Ideology in Swedish ELT:
A case study of a multilingual secondary school classroom

Eva Zetterberg Pettersson, Örebro University

Grounded in scholarship on multilingualism, this multimodal case study aims to identify factors related to ideologies of language and culture in an English language classroom in a public lower secondary school in Sweden for an enhanced understanding of learning conditions for multilingual students. Using a triangulation of methods, participant observation, materials analysis, and interviews, the study examines teaching practice, materiality, language use and teachers' perspectives on multilingualism and their own teaching practices in the multilingual classroom. The study finds a predominance of factors rooted ideologies of monolingualism and monoculturalism. Teaching practice was marked by the traditional approach to teaching English with a focus on Britain/the U.K. as a homogenous monocultural and monolingual nation and a Swedishness norm dominated teaching practice and classroom interaction: extensive usage of the Swedish language, examples of teaching strategies related to a contrastive Swedish-English grammar approach and a study of target language culture from a national Swedish perspective. An application of Nancy Hornberger's model of the continua of biliteracy to the data identifies teaching practice in the classroom as close to the privileged ends. The analysis of interviews suggests that the traditional approach was normalized and that teachers had limited awareness of pedagogical strategies for the inclusion of multilingual students.

Keywords: biliteracy, culture, ESL, EFL, ideology, language use, multilingualism, multiculturalism, secondary school, Sweden, teaching materials, teachers' perspectives, teaching practice

1 Introduction

As is widely recognized, the Swedish English language classroom of today is very diverse, in terms of levels, culture and first language/s spoken by students, (see e.g., Sundqvist & Sylvén, 2016, and Skolverket [Swedish National Agency for Education], 2023). There is a general concern among stakeholders about how to cater to the needs of students in these classrooms and one of the groups of particular concern is multilingual students. Surveys confirm that there is reason

for this concern as students whose first language is not Swedish have been found to underachieve in all subjects[1], including English (Skolverket, 2012).[2] This underachievement has, however, been given little scholarly attention and its relation to existent teaching practice is underexplored. Aiming to contribute to filling this gap in scholarship, this study examines a mainstream multilingual and multicultural classroom and its teachers to identify factors connected to ideologies of language and culture where the concept of "ideologies" is understood with Blackledge (2005) as discursively constructed "values, practices and beliefs . . . . always socially situated and tied to questions of identity and power" (pp 31-32). Such a focus is justified as classroom norms and practices grounded in monolingual and monocultural ideologies have been recognized by scholars such as Cummins (2021), and García et al. (2017) to negatively affect the learning of English for students with a multilingual background as it fails to recognize their language resources and identities. Grounded in scholarship on multilingualism, and through the exploration of a case, the study examines teaching approach, materiality, language use in the classroom, teachers' perceptions of multilingualism and their own teaching practices in the multilingual classroom.

There is a lack of research into multilingualism in the foreign language classroom in a national context where the target language is not the language of the majority. Up to date, few published studies have investigated this topic, something that is true internationally (see e.g. The European Commission, 2015), and in Sweden in particular. According to a Swedish research overview published in 2012 research in Sweden on multilingualism had by then almost exclusively focused on the learning of Swedish as second language in Sweden, alternatively to multilingual students' learning of their first language/s, their general cognitive development or to their learning in subjects across the curriculum (Hyltenstam et al., 2012). Since then, a few more articles have been published, but the field is still largely underexplored. Most importantly, these studies are connected to the project "Multilingual Spaces? Language Practices in English Classrooms," see e.g. Källkvist, Gyllstad et al. (2017), and Källkvist, Sandlund et al. 2022).[3] Other studies include Amir and Musk (2013), Gunnarsson et al. (2015), Gunnarsson (2019), and Paulsrud and Toth (2020). According to Källkvist et al., before their 2022 article there was no published study with a focus on learning in the multilingual and multicultural English-language classroom in Sweden.

Research about current teaching practice in the Swedish English-language classroom is equally scarce. This neglect includes the extent to which the changes of the 2011 and 2022 syllabi have been implemented, for example regarding the teaching of culture, as dynamic rather than static phenomenon, and the promotion of plurilingualism which is inscribed in the 2022 syllabus. Some, but rather limited, knowledge exists regarding the classroom use of English and Swedish, or the usage of other languages. A report from 2011 by the

1 According to statistics regarding secondary school leavers' grades, Skolverket (The Swedish National Agency of Education), for the academic year 2020/2021

2 According to the European Survey on Language Competences accounted for in a report by Skolverket (2012) students with a "foreign background" that is born abroad or whose parents were born abroad had significantly lower results in English than students with a Swedish background. More recent statistics are not available at present.

3 For information on the project see the Lund university website.

Swedish Schools Inspectorate (Skolinspektionen, 2011) on grades 6-9 finds that in almost half of the teaching examined Swedish, rather than English, was the predominant language resulting in weak conditions for the development of students' interactive skills. Results from studies by Sandlund and Sundqvist (2016) and Källkvist et al. (2022) give a more complex picture of teachers' language use, suggesting that some teachers use Swedish systematically to facilitate students' learning of English, findings which are in line with international research on the function of the L1 as a scaffolding (see e.g. Ellis, 2012).

Regarding the ideological dimension of the teaching of English, Tholin (2014) found that, judging by local syllabi, the teaching of English was marked by a Swedishness norm both in relation to language skills and cultural content. English was often taught through Swedish, meaning that the teaching of English grammar was based on contrasts to Swedish, and translation between Swedish and English, and that target culture was studied from the perspective of mainstream Swedish culture. Although Tholin's article is an important contribution to insights into teaching practices in the English-language classroom regarding ideology, it is, however, a rare example warranting further study.

Scholars in the fields of multilingualism and language teaching (notably Cummins & Early, 2011; García et al., 2017 and Kramsch, 2009) stress that teaching can have a positive power if the language classroom is allowed to become a space for interaction between students where their own experiences and identities matter. At best, the classroom can constitute a "third place" (Kramsch, 1993), or, as Tornberg (2000) prefers to call it, "ett mellanrum" ("a space in between," my translation) allowing cultural encounters to take place, and social and cultural matters to be problematized and critically discussed. As scholars like Cummins (2000, 2007) Kramsch (1993, 2009) and others assert, the language classroom is also a space where learners, individually as well as in groups, can be invited to express and explore their multicultural identities. As they stress, matters of culture and identity are intimately connected to the language acquisition process, and a pedagogy that intends to take the democratic mission of the school seriously, and to affirm the multicultural classroom, should assume a holistic approach. In sum, the traditional approach of foreign language teaching is no longer sustainable. As Kramsch writes: "Its main tenets (monolingual native speakers, homogenous national cultures, pure standard national languages, instrumental goals of education, functional criteria of success) have all become problematic in a world that is increasingly multilingual and multicultural, even though for many language teachers they remain convenient fictions" (Kramsch, 2009, p.190).

2 Research Overview: Ideologies of Language and Culture

This study relies on the comparatively new, but currently prolific, tradition of research in applied linguistics: scholarship on multilingualism. Historically, the dominant tradition in scholarship on language learning and teaching had monolingual underpinnings, as has been observed by critics such as Auer and Wei (2007), Blackledge and Creese (2010), Weber and Horner (2012), and others. As Auer and Wei (2007) observe, the historical dominance of monolingual

ideologies can be linked to the ideology of nationalism according to which the ideal nation represents one people, one culture, and one language.

> . . . it is a reasonable assumption that the marginal role research on multilingualism has played within linguistics until some decades ago is a result of the monolingual bias of (particularly) European thinking about language which came into being during a phase of European history in which the nation states defined themselves not in the least by the one (standard) language which was chosen to be the symbolic expression of their unity. (Auer & Wei, 2007, p.1)

Typically, ideologies of monolingualism understand languages as self-contained entities and language competence as dichotomous, as either complete or incomplete (Bagga-Gupta, 2013; Blackledge & Creese, 2010). As Bagga-Gupta (2013) puts it: "A key aspect of the Eurocentric ways of conceptualizing language issues that color understandings in educational contexts vis-à-vis the language-culture pairing is related to the assumption that human beings can (or should) have mastery of one language completely" (2013, p.35). In the Swedish context, the concept of "halvspråkighet" (semilingualism), coined by Hansegård (1968), which came to be used particularly in xenophobic discourse, exemplifies the dominant monolingual assumptions of the era. In the 1980s and onwards, critics, notably Skutnabb-Kangas (1981), have exposed the discriminatory, occasionally racist, discourses adopting the concept. The heated scholarly and political debates around the concept is a case in point as it illustrates the process in which the hegemony of monolingual and monolingual ideology started to be destabilized.

Developing alongside the dominant monolingual tradition in scholarship, "linear bilingualism" continued to assume that a condition for the development of full competence in two (or more) languages is that the languages are kept isolated from one other (García et al., 2011, p. 386). Like previous scholarship, traditional bilingual scholarship thus assumes that mixture is problematic and should be avoided.[7] Since the 1970s language research has, however, increasingly questioned scholarship with monolingual and traditional "linear" bilingual underpinnings, claiming it is mistaken about the nature of language competence and learning. As García notes, this was a turn toward "dynamic bilingualism" (García et al., 2011, p.387). An influential theorist and researcher in this development, Cummins (1980), proposed the Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP) model of bilingualism, claiming that languages do not compete, as monolingual and linear bilingual scholarship assume, but have a potential for reinforcing each other and boost cognitive development.

In the twenty-first century, in step with increasing globalization and migration in the Western world, research in language development has increasingly turned its attention toward multilingual contexts where several languages are involved (see e.g. Fielding, 2022 or May, 2014). Complementing concepts such as code-switching with "translanguaging" (García et al., 2011) or "languaging" (Gynne & Bagga-Gupta, 2013), for example, this new tradition of research asserts that a mixture of languages, or codes, are inherent in all human communication and learning. Research on multilingualism moreover sees language and language learning as intimately connected to identity (Fielding, 2022) and, in line with poststructuralist theory, identity is understood as

constructed in social practice and discourse (Baxter, 2016; Blackledge, 2005). Researchers like Cummins (2021), and García et al. (2017) address the ideological dimension of language, including pedagogy and teaching practice, and argue that oppressive ideologies and social structures inherent in colonialism and nationalism need to be confronted and destabilized to bring about equitable conditions for learning and teaching. This brand of research, notably represented by Cummins (2021), and García et al. (2017), favors a teaching approach that affirms students' multilingual and multicultural identities and invites them to draw on their entire language repertoire. A large number of other studies are concerned with multilingualism in education in general and with various forms of translanguaging, see e.g. Cenoz et al. (2021) Duarte (2020), Hélot et al. (2011), Hélot et al. (2018) Juvonen and Källkvist (2021), May (2014), and Peyer et al. (2020). Although the social agenda underpins most of these studies, few address the ideological dimension.

One of the most important contributions in the field of bilingualism/multilingualism, literacy development, and education is Hornberger's framework the "continua of biliteracy" (1989) which will be applied to the data collected in the present study. Hornberger's framework identifies four central and intersecting dimensions involved in research, teaching, and language planning: development, content, media, and contexts, each existing on a continuum where one end typically represents entities that are not privileged and the other those that are privileged. The binaries of importance for this study are regarding (language) *development*, oral and written modes, regarding *content* (of teaching and learning, that is culture/language/text) minority and majority, vernacular and literary, contextualized, and decontextualized, regarding *media*, dissimilar and similar structures (of the target languages, L1, L2, L3, etc), convergent and divergent scripts (literacy systems) and finally regarding *contexts* of biliteracy, oral and literate, bi/multilingual and monolingual contexts (Hornberger 1989, 2004, emphases and clarifications added). Understanding learning and teaching of languages in terms of Hornberger's continua enables researchers and teachers to challenge practices that are restricted to the privileged end of the continua and instead promote those that make use their entire lengths, as this, according to Hornberger, provides learners with the most favorable opportunities for language development (2004, p.158).

The poststructuralist and postcolonial critique of monocultural ideologies beginning in the last decade of the twentieth century, as illustrated in e.g. Hornberger's conceptual framework (1989), has also affected the content dimension of language teaching. In Sweden, scholars such as Tornberg (2000) have critiqued the traditional teaching of target language history, literature, and cultural practices (what is known in Sweden as "realia") as viewing culture/s as static and closed, and as intimately connected to nation states. A distinctive feature of this tradition, Tornberg explains, is the reduction, and objectification, of social life and cultural expressions in the target countries/areas as "typical" national features to be learned by students as "facts" (2000, pp. 63-7). In a cultural turn, this previous understanding of culture manifest in the Swedish national curricula of 1962 and 1969 was, according to Tornberg (2000), gradually destabilized, beginning with the national curriculum of 1980. Central to this shift from "realia" to "culture" was the move away from declarative knowledge to intercultural awareness, including the ability to discuss and reflect on social

and cultural topics in a wider sense. In the case of the subject of English in Sweden, the primary focus has traditionally been the U.K., and the secondary one the US; and later, in recognition of varieties of English, "English-speaking countries" were included. The target culture sphere in the 2000 curriculum is described as "engelskspråkiga områden" ("English-speaking regions," my translation), generally understood as the "inner circle" identified by Kachru (1997).[4] The Eurocentric grounding of this culture sphere is clear as it refers to countries having belonged to the British Empire and inhabited by large European settler communities. In the 2011 national syllabus, by contrast, indicative of a recognition of English as a global language, the target culture sphere was redefined by the National Agency for Education as: "områden och i sammanhang där engelska används," that is "regions and contexts where English is used" (my translation).

3 Aim and Research Questions

In light of the significance of ideologies for language development, teaching, and policy, as accounted for in the research overview above, this study aims to identify factors and norms that can be related to ideologies of *language*, and to target language *culture*, in English language teaching, through a multimodal analysis of a case, an English language classroom, and its teachers, in Sweden. The research questions are as follows.

1) What language teaching strategies can be detected in the physical space of the classroom, in teaching materials, in teaching strategies, and in classroom activities?
2) What languages, and language varieties, are used in the classroom and by teachers in communication with students in interaction: when, how, and for what purposes?
3) What are teachers' perspectives on their own practices in the classroom, in terms of teaching approach, language use in the classroom, and pedagogical strategies related to multilingual students?

4 Material and Method

This study employs the methodology of the case study, which is qualitative, rather than quantitative, research. As such, it does not presume to yield results that can be generalized, but rather to give an in-depth picture of an example, in this case a single classroom. For an elaboration on the merits of the case study, see Flyvbjerg (2006). For a rich description of the teaching of English classroom, and for the validity of results, this study uses a triangulation of methods: participant observation, materials analysis, and interviews with teachers.

   The case classroom of this study was located in a socially and culturally diversified public school district, regarding ethnicity and class. Three teachers, who have all been given pseudonyms, were part of the study: Louise and Laura, the main teachers of the class, both qualified English teachers, who had jointly planned the teaching, and Sara, a substitute teacher, also a qualified English

---

[4] Kachru mentions Australia, Britain, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, and the United States.

teacher, who also taught remedial classes of Swedish and English with some of the students. Louise and Laura had taught fourteen and nine years respectively, while Sara had only taught for a couple of years. Louise responded to an invitation sent out to the school as she welcomed greater insight into a class that she perceived as mixed in abilities.

The "class"/ "classroom" consisted of two parallel groups (altogether some 50 students), in grade 7, the lowest grade in Swedish secondary school. Roughly a third of the students had other first languages than Swedish.[5] Taken together, the class can thus clearly be understood as multilingual and multicultural. With one single exception,[6] caregivers readily gave their consent to the study. Seeking ethical approval of the study was not deemed necessary as it mainly focusses on the teachers.

The teaching approach was studied through participant observation in the classroom and analysis of materiality, that is teaching materials and the linguistic landscape of the classroom. Data concerning language usage was also collected during participant observation through field notes. Participant observation took place during seven lessons, each 60 minutes, over a span of two months and fieldnotes were taken during and in connection with class hours. An observation protocol was used for taking notes of what languages were used and approximately how much of teacher talking time. Participant observation mainly took place in lessons taught by Louise, as Laura was absent for several lessons, and in some taught by Sara who substituted for Laura. The teaching materials used in the classroom were collected and later analyzed. Semi-structured individual interviews, of some 60-90 minutes each, were carried out with all three teachers (Louise, Laura, and Sara) in connection with teaching. The questions asked revolved around multilingualism and plurilingualism, teaching approaches, teaching design, and students' learning profiles in the English language. These interviews were transcribed, coded and thematized using qualitative thematic analysis as defined by Braun and Clarke (2006) and subsequently analyzed with a view on ideologies related to language and culture.

5 Results

The present section accounts for the study's findings in relation to the three research questions, one by one.

5.1 The Teaching Approach: Classroom Materiality and Activities

Only partly designed for the subject of English, the linguistic landscape in the classroom where lessons took place did not signal any approach to English language teaching. Among the posters on the walls[7] two could be identified as connected to the English subject: a large map of the British Isles and small comic

---

5 The following languages were mentioned by the teachers, or by the students themselves in class: Albanian, Arabic, Armenian,

Assyrian/Syriac, Chinese, Croatian, French, Kurdish, Polish, Russian, and Serbian. Yet other languages, such as Finnish, Greek Romani and

Vietnamese were mentioned as spoken in the home, or by close relatives, but not by the students themselves.

6 The student whose parent refused consent was not present in the classroom during participant observation.

7 The other posters were of world heritage sites, famous international political leaders in history, Da Vinci's Vetruvian man, and tips on study

technique and reading skills in Swedish.

strip by Gary Larson parodying the fictional character of Tarzan's failure to deliver the polite educated English phrases he has prepared when he meets Jane, his romantic interest. The big map, on the one hand, is reminiscent of the prominent position of Britain in traditional Swedish English language teaching and the comic strip, recalls a Eurocentric worldview as it figures a character from a western (US American) colonialist fiction about Africa. These classroom posters, although not necessarily indicative of teaching in the classroom, signal certain assumptions concerning the subject of English, on the part of the school as an institution.

The impression given by the big map of the British Isles, that the target culture in focus was Britain, is reinforced when considering the commercial coursebook used, entitled *Wings 7 blue,* published by Natur & Kultur (2008).[8] Taken together, the coursebook series *Wings* aligns with the traditional Eurocentric target culture focus mentioned above where the book for grade 7 has focus on Britain, that for 8 on the U.S. and that for grade 9 on English-speaking countries. The coursebook consists of two books for student use, one "textbook" with fiction and nonfiction texts and another, a "workbook," with various exercises complementing the material in the textbook. In the interview, Louise reported that the coursebook had been chosen by the English teachers in the school, a choice in which she had participated. Both she and Laura claimed to appreciate the coursebook and therefor rely heavily on it, something that could be confirmed in classroom observation as the coursebook was the base of practically all teaching and learning activities in the classroom, and to some extent the test given.

A study of the texts and pictures in the coursebook *Wings 7 blue* shows a clear focus on Britain. This is evident in the table of content as, among the titles of sections and subsections, nine contain the words "British" or "Britain." Only two countries outside the United Kingdom figure in the table of contents; Ireland (represented by the music group U2) and the United States (in the texts "Eating at McDonald's" and "Popular British and American dishes"). Considering the texts in the coursebook more closely, the Britain represented is monocultural rather than multicultural and white European rather than global and multi-ethnic. The clothes in section 2, the food in section 3 and the houses and their decoration in section 4 are all identifiably western European. Among clothes, shirts and trousers are foregrounded, among dishes, "Fish 'n'chips" and hamburgers, and in the house section, teenagers are assumed to have rooms of their own.

In evidence of the prominent focus of Britain in the coursebook, the entire final section, entitled "Life in Britain," covers traditional icons of British, predominantly English, culture, history, and tradition: from sports, such as football and cricket, traditions like Guy Fawkes, landmarks like the Tower of London, to the beverage tea, which given a subsection of its own. The section "Life in Britain" introduces the four countries in the United Kingdom but does not explain why they are part of the same nation. Regarding ethnicity, among the 160, or more, identifiable faces in photographs or drawings in the textbook, only four are non-white. Concerning names of people and places, all can be recognized as white European British, the only exception being "Juan" (pp. 60-

---

[8] Earlier editions of the coursebook exist. The 2008 edition used during the data collection period was old and not updated according to the 2011 syllabus then in place.

61). The six British celebrities featured on pages 150 to 151 are all English, and white. There are a few mentions of English-speaking countries outside the United Kingdom, such as Australia and Canada, but none outside the western hemisphere.

The coursebook *Wings 7 blue* assumes the reader to be familiar with both Swedish language and culture as the forewords addressed to the learner are written in Swedish, and both "textbook" and "workbook" use the Swedish language, making continual references to culture and conditions in Sweden. Each section in the textbook ends with questions in Swedish asking the student to reflect on her/his learning. To scaffold Swedish-speaking students' reading and vocabulary learning the "textbook," has bilingual English-Swedish vocabulary lists in the margins of written texts and lists of "Useful phrases," with Swedish translations.[9] The "workbook," in turn, has two reference sections entirely in Swedish: one with a set of definitions,[10] and one with advice on learning strategies.[11] It also has a bilingual, and contrastive, grammar section with explanations of grammar rules in Swedish and sample English sentences are consistently translated into Swedish. In evidence of the Swedish bias in terms of culture, two activities in the section on "Food" are based on a Swedish perspective: one activity asks students to write a list of "popular" Swedish dishes and the other to translate the recipe of a "typically" Swedish dish into English (*Wings 7*, Workbook p. 71).

The teaching approach that could be observed in the classroom during the data collection period, manifest in teaching and learning activities, mirrored that of the coursebook, *Wings 7 blue.* Practically all activities were taken from two sections of the coursebook: "Food", Section 3, and "Life in Britain," Section 6. With one exception, a role play entitled "At the restaurant", an information gap activity to be done in pairs, all activities focused written texts and asked students to either read or write. Studies of section 3 in the coursebook ended with a written test on grammar, reading and listening skills (see Appendix). Work on section 6, "Life in Britain," consisted of students writing a text comparing schools and school life in Britain and in Sweden. It also included a project on the United Kingdom where the class, divided into groups, were instructed to find facts about the four different countries. Louise gave three presentations of grammar points highlighted in the coursebook sections at regular intervals during the data observation period: one on the plural form, one on the genitive apostrophe, and one on future tenses.

Like the coursebook, teaching in the classroom often used translation as a method. The three teacher presentations were all given in Swedish and accompanied by exercises that relied heavily on translation between Swedish

---

9 These phrases consist of standard formulaic sequences in English used in situations such as shopping (p.37), in restaurants (p.66), at meals (p.67) or when asking for directions (p. 107). In the thematic sections of the "workbook" there are six exercises called "Useful phrases" that match the bilingual lists of formulaic sequences in the textbook, presenting standard phrases in Swedish and instructing students to come up with the corresponding ones in English: "Eating out" (p. 60), "At the table (pp. 60-61), "Looking for a house" (p. 86), "Tidy up!" (pp. 86-87), "How stupid of me" (p.109), and "Which way?" (p.109).

10 This section contains descriptions of the phonetic alphabet and patterns of pronunciation, the usage of the capital letter, British and American units of measurement, British and American currency, "Facts about Sweden" and British/American conventions regarding to dates and postal codes

11 This section covers advice strategies for reading, learning vocabulary, and how to organize projects.

and English. The activity where students were to find a recipe on the internet and translate it into Swedish is another example of a translation activity. Finally, translation of words, phrases and sentences was the dominant method of assessing knowledge of English in the test closing work on the section with food as the theme. This test was constructed by the teachers as they had written some sections themselves and taken others from published materials, see Appendix for the five sections of the text written by the teachers[12]. Seven of the eleven sections in the test, that is 64% in total, were based on translation, of words or sentences. In the grammar section of the coursebook, by comparison, grammar did not constitute more than 30 % or the exercises. Two of the eleven sections of the test were based on receptive skills, one on listening and one on reading (omitted from the Appendix for copyright reasons) but the main part focused grammar, vocabulary, and spelling. None of the words, phrases, or sentences for translation were placed in contexts where their function was foregrounded.

5.2 Language Use in the Classroom

All teachers spoke mainly English, with a noticeable influence of standard southern English, when giving whole-class instructions, typically at the beginning of lessons, but Swedish was also heavily relied upon. Louise, whose lessons were mainly observed, first gave instructions in English, and then complemented them in Swedish, seemingly for clarification purposes, and Laura used the same strategy. In sum, English was used by Louise and Laura for close to 60 % of the time, Swedish for 40%. Sara, in turn, continually switched between English and Swedish when giving instructions, delivering some sentences of English and then, without checking students' comprehension, automatically the very same sentences in Swedish, making the distribution between English and Swedish 50% - 50%. Louise, Laura, and Sara could all be observed to mainly use Swedish for classroom management. In communication with pairs, smaller groups, or individual students, the teachers used both Swedish and English, but Swedish mostly. Here the percentage of English used was as low as 30%.

The written feedback, predominantly in Swedish, given by Louise on students' answers to a reading comprehension quiz on the text "Hamburger Stories" from the coursebook, serves to illustrates her usage of Swedish and English. Among the nineteen papers assessed, Louise responded to sixteen using a mix of Swedish and English and four entirely in Swedish. Her comments in Swedish conform to the pattern in the coursebook *Wings 7 blue* where Swedish is used for the teaching of language structure and grammar. She also uses Swedish when elaborating on her assessment communicating grades. English is only used for brief and positive summative evaluations such as "Very good" "Good" or "Excellent."

As opposed to teachers' language practices, marked by English and Swedish, students' production and interaction observed in the classroom may best be described using the Bakthinian concept of heteroglossia (1981) as they used a broader range of language varieties, Swedish, such as e.g. Swedish multietnolect, a dialect of Swedish widespread among the young in urban areas populated by

---

12 The sections which were taken from unidentified published teaching materials have been omitted.

ethnic minorities, see e.g. Bodén (2010), as well as English, and could be observed drawing on their knowledge of English from other, extra-mural contexts, such as computer games, films, and text messaging on cell phones.

5.3 Teachers' Perspectives

A coding of the transcriptions of the interviews with the three teachers Louise, Laura and Sara could be thematized according to the following four themes: ambivalent attitudes to multilingualism, divided opinions about the usefulness of Swedish in the teaching of English and a limited awareness of pedagogical strategies related to multilingual students.

All teachers professed a positive attitude to multilingualism and plurilingualism. They were all were very positive to students' taking classes in their first languages, "home languages" as they are called in the Swedish system and considered these to be beneficial for students' progress in general. When asked about the concrete benefits of multilingualism they identified enhanced communication skills, particularly in oral interaction, that is multilinguals' ability to make themselves understood even when their vocabulary and grammar is insufficient. Referring to her own knowledge of German and French, thus her plurilingualism, Louise observed, translated from Swedish: "When you know several languages you have recourse the other language and you juggle and twist them . . . . That's why I think I manage in many situations because I really want it to work".[13] In the following, the teachers' answers, all originally in Swedish, will be given in footnotes.

Nevertheless, the teachers also identified what they considered a problematic side of multilingualism: that learners may confuse languages. Laura explained that, in her view, languages should be kept apart and located in different spheres, such as the home and different classes and instructors, to avoid confusion: "You decide when you use the different languages because then they won't be mixed … but there I speak that, with that person, and there with the other, and there with another … you get a structure."[14] Speaking of her own multilingual background, Sara, the substitute teacher, said she feared that multilingualism may hamper language proficiency: "I have thought that maybe if you're plurilingual you may not ever learn a language fully, maybe, that can be negative."[15]

Regarding language choices in the classroom, Louise explained that the extensive use of Swedish in the classroom was a policy agreed upon among the English teachers in the school who wanted to establish a good rapport with students in grade 7 before exposing them to more English in the higher grades. And in elaboration on grammar presentations in Swedish she claimed contrasts between English and Swedish raise students' language awareness and that grammar points are better taught in Swedish as students do not know the terminology in English. Sara, the junior teacher, took the predominant use of Swedish in the classroom and translation to and from Swedish in the English

---

13 "När man kan flera språk så blir man så att man tar hjälp av dom andra språken och man fixar och trixar. . . . . Det tycker jag ligger till mycket grund för att jag liksom klarar mig i många situationer för jag vill så gärna att det ska fungera."

14 "[M]an riktar in sig på när man ska använda respektive språk, för då blir det inte så mycket "mix" utan där pratar jag det, med den, och där med den och där med den, det blir struktur".

15 "Jag har tänkt att kanske om man är flerspråkig att man kanske aldrig riktigt lär sig ett språk fullt ut, kanske, det kan var negativt."

language classroom, for granted, even though Swedish was not her first language. Although she spoke two of the first languages spoken by the multilingual students in the class, she claimed not to use these languages with students unless they did not understand Swedish.

Taking a critical stance on contrastive strategies, Laura noted that the traditional textbooks which use a great deal of Swedish, such as in bilingual vocabulary lists, are inadequate for students who speak little or no Swedish. She said that she often needs to give extra explanations of the Swedish words in the vocabulary lists for these students. She concluded that these books are no longer relevant, claiming that they should be replaced by books with monolingual vocabulary lists: "I think they should stop making such books … they should be English – English." [16] Ideally, Laura said, the teaching of English should be entirely in English, thus espousing the English only approach.

None of the teachers interviewed claimed they designed teaching in any way to cater to the needs of students with a multilingual, or multicultural, background, as a group; in fact, they were surprised by the question. Louise dismissed the idea of considering multilingual students as a group with certain needs in common, asserting that their individual profiles are so varied that they cannot be considered in such terms, but must be understood and treated as individual cases. She said: "One should adapt to the individual and plan for the individual. I see it more, not like a group, but they are individuals who need adaptations."[17]

The teachers were more verbal regarding adaptations to *individual* multilingual learners. All three mentioned the strategy of relying on English to a greater extent than with students with Swedish as their L1. Louise mentioned using Swedish and English interchangeably, enabling students to learn both languages. A learning strategy that she recommended students was to complement the obligatory Swedish-English vocabulary list with a column for their L1. An example of how this strategy may complicate, rather than facilitate, a student's learning of English was given by Sara, the substitute teacher. Referring to a newly arrived Arabic-speaking student, she noted that the practice of English-Swedish translation made learning English more difficult: If you think of [name of student] for example sometimes it's a little hard for her to translate into Swedish because she doesn't always understand the words in Swedish, so it's double, that she must translate first into Swedish maybe and then into Arabic, or directly into Arabic."[18]

6 Discussion

This section will discuss the factors related to ideology that were identified in the case classroom and apply Hornberger's model of the continua of biliteracy to the data to locate the teaching practices in the case classroom between the non-privileged and privileged ends on the continua.

A traditional approach to teaching English, according to the definition by Kramsch (2009), cited in the introduction above, could clearly be observed in

---

16 "Sånna böcker tycker jag man kan sluta göra nu snart .. det ska vara engelska – engelska."

17 "Man ska ju individanpassa och planera för individen. Jag ser det mer, inte som en grupp utan, dom är individer som behöver anpassning."

18 "Om man tänker på till exempel [elevens namn] ibland blir det lite svårt för henne att översätta till svenska för det är inte alltid hon förstår

orden på svenska, så det blir dubbelt, att hon måste översätta först till svenska kanske och sen till arabiska, eller direkt till arabiska.

materiality and teaching practices. The prominent position given to the UK in the classroom and in the coursebook *Wings 7 blue*, extensively used in the classroom, aligns with the traditional approach to teaching English which has monocultural, not to say colonialist, and monolingual underpinnings. Using Hornberger's continua of biliteracy, this focus on the UK can be identified on the privileged end of the continuum regarding the dimension related to content. The account of the coursebook in the section above revealed that the UK it represents conforms with the conventional pattern: it is European and monocultural rather than multicultural and multiethnic, and the history of the British Empire and its consequences for the spread of English around the world are not addressed. To some extent, the traditional focus on the UK in the classroom may be accounted for by the fact that the coursebook used was old, published in 2008, that is before the 2011 syllabus which extended the cultural sphere of the English subject. However, as the cultural focus of the coursebook was not complemented with other materials, the result was, nevertheless, a clear focus on the UK in the classroom.

Participant observation and an examination of teaching materials demonstrate that the Swedish language was extensively used by teachers and for a variety of purposes, beyond that of scaffolding, thereby constituting a norm in the classroom. Typically, Swedish was used to manage the classroom, to explain language structure and exercises, to establish rapport, and to communicate assessment. Students in turn responded in Swedish and spoke Swedish to each other. Interaction in the classroom observed was thus marked by the larger context, the privileged macro level in the context dimension, to use Hornberger's terminology, that is the Swedish school as an institution, monoculturally Swedish rather than drawing on the non-privileged local, micro, level, that is the multilingual classroom of students whose language practices can be located non-privileged end of the continuum connected to content as well a media.

That Swedish language and mainstream culture were norms in the classroom and the perspective from which target language and culture was studied was evident in the absence of elements from other languages and cultures, as perspectives or points of reference in activities. Although the class was multilingual and multicultural, students' various identities, experiences and languages were largely invisible in classroom interaction and student production, oral and written. The near invisibility of the languages spoken by the multilingual students, appearing only in the occasional non-standard word or accent, multietnolect, a vernacular of sorts, hence shows that the hierarchies and power structures at work in Swedish society existed in the classroom. A similar pattern was identified by Toth (2017) in her study of English medium instruction in a Swedish compulsory school. That the teacher Sara, who knew two of the first languages spoken by students claimed not to use these languages in the teaching of English, unless the students did not understand Swedish, is an illustrative example of the prevailing norms.

Target language and culture were approached from a Swedish perspective as is demonstrated in the above account of the dominating coursebook in the classroom, *Wings 7 blue.* This emphasis on Swedish majority culture in the coursebook can be identified as placed on the privileged end of the continuum related to content in Hornberger's model of biliteracy. Among the two coursebook exercises accounted for above that instruct students to describe

Swedish dishes, the latter, referring to a "typically" Swedish dish is more problematic than the former, referring to "popular" Swedish dishes, from a multicultural point of view. While the former asks students to mention dishes that are appreciated in the Swedish context, that is by great numbers of people living in Sweden, the latter asks students to identify dishes that may be considered representative of national culture. The latter clearly illustrates the monocultural bias distinctive of traditional language teaching in Sweden identified by Tornberg (2000). The section on "Life in Britain," in turn, illustrates the same ideological pattern as it includes an activity where students are instructed to imagine giving a speech to British family as a Swedish visitor about "what is typically Swedish compared to what is typically British" (*Wings 7 blue*, Workbook, p. 131). What makes the cultural approach in the coursebook problematic is the fact that activities tend to view Britain and Sweden as static homogenous cultures. Such a perception risks, as Tornberg (2000) argues, reinforcing superficial national, and nationalist, stereotypes rather than promote cultural awareness in wider sense. The tasks and activities designed by the teachers in this case study aligned with the traditional outlook on culture and society manifest in the textbook. Students were instructed to find "facts" about the different countries in the United Kingdom, but without engaging in reflection on the findings. One classroom assignment from the coursebook did however break with the tradition of "realia" and its prioritization of hard facts, the one asking students to relate to their own world, that is their life in a Swedish school, in writing a text comparing the school systems in England and Sweden. Nevertheless, as it neglected that students may have experiences outside of Sweden, it upheld the Swedish perspective as a norm.

The most obvious trait of the traditional approach to language teaching in the classroom was the strong reliance on grammar-translation strategies, as evidenced in Louise's grammar presentations and frequent exercises, including a graded test foregrounding translation, the emphasis on translation being even greater in classroom activities than in the coursebook, *Wings 7 blue*. This graded test exemplifies a reliance on the bilingual grammar-translation method, one that is incongruent with the contemporary multilingual English language classrooms in Sweden, the local micro context, to use Hornberger's terminology. Grammar presentations, in turn, stayed on the privileged end of Hornberger's continua of biliteracy (2004) in terms of content, by focusing on decontextualized items of language and on accuracy, rather than communication, as two of the three grammar points were the irregular plural, including spelling patterns, and the genitive apostrophe. By strictly focusing on the items of the prepared presentation, not interacting much with students as they reacted to the items presented, voicing a range of reactions, often of a playful kind, the teacher focused on the decontextualized items identified by Hornberger on the privileged side of the continuum.

Overall, the teaching approach in the classroom gave little space to speaking and listening activities in English, instead prioritizing the written mode. The central position of activities related to the written rather than oral mode in the classroom recalls the traditional approach but also Hornberger's continua of bilingualism regarding language development where the written mode is on the privileged end of the continuum and the oral on the non-privileged. Only one of the activities observed in the classroom was an oral one: the pair role play

entitled "At the restaurant" but instead of improvising a spoken dialogue, most students busied themselves writing a dialogue script for a performance.

In interviews, teachers voiced perceptions with both monolingual and multicultural underpinnings, and a rather limited awareness of pedagogical strategies for the inclusion of multilingual students. These results align with findings in other studies of language teacher ideologies with regard to multilingualism. Lundberg (2019) e.g. finds a similar pattern in a study of some forty Swedish primary school teachers, a generally positive attitude to multilingualism coupled with beliefs grounded in monolingual ideologies. Haukås (2016) found that L3 teachers in Norway considered multilingualism an asset but were reluctant to integrate teaching strategies and the findings of Tarnanen and Palviainen (2018) in the Finnish context are analogous.

On the one hand, the recognition of the strong oral communicative skills of many multilingual students voiced by the teachers interviewed in this study and their positive view of students' studying their first, "home," languages are borne out by research into multilingualism. On the other hand, their identification of language confusion as a problematic side of multilingualism echoes an idea central to monolingual ideologies: that languages compete within the mind of the speaker. Voicing the ideology of separation of languages, distinctive of ideologies of monolingualism and traditional bilingualism, Laura explained that, in her view, languages should be kept apart and located in different spheres, such as the home and different classes and instructors, to avoid confusion. And speaking of her own multilingual background, Sara echoed the monolingual notion that languages compete when she fears that multilingualism may hamper language proficiency.

As Louise and Laura claimed they did not consider multilingual students as a group who needed other pedagogical strategies, but as individuals who needed adaptations, their stand can be understood in terms of the normalized tradition. The fact that they expressed awareness of and a positive attitude to multilingualism, but still did not in any significant way question or problematize the traditional teaching approach, exemplifies the power of a normalized tradition. In their discussion of language policy teachers tended to waver between the bilingual contrastive method and the monolingual English-only approach, the former grounded in linear bilingualism and the latter in ideologies of monolingualism. Neither approach, however, caters to the multilingual Swedish English language classroom today where a wide range of first languages are represented. The strategy that Louise mentioned, however, of using Swedish and English interchangeably in communication with learners, enabling them to learn both languages, does have potential in a multilingual classroom as it may be understood as a translanguaging strategy, one that can draw on what Louise identified as a strength of the contrastive grammar approach: to raise students' language awareness. For elaboration of this idea see Källkvist et al (2022).

7 Conclusion

An examination of materiality, teaching practices and learning activities in the case classroom, combined with findings regarding teachers' perceptions of multilingualism and their own teaching practices, revealed a traditional and normalized approach to the teaching of English. The norm of "Swedishness,"

that is Swedish language and culture as points of reference, that Tholin unveiled in his (2014) study of national and local objectives was also found to mark the classroom. An application of Hornberger's continua of biliteracy to the data collected, in turn, enabled a location of materiality and practices as close to the privileged end of the continua. Drawing on Hornberger's model of biliteracy (1989, 2004), in classrooms like the one in this case study, where teaching practice was located near the privileged ends on the continua, the focus should, be moved toward the less privileged ends of the continua, as practices making use of the entire continua, according to Hornberger, will provide more favorable conditions of learning.

The traditional approach is problematic in a multilingual and multicultural classroom today, as, drawing on Kramsch's (2009, p.190) criticism cited in the introduction, it is out of synch with the modern globalized world and the needs of students in today's multilingual classrooms. The traditional approach also clashes with the current syllabus for English which advocates a dynamic view of culture and the promotion of plurilingualism. As the present study is a case study, examining only one classroom, generalizations of results are precarious. Nevertheless, it does demonstrate that the traditional approach persists in Swedish classrooms, a circumstance that may be explained by the power of a strong normalized tradition and a monocultural ideology that has not yet been displaced.

If the content dimension of English language teaching breaks with the monocultural tradition of considering nations as unified and static, illustrated in teaching materials of this case study, better conditions for affirming students' multicultural identities can be created. An intercultural approach where the multiple and fluid character of culture is recognized and where students are invited to relate to culture and social issues drawing on their own backgrounds and previous knowledge have a potential for better engaging students and for promoting in-depth discussion in the classroom. An intercultural approach is also necessary for the creation of a "third space" in the classroom (Kramsch, 1993) or "space in between" (Tornberg, 2000), a space of central significance for the realization of the democratic mission of the Swedish school.

Disclosure statement

The author declared no conflict of interest.

References

Auer, P., & Wei, L. (2007). *Handbook of multilingualism and multilingual communication*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Amir, A. & Musk, N. (2013). Language policing: Micro-level language policy-in-process in the foreign language classroom. *Classroom Discourse*, 4(2), 151–167. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2013.783500

Bagga-Gupta, S. (2013). The BOUNDARY-TURN: (Re)locating culture, identity and language through the Epistemological lenses of time, space and social interactions. In S. Imtiaz Hasnain, S. Bagga-Gupta, & S. Mohan (Eds.), *Alternative voices: (re)searching language, culture, identity (*pp. 28-49). ProQuest Ebook Central https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.db.ub.oru.se

Bakhtin, M. M. & Holquist, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination four essays*. University of Texas Press.

Baxter, J. (2016). Positioning language and identity: Poststructuralist perspectives. In S. Preece (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and identity (*pp. 60-75). Routledge.

Blackledge, A. (2005). *Discourse and power in a multilingual world*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. Continuum International Publishing Group.

Bodén, P. (2010). Pronunciation in Swedish multietnolect. In P. Quist, & B.A. Svendsen (Eds.), *Multilingual urban Scandinavia. New linguistic practices* (pp. 65–78). Multilingual Matters.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2021). *Pedagogical translanguaging*. Cambridge Open Access. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009029384

Cummins, J. (1980). The entry and exit fallacy in bilingual education. In C. Baker, & N.H. Hornberger, (2001). *An introductory reader to the writings of Jim Cummins*. Multilingual Matters. Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 29.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy*. Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 221-240.

Cummins, J. (2021). *Rethinking the education of multilingual learners: A critical analysis of theoretical concepts*. (1st ed.). Channel View Publications.

Cummins, J., & Early, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Identity texts: The collaborative creation of power in multilingual schools.* Trentham Book. UCL, IOE Press.

Duarte, J. (2020). Translanguaging in the context of mainstream multilingual education. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *17*(2), 232-247. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14790718.2018.1512607

Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research &language pedagogy*. Wiley-Blackwell.

European Commission. (2015). *Language teaching and learning in multilingual classrooms*. Publications Office of the European Union.

Fielding, R. (2022). *Multilingualism, identity and interculturality in education*. Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-5848-9

Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *12*(2), 219–245. https://doi-org.db.ub.oru.se/10.1177/1077800405284363

García, O., Sylvan, C. E., & Witt, D. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *The Modern Language Journal*, *95*(3), 385-400. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01208.x

García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Caslon.

Gunnarsson, T., Housen, A., Van de Weier, J., & Källkvist, M. (2015). Multilingual students' self-reported use of their language repertoires when writing in English. *Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies*, *9*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.17011/apples/2015090101

Gunnarsson, T. (2019). Multilingual students' use of their linguistic repertoires while writing in L2 English. *Lingua*, 224, 34–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2019.03.007

Gynne, A., & Bagga-Gupta, S. (2013). Young people's languaging and social positioning. Chaining in "bilingual" educational settings in Sweden. *Linguistics and Education*, *24*(4), 479-496.

Hansegård, N-E. (1968). Tvåspråkighet eller halvspråkighet? [Bilingualism or semilingualism?] Bokförlaget Aldus/Bonniers.

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

Hélot, C., Frijns, C., van Gorp, K., & Sierens, S. (Eds.). (2018). *Language awareness in multilingual classrooms in Europe: From theory to practice*. De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501501326

Hélot, C., & Ó Laoire, M. (2011). *Language policy for the multilingual classroom* (1st ed., Vol. 82, Bilingual education & bilingualism). Multilingual Matters.

Hornberger, N. H. (1989). Continua of biliteracy. *Review of Educational Research*, *59*(3), 271–296. https://doi.org/10.2307/1170183

Hornberger, N. H. (2004). The continua of biliteracy and the bilingual educator: Educational Linguistics in Practice. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *7*(2-3), 155–171. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050408667806

Hyltenstam, K., Axelsson, M., & Lindberg, I. (2012). *Flerspråkighet: En forskningsöversikt* [Multilingualism: A research Overview] No. 2012:5. Vetenskapsrådet. [The Swedish Research Council].

Juvonen, P., & Källkvist, M. (Eds.). (2021). *Pedagogical translanguaging: Theoretical, methodological and empirical perspectives*. Multilingual Matters.

Kachru, B. (1997). World Englishes and English-using communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 17, 66-87.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C. (2009). *The multilingual subject: What foreign language learners say about their experience and why it matters*. Oxford University Press.

Källkvist, M., Gyllstad, H., Sandlund, E., & Sundqvist, P. (2017). English only in multilingual classrooms? *LMS - Lingua*, *2017*(4), 27-31.

Källkvist, M., Gyllstad, H., Sandlund, E., & Sundqvist, P. (2022). Towards an in-depth understanding of English-Swedish translanguaging pedagogy in multilingual EFL Classrooms. *HumaNetten*, 48, 138–167. https://doi.org/10.15626/hn.20224807

Källkvist, M., Sandlund, E., Sundqvist, P., & Gyllstad, H. (2022). Interaction in the multilingual classroom. In I. Kecskes (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Intercultural Pragmatics* (pp.836-868). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.15626/hn.20224807

Larson, G. (1984). *The far side gallery*. Andrews Mcmeel Publishing.

Lund University. (n.d.). *Multilingual spaces*. The Joint Faculties of Humanities and Theology. https://projekt.ht.lu.se/en/multilingual-spaces/

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

May. S. (2014). *The multilingual turn: implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203113493

Mellerby, A., Rinnesjö, S., Glover, M., Glover, R., Hedberg, B., & Malmberg P. (2008). *Wings 7 blue, Textbook*. Natur och Kultur.

Mellerby, A., Rinnesjö, S., Glover, M., Glover, R., Hedberg, B., & Malmberg P. (2008). *Wings 7 blue, Workbook*. Natur och Kultur.

Paulsrud,B. & Toth, J. (2020). English as a medium of instruction. In Laviosa, S, Gonzalez-Davies, M. (Eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Education* (1st ed., pp. 143–155). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367854850-10

Peyer, E., Barras, M., & Lüthi, G. (2020). Including home languages in the classroom: Aa videographic study on challenges and possibilities of multilingual pedagogy. *International Journal of Multilingualism 19*(1), 162–177.

Sandlund, E., & Sundqvist, P. (2016). *Translanguaging, code-switching, or just doing ESL teaching? Teachers' translation' turns in response to learner questions in a multilingual ESL classroom* [conference presentation]. The 6th LANSI conference, Columbia University, New York City, NY, USA, 7-8 October.

Skolinspektionen. [The Swedish Schools Inspectorate]. (2011) Engelska i grundskolans årskurser 6-9. Kvalitetsgranskning. Rapport 2011:07 [English in Compulsory School grades 6-9. Quality report 2011:17].

Skolverket. (n.d.) [Swedish National Agency for Education]. *Kursplan. Engelska*. Retrieved February 15, 2022, from www.skolverket.se

Skolverket (n.d.) [Swedish National Agency for Education]. *Grundskolan. Slutbetyg årskurs 9. Läsåret 2020/2021* [Compulsory School. Final grades year 9. Academic year 2020/2021]. Retrieved March 25, 2022, from https://www.skolverket.se/publikationer?id=8633

Skolverket. (2012). *Internationella språkstudien 2011: Elevernas kunskaper i engelska och spanska* [International survey of languages 2011: Pupils' competence of English and Spanish]. No. 375. Stockholm. https://www.skolverket.se/publikationer?id=2832

Skolverket. (2023). *Sveriges officiella statistik. Läsåret 2022-23. Elever och skolenheter i grundskolan* [Official statistics of Sweden. School year 2022-23. Pupils and school units in compulsory school]. https://www.skolverket.se/publikationer?id=8633

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1981). *Tvåspråkighet* [Bilingualism]. Lund: Liber.

Sundqvist, P., & Olin-Scheller, C. (2013). Classroom vs. extramural English: Teachers dealing with demotivation. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 7(6), 329-338.

Sundqvist, P., & Sylvén, L., (2016). Extramural English in teaching and learning from theory and research to practice. Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-46048-6

Tarnanen, M. & Palviainen, Å. (2018). Finnish teachers as policy agents in a changing society. *Language and Education*, 32(5), 428–443. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2018.1490747

Tholin, J. (2014). "Swedishness" as a norm for learners of English in Swedish schools: A study of national and local objectives and criteria in compulsory schools. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *58*(3), 253-268. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2012.725096

Tornberg, U. (2000). *Om språkundervisning i mellanrummet - och talet om "kommunikation" och "kultur" i kursplaner och läromedel från 1962 till 2000* [About language teaching in the space "in between" – and the discourse about "communication" and "culture" in curricula and teaching materials from 1962 to 2000]. (Uppsala studies in Education, 92). Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.

Toth, J. (2017). English first: Policy and practice in a Swedish EMI primary class. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education, 5*(2), 214–237.

Weber, J.J., & Horner, K. (2012*). Introducing multilingualism: a social approach.* Routledge.

Appendix

English test   *Food*   Name:_____

1.

Översätt fraserna till engelska:

Vad vill du ha att dricka?

_____

Skulle vi kunna få titta på matsedeln?

_____

Var snäll och behåll växeln.

_____

Nej tack! Jag är mätt.

_____

Får jag ta en till?

_____

2.

Oversätt orden till engelska:

bricka _____   diskho_____

låda_____   skåp_____

kastrull_____   stekpanna_____

3.

Svenska	Amerikansk engelska	Brittisk engelska
kran	_____	_____
grytlapp	_____	_____
sophink	_____	_____
spis	_____	_____
köksbänk	_____	_____
kökshandduk	_____	_____

Para ihop orden genom att skriva rätt bokstav bredvid det engelska ordet.

1. cover ___
2. pinch ___
3. spread ___
4. dot ___
5. dough ___
6. sift ___
7. boil ___
8. chop ___

a. hacka
b. deg
c. sikta
d. koka
e. nypa, kryddmått
f. täcka
g. klicka
h. breda

6. Översätt meningarna till svenska.

1. Preheat the oven and bake the pastry for half an hour.

_____

2. Stir the beaten eggs and the melted butter until it's smooth.

_____

3. Let the cake cool and dust it with sugar or cacao powder.

_____

PLURAL = flertal

7.

B   Skriv orden i plural

1. one knife – many _____

2. one boy – many _____

3. one family – two _____

4. one baby – many _____

5. one wolf – many _____

6. one lady – many _____

7. one country – two _____

8. one life – many _____

9. one hero – many _____

10. one pony – two _____

11. one toy – many _____

12. one fly – many _____

C   Skriv rätt form av substantivet i meningarna. *Plural!*

1. She has lost two _____.
   (tand)

2. There are many _____ in this school.
   (barn)

3. I've got two _____.
   (fot)

4. There are five _____ in the field.
   (får)

5. Both _____ and _____ can be firemen.
   (man)   (kvinna)

Översätt till engelska.

1 min brors skateboard   _____

2 gatans namn   :   _____

3 kattens svans   _____

4 veckans dagar   _____

5 pojkarnas leksaker   _____