q studies in educational research. The study selection process yielded 74 studies. The characteristics of these Q studies published between 2010 and 2019 were presented first, then, a narrative analysis based on the SoLD principles of practice, as put forward by Darling-Hammond et al. (2019), served as an analytical framework for the included studies' results and implications. The discussion presents delimitations and limitations, followed by the most relevant results of the systematic review study. The paper concludes with directions for further research and implications for practice.

4.1 Delimitations and Limitations

First, even though this review did not apply an exclusion criterion for non-English publications, studies not using the English terms *Q method* or *Q methodology*, but a translation of them, might not have been identified. Second, 20 studies were excluded from this research review, because they reported findings based on a different analytical procedure than Q factor analysis and were therefore "not in line with the original aim of Q methodology" (Brown, 2019, p. 568).

However, 18 of them used Q sorting as a data collection technique and might have provided additional insights into characteristics of Q sampling and Q sorting procedures. Third, the review study included not only traditional literatures but also gray ones. Even though the latter are often associated with a lack of quality, the current study was set out to illustrate and represent how Q has been used recently, but it is important to note some included studies did not state all information about study characteristics reviewed in the present paper. Finally, when the initial literature search was conducted in January 2020, some of the publications were listed as *in press*. With an updated reference list, one article (Slaughter et al., 2020) is now listed as a 2020 publication.

4.2 Flexibility of Q methodology

Stephenson (1980) argued that Q was not prescriptive and items used in a sort could mean different things to different people and, depending on the situation, have different meanings for the same person. This characteristic of Q highlights the flexibility of this methodology and is interlinked to the described a posteriori assignment of meaning. Presenting the diverse and wide-ranging applications in educational research, this review further showcased Q's flexibility. For example, the included studies comprised elementary and secondary levels of compulsory education, but Q studies identified in the initial searches also encompassed studies in preschools and tertiary settings. The wide range of participants also evidences the methodology is flexible enough to be used with adults, older pupils and young pupils. The fact that sorting items vary in number, from 14 to 78 items, and in format, including text but also images, are other features that support Q's flexibility. In addition, the result section about research foci further presents the methodology's application for various projects. Moreover, a comparison with results from a review study in conservation research (Zabala et al., 2018), indicates that Q is applied in other research foci, such as management alternatives or conflict resolution. However, the full potential of Q's flexibility in terms of study designs is not yet tapped. For example, more studies using items other than written statements could further strengthen the methodology's application for pupils with disabilities.

4.3 A Methodology for the otherwise Marginalized

The variety of participant cohorts showcases Q's suitability as a research method for all members of a school setting, without a limitation in age and verbal understanding. It can therefore be concluded that Q is sufficient to provide a holistic and comprehensive collection of perspectives in educational research. An unexpected finding is that the cohort of pupils was the second most frequently studied group of participants. This finding can be regarded as a confirmation of Q's potential to explore subjectivity and perspectives of otherwise often marginalized pupils (Brown, 2006; Ellingsen et al., 2014). On the other hand, voices of school staff other than teachers or members of the principal class and specifically studies investigating teacher educators' subjectivity are underrepresented. This is surprising as several included studies call for an adaptation of pre- and/or in-service teacher education. The review study uncovers a lack of communication between teacher education and teachers' actual work environment. However, it needs to be noted that this conclusion only concerns Q studies. Teacher educators' perspectives might have been gathered with alternative research methods.

4.4 A Participatory Approach to Policy Formation

Across different subjects, included studies are demanding a participatory approach to policy formulation and implementation, illustrating how Q offers insight into perspectives and subjectivity of different actors. Applying Q, especially in a participatory fashion, where respondents are given the possibility to contribute to various stages in research, could considerably increase the sense of accountability and transparency, thicken its democratic dimension (Howe, 2004) and be beneficial for educational research. This is of particular relevance during reformation processes regarding inclusive education policies, pupils' well-being and their educational success. By granting pupils access to otherwise entirely adult conversations due to the methodology's characteristic of a non-verbal approach, policies are expected to meet pupils' need even more accurately (Heasley, 2017) and teachers are better equipped to successfully implement inclusive education. In summary, Q is a potent way to either include stakeholders into policy formation processes or at least inform and educate policy-makers and the larger community about educational issues from participants' subjective point of view.

4.5 Implications for Practice

A range of included studies have suggested the application of Q, and especially its item sorting technique, as an educational tool for critical reflection or for evaluating a particular aspect of learning (see Table 2: categories C and D). As an articulation tool within classroom dialogues or an instrument for formative feedback, a prominent component of SoLD on productive instructional strategies, Q allows the conjunction of teachers' and pupils' subjectivity in a constructive way and supports their learning and development. Q sorting was also applied for teachers to gain a better understanding of their pupils, as it allows them to group individuals (Beck, 2017), understand where they are coming from and continually assess if they are making growth in their competence (Sklarwitz, 2017). The review showcases Q's sheer limitless potential as an educational tool to support pupils' learning and development due to the methodology's flexibility in terms of study focus and design. However, more research is needed to investigate how educators with limited or no knowledge of Q can integrate Q sorting in their teaching practices. Based on the experience and motivation afforded by post-sorting discussion with learners, educators might move on to using Q in line with its original aim of elucidating shared subjective viewpoints.

4.6 Directions for Future Research

Even though the present review expands insights into the potential of Q to study subjectivity in educational research, a range of questions remains for future research. First, while included studies focused especially on areas of supportive environmental conditions and productive instructional strategies, the SoLD area of social and emotional development of pupils is underrepresented. With its reputation to include marginalized voices, Q is considered to be well-suited for research illuminating pupils' skills, habits and mindsets for successful learning and development. Strengthening this research trajectory would further develop the understanding of how to meet pupils' individual social and emotional needs.

Second, a considerable number of studies were excluded because they analyzed data gathered in Q sorting activities with other approaches than Q factor analysis. The carried-out

analysis was mostly descriptive statistics and Q factor analysis would provide a fruitful basis for future research and further highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the complete methodology. Moreover, it can be expected to see further implications of potential applications of Q sorting as an educational tool. We, therefore, recommend that future studies explore the possibilities of individual elements of Q methodology, especially its sorting technique, as a tool in educational practices.

Third, whereas teacher and pupil perspectives are highly represented in the included studies, parent and teacher educator perspectives, either as a single cohort or as part of mixed participant groups, are largely missing. This gap suggests the need for new research to supplement current educational research on improving communication between teacher education providers and their recipients thus highlighting more voices.

A final direction for further research, it needs to be noted the review was specifically focused on Q studies executed in compulsory education and on teacher education for compulsory education. Q studies from other educational settings, such as daycare and higher education settings were therefore excluded. We recommend that future reviews explore the characteristics and implications of Q studies in these additional educational settings.

5. Conclusion

Focusing on compulsory education, the characteristics of Q methodological studies since 2010 were systematically reviewed. In this ten-year timespan, 74 included studies illustrated wide-ranging and diverse ways in which researchers have been using Q as a means to analyze subjectivity, including participants who tend to be marginalized. To identify the implications that the selected Q studies for educational research purposes, the studies were grouped within the SoLD framework (Darling-Hammond et al., 2019). According to its inventor, Q “stands for *discovery* in subjectivity, of reality in nature, made possible by technique” (Stephenson, 2014, p. 43, emphasis in the original). This technique allows representing a person’s internal standpoint or subjective point of view as empirically observable, meaningful and relational, hence operantly subjective in the form of a Q sort (Stephenson, 1968). In other words, Q offers a flexible and systematic approach to data collection and analysis about subjectivity and is suited for educational research.

References

References marked with an asterisk indicate studies included in the review sample.

- Alexander, P. A. (2020). Methodological Guidance Paper: The Art and Science of Quality Systematic Reviews. *Review of Educational Research*, 90(1), 6-23. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654319854352>
- *Anderson, C., & Jacobson, S. (2018). Barriers to environmental education: How do teachers' perceptions in rural Ecuador fit into a global analysis? *Environmental Education Research*, 24(12), 1684-1696. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2018.1477120>
- *Atkin, L. V. (2019). *Support and Supervision for Emotional Literacy Support Assistants (ELSAs): Gathering ELSAs views about the support offered to them* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Sheffield].
- *Atkinson, G., & Rowley, J. (2019). Pupils' views on mainstream reintegration from alternative provision: a Q methodological study. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 24(4), 339-356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632752.2019.1625245>
- *Baltrinic, E. R., Jencius, M., & Brown, S. R. (2016). Excellent Teaching as Viewed by International Teaching Elites. *Operant Subjectivity*, 38(3-4), 16-28. <https://doi.org/10.15133/j.os.2016.009>
- *Bang, H., & Kim, J. (2016). Korean and American Teachers' Praising Styles and Teaching Practices. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 28(1), 28-54.
- *Bang, H., & Montgomery, D. (2010). Exploring Korean and American Teachers' Preferred Emotional Types. *Roeper Review*, 32, 176-188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2010.485305>
- *Barnes, C., Angle, J., & Montgomery, D. (2015). Teachers Describe Epistemologies of Science Instruction through Q Methodology. *School Science and Mathematics*, 115(3), 141-150.
- *Baron, C., Sklarwitz, S., Bang, H., & Shatara, H. (2019). Understanding what teachers gain from professional development at historic sites. *Understanding what teachers gain from professional development at historic sites*, 47(1), 76-107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2018.1489927>
- *Beck, P. D. (2017). Using Works of Art to Give a Voice to Culturally Diverse Students: Q-Methodology Study. *Journal of Leadership and Instruction*, 18-25.
- Berliner, D. C. (2002). Educational Research: The Hardest Science of All. *Educational Researcher*, 31(8), 18-20.
- *Berry, R. A. W. (2010). Preservice and Early Career Teachers' Attitudes toward Inclusion, Instructional Accommodations, and Fairness: Three Profiles. *Teacher Educator*, 45, 75-95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08878731003623677>
- *Berry, R. A. W., Shields, B. A., Krickovich, S. R., & Sadler, J. T. (2012). Prospective Student Teachers' Concerns Regarding the Student-Teaching Experience. *Operant Subjectivity*, 35(3), 159-175.
- *Bonar, G. (2018). *When I think of learning about Asia, ... Students' views of Asia, and their motivations towards Asia-related learning in two Australian secondary schools* [Doctoral dissertation, Monash University].
- *Boscardin, M. L., Schulze, R., Rude, H., & Tudryn, P. (2018). Do Leaders of Special Education Share Similar Perceptions of Standards Guiding the Leadership and

- Administration of Special Education? *Journal of Special Education Leadership*, 31(2), 61-84.
- *Brown, C., & Militello, M. (2016). Principal's perceptions of effective professional development in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 54(6), 703-726. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-09-2014-0109>
- Brown, S. R. (1980). *Political Subjectivity*. Yale University Press.
- Brown, S. R. (2006). A match made in heaven: A marginalized methodology for studying the marginalized. *Quality & Quantity*, 40(3), 361-382. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-005-8828-2>
- Brown, S. R. (2019). Subjectivity in the Human Sciences. *The Psychological Record*, 69, 565-579. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40732-019-00354-5>
- *Brown, Z. (2016). "We Just Have to Get on with it". Inclusive Teaching in a Standards Driven System: The Design Decisions of a Q Methodological Study. *Operant Subjectivity*, 38(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.15133/j.os.2016.001>
- Brown, Z., & Rhoades, G. (2019). Q-methodology: seeking communalities in perspectives of young children and practitioners. In Z. Brown & H. Perkins (Eds.), *Using Innovative Methods in Early Years Research: Beyond the Conventional* (pp. 202-215). Routledge.
- *Burke O'Connell, N., Dempsey, M., & O'Shea, A. (2019). An Investigation of Students' Attitudes to Science, Mathematics and the Use of Technology in Lower Secondary Education. *International Journal of Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology*, 7(4), 319-334.
- Cantor, P., Osher, D., Berg, J., Steyer, L., & Rose, G. (2019). Malleability, plasticity, and individuality: How children learn and develop in context. *Applied Developmental Science*, 23(4), 307-337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2017.1398649>
- *Çirak Kurt, S., & Yildirim, I. (2018). The Students' Perceptions on Blended Learning: A Q Method Analysis. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 18(2), 427-446. <https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2018.2.0002>
- *Coladonato, J. A. (2013). *Attitudes About Second-Career Teachers: An Exploratory Q Study of School Administrators and Classroom Teachers* [Doctoral dissertation, Long Island University].
- *Collins, L. J., & Liang, X. (2014). Task Relevance in the Design of Online Professional Development for Teachers of ELLs: A Q Methodology Study. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 15(3), 268-281.
- *Cooper, R. (2018). *A step towards clarifying TA ambiguity: A Q Methodological Study to Elicit the Views of Teaching Assistants Regarding Their Current and Ideal Roles* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Sheffield].
- Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2019). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791>
- *Davis, L. M. (2018). *Urban Elementary School Principals' Views of Principal Professional Development: A Q Methodology Study* [Doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University].
- *De Leeuw, R. R., de Boer, A. A., Beckmann, E. J., van Exel, J., & Minnaert, A. E. M. G. (2019). Young children's perspectives on resolving social exclusion within inclusive

- classrooms. *International Journal of Educational Reserach*, 98, 324-335. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2019.09.009>
- *Demir, S. (2016). An Analysis of Pre-Service Teachers' Attitudes and Opinions Regarding the Teaching Profession via Q-Methodology. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 17(3), 295-310. <https://doi.org/10.13187/ejced.2016.17.295>
- *DeVore-Wedding, B., Thomas, J., & Montgomery, D. (2018). Determining Optimal Professional Development Formats: A Q-Methodology Study of Science Teachers' Preferences. *Operant Subjectivity*, 40(1-2), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.15133/j.os.2018.001>
- *Dhillon, J. K., Howard, C., & Holt, J. (2019). Outstanding leadership in primary education: Perceptions of school leaders in English primary schools. *Management in Education*, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020619885942>
- *Dobrica-Tudor, V., & Théorêt, M. (2017). La méthode Q dans l'étude des réflexions des enseignants du secondaire sur leurs pratiques professionnelles. *Mesure et évaluation en éducation*, 40(2), 125-153. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1043570ar>
- Dryzek, J. S. (2005). Handle with care: The deadly hermeneutics of deliberative instrumentation. *Acta Politica*, 40, 197-211. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ap.5500099>
- Dryzek, J. S., & Holmes, L. (2002). *Post-Communist Democratization: Political Discourses Across Thirteen Countries*. Cambridge University Press.
- *Duncan, N., & Owens, L. (2011). Bullying, social Power and Heteronormativity: Girls' Constructions of Popularity. *Children & Society*, 25, 306-316. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1099-0860.2011.00378.x>
- Eisenhart, M., & DeHaan, R. L. (2005). Doctoral Preparation of Scientifically Based Education Researchers. *Educational Researcher*, 34(4), 3-13.
- Ellingsen, I. T., Arstad Thorsen, A., & Størksen, I. (2014). Revealing Children's Experiences and Emotions through Q Methodology. *Child Development Research*, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/910529>
- *Everman, D. J. (2016). *Teacher Candidates' Perceptions Regarding the Integration of Fictional Literature into Elementary Science Instruction* [Doctoral dissertation, Texas State University].
- *Frearson, A. E. (2013). *A Q-Methodological study to explore Muslim girls' viewpoints around how a secondary school setting can promote and support inclusion*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Sheffield].
- Gallagher, K., & Porock, D. (2010). The Use of Interviews in Q Methodology. *Nursing Research*, 59(4), 295-300. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NNR.0b013e3181e4ffff>
- Good, J. M. (2010). Introduction to William Stephenson's quest for a science of subjectivity. *Psychoanalysis and history*, 12(2), 211-241.
- Gooding, C. T., & Wilbur, P. H. (1971). Q Technique as an Effective Measure of Teacher Attitudes. *The Journal of Teacher Education*, XXII(1), 44-47.
- *Goodrich, K. (2017). Exploring School Counselors' Motivations to Work with LGBTQI Students in Schools: A Q Methodology Study. *Professional School Counseling*, 20(1a), 5-12. <https://doi.org/10.5330/1096-2409-20.1a.5>

- *Heasley, J. (2017). *Young people's views concerning their voice in Education, Health and Care planning meetings: A participatory Q-study* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Sheffield].
- *Heffernan, F. M. (2017). *'Constructions of resilience' A Q methodological study to explore how young women view resilience* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Sheffield].
- *Hobbs, P. A. (2011). *A Q-Methodological Study: Examining Teachers' Beliefs, Perceptions, and Attitudes about Cultural Competence* [Doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University].
- *Hock, T. T., Tarmizi, R. A., Yunus, A. S. M., & Ayub, A. F. (2015). Understanding the Primary School Students' Van Hiele Levels of Geometry Thinking in Learning Shapes and Spaces: A Q-Methodology. *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education*, 11(4), 793-802.
- Howe, K. R. (2004). A Critique of Experimentalism. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10(1), 42-61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800403259491>
- Hughes, M. (2016). Critical, respectful, person-centred: Q Methodology for educational psychologists. *Educational & Child Psychology*, 33(1), 63-75.
- *Irie, K., Ryan, S., & Mercer, S. (2018). Using Q methodology to investigate pre-service EFL teachers' mindsets about teaching competences. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(3), 575-598. <https://doi.org/10.14746/sslt.2018.8.3.3>
- *Jelizakova, M. (2015). Social Science Teachers on Citizenship Education: A Comparative Study of Two Post-Communist Countries. *Journal of Social Science Education*, 14(1), 31-46. <https://doi.org/10.2390/jsse-v14-i1-1379>
- Kelly, B. (2007). Methodological Issues for Qualitative Research with Learning Disabled Children. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 10(1), 21-35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645570600655159>
- *Kemp, S. (2014). *Language planning at the school level: The Great Wall of Chinese* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Melbourne].
- *Kim, J.-S., & Bang, H. (2017). Education fever: Korean parents' aspiration for their children's schooling and future career. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 25(2), 207-224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2016.1252419>
- *Kim, N., & Oh, I. (2017). Analysis of stakeholders' perceptions of zero tolerance policy for school violence in South Korea. *Kedi Journal of Educational Policy*, 14(1), 61-78.
- *Kotul'áková, K. n. (2019). Identifying Teachers' Beliefs Prior to CPD Training Focusing on an Inquiry-Based Approach in Science Education. *Research in Science Education*, 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-019-9841-0>
- *Levine, A. C. (2013). The Sustaining Power of Hope: Perspectives of Public School Teachers. *Research in the Schools*, 20(1), 57-75.
- *Levine, A. C., & VanSlyke-Briggs, K. (2014). Speaking Up Publically or Acting Behind the Scenes: Renegade Teachers Operant Subjectivity, 37(4), 3-22. <https://doi.org/10.15133/j.os.2014.013>
- *Levitt, R., & Red Owl, R. H. (2013). Effects of Early Literacy Environments on the Reading Attitudes, Behaviours and Values of Veteran Teachers. *Learning Environments Research*, 16(387-409). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-013-9140-z>

- *Lo Bianco, J., & Aliani, R. (2013). *Language Planning and Student Experiences : Intention, Rhetoric and Implementation* (1st ed.). Channel View Publications.
- *Lundberg, A. (2019a). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism: findings from Q method research. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 20(3), 266-283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2018.1495373>
- *Lundberg, A. (2019b). Teachers' viewpoints about an educational reform concerning multilingualism in German-speaking Switzerland. *Learning and Instruction*, 64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2019.101244>
- McKeown, B., & Thomas, D. B. (1988). *Q Methodology* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483384412>
- *McLain, M. (2018). Emerging perspectives on the demonstration as a signature pedagogy in design and technology education. *International Journal of Technology & Design Education*, 28, 985-1000. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10798-017-9425-0>
- *Militello, M., Bass, L., Jackson, K. T., & Wang, Y. (2013). How Data Are Used and Misused in Schools: Perceptions from Teachers and Principals. *Education Sciences*, 3, 98-120. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci3020098>
- *Militello, M., Fusarelli, B., Alsbury, T., & Warren, T. P. (2013). How Professional Standards Guide Practice for School Principals. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 27(1), 74-90. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541311289837>
- *Militello, M., & Janson, C. (2014). The Urban School Reform Opera: The Obstructions to Transforming School Counseling Practices. *Education and Urban Society*, 46(7), 743-772. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124512468007>
- Militello, M., Janson, C., & Tonissen, D. (2016). InQuiry: A Participatory Approach for Understanding Stakeholder Perceptions. *The Foundation Review*, 8(1), 88-107. <https://doi.org/10.9707/1944-5660.1286>
- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & The PRISMA Group. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *PLoS Medicine*, 6(7), e1000097. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097>
- Montgomery, D. (2010). Q Applied to Educational Issues. *Operant Subjectivity*, 33(1/2), 1-2.
- *Nauman, A. D., Stirling, T., & Borthwick, A. (2011). What Makes Writing Good? An Essential Question for Teachers. *The Reading Teacher*, 64(5), 318-328. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RT.64.5.2>
- Newman, M., & Gough, D. (2020). Systematic Reviews in Educational Research: Methodology, Perspectives and Application. In O. Zawacki-Richter, M. Kerres, S. Bedenlier, M. Bond, & K. Buntins (Eds.), *Systematic Reviews in Educational Research: Methodology, Perspectives and Application* (pp. 3-22). Springer VS.
- *Nzahabwanayo, S., Finchilescu, G., & Divala, J. J. (2019). What are the Qualities of Good Citizenship in Post-genocide Rwanda? High School Teachers Speak Through a Q-Methodological Approach. *Interchange*, 50, 461-499.
- OECD. (2012). *Equity and Quality in Education: Supporting Disadvantaged Students and Schools*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264130852-en>
- Osher, D., Cantor, P., Berg, J., Steyer, L., & Rose, T. (2020). Drivers of human development: How relationships and context shape learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(1), 6-36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2017.1398650>

- *Parker, T. W. (2015). *Understanding the private school choice decision process: A Q methodological study* [Doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University].
- Pigott, T. D., & Polanin, J. R. (2020). Methodological Guidance Paper: High-Quality Meta-Analysis in a Systematic Review. *Review of Educational Research*, 90(1), 24-46. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654319877153>
- Pike, K., Wright, P., Wink, B., & Fletcher, S. (2015). The assessment of cultural ecosystem services in the marine environment using Q methodology. *Journal of Coastal Conservation*, 19(5), 6677-6675.
- Popay, J., Roberts, H., Sowden, A., Petticrew, M., Arai, L., Rodgers, M., Britten, N., Roen, K., & Duffy, S. (2006). *Guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews*. University of Lancaster, UK.
- *Provost, J., Boscardin, M. L., & Wells, C. (2010). Perceptions of Principal Leadership Behaviors in Massachusetts in the Era of Education Reform. *Journal of School Leadership*, 20, 532-560.
- *Pruslow, J. T., & Red Owl, R. H. (2012). Demonstrating the Application of Q Methodology for Fieldwork Reporting in Experiential Education. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 35(2), 375-392.
- *Ramlo, S. (2012). Inservice science teachers' views of a professional development workshop and their learning of force and motion concepts. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28, 928-935. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.04.002>
- *Ramlo, S. (2017). Improving Student Evaluation of Teaching: Determining Multiple Perspectives within a Course for Future Math Educators. *Journal of Research in Education*, 27(1), 49-78.
- *Ramlo, S. (2019). Examining Urban, American, Middle-School Students' Divergent Views of Nature before and after a Field Trip to a University Field Station and Nature Preserve. *Urban Review: Issues and Ideas in Public Education*, 51, 231-246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-018-0473-x>
- Ramlo, S. (2020). Divergent viewpoints about the statistical stage of a mixed method: qualitative versus quantitative orientations. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 43(1), 93-111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2019.1626365>
- *Ramsay, J., Cowell, N., & Gersch, I. (2018). How school staff understand the relationship between problem behaviours and language difficulties. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 34(1), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2017.1367647>
- *Sabo, R., Vančíková, K., Vaníková, T., & Šukolová, D. (2018). Social Representations of Inclusive School from the Point of View of Slovak Education Actors. *The New Educational Review*, 54, 247-257. <https://doi.org/10.15804/tner.2018.54.4.20>
- Schmolck, P. (2014). *PQMethod*. Retrieved 20.11.2017 from <http://schmolck.userweb.mwn.de/qmethod/downpqmac.htm> (accessed 20 November 2017)
- *Sklarwitz, S. (2017). Assessing Global Citizenship Attitudes with Q Methodology *The Journal of Social Studies Reserach*, 41, 171-182. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2016.09.001>
- *Slaughter, Y., Lo Bianco, J., Aliani, R., Cross, R., & Hajek, J. (2020). Language programming in rural and regional Victoria Making space for local viewpoints in policy development.

- Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 42(3), 274-300.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.18030.sla>
- Snilstveit, B., Oliver, S., & Vojtkova, M. (2012). Narrative approaches to systematic review and synthesis of evidence for international development policy and practice. *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, 4(3), 409-429.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19439342.2012.710641>
- *Spendlove, D., Barton, A., Hallett, F., & Shortt, D. (2012). Shifting codes: education or regulation? Trainee teachers and the Code of Conduct and Practice in England. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(4), 449-462.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2012.662638>
- Stephenson, W. (1935). Technique of factor analysis. *Nature*, 136, 297.
- Stephenson, W. (1953). *The Study of Behavior: Q Technique and its Methodology*. Chicago University Press.
- Stephenson, W. (1968). Consciousness out - subjectivity in. *Psychological Record*, 18, 499-501.
- Stephenson, W. (1980). Newton's Fifth Rule and Q methodology: Application to educational psychology. *American Psychologist*, 35(10), 882-889. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.35.10.882>
- Stephenson, W. (2014). General Theory of Communication. *Operant Subjectivity*, 37(3), 38-56. <https://doi.org/10.15133/j.os.2014.011>
- *Stickl Haugen, J., Wachter Morris, C., & Wester, K. (2019). The Need to Belong: An Exploration of Belonging Among Urban Middle School Students. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Counseling*, 5(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21501378.2017.1419425>
- *Stollery, R. L. (2013). *A Q Methodological Study of the support Valued by Students with English as an Additional Language* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Sheffield].
- *Subba, L., Bru, E., & Arstad Thorsen, A. (2016). Perceived Teacher Support among Primary and Lower Secondary School Students with Learning Difficulties. *Operant Subjectivity*, 38(1), 15-34. <https://doi.org/10.15133/j.os.2016.002>
- *Subba, L., Bru, E., & Arstad Thorsen, A. (2017). Primary and Lower Secondary School Teachers' Perceptions of how they Manage to Support Students with Learning Difficulties in Inclusive Classrooms. *Operant Subjectivity*, 39(3-4), 25-45. <https://doi.org/10.15133/j.os.2017.010>
- *Swetnam, K. G. (2010). Dropout and Academic Achievement Perceptions of Middle and High School Students of Mexican Descent: A Q-Methodology Study. *Operant Subjectivity*, 33(3-4), 103-128.
- Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research: integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences*. SAGE Publications.
- *Tudryn, P. R. (2012). *Examining Perceptions of Practices and the Roles of Special Education Leaders through the Distributed Leadership Lens* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst].
- *Vandeyar, T. (2014). 'Windows' on Teachers' Beliefs and Attitudes about School ICT Policy Statements. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(14), 339-351.
<https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n14p339>

- Watts, S., & Stenner, P. (2012). *Doing Q methodological research: theory, method and interpretation*. SAGE Publications.
- *Wirth, J. (2014). *Perceptions of Secondary Mathematics Teachers concerning Influences on Pedagogical Practices* [Doctoral dissertation, North Dakota State University].
- Wohlin, C. (2014). A Snowballing Procedure for Systematic Literature Studies and a Replication. *Proceedings 18th International Conference on Evaluation and Assessment in Software Engineering*, 321-330.
- *Xi, J., Owens, L., & Feng, H. (2016). Friendly Girls and Mean Girls: Social Constructions of Popularity among Teenage Girls in Shanghai *Japanese Psychological Research*, 58(1), 42-53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpr.12101>
- *Yang, Y., & Montgomery, D. (2013). Gaps or bridges in multicultural teacher education: A Q study of attitudes toward student diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 30, 27-37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.10.003>
- *Yeboah, T., Sumberg, J., Flynn, J., & Anyidoho, N. A. (2017). Perspectives on Desirable Work: Findings from a Q Study with Students and Parents in Rural Ghana. *The European Journal of Development Research*, 29, 423-440. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41287-016-0006-y>
- Zabala, A., Sandbrook, C., & Mukherjee, N. (2018). When and how to use Q methodology to understand perspectives in conservation reserach. *Conservation Biology*, 32(5), 1185-1194. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13123>

III

Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism: findings from Q method research

Adrian Lundberg

Department of School Development and Leadership, Faculty of Education and Society, Malmö University, Malmö, Sweden

ABSTRACT

This study explores teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and multilingual students in Swedish primary schools. The aim is to support a better-informed discussion about teachers' decision-making in linguistically diverse classrooms in the European nation-state. The use of Q method combines qualitative and quantitative data analyses. Q material applied in the present study provided the participants with all the necessary language to describe their beliefs. Two Q sets of statements – one regarding the understanding of the phenomenon and the other concerning suggested pedagogical responses in relation to current multilingualism – were constructed using a variety of sources. The participants are forty teachers, predominantly female, employed at three different primary schools in southern Sweden. Applying inverted factor analysis and abductive interpretation, three sets of teachers' beliefs emerged and descriptions represent the teachers' complex views about multilingualism in the classroom. Overall, teachers' beliefs are rather welcoming towards multilingualism and multilingual students and recent concepts with growing acceptance in literature, such as translanguaging, are well accepted. However, sceptical views, often based on monolingual ideologies are present and are likely to pose challenges for the implementation of pluralistic policies. This study contributes to an open debate about benefits and challenges of current multilingualism in education.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 13 March 2018
Accepted 8 June 2018

KEYWORDS

Sweden; teachers' beliefs; multilingualism; Q methodology; pedagogy

Introduction

Historically, the social and political organisation of nation-states along monolingual lines has been 'the dominant modality for the organisation of European territory and the management of its populations' (Lo Bianco, 2005, p. 115). However, the increase in linguistic and cultural diversity due to accelerated migration flows challenges 'the idea of a single, common "national" language [as] the leitmotif' (May, 2017, p. 5). Sweden is a prominent example of such a practice, in which a national language is elevated to the role of safeguarding a national culture and identity (Cots, Lasagabaster, & Garrett, 2012). At the

CONTACT Adrian Lundberg adrian.lundberg@mau.se; adrian.r.lundberg@gmail.com Department of School Development and Leadership, Faculty of Education and Society, Malmö University, Nordenskiöldsgatan 10, 205 06, Malmö, Sweden

© 2018 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

same time, the education system has an opportunity to sensitise the society about a possible new social norm that foregrounds multilingualism¹ with Swedish as the shared national language. From a language ecology perspective, the classroom represents ‘a key site where policies become action’ (Hult, 2014, p. 159), and teachers, through their pedagogical decisions based on their beliefs, are at the metaphorical heart of language policy implementation (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007; Menken & García, 2010; Ricento & Hornberger, 1996). In recent years, research has shown increasing interest in educators’ dilemma of finding themselves in linguistically diverse classrooms, which are historically perceived monolingual spaces in many nations. Some examples include a study of pluralist language ideologies of two primary school teachers in the United States (Henderson, 2017), a research project on monoglossic echoes in multilingual spaces in Australia (Reath Warren, 2018) and tensions between ‘globalising’ and ‘nationalising’ discourses in Estonian higher education (Soler & Vihman, 2018). Furthermore, Young (2014) in France and Haukås (2016) in Norway investigated teachers’ beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogy with interviews and focus group discussions, while De Angelis (2011) used a questionnaire for her study of teachers’ beliefs about their students’ prior language knowledge.

Teachers’ beliefs

Research about teachers’ beliefs is considered especially challenging, due to the fact that different teachers’ beliefs and their interrelationships are not observable and may not be entirely consciously accessible (Rokeach, 1968). Moreover, when asked, teachers may respond with what is culturally and socially desirable. Observations, questionnaires or interview studies are therefore insufficient means to investigate teachers’ beliefs. As a result, the present study has adopted a powerful qualitative method with quantitative features to provide accounts of human subjectivity to explore teachers’ beliefs in the context of multilingualism in Swedish primary education.

Drawing on a review of teacher cognition in language teaching, Borg (2003) describes teachers as ‘active, thinking decision-makers who make instructional choices by drawing on complex, practically-oriented, personalised, and context-sensitive networks of knowledge, thoughts and beliefs’ (p. 81). Because it is often difficult or even impossible to clearly determine whether the teacher knows or believes something (Pajares, 1992), and because ‘in the mind of the teachers these concepts are not held distinctively separate’ (Borg, 2006, p. 33), in the present study the concept of teachers’ beliefs refers to the teachers’ understanding of and pedagogical thinking about multilingualism and multilingual students. Belief elements of different strength are organised in complex networks and structured in a central-peripheral way. The more central and stronger an element is, the more resistant it is to change (Rokeach, 1968). Moreover, different beliefs may contradict one another, reflecting their complexity (Pajares, 1992).

Complexity of multilingualism

This study aims to shed light on teachers’ beliefs about multilingualism as a social phenomenon and on their pedagogies regarding multilingualism ‘in the most unbiased way possible’ (Aronin & Jessner, 2015, p. 286). Most of the research carried out about

multilingualism supports the acquisition and use of different languages in different domains and illustrates advantages of multilinguals, such as superior metalinguistic and meta-cognitive abilities (Bialystock, 2011; Cenoz, 2003; De Angelis, 2007) or multilingualism's positive effect on earnings (Grin, Sfreddo, & Vaillancourt, 2010) to name but a few. According to Jessner and Kramsch (2015) the 'dark side to linguistic diversity' (p. 6) has received far less attention in academia. They proceed to say that current multilingualism 'is part of a *general revolution against monolingualism and what it stands for*, namely [...] the bedrock of schooling, the nation-state and the Academy' (p. 7, italics in original). By adding a complexity lens (Larsen-Freeman, 2014), the current paper understands multilingualism as a dynamic phenomenon, consisting of opportunities and difficulties to be faced by individuals, the society and its institutions.

In academia, the bi- and multilingual norm in societal language use seems to have replaced the monolingual perspective (Aronin, 2015; Jessner & Kramsch, 2015; May, 2014). This multilingual turn (May, 2014) is characterised by the acknowledgement of multilingual speakers' fluid language practices in their full complexity (García, 2009). García refers to *translanguaging* when multilingual individuals use their full linguistic repertoire and receive positive confirmation for their linguistic capacity. As a new method of teaching and an alternative to traditional pedagogies, where the teachers 'keep knowledge about other languages, including the L1 [the students' first language], out of the classroom in order not to confuse students' (Jessner, 2008, p. 39), translanguaging requires the teachers' willingness to engage in learning with their students and equalise power relations (Flores & García, 2013). Comparable terms to translanguaging which all 'shift the focus from languages to speakers and open up the possibility for a multilingual analysis, rather than a monolingual one' (Jonsson, 2017, p. 22) include Canagarajah's (2011) *codemeshing* or Jørgensen's (2008) *polylingual languaging*. According to Paulsrud, Rosén, Straszer, and Wedin (2017), the concept of translanguaging creates a stronger home-school connection and allows for better participation between weaker and stronger learners in mixed-ability classes. However, this more fluid understanding of language use in current multilingualism represents a challenge for educators, because it destabilises codes, norms and conventions that teachers and especially language teachers have relied upon (Kramsch, 2014). It is therefore not surprising that different research studies have identified a discrepancy between multilingual pedagogies celebrated in literature or pluralistic policies and current classroom practice (Cenoz & Gorter, 2011; Cummins, 2007; Daryai-Hansen et al., 2015). The reasons for this gap are manifold. The implementation of a multilingual pedagogy is connected to new curricula, new appropriate learning material, adapted assessment practices and enough time for the teachers to engage and adapt, as they are expected to perform a major paradigmatic shift. In order to understand the reasoning behind sceptical beliefs and to lead a better-informed discussion about multilingual education, this current research project applies a methodology that captures the richness of the phenomenon and explores patterns of Swedish primary school teachers' beliefs about it.

Linguistic ecology of Sweden

The current research project is situated in Sweden, where the national language hierarchy is clearly dominated by Swedish and English (Josephson, 2004). To secure the

development of Swedish, mainly in respect to the rise of English, Swedish became the official language of the country in 2009 (Swedish Ministry of Culture, 2009:600). English is considered a transcultural language (Hult, 2012) whose position is continually negotiated and part of the local dominant language constellation, which is described as ‘the complex of languages shared on a day-to-day basis [to meet] essential functions of communication, interaction and identity-marking’ by Aronin and Singleton (2012, p. 59). While Swedish is taught as a mandatory subject from first grade and English from third grade in public schools, other major European languages and minority languages, non-official ones in particular, are marginalised in the Swedish educational system. This is partly due to the organisation of school subjects, where languages are treated as ‘separate units, each with specific goals and learning outcomes’ (Rosén, 2017, pp. 44–45). In addition, studying an additional language to Swedish and English lies in the students’ responsibility. Many students however choose more lessons in Swedish or English (Tholin, 2012, p. 71) and thereby miss the European Union’s policy objective of ‘mother tongue plus two other languages’ (European Commission, 2004, p. 16). Nevertheless, three efforts to foster multilingual development need to be mentioned. Mother tongue instruction was established in 1977 and is currently an elective school subject in its own right. Municipalities are obliged to organise the classes, if five students or more use a particular language on a daily basis with a caregiver and wish to receive such an instruction. Moreover, a suitable teacher must be available. These requirements are waived for official minority languages. The second, more short-term educational support is study guidance in the mother tongue, which aims at helping students with limited Swedish language competence understand schooling held in the national language. Thirdly, *Swedish as a Second Language* was established as a school subject in 1995 to provide a more systematic support for immigrant students’ development of the Swedish language. It is telling that in Sweden these immigrant children are often referred to as *multilingual students*, which is an acknowledgment that the children have a language other than Swedish as their first form of communication and now need to acquire the dominant language of their host country, thus becoming even more multilingual. As concluded by Lundberg (2018), even in research results, discourses of multilingual students in Sweden often refer to children with a migration background and mother tongues other than Swedish. They are thereby discriminated as different from the perceived monolingual norm in national education policy documents. On the other hand, multilinguals in a wider understanding, are not necessarily called *multilingual* for at least two reasons. First, the particular usage, described by Lundberg, has a strong negative connotation and is avoided when referring to native Swedish speakers. Second, individual multilingualism is still popularly understood as consisting of a native-like control of two or more languages (Bloomfield, 1933) and speakers whose linguistic proficiencies are partial tend not to be considered multilingual. As a consequence of the described monolingual stance, it can be hypothesised that the linguistic repertoire of multilingual individuals who have high Swedish language competency is overlooked.

This monolingual disposition stands in sharp contrast with the multilingual sociolinguistic reality of most children (monolingual and multilingual ones) entering the Swedish school system and the current state of research about multilingualism and multilingual pedagogy described above.

Research setting

In light of these peculiarities in the Swedish context, the present study used a range of school settings to ensure representative coverage of typical conditions. Forty teachers from three different primary schools in the southern Swedish region of Scania were recruited for this study on a voluntary basis. The biggest school, with around 400 students of which 95% have a non-Swedish background, is located in the inner city of Malmö, Sweden's third largest city and an excellent example of a 'test bed for understanding social diversity and complexity' (King & Carson, 2017, p. 3). Twenty-nine teachers (23 female and 6 male) from this school took part in the study. According to their self-evaluation, all of these teachers can communicate in at least two languages and more than half of them do not have Swedish as a first language. The other two schools are smaller and located in a more rural area, approximately 40 minutes away from the city of Malmö. Seven teachers (5 female and 2 male) participated from a school with about 250 students, whereby 20% are of a non-Swedish background. The four remaining participants are all female and employed at a school with 110 students who are almost exclusively of Swedish background. All of the teachers in the rural area are native speakers of Swedish and consider themselves able to communicate in at least two languages.

Materials and methods

In order to explore teachers' subjective beliefs from the individual's point of view instead of imposing researcher-defined categories onto them, Q methodology (henceforth Q) was selected as particularly well suited to the requirements of the current research project. Moreover, Q provides the sometimes insufficient language to describe and label their beliefs (Ernest, 2001) and is an interactive, dynamic and operant methodology (Brown, 1980), which approaches individuals in terms of their own priorities, values, beliefs and opinions (Ernest, 2011). Furthermore, by making use of a form of inverted factor analysis thereby combining qualitative and quantitative aspects, Q 'is an effective method for turning subjective statements into an objective outcome' (Akhtar-Danesh, Baumann, & Cordingley, 2008, p. 770). Invented by psychologist William Stephenson in the 1930s, Q methodology locates shared viewpoints in a purposely-selected group of people about an issue. One of the many strengths of Q's abductive approach lies in its exploratory and theory-generating potential, because typically no hypotheses are formulated before the execution of the study (Stenner, Dancey, & Watts, 2000). Many studies have shown Q to be a reliable method (Watts & Stenner, 2012). Moreover, Lo Bianco (2015) describes Q as a valuable research method in the field of language policy and for plans to explore and define 'the nature and complexity of communication problems' (p. 70) by mapping out the field of arguments, positions, and the underlying discourses in the debates about multilingualism.

Research design

To identify the complexity of teachers' beliefs about multilingualism in general, multilingual students in particular and respect the approach to the concept of teachers' beliefs mentioned above, the participants in this study were given two Q samples to complete. The first aimed to capture their underlying understanding of the subject while the

second explored the teachers' suggested pedagogical action regarding multilingualism and multilingual students. Stainton Rogers and Stainton Rogers (1990) describe this procedure as, in practice, a means of exploring what cultural elements tend to be voiced in conjunction with each other thus providing a further level of interpretation. In the current study, the subdivision into *understanding* and *pedagogy* does justice to the complex nature of the studied teachers' beliefs.

Various sources, such as academic literature, popular science magazines, educational policy documents and discussions with teachers were used in an unstructured way to gather a variety of items containing various discourses of multilingualism. Four domain experts and two experienced Q researchers were then approached to evaluate the statements, which were reformulated in a language the participants were likely to use and understand (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002) and represent the nuanced thoughts of teachers as closely as possible. All experts focused on the same criteria: simplicity, clarity, wording, and breadth and depth (Paige & Morin, 2016; Watts & Stenner, 2012). This procedure is especially important for the de-contextualised Q statements and resulted in a reduction of the items and the creation of two separate Q samples which were piloted with twelve teachers and teacher trainers. After some further adjustments, the Q samples for the current study were finalised. While the first component study (called *understanding* in this paper) comprises a 39-item Q sample, the second (called *pedagogy* in this paper) is a Q sample comprising 32 items.

Data collection

In 2017, the researcher visited all the schools and was present during the collection of the empirical data. The participants were provided with explanatory information about the research project and signed a consent form. They then completed a short questionnaire supplying additional demographic details. Next, the participants were asked to perform a card-ranking activity using the 39 items on *understanding*. Each item had to be assigned a hierarchical position in a forced-choice, quasi-normal and symmetrical distribution according to the extent to which the statement was felt to describe the participant's understanding of *multilingualism* and *multilingual students*. The face-validity dimension among which the items had to be sorted was labelled as 'most disagree' to 'most agree', and the most negative value (−4) represented the left pole while the most positive value (+4) was located on the right pole. The aim of this dynamic procedure was to generate a single and holistic configuration of all the items, consisting of each participant's constant comparison between the items. The product is considered to be a dynamic representation of their viewpoint on the subject. Some participants added one or several reasons for their choices of items at +4/−4 by writing on the back of the page. The procedure was repeated with the 32-item Q sample about *pedagogy*, the second component discussed in this present paper.

Analytical procedures

The data for the 40 participants was statistically analysed using the dedicated software, PQMethod (Schmolck, 2014). The software offers a variety of by-person factor-extraction and rotation methods and provides the researcher with a number of statistical measures. After properly exploring the data by engaging with the process of factor rotation in an

-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
29	12	1	17	4	13	3	28	9
[1]	5	7	25	21	11	31	26	[1]
	8	22	10	20	2	18	15	
		30	24	27	23	16		
	[3]		6	19	32		[3]	
		[4]		14		[4]		
			[5]		[5]			
				[6]				

Figure 1. Factor array for Factor 1-P on *pedagogy*.

investigatory fashion (Watts & Stenner, 2012), the most informative solution for each component was chosen, which resulted in the application of different data-reduction techniques. Q sorts on *understanding* were subjected to principal components analysis² and centroid factor analysis was used for the related Q study on *pedagogy*. One can refer to Kline (1994) for a point-by-point comparison between principal component analysis and centroid factor analysis. For both components, the automatic varimax procedure was used to rotate the factors according to statistical criteria and account for the maximal amount of opinion variance (Watts & Stenner, 2012). After the elimination of factors with insufficient statistical strength, three accounts of *understanding* (Factors 1-U, 2-U and 3-U) were identified, which, when taken together, explain 56% of the opinion variance. A simple equation outline in Brown (1980, pp. 222–223) was used to calculate each Q sort’s significance at the $p < 0.01$ level: $2.58(1/\sqrt{\text{no of items}})$. For this first component, factor loadings of at least ± 0.41 were significant at the $p < 0.01$ level and 26 of the 40 Q sorts loaded significantly on one of these three factors. In the related *pedagogy* study, three factors (Factors 1-P, 2-P and 3-P) were extracted, accounting for 55% of the opinion variance. Here, 31 of the 40 Q sorts loaded significantly (± 0.45 at the $p < 0.01$ level) on only one of these three factors. All Q sorts loading significantly on the same factor were merged to a single ideal-typical Q sort according to a procedure of weighted averaging. This shared, distinct understanding of the subject matter is called a *factor array*. Figure 1 shows the factor array for Factor 1-P on *pedagogy*. The top line represents the values (–4 to +4) and the numbers in brackets show how many items could be allocated per value.

To move from the factor arrays to the factor interpretations, a careful and holistic inspection of the patterning of items within a factor array was applied by using the crib sheet method (Watts & Stenner, 2012). Apart from the three items on top and at the bottom of the factor array, the crib sheet also focuses on items, which are ranked higher or lower in a particular factor array relative to other factor arrays. As a consequence, even items ranked zero (indifferent) in one factor are important for the interpretation of this factor if the same item is given extreme scores on other factors (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002).

Results

Three sets of teachers’ beliefs have emerged in the current research project. Each of these sets consists of one factor in each of the two components. Despite their varying explained

Table 1. Quantitative summary for all factors.

		Understanding			Pedagogy		
		1-U	2-U	3-U	1-P	2-P	3-P
Explained opinion variance		28%	12%	16%	26%	10%	19%
Significant loadings	Women	13	3	4	13	5	4
	Men	1	4	1	2	4	1
	Urban	9	3	5	10	6	4
	Rural	5	4	0	5	3	1

opinion variance indicating their statistical strength, all three emerged factors in the *understanding* component and all three emerged factors in the *pedagogy* component meet sufficient statistical criteria to be included in this study. The respective explained opinion variance and significant loadings, separated by gender and school context are shown in Table 1.

The following result section is structured according to the three sets teachers' beliefs which have emerged. A short quantitative description including the statistical connection between the components is followed by a summary of the underlying understanding of multilingualism and multilingual students (component 1) and a more detailed narrative of the suggested pedagogical action (component 2). In these qualitative interpretations of the single factors, which have been given titles for mnemonic reasons (Stenner et al., 2000), the numbers in brackets represent factor item rankings. Taking Factor 1-P for example, we can see that (20: -1) indicates that item 20 was ranked in the -1 position by the merged average of all participants significantly loading on this factor. Relevant comments by participants are also cited in the interpretations, followed by the number of the Q sort in parentheses.

The Q-sort items and the allocated values for each of the three factors in the second component are presented in Table 2 at the end of the results section as a reference. The single Q-sort items and allocated values for the first component on *understanding* can be requested from the author.

Teachers' belief set 1 (TBS1) – let us help you exercise your right to be multilingual!

A total of 14 respondents load significantly on Factor 1-U, explaining 28% of the opinion variance in the *understanding* component and 15 respondents load significantly on Factor 1-P, which explains 26% of the opinion variance in this second component. Twelve out of the 14 respondents aligning with Factor 1-U also load significantly on Factor 1-P, illustrating the clear connection between the two components. Five of these 12 are however listed as confounded, because they also show a significant loading on Factor 3-P. One teacher loads on Factor 2-P and one on Factor 3-P.

Due to the high-explained opinion variance of Factors 1-U and 1-P, it can be concluded that this first teachers' belief set represents the group consensus, which mainly draws from the common disciplinary socialisation that teachers share.

Understanding Factor 1-U

Participants loading strongly on Factor 1-U have a highly positive understanding of multilingualism and do not identify any negative changes that occur at school with the presence

Table 2. Q-sort values for items in *pedagogy*.

	Factors	1-P	2-P	3-P
1	It is important that students with low motivation can withdraw from foreign language classes	-2	-4	-1
2	Multilingualism is an important topic of debate in education	1	1	2
3	A common language is important	2	3	1
4	Multilingual students need additional support to learn Swedish	0	1	0
5	Multilingual students should not learn additional languages but rather focus on the ones they already know	-3	-2	-2
6	Everybody should be functionally trilingual	-1	0	-3
7	Multilingual students need special education support	-2	-2	-2
8	Multilingual and monolingual students should learn Swedish separately	-3	-2	-2
9	Multilingualism is a right at school	4	1	3
10	Multilingual students should be evaluated in their mother tongue	-1	-3	-1
11	Schools should have access to multilingual material	1	1	1
12	Competence in more than two languages is unnecessary. One foreign language is sufficient	-3	-3	-1
13	Cooperation with the multilingual students' parents is vital for the students' success.	1	2	1
14	Teaching materials should include multilingualism as a topic	0	-1	0
15	A common attitude towards multilingualism is important among the teaching staff	3	1	2
16	Schools ought to change their way of teaching due to a society's increased multilingualism	2	-2	0
17	Separate languages should be taught separately	-1	-1	-2
18	Students should be encouraged to use their full linguistic repertoire	2	-1	3
19	The school needs more concrete guidelines concerning multilingualism	0	1	1
20	I treat every student the same regardless of their mother tongue	0	4	4
21	Here, Swedish is the norm and not the students' multilingualism	0	3	-3
22	Students with a migration background should be excluded from foreign language classes	-2	-3	-1
23	Multilingualism should be a part of teacher education programmes	1	-1	2
24	Multilingual students should take a preparatory course before they take part in regular classes	-1	3	0
25	Multilingual students often need reduced individual learning objectives	-1	0	-1
26	Multilingual students have the right to receive individual support in their mother tongue	3	2	0
27	Teaching staff should receive information about multilingualism to distribute to parents and students	0	0	0
28	Being allowed to use all their languages during lessons helps multilingual students in their general learning	3	0	2
29	We need a 'Swedish only' policy in our public schools here	-4	0	-3
30	I don't understand the students' mother tongue, so I don't want them to use them	-2	2	-4
31	Teachers of different language subjects should collaborate closely	2	-1	1
32	A central task of the teacher is the systematic support of the students' multilingual self-perception	1	0	3

of multilingualism. In the view of these teachers, multilingual students generally do not experience problems at school. On the contrary, they believe multilingualism develops verbal skills and produces cognitive advantages.

The teachers representing Factor 1-U consider the mother tongue spoken at home to be a crucial aspect for students' educational success and correspondingly believe that the Swedish competence of the parents of multilingual students is irrelevant. They regard multilingual students as a valuable resource for society and multilingualism as a positive influence on their own teaching practices.

Pedagogy Factor 1-P

Teachers loading on Factor 1-P do not treat every student the same but rather individualise their pedagogical practices according to the students' mother tongue (20: -1). This is due to their awareness of the needs of multilingual students and the respondents' acknowledgment that individual support in the students' mother tongue is needed (26: 3). However, they do not believe that multilingual students need reduced individual learning objectives (25: -2) or any additional support to learn Swedish (4: 0). Teaching Swedish as a second language to multilingual students and not integrating them in standard Swedish

classes is clearly opposed (8: -3), for example because of the missed chance to provide good linguistic examples for weaker students (Q sort 21). Also, the idea of sending such students to preparatory courses before they are permitted to take part in regular classes is rejected (24: 0).

Most important for these teachers is the idea that multilingualism is a right at school (9: 4), and they hold that all schools ought to adapt their teaching practices in response to society's increased multilingualism (16: 2). Although they do not see multilingualism as a high priority topic for schools (2: 1), a common attitude towards the topic among the teaching staff is considered to be of prime importance (15: 3), as this is considered to communicate a positive signal to students (sort 3) and promote closer collaboration among language teachers (31: 2). Nonetheless, according to Factor 1-P, there is no need for more concrete guidelines concerning multilingualism (19: 0).

This factor clearly opposes the idea of a 'Swedish only' policy in public schools (29: -4). On the contrary, these teachers believe that multilingual students' use of all their languages during lessons will assist them in their general learning (28: 3), and therefore, Factor 1-P respondents are in favour of allowing translanguaging strategies in their classes (30: -2) and encourage this multiple language use (18: 2).

Despite their view that functional trilingualism is not considered entirely necessary (6: -1), teachers loading on this factor clearly want all their students to learn more than two languages (12: -3) and hold that multilingual students should learn additional languages rather than focus on the ones they already know (5: -3).

Teachers' belief set 2 (TBS2) – you're tolerated. Now adapt!

At total of 7 respondents load significantly on Factor 2-U, explaining 12% of the opinion variance in the understanding component and 9 respondents load significantly on Factor 2-P, which explains 10% of the opinion variance in this second component. Four out of the seven respondents aligning with Factor 2-U also load significantly on Factor 2-P. One teacher loads on Factor 1-P, one on Factor 3-P and one participant shows no significant loading in the *pedagogy*-component. TBS2 consists of a comparatively high percentage of male respondents. Moreover, in the understanding component, teachers from the rural schools outnumbered their colleagues from the urban school, despite the much smaller numbers of participants.

Understanding Factor 2-U

The topic of multilingualism is considered to have gained too much prominence in schooling. The aligning respondents doubt if their engagement with questions of multilingualism broadens their horizon as a professional. However, they expressed the view that increased multilingualism among students does make their task to communicate social values more difficult.

Teachers loading on this factor believe that children who are raised monolingually can become multilingual and that multilingualism can be a resource for learning additional languages. However, they do not believe that multilingual children have a bigger vocabulary nor any particular cognitive advantages or any higher cultural awareness.

Respondents aligning with Factor 2-U do not believe in the benefits of speaking the students' mother tongue at home and the Swedish competence of multilingual students' parents is considered to be crucial for any successful collaboration between schools and parents.

Pedagogy Factor 2-P

According to Factor 2-P, multilingualism should not be an important topic at school (2: 1), while a common language is vital (3: 3). The normative assumption that the use of Swedish language should be an uncontested reality in Swedish schools (21: 3) is confirmed by the comment that the students' educational success is more likely if their Swedish language competency is good (Q sort 8). The logic of these positions is that multilingualism essentially constitutes a problem, which undermines the assumed monolingual norm, where students are painted in terms of deficit. The suggestion of implementing a 'Swedish only' policy in public schools is not categorically opposed by the respondents loading on Factor 2-P (29: 0), and moreover, multilingualism is not necessarily seen as a right at school (9: 1), which means that no school ought to change its teaching practices due to society's increased multilingualism (16: -2). It follows from these beliefs that it is not the teachers' central task to systematically support the students' multilingual self-perception (32: 0).

According to the belief system of this factor, multilingual students are essentially considered problematic because they usually require additional support, for example, to learn Swedish (4: 2) or to even be able to participate in regular class activities (24: 3). Although drawing a distinction between subjects called *Swedish* and *Swedish as a Second Language* is strongly opposed (8: -2), Factor 2-P holds that multilingual students should be well prepared before they meet monolingual Swedish students. Yet, they often need reduced individual learning objectives (25: 0), which seems to be rather disturbing to the teachers loading on this factor, as they want to treat every student the same, regardless of their mother tongue (20: 4). Therefore, it is not surprising that these teachers regard it as absolutely unimportant that students with low motivation may be excluded from foreign language classes (1: -4). Perhaps they should not be excluded (22: -3) because school is not a place where the student can choose subjects but rather receives the same schooling as everybody else. A different interpretation for this strong statement against the possible exclusion from language subjects is provided by Q sort 32, which states that all students of migrant backgrounds should be obliged to participate in Swedish classes. It is implied that respondent 32 means Swedish when referring to the foreign language for non-Swedish students.

Without the support of teachers and well-functioning cooperation with their parents, multilingual students will not achieve similar levels as native Swedish students and will not be successful (13: 2). At the same time, respondents who align with this factor prefer to receive information about multilingualism that can be distributed to parents and students (27: 0) rather than include multilingualism in teaching materials (14: -1) or in teacher education (23: -1) thereby keeping the responsibility to inform their students. Moreover, there does not need to be additional collaboration among teachers (31: -1), and a common attitude towards multilingualism within the teaching staff is not considered to be particularly important (15: 1).

The formulation of this factor does not permit any translanguaging strategies during lessons. Students should not be encouraged to use their full linguistic repertoire (18: -1). Teachers loading on this factor do not wish to hear mother tongues unknown to

them during lessons (30: 2) and believe that it does not facilitate the students' learning process (28: 0); additionally, the evaluation of multilingual students in their mother tongue is unthinkable for this factor (10: -3).

These teachers acknowledge the necessity of competence in more than two languages (12: -3) but are not convinced that everybody needs to be functionally trilingual (6: 0), and particularly, that multilingual students may be better off focusing on the languages they already know (5: -2).

Teachers' belief set 3 (TBS3) – why make such a fuss? Everyone will be fine

At total of 5 respondents load significantly on Factor 3-U, explaining 16% of the opinion variance in the understanding component and 5 respondents load significantly on Factor 3-P, which explains 19% of the opinion variance in this second component. Four out of the five respondents aligning with Factor 3-U also load significantly on Factor 3-P. One of them shows however a confounded viewpoint with an additional significant loading on Factor 1-P. One teacher loads on Factor 1-P and one participant shows no significant loading in the *pedagogy*-component. No teacher from the schools in the rural area aligns with Factor 3-U and only one with Factor 3-P.

The factors in TBS3 share a relatively high inter-correlation with the first factors in their component (Factors 1-U and 1-P), indicating that those factors are not mutually exclusive and could statistically be considered two different manifestations of the same consensus factor (Watts & Stenner, 2012). However, in terms of content, Factors 3-U and 3-P represent different viewpoints and are therefore kept as an independent set of teachers' beliefs.

Understanding Factor 3-U

Although Factor 3-U adherents do not believe mass immigration to be the reason for society's increased multilingualism, they state that children are either monolingual or multilingual and that it is impossible to become multilingual. At the same time, these teachers see many benefits of being multilingual, such as the enhanced development of general verbal skills and the increased capacity to use effective reading strategies. According the teachers loading on Factor 3-U, multilingualism also produces cognitive advantages and permits children to gain new perspectives on their surroundings. In general, multilingualism here is seen as the key to effective communication, contacts and an asset towards gaining employment.

These teachers see the school as heavily and positively influenced by the students' individual multilingualism and do not consider that additional efforts are required, most likely because any potential problems of being a non-native Swedish speaker are opposed by this factor.

Pedagogy Factor 3-P

Arising from principles of personal integrity and to avoid discrimination, teachers loading on Factor 3-P want to treat every student the same regardless of their mother tongue (20: 4). They see equal treatment as a fundamental principle of a teacher's professional practice (Q sorts 4, 5 and 9). At the same time, equal treatment does not mean identical teaching. A distinction between these notions is key to the reasoning underlying this factor. Given that students' individual multilingualism is considered normative (21: -3) and multilingualism

is seen as a right at school (9: 3), the idea of a 'Swedish only' policy at public schools is therefore strongly opposed (29: -3) and multilingualism is considered to be an important topic of debate in education (2: 2). However, no additional support for multilingual students is considered necessary, which is a main distinction in relation to TBS1. Other special measures such as preparatory courses (24: 0), additional support to learn Swedish (4: 0), special education support (7: -2), mother tongue instruction (26: 0) or reduced individual learning objectives (25: -1) are all deemed unnecessary. Teachers loading on this factor also oppose the separate learning and teaching of *Swedish as a second language* from regular *Swedish* (8: -2). At the same time, they adhere to the view that multilingual students should be excluded from foreign language classes altogether (1: -1) if they show low motivation. Students with migrant backgrounds should generally be excluded from these lessons (22: -1) and focus on the languages they already know instead (5: -2). These items correspond well with a low agreement with the statement that everybody should be trilingual (6: -3) and that one foreign language is sufficient (12: -1). Q sort 4 underlines this by saying that students do not necessarily feel better with more languages and they should be able to choose themselves if they wish to learn an additional language.

Teachers aligning with this factor consider the systematic support of students' multilingual self-perception as a central task (32: 3) and that learning about multilingualism should also be included in teacher education programmes (23: 2). Although respondents loading on this factor believe it is important to present a common attitude towards multilingualism as the teaching staff of a school (15: 2), they are unsure if schools should adapt to the society's increased multilingualism (16: 0). There does not necessarily need to be an increase in the cooperation between the multilingual students' parents and the teachers (13: 1), not even in the form of external information be provided to parents (27: 0).

Teachers loading on factor 3-P see extensive benefits in students' use of their full linguistic repertoire during lessons (30: -4), as they believe that this aids the students in their general learning (28: 2). They consider that students should be actively encouraged to draw on all their available translanguaging strategies (18: 3), and they could even accept evaluating students in their mother tongues (10: -1). Q sort 40 states that it is the teacher's own problem if they do not understand the students and not the students' duty to use the dominant language.

Discussion

The main objective of the present paper is to investigate the spread and depth of the beliefs shared by teachers on the understanding of and suggested pedagogical approaches to multilingualism and multilingual students in Swedish primary school. The patterns in the two components are highly similar and lead to clear connections between the factors across the components, which allowed the creation of three sets of teachers' beliefs, consisting of information from both components.

Summaries of teachers' belief sets

TBS1 falls largely in line with the current state in educational linguistics, which is generally favourably disposed towards a pluralistic approach to teaching. In this approach,

the concept of translinguaging, which promotes a better understanding of class content, creates a stronger home-school connection and allows for better participation between weaker and stronger learners in mixed-ability classes is supported (Paulsrud et al., 2017). TBS2 serves as the antithesis to TBS1, as it takes a critical stance towards the subject matter of multilingualism, displaying a more personal and political identity rather than the professional viewpoint found in the other two belief sets. The illustrated rather traditional understanding of language education rooted in a monolingual ideology is typical to nation-states and their construction of 'the recognition/accommodation of linguistic diversity as a *threat* to the maintenance of national cohesion and related notions of social and political stability' (May, 2017, p. 3, italics in original). Teachers loading on TBS3 agree with their colleagues aligning with TBS2 that there is no need to change their professional practice due to the increased societal diversity in Sweden, however, they see multilingualism as a benefit and do not show a deficit-oriented view of multilingual students.

Context

The high percentages of teachers in the rural areas of Sweden loading on TBS2 indicate that professional experience in terms of student population has an influence on how *multilingualism* and *multilingual students* are received. On the one hand, the lack of engagement with non-native speakers of Swedish obviously nurtures insecurity about the topic and scepticism of more pluralistic approaches to teaching. However, on the other hand, all teachers except for one from the rural schools that significantly load on Factor 1-P also load on Factor 1-U in *understanding*. Ultimately, this means that if teachers have a positive understanding of multilingualism, even if they rarely work with multilingual students in their daily professional context, they will opt for a more pluralistic way of teaching. Generally, school affiliation seems to be more predictive in the *understanding* component, where only 18% of the teachers in the urban school load on Factor 2-U compared to the 44% in the rural schools. However, in *pedagogy*, the difference of 3% between urban and rural educators loading on Factor 2-P is miniscule.

Consensus across the teachers' belief sets

The three teachers' belief sets align closely on certain topics. A finding which stands in clear contrast to current teaching practices and education policy in Sweden, is the explicit disagreement with the separation of languages by all sets. While a critical discourse about the subject of *Swedish as a Second Language* exists, the single-language subjects are generally not questioned (Rosén, 2017). Another consensus across all the sets is the positive attitude towards the acquisition of new languages by multilingual students. However, the European Commission's (2004) recommendation that at least three languages should be taught from an early age receives a rather low ranking by all teachers' belief sets in the present Q study, confirming the dominant language constellation in Sweden and the Swedish understanding of the term *multilingual student* which only represents people with another first language than Swedish.

Complexity awareness as a prerequisite for change

The results of the current research study suggest that the discrepancy between language policies promoting more pluralistic approaches to teaching and teachers' pedagogical decision-making in classrooms is at least partly based on teachers' beliefs rooted in monolingual and traditional ideologies. Bearing in mind that 'belief change during adulthood is a relatively rare phenomenon' (Pajares, 1992, p. 325), a complexity lens was applied to gain awareness of the underlying structures of these predominant sets of teachers' beliefs, because a better understanding of how teachers think is a prerequisite to deconstruct and rebuild teachers' beliefs in favour of multilingual education (Young, 2014). As research shows, awareness of the complexity of concepts such as multilingualism is 'critically important for practicing teachers who work with diverse populations of pupils' (Aronin & Jessner, 2015, p. 287) in order to 'acknowledge the individual differences among learners, which call for differentiated instruction' (Larsen-Freeman, 2014, p. 232) and eventually prepare them for our diverse world, where multilingualism is more complex than simply positive or negative.

Final remarks

The current study indicates that pluralistic approaches to language teaching, including translanguaging as a recent concept with a growing acceptance in the literature (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017), are, on a conceptual level, well-accepted among teachers at Swedish primary schools investigated in this study. There is no intention to claim that the results of the current study are statistically representative for all Swedish primary teachers. Yet, a genuine representation of factors discovered in Q studies can be seen to exist in a larger population (Brown, 1980; Dryzek & Holmes, 2002). Further research is needed to explore the representation of the various teachers' beliefs in practice.

Several misconceptions about multilingualism were revealed, which are often based on monolingual ideologies still predominant in the Swedish nation-state. The fact that all students and not just those who are already multilingual, can benefit from pluralistic teaching practices (Molyneux, Scull, & Aliani, 2016) calls for an intensified collaboration between policy makers, schools and families in order to help all students become successful language users. Moreover, the findings in current study are in line with Young (2014), who states that 'the absence of a declared language policy referring explicitly to plurilingual pupils, who are not new arrivals, is leaving ordinary class teachers in limbo' (p. 167). In addition, the clear connections between the two components in this study indicate that the more well-informed the teachers are about multilingualism, the more fitting their proposed course of action at a pedagogical level becomes. The main implication of this study is that an intensified pre- and in-service teacher education about benefits and challenges of current multilingualism as a complex phenomenon is needed. The ultimate aim is to educate more benevolent gatekeepers in terms of language variation (Boyd, 2003), more multilingual development in the classroom (Aronin, 2015) and an open public debate about the unique Swedish view of multilingualism.

Notes

1. The term 'plurilingualism' is often used when referring to individual language repertoires. To ensure continuity with earlier research, in this paper, the terms 'multilingualism' and 'multilingual' are used to refer to both individual and societal multilingualism.
2. Although the results of principal component analysis as an extraction option are usually called *components*, the term *factors* will be used for improved readability.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes on contributor

Adrian Lundberg's current research focuses on educational language policy and multilingualism in the Nordic countries and Switzerland.

ORCID

Adrian Lundberg <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8555-6398>

References

- Akhtar-Danesh, N., Baumann, A., & Cordingley, L. (2008). Q-methodology in nursing research. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 30(6), 759–773.
- Aronin, L. (2015). Current multilingualism and new developments in multilingual research. In M. P. Safont-Jordà & L. P. Falomir (Eds.), *Learning and using multiple languages: Current findings from research on multilingualism* (Vol. 1, pp. 1–27). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Aronin, L., & Jessner, U. (2015). Understanding current multilingualism: What can the butterfly tell us? In U. Jessner & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *The multilingual challenge: Cross-disciplinary perspectives* (pp. 271–291). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Aronin, L., & Singleton, D. M. (2012). *Multilingualism*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bialystock, E. (2011). Reshaping the mind: The benefits of bilingualism. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 65(4), 229–235.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36, 81–109.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. London: Continuum.
- Boyd, S. (2003). Foreign-born teachers in the multilingual classroom in Sweden: The role of attitudes to foreign accent. In A. Creese & P. W. Martin (Eds.), *Multilingual classroom ecologies: Inter-relationships, interactions and ideologies* (pp. 123–135). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Brown, S. R. (1980). *Political subjectivity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 401–417.
- Cenoz, J. (2003). The additive effect of bilingualism on third language acquisition: A review. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 7(1), 71–87.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). Focus on multilingualism: A study of trilingual writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 356–369.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: Threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(10), 901–912.

- Cots, J. M., Lasagabaster, D., & Garrett, P. (2012). Multilingual policies and practices of universities in three bilingual regions in Europe. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 216, 7–32.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 221–240.
- Daryai-Hansen, P., Gerber, B., Lörcincz, I., Haller, M., Ivanova, O., Krumm, H.-J., & Reich, H. H. (2015). Pluralistic approaches to languages in the curriculum: The case of French-speaking Switzerland, Spain and Austria. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 12(1), 109–127.
- De Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or additional language acquisition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- De Angelis, G. (2011). Teachers' beliefs about the role of prior language knowledge in learning and how these influence teaching practices. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 8(3), 216–234.
- Dryzek, J. S., & Holmes, L. (2002). *Post-communist democratization: Political discourses across thirteen countries*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ernest, J. M. (2001). An alternate approach to studying beliefs about developmentally appropriate practices. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 2(3), 337–353.
- Ernest, J. M. (2011). Using Q methodology as a mixed methods approach to study beliefs about early childhood education. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 5(2), 223–237.
- European Commission. (2004). *Promoting language learning and linguistic diversity. An action plan 2004–2006*. Luxembourg: Directorate-General for Education and Culture.
- Flores, N., & García, O. (2013). Linguistic third spaces in education: Teachers' translanguaging across the bilingual continuum. In D. Little, C. Leung, & P. V. Avermaet (Eds.), *Managing diversity in education* (pp. 243–256). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell/Wiley.
- Grin, F., Sfreddo, C., & Vaillancourt, F. (2010). *The economics of the multilingual workplace*. New York: Routledge.
- Haukås, Å. (2016). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 13(1), 1–18.
- Henderson, K. I. (2017). Teacher language ideologies mediating classroom-level language policy in the implementation of dual language bilingual education. *Linguistics and Education*, 42, 21–33.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Johnson, D. C. (2007). Slicing the Onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(3), 509–532.
- Hult, F. M. (2012). English as a transcultural language in Swedish policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly: A Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages and of Standard English as a Second Dialect*, 46(2), 230–257.
- Hult, F. M. (2014). How does policy influence language in education? In R. E. Silver & S. M. Lwin (Eds.), *Language in education: Social implications* (pp. 159–175). London: Continuum.
- Jessner, U. (2008). Teaching third languages: Findings trends and challenges. *Language Teaching*, 41(1), 15–56.
- Jessner, U., & Kramersch, C. (2015). Introduction: The multilingual challenge. In U. Jessner & C. Kramersch (Eds.), *The multilingual challenge: Cross-disciplinary perspectives* (pp. 1–18). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Jonsson, C. (2017). Translanguaging and ideology: Moving away from a monolingual norm. In B. Paulsrud, J. Rosén, B. Strasz, & Å Wedin (Eds.), *New perspectives on translanguaging and education* (Vol. 108, pp. 20–37). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Jørgensen, J. N. (2008). Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5(3), 161–176.
- Josephson, O. (2004). *Ju: ifrågasatta självklarheter om svenskan, engelskan och alla andra språk i Sverige*. Stockholm: Norstedts akademiska förlag.
- King, L., & Carson, L. (Eds.). (2017). *Multilingual identities: A study of attitudes towards multilingualism in three European cities*. London: The Languages Company.
- Kline, P. (1994). *An easy guide to factor analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Kramersch, C. (2014). Teaching foreign languages in an era of globalization: Introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(1), 296–311.

- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2014). Complexity theory. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (pp. 227–244). New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2005). Globalisation and national communities of communication. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 29(2), 109–133.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2015). Exploring language problems through Q-sorting. In F. M. Hult & D. C. Johnson (Eds.), *Research methods in language policy and planning: A practice guide* (pp. 69–80). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lundberg, A. (2018). Multilingual educational language policies in Switzerland and Sweden: A meta-analysis. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 42(1), 45–69.
- May, S. (Ed.). (2014). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- May, S. (2017). Language education, pluralism, and citizenship. In T. L. McCarty & S. May (Eds.), *Language policy and political issues in education* (pp. 2–16). Cham: Springer.
- Menken, K., & Garcia, O. (2010). *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policy-makers*. New York: Routledge.
- Molyneux, P., Scull, J., & Aliani, R. (2016). Bilingual education in a community language: Lessons from a longitudinal study. *Language and Education*, 30(4), 337–360.
- Paige, J. B., & Morin, K. H. (2016). Q-sample construction: A critical step for a Q-methodological study. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 38(1), 96–110.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307–332.
- Paulsruud, B., Rosén, J., Straszer, B., & Wedin, Å. (2017). *New perspectives on translanguaging and education* (Vol. 108). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Reath Warren, A. (2018). Monoglossic echoes in multilingual spaces: Language narratives from a Vietnamese community language school in Australia. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 19(1), 42–61.
- Ricento, T. K., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the Onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, 401–427.
- Rokeach, M. (1968). *Beliefs, attitudes, and values: A theory of organization and change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rosén, J. (2017). Spaces for translanguaging in Swedish education policy. In B. Paulsruud, J. Rosén, B. Straszer, & Å Wedin (Eds.), *New perspectives on translanguaging and education* (Vol. 108, pp. 38–55). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Schmolck, P. (2014). PQMethod. Release 2.35. Retrieved from <http://schmolck.userweb.mwn.de/qmethod/downloadpqmac.htm>
- Soler, J., & Vihman, V.-A. (2018). Language ideology and language planning in Estonian higher education: Nationalising and globalising discourses. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 19(1), 22–41.
- Stainton Rogers, R., & Stainton Rogers, W. (1990). What the brits got out of the Q: And why their work may not line up with the American way of getting into it!. *Electronic Journal of Communication*, 1(1), 1–11.
- Stenner, P., Dancey, C. P., & Watts, S. (2000). The understanding of their illness amongst people with irritable bowel syndrome: A Q methodological study. *Social Science & Medicine*, 51, 439–452.
- Swedish Ministry of Culture. (2009:600). Language Act (2009:600).
- Tholin, J. (2012). If you get double the time: Teaching practices in the “Swedish/English” language subject option in Swedish nine-year compulsory schooling. *Apples – Applied Language Studies*, 6(1), 69–91.
- Watts, S., & Stenner, P. (2012). *Doing Q methodological research: Theory, method and interpretation*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- 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.

IV

Teachers' viewpoints about an educational reform concerning multilingualism in German-speaking Switzerland

Adrian Lundberg^{a,*}

^a Malmö University, Malmö, Sweden

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Multilingual education
Teacher cognition
Switzerland
Innovation implementation
Q methodology

ABSTRACT

Multilingualism is ubiquitous in European mainstream education and has increasingly found its way into educational policy documents. Teachers interpret these documents and make pedagogical decisions based on their experiences and beliefs in order to manage their classrooms. The overtly multilingual polity of Switzerland underwent a paradigmatic shift in language teaching in line with a multilingual turn and provides a particularly useful context to investigate the covert educational language policy by exploring sixty-seven primary teachers' subjective viewpoints about multilingualism. The qualitative interpretation of the inverted factor analytical result uncovers a gap between the common understanding of the nature of multilingualism and the fragmented intentions of pedagogically reacting to linguistic diversity in the classroom. In conclusion, the current study shows the need for a continuation of professional development and establishment of supportive school conditions for the implementation of this large-scale innovation endeavour in the context under scrutiny.

1. Introduction

The current research project investigates teachers' viewpoints about multilingualism¹ and multilingual students in the context of mainstream multilingual education. In a time of a large-scale innovation programme based on regenerated theories of teaching and learning of second and additional languages and against the backdrop of increased international migration, multilingualism is of prime relevance for a wide range of educational settings.

This paper reports about the situation in Switzerland, which has self-constructed a political identity that differs from most other European states (Stotz, 2006). Switzerland has experienced the co-existence of four linguistically distinct communities and has applied the principles of territoriality and subsidiarity to consolidate national cohesion. The pride in linguistic pluralism and regional diversity is described as the essence of Swiss cultural identity and resonates largely with the advice by Lo Bianco (2017) that 'multilingualism should be centrally associated with shared communication, social cohesion and economic and civic betterment' (p. 45–46). It is often assumed that if a polity of a state such as Switzerland is multilingual, the population is also multilingual (Schiffman, 1996). That is not the case *per se*, but multilingualism, with varying proficiencies in the registers of different

linguistic codes, is a key element of the Swiss national culture (Schwab, 2014) and deep-seated in the national education system on an overt policy level. In fact, people's individual multilingualism is one of the main objectives in current Swiss curricula for primary and secondary schooling, mainly achieved via foreign language teaching and learning. Since 'language policy is never developed and implemented in a historical, social, or political vacuum' (May, 2015, p. 45), the language policy landscape of the particular setting, in the present case German-speaking Switzerland, needs to be explored.

1.1. Educational language policy and planning in Switzerland

Due to the decentralised and federalist structure of Switzerland, the organisation of schools falls within the remit of the cantons and a large amount of autonomy is assigned to the municipalities. The Swiss Conference of Cantonal Ministers of Education (EDK) coordinates the work of the cantons through intercantonal agreements and recommendations. Prior to HarmoS (EDK, 2007), the large-scale innovation and harmonisation process in national education, which came into effect on 1 August 2009, Switzerland knew 26 different curricula, one for each canton. Currently, there are three different curricula; *Le plan d'études romand* for western, French-speaking Switzerland, *Il piano di*

* Corresponding author. Malmö University, Malmö, Sweden.

E-mail address: adrian.lundberg@mau.se.

¹ Although Moore and Gajo (2009) have proposed the term *plurilingualism* for the 'study of individuals' repertoires and agency in several languages' (p. 138), the terms *multilingualism* and *multilingual* are used in this article to describe both societal and individual multilingualism in order to ensure continuity with earlier research and the dominant use of the terms *Mehrsprachigkeit* and *mehrsprachige SchülerInnen* in German-speaking Switzerland.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2019.101244>

Received 6 February 2019; Received in revised form 30 July 2019; Accepted 4 August 2019

Available online 14 August 2019

0959-4752/ © 2019 The Author. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

studio for southern, Italian-speaking Switzerland and *Lehrplan 21* for central and eastern, German-speaking Switzerland. In terms of the number of languages taught and the age of onset, all of these curricula follow the EDK's Strategy of Language Teaching (EDK, 2004). In addition to the local dominant official language, all children in Switzerland learn an additional official language of the country and English. While the word *additional* would imply an additive approach (Spolsky, 2009), the Swiss education system applies the term *foreign* languages when referring to any language other than the regionally dominant official language, including other Swiss national languages. Hence, the first foreign language is generally learned from 5th school year² onwards and the second foreign language is learned from the 7th school year onwards. All curricula thereby respect the European Union's policy objective of 'mother tongue plus two other languages' (European Commission, 2004, p. 16) and present the basic condition to become multilinguals, which 'is a prerogative and duty of the citizens of this multilingual state' (Stotz, 2006, p. 252) from a confederate discourse perspective, where cultural diversity and mutual understanding are of prime importance. Representing a more federalist discourse, popular initiatives are still pending in certain cantons to limit the teaching and learning to only one foreign language in primary school, and focusing rather on English than a second official language of Switzerland. The third discourse described by Stotz (2006) is connected to globalisation and 'is a bottom up, populist discourse [to serve] the need for transnational integration and opportunities for wealth creation' (p. 257). The second and third discourses have led to the fact that English is taught as a first foreign language in cantons in Eastern Switzerland. Because of this failure to have a harmonised policy, the six cantons along the French-German language boarder agreed to a common project curriculum for foreign language learning in 2006, which was named *Passepartout* and later integrated into process-oriented *Lehrplan 21*. Since the current study focuses on the canton of Berne, the *Passepartout* curriculum (Bertschy, Egli Cuenat, & Stotz, 2015) is described in more detail.

1.2. A pluralistic curriculum in a monolingual context

The *Passepartout* curriculum is highly prescriptive in terms of teaching methods and desired outcomes and represents a paradigmatic shift from a rather monolingual to a multilingual approach in language teaching and learning in Swiss primary and secondary schools. The sum of new approaches and methods involved clearly meets the definition of complex and multilevel innovations provided by Century and Cassata (2016).

Moreover, the curriculum is based on current research about third language acquisition and is in many ways in line with the multilingual turn in language teaching and learning described by May (2014), including the acknowledgment of multilingual speakers' fluid language practices in their full complexity (García, 2009). As an example, even though the term *translanguaging* is not mentioned in the curriculum, characteristics of pedagogical translanguaging, especially its spontaneous application referring 'to the reality of bi/multilingual usage in naturally occurring contexts' (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017) are clearly recognisable. In summary, *Passepartout* represents a language as a resource orientation (Hult & Hornberger, 2016; Ruiz, 1984) and showcases an affinity to multilingualism described as part of the Swiss national identity (Giudici & Grizelj, 2017). In the curriculum, language learning is considered a lifelong process and teachers are encouraged to see potential challenges due to migration induced multilingualism as beneficial for students' academic success (Maluch, Kempert, Neumann,

& Stanat, 2015). However, as stated by Spolsky (2009), 'the school as an institution normally works towards uniformity and monolingualism' (p. 91), which has traditionally also been the case in Switzerland and still is true, when regarding the organisation of language education. Even though the curriculum suggests different ways of connecting the teaching and learning of German, French, English and students' mother tongues, all languages are represented as separate units in planning and schedules, indicating a monolingual norm at school (Jonsson, 2013) as opposed to a more heteroglossic and combined use of linguistic resources in the classroom. Maintaining boundaries between languages can also be seen as representing an entrenched monolingual nationalist ideology (Musk, 2010). Another example can be drawn from the misalignment between the new curriculum and the traditional way of assessing language competence in the canton, where the native speaker of the target language is the reference. Teachers find themselves in the midst of the tension between long standing codes, norms and conventions they have relied upon (Kramsch, 2014) and new educational language policy fostering a more fluid understanding of language use. In other words, the context and conditions, which 'can affect innovation enactment in legitimate ways' (Century & Cassata, 2016, p. 172), are not ideal for a prompt enactment of new policies according to their intentions, especially because they involve a rather high level of self-doubt and uncertainty (Geijsel, Slegers, van den Berg, & Kelchtermans, 2001) among the teachers.

1.3. Teacher cognition and teacher education

Within language education policy, decisions about languages and their uses in educational contexts (Shohamy, 2006), are understood as multidimensional, involving scales of social organization (Hult, 2018). In the current implementation research article, the focus is put on teachers as 'active, thinking decision-makers' (Borg, 2003, p. 81) and 'policy arbiters' (Johnson, 2013; Menken & García, 2010). The importance of their role in making educational reforms successful is generally accepted (Dori & Herscovitz, 2005) and particularly their subjective perceptions based on what Borg (2015) describes as teacher cognition when he refers to 'the complex, practically-oriented, personalized and context-sensitive networks of knowledge, thoughts and beliefs' (p. 321) play a pivotal role in the potential enactment of policies (Coburn & Talbert, 2006). In the results section, the label *teacher viewpoint* will be used to describe the collectivity of their beliefs, including cognitions of different consciousness levels and objective truth that potentially explain their classroom decision-making (e.g. Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992) and pedagogical practices (Richardson, 1996) in connection with multilingualism.

Concurrently, a number of studies have reported on a discrepancy between theoretical multilingual pedagogies and current classroom practice (e.g. Cenoz & Gorter, 2011; Cummins, 2007; Daryai-Hansen et al., 2015). Reasons for teachers' resistance to implement research based curricular reformation are diverse. General teacher education often does not devote a sufficient amount of time to teachers' knowledge development about multilingualism and multilingual pedagogy (De Angelis, 2011; Lundberg, 2019; Otwinowska, 2014), despite the fact that professional development activities are regarded 'as important for fostering the implementation of large-scale innovations by teachers' (Geijsel et al., 2001, p. 132). On the one hand, teacher education is supposed to help interpret and negotiate (Menken & García, 2010) and on the other hand critically reflect on and engage with policy to avoid educators merely acting as servants of the system that follow top-down initiatives unquestioningly (Hult, 2018; Shohamy, 2006). Providing teachers with multiple opportunities of reflection about culturally diverse schools and classrooms is shown to confront their biases (Kumar & Lauermann, 2018). Furthermore, if language teachers do not recognise an increased efficiency of language learning, they are reported to be resistant to implementing a new approach (Egli Cuenat, 2011; Jakisch, 2014).

² With *HarmoS*, two years of kindergarten are counted as the first two years of schooling. This new way of counting years of school is applied in this study to ensure continuity with the new curriculum in the context. Example: 5th school year equals two years of pre-school and third year of primary school.

As outlined by Haukås (2016) in her study about teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach, changes in teachers' beliefs and pedagogical approaches take time and only happen if the teachers are convinced that the modifications are for the better. In order to 'persuade' the educational establishment to consider the possible value of multilingualism' as described as the first level of conflict by Spolsky (2009, p. 91), a further education course of 72 contact hours was made compulsory as a implementation support strategy (Century & Cassata, 2016) for all in-service primary school teachers of French and English in the *Passepartout* region and was organised in several meetings over a time span of 18 months. These courses addressed teachers' language competences, teachers' methodological didactical competences and introduced new textbooks for French and English in a sustained way consisting of a multitude of feedback cycles and collaborative learning opportunities. During numerous sessions in the course, the teachers were asked to carefully analyse the highly prescriptive curriculum and become 'critical, culturally responsive and potentially transformative' (Arias, 2012, p. 17). During the *Passepartout* professional development courses, which measure up to many structural and core features of effective in-service education (Bell & Gilbert, 1996; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001), teachers often found themselves navigating between new policies and best practices communicated during the course on the one hand side and their own experience and beliefs on the other hand side. Pre-service teacher education in the context under scrutiny was also adapted by adding didactics of multilingualism and the presentation of the new textbooks to the syllabi of relevant subjects. In the remainder of this paper the term *Passepartout* course will be used for both, pre- and in-service education settings.

The present educational language policy implementation study tackles hardly observable teachers' subjective viewpoints about multilingualism and multilingual students on a conceptual level and about potential pedagogical actions, which serve as language management tools in their content classroom. Considering the policy-practice gap reported in the several studies mentioned above and the difficulty to change beliefs (Pajares, 1992) a range of different viewpoints, showcasing different degrees of acceptance of the current curriculum for language learning as a by-product, can be expected.

2. Methodology

The purpose of this investigation is to de- and reconstruct underlying linguistic ideologies in predominant teachers' viewpoints without imposing researcher-defined categories onto them in order to investigate covert educational language policies in Swiss primary schools with regard to the adapted overt educational policy situation in multilingual Switzerland.

2.1. Research design

Q methodology (henceforth Q) is regarded as particularly well suited to investigate subjective phenomena that are not entirely consciously accessible (Irie, Ryan, & Mercer, 2018). This is partly because the participants are provided with the necessary language to describe and label their beliefs (Ernest, 2001).

Psychologist William Stephenson invented Q in the 1930s to locate shared viewpoints in a purposely-selected group of people about an issue by combining the qualitative Q sorting technique and the inverted, by-person Q factor analysis as opposed to the more traditional by-variable factor analysis known as R methodology (Watts & Stenner, 2005). The resulting abductive approach with great exploratory and theory-generating potential is an interactive, dynamic and operant methodology (Brown, 1980). In the field of language policy, Lo Bianco (2015) advocates Q as a valuable research method to investigate 'the nature and complexity of communication problems' (p. 70) by delineating underlying discourses in the debates about multilingualism.

Constructing the set of cards, called Q sample, is achieved by collecting, evaluating, culling and reformulating statements with the aim of approaching individuals 'in terms of their own priorities, values, beliefs and opinions' (Ernest, 2011, p. 234) in a language the participants are familiar with (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002) but represent the nuanced thoughts of the participating educators. The statements in the present study were initially compiled with an unstructured approach (Watts & Stenner, 2012) using a variety of sources, such as academic literature, popular science magazines, educational policy documents and discussions with teachers. Four domain experts, whereas two from the Swiss context, and two experienced Q researchers evaluated each statement in terms of simplicity, clarity, wording, breadth and depth (Paige & Morin, 2016; Watts & Stenner, 2012) in order to reach a balanced and well-formulated Q set with a good coverage of the issue in question.

To align the methodology with this study's theoretical foundation drawing on teacher cognition and language education policy, the statements were separated into two sets of cards. While the statements on the cards in the first study component (henceforth called *understanding*) aimed to reveal the teachers' underlying understanding of and belief about central concepts in linguistically diverse school settings, the second one (called *pedagogy*) focused on potential pedagogical practices regarding multilingualism and multilingual students. The two final Q samples were piloted with twelve teachers and teacher trainers and again slightly adjusted.

2.2. Research setting

As Q methodology represents an inversion of more traditional R methodological research techniques, each participant in this study was purposefully selected and treated as a variable. The main sampling criterion was the expectation of the participants to have a defined viewpoint that matters in relation to multilingualism in education. To achieve a heterogeneous group of teachers in a city, which can be seen as a distinguished proving ground for 'understanding social diversity and complexity' (King & Carson, 2017, p. 3), three primary schools in the metropolitan area of Berne were selected to illustrate a range of schools with regard to size and linguistic composition. Since all teachers meet students of diverse linguistic background and all students in mainstream classrooms learn several languages, all teachers at these three schools were invited to participate. Sixty-seven of them, representing a participation rate of 55%, agreed to share their viewpoint on a voluntary basis.

School A is the smallest school with around 150 students of almost exclusively (Swiss)-German language background. Seven teachers participated from the school and all except for one teacher had attended a *Passepartout* course. From School B with its 250 students of mixed linguistic origin, only 3 out of the 25 participating teachers had attended a *Passepartout* course. School C has about 350 students and a migration background was common among these children. Thirty-five teachers from this school participated in the current study and 14 of them had attended a *Passepartout* course. The differences in the percentage of teachers' participation in *Passepartout* is due to their distribution of French and English lessons among the teaching staff and the low support for the innovative curriculum reform by School B's principal, resulting in an unfavourable condition for this school's improvement (Dori & Herscovitz, 2005; Thoonen, Slegers, Oort, Peetsma, & Geijssels, 2011). In addition to the compulsory subjects, all participating schools provide lessons in German as a second language and offer mother tongue instruction programmes upon request.

2.3. Data collection

All participating schools were visited in 2017 and the researcher was present during the face-to-face collection of the empirical data. Before completing a short demographic questionnaire, including their

← most disagree					most agree →				
-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	
30	21	25	17	27	28	9	32	20	
	22	7	6	26	11	2	23		
[1]	29	1	10	31	15	3	18	[1]	
		[3]	8	12	4	16	14		
			5	19	13				
		[4]		24		[4]	[3]		
			[5]		[5]				
				[6]					

Fig. 1. Factor array for consensus viewpoint 1 in the second study component on pedagogy.

self-assessment of their foreign language skills, the participants were briefed about the research project and signed a consent form. The participants were then asked to physically sort the 39 statements on *understanding* according to a set pattern determined by a sorting grid (see Fig. 1 for a completed sorting grid on pedagogy). Items they disagreed with more strongly had to be put closer to the left pole (−4), while the statements with the most agreement were located towards the right pole (+4). The aim of this forced choice procedure for each participant was a single and holistic configuration of all the statements, called a Q sort, taking into account the connections and relations between the statements. The participants were asked to add comments about their choice of items at +4/−4 as well as, according to them, missing items by writing on the back of the page. The procedure was repeated with the 32 statements for second component about pedagogy.

2.4. Data analysis

The empirical data for the 67 participants was quantitatively analysed using the dedicated software PQMethod (Schmolk, 2014), applying a by-person factor analysis as a data-reduction technique. By engaging with the processes of principal components analysis and varimax rotation in an investigatory fashion (Watts & Stenner, 2012), the most informative solution for each component was selected. For each viewpoint, a factor array, that is a single ideal-typical Q sort according to a procedure of weighted averaging of all significantly loading Q sorts, was created. The consensus factor in the second component is illustrated in Fig. 1. The values are shown in the top line, while the numbers in brackets indicate the number of items per value. The crib sheet method by Watts and Stenner (2012) was used to carefully and holistically inspect the patterning of items in the factor arrays and prevented the oversight of items ranked zero (indifferent) in a particular factor for description of its viewpoint if they were given extreme scores in other factors.

3. Results

The results section is divided into the two study components starting with *understanding*, followed by pedagogy.

3.1. Component 1: What do multilingualism and multilingual students mean to you?

After the elimination of factors with insufficient statistical strength, two factors could be kept for the first component. A total of 51 respondents loaded significantly (at ± 0.41 at the $p < 0.01$ level) on only one of the factors and an additional 14 were confounded with significant loadings on both factors, indicating that they are not mutually exclusive, but rather two manifestations of one consensus viewpoint called A. Together they explain 52% of the variance and share a rather high intercorrelation (0.55). Viewpoint A is presented in a narrative fashion below. Since there are relevant differences between the two manifestations with regard to the sorting of specific statements, they are then described separately, using distinguishing statements and called A+ and A−.

3.1.1. Viewpoint A: the broad consensus

Sixty-five out of 67 participating teachers significantly loaded on Viewpoint A and show a general agreement of multilingualism as a resource, where students can draw on knowledge in different language while learning new languages, regardless of their first language. They believe that multilingualism has no negative influence on their school environment and the communication of social skills. On the contrary, coping with multilingualism is experienced to broaden the teachers' professional horizon. They are certain not to regard students with mother-tongue-like skills in the local dominant language as monolingual, but respect these students' full linguistic repertoire. At the same time, multilingual students do not need to speak all of their languages fluently to be considered multilingual. The consensus viewpoint is generally unsure about cognitive aspects of multilingualism.

3.1.2. Viewpoint A+: foreign language teachers

This viewpoint explains 33% of the study variance and had a total of 37 respondents loading significantly on this factor without a second significant loading on A−. Nineteen out of these 37 teach at least one foreign language (French or English) and almost all of them have received *Passepartout* pre- or in-service education about a multilingual pedagogical approach.

Respondents adhering to Viewpoint A+ believe that monolinguals can become multilinguals and that they do not necessarily have another mother tongue than (Swiss-)German. Moreover, they are sure that multilingualism is not a consequence of mass migration, but a result of their teaching. Not seeing any particular problems with (Swiss-)German or general problems in school is therefore in line with their understanding of multilingualism.

3.1.3. Viewpoint A−: other teachers, including German teachers

The 14 significant loadings on this viewpoint explain 19% of the study variance. Except for two, whereas one with *Passepartout* course participation, Viewpoint A− adherents do not teach foreign languages. Since none of the participating schools was a bilingual school, it can be concluded that a vast majority of teachers loading on this viewpoint teach in German. They regard their students' parents' (Swiss-)German skills as crucial for the educational success of their children and consider it a fact that multilingual students do not have a bigger vocabulary than their monolingual peers. Moreover, they can see a potential frustration coupled with multilingualism.

3.2. Component 2: How should multilingualism and multilingual students be handled according to you?

Six accounts, which together explain 73% of the variance were identified for the second component about the suggested pedagogical actions of teachers. They are displayed in Fig. 2, where the size of the shape roughly represents the explained study variance of each factor. 47 of the 67 Q sorts loaded significantly on one of these six factors. Factor loadings of at least ± 0.45 were significant at the $p < 0.01$ level and the number of significant loadings per factor is as well visible in Fig. 2.

From a purely statistical point of view, the case for only two separate factors could be made due to high factor intercorrelations among five of the six viewpoints. Viewpoints 1 to 5 are visually represented on the left-hand side and connected with arrows to illustrate their interconnection. Viewpoint 1 serves as the consensus and is in line with national policy documents about multilingualism and a professional stance. The other four viewpoints below Viewpoint 1 are a result of a certain level of insecurity in connection with linguistic diversity and can be distinguished by their approach to overcome their lack of knowledge about the topic. Viewpoint 2 shows a positively evolving stance, while the remaining three viewpoints are much more traditional and less open-minded. A further distinction can be made between Viewpoints 4 and 5, which both show aspects of a nationalist ideology. Viewpoint 4 agrees with potential policies to secure a monolingual

Fig. 2. Quantitative summary and visual representation of all viewpoints in the second component.

norm, whereas Viewpoint 5 applies a more self-centred approach in overcoming linguistic diversity. Viewpoint 6 has no significant inter-correlation with other viewpoints. While Viewpoint 1 could be considered the most favourable one due to its sound agreement with current research about multilingual pedagogy, the other viewpoints are equally interesting as they pinpoint critical issues in the teachers' socio-cultural reality and allow a vital discussion about multilingualism in education. Fig. 2 also lists the distribution of loadings in the first component (*understanding*) per viewpoint in the second component to illustrate the connection between the two questions posed.

This quantitative summary of all viewpoints is followed by the qualitative interpretation and description of single viewpoints, named to evoke their interpretation, using as many items from the Q sample as possible. The numbers in brackets show factor item values. Taking Viewpoint 1 as an example, (20: 4) indicates that item 20 was ranked in the 4 (most agree) position by the merged average of all participants significantly loading on this factor. The possibility of adding comments about the reasons for the sorting was used often and integrated into the viewpoint descriptions. Comments adding a further layer of interpretation or improved clarity of the viewpoints are quoted in the interpretations, followed by the number of the Q sort in parentheses. The viewpoints' names are enriched with a symbolic and mnemonic statement formulated by the researcher.

3.2.1. The consensus Viewpoint 1 – Multilingualism is good for all of us!

Twenty-two respondents load significantly on Viewpoint 1, explaining 25% of the opinion variance. Additional seven out of eight respondents not loading significantly on a single factor had a high loading on Viewpoint 1, indicating an even stronger consensus.

The teachers loading on this viewpoint consider multilingualism to be an important topic at school (2: 2), beneficial for everybody (Q sort

59) and a right of every student (9: 2). They treat everybody the same (20: 4), which is understood as a non-discriminating act and to provide the same rules for all students (Q sort 50). Moreover, students with migration background should not be excluded from foreign language learning (22: –3).

They consider the students' individual multilingualism as the norm (21: –3) and want to support them develop their multilingual self-perception (32: 3). At the same time they believe it is quite important to have a common language (3: 2) for a functioning communication (Q sort 60), but a 'German-only policy' is not requested (29: –3). Q sort 7 underlines his viewpoint about the importance of a common language with functioning communication and a feeling of togetherness.

Translanguaging strategies are allowed by the teachers loading on this factor (30: –4, 28: 1) and are also used to develop the students' self-perception (Q sort 42). They even encourage their students to use their full linguistic repertoire (18: 3). Evaluating multilingual students in their mother tongue is however considered to be difficult (10: –1) or impossible due to lacking language skills of the teacher (Q sort 60).

While multilingualism should be part of teachers' education (23: 3) and included in teaching materials (14: 2), information to hand out to parents is not requested (27: 0). Schools should however adapt to the society's increase multilingualism (16: 1).

3.2.2. The evolving Viewpoint 2 – With some more information, we can do it together!

The teachers loading on this factor want more collaboration, for example with multilingual students' parents (13: 4), who highly influence their children's success with their attitude (Q sort 58) or among language teachers (31: 3) who should promote a common attitude about multilingualism (15: 2). They also see massive advantages in

receiving multilingual teaching materials (11: 3) to increase the students' joy of learning languages (Q sort 64) and the inclusion of multilingualism in textbooks (14: 2). They believe multilingualism is an important topic at school (2: 2) and should be part of teacher education (23: 2). On the whole, this factor shows quite some willingness to change, even in the teachers' professional practices (16: 1).

These teachers highlight the importance of a common language (3: 3) and the non-necessity of a 'German-only policy' (29: -3), while they still see German as the norm (21: 1). At the same time, they are unsure about multilingualism as a right at school (9: 0), if multilingual students should receive individual support in their mother tongue (26: 1) or to learn German (4: 0) and if they should treat every student the same (20: 0).

All students, regardless of their linguistic background and competence, should learn German together (8: -3) in order to benefit from positive consequences of peer learning (Q sort 64). No students should be allowed to withdraw from language subjects due to low motivation (1: -4) or be excluded because of another mother tongue (5: -2). However, one foreign language is considered being enough (12: -2) and the teachers loading on this factor are unsure about the concept of translanguaging (18: 1, 28: 0, 30: -1, 10: -1).

3.2.3. *The traditionalist Viewpoint 3 – That's just the way it is! We're not going to change!*

Multilingualism is important (2: 3) and should be part of teachers' education (23: 3), partly because of insecurity among teachers (Q sort 40). Nevertheless, schools don't necessarily need to change their practices due to the society's increased multilingualism (16: -1). Even though the teachers loading on this factor are unsure about the need of being trilingual (6: 0), they see the benefits of learning additional languages (12: -3) by all students (1: -4, 5: -3, 22: -2). Moreover, they feel it is the reality of school and life in general to be forced to do things you don't like (Q sorts 39, 55, 65).

The evaluation of students in their mother tongue is unthinkable for these teachers (10: -3). Generally, translanguaging is not considered to be a beneficial concept (30: 1, 18: 1, 28: 0). In addition, using other languages would allow students to make fun of peers and teachers would not realise it (Q sort 55). Students with other mother tongues should rather go to preparatory classes (24: 2) to learn German, because a common language is important (3: 3) and then come back to these teachers' classes.

Every student is treated the same, regardless of linguistic background (20: 4). The teachers loading significantly on this factor have however experienced the need for additional support for multilingual students (4: 2). This is accompanied with the belief that neither individual support for these students (26: -1) nor multilingualism as a whole is a right (9: 0).

3.2.4. *The policy Viewpoint 4 – A monolingual policy could make our job easier!*

The teachers loading on this factor consider multilingualism to be an important topic at school (2: 3), as it is challenging German as the uncontested norm (21: 3) and because a common language is important (3: 4) for vital and fast communication during the lessons (Q sort 46). Even a 'German-only policy' is not entirely opposed (29: 0).

There exists a strong attitude against the objective of what Q sort 38 calls forced trilingualism for every student (6: -4, 12: 2) and the use of translanguaging strategies (18: -3, 10: -2, 28: -1, 30: 1). Language subjects should not be merged (17: 2) and multilingualism does not need to be included in teaching materials (14: 0).

Multilingual students are not in need of special education support (7: -3) or reduced learning objectives (25: -3). Nor should they necessarily go to preparatory classes (24: -1) or expect individual support in their mother tongue (26: -1).

While schools don't need to change their practices (16: 0), the teachers desire to receive information material about multilingualism to hand out to parents of multilingual students (27: 3). At the same time, the cooperation with these parents is not considered to be vital (13: 0).

3.2.5. *The self-centred Viewpoint 5 – We have more work because of multilingualism even though we have nothing to do with it!*

The teachers loading on this factor consider multilingualism being an important topic (2: 3) because it is challenging German as the uncontested norm (21: 4). At the same time, no 'German-only policy' is regarded necessary (29: -4) and schools do not need to adapt to the increased diversity (16: -1). All students are entitled to receive the same treatment (20: 3). Multilingual students however need additional support and thereby increase the teachers' workload by creating reduced learning objectives (25: 2) or organising additional German classes (4: 2).

These teachers request more concrete guidelines about multilingualism (19: 1) and a discussion about the topic within the teaching staff to present a common attitude (15: 1). An intensified collaboration between language teachers is however not considered to be beneficial (31: -1), as language subjects should be taught separately (17: 2).

Multilingualism shouldn't be included in teacher education (23: -2), as it is not the teachers' task to support the multilingual self-perception of the students (32: -1). Translanguaging strategies are opposed by the teachers representing this factor (30: -3, 10: -2, 28: 0, 18: 0) and trilingualism is not a responsible learning objective for all students (6: -3, 12: -2). Multilingual students should not be excluded from foreign language learning (1: -3), considering the fact that the common language at school (German) is a foreign language for these students.

3.2.6. *The minimalist Viewpoint 6 – I don't do more than necessary to make it work!*

Although the single teacher loading significantly on this factor believes multilingualism is right at school (9: 3), he considers a common language, especially among peers, to be important (3: 4) and therefore suggests additional support for multilingual students to learn German (4: 3) in order to facilitate learning in other subjects and for the integration into normal classes. They should at the same time be excluded from other language subjects (22: 3) to let them focus on the languages they already know or need to know (5: 2). Generally, learning one foreign language is considered being sufficient (12: 2, 6: -1). While German could also be taught separately to L1 and L2 students (8: 0), probably due to the different pre-conditions, other language subjects could be merged (17: -3). In terms of translanguaging, this teacher shows a rather inconsistent account. While he seems to be aware of the benefits of using all languages in classes (28: 1), he does not think multilingual students should be encouraged to use their full linguistic repertoire (18: -1). If they do it however, he accepts it (30: -2). An evaluation in the students' mother tongues is considered to be an overkill (10: -3).

Multilingualism is not considered being an important topic at school (2: -1) and teaching materials do not need to cover it (14: -1). The teacher loading on this factor does not request more concrete guidelines about the topic (19: -2) and sees no benefit in a common attitude about it within the teaching staff (15: -2). A 'German-only policy' is clearly opposed (29: -4).

Multilingual students neither need special education support (7: -3) nor reduced learning objectives (25: -2). Cooperation with their parents is however vital for the educational success (13: 2).

4. Discussion

The objective of the present curriculum implementation study is to investigate shared subjective teachers' viewpoints about multilingualism and potential pedagogical language management practices in connection with a large-scale innovation in increasingly linguistically diverse settings.

4.1. *The professional consensus*

Both of these study components display viewpoints in favour of a language as resource orientation (Rufz, 1984), adapted by the current

foreign language curriculum. Due to the intense undertaking of a mandatory further education which is largely in line with literature about effective professional development for teachers (Garet et al., 2001), the implementation of the new curriculum affected all teachers and involved them in discussions about changes or even paradigmatic shifts in the teaching and learning of foreign languages and the handling of multilingualism in educational contexts. It can be assumed that a resulting common disciplinary socialisation was a vastly influential factor resulting in a large consensus among the participants of the study. However, the results also suggest a relationship between discourses of a Swiss national identity, where multilingualism is a key element, and the understanding of the subject matter. After all, all teachers considered themselves capable of communicating in more than one language. It is telling that even the traditionalist Viewpoint 2 in the second study component is in line with a confederate discourse perspective (Stotz, 2006).

4.2. The personal stance

Apart from the striking consensus, a distinction between foreign language teachers, who consider their own teaching as an important component of the students' multilingualism, and all other teachers, who teach in the dominant school language German, could be drawn in the first study component. Due to their intense and sustained examination of the new curriculum and its didactic principals based on pluralistic approaches, it is hardly surprising that foreign language teachers seem to be better at navigating new language policies to cater their students' needs (Hult, 2014) as policy arbiters (Menken & García, 2010). Furthermore, the aim of their teaching is the development of the students' multilingualism, where teachers of other subjects use language as a means and potentially see more difficulties with linguistic diversity in their classes.

While the professional development course *Passepartout* seemed to have had a larger influence on what multilingualism means to the teachers (study component 1), their reactions to pedagogical actions (study component 2) are rather rooted in their personal stance, where previous classroom experience as students and teachers are a strong influence and difficult to ignore. On an institutional scale, this result on teachers' viewpoints can be interpreted as in line with the schools' effort towards uniformity and monolingualism (Spolsky, 2009).

The most intriguing viewpoints in the second component are arguably the ones that indicate a certain level of uncertainty, which is an expected source of concern for teachers in 'a turbulent policy environment' (Geijsel et al., 2001, p. 134) during the introduction of a large-scale innovation like *HarmoS*. Especially viewpoints 3, 4 and 5 base their reactions to pedagogical actions on long standing traditions in their teaching context, which is in line with research on uncertain teachers (Thoonen et al., 2011). The discrepancy between new policies and routines, including the organisation of (separate language) subjects and expectations concerning forms of assessment, is still too substantial to allow teachers to fully implement a paradigmatic change concerning multilingualism as the norm. The rather moderate readiness to encourage students' use of translanguaging capacities, which enjoy a growing acceptance in literature (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017), serves as an illustrative example of the teachers' current dilemma. Especially teachers of other subjects than foreign languages seem to lack expertise in how to make use of their students' full linguistic repertoire. This result would suggest that professional development courses on topics of multilingualism should be offered to all educators and not be limited to foreign language teachers.

4.3. The importance of context

Participants of this study are teachers from schools of different size and with different student populations. Contrary to the expectation to be able to trace back specific viewpoints to particular school settings,

results in this study indicate a neglectable role assigned to local context. The understanding of multilingualism and its management in the classroom was rather influenced by the characteristics of the professional consensus described above, the broader regional context and the Swiss cultural identity. This result stands in clear contrast to a similar study in the Swedish nation state context (Lundberg, 2019), where no professional development endeavour about multilingualism was organised. There, three different viewpoints, each consisting of an *understanding* and a *pedagogy* component, could clearly be assigned to local contexts with varied degree of student diversity.

4.4. Limitations and further directions

Even though the present study contributes to the existing literature about teacher cognition, the results only describe shared viewpoints in three schools. While Q methodology does not aim to make generalisations in the sense of pertaining statistical inference, factors discovered with this research methodology serve to contradict established preconceptions about a particular category of people. Against the backdrop of the faint or even absent importance of the local context, the results of this study clearly show that neither school size, nor their student composition or school leadership are decisive in terms of their understanding of multilingualism. Nevertheless, similar research in other schools, especially in other linguistic areas of Switzerland, where a more product-oriented curriculum is applied, would indicate if there exist significant differences among representatives from different linguistic communities or if there is a common, language and curriculum independent, understanding of multilingualism in Switzerland.

The study's results suggest that teachers have not yet fully shifted their preference and beliefs in favour of a pluralistic pedagogical approach. However, without a similar study prior to the undertaking of the professional development courses, it is impossible to assign clear value to *Passepartout*. Nevertheless, similar research in a few years will show if teachers are able to accept new practices and draw on new and positive experiences, as adapting to new paradigms is a slow process (Pajares, 1992). Providing motivational conditions in line with the current curriculum to experiment with new pedagogical approaches and reflect upon them will support the teachers' further development (Thoonen et al., 2011). In accordance with this, more research about teachers' language practices, the observable behaviours and choices (Spolsky, 2009) is suggested, as the current project only discusses the teachers' intended practical actions in the classroom. Methodologically, classroom observations could be one way of connecting the described teachers' viewpoints with their practical representations. Moreover, in-depth interviews with teachers from different viewpoints, but also with participants showing confounded results, could lead to a better-informed understanding of the underlying ideologies about multilingualism in the studied Swiss primary schools.

5. Conclusions

To summarise, adapting beliefs about practical language management is incomparably more challenging than about the theoretical understanding of the concept. Neither the teachers' personal and professional experience, nor *Passepartout* seem to be enough to equip all educators with pedagogical strategies to tap all students' linguistic potential and facilitate the formation of multilingual identities. Desirably, especially teachers of other subjects than foreign languages are involved in awareness raising and knowledge development concerning multilingualism and critical teacher agency in (language) policy implementation processes in order to establish proactive school climates that welcome the increasingly heteroglossic classroom reality due to international migration and challenge monolingual ideologies in teaching and learning.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank Mona Holmqvist of Malmö University, Francis M. Hult of University of Maryland, Baltimore County and Joseph Lo Bianco of Melbourne University for their insightful and valuable comments on earlier versions of the manuscript.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2019.101244>.

References

- Arias, M. B. (2012). Language policy and teacher preparation: The implications of a restrictive language policy on teacher preparation. In C. Faltis, & M. B. Arias (Eds.), *Implementing educational language policy in arizona: legal, historical and current practices in SEL* (pp. 3–20). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Bell, B., & Gilbert, J. (1996). *Teacher development: a model from science education*. London: Falmer Press.
- Bertschy, I., Egli Cuenat, M., & Stotz, D. (2015). *Lehrplan Französisch und Englisch [Curriculum French and English]*. Basel/Pratteln: Gremper AG.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: a review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36, 81–109.
- Borg, S. (2015). *Teacher cognition and language education: research and practice*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Brown, S. R. (1980). *Political subjectivity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). Focus on multilingualism: A study of trilingual writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 356–369.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Minority languages and sustainable translinguaging: threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(10), 901–912.
- Century, J., & Cassata, A. (2016). Implementation research: Finding common ground on what, how, why, where, and who. *Review of Research in Education*, 40(1), 169–215.
- Coburn, C. E., & Talbert, J. E. (2006). Conceptions of evidence use in school districts: Mapping the terrain. *American Journal of Education*, 112, 469–495.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 221–240.
- Daryai-Hansen, P., Gerber, B., Liering, L., Haller, M., Ivanova, O., & Krumm, H.-J. et al. (2015). Pluralistic approaches to languages in the curriculum: The case of French-speaking Switzerland, Spain and Austria. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 12(1), 109–127.
- De Angelis, G. (2011). Teachers' beliefs about the role of prior language knowledge in learning and how these influence teaching practices. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 8(3), 216–234.
- Dori, Y. J., & Herscovitz, O. (2005). Case-based long-term professional development of science teachers. *International Journal of Science Education*, 27(12), 1413–1446.
- Dryzek, J. S., & Holmes, L. (2002). *Post-communist democratization: political discourses across thirteen countries*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- EDK (2004a). *Spärchenunterricht in der obligatorischen Schule: Strategie der EDK und Arbeitsplan für die Gesamtschweizerische Koordination*. Retrieved from http://edudoc.ch/record/30008/files/Sprachen_d.pdf, Accessed date: 10 October 2017.
- EDK (2007). *Interkantonale Vereinbarung über die Harmonisierung der obligatorischen Schule (HarmoK-Konkordat)*. Retrieved from http://edudoc.ch/record/24711/files/HarmoK_d.pdf, Accessed date: 10 October 2017.
- Egli Cuenat, M. (2011). Curriculums pour une éducation plurilingue et interculturelle, le projet suisse Passepartout et la formation des enseignants. *ForumSprache*, 1(3), 43–58.
- Ernest, J. M. (2001). An alternate approach to studying beliefs about developmentally appropriate practices. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 2(3), 337–353.
- Ernest, J. M. (2011). Using Q Methodology as a mixed methods approach to study beliefs about early childhood education. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 5(2), 223–237.
- European Commission (2004). *Promoting language learning and linguistic diversity, an action plan 2004–2006*. (Retrieved from Luxembourg).
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: a global perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell/Wiley.
- Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(4), 915–945.
- Geijsel, F., Slegers, P., van den Berg, R., & Kelchtermans, G. (2001). Conditions fostering the implementation of large-scale innovation programs in schools: Teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(1), 130–166.
- Gludici, A., & Grizelj, S. (2017). National unity in cultural diversity: How national and linguistic identities affected Swiss language curricula (1914–1961). *Paedagogica Historica*, 52, 127–154.
- Haukås, Å. (2016). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 13(1), 1–18.
- Hult, F. M. (2014). How does policy influence language in education? In R. E. Silver, & S. M. Lwin (Eds.), *Language in education: social implications* (pp. 159–175). London: Continuum.
- Hult, F. M. (2018). Engaging pre-service English teachers with language policy. *ELT Journal*, 72(3), 249–259.
- Hult, F. M., & Hornberger, N. H. (2016). Revisiting orientations in language planning: Problem, right, and resource as an analytical heuristic. *Bilingual Review/Revista Bilingüe*, 33(3), 30–49.
- Irie, K., Ryan, S., & Mercer, S. (2018). Using Q methodology to investigate pre-service EFL teachers' mindsets about teaching competences. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(3), 575–598.
- Jakisch, J. (2014). Lehrperspektiven auf Englischunterricht und Mehrsprachigkeit. *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht*, 19(1), 202–215.
- Johnson, D. C. (2013). *Language policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jonsson, C. (2013). Translanguaging and multilingual literacies: Diary-based case studies of adolescents in an international school. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 224, 85–117.
- King, L., & Carson, L. (Eds.). (2017). *Multilingual identities: a study of attitudes towards multilingualism in three european cities*. London: The Languages Company.
- Kramsch, C. (2014). Teaching foreign languages in an era of globalization: Introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(1), 296–311.
- Kumar, R., & Lauermann, F. (2018). Cultural beliefs and instructional intentions: Do experiences in teacher education institutions matter? *American Educational Research Journal*, 55(3), 419–452.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2015). Exploring language problems through Q-sorting. In F. M. Hult, & D. C. Johnson (Eds.), *Research methods in language policy and planning: a practice guide* (pp. 69–80). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2017). Accent on the positive: Revisiting the 'Language as Resource' orientation for bolstering multilingualism in contemporary urban Europe. In H. Peukert, & I. Gogolin (Eds.), *Dynamics of linguistic diversity* (pp. 31–48). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lundberg, A. (2019). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism: findings from Q method research. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 20(3), 266–283.
- Maluch, J. T., Kemper, S., Neumann, M., & Stanat, P. (2015). The effect of speaking a minority language at home on foreign language learning. *Learning and Instruction*, 36, 76–85.
- May, S. (Ed.). (2014). *The multilingual turn: implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education*. New York and London: Taylor and Francis.
- May, S. (2015). Language policy and political theory. In F. M. Hult, & D. C. Johnson (Eds.), *Research methods in language policy and planning: a practice guide* (pp. 45–55). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Menken, K., & García, O. (2010). *Negotiating language policies in schools: educators as policymakers*. New York: London: Routledge.
- Moore, D., & Gajo, L. (2009). Introduction – French voices on plurilingualism and pluriculturalism: Theory, significance and perspectives. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 6(2), 137–153.
- Musk, N. (2010). Code-switching and code-mixing in Welsh bilinguals' talk: Confirming or refuting the maintenance of language boundaries? *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 23(3), 179–197.
- Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19, 317–328.
- Otiwinowska, A. (2014). Does multilingualism influence plurilingual awareness of Polish teachers of English? *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 11(1), 97–119.
- Paige, J. B., & Morin, K. H. (2016). Q-sample construction: A critical step for a Q-methodological study. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 38(1), 96–110.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307–332.
- Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 102–119). (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 8(2), 15–34.
- Schiffman, H. F. (1996). *Linguistic culture and language policy*. London: Routledge.
- Schmolck, P. (2014). PQMethod. Release 2.35. Retrieved from <http://schmolck.userweb.mwn.de/qmethod/download.htm>, Accessed date: 20 November 2017.
- Schwab, P. (2014). *The swiss parliament as a plurilingual forum*. Bern: Association of Secretaries General of Parliaments.
- Shohamy, E. G. (2006). *Language policy: hidden agendas and new approaches*. London: Routledge.
- Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stotz, D. (2006). Breaching the peace: Struggles around multilingualism in Switzerland. *Language Policy*, 5, 247–265.
- Thoonen, E., Slegers, P., Oort, F., Peetsma, T., & Geijsel, F. (2011). How to improve teaching practices: The role of teacher motivation, organizational factors, and leadership practices. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(3), 406–526.
- Watts, S., & Stenner, P. (2005). Doing Q methodology: Theory, method and interpretation. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 2, 67–91.
- Watts, S., & Stenner, P. (2012). *Doing Q methodological research: theory, method and interpretation*. Los Angeles: London: SAGE Publications.

Doctoral Dissertations in Education published by the Malmö School of Education

From the publication series *Studia Psychologica et Paedagogica - Series Altera*
Editors: Åke Bjerstedt & Horst Löfgren

17. Löfgren, Horst: The Measurement of Language Proficiency. 1972.
18. Bierschenk, Bernhard: Självkonfrontation via intern television i lärarutbildningen. 1972.
19. Gestrelius, Kurt: Job Analysis and Determination of Training Needs. 1972.
21. Larsson, Inger: Individualized Mathematics Teaching. 1973.
22. Fredriksson, Lennart: The Use of Self-Observation and Questionnaires in Job Analysis. 1974.
23. Idman, Pekka: Equality and Democracy: Studies of Teacher Training. 1974.
26. Holmberg, Ingrid: Effects of Some Trials to Improve Mathematics Teaching. 1975.
27. Lindsten, Carin: Hembygdskunskap i årskurs 3. 1975.
29. Nordén, Kerstin: Psychological Studies of Deaf Adolescents. 1975.
31. Jernryd, Elisabeth: "Optimal auktoritets- och propagandaresistens". 1976.
33. Wiechel, Lennart: Roller och rollspel. 1976.
34. Hedlund, Carl: Commissioned Army Officers. 1976.
37. Wetterström, Magnhild: Medinflytande i skolan. 1977.
42. Eneskär, Barbro: Children's Language at Four and Six. 1978.
45. Leonardsson, Sigurd: Den franska grammatikens historia i Sverige. I. 1978.
46. Leonardsson, Sigurd: Histoire de la Grammaire Française en Suède. II. 1978.
48. Lindholm, Lena-Pia: Pupils' Attitudes to Equality between the Sexes. 1980.
50. Carlström, Inge: Law and Justice Education. 1980.
53. Fritzell, Christer: Teaching, Science and Ideology. 1981.
56. Wiechel, Anita: Olika personalgruppers åsikter om barn i förskola och på lågstadium. 1981.
59. Gran, Birgitta: Från förskola till grundskola: Villkor för barns utveckling i åldrarna kring skolstarten. 1982.
65. Annerblom, Marie-Louise: Att förändra könsroller. 1983.
66. Holmberg, Lena: Om en speciallärares vardag: Analys av en dagbok. 1983.
67. Skov, Poul: Værdinormer om skolen: Analyse af konfliktmuligheder og mulige udviklingslinjer. 1983.
69. Carlsson, Gunborg: Teater för barn: Tre åldersgruppers upplevelser av professionell teater. 1984.
70. Welwert, Claes: Läsa eller lyssna? 1984.
71. Klasson, Maj: Höskolebibliotek i förändring. 1984.
76. Jönsson, Annelis: TV – ett hot eller en resurs för barn? 1985.

77. Berglund, Lars: Decentraliserat högstadium. 1985.
79. Hellström, Leif: Undervisningsmetodisk förändring i matematik: Villkor och möjligheter. 1985.
84. Bjurwill, Christer: Framtidsföreställningar. 1986.
85. Åkerberg, Hans: Livet som utmaning: Existentiell ångest hos svenska gymnasieelever. 1987.
87. Berglund, Brigitte: Pedagogiska dagböcker i lärarutbildningen. 1988.
88. Svensson, Bengt E.: Mot samlad skoldag. 1988.
89. Rosenqvist, Jerry: Särskolan i ett arbetsmarknadsperspektiv. 1988.
91. Varming, Ole: Holdninger til børn. 1988.
93. Löfqvist, Gert: The IEA Study of Written Composition in Sweden. 1990.
94. Digerfeldt, Gunvor: Utvecklingspsykologiska och estetiska aspekter på danslek. 1990.
95. Ekstrand, Gudrun: Kulturens barn: Kontrastiva analyser av kulturmönster avseende förhållandet till barn och ungdom i Sverige och Orissa, Indien. 1990.
96. Rooke, Liselotte: Omvårdnad och omvårdnadsteoretiska strukturer. 1990.
99. Tallberg Broman, Ingegerd: När arbetet var lönen. 1991.
100. Derbring, Lena & Stölten, Charlotte: Sjuksköterskeutbildningens forskningsanknytning – vision och verklighet. 1992.
101. Nissen, Poul: Om børn og unge med fastlåst identitetsudvikling. 1992.
102. Helldén, Gustav: Grundskoleelevers förståelse av ekologiska processer. 1992.
103. Tvingstedt, Anna-Lena: Sociala betingelser för hörselskadade elever i vanliga klasser. 1993.
104. Kühne, Brigitte: Biblioteket – skolans hjärna? Skolbiblioteket som resurs i det undersökande arbetssättet på grundskolan. 1993.
105. Svensson, Ann-Katrin: Tidig språkstimulering av barn. 1993.
106. Rubinstein Reich, Lena: Samling i förskolan. 1993.
108. Heiling, Kerstin: Döva barns utveckling i ett tidsperspektiv. 1993.
111. Henrysson, Lennart: Syo-kulturer i skolan. 1994.
113. Persson, Sven: Föräldrars föreställningar om barn och barnomsorg. 1994.
114. Klason, Satya Mehndiratta: The Quality of Social Relations and Some Aspects of Self-Conception of a Group of Elderly People. 1994.
115. Persson, Bodil: När kvinnorna kom in i männens värld. Framväxten av ett kvinnligt tekniskt yrke – Laboratorieassistent under perioden 1880–1941. 1994.
116. Morsing Berglund, Barbro: Förskolans program för sexåringar. 1994.
117. Gunnarsson, Bernt: En annorlunda skolverklighet. 1995.
119. Persson, Ann-Elise: Ungdomars åsikter om orsaker till, effekter av och åtgärder mot vardagsvåldet. 1995.
122. Ursberg, Maria: Det möjliga mötet: En studie av fritidspedagogers förhållningssätt i samspel med barngrupper inom skolbarnsomsorgen. 1996.

123. Willman, Ania: Hälsa är att leva: En teoretisk och empirisk analys av begreppet hälsa med exempel från geriatrisk omvårdnad. 1996.
124. Hjorth, Marie-Louise: Barns tankar om lek: En undersökning av hur barn uppfattar leken i förskolan. 1996.
128. Engström, Arne: Reflektivt tänkande i matematik: Om elevers konstruktioner av bråk. 1997.
130. Elmeroth, Elisabeth: Alla lika – alla olika: Skolsituationen för elever med båda föräldrarna födda utomlands. 1997.
133. Lepp, Margret: Pedagogiskt drama med fokus på personlig utveckling och yrkesmässig växt: En studie inom sjuksköterske- och vårdlärarutbildningen. 1998.
134. Viggósson, Haukur: I fjärran blir fjällen blå: En komparativ studie av isländska och svenska grundskolor samt sex fallstudier om närhet som en förutsättning för pedagogiskt ledarskap. 1998.
136. Vallberg Roth, Ann-Christine: Könssdidaktiska mönster i förskolepedagogiska texter. 1998.
138. Folkesson, Anne-Mari: Muntlig framställning i årskurs 5. 1998.
140. Olofsson, Sten-Sture: Kvinnliga rektorers ledarstil i svensk grundskola. 1998.
142. Karlsudd, Peter: Särskolebarn i integrerad skolbarnsomsorg. 1999.
143. Eriksson, Keijo: På spaning efter livets mening: Om livsfrågor och livsåskådning hos äldre grundskoleelever i en undervisningsmiljö som befrämjar kunskapande. 1999.
144. Uta Carlsson, Karin: Violence Prevention and Conflict Resolution: A Study of Peace Education in Grades 4-6. 1999.
145. Havung, Margareta: Anpassning till rådande ordning: En studie av manliga förskollärare i förskoleverksamhet. 2000.
146. Hamilton, Ingela: Leva med stroke - lära av erfarenheter. 2000.
147. Månsson, Annika: Möten som formar: Interaktionsmönster på förskola mellan pedagoger och de yngsta barnen i ett genusperspektiv. 2000.
148. Albinsson, Gunilla & Arnesson, Kerstin: Maktutövning ur ett organisations- och genus-perspektiv: En studie vid tre vårdavdelningar. 2000.
149. Campart, Martina: Schooling Emotional Intelligence through Narrative and Dialogue: Implications for the Education of Children and Adolescents. 2000.
150. Arvidsson, Barbro: Group Supervision in Nursing Care: A Longitudinal Study of Psychiatric Nurses' Experiences and Conceptions. 2000.
151. Sandén, Ingrid: Skoldaghem: Ett alternativ för elever i behov av särskilt stöd. 2000.
152. Lovén, Anders: Kvalet inför valet: Om elevers förväntningar och möten med vägledare i grundskolan. 2000.
153. Ivarsson, Heléne: Hälso pedagogik i sjuksköterskeutbildningen. 2000.
154. Möller, Tore: Undervisa mot våld: Attityder, läromedel, arbetssätt. 2001.

155. Hartsmar, Nanny: Historiemedvetande: Elevers tidsförståelse i en skolkontext. 2001.
156. Jakobsson, Anders: Elevers interaktiva lärande vid problemlösning i grupp: En process-studie. 2001.
157. Möllehed, Ebbe: Problemlösning i matematik: En studie av påverkansfaktorer i årskurserna 4-9. 2001.
158. Wetterholm, Hans: En bildpedagogisk studie: Lärare undervisar och elever gör bilder. 2001.
160. El-Zraigat, Ibrahim: Hearing-impaired Students in Jordan. 2002.
161. Nelson, Anders & Nilsson, Mattias: Det massiva barnrummet. 2002.
162. Damgren, Jan: Föräldrars val av fristående skolor. 2002.
163. Lindahl, Ingrid: Att lära i mötet mellan estetik och rationalitet: Pedagogers vägledning och barns problemlösning genom bild och form. 2002.
164. Nordäng, Ulla Karin: Lärares raster: Innehåll i mellanrum. 2002.
165. Lindqvist, Per: Lärares förtroendearbetstid. 2002.
166. Lin, Hai Chun: Pedagogy of Heuristic Contextualisation: Intercultural Transmission through Cross-cultural Encounters. 2002.
167. Permer, Karin & Permer, Lars Göran: Klassrummets moraliska ordning: Iscensättningen av lärare och elever som subjekt för ansvarsdiskursen i klassrummet. 2002.
168. Anderson, Lotta: Interpersonell kommunikation: En studie av elever med hörselnedsättning i särskolan. 2002.
169. Lundgren, Ulla: Interkulturell förståelse i engelskundervisning - en möjlighet. 2002.

Malmö Studies in Educational Sciences

Doctoral Dissertations in Education

Editor: Jerry Rosenqvist

&

Doctoral Dissertations in the Theory and Practice of Teaching and Learning Swedish

Editor: Bengt Linnér

3. Nilsson, Nils-Erik: Skriv med egna ord. En studie av läroprocesser när elever i grundskolans senare år skriver "forskningsrapporter". 2002.
4. Adelman, Kent: Att lyssna till röster. Ett vidgat lyssnandebegrepp i ett didaktiskt perspektiv. 2002.
5. Malm, Birgitte: Understanding what it means to be a Montessori teacher. Teachers' reflections on their lives and work. 2003.
6. Ericsson, Ingegerd: Motorik, koncentrationsförmåga och skolprestationer. En interventions-studie i skolor 1-3. 2003.
7. Foisack, Elsa: Döva barns begreppsbildning i matematik. 2003.
8. Olander, Ewy: Hälsovägledning i barnhälsovården. Syntetisering av två uppdrag. 2003.
9. Lang, Lena: Och den ljusnande framtid är vår. Några ungdomars bild av sin gymnasietid. 2004.
10. Tullgren, Charlotte: Den välreglerade friheten: Att konstruera det lekande barnet. 2004.
11. Hägerfelth, Gun: Språkpraktiker i naturkunskap i två mångkulturella gymnasieklassrum:
En studie av läroprocesser bland elever med olika förstaspråk. 2004.
12. Ljung-Djärf, Agneta: Spelet runt datorn: Datoranvändande som meningsskapande praktik
i förskolan. 2004.
13. Tannous, Adel: Childhood depression: Teachers' and children's perceptions of the symptoms and causes of depression in Jordan. 2004.
14. Karlsson, Leif: Folkhälsopedagogen söker legitimitet: Ett möte mellan pedagogik och verksamhetsförlagd utbildning. 2004.
15. Selghed, Bengt: Ännu icke godkänt: Lärares sätt att erfara betygssystemet och dess tillämpning i yrkesutövningen. 2004.
17. Göransson, Anna-Lena: Brandvägg: Ord och handling i en yrkesutbildning. 2004.
18. Olsson, Rose-Marie: Utbildningskontextens betydelse för lärandeprocesser: Datorstött flexibel utbildningsmiljö för gymnasie studerande. 2005.
19. Enö, Mariann: Att våga flyga: Ett deltagarorienterat projekt om samtalets potential och förskolepersonals konstruktion av det professionella subjektet. 2005.

20. Bergöö, Kerstin: Vilket svenskämne? Grundskolans svenskämnen i ett lärarutbildningsperspektiv. 2005.
21. Hallstedt, Pelle & Högström, Mats: The Recontextualisation of Social Pedagogy. A study of three curricula in the Netherlands, Norway and Ireland. 2005.
22. Cederberg, Meta: Utifrån sett – inifrån upplevt. Några unga kvinnor som kom till Sveige i tonåren och deras möte med den svenska skolan. 2006.
23. Malmberg, Claes: Kunskapsbygge på nätet – En studie av studenter i dialog. 2006.
24. Korp, Helena: Lika chanser på gymnasiet? – En studie om betyg, nationella prov och social reproduktion. 2006.
25. Bommarco, Birgitta: Texter i dialog – En studie i gymnasieelevers litteraturläsning. 2006.

Malmö Studies in Educational Sciences

Doctoral Dissertations in Education

Editor: Lena Holmberg (until April 4, 2007)

Editor: Feiwei Kupferberg (from April 5, 2007)

Editor: Claes Nilholm (from January 1, 2014)

&

Doctoral Dissertations in the Theory and Practice of Teaching and Learning Swedish

Editor: Bengt Linnér (until June 30, 2008)

Editor: Johan Elmfeldt (from July 1, 2008)

Editor: Cecilia Olsson Jers (from June 1, 2011)

26. Petersson, Eva: Non-formal Learning through Ludic Engagement within Interactive Environments 2006.
27. Cederwald, Elisabeth: Reflektion och självinsikt i "Den kommunikativa pedagogiken". 2006.
28. Assarsson, Inger: Talet om en skola för alla. Pedagogers meningskonstruktion i ett politiskt uppdrag. 2007.
29. Ewald, Annette: Läskulturer. Lärare, elever och litteraturläsning i grundskolans mellanår. 2007.
30. Bouakaz, Laid: Parental involvement in school. What hinders and what promotes parental involvement in an urban school. 2007.
31. Sandell, Anna: Utbildningssegregation och självsortering. Om gymnasieval, genus och lokala praktiker. 2007.
32. Al-Sa'd, Ahmed: Evaluation of students' attitudes towards vocational education in Jordan. 2007.
33. Jönsson, Karin: Litteraturarbetets möjligheter. En studie av barns läsning i årskurs F-3. 2007.
34. Lilja Andersson, Petra: Vägar genom sjuksköterskeutbildningen. Studenters berättelser. 2007.
35. Jonsdottir, Fanny: Barns kamratrelationer i förskolan. Samhörighet tillhörighet vänskap utanförskap. 2007.
36. Bergman, Lotta: Gymnasieskolans svenskämnen. En studie av svenskundervisningen i fyra gymnasieklasser. 2007.
37. Schyberg, Solbritt: Högskolelärares personliga teorier om sin pedagogiska praktik. 2007.
38. Eilard, Angerd: Modern, svensk och jämställd. Om barn, familj och omvärld i grundskolans läseböcker 1962 – 2007. 2008.
39. Davidsson, Eva: Different images of science. A study of how science is constituted in exhibitions. 2008.
40. Vincenti Malmgren, Therese: Motiverande grundskolemiljö med fokus på klassrummet. En analys utifrån det obligatoriska skolväsendets läroplansmålsättningar. 2008.

41. Jönsson, Anders: Educative assessment for/of teacher competency. A study of assessment and learning in the "Interactive examination" for student teachers. 2008.
42. Parmenius Swärd, Suzanne: Skrivande som handling och möte. Gymnasieelever om skrivuppgifter, tidsvillkor och bedömning i svenskämnet. 2008.
43. Brante, Göran. Lärare av idag. Om konstitueringen av identitet och roll. 2008.
44. Lutz, Kristian. Kategoriseringar av barn i förskoleåldern. Styrning & administrativa processer. 2009.
45. Löfgren, Lena. Everything has its processes, one could say. A longitudinal study following students' ideas about transformations of matter from age 7 to 16. 2009.
46. Ekberg, Jan-Eric. Mellan fysisk bildning och aktivering. En studie av ämnet idrott och hälsa i skolor 9. 2009.
47. Johnsson, Annette. Dialogues on the Net. Power structures in asynchronous discussions in the context of a web based teacher training course. 2009.
48. Hagström, Birthe. Kompletterande anknytningsperson på förskola. 2010.
49. Jönsson, Lena. Elevers bilder av skolan. Vad elever berättar om och hur lärare och lärarstudenter reflekterar och samtalar om skolan utifrån elevers bilder. 2010.
50. Nilsson, Elisabet M. Simulated "real" worlds. Actions mediated through computer game play in science education. 2010.
51. Olsson Jers, Cecilia. Klassrummet som muntlig arena. Att bygga och etablera ethos. 2010.
52. Leijon, Marie. Att spåra tecken på lärande. Mediareception som pedagogisk form och multimodalt meningsskapande över tid. 2010.
54. Horck, Jan. Meeting diversities in maritime education. A blend from World Maritime University. 2010.
55. Londos, Mikael. Spelet på fältet. Relationen mellan ämnet idrott och hälsa i gymnasieskolan och idrott på fritid. 2010.
56. Christensen, Jonas. A profession in change – a development ecology perspective. 2010.
57. Amhag, Lisbeth. Mellan jag och andra. Nätbaserade studentdialoger med argumentering och responsgivande för lärande. 2010.
58. Svensson, Anna-Karin. Lärarstudenters berättelser om läsning. Från tidig barndom till mötet med lärarutbildningen. 2011.
59. Löf, Camilla. Med livet på schemat. Om skolämnet livskunskap och den riskfyllda barndomen. 2011.
60. Hansson, Fredrik. På jakt efter språk. Om språkdelen i gymnasieskolans svenskämne. 2011.
61. Schenker, Katarina. På spaning efter idrottsdidaktik. 2011.
62. Larsson, Pia Nygård. Biologiämnets texter. Text, språk och lärande i en språkligt heterogen gymnasieklass. 2011.

63. Palla, Linda. Med blicken på barnet. Om olikheter inom förskolan som diskursiv praktik. 2011.
64. Lundström, Mats. Decision-making in health issues. Teenagers' use of science and other discourses. 2011.
65. Dahlbeck, Johan. On childhood and the good will. Thoughts on ethics and early childhood education. 2012.
66. Jobér, Anna. Social class in science class. 2012.
67. Östlund, Daniel. Deltagandets kontextuella villkor. Fem träningskoleklassers pedagogiska praktik. 2012.
68. Balan, Andreia. Assessment for learning. A case study in mathematics education. 2012.
69. Linge, Anna. Svängrum – för en kreativ musikpedagogik. 2013.
70. Sjöstedt, Bengt. Ämneskonstruktioner i ekonomismens tid. Om undervisning och styrmedel i modersmålsämnet i svenska och danska gymnasier. 2013.
71. Holmberg, Ylva. Musikskap. Musikstunders didaktik i förskolepraktiker. 2014.
72. Lilja, Peter. Negotiating teacher professionalism. On the symbolic politics of Sweden's teacher unions. 2014.
73. Kouns, Maria. Beskriv med ord. Fysiklärare utvecklar språkinriktad undervisning på gymnasiet. 2014.
74. Magnusson, Petra. Meningsskapandets möjligheter. Multimodal teoribildning och multiliteracies i skolan. 2014.
75. Serder, Margareta. Möten med PISA. Kunskapsmätning som samspel mellan elever och provuppgifter i och om naturvetenskap. 2015.
76. Hasslöf, Helen. The educational challenge in 'Education for sustainable development'. Qualification, social change and the political. 2015.
77. Nordén, Birgitta. Learning and teaching sustainable development in global-local contexts. 2016.
78. Leden, Lotta. Black & white or shades of grey. Teachers' perspectives on the role of nature of science in compulsory school science teaching. 2017.
79. Segerby, Cecilia. Supporting mathematical reasoning through reading and writing in mathematics. Making the implicit explicit. 2017.
80. Thavenius, Marie. Liv i texten. Om litteraturläsningen i en svensklärodbildning. 2017.
81. Kotte, Elaine. Inkluderande undervisning. Lärares uppfattningar om lektionsplanering och lektionsarbete utifrån ett elevinkluderande perspektiv. 2017.
82. Andersson, Helena. Möten där vi blir sedda – En studie om elevers engagemang i skolan. 2017.
83. Lindgren, Therese. Föränderlig tillblivelse. Figurationen av det posthumana förskolebarnet. 2018.

84. Walldén, Robert. Genom genrens lins. Pedagogisk kommunikation i tidigare skolor. 2019.
85. Rubin, Maria. Språkliga redskap – språklig beredskap. En praktknära studie om elevers ämnesspråkliga deltagande i ljuset av inkluderande undervisning. 2019.
86. Karlsson, Annika. Det flerspråkiga NO-klassrummet. En studie om translanguaging som läranderesurs i ett NO-klassrum. 2019.
87. Schulín, Simon. Livslang læring og livslang vejledning - en kompetencediskurs. Dannelse og kompetence som sprog og policy i Norge, Sverige og Danmark. 2019.
88. Lindh, Christina. I skrivandets spår. Elever skriver i SO. 2019.
89. Ryan, Ulrika. Mathematics classroom talk in a migrating world. Synthesizing epistemological dimensions. 2019.
90. Lundberg, Adrian. Viewpoints about educational language policies. Multilingualism in Sweden and Switzerland. 2020.

Doctoral Dissertations published elsewhere

Ullström, Sten-Olof: Likt och olik. Strindbergsbildens förvandlingar i gymnasiet. Stockholm/Stehag: Brutus Östlings Bokförlag Symposium. 2002. (Nr 1 i avhandlingsserien.)

Ulfgard, Maria: För att bli kvinna – och av lust. En studie i tonårsflickors läsning (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska barnboksinstitutet nr 78). Stockholm: B. Wahlströms. 2002. (Nr 2 i avhandlingsserien.)

Ursing, Anna-Maria: Fantastiska fröknar. Studier av lärarinnegestalter i svensk skönlitteratur. Eslöv: Östlings Bokförlag Symposium. 2004. (Nr 16 i avhandlingsserien.)

Gustafson, Niklas: Lärare i en ny tid. Om grundskolelärares förhandlingar av professionella identiteter. Umeå: Doktorsavhandlingar inom den Nationella Forskarskolan i Pedagogiskt Arbete (NaPA). 201. (Nr 53 i avhandlingsserien)

Education is inherently connected to language. Many minority language speakers experience a disadvantaged situation as their linguistic repertoire is not valorised for learning in mainstream classrooms. At the same time, even majority language speakers are expected to strive, if teachers make decisions in favour of the acknowledgment of the full and dynamic linguistic repertoire of their pupils. By investigating the grounds on which these language management decisions are taken, the overall purpose of the current investigation is to advance the discussion about the way education and research may contribute to the change for greater social justice and betterment for all students.

This is achieved by comparatively analysing stakeholders' viewpoints about multilingualism in Sweden and Switzerland on the one hand and illustrating the potential of Q methodology to identify participants' subjectivity for educational research on the other hand. Due to the twofold nature of this thesis' purpose, two overarching research questions guide the separate studies in this compilation thesis:

1. How does language management in education take shape in relation to socially situated discourses about multilingualism and (language) policy?
2. What are the benefits and limitations of using Q methodology in educational research?

Adrian Lundberg has a Teaching Diploma for Secondary School Level from Teacher Training University Bern, Switzerland and an M.A. in Languages and Literature in Multilingualism and Plurilingual Education from Fribourg University, Switzerland. *Viewpoints about Educational Language Policies: Multilingualism in Sweden and Switzerland* is his doctoral dissertation in education.

ISBN 978-91-7877-076-2 (print)

ISBN 978-91-7877-077-9 (pdf)

ISSN 1651-4513

MALMÖ UNIVERSITY
205 06 MALMÖ, SWEDEN
WWW.MAU.SE