

Discursive portraits of language, literacy and learning: emerging bilinguals in Norway

Jarmila Bubíková-Moan



Thesis submitted for the degree of Ph.D.

**Department of Education
Faculty of Educational Sciences
University of Oslo**

2017

© **Jarmila Bubíková-Moan, 2017**

*Series of dissertations submitted to the
Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Oslo
No. 272*

ISSN 1501-8962

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be
reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without permission.

Cover: Hanne Baadsgaard Utigard.
Print production: Reprosentralen, University of Oslo.

‘... – and that shows that there are three hundred and sixty-four days
when you might get un-birthday presents – ‘
‘Certainly,’ said Alice.
‘And only *one* for birthday presents, you know. There’s glory for you!’
“I don’t know what you mean by “glory,”” Alice said.
Humpty Dumpty smiled contemptuously.
‘Of course you don’t – till I tell you.
I meant ‘there’s a nice knock-down argument for you!’
‘But “glory” doesn’t mean “a nice knock-down argument,”’ Alice objected.
‘When *I* use a word,’ Humpty Dumpty said in rather a scornful tone,
‘it means just what I choose it to mean – neither more nor less.’
‘The question is,’ said Alice, ‘whether you *can* make words mean so many different things.’
‘The question is,’ said Humpty Dumpty, ‘which is to be master – that’s all.’...

**Lewis Carroll,
Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking Glass**

Acknowledgements

No man is an island. In the process of working on this doctoral dissertation, a large number of people have crossed my path and “travelled” along with me, however briefly. Many of these travels and encounters have been a source of ideas, inspiration, support and encouragement, shaping this project in manifold ways. The following deserve my special thanks:

First of all, the 19 Polish families who agreed to participate in this project - you found time for me in your busy daily schedule, opened up to me and shared your stories. It has been a privilege and joy, dziękuję bardzo!

The Department of Education, University of Oslo – for great working conditions, an inspiring PhD training, professional administrative aid, generous travel support and an ambiance of collegiality.

Colleagues at the TextDIM research group – for including me in seminars and discussions and for exposing me to a broad range of issues in research on language, literacy and text comprehension, well beyond the scope of this research project.

The National Graduate School in Educational Research (NATED) – for giving me the opportunity to participate in thought-provoking doctoral courses, seminars and conferences. By inviting so many great scholars from across the globe to our regular NATED meetings, you have made the world come to Oslo – for me and others. It has been truly inspiring!

My fellow PhD students at the Department of Education, NATED and Oslo Science Park – particularly Caroline, Emily, Irina, Kristin A., Leila, Maike, Marianne, Rachel and Svitlana – for sharing joys and sorrows, ideas and reflections, tea and gyoza. You have made my daily life as a graduate student an experience I will cherish for life.

My language/research assistant Paulina Solowianiuk – for alerting me to the complexities of the Polish language and for sharing your views on Poland, its culture, literature, history and people. Our regular meetings were a most welcome addition to my work days and continue to be sorely missed.

Pia Lane – for your interest in my work and your careful, critical reading of the emerging manuscript both mid-way and as it neared completion. Your comments, insights and input have been a great source of inspiration.

My supervisors, Vibeke Grøver and Ivar Bråten – for your wisdom, patience, support and trust in me. Our regular discussions have sensitized me to the craft of scientific work and its riches. I am forever grateful.

My mum and dad – for your boundless faith and confidence in the choices I make. I am humbled by the love and care you have for me. My sister Gabriela – my kindred spirit – you always knew I would do this! I treasure our friendship dearly.

My husband Per Christian – my steadfast mountain – for your love, understanding and being there for me. Our children Julie and Filip – for making emerging bilingualism real for me on a daily basis. Watching you grow is the greatest joy of my life.

JBM

Oslo, April 2017

Table of Contents

PART I: Extended Abstract

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	<i>Broad framing of the study.....</i>	1
1.2	<i>Statement of purpose.....</i>	2
1.3	<i>A preliminary note on researcher reflexivity.....</i>	4
1.4	<i>Dissertation outline.....</i>	5
2	THE DISCOURSE-ANALYTICAL APPROACH.....	6
2.1	<i>Critical approaches to discourse analysis – locating the field.....</i>	6
2.2	<i>Discourse – preliminary terminological clarifications.....</i>	6
2.3	<i>The interdisciplinary critical pool.....</i>	7
2.4	<i>Basic assumptions of critical approaches to discourse.....</i>	9
2.5	<i>Approaching the social world through the critical lens of discourse analysis.....</i>	11
2.5.1	<i>A 'Faircloughian' model of discourse – considerations and critique.....</i>	11
2.5.2	<i>Narrative discourse analysis.....</i>	13
3	LANGUAGE EDUCATION POLICY – THE EMPIRICAL CONTEXT.....	18
3.1	<i>Framing the field.....</i>	18
3.2	<i>A preliminary note on terminology.....</i>	19
3.3	<i>LEP in the age of superdiversity: the multilingual turn.....</i>	20
3.3.1	<i>The language dimension.....</i>	20
3.3.2	<i>The literacy dimension.....</i>	23
3.3.3	<i>The learning dimension.....</i>	25
3.4	<i>The multi-scalar nature of LEP.....</i>	27
3.5	<i>Language education policy and practice: Norway and beyond.....</i>	29
3.5.1	<i>The scale of LEP creation and appropriation.....</i>	30
3.5.2	<i>The scale of LEP instantiation – the voice of the family.....</i>	33
4	METHOD.....	38
4.1	<i>Conducting qualitative research – preliminaries.....</i>	38
4.2	<i>Written and spoken data – conceptual considerations and differences.....</i>	38
4.3	<i>Policy documents.....</i>	40
4.3.1	<i>Choice of documents.....</i>	40
4.3.2	<i>Analytical procedure.....</i>	41
4.4	<i>Interview data - preliminaries.....</i>	42
4.4.1	<i>Data collection.....</i>	43
4.4.2	<i>Data analysis.....</i>	49
4.5	<i>Ensuring methodological quality.....</i>	50
4.5.1	<i>Validity, reliability and generalizability.....</i>	51
4.5.2	<i>Ethical considerations.....</i>	54
5	SUMMARY OF THE ARTICLES.....	56
5.1	<i>Article I.....</i>	56

5.2	<i>Article II</i>	57
5.3	<i>Article III</i>	59
6	SUMMARIZING DISCUSSION	61
6.1	<i>Research contributions</i>	61
6.1.1	Voice in discourse on LEP	61
6.1.2	Language education policy in Norway: critical perspectives	64
6.2	<i>Limitations</i>	68
6.3	<i>Future perspectives</i>	69
7	REFERENCES	71
8	APPENDICES	87
8.1	<i>Research ethics documentation</i>	87
8.1.1	Approval from the Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD).....	87
8.1.2	Consent letter – in Norwegian.....	89
8.1.3	Consent letter – in Polish	90
8.2	<i>Interview guide</i>	92
8.3	<i>Transcription conventions</i>	93

PART II: The Articles

- Article I Bubikova-Moan, J. (2017). Constructing the multilingual child: the case of language education policy in Norway. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 14(1), 56–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2016.1190389>
- Article II Bubikova-Moan, J. (in review). Negotiating learning in early childhood: narratives from migrant homes. Revised and resubmitted to *Linguistics and Education*.
- Article III Bubikova-Moan, J. (2017). Reported parent-teacher dialogues on child language learning: voicing agency in interview narratives. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1313192>

PART I

Extended Abstract

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Broad framing of the study

In our globalized world, interconnected across time and space through digital technologies, an increasingly wider pool of people interacts daily beyond their immediate spheres of communication and influence. For some, this may foreground a personal-practical need to cross beyond their own linguistic communities in order to engage successfully in such interactions. For others, it becomes a dynamic and organic site for living out their multiple, multilingual identities and enacting their multimodal linguistic repertoires across new contexts. In the face of rapid change, growing complexity and superdiversity (Vertovec, 2007), particularly in urban linguistic landscapes (Blommaert, 2013a), the shift away from monolingualism and towards multilingualism, also referred to as the 'multilingual turn', has become a key perspective in language learning and teaching (May, 2014b).

Norway's rise to superdiversity and complex multilingual landscapes is a case in point. In addition to several indigenous groups, Norway's immigrant population totalled 1, 5% in 1970. Almost five decades later, in 2017, 16% of Norway's population has an immigrant background¹, representing 221 countries and independent regions (Statistics Norway, 2017). In the Norwegian capital, Oslo, almost one-third of the population are migrants or descendants of migrants, with the Polish, Pakistanis and Somalis representing the largest groups (Oslo Municipality, 2017b). This is reflected in the increasingly multi-ethnic profile of Norwegian preschools and schools: 150 languages have been reported spoken in schools nation-wide, more than 120 in Oslo schools alone (Oslo Municipality, 2015, referenced in Pran & Holst, 2015, p. 4); in the current academic year of 2016/2017, almost 40% of all students in Oslo schools are of non-Norwegian ethnolinguistic background (Oslo Municipality, 2017a).

This research study aims to contribute to understanding a particular dimension of the multilingual turn in Norway, namely as it plays out in early childhood education as a specific part of Norwegian educational policy and practice. The study is located within and draws upon two fields: discourse analysis (DA) and language education policy (LEP) as a subfield of language policy and planning (LPP). While discourse analysis is employed as an overarching theoretical and analytical approach, LEP provides a field of application and hence a general interpretive frame and broad empirical grounding.

¹ This includes both first and second generation immigrants, the former designating persons born outside of Norway and the latter persons born in Norway with two first-generation immigrant parents.

The two fields have not developed in isolation but rather in a common intellectual climate, making them natural allies: indeed, since the 1970s, developments in the field of linguistics and the field of language policy and planning (LPP) have followed partly overlapping trajectories and, hence, multiple points of interaction between them can be discerned. It is particularly the critical turn in both fields that provides a unifying platform in the context of this study. In fact, LPP can be seen as 'an applied branch' of critical, socio-linguistic approaches to DA (Blommaert, 2005, p. 10). As a result of a productive cross-fertilization between DA and LPP (see e.g. D. C. Johnson, 2011), there is a sizable and growing body of empirical work employing discourse-analytic approaches in exploring the various layers of the 'language policy onion' (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996). This includes policy creation, implementation, appropriation and instantiation, as well as interconnections between these layers (see D. C. Johnson, 2009; E. J. Johnson, 2012). This study builds on the theoretical and empirical advances and insights of DA and LPP in specific ways which are laid out and critically interrogated in the rest of this text.

1.2 Statement of purpose

As briefly stated above, in this dissertation I explore, in a broad sense, the specifically discursive aspect of language education policy in Norway; more narrowly, it is language, learning and literacy provision offered to young multilinguals of non-Norwegian ethnolinguistic heritage, here referred to as 'emerging bilinguals' (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010), in mainstream preschools and schools in Norway that is studied through the critical lens of discourse analysis.

The approach is socio-constructionist and has a critical agenda. This implies that it recognizes power relations and ideology as crucial dimensions in human interaction (Blommaert, 2005; Fairclough, 2001; Norton Peirce, 1995). With recourse to the concept of sociolinguistic scales (Blommaert, 2007), explicated in the following chapters, my theoretical and empirical interest is both in the more durable discursive scale of policy creation and the more situationally occasioned scale of policy instantiation (see Hult, 2010; D. C. Johnson, 2009; E. J. Johnson, 2012). Language policy is thus understood in a broad sense, encompassing both its formal, legislative aspect but also its local application in choices individuals make in different settings and at variable points in time to interpret, appropriate or instantiate aspects of language education policy, including multilingual literacy, multiple language use and learning.

The overarching research question guiding this research study is as follows:

- *How is language education policy in Norway discursively realized in Norwegian early childhood educational provision?*

This question is explored in detail in the three publications that form the backbone of this thesis. Each has its own research question, which can be seen as sub-questions to the overarching research question above:

Article I: *How has the multilingual child been constructed in language education policy discourse in Norway over time?*

Article II: *How do migrant parents experience learning provision offered to their children in early childhood educational institutions in Norway?*

Article III: *How do migrant parents construct their own agency in parent-teacher dialogues on child language learning?*

The first sub-question developed gradually upon extensive reading of discourse-analytic and other literature on bilingual education policy, programs and practice. Hence, rather than following a hypothesis-driven set of rules, it was through an exploration of theory and empirical data as well as possibilities emanating thereof that the first sub-question took shape. Similarly, while the second and third sub-questions build on the first, they too emerged gradually in the iterative process of qualitative data analysis (Creswell, 2013).

In sum, while the study scrutinizes written 'texts of authority', where the main focus is on policy discourse that merits official status, it also explores 'the (often unheard) voices of minority groups' (Blackledge, 2003, p. 343), represented here by oral texts authored by Polish migrant parents in research interviews on their children's language, literacy and learning provision in the host country.

There are a number of key concepts I draw on in this thesis, such as discourse, language, voice, language education policy, bilingualism/multilingualism and biliteracy/multilingual literacy. Embedded in their analytical, theoretical and empirical contexts, these terms will all be laid out at appropriate points in the text.

1.3 A preliminary note on researcher reflexivity

One of the common denominators of critical approaches to both LPP/LEP and DA is concerns with how researchers' own 'historically and socially situated subjectivities shape different stages of the research process' (Martin-Jones, 2016, p. 30). In what follows, I will therefore briefly position myself in relation to the subject matter explored in this thesis. I will return to this theme throughout the coming chapters and elaborate as appropriate.

Born in a small industrial town on the border between the former Czechoslovakia and Poland, I grew up diglossically with a local dialect of Polish as the main family language and Czech as the language spoken in institutional contexts, such as in preschool and school. A few years upon the 1989 collapse of the Communist regime, as a 16-year old, I moved to London on a governmental scholarship to complete my secondary education. As I had had only beginner's training in academic English, this represented my very own encounter with a sink-or-swim English immersion, albeit with a weekly, supplementary ESL class. Upon graduation from high school, I went on to complete my tertiary education in modern and medieval languages (Russian and German) at the University of Cambridge, United Kingdom, and the University of Melbourne, Australia. Although this may represent a story of a 'swimming success', it has provided me with an intimate personal experience of the long-term, daily hardship, struggles and barriers that language education policies, programs and practice, ill-prepared and/or insensitive to emerging bilinguals' individual needs, may potentially create in their young lives. Professionally, in addition to language and other teaching, mostly at university level, I also have a 10-year working experience from the Norwegian state administration. While my duties there were manifold, the common denominator has always been education with a variable emphasis on language use, language learning, teaching and professional practice as well as educational policy. All in all, my interest in multilingualism is necessarily shaped by these various influences: it is interlaced with a host of related socio-political concerns, particularly migration in a fast-changing, globalized world.

This interdisciplinary attitude is also reflected in the way the research questions have been shaped and approached, namely, as part of a wider socio-political ecology where the different constituent parts either directly or more obliquely constitute each other. Article I most directly communicates and reflects this positioning: it is not limited to an interest in language ideologies *per se* but in how these are interlaced with other ideologies relevant in the broader context, particularly educational ideologies in diverse global spaces. This approach

expresses an acute sense of the transnational dimension of the social in the contemporary, late modern and late capitalist world, characterized by complex, hybrid discursive practices.

1.4 Dissertation outline

The dissertation is structured as follows: In *Part I*, I explicate the overarching theoretical-analytical, interpretive-empirical and methodological frameworks that bind the three individual studies presented in *Part II*. *Part I* is therefore, first and foremost, meant to build a broad conceptual skeleton of this research project but also to elaborate on what the peer-review format of academic publications does not provide room for. It will thus unite the publications into a coherent whole and provide updates and clarifications where necessary.

The structure of *Part I* is as follows. In Chapter 2, critical approaches to discourse analysis as the overarching analytical-theoretical framework informing this study will be laid out in detail, including its basic assumptions and specific approaches adopted. In Chapter 3, I discuss language education policy as the broad empirical grounding of my research. This entails a presentation of the current, relevant theoretical advances built into the fabric of this thesis but also a broad overview of empirical work within which the findings of this study can be interpreted. A detailed treatment of, and reflection on, methodical issues is provided in Chapter 4. A summary of the individual empirical studies is given in Chapter 5. In Chapter 6, I consider the theoretical and empirical significance of this research project and reflect on its limitations and as well as avenues for future research emanating thereof.

2 THE DISCOURSE-ANALYTICAL APPROACH

2.1 Critical approaches to discourse analysis – locating the field

For a novice, settling into the field of (critical) discourse analysis and finding his or her position may be a daunting task, not only because it is not a well-delineated field of enquiry but also because, relatedly, there is a multitude of central, theory-laden terms and concepts that are being appropriated and applied variably across the field, such as discourse/language or text/context. In fact, the very labelling of the field is a site of contest, spanning possibilities such as 'critical discourse analysis' (lowercase), 'Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)' (uppercase), 'critical discourse studies', 'critical approaches to discourse analysis'/'critical approaches to language' or, simply, 'discourse analysis'.

In what follows below, I will unpack some of the suggested complexity. Upon an initial reflection on, and clarification of, terminological issues, I will explicate some of the basic assumptions embedded in the approaches informing this study. A model of approaching the social world through a critical lens of discourse analysis, as applicable in this thesis, will be outlined. Upon consideration of critique levelled at the outlined model, a theoretical-analytical extension will be proposed with a specific recourse to narrative discourse, an approach adopted and pursued in parts of this research project.

2.2 Discourse – preliminary terminological clarifications

The term discourse has various connotations and applications across the social sciences. In traditional linguistic/pragmatic understanding, discourse is taken to represent a unit of language beyond the sentence (see on this Blommaert, 2005; Georgakopoulou & Goutsos, 2004). Similarly, at an abstract level, discourse may represent an analytical category encompassing a multitude of meaning-making (semiotic) resources that can be subjected to rigorous study (Fairclough, Mulderring, & Wodak, 2013, p. 79). Discourse can, however, also be seen in broader terms as representing ways of *doing and achieving things*² in the world, or, in other words, as a form of social practice. This view of discourse is common for CDA practitioners (e.g. Fairclough, 2001) and (critical) discourse analysts alike (e.g. Blommaert, 2005; De Fina & King, 2011). Also, at this broader level, more nuanced semantic distinctions in labelling discourse exist. Krzyzanowski (2016), for example, provides a useful terminological heuristic that identifies four different applications: 1) 'a specific discourse'

² All italics in this text are mine, unless otherwise stated.

where the adjectival modifier denotes a particular identifiable discourse type, such as 'racist' or 'sexist'; 2) 'discourse of' a particular smaller or larger socio-political, cultural entity or community of practice, such as the EU, which makes it traceable to its production site; 3) 'X + discourse', such as globalization discourse, relating it to larger social structures but also 4) 'discourse about/on' which underscores thematic concerns, such as discourse on early childhood education. Another wide-spread conceptualization of discourse (Gee, 2001, 2011, 2014) distinguishes between discourse (lowercase) and Discourse (uppercase), corresponding roughly to the distinction between discourse as language in use and as social practice. For the purpose of this study, I see both conceptualizations as relevant and will expand and/or specify further, as appropriate.

2.3 The interdisciplinary critical pool

As briefly noted above, a number of denotations of the field of (critical) discourse analysis are in circulation. In fact, researchers may variably embrace or distance themselves from these denotations, not infrequently changing their terminological affiliation across time (see e.g. Grue, 2011). In the *Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education*, Rogers (2011a, p. 2) makes a similar point and argues for an interchangeable use of the various terms as depending on their context of application.

Broadly speaking, while critical approaches to discourse analysis may be seen as a more generic term, encompassing a range of analytical approaches with a more-or-less blatantly avowed critical agenda, approaches such as CDA (uppercase), with Norman Fairclough as one of its first and most prominent proponents, may be seen as but one example that falls within the broader scope of critical approaches. Blommaert (2005, pp. 5–6), for example, argues that, while providing a number of ground-breaking insights on bridging social and linguistic theory, CDA is often, mistakenly, equated with *the* critical and 'socially committed analysis of language'. He singles out two other approaches to language – American linguistic anthropology and mainstream sociolinguistics – to underscore how these too, in their distinct ways, belong to the wider 'critical pool'. In a similar spirit, James Paul Gee has long advocated for seeing language as a key element in negotiating the distribution of social goods of an a priori unequal social status (see e.g. 2011, p. 31): he argues that, in line with such a conceptualization of language, discourse analysis is/should be inherently 'critical'/'political', hence making the modifier 'critical' into a pleonasm.

In this thesis, critical approaches to discourse analysis are adopted as an overarching analytical perspective. As will become clear upon reading this study in its entirety, I have

traversed a trajectory which starts off with an exploration and application of CDA (uppercase), particularly as conceptualized by Fairclough (1992, 2001, 2003, 2010) (see Article I), and drifted towards a broader enactment of discourse analysis as a field of critical enquiry *per se* (see Articles II and III). While necessarily reflecting in part my own emergent positioning as a discourse analyst, this trajectory also underscores deeper theoretical and methodological concerns that have emerged along the way and fuelled a need to explore beyond Fairclough's CDA, yet still within the 'critical pool'.

As already foregrounded, critical approaches to discourse analysis are necessarily inherently interdisciplinary or eclectic: they variably draw on a number of perspectives embedded in different traditions of scholarships, including, broadly speaking, text linguistics, language studies, sociology/anthropology of language, cultural studies, history and/or social and political theory (see e.g. Blommaert, 2005; Chilton & Wodak, 2005; Rogers, 2011a; Van Dijk, 2001; Wodak & Meyer, 2001). While the term 'eclectic' may have pejorative connotations, suggesting a lack of theoretical, analytical or methodological rigor, it is here understood as a 'controlled use of tools coming from different paradigms' (Kerbrat-Orecchioni, 2010, p. 72). Jørgensen and Phillips see such strategic eclecticism, or, in their terminology, 'multiperspectival work' (2002, p. 4), as a key dimension of (critical) discourse analysis, not only inherent but also positively valued in the different strands of the field. On my reading, the term also reflects a shared premise of late-modern, critical approaches in general: rather than privileging one single approach as primary, the suggested heterogeneity or plurality of approaches resonates with a commitment to keeping analytical possibilities open as well as subject to a continuous, rigorous interrogation.

The inter-disciplinarity inherent in the wider critical pool necessarily implies certain caveats. Wodak and Weiss (2005, p. 124), for example, identify frequent under-specifications of the different levels of theory as a looming danger. While recognizing that interdisciplinary insights may furnish researchers with 'creative dynamics', they call for a constant vigilance of epistemological concerns throughout the entire research process. Blommaert (2005), on the other hand, adopts a pragmatic view and argues that analytical ventures beyond disciplinary orthodoxies are imperative if one is to arrive at viable explanations of the workings of language in society.

Wary of these dangers and in recognition of the comprehensive volume of work that has already been generated on these issues, I will not attempt an all-encompassing overview of the different critical approaches, nor will I trace their various roots and influences: I see this as being beyond the scope of this thesis. Furthermore, as Blommaert aptly notes, any such

attempt is necessarily bound to be burdened by differential understandings of what does and does not constitute the term 'critical' (2005, p. 6). Consistent with this view, scholars within the critical pool have recently raised the issue of the culturally specific connotations of the term 'critical' (Zhang, Chilton, He, & Jing, 2011) and have also questioned the possibilities and limits of normative critique in empirical discourse studies (Herzog, 2016).

In what follows, I will therefore restrict myself to singling out the basic assumptions in approaches central in this research: 1) CDA as a critical approach to discourse that has given this study its initial conceptual form (Article I) and 2) critical perspectives on narrative discourse in the post-Labovian, social-interactionist paradigm (see e.g. De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2012; Ochs & Capps, 2001) (Articles II & III). While the former will form a vantage point, I will elaborate, comment and expand with reference to the latter, as appropriate, in relevant sub-sections below. Overall, rather than emphasizing differences and nuances that set the various critical approaches apart, my aim is to underscore commonality and possibilities for mutual interaction and synergy. In other words, my aim is to contribute to tapping 'sources of mutual inspiration' within the critical pool (Blommaert, 2005, p. 9).

2.4 Basic assumptions of critical approaches to discourse

As with the different critical strands of discourse analysis, CDA itself represents a number of approaches that may differ to a greater or lesser extent in terms of their specific analytical and methodological focus and techniques (Fairclough et al., 2013). Some of the most prominent ones are the dialectic-historical approach associated with Norman Fairclough and colleagues (e.g. Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Fairclough, 2001), the discourse-historical approach developed and applied by Ruth Wodak and colleagues (e.g. Krzyżanowski & Wodak, 2011; Reisigl & Wodak, 2001) and the socio-cognitive approach pursued by Teun Van Dijk and others (e.g. Chilton, 2004; Van Dijk, 1998). A number of texts, concerned with providing an introduction to and/or overview of the field (Chilton & Wodak, 2005; Fairclough et al., 2013; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Huckin, 1997; M. Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002; R. Wodak & Meyer, 2001) mention the following as fundamental assumptions that unite these various approaches to CDA on a generic level:

First, the focal interest is directed at the relationship between language and society, or, in CDA terms, at the discursive aspects of various social practices. This is often accomplished by combining linguistic insights with social and/or political theory. Nonetheless, the application of each analytical element may vary from analyst to analyst. Second, CDA recognizes that social practices also contain non-discursive elements and underscores the

dialectic nature of relations between the semiotic and non-semiotic elements of the social as mutually constitutive and constituted. Third, CDA is preoccupied with power and the ideological effects of discourse: it interrogates the role of discourse in a broad semiotic sense in the production and re-production of social difference and change. In other words, differential access to linguistic and social semiotic means of expression and, by implication, access to social identities and goods of unequal social status, are intimately connected in CDA with questions of power, social equity and justice. Furthermore, as a number of prominent proponents of CDA/critical approaches to discourse argue (e.g. Blackledge, 2003; Fairclough, 2001), the ideological effects of texts are at their most powerful when their implicit assumptions come to be regarded as common sense and are hence taken for granted rather than questioned or challenged. It is thus obviating the ideological nature of these assumptions and making the implicit explicit that may be seen as a crucial aspect of CDA. Fourth, closely connected to the third assumption, CDA can be seen as part of a wider social practice, and, since any social practice is regarded as being inherently ideological, CDA practitioners may avow a variable degree of commitment to social change. In sum, CDA can be seen as a 'problem-oriented interdisciplinary movement' (Fairclough et al., 2013, p. 79) or even an 'attitude' towards discourse analysis embedded in a wider socio-political and cultural ecology and variably combinable/compatible with other approaches (Huckin, 1997, p. 78; Van Dijk, 2001, p. 96).

While the power/ideological aspect of discourse is a particularly prominent feature of enquiry in CDA, as made clear above, it does figure in other approaches within the critical pool too, albeit in a more subdued way. Blommaert's critical introduction to discourse (2005) provides a succinct treatment of this line of argument. He lists a number of features as fundamental in what he, unwillingly, labels an 'ethnographic-sociolinguistic analysis of discourse' with a distinctly critical agenda, including work within interactional sociolinguistics, (critical) linguistic ethnography, ethnography of communication and narrative/narrative discourse analysis, among others. Blommaert argues that the critical perspective embedded in this wide pool of approaches is, first and foremost, built from the bottom up. Hence, it is the 'insiders' view' that is one of its distinguishing features. Secondly, stressing the role of the environment in how language and language forms are enacted, their rich contextualization in time and space are imperative. As Blommaert notes, this principle is deeply entrenched in and derives from the field of anthropology and ethnography. Relatedly, it implies paying utmost attention to local conditions and environmental specifics. Thirdly, he sees language users as possessing linguistic repertoires conditioned upon their sociolinguistic

background and subject to variation across time and space. Implicated in this view is an understanding of these repertoires as unequally distributed and their enactment as refracting wider structural injustice, well beyond national contexts. In sum, these approaches not only acknowledge the fundamental links between language and society, but they also place the inherent differences in the distribution of linguistic and other resources, available to speakers, at their core.

Developed by Ron and Suzie Scollon (2004), nexus analysis represents a critical approach to discourse that combines key CDA concepts of power, history and ideology with an ethnographic attention to social action performed by social actors in time and space as its springboard (see Lane, 2014). Since it is not pursued in this study, I will refrain from further elaboration.

2.5 Approaching the social world through the critical lens of discourse analysis

While different strands of critical approaches to discourse analysis may have developed specific models of conceptualizing discourse in the social world, I will here draw on Fairclough's model (1992, 2001, 2003, 2010, 2011), which informs Article I. This will entail foregrounding its key components, conceptualizations of these components as well as wider theoretical issues emanating thereof. The model will also serve as a useful analytical vantage point for illustrating how the broad thematic and interpretative framework, laid out in Chapter 3, may figure therein, thus ensuring an internal analytical-theoretical and interpretive coherence in this study.

2.5.1 A 'Faircloughian' model of discourse – considerations and critique

Although some variation is discernible between the different versions of Fairclough's model (1992, 2001, 2003, 2010, 2011), they are united in presenting an approach to discourse that distinguishes between three dialectically interlaced elements: social events, social practices and social structures. Language, in a broad semiotic sense, is here viewed as a pervasive feature of the social present at all its levels (Fairclough, 2003, p. 24).

Social events are operationalized as different types and forms of multimodal texts, including variations of oral and written artefacts. Policy documents and audio recordings, as well as transcripts of research interviews, which constitute data material drawn on in Article I and Articles II & III, respectively, are relevant examples.

Texts are never seen as isolated units or as arising in a vacuum but rather as highly integrated in their socio-historical contexts, which implies particular processes of production and interpretation. In other words, texts are produced for a purpose and thus embedded within a multitude of social practices that may variably shape or constrain them, such as the practice of language education policy or, even more specifically and with an immediate application in this thesis, the policy and practice of language and literacy education for emerging bilinguals in preschool and early grades in school. While the concept of practice is fundamental across social sciences, it is particularly Bourdieu's theorizing that is drawn on here and in other CDA work (see e.g. Krzyżanowski, 2014). On the most abstract level, Fairclough conceptualizes social practice as 'ways to control the selection of certain structural possibilities at the exclusion of others, and the retention of these selections over time in particular areas of social life' (2011, p. 120). It is the network of social practices in their specifically discursive (semiotic) aspects that are of fundamental interest. Fairclough terms these *orders of discourse* and singles out three modes or types of meaning inherent in these – 1) *genres* as ways of acting in/through language, 2) *discourses* as ways of representing and 3) *styles* as ways of interacting. Mapping onto Halliday's (2014) functional structural linguistics, they represent analytical tools for approaching texts, such as through an investigation of grammatical mood (genres), grammatical metaphors (discourse) or modality (style), among others.

Orders of discourse are again embedded in larger social structures, as represented for example by language at its most abstract level, class/kinship systems or economic systems. Rather than determining the other elements, social structures can be seen as 'defining a potential – a set of possibilities' (Fairclough, 2011, p. 120).

A crucial aspect of the model is the relational connection between the internal/lexico-grammatical, external/inter-textual relations of texts and their wider socio-political aspects. Of particular note is also that, while the model clearly suggests causal effects between elements, it is not simple mechanical/linear causality or regularity but rather more diffuse and not easily measurable effects of texts that are of interest, in particular their ideological effects.

While the model represents a highly elaborate theoretical-analytical attempt at approaching the social world through the lens of discourse, multiple forms of critique have been levelled at its conceptual-theoretical as well as analytical validity (e.g. Blommaert, 2005; Schegloff, 1997; Widdowson, 1995, 2004). In fact, this critique is not limited to Fairclough's conceptualization of CDA only but applies to other CDA approaches as well. In their synthesis of this critique, Rogers et al. (2005, p. 372) mention the following as particularly salient: 1) CDA's ideological commitments as providing an a priori lens on data; 2) an uneasy

balance between social and linguistic theory and method; and 3) an inadequate or problematic embedding in social contexts. Needless to say, these points have generated much polemical, on-going debate between CDA practitioners and CDA critics (for useful summaries see e.g. Benwell & Stokoe, 2006; Blommaert, 2005).

Within the scope of this research, it is particularly the issue of text/context, or, in other words, CDA's attempt to bridge micro and macro contexts of analysis but also, relatedly, the question of voice and researcher reflexivity, which deserve further reflection. Firstly, Fairclough's three-tier framework and other approaches within CDA have been accused of paying undue attention to 'texts of authority' (Blackledge, 2003), typically produced in institutional contexts and presenting power as, primarily, a top-down affair with an a priori negative slant. In other words, CDA's preoccupation with institutional power all too often translates into unmasking institutional power abuse, as enacted in racist, sexist or other discriminatory discourse (see also Grue, 2011). In doing so, CDA is seen as imposing a view from above in a 'stentorian analyst's voice', rather than empowering the voice of the speaking subject through thick, preferably ethnographic, contextualization (Blommaert, 2005, p. 33). Interestingly, Blommaert extends his conceptualization of context beyond visible contextual frames and into invisible contexts that are represented, for example, by linguistic and other resources, seen as the very carriers of patterns of privilege and disenfranchisement. Despite an emphasis and an empirical integration of ethnographic insights in, for example, Wodak's discourse-historical approach, as well as in a growing number of recent CDA/CDA-inspired work (D. C. Johnson, 2011; Krzyżanowski, 2011; Rogers, 2002, 2005, 2011b), it is the critically reflexive theorization of the emic perspective, particularly as represented by voices that often remain silent and invisible, that was found wanting for the purposes of this study. Below, I therefore lay out perspectives on narrative discourse which have been applied in this project in an attempt to capture such perspectives in a theoretically robust way.

2.5.2 *Narrative discourse analysis*

The capacity of narrative to provide a window into the lived experience has long been noted across both humanities and social sciences. Bruner (2002, p. 16), for example, argues that our collective life in culture is made possible through sharing our experience in a narrative form. For Nelson (1998), narrative represents the very tool for structuring such experience, acquired early in life. Broadly speaking, narrative is seen as a way of making human experience meaningful (Polkinghorne, 1988). Indeed, the very etymology of the term gives away the two inseparable elements it entails, namely "telling" (*narrare*) and "knowing in some particular

way" (*gnarus*)' (Bruner, 2002, p. 27). As such, narratives can be seen as an essential part of our social life (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2012; Gubrium & Holstein, 2009).

There are a number of ways of approaching narrative. Several typologies have been proposed, such as the tripartite distinction between thematic approaches (the 'what' of narratives'), structural approaches (the 'how' of narratives') and performance-dialogic approaches (the context of 'what' and 'how') (Riessman, 2008). Yet, as De Fina and Georgakopoulou (2012) argue, narrative analyses often entail a combination of elements, making too hard and fast distinctions between approaches analytically problematic.

In line with the above account of critical approaches to discourse analysis, narrative analysis, as understood and applied here, is affiliated with and arises out of insights within sociolinguistics, particularly social-interactional approaches (e.g. De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2012; Ochs & Capps, 2001). This implies that narratives are not simply viewed as content only, amenable primarily to content analysis, but also as texts in their own right (Baynham, 2011); they are 'replete with indexical elements – connections between linguistic-narrative form and context, situation and social order' (Blommaert, 2005, p. 84). Viewed as such, narrative discourse analysis becomes a privileged site for critical investigations into individual experience nested in complex webs of social relationships and practices (Norton, 2013). Narrative analysis thus also becomes a 'locus of expression, construction and enactment of identity' (De Fina, 2003b, p. 11).

As Articles II and III demonstrate, narrative as a unit of analysis in this study does not span the entire biography or life story but rather represents more-or-less fluid segments relating present, past or even future hypothetical accounts of experience. In this analytical tradition, the seminal work by Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972) is often referred to as establishing an analytical canon that has long dominated the field (see on this e.g. Bamberg, 2006; Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008; Georgakopoulou, 2007). Labov's (1972, p. 360) minimal definition sees narrative as a linguistic encoding of events that have entered the personal biography of the narrator and are composed of at least two clauses that are sequentially organized and temporally ordered. Eliciting narratives of past experience among members of Harlem youth gangs, prompted specifically by questions on their encounter with situations charged with emotional danger, Labov and Waletzky proposed a basic analytical framework of fully-fledged narrative structure, involving the following elements:

1. Abstract – what was this about?
2. Orientation – who/what does the story involve + where/when does it occur?

3. Complicating Action – then what happened?
4. Evaluation – so what?
5. Result/resolution – what finally happened?
6. Coda – what does it all mean?³

Although highly influential, the framework has been critiqued as being too rigid, neither reflecting the way stories are often told across different contexts nor taking stock of the contextual and interactional work that occurs in much narrative activity (for a useful overview, see e.g. Lampropoulou, 2012). Looking at conversational storytelling rather than narratives elicited in research interviews, Ochs and Capps (2001) proposed an alternative framework that looks at narrative in less rigid structural terms and along the following dimensions:

1. Tellership – from one to more tellers
2. Tellability – from high to low
3. Linearity – from closed temporal and causal ordering to openness and fluidity
4. Embeddedness in the surrounding discourse – from high to low
5. Moral stance – from constant to fluid

Ochs and Capps' dimensions are particularly instructive for, and readily applicable to, empirical explorations of a broad range of narrative formats, well beyond the 'Labovian' canonical or 'big' story (on this, see e.g. Bamberg, 2004b; Georgakopoulou, 2007; Lampropoulou, 2012). Termed 'small stories', they represent 'a gamut of underrepresented narrative activities, such as tellings of ongoing events, future or hypothetical events, and shared (known) events but it also captures allusions to (previous) tellings, deferrals of tellings, and refusals to tell' (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008, p. 381). This move away from well-elaborated and towards variably coherent and open-ended storytelling also reflects a general recognition in postmodern approaches to narrative reality of the importance of the socially constructed and circumstantially occasioned nature of narrative. For Gubrium and Holstein (2009), for example, narrative work and narrative environment are key operating components in the weaving of narrative accounts of experience. On this view, constructing a story of self becomes equivalent to constructing a personal myth, enabled by a combination of narrative

³ Note that while Labov (1972, p. 370) formulates elements 1–5 with the aid of accompanying questions, relating to the 'function of effective narrative', as rendered above, he argues that the sixth element, the coda, '*puts off* a question – it signals that Questions 3 and 4 are no longer relevant.

rights, obligations and power and performed collaboratively between the teller and the variably active listener (Gubrium & Holstein, 2009, p. 47). Narrative thus becomes a form of social practice performed across a range of interactional contexts, including but not limited to research interviews (for discussion see e.g. De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2008; De Fina & Perrino, 2011; Talmy, 2010, 2011; Wortham, Mortimer, Lee, Allard, & White, 2011).

The post-Labovian, social-interactional approach to narrative discourse adopted in this study reflects these analytical concerns closely. The issue of the multi-layered embedding of narrative work in both local and broader societal contexts is a central theme in the positioning framework, first proposed by Bamberg (Bamberg, 1997, 2004a) and applied and further refined in much recent scholarship (e.g. De Fina, 2013; Poveda, 2004; Wortham & Gadsden, 2006). Essentially, Bamberg's framework entails a three-tier analysis which normally proceeds from the discursive micro-detail of the constructed story towards broader structural concerns emanating from the inherent embedding of the story in wider structural frames. This includes: 1) the story world itself, which normally builds on a particular theme and is peopled with characters that may variably drive the story forward; 2) the interactional layer, which places the act of storytelling in the immediate, interactional environment and 3) the broader contexts, where structural indexicals may apply and be variably enacted or resisted by the narrator. It is this acute attention to the multi-layered positioning work woven into the fabric of narrative that has been recognized as a tool for a productive bridging of the micro and macro discursive environments or, in other words, as a way of connecting 'the local focus of conversation analytic and the more global focus of critical discourse analytic approaches' (De Fina, Schiffrin, & Bamberg, 2006, p. 8). For further details on the framework and its application within the scope of this study, see Articles II & III.

Related to the issue of narrative rights, obligations and status is the question of agency and voice in discourse. In critical approaches to discourse, the analysis of voice has been singled out as an essential aspect of the study of power effects as well as conditions of power: on this view, the study of voice in its different configurations across time and space is equated with the very foundations of critical analysis (Blommaert, 2005). Acknowledging the capacity of space to be agentive (Blommaert, Collins, & Slembrouck, 2005), critical approaches to discourse, such as narrative analysis, pay attention to the variable conditioning of agency in interaction and aim at creating opportunities for empowered positions from which to speak rather than remain silent (Norton, 2013). Referring to the current upsurge of scientific interest in agency as the agentive turn, Ahearn (2001, p. 112) has proposed an oft quoted definition of agency as "the socioculturally mediated capacity to act". Drawing on the sociological theory

of practice as formulated in the work of Bourdieu and Giddens, Ahearn's definition underscores the centrality of human action, yet neither as totally free, synonymous with resistance nor as a mere function of overpowering, impersonal discursive and other structures. By attending to both the constituting as well as constituted nature of human action, Ahearn propels to visibility the complex theoretical question of how "social reproduction becomes social transformation" (2001, p. 131). Noting the inevitability of agency at the existential, performative and grammatical level, Duranti (2004, pp. 467–477) argues that its encoding in language remains both important and problematic for speakers. One, though not the only, avenue for exploring the encoding of agency as variable across time and space is by zooming the discursive analysis in on the linguistic device of reported speech frequently employed by narrators to re-create their story worlds. Fundamentally polyphonic, reported speech has been studied across different linguistic fields, such as functional linguistics, sociolinguistics as well as discourse analysis to unravel the complexities of voice in discourse (De Fina, 2003b; Ingrid & Aronsson, 2014; Lampropoulou, 2011; Lanza, 2012; E. R. Miller, 2014; Schiffrin, 2006; Tannen, 1981, 2007). For further details on how this challenge has been embraced in this research project, see Article III.

In sum, both the notion of positioning in narrative discourse as well as the issue of reported speech as agency, constructed as part of a situationally occasioned narrative reality, foreground in important ways the collaborative nature of narrative and, by extension, the position of the researcher as fundamentally implicated in how narrative environments in their entirety condition what stories emerge, how and when. These approaches thus not only obviate researcher reflexivity as an essential aspect of critical research practice, but they also provide tools for subjecting it to rigorous analytical scrutiny (for further details, see Articles II & III).

3 LANGUAGE EDUCATION POLICY – THE EMPIRICAL CONTEXT

3.1 Framing the field

Language policy and planning (LPP), sometimes simply referred to as language planning (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997) or language policy (Spolsky, 2004), is a broad and complex field of enquiry⁴. Recapitulating earlier scholarship, frameworks and typologies, Hornberger (2006) underscores as its two key, widely accepted dimensions *types* and *approaches*, developed early in the field and necessarily mutually related. In terms of *types*, LPP is in her model concerned with 1) status planning (about uses of language) 2) acquisition planning (about users of language) and 3) corpus planning (about language), which can all be realized within either a policy planning approach (policy form) or a cultivation planning approach (policy function). In this study, it is particular aspects of the dimension of acquisition planning that are targeted, notwithstanding a certain degree of interlacing among the different sub-types (Hult, 2004; Liddicoat, 2007). Termed in scholastic literature variably language education policy (LEP) (Evans & Hornberger, 2005; Menken, 2013), language-in-education planning (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997) or language policy in education (LiEP) (Garcia, 2009), bilingual education is here considered LEP's basic realization in multilingual settings and provides this research project with a broad empirical grounding.

As Ricento (2006, p. 10) argues, there is no overarching theory of LPP. Similarly to discourse analysis, the field is profoundly inter- and transdisciplinary. On a broad scale, LPP, but also LEP, can be conceived of as an element of social policy (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996): nested in wider socio-political, historical and economic structures, it is not restricted to language only but is profoundly interlaced with a myriad discursive and non-discursive processes at various levels of society, including local, regional, national but also transnational levels. Tracing the historical and theoretical influences that have shaped LPP as a scientific discipline, Ricento (2000) conceptualizes these as 1) macro-political, 2) epistemological and 3) strategic. Epistemologically, the advent of critical social theory in the study of LPP is seen as being precipitated by macro-political forces and processes, such as nationalism, nation-building or the failure of modernization, which have also stimulated a re-definition of broader strategic aims in LPP. As already noted by Ricento and Hornberger (1996), while early approaches conceptualized LPP as neutral/apolitical, problem-oriented and pragmatic, later

⁴For a discussion of nuances in the different terminological denotations of the field, see Johnson (2013).

approaches have come to question central LPP concepts as ideologically laden and LPP processes as inherently implicated in the political and moral order. Furthermore, rather than unification, modernization or efficiency, equality and social justice have come high on the agenda. This can also be mapped onto Ruiz' (1984) oft-quoted typology of language planning in terms of three basic orientations to language as either 1) problem, 2) right or 3) resource, with the first orientation reflected in the early, positivist approaches to LPP and the other two as incorporated in the later, critical/post-modern LPP theorizing and methodology. As already foreshadowed, in this study, LEP, as a constituent part of LPP, is studied from a critical perspective and draws on scholarship that builds on an orientation to language as both right and resource.

While broadly related to social and educational policy, LEP in multilingual settings is also closely intertwined with insights emanating from strands of sociolinguistic and applied linguistic research, most notably bilingualism and literacy. Similarly to Ricento's remark above on the theoretical nature of LPP, Hornberger (2003a, p. 5) argues that there is no unified or complete theory of either bilingualism or literacy, given their complexity and multi-disciplinarity and the inter-dependence between research, policy and practice; this then necessarily renders 'unity and coherence elusive objects'. In terms of the tripartite interaction between research, policy and practice, a growing dissonance across national contexts has been noted (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010). In what follows, I will therefore first discuss a selection of current theoretical advances relevant in the context of this study. This will encompass conceptualizations of LEP and perspectives on bilingualism and bilingual education, including biliteracy and equitable learning for emergent bilinguals as their indelible parts. Foregrounding LEP as profoundly multi-scalar, I will then locate the present study within LEP research in Norway and other relevant/comparative empirical contexts, foregrounding those perspectives that are brought to bear in specific ways on this research project.

3.2 A preliminary note on terminology

In research on LEP in multilingual settings, terms such as bilingualism, multilingualism, bilingual and multilingual literacy, bi-/multiliteracy, pluriliteracies, among others, proliferate. While the very conceptualization of language as well as a host of related terms have been challenged and fundamentally redefined in recent years, as will be discussed below, it is specifically the prefixes 'multi' and 'bi' that are used variably in research to capture the co-existence of more than two languages in people's linguistic repertoires and in society. As Garcia (2009) argues, while the former may better capture the diverse language and literacy

practices in *multilingual* communities around the world today, the latter implies rather than denies it. In line with this view and driven by pragmatic concerns, I will employ both prefixes interchangeably and as a refraction of their variable usage in the specific theoretical and empirical work referenced here. This applies also to the individual studies in *Part II*. As already noted in Section 1, children acquiring two or more languages simultaneously or sequentially will be referred to as *emerging bilinguals* (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010). As in the above introductory discussion, and wary of different terminological preferences among scholars, I will adopt the terms language education policy (LEP) and language policy and planning (LPP) throughout this manuscript.

3.3 LEP in the age of superdiversity: the multilingual turn

With the advent of globalisation and the rapid technological advances of recent years, the study of society and of language in society has been redefined in fundamental ways. While immigrant communities in Western democracies have for decades been conceptualized as more or less well-organized entities with identifiable core values (Smolicz, 1981), new immigrant demographics have challenged this notion of ethnic diversity. Coined 'superdiversity', the current patterns of social organization, particularly in large metropolitan centres of the globalized world, are characterized by 'a dynamic interplay of variables among an increased number of new, small and scattered, multiple-origin, transnationally connected, socio-economically differentiated and legally stratified immigrants' (Vertovec, 2007, p. 1024). As Vertovec further notes, the scale of these changes necessarily translates into a particular challenge for both research and policy.

The research field of bilingualism and bilingual education has responded by re-directing its scientific attention towards these new forms of diversified, hybrid, ethnolinguistic communities and their way of 'being linguistically' in the new superdiverse social order (see e.g. Blommaert, 2010). This has resulted in fundamental redefinitions of a number of central concepts within the discipline, including language itself. By extension, and with applicability in this research project, this also necessarily implies a particular challenge for language education policy research, and will be discussed below across the three key dimensions of this research project: language, literacy and learning.

3.3.1 The language dimension

Within critical applied linguistic and sociolinguistic research, the upsurge of scientific interest in urban linguistic landscapes and mediascapes as particularly complex, polyphonic loci of

fluid semiotic encounters across time and space marks the so-called 'multilingual turn' (May, 2014d). It implies that multilingualism, rather than monolingualism, is recognised as the common linguistic behaviour of the global citizen. Language itself, linked in the centuries-long, initially mostly European, nation-building project to the very concept of a people united by a common monoglot expression (Heller, 1999; May, 2012), is no longer seen as a bounded entity, 'territorialized in one place and owned by one community' (Canagarajah, 2014, p. 78). Rather, it is seen as a fluid and mobile semiotic resource (Blommaert, 2010), enacted by its users to accomplish their communicative goals. By extension, multiple linguistic resources are seen as part of an individual's communicative repertoire and the variable enactment of the repertoire across time and space as a dynamic tool for sense-making. Termed translanguaging (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Garcia, 2009; Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012), codemeshing (Canagarajah, 2011), polylingual languaging/polylanguaging (J. N. Jørgensen, 2008; J. N. Jørgensen, Karrebæk, Madsen, & Møller, 2011) or metrolingualism (Otsuji & Pennycook, 2010), among others, it underscores the multilingual individual's dynamic and mobile linguistic capacities from a position of strength rather than that of deficit or weakness. Language competence, conditioned upon the space in which it is enacted (Blommaert et al., 2005), is seen as a central ingredient in an individuals' variable communicative repertoire of multicompetence (Hornberger, 2003a). In fact, replacing the term multilingualism with the more dynamic, Bakhtinian 'heteroglossia', has been proposed (Blackledge, Creese, & Takhi, 2014) and endorsed in current sociolinguistic research (e.g. Garcia, 2009).

These insights and advances from the 'sociolinguistics of complexity'/'sociolinguistics of mobility' (Blommaert, 2010, 2013b) necessarily impact research on the educational practice in bilingual classrooms and, potentially, the practice itself too. Firstly, the reconceptualization of language as a mobile semiotic resource with fluid boundaries challenges long-established concepts within second language acquisition (SLA) research, such as mother tongue, first language (L1), second language (L2), interlanguage or fossilization. They have been critically examined by a number of scholars (Blackledge et al., 2014; May, 2014a) who have pointed out that these concepts are entrenched in a unidirectional, linear and mostly sequential view of bilingual development that ignores the much more prevalent form of simultaneous bilingual development in many parts of the world. On this view, bilingualism is essentially conceptualized as two or more monolingualisms (Heller, 1999) and the emerging bilingual as ideally aiming at a form of 'ultimate attainment'; before the stage of balanced bilingualism is reached, the language learner is rendered 'incomplete' (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010, p. 44). The monolingual bias in terminology is also

often refracted in educational practice, leading to the 'two solitudes' assumption in bilingual education, whereby instruction is strictly reserved to one language at a time, and alternations between languages are discouraged (Cummins, 2008; see also Heller, 1999). As Cummins argues, 'when we free ourselves from exclusive reliance on monolingual instructional approaches, a wide variety of opportunities arise for teaching bilingual instructional strategies that acknowledge the reality of, and strongly promote, cross-linguistic transfer (2008, p. 65).

Translanguaging, in particular, has been recognized as one such resource that can enhance educational practice in multilingual classrooms and promote emerging bilinguals' linguistic repertoires in a creative and scaffolded fashion. This may imply a dynamic use of several languages to accomplish various instructional tasks but also an alternate switching of languages between tasks, such as reading a story in one language and discussing it in another. With reference to Duverger, Garcia and Kleifgen (2010, p. 46) refer to these types of translanguaging classroom practices as micro- and macro-alternation respectively. They further argue that 'if properly understood and suitably applied, such instructional practices can in fact enhance the complex cognitive, linguistic, and literacy abilities that students need' (2010, p. 46). Since classroom practice is not a specific concern of this research project, insights from the growing pool of empirical research on the implementation of translanguaging as a resource in classrooms will not be pursued here. It is, however, of note that these insights offer reflections and inspiration that have stimulated much scholastic discussion on the possibilities and limitations of current models of bilingual education provision (see e.g. Garcia, 2009; Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010; Hornberger & Link, 2012; Lewis et al., 2012; Menken & García, 2010; Velasco & García, 2014).

A case in point is, for example, the work of Garcia and colleagues (Garcia, 2009; Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010), who interrogate typologies of bilingual education, variably adopted in national language education policies around the world. Traditionally conceptualized as weak or strong or as subtractive or additive (Baker, 2011), subject to the amount of instructional language support and aims that each model promotes and advocates, the typology has recently been reshuffled by Garcia (2009) to include two broad categories: 1) monoglossic and 2) heteroglossic. While Garcia's former category includes bilingual education forms that are constructed from a monolingual, uni-directional, linear-acquisitional perspective, the latter encompasses models that embrace the fluid nature of bilingual development, as outlined above. Drawing on the metaphor of the banyan tree that organically adapts to its soil or that of a four-wheel-drive vehicle managing on any terrain, Garcia argues that heteroglossic bilingual education is better suited to and reflective of today's multilingual

realities and repertoires. Seeing emergent bilingualism in terms of a dynamic continuum and integrating it in bilingual pedagogy for all children, Garcia and Kleifgen suggest that it may aid in uprooting rigid monolingual standards in education and in accelerating their replacement with more flexible ones (2010, p. 3). Relatedly, they see such dynamic models as a way of endowing emerging bilinguals with agency to manage and negotiate their linguistic repertoires, with the aim of acquiring multilingual academic proficiency over time and with active support by caring and knowledgeable educators. When such dynamic, heteroglossic models are not a policy alternative, such as in Norway, transitional models can also adopt elements of the dynamic models, such as by enacting a constructive and effective use of translanguaging and other scaffolding resources, including building bridges between school and home cultures of learning. Ultimately, rather than arguing for a strict delineation of the various models, Garcia (2009) underscores their co-existence in different contexts of application.

As will be clear upon reading this study in its entirety, I draw on labels such as L1 and L2 in my own work. While it may be suggestive of a monolingual bias, as explicated above, this choice is a refraction of the reality of the mostly sequential bilingual development and education of the children in the participating families, a reality shared by many children of non-Norwegian ethnolinguistic heritage attending early childhood educational institutions in Norway nowadays (Ryen & Simonsen, 2016, p. 196).

3.3.2 The literacy dimension

Given the inherent complexity of both bilingualism and literacy as fields of scientific enquiry, they have traditionally been kept somewhat apart to prevent an amplification of already compounded issues (Hornberger, 2003a, p. 4). In this study, LEP is understood and underscored not only as encompassing tuition in one or more languages but also, ultimately, as providing opportunities to develop literacy skills in those languages. This conceptualization is inspired by Hornberger's framework for bilingualism and biliteracy where different intersecting and nested continua capture the complexity of the processes that pinpoint multilingual and multiliteracy development (2002, 2003a, 2003b). In this framework, biliteracy is seen as 'any and all instances in which communication occurs in two (or more) languages in or around writing' (2003c, p. xiii). As semiotic processes, all these communication instances, be they reading, writing, listening or speaking, build on each other in an interlaced and mutually supportive fashion (Garcia, 2009, pp. 337–338). As such, 'biliteracy itself represents a conjunction of literacy and bilingualism' (Hornberger, 2003a, p.

4). Such a close alliance between biliteracy and bilingualism can also be seen as part of an overarching 'language ecology' approach, first proposed by Haugen (1972) to refer to the study of the interlacing of language and its environment. It has since been foregrounded and variably applied in the work of numerous language, literacy and LEP scholars (Barton, 2007; Blackledge & Creese, 2010; Hornberger, 2003b; Hult, 2010; Martin-Jones & Jones, 2000; Norton, 2014; Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996).

This conceptualization of LEP is particularly relevant in the context of early childhood education where language and literacy development form a close alliance. From a psycholinguistic, cognitive perspective, it is particularly the robust connection between vocabulary size and future reading achievement (Lervåg & Aukrust, 2010), as well as the strong predictive relationship between phonological awareness and early decoding skills, that are well documented in research (Catts, Fey, Zhang, & Tomblin, 2001; Geva, 2006; Melby-Lervåg & Lervåg, 2011). Building on the theoretical premise that successful language learning occurs in and through participation in collaborative activities with shared goals and intentions (Tomasello, 2003, 2008; Tomasello, Carpenter, Call, Behne, & Moll, 2005), responsive child-adult interactions, fine-tuned to the child's attentional focus and based on frequent and rich linguistic input, such as through shared book reading (Cameron-Faulkner & Noble, 2013), have been shown to be of fundamental importance for both language and early literacy development (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Weizman & Snow, 2001).

However, rather than a set of dissected, cognitive skills to be acquired, multilingual literacy is, in line with research within the New Literacy Studies, perceived here as a form of social practice that is socially situated and sensitive to, as well as variable upon, dynamic contexts of use (Barton, 2007; Barton, Hamilton, & Ivanic, 1999; Street, 1985, 2005). On this view, literacy acquires a distinct power dimension, operating at both local and broader levels, such as in actual literacy interactions and encounters but also through societal processes infused with power hierarchies and ideologies and refracted at the scale of individual literacy encounters (Baynham, 2000, p. 99). On such an ideological view of literacy, literacy is not easily transferable across contexts but rather remains 'to be discovered, investigated and researched' in its local configurations (Baynham, 2000, pp. 99–100). By implication, multilingual literacy development in early childhood is, in this study, not understood as a unidirectional process proceeding from oral to written expression but as multi-directional, with variable points of influence and continuities (Hornberger, 1998). As such, it is closely related to the concept of dynamic bilingualism that, as already related above, is meant to capture the non-linear nature of bilingual development and use.

Within LEP, this translates to the conceptualizing of literacy as well in terms of repertoires of resources that students possess and that are employed within the context of schooling and classroom learning practice in a way that emerging bilinguals can relate to and capitalize on (Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester, 2003). Visualized through the biliteracy continua model, this implies drawing upon and thus empowering the traditionally less powerful ends of each continuum, such as through 1) foregrounding micro-level, oral and bilingual contexts of biliteracy over their macro-level, literate and monolingual counterparts, 2) underscoring oral, L1, receptive forms of literacy over written, L2 production or 3) acknowledging minority, vernacular and contextualized contents of biliteracy rather than through a single-handed attention to majority, literacy and decontextualized contents. Yet, this does not imply that attaining academic literacy across students' multilingual repertoires should no longer be the aim of classroom learning practice for emerging bilinguals. Rather, it highlights the importance of a scaffolded approach to multiple language and literacy development where sustained effort over time remains key (Garcia and Kleifgen, 2010, p. 121). In this study, the literacy dimension of policy is seen as an element intricately interlaced in a broad LEP ecology with language and learning and will be explored as such, rather than separately, in Articles II and III.

3.3.3 The learning dimension

An ecological approach to language education for emerging bilinguals does not stop at the language and literacy dimensions but also encompasses aspects of learning in general, realized through equitable curricular and pedagogical opportunities that foreground emergent bilinguals' developmental and learning needs. While pursued already in much earlier scholarship (for a particularly influential framework, see e.g. Cummins, 2000), such a broad vision for educating emerging bilinguals has recently been succinctly articulated by Garcia and Kleifgen (2010). Citing Gandara and Contreras, they argue that '(t)he problem of English learners' underachievement ... is more likely related to the quality of education that these students receive, regardless of the language of instruction' (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010, pp. 70–71). In more general terms, this vision can be seen as building on the ideals of multicultural education emerging from the 1960s civil rights movement, sweeping across Western liberal democracies, and embracing firmly in its platform the inclusion and reflection of experiences, histories, cultures, perspectives and values of marginalized groups, such as ethnic and linguistic minorities (Banks & Banks, 2010). Building on these insights, responsive, critical multicultural education not only incorporates diversity as a core value in educational curricula

but also aims to provide for structural-systemic feasibility to implement such curricula effectively (May, 1999). The extent to which educational systems embrace these ideals and respond to the demands of marginalized groups, catering for their diversified needs and recognizing the unique value of their distinct voices, can be seen as a measure of recognition of the unequal power relations that may a priori exist between majority and minority groups. On a broader scale, it represents a measure of success in embracing the ideals of a socio-political system based on the values of social inclusion, civil liberties and equity. Struggles with implementing the ideals of critical multicultural education, including bilingual education, closely parallel struggles surrounding immigration and immigrant rights (Thompson & Hakuta, 2012) and are thus an indelible part of a broader socio-political order.

Garcia and Kleifgen (2010) identify the following as some of the key components of equitable curricular and pedagogical opportunities that should be afforded to emerging bilinguals through the mainstream educational system: 1) inclusive education that takes into account children's variable learning histories and identities as learners, thinkers, readers and writers; 2) challenging and creative curricula that, rather than focusing single-handedly on basic skills and testing of those skills, provide rich language input across curricular content; 3) creative and collaborative peer-learning and 4) caring and responsive educators, aware of how to reach out to families, parents and communities to create empowering scaffolded learning across classroom contexts. Common to these components is a view of diversity in classrooms that underscores and actively promotes learning opportunities beneficial for all children.

In discussing alternative approaches to curricular and pedagogic practice in bilingual classrooms, Garcia and Kleifgen (2010) devote particular attention to early childhood educational programs as a particularly fertile soil in which emergent bilingualism can flourish, if planned and implemented in inclusive and responsive manner. The above-listed components are all variably refracted in their discussion and are also particularly relevant dimensions in this research project, given its key thematic interest in emerging bilinguals in the early years. The Norwegian discourse on and practice of early childhood education, where child-centredness as well as responsive adult care and play-based learning among peers are traditionally key (Kristjansson, 2006; Wagner, 2004; Wagner & Einarsdottir, 2006), can be seen as conceptually consonant with the ideals for equitable education for all children, including emerging bilinguals (for an extended discussion, see Article II). The way this discourse may be changing towards a more skills-based early childhood education approach is but one dimension of investigation in Article I. Migrant parents' narrative accounts of their

encounters with the childhood educational practice in Norway, particularly learning and language learning, are given sole attention in Articles II and III.

3.4 *The multi-scalar nature of LEP*

In LPP/LEP studies, the issue of the interaction between micro and macro contexts of policy remains a perennial challenge (Hult, 2010, p. 267; D. C. Johnson, 2011). For Ricento (2000, p. 208), an integration of micro-level and macro-level perspectives on LPP translates into a more active synergy between the sociolinguistics of language and the sociolinguistics of society. He singles out agency, defined as 'the role(s) of individuals and collectivities in the processes of language use, attitudes, and ultimately policies', as a key force across policy contexts. Ricento and Hornberger's (1996) metaphor of the 'policy onion' can be seen as a particularly influential attempt to conceptualize the bridging of micro and macro policy concerns with agency at the centre of attention: they argue for a shift away from studying policy texts produced by agents of power and authority (see e.g. Tollefson, 1991, 2006), such as the state, and towards policy processes within and across different layers, involving agents variably active in instigating policy change in their local contexts.

Ethnography/linguistic ethnography of language policy has been proposed as a particularly productive way of mapping out the multi-layered and multi-sited policy onion (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007). Building on this line of scholarship, Johnson (2009) further nuances the policy onion as a tripartite set of processes potentially in place at each layer. This includes 1) policy creation, 2) policy interpretation and 3) policy appropriation. Johnson (2012, p. 58) extends the model with a fourth component – *instantiation* – which represents 'the interface between the way a policy is enacted and the ways in which languages are used as a result'. Johnson (2009, p. 156) argues that LPP research must aim at untangling and connecting the complex web of policy across layers, 'from the office of the president to group work in a multilingual classroom'. Johnson underscores that this exercise may, therefore, involve a dynamic consideration of the mutual interlacing of 1) agents 2) goals 3) processes and 4) discourses on and of policy in 5) their social and historical contexts. On this view, language policy processes are not conceived of as an exclusively top-down dissemination of language ideologies and discourses by powerful agents but as a springboard to exploring 'agentive spaces in which local actors implement, interpret and perhaps resist policy initiatives in varying and unique ways' (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007, p. 509). Placed by Ricento and Hornberger at the very heart of the onion, teachers in particular can become 'catalysts of policymaking', not least through an active cooperation and communication with students and

their communities (1996, p. 418). On this view, Garcia and Kleifgen's teaching for equity, as related above, can be a way for teachers to open up the implementational and ideological spaces of restrictive language policies.

An alternative conceptualization of the micro-macro challenge in language policy studies, yet still within the ethnographic tradition, is based on the concept of scales (Blommaert, 2007). Underscoring the situatedness of power in human interactions, the concept of scales is seen as transgressing the traditional linear, micro-macro conceptualization of power and situates its enactments in particular time and space. As already briefly noted in Chapter 2, in Blommaert's sociolinguistic work (Blommaert, 2007; Blommaert et al., 2005), space itself becomes constitutive and agentive, variably conditioning the enactment of multilingual repertoires in various contexts. For example, since space is seen as defining a range of possibilities and identities that individuals can enact at specific moments in time, it may condition multilingualism into a 'truncated competence, which, depending on scalar judgements, may be declared "valued assets" or dismissed as "having no language"' (Blommaert et al., 2005, p. 197). By implication, scales are here seen as mutually related and inherently ideological.

In LPP scholarship, Hult (2010), for example, builds on the scalar conceptualization of the micro-macro challenge. Drawing also on Scollon and Scollon's nexus analysis (2004), he posits that the state policy creation can be seen as a scale where discursive policy processes may operate at a slower time scale and across multiple sites, while appropriations and enactments of policy, such as in classroom practices and interactions, represent a scale where the passing of time is situational and may be enacted in, for example, conversational turns. Studying a particular LPP situation is here equivalent to a study of a particular nexus of practice, composed of both micro- and macro-discursive processes. In the nexus-analytic terminology, these are identified as 1) discourses in place, 2) interaction order and 3) the historical body, with the specific social action at their mutual epicentre. While discourses in place may be identified through the study of long timescales and broader/wider social spaces, including policy or media analysis, the interaction order concerns face-to-face interactions. The historical body, much like Bourdieu's habitus (1977), captures the deeply ingrained dispositions or habits that individuals possess as members of larger communities of practice (for a discussion of habitus within nexus analysis, see Scollon & Scollon, 2005). Although this study does not specifically pursue Scollon and Scollon's nexus analytic approach but rather, as outlined in Chapter 2, combines different approaches within the critical discourse-analytic pool, Hult's multidimensional discourse-analytic framework for the ecology of

language policy resonates particularly well with the analytical-theoretical as well as broader empirical frame of this study. That is, upon an initial identification of different discourses in a particular nexus of language policy practice operating at a broad timescale, recommended by Hult as the very initial analytical step and realized in this study through the tracing of discourses on bilingual education in selected policy texts over time (Article I), their fractal realizations are then traced in situationally occasioned accounts of that practice, here realized through migrant parents' narrative constructions of experience with that practice specifically explored through research interviews (Articles II & III).

3.5 Language education policy and practice: Norway and beyond

As established above, there are multiple points of interaction between policy, educational practice, multilingual practice and research, which feed into the different models of bilingual education with a variable degree of consonance or dissonance. As with any typology or taxonomy, particularly in the superdiverse, post-modern and late capitalist age, bilingual education policy models do not necessarily accommodate real-life examples neatly (Baker, 2011, p. 208). Thus, as already noted above, while the official policy may be set at providing a weak, transitional form of bilingual education, there are windows of opportunity for local classroom practice to be much more versatile and, under the guidance of skilled and knowledgeable educators, aimed at enabling children's bilingual practice to flourish (Schwartz & Palviainen, 2016).

In line with recent developments, as related above, the field of LEP is in this study regarded as multi-scalar and the scales therein interlaced in intricate ways. While this represents a firm conceptual premise here, in reviewing relevant strands of empirical evidence on LEP, I will distinguish between sources concerned with and generated on the following scales: 1) the scale of language policy creation and appropriation, where the main focus will be on official LEP in Norway and comparable contexts and, briefly, in multilingual classrooms as a key policy appropriation site and 2) the scale of language policy instantiation, where I zoom in on the family as a crucial language policy and practice site as well as a key partner for teachers in facilitating equitable curricular opportunities for all children. In line with a broad ecological vision of language policy, in this study, I include families under the umbrella of agents in LEP instantiation processes. With reference to international but also Norwegian research conducted to date, I will emphasize two particular aspects of the family dimension: 1) families as funds of knowledge for language educational policy and practice

and 2) opportunities for bi-directional home-school cooperation as foundational for creating equitable pedagogical practice for emerging bilinguals.

3.5.1 The scale of LEP creation and appropriation

As already foregrounded, educational policies generally – and bilingual education policies specifically – are necessarily an area of deep political divides and controversies across the political spectrum (Wright, 2013). As detailed in Article I, these struggles and tensions are reflected in the Norwegian case as well. In parallel with Norway's changing interethnic and linguistic landscape accompanied by an increasing mass of students in Norwegian schools with other first languages than Norwegian (Statistics Norway, 2014), the public policy on bilingual education has gone through substantial changes in the last few decades. Until 1998, it was an expressed policy aim to provide language minority children with opportunities for achieving functional bilingualism in the mainstream school, through a combination of bilingual content-area instruction as well as tuition in their home language (L1) and Norwegian (L2). Since 1998, bilingual education and L1 tuition are primarily operationalized as temporary supportive mechanisms aiding in as fast a transition to Norwegian-only classes as possible, thus serving mostly transitional aims. These changes and relevant empirical work are reviewed in Article I. While policy appropriation by teachers in multilingual classrooms is not targeted in this thesis, classroom practice is nonetheless a key policy site representing the thematic backbone of the parental narratives in Articles II and III. In line with an ecological view of LEP, empirical work on classroom teaching practice will therefore be briefly laid out below with the aim of illustrating the intimate connections between layers of the policy onion and their specificity across local, national and different educational levels.

As argued in Article I, in its current formulation, Norwegian language education policy provides leeway for variable local interpretations in a classroom setting. While empirical evidence from Norwegian classrooms is expanding, the findings do not present current instructional practices as spaces that unanimously promote children's diverse linguistic and cultural resources. For example, Ryen, Wold and Pastoor (2005, 2009) showcase an ethnographic study of the enactment of the current transitional model of bilingual education at three different primary schools in Norway, all representing complex linguistic landscapes. Their study revealed substantial differences in how the three schools put mother tongue tuition as well as bilingual content-area instruction into practice, ranging from a more open and positive approach to a restricted one, whereby an active instructional support of children's mother tongue development was viewed with suspicion and as a stumbling block on the way

to a fast acquisition of Norwegian. The implementational leeway of the current legislation was here found to be subject to a minimalist interpretation at the municipal policy level where decisions on the allocation of necessary teaching resources are made. Across the schools, windows of instructional opportunity for multilingual practice to flourish were thus largely closed, despite students' vibrant multilingual practices outside of instructional time.

Grimstad's (2012) recent mixed-methods study on aspects of multilingual students' everyday realities in Norwegian primary and lower secondary classrooms corroborate the minimal lack of mother tongue enactment during instruction. In addition, the study demonstrates that emerging bilinguals may be relegated to passive listeners with limited opportunities for establishing and maintaining communication on aspects of the curriculum with both peers and teachers. Also, opportunities for nourishing linguistic and cultural diversity through instruction were generally found wanting here.

Looking specifically at bilingual teacher training, Hvistendahl's findings (2009a, 2012) stand in contrast to these practices. She shows how bilingual teacher-students are set on actively promoting not only bilingual and biliterate instructional practices but also inclusive, empowering multicultural educational spaces at their placement schools, and how they thus resist and challenge the entrenched monolingual bias they may see there. In the most comprehensive study on bilingual teachers in Norway to date, Dewilde (2013) interrogates teaching practices and teacher collaboration at primary and lower secondary level in two multilingual schools in Norway. The study reveals, among other things, that the bilingual teachers opened some implementational spaces in their collaborative teaching practice, such as by drawing on translanguaging as a creative resource, yet also left some spaces closed, such as through their lack of involvement in facilitating multilingual teaching materials. In their comprehensive action research on teaching practices in five multilingual primary schools in Oslo, Danbolt and Kulbrandstad (2012) demonstrate that teachers' reflections on their own practice in collaboration with researchers promoted awareness of specific challenges in linguistically diverse classrooms and ways to facilitate language and literacy tuition tailored to their different needs in culturally sensitive ways. They conclude that '(t)here is a strong need in Norwegian teacher education on developing knowledge about the heterogeneity of teaching literacy in multicultural schools' (2012, p. 225).

Research shows that the incongruence between bilingual education policy, practice and research, observed in Norway, is not uncommon among the Nordic countries. The 2010 Special Issue of the journal *Intercultural Education* on multicultural education in the Nordic countries features five articles which, despite their empirical anchoring in unique cultural and

national contexts, document the varying degrees of lack of recognizing/foregrounding the distinct voices of ethnic minority groups as legitimate parts of their respective national, educational settings. With its strict immigration policy of late, Denmark represents a particularly interesting LEP site. Horst and Gitz Johansen's (2010) study, for example, demonstrates how both Danish policy initiatives and legal documents promote a hegemonic position of a monolingual and mono-cultural approach to education, whereby deviations from Danish norms are established as forms of deprivation. This echoes Gitz-Johanson's (2004) earlier ethnographic study where he demonstrates how exclusion of ethnic minority children in the Danish school context may be signalled through stigmatising discursive practice on ethnicity. Interestingly, the term 'bilingual' becomes a euphemism signalling lack of competence: linguistic, academic and socio-cultural. It is also a marker of otherness rather than normality, synonymous with a threat to the Danish school and child culture. As also other Danish scholars note (Daugaard & Laursen, 2012; Holm & Laursen, 2011), the deficit view of bilingualism and its counterpart LEP orientation to linguistic diversity as a problem seems fairly entrenched in Denmark. Horst and Gitz Johansen (2010) argue that, by providing empirical evidence on the educational realities of bilingual children, the academic discourse may function as a pocket of resistance against the hegemony of a mono-cultural approach. For example, in Daugaard and Laursen's (2012) study, the multilingual children themselves are shown to negotiate the implementational spaces in their instructional time and actively challenge entrenched categorisations as well as unmarked values, identities and linguistic choices assumed by the school discourse.

Beyond Scandinavia, a number of scholars have commented on the recent developments in bilingual education policy in the US as being at odds with the educational needs of emerging bilinguals (e.g. Baker, 2011; Thompson & Hakuta, 2012; Wright, 2013). Drawing specifically on the anti-bilingual education voter initiatives in California, Arizona and Massachusetts, Wright (2013) argues that this wave of restriction-oriented policies undermines even the weak forms of bilingual education, resulting in a substantial decrease in bilingual education provision in these states. As he further underscores, and as reverberates in the work of other scholars (Baker, 2011; Garcia, 2009; E. J. Johnson & Johnson, 2015; Menken, 2009), it is not only the apparent decentralization of bilingual education in federal policies such as the 2001 *No Child Left Behind* Act (NCLB) (2002), but it is also the shift of emphasis in NCLB on accountable educational standards and the related large-scale educational testing that are the main engines behind English-only instruction in schools. According to Hornberger (2002), this represents a formidable attempt at closing the

ideological space for multilingualism and multiliteracy. Although reviewing research on local classroom appropriations of the current restrictive state and federal policies in the US is beyond the scope of this thesis, this literature resonates on a general level with findings from the Norwegian classroom context in that it demonstrates how it may negatively impact educational provision for emerging bilinguals (Menken, 2013; Menken & Kleyn, 2010; Olson, 2007) but also how educators may variably see themselves as empowered to foster and nourish instructional spaces in which they can promote multilingual practices and development (D. C. Johnson, 2010; E. J. Johnson, 2012; E. J. Johnson & Johnson, 2015).

3.5.2 The scale of LEP instantiation – the voice of the family

The voice of the family is in this study conceptualized as part and parcel of family language policy, connected in important ways with other dimensions of LPP, such as LEP. Several decades ago, Fishman's *Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale* (GIDS) for reversing language shift (1991) emphasised the home-community-school dimension as key in LPP as well as broader language maintenance efforts. In Ricento and Hornberger's 1996 conceptualization of the policy onion, the family dimension is nonetheless not specifically foregrounded. Sixteen years later, in the editorial to the 2012 special issue of the *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* on language policy and practice in multilingual, transnational families, Li Wei contends that, indeed, family language policy and practice have so far been under-explored in sociolinguistic research (2012, p. 1). Furthermore, in the preface to the special issue, Spolsky (2012, p. 3) echoes Li Wei's observation in his opening, rhetorical remark: 'Where does the family fit into language policy?'. Seeing the family as 'the critical domain' sandwiched between internal pressures of significant others and external pressures such as the school, he argues that it is imperative not only to start answering basic questions about this domain but also about the complex interrelation between this and other sociolinguistic domains that all comprise what he terms 'the linguistic ecology of our modern multilingual societies' (p.8).

Somewhat paradoxically, on a broad transnational as well as national educational policy scale, the role of the family and the value of parental involvement in their children's education have long been recognized. Based on the premise that 'education begins at home', the 2012 OECD report argues that parental involvement is key in children's educational achievement (OECD, 2012, p. 3). Likewise, the US *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (2002) explicitly embraces parental involvement and mandates schools to account for its facilitation. In the current Norwegian educational policy legislation, institutional provision of equitable

education is also explicitly predicated on cooperation with children's homes. In both the 2005 Kindergarten Act (2005) and the 1998 Education Act (1998), this position is articulated in the very opening lines and elaborated on in specific sections of each Act. By extension, it is either a priori assumed and/or actively supported in numerous advisory and/or strategic policy documents (Ministry of Church Affairs, Education and Research, 1995, 1997, Ministry of Education and Research, 2006a, 2010, 2013), also at the national curricular level (Ministry of Education and Research, 2006b).

As a result and in recognition of the close ties between parental involvement and student achievement, there is a sizeable and growing body of research that interrogates types and forms of parental involvement across national educational contexts (Harris & Goodall, 2008; Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005; Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997; Huntsinger & Jose, 2009; Wesely, 2016). Within the field of bilingual education, Garcia and Kleifgen (2010) have recently articulated a succinct argument for parental involvement as a crucial aspect of the language educational ecology of practice, programs and policy. Seeing parents as 'emergent bilinguals' primary advocates for an equitable education', they argue that it is through the concerted effort of families, schools and communities that equitable educational opportunities for emerging bilinguals can be promoted and ensured in informal and formal learning contexts; by the same token, educational policies that do not grant such opportunities can be resisted and re-moulded on a local level, not least through meaningful home-school collaborative practice (2010, p. 210).

Garcia and Kleifgen's approach is predicated on and promotes a view of families as 'funds of knowledge' (Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992). Essentially, this endows families with an empowered position as experts in their home language and culture and thus as symbolic motivators rather than detractors from the aim of multilingual and multiliterate attainment. Garcia and Kleifgen argue that, to ensure equitable pedagogies for young emerging bilinguals, educators must be willing and able to see migrant homes as such 'funds of knowledge'. Through a bidirectional effort, avenues for successful home-school communication and cooperation can be established and a scaffolded instructional support, which bridges the young learner's home and school learning experiences, actively nurtured.

However, research shows that promoting and cultivating windows of opportunity for successful home-school synergies often remains relegated to the shadows (Goldenberg, Rueda, & August, 2006; Reese, Sparks, & Leyva, 2010; Roy & Roxas, 2011). In fact, stereotypical conceptions about non-mainstream homes' interest and involvement in their

children's education continue to abound, placing them persistently in a position of deficit rather than that of knowledge and strength (Scott, Brown, Jean-Baptiste, & Barbarin, 2012). As various scholars point out (Carrington & Luke, 2003; Crozier, 2000; Crozier & Davies, 2007), the deficit view of migrant and other non-mainstream families is consonant with a normative model of schooling that persists in many contexts and that places children from these families a priori at a disadvantage: reflecting mostly mainstream, middle-class values, difference here translates into deficit or lack. Now, as before, it may be the degree of alignment between family and school language, literacy and learning practices that largely predicates children's preparedness for entry into formal learning and their educational attainment (for a classic study, see Heath, 1983).

The funds of knowledge approach can be seen as but one attempt at nurturing a greater realignment of the mainstream schooling models and the diverse worlds of children from non-mainstream homes, whereby their informal learning experiences would form a legitimate springboard to a socio-culturally sensitive school apprenticeship to formal learning. As Gee (2012, p. 110) argues, 'it is the job of the teacher to allow students to grow beyond both the cultural models of their home culture and those of mainstream and school culture'. Identifying and exploring the chasms but also points of contact between these cultures, such as through 1) parental views of, as well as values attached to, their children's education and learning in the resettlement context (Compton-Lilly, 2007, 2012; Levine-Rasky, 2009; Roy & Roxas, 2011; Yahya, 2015) and 2) the perceptions of these families by teachers and schools (Huss-Keeler, 1997; Kim, 2009) are but two prominent aspects explored in this line of research. Parents' experience of educational provision is also foregrounded in this study (Articles II & III).

Some researchers further nuance the misalignment paradigm in language and literacy research, suggesting that children variably labelled 'at risk', 'low-SES', 'language minority' or 'language learner' may in fact construct their own identities as learners *within* rather than *outside* of the often marginalizing discourse of school. In her longitudinal ethnographic study, Rogers (2002, 2003), for example, traces family literacy practices inter-generationally, and shows how mother and daughter in one Black-American family, labelled low-income and low-literacy, struggle to navigate the complex web of institutional discourse in their own encounters with literacy and schooling across time and space. Despite possessing a set of multiple language and multimodal literacy skills employed with much success outside of institutional contexts, Rogers shows how the family members fail to turn their literate capital into social profit in the situated context of school: rather than withstanding the powerful forces of the institutional deficit discourse, there and then, they align their ways of being with

it. Drawing on Gee's distinction between *learning* and *acquisition* in the formation of children's discursive identities, Rogers argues that, while her study participants are in the process of *skills-learning* at school, measured on a regular basis through standardized test batteries, they are simultaneously *acquiring* marginalising deficit discourses about themselves as readers and learners which eventually come to define their linguistic and literate identities.

This distinction becomes relevant also in Jones' (2013) ethnographic study on literacy practices inside and outside of the school settings of young marginalized readers. She suggests that these readers, rendered through the main discourse as virtually non-existent, may need to position themselves as entitled to being text analysts in the first place before they can challenge and question mainstream school texts and the discourses they enact. This resonates with a number of research findings on bilingual students synthesized in Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester's (2003) critical re-reading of the continua of biliteracy framework: while emerging bilinguals may successfully draw on multiple vernacular literacy resources at home, these are rendered through school discourse virtually invisible and their users labelled 'non-writers' in school contexts.

In Norway, parental involvement in schools has been investigated in terms of opportunities for, and forms of, home-school partnerships as well dynamics of home-school communication and cooperation in general (Bø, 2001; Ericsson & Larsen, 2000; Nordahl, 1998, 2000, 2004, 2015; Sorknes, 2013). This literature suggests that, prior to the turn of the millennium, home-school communication was often embedded in asymmetrical parent-teacher relations, with teachers and schools claiming definitional power and setting the agenda rather than acknowledging parents as partners for schools in ensuring equitable educational opportunities for their children (Bø, 2001). Fifteen years later, Nordahl (2015, p. 12) argues that parents, regardless of ethnic background, continue to be 'the silent majority' in Norwegian schools. While there is some research that looks specifically at values, attitudes, beliefs and/or forms of cooperation and communication between migrant homes, preschools and schools in Norway (e.g. Aamodt & Hauge, 2008; Becher, 2006; NAFO, 2011), it remains relatively scarce. The most recent publication, the 2011 report of the National Centre for Multicultural Education (NAFO, 2011), details forms and mechanisms for home-school cooperation in seven Norwegian schools with diverse linguistic profiles. This includes an active promotion of home-school cooperation at all levels of the school staff hierarchy, such as through multicultural awareness raising initiatives, careful planning of home-school meetings and an increased emphasis on child-parent shared book reading through the use of local multilingual library resources but also via an active involvement of interpreters and

bilingual teaching staff. Both Becher (2006) and Aamodt and Hauge's edited volume (2008) also actively promote symmetrical views of home-school relations as a platform on which to build equitable pedagogical and curricular provision for emerging bilinguals in Norway.

The positive role of bilingual teachers as potential bridge builders between homes and schools is underscored in a number of empirical studies (Hauge, 2004; Ryen et al., 2005, 2009). However, as Hvistendahl notes, unleashing this potential is predicated on their proper qualification as bilingual teachers (2009a, 2012). Taking the dynamics of home-school meetings with the aid of bilingual teachers under scrutiny, Dewilde (2013) also points at the numerous challenges encountered therein. In addition to different a priori conceptualizations of the meeting agenda that render the meeting a potential site of conflict and frustration, Dewilde's analysis reveals multiple communication difficulties between the parents and the monolingual staff due to existing language barriers. Leaving the bilingual support staff in the challenging double role of being teachers and interpreters, the need for a better conceptual planning of such meetings is underscored. Beyond these studies, research on migrant parents' experiences, attitudes and views on home-school cooperation and communication, or forms of involvement in their children's language and literacy education and learning in early childhood in Norway, has not been identified. The general gap in research literature, well beyond the Norwegian context, has recently been noted by Bergroth and Palviainen as well (2016, p. 649).

As Gebhard (2004) argues, research agendas need to broaden to include in-depth studies of policy and discourse practices across different settings, including the institutional context of preschool and school as well as the home setting, to gain a deeper understanding of their role in shaping children's identities as speakers, readers and learners in an increasingly complex world steeped in rapid social and economic change. The 2016 special issue of the *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* on preschool bilingual education, for example, aims to answer calls for more, culturally sensitive research on emerging bilingualism in early childhood with children's, parents' and educators' agencies at the centre of attention (Schwartz & Palviainen, 2016). This is also an aim embraced in both Articles II and III.

4 METHOD

4.1 Conducting qualitative research – preliminaries

In this study, the choice of qualitative methodology resonates with the choice of theoretical and analytical approach. As already explicated, critical approaches to discourse analysis are embedded in post-modern, social constructionist thought where social reality is perceived as a site of contest: this entails an acknowledgement of multiple perspectives in circulation, of central concepts as non-essentialist and of their construction as contingent upon both situational and wider social circumstances. Likewise, in much qualitative research, it is the emergent, dynamic nature of concepts, social relations, interactions as well as subjectivity and authenticity of human experience that are considered key (Creswell, 2013; Patton, 2002; Silverman, 2013). Necessarily, qualitative data do not resonate well with neatly delineated, pre-determined analytical categories: it is often 'messy' and 'inelegant', necessitating an application of conceptual frameworks which acknowledge rather than obscure such messiness (Norton, 2013, p. 16). In other words, the inelegance or 'indeterminacy of data' (E. R. Miller, 2011) is regarded as an essential source and object of knowledge that needs to be examined as such. This does not, however, imply that qualitative research is exempted from standards of methodological quality.

In what follows, I will explicate what specific methodical decisions have been made in this research study. In line with Meyer (2001), laying out one's methodical procedure does not only bridge observation with theory but also ensures a systematic understanding of what steps have been taken, when and at which junctions: 'methodical procedure can, like Ariadne's thread, guarantee the researcher a safe route back' (Titscher et al., 2000, cited in Meyer, 2001, p. 15). By extension, this applies also to others who wish to traverse the path already travelled by the researcher and open it up to methodical scrutiny. While some of the information given below is also embedded in the individual studies, presented in Part II, my aim is to expand on them and thus complement in a coherent manner what has not found its way into the individual manuscripts, both published and in review.

4.2 Written and spoken data – conceptual considerations and differences

Two types of texts, in a broad semiotic sense, form the empirical backbone of this study. First, it is policy texts of considerable length, produced in the state apparatus, and falling broadly within the genre of political advisory documents (Article I). Given their site of production,

they can also be seen as 'texts of authority' (Blackledge, 2003) or as authored by 'a major centring institution' – the state – which holds a privileged position of regulating access to, and distribution of, linguistic resources and their contextualizing spaces (Blommaert, 2005, p. 76). Second, it is texts based on face-to-face interviews conducted by the researcher with members of the Polish community in Norway (Articles II & III). These a priori oral texts thus represent a genre of research interviewing resulting in audio-recorded and subsequently transcribed written artefacts. These texts are here seen as co-produced encounters between the interviewer (the researcher) and the interviewee/s (the migrant parent/s). They are also seen as semiotic, locally negotiated, interactional occasions that display a variable orientation of their participants towards wider ideological frames. The two main empirical sources thus not only constitute different voices within the wider scale of LEP, but they also merit a differential power status within it.

There are necessarily numerous other essential epistemological differences between these two textual genres. The genre of policy documents is highly regulated, normally penned by specifically appointed state employees and endorsed/sanctioned by the appropriate authority on whose behalf the text has been produced. Not only is individual agency diffuse in such documents, they also stand as artefacts that, in the Norwegian context, can normally be accessed freely by members of the public through digital channels but also as printed material. In other words, they are a part of the democratic system of government in Norway and are, as such, subject to broad public scrutiny. As written texts, they have an audience of readers. In the case of advisory policy documents, it is the commissioning state agency and policy-makers that comprise the primary readership. Beyond this, there is also a wider audience for whom these texts may be of particular interest, such as practitioners in the different fields of application or the general public. Broadly speaking then, given their accessibility and in line with hermeneutic approaches, public policy documents invite subjective interpretations and widespread re-contextualization.

On the other hand, research interviews are oral, interactional encounters between participants with an a priori power and status asymmetry: in the context of this study, it is the interviewer-researcher with scientific competence and representing an institutional voice involved in formally sanctioned forms of knowledge production, and the interviewee/s, representing an ethnolinguistic minority in their host country, whose voice is the main object of interest (see also Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 33). These oral texts become written artefacts only upon a process of transcription, itself an interpretative process (Riessman, 2008,

p. 29). In what follows below, I will unpack some of the complexity in analysing these different types of data material with an immediate application in this study.

4.3 Policy documents

4.3.1 Choice of documents

As a key centring institution, the Norwegian state produces regularly a large number of policy documents, which merit differential status. Some, such as bills/acts and regulations, are policy-prescriptive in that they regulate policy in a given area, such as education/language education. A host of other documents are advisory, such as strategy plans, circulars, Official Norwegian Reports (*NOUs*) or white papers (*Melding til Stortinget*). There is thus a clear status hierarchy between but also within these document categories. In any analytical treatment of policy texts, these hierarchies should be taken into account, not least because of the differential legislative but also wider symbolic value the various documents have across time and space. Nonetheless, in educational research, such differentiation is often not made explicit, and documents with variable status are analysed as one category (see on this Pihl, 2001).

In this study, it is the genre of Official Norwegian Reports (NOUs) that is under scrutiny. The selection was based on the following criteria: first, I looked for texts with a common thematic interest in language educational provision for multilingual children of non-Norwegian ethnolinguistic heritage in the mainstream educational system. Second, given my research aim of tracing discursive change over time, I was primarily interested in texts produced at different points in time and thus potentially spanning wider socio-political shifts and developments. Third, I wished to make comparative statements in line with calls for analytical vigilance in approaching different categories of texts, as explicated above. A careful perusal of a large number of different policy texts resulted in the selection of the following two Official Norwegian Reports (NOUs): 1) *Education in a Multicultural Norway* (R1995) (Ministry of Church Affairs, Education and Research, 1995) and 2) *Diversity and Competence: Multilingual Children, Youth and Adults in the Educational System* (R2010) (Ministry of Education and Research, 2010). Both provide a comprehensive treatment of the main theme and represent the same genre of policy documents produced within a 15-year time lag, filled with a number of crucial socio-political developments, tensions and struggles (for further details, see Article I).

4.3.2 Analytical procedure

Official Norwegian reports (NOUs) as a genre represent a multitude of different voices that participate in the formation of the recommendations that are being put forward in a specific policy area, in this case language educational provision for Norway's emerging bilinguals of non-Norwegian ethnolinguistic heritage. Given such inherent polyphony, it was particularly the intertextual and interdiscursive features of both texts that were the target of the present analysis (for further details, see Article I).

In line with Creswell's data analysis spiral (2013, p. 183), this entailed an iterative analytical process of reading, re-reading, memoing, coding as well as color-coding, visualizing and interpreting. The following steps were crucial in this process:

First, while both documents represent particularly comprehensive, written texts, stretching beyond 200 (R1995) and 400 pages (R2010), approaching such texts analytically does not imply an all-encompassing interrogation of their entire textual fabric. Following Fairclough (1992, 2001, 2003, 2010), I aimed at foregrounding those parts of their canvas that were considered crucial for their textual identity. Such moments in texts are referred to by Fairclough as 'cruces' and may, for example, represent instances of miscommunication or communication breakdown or points where the often tacit ideological assumptions may stand out in a particularly illustrative way. As Article I makes clear, I identified such points in both texts and interrogated their specific discursive nature following the analytical procedure of Fairclough's CDA.

Second, this analytical sub-process was aided with the qualitative analysis software NVivo10. This was particularly useful in calculating word frequencies in both documents. Yet, while NVivo10 was also employed in the initial stage of the discourse analysis performed on the identified 'cruces' in both texts, as explicated above, this approach was eventually abandoned and replaced by a graphic representation of key tendencies and discursive features, drawn up manually as a large conceptual matrix, and seconded with colour-coding and memoing in working copies of both texts: this aided with visualizing key components in each textual 'cruce' as well as comparatively across the two documents. Results of this procedure were laid out in the final published account (Article I).

It should also be noted that while the discourse analysis was performed on the Norwegian originals of each document, all relevant citations were translated into English by myself and presented as such, rather than bilingually, in the final version of the published manuscript. While this potentially presents a challenge regarding equivalence of meaning, the linguistic-typological proximity between Norwegian and English as well as translation

vigilance ensured that the selected excerpts render the original texts with as little analytically substantial loss of semantic nuance as possible. As online publications, they can be easily accessed and their translation validated.

4.4 Interview data - preliminaries

In their now classic text on the craft of qualitative research interviewing, Kvale and Brinkmann argue that the interview is 'particularly well suited for studying people's understanding of the meanings in their lived worlds, describing their experiences and self-understanding, and clarifying and elaborating their own perspective on their lived world' (2009, p. 116). Since one of the aims of this study was to explore migrant parents' experience of early childhood language, literacy and learning provision offered to their children in preschools and early grades in school in Norway, the research interview as a method of studying such experience was here considered particularly well suited.

In line with the general approach in this study, the approach to research interviewing is here informed by 'postmodern sensibilities', where the key terms are 'reflexivity, poetics and power', refracted in the interview process 'through the lenses of language, knowledge, culture and difference' (Gubrium & Holstein, 2003, p. 3). This has a number of important implications for how the entire interview process was planned, conducted and the knowledge emanating thereof regarded.

Kvale and Brinkmann list seven features that characterize interview knowledge in the postmodern age: knowledge as 1) produced, 2) relational, 3) conversational, 4) contextual, 5) linguistic, 6) narrative and 7) pragmatic (2009, p. 53). Echoing the Bakhtinian notion of dialogue, postmodern research interviews can, in other words, be seen as interactional encounters where meaning is co-constructed situationally through available semiotic resources by two or more participants, embedded in wider contexts of meaning (E. R. Miller, 2014; Talmy, 2010, 2011).

However, as already briefly noted above, this does not imply a power and status symmetry between participants. Parker (2005, p. 56) argues that interviews are 'conversations with a purpose', with certain expectations about participant roles as well as form. In the context of this study, this implies that the researcher-interviewer has an a priori definitional power in initiating the interview, setting its overarching thematic agenda and deciding on the degree of control over its sequence and duration (see also Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, pp. 33–34). Yet, as Parker contends, while the initial and general purpose may be in the hands of the interviewer, power dynamics may be negotiated and changed in the process by the

interviewee/s. Thus, qualitative interviews can be seen as always necessarily at least semi-structured, since the embedded power dynamics will inevitably 'hold things in place' to some degree (Parker, 2005, p. 53) (see also Sections 4.4.1.4–5. for further reflections on language power relations and participant dynamics in the present data).

Furthermore, since postmodern interviewing implies that the interview situation is considered in its entirety, including power relations in their situational enactment, interviews necessarily represent 'occasions in which particular kinds of narratives are enacted and in which "informants" construct themselves and others as particular kinds of moral agents' (Atkinson & Coffey, 2001, p. 808). Indeed, interviews present mimetic occasions of meaning construction; in other words, it is a mediated experience that is presented and hence necessarily one step removed from the actual experience (see on this Riessman, 2008, 22-23). Narrative discourse, as already noted in Section 2, represents a key site for mimetic renditions of experience where variable temporal and spatial worlds are recreated and characters inhabiting these worlds called to life (see e.g. Tannen, 2007, and Articles II & III) (see also Section 4.5.1. where 'validity' issues in this research project are considered in more detail).

Last but not least, if research interviews are conceived of as conversations with at least 'two participants who jointly construct narrative and meaning' and if the emphasis of the research is on the emic perspective, as in this research, then the researcher will necessarily aim at following participants 'down their trails' rather than pursuing strictly his or her own agenda (Riessman, 2008, p. 24). This underscores the fact that the way data collection proceeds will impact what data are collected as well as, inevitably, what conclusions can be drawn (Norton, 2013, p. 26). The following account will explicate this process, as pursued in this study.

4.4.1 Data collection

4.4.1.1 Participants – general remarks

Participants in this study were migrants of Polish ethnolinguistic background, all recently resettled in Norway and parenting young children (3 – 8 years). They all represented voluntary, labour migrants, enacting the principle of free movement of workers within the EU/EEA enshrined in the EU legislation and legally binding for both Norway and Poland as EEA and EU member states, respectively. The Polish were targeted specifically as members of a minority ethnic group that has, within one decade of Poland's EU membership, become the largest in the Norwegian context, with nearly 100,000 legal residents in 2016 (Statistics

Norway, 2016). Also in other national contexts, the Polish immigrant community has experienced an unprecedented expansion since the 2004 EU enlargement. In the UK, the Polish represent the most sizeable community of foreign nationals in the country, reaching nearly 750,000 legal residents in 2014 (Trevena, McGhee, & Heath, 2016). In the US as well, the community continues to expand, particularly in urban areas with well-established Polish networks and greater employment opportunities (Szuber, 2008). Its growing size and its specifics as a labour migrant community, generally well educated and of a highly literate, European cultural heritage, makes it into an attractive empirical site of 'new speakers' in diverse global multilingual landscapes (see e.g. www.nspk.org.uk). Nonetheless, at the onset of this study, research on the Polish community in Norway covered mostly labour-related issues (Friberg, 2012a, 2012b, 2012c; Friberg & Eldring, 2011), while research extending into areas of education/language education and learning was limited mostly to educational sociology as well as corpus linguistic and other scholarship on second language acquisition (Bergersen, 2012; Friberg & Golden, 2014; Slany & Pustulka, 2016) (for more detailed information on the Polish community in Norway as well as a more detailed review of available empirical research, see Article II).

4.4.1.2 Sampling

As Miller (2014) argues, in the very act of setting research participation criteria, the researcher constructs his/her 'imagined subject' of primary scientific interest. This is necessarily true of this research as well. In planning data collection, the following participation criteria were set: 1) both parents were of Polish ethnolinguistic background; 2) they parented children attending the last stage of preschool and/or early grades in school (3 – 8 years of age) and 3) they used Polish as the main language of communication at home. My 'imagined subjects' were, in other words, migrant parents in families with young children who have made an acquaintance with the Norwegian educational system through an active participation in the very first stages of early childhood education. Through their children, the parents would have made an acquaintance with the system too as caretakers ensuring their children's institutional attendance and also variably facilitating bridging between their informal and formal learning.

Using snowballing to identify participation-relevant cases, a widespread purposeful sampling strategy in qualitative social-scientific research (Bryman, 2008; Creswell, 2013; Patton, 2002), I recruited my 'imagined subject' primarily through a wide mediation of contact in private networks and in the Polish community resident in the Norwegian capital, Oslo, and

neighbouring municipalities. This included contact with the Catholic Church in Oslo, a well-known meeting point of the Polish community in the capital, but also contact with employer representatives in the Norwegian construction sector, two Polish language community schools in Oslo as well as selected members of the Polish community with a voice in the Norwegian media. My own command of Polish proved to be an essential door opener to potential recruitment sites.

While no hard and fast rules exist regarding an ideal number of participants for a qualitative interview sample, as it is necessarily tied to an individual study purpose, Kvale and Brinkmann (2009, p. 113) note that this may be a combination of time, resources and 'a law of diminishing returns', which implies a point of saturation beyond which less and less new knowledge will be yielded. While contact with a considerable number of families was established, some expressed no interest or, upon reflection, withdrew their initial willingness to participate. The snowballing strategy employed in this study thus resulted in the recruitment of 19 families. Their profiles broadly matched general demographic tendencies of the Polish community in Norway, with a preponderance of fathers with secondary education and employment in the Norwegian construction services and mothers with a more variable educational as well as professional background than their male partners (for a detailed description of the sample profile, see also Articles II and III).

4.4.1.3 Interview format

While the interview followed a semi-structured format, it also aimed at a detailed exploration of issues and themes arising in its course and as instigated spontaneously by the participants. This was in line with a general methodological aim at data co-construction as a way of redressing the inherent interviewer/interviewee power asymmetry in qualitative interviewing and with the theoretical-analytical aim of generating data rich in textual and narrative detail, as elaborated on earlier.

The interview guide was thus followed loosely and contained three broad themes of interest: 1) the participants' migration experience, 2) their experience with language learning and family multilingualism and 3) their experience with language and literacy learning in the context of the mainstream educational system in Norway. The guide thus reflects a preoccupation with broad yet interconnected themes which could serve as a springboard to a discursive exploration of the overarching theme of language, literacy and learning in a migration context (see also Appendix 8.2).

The interview guide was piloted on one participant matching all the set criteria but one, namely, the age of the child the interviewee parented: rather than being in preschool or early grades in primary school, the child attended the last grades of lower secondary school⁵. This was nonetheless considered a legitimate option for piloting purposes, particularly since the parent and child in question had had experience of the Norwegian educational system since preschool. Given my interest in emerging issues, rather than aiming at a strict interactional and data elicitation control, the piloting was regarded mainly as an opportunity to practice the skill of qualitative interviewing and resulted only in minor adjustments to the interview guide.

4.4.1.4 Conducting the interviews

While several participants self-assessed their L2 skills as good, none opted for the use of Norwegian as the main language of communication in the interview process. This can be seen as salient in terms of linguistic power dynamics enacted in the interview process. As Blommaert notes, what is told is contingent upon the very resources available for telling: 'complex stories become even more complex when they are told in uncomfortable varieties of language' (2005, p. 60). Translated to this research study, despite my own, greater ease in speaking Norwegian rather than Polish, opening up for Polish as a mutual language of communication underscores my effort at empowering the participants to tell their stories with recourse to linguistic resources they themselves considered as serving their purposes best. In fact, there were generally, and somewhat surprisingly, very few instances of Norwegian language use in the collected data: those that were recorded were limited to mostly sporadic lexical alterations. On a broader scale, the issue of language choice and enactment illustrates the very commitment of critical discourse-analytic approaches to addressing the issue of status, power and privilege in both forgotten contexts and in their covert figurations (see Blommaert, 2005, pp. 56–66), including the present data collection.

The participants were also free to choose the site for data collection: While eleven interviews were conducted in the participants' homes, eight occurred in the researcher's office on campus. Both mothers and fathers were invited to participate. However, father participation occurred only in cases where the interview was conducted in the participants' homes. This ranged from full (two cases) to fleeting participation (four cases), such as by offering occasional comments during various activities taking place in parallel with the

⁵ In Norway, the lower secondary school comprises three years, following seven years in primary school and beginning, for most children, at age 13.

interview within the bounded space of the participants' homes. The interviews lasted between 50 minutes and 2 hours. They were all audio-recorded. I was also making notes during each interview, recording information that could not be traced from the audio-records alone, such as particularly notable instances of gesticulation but also spontaneous records of any particular linguistic or thematic features considered salient at the specific time and place.

4.4.1.5 Contextual remarks on interview participant dynamics

As an educational researcher of Czech origin resident in Norway, I do not share the participants' ethnic background and I had no personal acquaintance with any of them prior to the interview. Likewise, beyond several personal friendships, I have no ties to the Polish community in Norway. Yet, regular meetings and extended discussions with my Polish research assistant, a Polish writer with an advanced university degree in Polish philology, on aspects of Polish culture, language and society provided me with her perspective on and experience of a 'Polish way of being' in the world. Likewise, my visits to the Catholic church in Oslo as well as to one of the Polish language community schools were opportunities to witness community efforts at language maintenance and cultural continuity in the capital. While potentially of ethnographic import, these and similar experiences were not planned or conducted in a systematic manner. They thus serve mostly as broad contextualizing spaces informing my general understanding of the Polish community in Norway and remain outside of my analytical focus.

As already noted, my own conversational command of Polish facilitated access to the community and enabled me to conduct interviews with interested families without the aid of an interpreter. Being myself a migrant parent, caring for young preschool and school children in Norway, a fact communicated to the participants prior to each interview as part of initial courtesies, may also have aided in establishing rapport. Similarly to Yahya (2015, p. 4), my own position as a researcher-interviewer was thus that of 'in-betweenness': an outsider in the Polish community, yet potentially related through our common Eastern European roots, Polish as our mutual language of communication and our experience of parenting emerging bilinguals in Norway. These commonalities may have further impacted the power dynamics and data co-construction in the interview process, such as through an assumed common ground on aspects of our migration experience and/or cultural heritage. To illustrate, I provide two examples from the data set. In the first example, while comparing Norwegian work ethics with those in several Eastern European countries, the interviewee makes salient her awareness of my own ethnic background as a researcher-interviewer and foregrounds interactionally her

assumption of our shared otherness in Norway, also signalled by deictic pronominal choices (we - line 1; the generalized 'one' in line 4, pointing back to line 1; they – line 6)⁶.

- M14: 01: i MY mamy swój styl pracy. bo podejrzewam że:: Czesi i Słowacy
02: też podobnie pracują. dużo ciężko byle tylko –
Int: 03: hmmm
M14: 04: nie nie nie zrobisz tylko jednej rzeczy ale umiesz jeszcze kilka przy okazji ::
Int: 05: hmmm
M14: 06: hmmm. a tutaj? no:: tak jak popatrzeć na Norwegów to oczywiście oni
umią tylko
07: jeżeli się czegoś tam nauczyli. to tylko TO nic więcej.
- M14: 01: and WE have our own work ethics. because I guess that:: Czechs and Slovaks
02: work in a similar way. a lot and hard just –
Int: 03: hmmm
M14: 04: one does not not not just do one thing but several things at the same time ::
Int: 05: hmmm
M14: 06: hmmm. and here? well:: when you look at Norwegians they can of course only
07: do whatever they learnt. only THAT nothing else.

In the second example, the participating mother explains the challenges facing Polish children attending the Polish language community school in Oslo in mastering Polish orthography. The following four turns illustrate how we align our interaction based on shared linguistic knowledge and comparative aspects of parenting in a resettlement setting:

- M10: 01: mowie wygląd liter w ogóle. litery zupełnie inaczej wyglądają –
Int: 02: tak tak rozumie. to w języku czeskim też mamy. w czeskiej szkole –
M10: 03: tez aha! a pani dzieci chodzą do do ((Czech language
community school in Oslo)) –
04: mogę zapytać?
- M10: 01: as I say the way letters look in general. letters look totally different –
Int: 02: sure sure I understand. we also have that in Czech. in Czech school –
M10: 03: also I see! and your children attend the the – ((Czech language
community school in Oslo)) –
04: if I may ask?

While both examples can be seen as a way of bonding that may have primed the interviewees to display a greater degree of trust and openness towards myself as a researcher-interviewer in the interview process in general, disentangling these assumptions in the interactional canvas of the interviews remains a formidable analytical challenge, particularly when not specifically textually marked. Since none of the excerpts analysed in Articles II and

⁶ For transcription conventions, see Appendix 8.3.

III contain specific discursive marking of these potentialities of broad cultural, linguistic or experiential bonding, I have refrained from elaborating on them in the analysis. Nonetheless, the analysed data do point at interactional alignments that indicate trust, openness and responsiveness between the interviewer and interviewee, as commented on in both Article II and Article III.

4.4.2 Data analysis

As already noted above in my discussion of policy text analysis (Section 4.3.2.), qualitative research represents an iterative rather than linear process, involving multiple steps that can be made and revisited in a spiral fashion (Creswell, 2013, p. 183). In analysing the collected data in the present study, the same principle applies. The data analysis process can in fact be seen as launched already in the process of note-taking during interviews and continued during multiple listening to the recorded material and, particularly, during the initial transcription process, performed by myself with the aid of my research assistant. Since the individual interviews ranged in duration from slightly below one hour to almost two hours, initial verbatim transcriptions thus involved a prolonged process of an intimate acquaintance with the data material. Upon broad transcriptions, multiple readings of physical copies of each manuscript but also their digital versions in NVivo10 followed, encompassing memoing, annotating and colour-coding but also producing summaries of the main features and idiosyncrasies of each interview.

Given the sheer amount of data generated in the interview process, the next step was to conduct a broad aerial coding. NVivo10 was employed throughout this process. While the interview guide with its broad thematic categories provided some initial coding structure, care was taken to let nodes and sub-nodes, representing categories and themes in NVivo, emerge in more open, data-driven fashion (see on this Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). While the thematic analysis was performed on the entire data set, only a selection of sub-themes was subjected to further narrative analysis. This included the following: 1) language, literacy and learning in early childhood and 2) home-school communication on the subject of children's language and literacy developments. These provided the empirical basis for Articles II and III, respectively.

As detailed in the articles but also as explicated in Section 2, interview narratives are here defined in discourse-analytic terms as text rather than content only (see e.g. Baynham, 2000). To map the different narrative formats employed by the interviewees but also to gain an overview of specific discursive features across different formats and themes, I transferred

all identified narrative excerpts in their broad context into rows of an Excel sheet and recorded all analytic information systematically in specified vertical fields. This provided an aerial view and facilitated a considerable flexibility in working with the narrative excerpts. This analytical process was seconded with multiple careful listening to the audio-recorded data, complemented by incessant re-contextualizing of identified excerpts in the physical copies of the manuscripts. Only selected excerpts were transcribed interactionally (see Appendix 8.3 for transcription details) and presented in the article manuscripts submitted for peer review. As with the policy documents data, all translations from Polish into English were conducted by myself and were quality-assured by my Polish research assistant. Necessarily a challenge in any translation work, preservation of semantic nuances was at the centre of attention. While there are, for example, prosodic differences between Polish and English, the transcribed excerpts render these differences as closely as possible to the original linguistic expression. All excerpts are presented bilingually either in the body of the manuscript (Article II) or as appendix (Article III), subject to specific journal requirements.

4.5 Ensuring methodological quality

In considering methodological quality in qualitative research, qualitative researchers have questioned whether concepts, such as validity, reliability and generalizability, seen as quintessentially positivist/post-positivist, are applicable beyond the paradigms within which they were conceived (for discussion and synthesis, see e.g. Creswell, 2013; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). To avoid an epistemological breach through an application of primarily quantitative concepts on to qualitative research, other concepts/labels have been suggested which are meant to capture standards for methodological quality in qualitative research, such as credibility or dependability (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Lincoln & Denzin, 2013) but also trustworthiness (Riessman, 2008), among others. However, regardless of terminological choices, there is a general agreement among researchers that qualitative projects should be demonstrably dependable/credible/trustworthy (Creswell & Miller, 2000). Such calls for ensuring methodological quality appeal to a number of fundamental issues in conducting qualitative research, rescuing it from an untenable, strong version of epistemological relativism it may sometimes be taken to imply (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 241).

In attempting to account for methodological quality in qualitative research, it is important to note that 'there is no canon, clear set of rules or list of established procedures and abstract criteria for validation that fit all projects' (Riessman, 2008, p. 200). Indeed, various procedures have been suggested as guidance or aid for qualitative researchers in their choice

for demonstrating the credibility of their research (see e.g. Creswell & Miller, 2000). What follows below is therefore an account where issues of methodological quality are laid out and considered within the confines of this project, framed by perspectives and traditions already laid out in previous chapters. Wary of terminological nuances, I will employ the terms validity, reliability and generalizability. This is mostly a pragmatic choice, reflecting terminological alignment with sources that I draw on in my discussion.

4.5.1 Validity, reliability and generalizability

With reference to narrative research, Riessman (2008, p. 184) points out that there are two levels of validity to bear in mind: 1) validity of the story told by the research participant and 2) validity of the story told by the researcher. Translated to this project, the former touches upon the question of truth of the stories constructed in the interviews and the latter to the validity of the analytical procedure employed in general and extends to both the document and narrative analysis conducted in this study.

In terms of the former, Riessman considers different truth criteria applicable to different narrative research projects. Given the constructionist epistemology framing this study, it is, as already explicated, the very act of meaning-making or construction of the lived experience within its situational and broader social context that is central here. Hence, correspondence criteria for establishing the truth of the constructed stories are not readily applicable. Similarly, while the meaning-making process may result in a more or less coherent account, the approach to narrative adopted in this study underscores fluid rather than rigid structures of meaning-construction or what has been termed the constitutive nature of narratives (Gubrium & Holstein, 2009). With reference to Ricoeur, Riessman argues that lived experience may not have coherence in itself but may acquire it through the process of mediating and interpreting that experience (2008, p. 190). It is precisely such inherent 'hermeneutical composability of narrative' which renders the search for narrative truth susceptible to pragmatic criteria and implicates also broader contexts of meaning in judgements of coherence (Bruner, 1991, p. 13). As in this study, it is the actual theoretical and empirical usefulness of illuminating new facets of experience that provides an anchor in adjudicating narrative truth.

In terms of the inferences drawn from the present data, or Riessman's 'story told by the researcher', Creswell and Miller's typology for validation procedures in qualitative research can be used as a useful point of departure for assessing the validity of both the document and the narrative analysis conducted in this project. It includes nine different steps applicable

within different paradigms and viewed via three different lenses: 1) the lens of the researcher, 2) the lens of the participants and 3) the lens of external individuals, such as readers and reviewers. It is particularly the following that are relevant in the context of this study: 1) peer debriefing; 2) researcher reflexivity, including clarifying researcher bias; 3) rich, thick description of the methodical choices made and 4) keeping an audit trail.

The first type of validity encompasses discussions with peers who may subject the project execution to detailed interrogation and scrutiny along the way or upon completion. Regular supervisions, presentations and discussions in research group meetings, national and international conference participation predicated upon peer-review but also the very process of publication in international peer-reviewed journals were all parts of this project, ensuring continuous multi-voiced feedback.

In line with critical approaches to both discourse analysis and LEP, the second criterion, researcher reflexivity, has been woven into the very fabric of this research project, impacting not only theoretical-analytical choices but also methodical decisions, such as an emphasis on data co-construction, as already related at various points of this text.

While Step 3 has been carefully detailed in this section as well as in the three individual articles, I wish to elaborate on the use of computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS), such as NVivo10 employed in this project, as an example of Cresswell and Miller's fourth validity procedure applied in this thesis. A number of researchers have singled CAQDAS out as a way of increasing scientific credibility in qualitative research projects. Silverman (2013) for example, argues that CAQDAS can aid in increasing the transparency of the data and the analytic process itself by allowing for both 1) an easily accessible re-visitation by others through the embedded project-sharing functionality and 2) a reduction of anecdotalism in qualitative research through a global search across the entire data set. Midré (2010) contends that, by introducing greater transparency into the data analysis process, greater data accessibility and systematic documentation practice, one also increases the quality of qualitative research.

However, despite possibilities of increased transparency in qualitative research through the use of NVivo, it is not as straightforward as it may seem. In their discussion of maximising transparency in a doctoral research project, Bringer et al. (2004) discuss the challenges of providing a transparent account of the use of NVivo within a grounded theory framework. They underline the difficulties of writing about an iterative interpretive process in a linear manner and urge for using NVivo in congruence with the chosen methodology and for providing a transparent account of its use.

On a similar note, Richards (2009) warns about getting caught in the so-called coding trap, as computer software offers no limits to the number of codes one can assign to data. Indeed, coupled with its flexibility and accessibility, coding and coding-on in NVivo can be a tempting and potentially endless affair. Furthermore, dissecting qualitative data into too many segments, robbed of their original, narrative context, may contribute not only to unwanted data fragmentation but also to potential researcher alienation from the original source, despite possibilities for a quick and easy retrieval of the coded segment in its context.

As already noted, some of these issues transpired in this project as well, such as when working with lengthy policy texts beyond frequency counts and broad thematic coding. Keeping sight of discursive detail in their immediate and broader context while also maintaining a coherent picture within and across documents proved a challenge when using NVivo alone. Interrogating physical, working copies of each document and manually producing a large comprehensive analytical matrix aided in balancing an analytical need for proximity to data with a need for an aerial view. Similarly, given the challenge of drawing boundaries in narratives constructed in research interviews (Riessman, 2008), a continuous dialogue between coded segments in NVivo, physical copies of each transcript as well as audio-recorded material was conducted throughout the analytical process.

The issue of methodological rigour through the use of NVivo can be extended to the issue of reliability of the coding process. NVivo, for example, offers the possibility of calculating a Cohen's kappa statistics of inter-rater agreement. Being a primarily quantitative concept shunned or even blatantly rejected by qualitative researchers, Richards (2009) provides insightful reflections on how this may be used to enhance research reliability in creative ways. She argues that freezing codes in a moment in order to measure inter-rater coding agreement may be problematic, given that qualitative coding is not supposed to be a linear exercise but rather a dynamic, iterative process. In her view, reliability measures in qualitative research should, therefore, always be subject to careful interpretation: comparing coding agreement between independent coders may, for example, be taken as an opportunity to pose important comparative questions about the data and the coding process. As such, it can be seen as enhancing analytic rigour as well as the legitimacy of the data and qualitative research enquiry generally.

In working on Articles II and III, it is precisely such concerns that prompted an involvement of an inter-coder. Rather than including a report on inter-rater reliability in the articles, the results of this procedure prompted a reflection on the issue of developing analytical categories and their re-application on a unit of analysis with a shifting

indeterminate boundary, such as narrative. By extension, this procedure facilitated not only a deeper methodological awareness but also touched upon the very epistemological and ontological nature of the material at hand.

In terms of generalizability concerns in this project, several issues are of note. An important premise for such considerations is to bear in mind the very nature of qualitative research as primarily concerned with elucidating the specific or particular rather than the broad that can be generalized across different populations (Creswell, 2013, p. 156). As Riessman (2008) argues in her discussion of narrative research, it is the context-dependent knowledge that emerges in and through qualitative research that may aid in expanding the frontiers of specific fields of enquiry. She argues further that the contribution itself is in exploring, revealing and obviating new in-depth facets of experience, rather than in interrogating broad abstract models and rules. On this view, generalizing, other than on a theoretical level, may in fact be beside the point. In this project, these insights resonate throughout each individual manuscript where reflections are offered on the nature of the data itself and the data analysis conducted. I stress the aim of providing as nuanced and rich portraits of the research participants' experience as possible. Analytical, rather than statistical/sample generalizability are underscored throughout, not least by showing how the findings add to our understanding of relevant theoretical concepts, such as intertextuality, positioning in narrative discourse or reported speech as agency, and also how they aid in carving out the broader empirical landscape with an attention to empirical detail and nuance. Leaning on to an interpretive, hermeneutic frame, embedded in social-constructionist approaches to discourse, it is also the theoretical potential of detailing and unfolding layers of contextually occasioned constructions of human experience and understanding that the project has underscored throughout (see Articles I, II & III for further details).

4.5.2 Ethical considerations

In the context of the present study, the issue of research ethics is considered as one of the key dimensions of scientific conduct, validity, integrity and, ultimately, quality (Punch, 2009, p. 38). While the policy documents analysed in this study do not raise specific ethical issues, since they are publically available and hence subject not only to individual interpretation but also broad public scrutiny, a careful consideration of ethical issues is particularly relevant in relation to the collected interview data.

In addition to existing legislation on issues such as data and the privacy protection of individuals and groups, the Norwegian National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social

Sciences (NESH) defines the concept of research ethics as 'a complex set of values, standards and institutional schemes that help constitute and regulate scientific activity' (NESH, 2006, p. 5). In collecting the interview data, these have been ensured in multiple ways.

First and foremost, before launching piloting and data collection, an application for ethical approval of the project by the Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD) was drawn up, detailing all essential aspects of data collection and management, as required. The application was approved (see Appendix 8.1).

Second, Tangen (2013, p. 3) argues that complex ethical dilemmas and conflicts most often arise at the cross-section between the need 'to protect participants and the need for research-based knowledge founded on best possible data'. She lists a number of related issues that need to be considered at different stages of the research process. One of these is free and informed consent to participate in research which, in my view, lies at the very core of research ethics within educational sciences and is a requirement on which the approval by NSD is predicated. In the context of this study, an elicitation of formal participant consent was conducted in agreement with NSD's requirements. The consent form was available to participants in both Polish and Norwegian prior to data collection (see Appendices 8.1.2 & 8.1.3).

Third, to ensure anonymity, privacy and confidentiality of interview participants (NESH, 2006, p. 14), strict routines regarding the management of personal information were installed, in line with NSD's requirements, at the outset of the research project and respected at all its stages. For example, all data were stored in a secured, password-protected server owned by the University of Oslo. In transcribing the interviews, participants were anonymized by being assigned numerical labels. This applies also to the naming of all digital files that could potentially be traced to individual interviews. A translation key linking participants with their assigned labels was stored separately from the audio-files and with password-protected access. In publishing the research findings of this study, all proper names were replaced with pseudonyms and anonymity was otherwise ensured by a purposeful diffusion of any personal traits linking participants with presented excerpts of data.

5 SUMMARY OF THE ARTICLES

In this section, I will briefly introduce the three empirical studies that constitute Part II of this dissertation. Since they share a common analytical, interpretative and methodological foundation, as laid out in detail in the previous sections, there are multiple continuities and points of interaction. Nonetheless, each study also attempts to answer the overarching research question in its idiosyncratic manner, with the aim of making a unique contribution to research. In addition to summaries of main points, the following text will also provide updates and relevant expansions or clarifications, whenever appropriate and/or necessary.

5.1 Article I

TITLE: Constructing the multilingual child: the case of language education policy in Norway

In this article, I ask what discursive changes have occurred in the way the multilingual child has been constructed in official Norwegian language policy discourse over time. While the broad LEP changes sweeping through Norway over the last few decades have been laid out in a number of studies (Engen & Kulbrandstad, 2004; Hvistendahl, 2009b, Øzerk, 2008), often as a premise to investigations of bilingual teaching practices in classroom settings (e.g. Dewilde, 2013; Ryen et al., 2009), in this study I revisit the issue of policy creation as a dynamic concept and interrogate the specifically discursive fabric of two advisory LEP documents at the backdrop of broader socio-political change.

To accomplish this, I combine insights from two approaches, both with a critical agenda. Firstly, I follow Fairclough's (2001, 2003, 2010, 2013) critical discourse-analytic approach and apply his conceptualization of intertextuality as a central analytical lens on the data. The emphasis is thus firmly on the issue of voice/multi-voicedness in state policy creation. Secondly, I apply May's (2001) minority language rights (MLR) framework as an interpretative lens. The framework has a distinct rights orientation to language (Ruiz, 1984), critiqued for implying a static rather than a dynamic view of language and multilingualism (see e.g. Garcia, 2009). On my reading, however, May's approach does not preclude a dynamic view of language as a resource: in endorsing strong/heteroglossic models of bilingual education and thus granting different languages a legislative (i.e. rights) status, they may gain a greater symbolic status as a resource in a crucial institutional context, namely education, and, by implication, beyond. The orientation to language as both right and resource

is also interlaced with a broader interest in opportunities for equitable education offered to emerging bilinguals in the current system. In line with Garcia and Kleifgen's (2010) vision for educating emerging bilinguals, May's MLR framework is here seen as compatible with ensuring such opportunities.

The findings of Article I demonstrate a substantial discursive shift in how the young multilingual child is constructed in the two policy documents under scrutiny: while the older text endorses a view of strong forms of bilingual education as a right embedded in a pluralist notion of educational equity, in the more recent text, Norwegian (L2) is discursively promoted as primary in formal educational contexts. As such, the broader globalization and educational accountability discourse, on which the text draws, frames the young multilingual child increasingly as a young learner on as fast an L2 trajectory as possible while nurturing a symbolic heritage link to L1.

In retrospect, I see that the discussion could have been strengthened through an inclusion of a broader range of available scientific literature on the commodification of language and language learning in the era of late capitalism. This line of thought is, for example, comprehensively articulated in the work of Monica Heller and colleagues (Duchêne & Heller, 2012; Heller, 2010, 2011). They see the advent of language commodification as linked to the problem of legitimacy for the maintenance of, and education in and through, minority languages in a resettlement setting, leading to the 'recasting of heritage language education as value-added' (Duchêne & Heller, 2012, p. 7). Termed a 'profit discourse of multilingualism', predicated on a complex discursive as well as trans-national, socio-political and economic change (2012, 8), it is a perspective compatible with findings in the present study.

5.2 Article II

TITLE: Negotiating learning in early childhood: narratives from migrant homes

In this study, I build on Article I and take under scrutiny the discourse on the young multilingual child in early childhood education, identified as undergoing a process of discursive change in official Norwegian LEP. My key analytical interest here was to explore its local instantiations in the interviewed parents' narrative accounts of experience.

Thematically, these accounts all concern different aspects of their children's learning in early years educational institutions in Norway, identified in the analysis as either 1) academic, 2) emotional, 3) relational or 4) organizational. In line with Garcia and Kleifgen's vision (2010)

for equitable educational provision for emerging bilinguals, this article thus enacts a broad perspective on LEP that targets a generic learning dimension, including but not limited to language and early literacy development, and its discursive configurations in the Norwegian early years educational context.

The narratives are explored through the positioning framework, as proposed and developed by Bamberg (1997, 2004a). This allows for tracing the narrator's discursive positioning across three narrative levels: 1) the story world constructed in the process of telling; 2) the interactional world which represents the close interactive context in which the act of telling is nested and 3) wider contexts where broad indexical categories are available and which the narrator/s can variably effectuate or resist in the situationally occasioned storytelling account.

The analysis shows that, parallel to the broader discursive shift on the multilingual child in official policy texts, the parents display a differential positioning towards the educational practice in the early years in Norway, subject to foregrounded thematic concerns. Their positions range from ambivalence, scepticism and even downright rejection to less clear-cut, shifting stances but also careful acceptance or embrace. The parents position themselves with most apprehension and reserve towards the academic content of the observed practice. In particular, they question whether the traditional child-centred, play-based early years education in Norway can ensure their children's optimal Norwegian language (L2) and literacy development. They are also shown to actively negotiate their positioning towards the emotional, relational and organizational aspects of practice, subject to the immediate interactional environment of the interview but also across longer time scales. The interviews thus become a platform for a discursive reflection on their new social reality as well as their children's learning and their own parenting in a resettlement context.

While the positioning framework offers, on my reading and in line with recent theorizing (e.g. De Fina, Schiffrin, & Bamberg, 2006), a robust way of connecting both micro and macro concerns in discourse, I also acknowledge some limitations and challenges which are not specifically addressed in the article. While narratives constructed in interview dyads or triads, as was the case here, may come in a number of formats, they are not all equally susceptible to a neat division into discursive levels and, relatedly, not all levels provide grounds for an equally comprehensive positioning analysis. For example, short narrative snippets may not lend themselves easily to the analytical framework. It is particularly more elaborate stories, articulated with some degree of narrative detail by one or several narrators to (a) variably active interlocutor/s, that provide the richest soil from which discursive

positions may emerge. In the present data, it is first and foremost such stories that are presented. The interactional level analysis of the present data consistently shows that the emergence of such stories is predicated upon the interviewee/s assuming interactional control in the storytelling act, while relegating the interviewer to what Labov (1997, p. 397) terms an ideal audience: 'attentive, interested and responsive'. In the case of interview dyads, it is thus the first and third analytical levels of the positioning framework that may gain primacy. In the case of interview triads, the interactional negotiations between the narrators may emerge as salient in addition to, but also potentially at the expense of, a rich story line development. As underscored throughout, the situationally occasioned negotiations of narrative control and power mechanisms embedded in interview research play a central role in what stories emerge, how, when as well as where boundaries are drawn between one story and the next (Norton, 2013; Riessman, 2008).

5.3 Article III

TITLE: Reported parent-teacher dialogues on child language learning: voicing agency in interview narratives

In this study, I ask how the interviewed parents construct their dialogues on child language learning in encounters with their children's educators in preschool and early grades in school. Once again, the issue of polyphony in discourse (Bakhtin, 1981) becomes central. Yet, this time, I specifically trace this polyphony as enacted in the narrators' story worlds through the linguistic tool of reported speech (RS). This includes different types of RS, including both direct and indirect speech, through which the narrators assign story characters with a variable degree of agency, understood here as a locally occasioned, discursively mediated capacity to act (Ahearn, 2001; E. R. Miller, 2014). It is specifically the weaving of narrative agency in parental narratives that relate past, recurring or even future hypothetical encounters with their children's early childhood educators on issues related to child language learning that are in focus.

The analysis reveals that the parents use reported speech as a strategic discursive device to enact their own agency in matters concerning their children's language development and learning of both Polish (L1) and Norwegian (L2). Thematically, it is narratives concerning their children's development and progress in L2 that predominate. The parents may position themselves as keen instigators of requests for information, advice and brief assessments of L2 skills by teachers. Nonetheless, even when they do not construct

themselves as dialogue initiators, they used school voices strategically to express their own endorsement of, as well as involvement and interest in, communication with school authorities on aspects of their children's L2 progress. This communication is shown to occur in parallel with the parents' own L1 maintenance efforts. Here the parents often construct themselves as actively claiming ownership of their children's L1 development and even negotiating the value of L1 with the educators in cases of dissonance or disagreement. Drawing on Norton's (2013, 2016; 1995) concept of investment in language learning and imagined memberships in different language communities, the parents are shown to be vocal advocates of their children's linguistic participation in both home and host societies.

As the discussion of findings points out, parental concern for their children's Norwegian language skills and their interest in monitoring their L2 progress in cooperation and communication with educators is particularly noteworthy. In fact, while the interview included questions on bilingual educational support at pre-/school, including possibilities for Polish language maintenance and development through formal educational channels, this did not become a prominent theme in the parental narratives and merited only minimal reflection on the parents' part. Indeed, as Hornberger (2002, p. 40) argues, 'the challenge of popular demand for the societal language of power is a very real one in contexts all over the world, one not to be lightly dismissed'. Indicative of deep-seated ideologies increasingly favouring the majority language at the policy level, L2 in the Norwegian context arguably represents a symbolic means of access to mobility, prestige, status and power. The migrant parents' keen support of the powerful ends of the biliteracy continua in the resettlement context can be read as at least a partial refraction of this.

6 SUMMARIZING DISCUSSION

6.1 Research contributions

As laid out in the previous chapters, in this thesis I take a broad ecological and multi-scalar view of the language education policy onion, with language, literacy and learning as its three key thematic components, all nested in the discursive processes of policy creation, interpretation, appropriation and instantiation. My primary empirical interest has been in emerging bilinguals growing up in resettled, migrant families and attending Norwegian early childhood educational institutions. Analytically, the three studies in this thesis variably thematise the issue of voice in discourse, particularly as it is enacted in 'texts of authority', penned in the regulating space of the state, and in migrant parents' oral texts, a voice often silent and/or under-represented in LPP and LEP processes. The discursive interaction between the two is also foregrounded. Throughout, I stress researcher reflexivity as an indelible part of critical discourse-analytic perspectives on LEP research.

The overarching research question of this thesis broadly asks how language education policy is discursively realized in early childhood educational provision in Norway. Nested on a common theoretical, empirical and methodological foundation, each of the three articles included in this thesis provides a unique answer to this question. In addition to summarizing discussions presented in each individual manuscript and summaries of the main findings of each study offered in Section 5, below, I take a broad, aerial view and synthesize both the theoretical-analytical and the broader empirical contributions of this thesis that merit particular attention, namely the issue of voice in discourse on LEP and critical perspectives on the LEP ecology in Norway.

6.1.1 Voice in discourse on LEP

The issue of voice is arguably one of the most fundamental in critical approaches to both discourse analysis and LEP (Blommaert, 2005; Ricento, 2000). As underscored in this text and in the three individual studies, it is particularly attempts at robust theoretical conceptualizations of the subtle connections within and across the polyphony of various voices operating at different policy sites and involved in a multitude of semiotic activities that are primarily at stake. Variably referred to as the micro-macro challenge (De Fina et al., 2006; Hult, 2010; D. C. Johnson, 2011) or as the agency-structure dilemma (Block, 2014), different approaches have been proposed and applied in both discourse-analytical and LPP research, drawing on distinct metaphors and theoretical concepts, such as the LPP onion (Ricento &

Hornberger, 1996), sociolinguistic scales (Blommaert, 2007; Hult, 2010) or the positioning framework (Bamberg, 1997). Building on these insights, this project has contributed to its continued interrogation in several distinct ways.

First, in the three individual articles, I have attempted to combine an in-depth investigation into the discursive dynamics of policy creation, operating on a broader and longer time scale (Article I), with a study of the discursive scale of policy instantiation, where concerns of a more situationally occasioned nature are foregrounded (Articles II and III). While the different discursive levels of policy necessarily constitute a multi-sited and multi-scalar policy ecology where the different scales and sites are intimately interlaced (Hult, 2010), a carefully crafted discourse-analytical dive into the polyphonic nature of each scale facilitated the emergence of a more focused image of each layer.

Second, this research study has attempted to tap into shared resources between different critical approaches to discourse analysis, guided by a keen pragmatic-methodological interest: rather than fitting any data material into one approach, such as CDA, the primary goal was to let the 'data speak'. This has implied drawing on and exploring analytical frameworks that provide their idiosyncratic tools to investigate different policy sites and scales in a rigorous manner. As Article I demonstrates, Fairclough's approach (2001, 2003, 2010, 2013) proved particularly instructive when working with official policy documents. Not only did it aid in systematically teasing out the intertextual and interdiscursive texture of each document, it also underscored the nature of policy creation as itself a dynamic process involving a polyphonic chorus of policy agents operating at different policy sites. The interview material, on the other hand, necessitated a venture beyond Fairclough's approach (Articles II & III). This has led to an application of critical approaches to narrative discourse that offered more theoretically-nuanced tools to explore the emic perspective. As both Article II and Article III demonstrate, the capacity of narrative to provide a window into the interviewees' lived experience, yet indirectly through their discursive re-staging of past worlds and voices, facilitated insights on parental experience of LEP in Norwegian early childhood education. This included two dimensions in particular: 1) ways in which they enter into a narrative process of reflection on, and negotiations of, aspects of their experience with early childhood education in Norway and 2) how they construct and perform their agency in narratives concerning home-pre/school dialogues on their children's language development. By focusing on parental voices in LEP processes, Articles II and III complement the intertextual analysis of policy documents in Article I, drawn against a broader canvas of socio-political change. Combining CDA and narrative analysis as critical

lenses on LEP discourse in one study has, to my knowledge, not been attempted in Norway or elsewhere. As such, it represents an attempt at finding and creating productive synergies between different strands of critical approaches to discourse, as called for in the research community (see Blommaert, 2005).

Third, the choice of including written documents, penned at the official policy level, as well as oral empirical data, constructed in research interviews with migrant parents, was also motivated by a broad, critical-theoretical interest in issues concerning both agency and structure in LEP discourse, rather than just one at the expense of the other. Singling out individualization and the related concept of individual agency as key optics of much social scientific research in late modernity, Block (2013, 2015) argues that this has led to an under-theorization of structure, rendering the concept without much value beyond, at best, its function as a metonymic device or an epistemic metaphor. These concerns are echoed in other strands of language/LEP studies and beyond (Bakewell, 2010; May, 2014c, 2016). Seen against the backdrop of Block's operationalization of structure (2015), in this research project, the structural aspect emerges in at least two of its configurations: first, as the highly regulated, yet also more diffuse, institutional discourse of official policy texts (Article I), which imposes variable constraints on text production, on the one hand, and on conditions for policy implementation and appropriation, on the other. Fairclough's model of discourse and the analytical toolkit it offers, deeply invested in and crafted with recourse to strands of linguistic and social/political theory, most notably Halliday's (2014) functional grammar and Bourdieu's (1977) theorizing of habitus respectively, were particularly instructive in conceptualizing these relations. Second, it is the subtle structuring power of physical environments, included in Block's broader multimodality of structure, which has been shown to operate in the interview data analysed in Article II and Article III. This is consistent with previous work within sociolinguistics, discourse analysis and narrative analysis (Blommaert et al., 2005; De Fina, 2003a; Norton, 2013), where the recognition of 'space', including the local space of the research interview as well as broader contextualizing spaces, is underscored in variably enabling the emergence of particular identities and senses of self.

However, this research does not in any way suggest structural primacy in discourse. On my reading, structural forces can be seen as offering a set of potentialities (Fairclough, 2003, 2011) or as possessing an 'anteriority' vis-à-vis the exercise of agency (Block, 2015, p. 21). Against this conceptual context, all three studies also variably target and underscore the dynamic, polyphonic and agentive aspects of discourse. While policy text production may ultimately obfuscate individual agency and smooth potential heteroglossia into greater

uniformity and consensus (R. Wodak, 2000), official policy texts do not represent a monolithic institutional voice. As Article I demonstrates, they too are polyphonic discursive sites that point intertextually and interdiscursively into the past, present and future. Policy agents can variably mould and shape official policy text production against the available set of potentialities. Laying out how texts of identical political status may variably embrace this challenge is but one contribution of Article I. The two interview studies presented as part of this research project also contribute to obviating links between agency and structure in several distinct ways. First, as analytical and empirical platforms for the voices of a group of Polish migrant parents in Norway, both studies acknowledge them as agents in LPP/LEP processes. Second, consistent with, for example, Ahearn's (2001) oft quoted conceptualization of agency as a socioculturally mediated capacity to act, the parental narrative acts of identity and agency are not portrayed as expressions of unconstrained free will, agentive resistance only or as subject to omnipotent structural forces. Rather, the complex orchestration, performance and negotiation of different narrative voices, nested in both local and broader contexts of meaning, are shown to be central. Throughout, these careful balancing acts of discursive positioning were aided by critical perspective on discourse and LEP processes. This included the role of the researcher, enacted through an emphasis on reflexivity, co-construction and negotiation of narrative control and status differences at different sites and scales.

While the study by no means claims to have resolved the micro-macro challenge, it has, in at least some measure, aided in obviating the complexity of issues involved in arguably any such attempt. Rather than aligning myself to one set of conceptualizing tools, I have drawn on the metaphor of the policy onion, discursive and policy scales, micro-macro optics but also agency and structure concepts throughout. While the concept of scales, in particular, adds nuance to the metaphor of the policy onion or the dichotomous micro-macro or agency-structure divides, I found the complementary use of these concepts, subject to careful contextual considerations, useful in trying to grasp the complexity of the challenge at hand. Ultimately, regardless of the point of departure, be it at the more structural level of texts of authority or at the more grass-root level of individual parental voices, it remains imperative to keep a critical sight of both as well as their mutual interaction.

6.1.2 Language education policy in Norway: critical perspectives

On a broad, interpretative scale, several issues deserve a special note. First, in line with recent advances in LPP/LEP research (see e.g. Hornberger, 2006; Hult, 2010), this study endorses a broad ecological view of LEP where the interlacing of different policy agents across sites and

scales are foregrounded as central. As already noted above, it critically interrogates two policy layers in particular: 1) the official policy creation, represented by what Blackledge (2003) terms 'texts of authority' and 2) policy instantiation in narrative accounts of experience constructed in interviews with migrant Polish families, recently resettled in Norway. As has been pointed out by prominent scholars on language policy and/or bilingualism (e.g. Spolsky, 2012; Wei, 2012), the family is one of the critical domains in the language policy ecology: to understand and theorize this ecology in a robust way, the family should both receive closer attention and be explored as a site interlaced with other domains of the broader LPP ecology. In this thesis, I have attempted to explore the voice of the migrant family as part of LEP in multilingual settings. In line with critical perspectives on LEP discourse, the often unheard voice of the migrant family has thus been propelled to greater visibility and the family empowered as a policy agent in its own right (Articles II and III).

Given the dearth of empirical research on the role of the migrant family in early childhood educational practice and policy in Norway, the study also represents an attempt to fill some of this gap by unearthing aspects of this largely unexplored territory in the Norwegian context. Two perspectives have guided the investigation: 1) rather than seeing the family from an a priori deficit perspective, noted as widespread in research on partnerships between pre/schools and non-mainstream, migrant families across contexts (Bø, 2001; Compton-Lilly, 2007, 2012, Rogers, 2002, 2003; Roy & Roxas, 2011), I build on a view of families as 'funds of knowledge' (Gonzalez et al., 2005; Moll et al., 1992) and as indispensable communication and cooperation partners for educators, potentially united in a concerted effort to provide emerging bilinguals with equitable curricular and pedagogical opportunities in early childhood and beyond (Garcia, 2009; Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010). Contributing to an in-depth knowledge of families, their unique cultures of learning and their views, perspectives and beliefs about education, this study can be seen as a springboard to such culturally and linguistically sensitive, scaffolded educational provision.

Second, the study contributes in its specific ways to the debate on how or whether the current wider trends in language education policy in Norway foster a climate in which the development of emerging bilingualism in Norwegian early childhood education can thrive and how the current implementational and ideological spaces for multilingualism are appropriated and/or instantiated by policy agents, here represented by migrant families. The legislative shift towards transitional forms of bilingual education in the late 1990s, suggesting a narrowing down rather than opening up of these spaces, has already been commented on and/or employed as a general contextual canvas on which to explore agentic responses in

classroom practice (Dewilde, 2013; Engen & Kulbrandstad, 2004; Hvistendahl, 2009c; Sand, 1997). However, rather than leaving the issue at rest, this study represents a critical re-visitation of these changes from a dynamic, discursive perspective. Through a close reading of two comprehensive policy documents with a shared advisory policy text status, the process of official policy creation was shown to be profoundly intertextually interlaced with broader socio-political discursive changes but also transnational trends, sending powerful echoes through the Norwegian LEP landscape.

As demonstrated in Article I, while the chronologically older text, embedded in a view of educational equity through plurality, promotes a view of the young emerging bilingual as a young child with a right to mother tongue tuition, the more recent text does not only display a clear discursive preference towards the development of the majority language, Norwegian. It also intertextually draws on the 'profit discourse of multilingualism' that dramatically extends the conceptualization of language dominance beyond the confines of the national (Duchêne & Heller, 2012). With instrumentality as one of its key trademarks, this suggests an emergence of new forms of language governmentality and regimentation, with traditional elite languages, particularly English, and majority national languages, such as Norwegian, becoming winners and other, minority and/or immigrant languages potential losers within the wider, transnational language ecology. As such, the current Norwegian language education policy space can be seen as increasingly normatively restricted as to which languages are seen as legitimate and which are not within the institutional space of formal schooling, clearly tending towards the powerful ends of the biliteracy continua (Hornberger, 2003a; Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester, 2003). Thus, although multilingual practices may flourish outside of the classroom or even within, thanks to individual educators' attempts at filling available ideological spaces with equitable content for emerging bilinguals (Dewilde, 2013; Hvistendahl, 2012), the findings of Article I also suggest that the current transitional bilingual education policy, coupled with the interpretational leeway in legislation, may not ensure optimal conditions for an equitable development of entire linguistic repertoires at the emerging bilinguals' disposal.

Articles II and III, on the other hand, trace the variable instantiations of these broader discursive trends in parental discourse. The interviewed Polish parents are shown to represent particularly active and resourceful voices, eager to question and negotiate early educational provision offered to their children in Norway and keen to ensure their development and growth in both the host and home/heritage language. They are also shown to display a particularly keen awareness of the distribution of symbolic goods, including linguistic and wider educational capital in the Norwegian context: it is their children's learning of

Norwegian as the dominant societal language they wish to see prioritized in the institutional context of preschool and school. Interestingly, the child- and play-centred pedagogical ideals, deeply entrenched in the Norwegian early childhood educational philosophy and practice (Wagner, 2004; Wagner & Einarsdottir, 2006) and seen here as particularly compatible with a vision for equitable multilingual pedagogies, represent for some parents in the study a stumbling block on the way to a Norwegian language and literacy growth (Article II). Yet, the kinds of negotiations and reflections they are shown to enter into also bear witness to an active effort to weigh and deliberate their own parenting practices, aims and values. As such, the parental discourse may variably resist or challenge but also actively endorse the current policy focus on L2 as primary. The latter in particular may be suggestive of an alignment with a broader transnational neoliberal discourse that conditions majority and elite language competence as the ultimate means of access to the national or even global market economy, and thus as key to gaining social mobility. It also signals a sanctioning of the traditionally more powerful ends of the biliteracy continua as a benchmark of classroom practice. As already pointed out in Articles II and III, this finding may be tied to the participants' own status in Norway as voluntary labour migrants keen on seizing better employment/economic opportunities in Norway but also as migrants of a highly literate Polish heritage eager to warrant their membership in a common European, and arguably also global, project.

The parental demand for the majority language for their children foregrounds yet another key dimension of educational provision for emerging bilinguals. As Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester aptly point out, in our late modern times 'an ability to construct wholes with appropriate parts is quite important if one wants to speak the language of power' (2003, p. 53). Indeed, in the current political climate, it becomes imperative that emerging bilinguals have in their repertoires also high levels of competence in the majority language in order to exploit the available educational, socio-cultural or professional opportunities and not fall prey to structural injustice. By the same token, provision and continued advocacy for strong, dynamic and heteroglossic forms of bilingual education (Garcia, 2009) can be seen as an equitable response to this challenge, whereby the development and strategic employment of emerging bilinguals' linguistic repertoires can be ensured (Blackledge et al., 2014).

Third, connected to the arguments presented above, this research study also thematises the growing disparity between the sociolinguistic practice on the ground, displaying novel forms of linguistic complexity and cultural hybridity across time and space (Blommaert, 2010, 2013b), and the current broad trends in Norwegian language education policy, which seem to constrain rather than foster the development of emerging bilingualism in Norwegian

preschools and schools. Observed also in other contexts (see Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010), this disparity may be further exacerbated by the current upsurge of a fierce anti-globalization, anti-immigration and pro-nationalist sentiment in many parts of the Western world. Dismissed as an antediluvian entity in the age of superdiversity, the nation-state with its rhetoric and predilection for civism, homogeneity, uniformity and monolingualism (May, 2014c, p. 233) once again demonstrates its resilience and appeal. However, rather than inviting new and more accommodating implementational and ideological spaces for bilingual education policy, this may potentially mark renewed efforts at the retrenchment of its support. In fact, the advent of increasingly restrictive language and language education policies may be accompanied with renewed interest to see language increasingly as a problem (Daugaard & Laursen, 2012; Holm & Laursen, 2011), which may potentially result in misguided classroom practice (see on this, Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010, p. 122).

In conclusion, as already suggested in strands of research discussed in this thesis, integrating equitable curricular options in classroom practice, nourishing dialogue with parents about this practice but also combining approaches and transgressing disciplinary boundaries can be seen as a way forward. This may foster the complex interconnections between language, literacy and learning and obviate the benefits of heteroglossic forms of bilingual education, sensitive to emerging bilinguals' variable needs and vantage points. Ultimately, '(w)hat is needed is to find as many ways as possible to open up ideological spaces for multiple languages and literacies in classroom, community, and society' (Hornberger, 2002, p. 42).

6.2 *Limitations*

While aiming to make a unique empirical contribution to scholarship, this project is not without shortcomings. In addition to those that have been noted along the way, particularly in Section 5, and commented on in each individual study, the following merit a special mention:

First, the empirical sources in this study are limited to official policy documents and interviews with parents only. Moreover, the interviews themselves have been conducted with each family only at one point in time. While representing a sizeable volume of data for discourse-analytical purposes, the two data sources could have been supplemented by, for example, systematic ethnographic insights. This would, first and foremost, provide a window of opportunity to contextualize the collected data in greater depth as well as triangulate the present findings with additional analytical dimensions. On a more pragmatic note, it is also important to consider the embedded difficulties of conducting ethnographic research in

communities that are not closely-knit geographically, as was the case with the interviewed Polish migrants. De Fina (2013) discusses this very challenge with recourse to her own research of illegal migrants to the US. She argues that their very status and living conditions do not render ethnography easily applicable and/or feasible. She considers the close attention to detail embedded in discourse-analytic approaches as a suitable leverage to such constraints on ethnographic access.

Second, the data is limited to only two layers of the policy onion: 1) the official policy creation layer and 2) the layer of discursive instantiations of LEP in parental narratives on their encounters with early years education in Norway. Occupying the very heart of Ricento and Hornberger's (1996) policy onion, educators and their classroom appropriations of LEP are not investigated in this study. This could have added interesting perspectives on issues such as actual language and pedagogical practice in ethnolinguistically diverse classrooms, teacher-student interactions or home-school partnerships. While the inclusion of this empirical layer to the present data was carefully considered as a desirable option in the initial stage of this research, it was not pursued in the end due to practical, particularly time, constraints, imposed on doctoral research projects.

Third, the study directs its specific focus on the discursive aspects of LEP in early childhood education in Norway. By extension, in the interview studies, it is not the actual language and literacy practices as observed in the different homes that are investigated but rather how the interviewed parents experience aspects of policy and practice and how they communicate this experience in the interview context. The parental capacity to act is thus understood and investigated as discursively mediated in the research interview setting only. To what extent they enact this capacity in actual encounters with their children's educators is not investigated. As, for example, Rogers' (2003) ethnographic study of family literacy practices reveals, the challenge of resisting disempowering institutional discourse remains real for many non-mainstream and arguably also migrant parents. Additional data, investigating home-pre/school meetings in naturally occurring settings could have offered an important dimension that would have usefully triangulate the present findings.

6.3 Future perspectives

Drawing on a number of related disciplines, most notably multilingualism, literacy and education, the field of language education policy is necessarily vast and complex. Any attempt at unpacking this complexity is bound to be predicated on making a choice as to which aspect/s will be feasible to foreground within a particular research project and which

will necessarily remain backgrounded. In this study, I have attempted to bring to light the specifically discursive aspect of several constituent elements in the Norwegian LEP onion. Rather than seeking or attempting a closure, a number of ancillary issues and questions have emerged along the way, providing a springboard to subsequent research, such as:

- Drawing on discourse-analytical and other approaches within the critical pool, such as critical linguistic ethnography, to explore other scales of the policy onion, particularly the institutional setting of ethnolinguistically diverse, early childhood classrooms. This may add further texture and nuance to the current body of knowledge on whether and how the ideological and implementational policy spaces are filled with equitable content for emerging bilinguals by educators.
- Forms of interaction between different layers of the policy onion, including dynamics and mechanisms of home-school partnerships between migrant parents and educators in the Norwegian educational context, including migrant parents' (emic) perspectives on and involvement in their children's formal and informal learning across and within different ethnolinguistic communities. Despite the empirical recognition of home-school partnerships as being crucially related to student achievement as well as recognition of their importance in current Norwegian legislation, there continues to be a dearth of empirical research in Norway on these issues.
- Further empirical work on family language policy in and across varied ethnolinguistic communities of practice in Norway as well as the interaction of family language policy with other policy sites in the multi-sited, multi-voiced 'linguistic ecology of our multilingual societies' (Spolsky, 2012, p. 8). As a vital language acquisition site and as a community of practice (Lanza, 2007, pp. 46–47), the multilingual family in its different shapes and sizes, ranging from single (migrant) parent to multi-generational homes, offers a unique empirical ground for exploring how language and literacy repertoires of its members are enacted in their day-to-day lives and how these figure in and interact with formal contexts of language and literacy development and learning. This may include the perspectives of emerging bilingual digital natives themselves, including young pre-schoolers and school-goers, but also siblings and grandparents.

It is through a continued empirical and theoretical effort at such scalar understandings of LEP in Norway and beyond that research can contribute to informing and developing equitable curricular and pedagogical opportunities for all children.

7 REFERENCES

- Aamodt, S., & Hauge, A.-M. (Eds.). (2008). *Familiel ring og andre modeller innenfor flerkulturell oppl ring [Family learning and other models within multicultural education]*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Ahearn, L. M. (2001). Language and Agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30, 109–137.
- Atkinson, P., & Coffey, A. (2001). Revisiting the relationship between participant observation and interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: context & method* (pp. 801–814). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Bristol: Multilingual matters.
- Bakewell, O. (2010). Some Reflections on Structure and Agency in Migration Theory. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(10), 1689–1708. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2010.489382>
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: four essays*. (M. Holquist & C. Emerson, Eds.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bamberg, M. (1997). Positioning between structure and performance. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7(1–4), 335–342.
- Bamberg, M. (2004a). Form and Functions of ‘Slut Bashing’ in Male Identity Constructions in 15-Year-Olds: ‘I know it may sound mean to say this, but we couldn’t really care less about her anyway.’ *Human Development*, 47(6), 331–353.
- Bamberg, M. (2004b). Talk, Small Stories, and Adolescent Identities. *Human Development*, 47(6), 366–369. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000081039>
- Bamberg, M. (2006). Stories: Big or small: Why do we care? *Narrative Inquiry*, 16(1), 139–147. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.16.1.18bam>
- Bamberg, M., & Georgakopoulou, A. (2008). Small stories as a new perspective in narrative and identity analysis. *Text & Talk - An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse Communication Studies*, 28(3), 377–396. <https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2008.018>
- Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (2010). *Multicultural education: issues and perspectives* (7th edition.). Hoboken, NY.: Wiley.
- Barton, D. (2007). *Literacy: an introduction to the ecology of written language*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publ.
- Barton, D., Hamilton, M., & Ivanic, R. (1999). *Situated literacies: Theorising reading and writing in context*. New York: Routledge.
- Baynham, M. (2000). Narrative as evidence in literacy research. *Linguistics and Education*, 11(2), 99–117. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898\(00\)00027-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898(00)00027-9)
- Baynham, M. (2011). Narrative analysis. In K. Hyland & B. Paltridge (Eds.), *Continuum companion to discourse analysis* (pp. 69–84). London: Continuum.
- Becher, A. A. (2006). *Flerstemmig mangfold: samarbeid med minoritetsforeldre [Polyphonic diversity: cooperation with minority parents]*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Benwell, B., & Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bergersen, O. (2012). *Spr kl ring som medborgerlig kunst: framstillinger av spr kl ring i en polsk-norsk kontekst [Language learning as a civic art: portraits of language learning in a Polish-Norwegian context.]* (PhD Dissertation). NTNU, Trondheim.
- Bergroth, M., & Palviainen,  . (2016). The early childhood education and care partnership for bilingualism in minority language schooling: collaboration between bilingual families and pedagogical practitioners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 19(6), 649–667. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1184614>

- Blackledge, A. (2003). Imagining a Monocultural Community: Racialization of Cultural Practice in Educational Discourse. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 2(4), 331–347. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327701JLIE0204_7
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: a critical perspective*. London: Continuum.
- Blackledge, A., Creese, A., & Takhi, J. K. (2014). Beyond Multilingualism: Heteroglossia in Practice. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 191–215). New York: Routledge.
- Block, D. (2013). The structure and agency dilemma in identity and intercultural communication research. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 13(2), 126–147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2013.770863>
- Block, D. (2014). The Structure and Agency Dilemma in Identity and Intercultural Communication Research. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 13(2), 126–147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2013.770863>
- Block, D. (2015). Structure, agency, individualization and the critical realist challenge. In P. Deters, G. Xuesong, E. R. Miller, & G. Vitanova (Eds.), *Theorizing and analyzing agency in second language learning* (pp. 17–36). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse : a critical introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2007). Sociolinguistic scales. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 4(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1515/IP.2007.001>
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2013a). Citizenship, Language, and Superdiversity: Towards Complexity. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 12(3), 193–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2013.797276>
- Blommaert, J. (2013b). *Ethnography, superdiversity and linguistic landscapes: chronicles of complexity*. Multilingual Matters.
- Blommaert, J., Collins, J., & Slembrouck, S. (2005). Spaces of multilingualism. *Language & Communication*, 25(3), 197–216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2005.05.002>
- Bø, A. K. (2001). Foreldre: skolens forlengede arm. [Parents: the extended arm of schools?]. In M. Sandbæk (Ed.), *Fra mottaker til aktør: brukernes plass i praktisk sosialt arbeid og forskning [From recipient to agents: users' place in practical social work and research]* (pp. 227–242). Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bringer, J. D., Johnston, L. H., & Brackenridge, C. H. (2004). Maximizing Transparency in a Doctoral Thesis1: The Complexities of Writing About the Use of QSR*NVIVO Within a Grounded Theory Study. *Qualitative Research*, 4(2), 247–265. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794104044434>
- Bruner, J. (1991). The Narrative Construction of Reality. *Critical Inquiry*, 18(1), 1–21.
- Bruner, J. (2002). *Making Stories: Law, Literature, Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social Research Methods* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cameron-Faulkner, T., & Noble, C. (2013). A comparison of book text and Child Directed Speech. *First Language*, 33(3), 268–279.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 401–417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x>

- Canagarajah, S. (2014). Theorizing a competence for translanguaging practice at the contact zone. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 78–102). New York: Routledge.
- Carrington, V. M., & Luke, A. (2003). Reading Homes, and Families: From Postmodern to Modern. In A. van Kleeck, S. A. Stahl, & E. B. Bauer (Eds.), *On reading books to children: parents and teachers* (pp. 221–241). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Ass.
- Catts, H. W., Fey, M. F., Zhang, X., & Tomblin, B. J. (2001). Estimating the Risk of Future Reading Difficulties in Kindergarten Children: A Research-Based Model and Its Clinical Implementation. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 32(1), 38–50. [https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461\(2001/004\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2001/004))
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Chilton, P., & Wodak, R. (Eds.). (2005). *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis : Theory, Methodology, and Interdisciplinarity* (Vol. v. 13). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Compton-Lilly, C. (2007). *Re-reading families. The literate lives of urban children*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Compton-Lilly, C. (2012). *Reading time : the literate lives of urban secondary students and their families*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory (3rd Edition)*. SAGE Publications Inc.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining Validity in Qualitative Inquiry. *Theory Into Practice*, 39(3), 124–130. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3903_2
- Crozier, G. (2000). *Parents and schools: partners or protagonists?* Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Crozier, G., & Davies, J. (2007). Hard to reach parents or hard to reach schools? A discussion of home–school relations, with particular reference to Bangladeshi and Pakistani parents. *British Educational Research Journal*, 33(3), 295–313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920701243578>
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education. In J. Cummins & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Volume 5 : Bilingual education* (2nd ed., Vol. 5, pp. 65–75). New York: Springer.
- Danbolt, A. M. V., & Kulbrandstad, L. I. (2012). Teacher Reflections under Changing Conditions for Literacy Learning in Multicultural Schools in Oslo. In A. Pitkänen-Huhta & L. Holm (Eds.), *Literacy Practices in Transition: Perspectives from the Nordic Countries* (pp. 209–227). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Daugaard, L. M., & Laursen, H. P. (2012). Multilingual classrooms as sites for negotiations of language and literacy. In A. Pitkänen-Huhta & L. Holm (Eds.), *Literacy Practices in Transition: Perspectives from the Nordic Countries* (pp. 103–118). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- De Fina, A. (2003a). Crossing borders: Time, space, and disorientation in narrative. *Narrative Inquiry*, 13(2), 367–391.
- De Fina, A. (2003b). *Identity in narrative : a study of immigrant discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- De Fina, A. (2013). Positioning level 3: Connecting local identity displays to macro social processes. *Narrative Inquiry*, 23(1), 40–61. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.23.1.03de>
- De Fina, A., & Georgakopoulou, A. (2008). Analysing narratives as practices. *Qualitative Research*, 8(3), 379–387. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794106093634>
- De Fina, A., & Georgakopoulou, A. (2012). *Analyzing narrative : discourse and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Fina, A., & King, K. A. (2011). Language problem or language conflict? Narratives of immigrant women’s experiences in the US. *Discourse Studies*, 13(2), 163–188. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445610392135>
- De Fina, A., & Perrino, S. (2011). Introduction: Interviews vs. ‘natural’ contexts: A false dilemma. *Language in Society*, 40, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000849>
- De Fina, A., Schiffrin, D., & Bamberg, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Discourse and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Dewilde, J. I. (2013). *Ambulating teachers: a case study of bilingual teachers and teacher collaboration* (PhD Dissertation). Department of Teacher Education and School Research, Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Oslo, Oslo.
- Dickinson, D. K., & Tabors, P. O. (2001). *Beginning literacy with language: young children learning at home and school*. Baltimore, Md.: P.H. Brookes Pub. Co.
- Duchêne, A., & Heller, M. (2012). *Language in late capitalism: pride and profit* (Vol. 1). London: Routledge.
- Duranti, A. (2004). Agency in Language. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A Companion to linguistic anthropology* (Vol. 1, pp. 451–473). Malden, Mass: Blackwell.
- Education Act [Lov om grunnskolen og den vidaregåande opplæringa] (1998). Retrieved from <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1998-07-17-61>
- Engen, T. O., & Kulbrandstad, L. A. (2004). *Tospråklighet, minoritetsspråk og minoritetsundervisning [Bilingualism, minority languages and minority language tuition]* (2. utg.). Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk.
- Ericsson, K., & Larsen, G. (2000). *Skolebarn og skoleforeldre: om forholdet mellom hjem og skole [School children and school parents: on the relationship between home and school]*. Oslo: Pax.
- Evans, B. A., & Hornberger, N. H. (2005). No child left behind: Repealing and unpeeling federal language education policy in the United States. *Language Policy*, 4(1), 87–106.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). Harlow: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse : textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2011). Semiotic Aspects of Social Transformation and Learning. In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education* (2nd ed., pp. 119–128). New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Routledge.

- Fairclough, N., Mulderrig, J., & Wodak, R. (2013). Critical Discourse Analysis. In Ruth Wodak (Ed.), *Critical discourse analysis* (pp. 79–101). London: Sage.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as Structure and Process: Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. United Kingdom, London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Friberg, J. H. (2012a). Culture at work: Polish migrants in the ethnic division of labour on Norwegian construction sites. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 35(11), 1914–1933. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2011.605456>
- Friberg, J. H. (2012b). The ‘Guest-Worker Syndrome’ Revisited? *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 2(4), 316–324.
- Friberg, J. H. (2012c). The stages of migration. From going abroad to settling down: Post-accession Polish migrant workers in Norway. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38(10), 1589–1605. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2012.711055>
- Friberg, J. H., & Eldring, L. (2011). *Polonia i Oslo 2010. Mobilitet, arbeid og levekår blant polakker i hovedstaden [Polonia in Oslo 2010. Mobility, work and living conditions among the Polish in the capital]*. Oslo: Fafo.
- Friberg, J. H., & Golden, A. (2014). Norges største innvandrerguppe: Historien om migrasjon fra Polen til Norge og om andrespråkskorpuset ASK. *NOA - Norsk som andrespråk*, 30(2). Retrieved from <http://ojs.novus.no/index.php/NOA/article/view/980>
- Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: a global perspective*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garcia, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2010). *Educating emergent bilinguals: policies, programs, and practices for English language learners*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gebhard, M. (2004). Fast Capitalism, School Reform, and Second Language Literacy Practices. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(2), 245–265. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.00228.x>
- Gee, J. P. (2001). Reading as situated language: A sociocognitive perspective. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 44(8).
- Gee, J. P. (2011). Discourse Analysis: What makes It Critical? In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education* (2nd ed., pp. 23–45). New York: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2012). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: theory and method* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Georgakopoulou, A. (2007). *Small stories, interaction and identities*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Georgakopoulou, A., & Goutsos, D. (2004). *Discourse analysis: an introduction* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Geva, E. (2006). Second-Language Oral Proficiency and Second-Language Literacy. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners: report of the National Literacy Panel on Language Minority Children and Youth* (pp. 123–139). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gitz-Johansen, T. (2004). The incompetent child: representations of ethnic minority children. In B. Johansson, J. Kampmann, H. Brembeck, A. T. Kjørholt, & H. Lidén (Eds.), *Beyond the competent child: exploring contemporary childhoods in the Nordic welfare societies* (pp. 199–225). Fredriksberg: Roskilde University Press.

- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Goldenberg, C., Rueda, R. S., & August, D. (2006). Sociocultural Influences on the Literacy Attainment of Language-Minority Children and Youth. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners: report of the National Literacy Panel on Language Minority Children and Youth* (pp. 269–318). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gonzalez, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Funds of knowledge : Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. New York: Routledge.
- Grimstad, B. F. (2012). Flerspråklige elever og aktivitetene i klasserommet [Multilingual students and activities in the classroom]. *NOA - Norsk som andrespråk*, 28(2).
- Grue, J. (2011). *Interdependent Discourses of Disability: A Critical Analysis of the Social/Medical Model Dichotomy* (PhD Dissertation). University of Oslo, Oslo.
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2003). *Postmodern interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2009). *Analyzing narrative reality*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Harris, A., & Goodall, J. (2008). Do parents know they matter? Engaging all parents in learning. *Educational Research*, 50(3), 277–289.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131880802309424>
- Hauge, A.-M. (2004). *Den felleskulturelle skolen: pedagogisk arbeid med språklig og kulturelt mangfold [The school with a shared cultural base: pedagogical work with linguistic and cultural diversity]*. Oslo: Universitetsforl.
- Haugen, E. (1972). *The ecology of language*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: a sociolinguistic ethnography*. London: Longman.
- Heller, M. (2010). The Commodification of Language. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 39, 101–114.
- Heller, M. (2011). *Paths to post-nationalism: a critical ethnography of language and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Herzog, B. (2016). Discourse analysis as immanent critique: Possibilities and limits of normative critique in empirical discourse studies. *Discourse & Society*, 27(3), 278–292. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926516630897>
- Holm, L., & Laursen, H. P. (2011). Migrants and Literacy Crises. *Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 5(2), 3–16.
- Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (1997). Why Do Parents Become Involved in Their Children's Education? *Review of Educational Research*, 67(1), 3–42.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543067001003>
- Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., Walker, J. M. T., Sandler, H. M., Whetsel, D., Green, C. L., Wilkins, A. S., & Closson, K. (2005). Why do parents become involved? Research findings and implications. *The Elementary School Journal*, 106(2), 105–130.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/499194>
- Hornberger, N. H. (1998). Language policy, language education, language rights: Indigenous, immigrant, and international perspectives. *Language in Society*, 27(04), 439–458.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404598004011>

- Hornberger, N. H. (2002). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. *Language Policy*, 1(1), 27–51.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014548611951>
- Hornberger, N. H. (2003a). Continua of Biliteracy. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Continua of biliteracy: an ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings* (pp. 3–34). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2003b). *Continua of biliteracy: an ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings* (Vol. 41). Multilingual Matters.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2003c). Introduction. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Continua of biliteracy: an ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings* (pp. xii–xxiii). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2006). Frameworks and models in language policy and planning. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method* (pp. 24–41). Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishing.
- 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.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: a biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3), 261–278.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2012.658016>
- Hornberger, N. H., & Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2003). Revisiting the Continua of Biliteracy: International and Critical Perspectives. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Continua of biliteracy: an ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings* (pp. 35–67). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Horst, C., & Gitz-Johansen, T. (2010). Education of ethnic minority children in Denmark: monocultural hegemony and counter positions. *Intercultural Education*, 21(2), 137–151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675981003696271>
- Huckin, T. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In T. Miller (Ed.), *Functional Approaches to Written Text: Classroom Applications*. (pp. 87–101). Washington, D.C.: United States Information Agency.
- 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. (2010). Analysis of language policy discourses across the scales of space and time. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2010(202), 7–24.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2010.011>
- Huntsinger, C. S., & Jose, P. E. (2009). Parental involvement in children’s schooling: Different meanings in different cultures. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 24(4), 398–410. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2009.07.006>
- Huss-Keeler, R. L. (1997). Teacher perception of ethnic and linguistic minority parental involvement and its relationships to children’s language and literacy learning: A case study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(2), 171–182.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(96\)00018-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(96)00018-2)
- Hvistendahl, R. (2009a). Å bli kompetent og være til nytte. Utdanning av tospråklige lærere. [to be competent and useful. Education of bilingual teachers]. In R. Hvistendahl (Ed.), *Flerspråklighet i skolen [Multilingualism in school]* (pp. 175–193). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

- Hvistendahl, R. (2009b). Elever fra språklige minoriteter i norsk skole [Language minority pupils in school]. In R. Hvistendahl (Ed.), *Flerspråklighet i skolen [Multilingualism in school]* (pp. 69–94). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Hvistendahl, R. (Ed.). (2009c). *Flerspråklighet i skolen [Multilingualism in school]*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Hvistendahl, R. (2012). Bilingual Teachers: Making a Difference? In A. Pitkänen-Huhta & L. Holm (Eds.), *Literacy Practices in Transition: Perspectives from the Nordic Countries* (pp. 228–243). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Ingrids, H., & Aronsson, K. (2014). Reported Speech and Reported Affect in Child Custody Disputes. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 47(1), 69–88.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2014.871806>
- Johnson, D. C. (2009). Ethnography of language policy. *Language Policy*, 8(2), 139–159.
- Johnson, D. C. (2010). Implementational and ideological spaces in bilingual education language policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(1), 61–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050902780706>
- Johnson, D. C. (2011). Critical discourse analysis and the ethnography of language policy. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 8(4), 267–279.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2011.601636>
- Johnson, D. C. (2013). *Language policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Johnson, E. J. (2012). Arbitrating repression: language policy and education in Arizona. *Language and Education*, 26(1), 53–76.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2011.615936>
- Johnson, E. J., & Johnson, D. C. (2015). Language policy and bilingual education in Arizona and Washington state. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(1), 92–112.
- Jones, S. (2013). Critical literacies in the making: Social class and identities in the early reading classroom. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 13(2), 197–224.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1468798411430102>
- Jørgensen, J. N. (2008). Polylingual Linguaging Around and Among Children and Adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5(3), 161–176.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710802387562>
- Jørgensen, J. N., Karrebæk, M. S., Madsen, L. M., & Møller, J. S. (2011). Polylinguaging in Superdiversity | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. *Diversities*, 13(2), 22–37.
- Jørgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B. (1997). *Language planning : from practice to theory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (2010). The case for an eclectic approach to discourse-in-interaction. In J. Streeck (Ed.), *New adventures in language and interaction* (pp. 71–98). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kim, Y. (2009). Minority parental involvement and school barriers: Moving the focus away from deficiencies of parents. *Educational Research Review*, 4(2), 80–102.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2009.02.003>
- Kindergarten Act [Lov om barnehager] (2005). Retrieved from <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/2005-06-17-64>
- Kristjansson, B. (2006). The making of Nordic childhoods. In J. T. Wagner & J. Einarsdottir (Eds.), *Nordic childhoods and early education: Philosophy, research, policy, and practice in Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden* (pp. 13–42). Greenwich: IAP.

- Krzyżanowski, M. (2011). Ethnography and critical discourse analysis: towards a problem-oriented research dialogue. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 8(4), 231–238.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2011.601630>
- Krzyżanowski, M. (2014). Values, imaginaries and templates of journalistic practice: a Critical Discourse Analysis. *Social Semiotics*, 24(3), 345–365.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2014.930607>
- Krzyżanowski, M. (2016). *Nordisco CDA workshop*. Presented at the NORDISCO Pre-conference workshop on CDA, 22 November 2016, Oslo.
- Krzyżanowski, M., & Wodak, R. (2011). Political strategies and language policies: the European Union Lisbon strategy and its implications for the EU's language and multilingualism policy. *Language Policy*, 10(2), 115–136.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-011-9196-5>
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Los Angeles, Calif.: Sage.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: Studies in the black English vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, W. (1997). Some Further Steps in Narrative Analysis. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7(1), 395–415. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jnlh.7.49som>
- Labov, W., & Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. In J. Helm (Ed.), *Essays on the verbal and visual arts* (pp. 12–44). Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Lampropoulou, S. (2011). Having a say: Direct speech representation in Greek youth storytelling. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(14), 3374–3386.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.07.009>
- Lampropoulou, S. (2012). *Direct Speech, Self-Presentation and Communities of Practice*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Lane, P. (2014). Nexus analysis. In J.-O. Östman & J. Verschueren (Eds.), *Handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 1–17). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lanza, E. (2007). Multilingualism and the family. In P. Auer & L. Wei (Eds.), *Handbook of multilingualism and multilingual communication* (Vol. 5, pp. 45–67). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lanza, E. (2012). Empowering a migrant identity: agency in narratives of a work experience in Norway. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 6(2), 285.
- Lervåg, A., & Aukrust, V. G. (2010). Vocabulary knowledge is a critical determinant of the difference in reading comprehension growth between first and second language learners. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 51(5), 612–620.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2009.02185.x>
- Levine-Rasky, C. (2009). Dynamics of parent involvement at a multicultural school. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 30(3), 331–344.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690902812604>
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 655–670.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718490>
- Liddicoat, A. (2007). Introduction: Literacy and language planning. In A. Liddicoat (Ed.), *Language planning and policy: issues in language planning and literacy* (pp. 1–12). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Denzin, N. K. (2013). *The landscape of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE.

- Martin-Jones, M. (2016). *A critical linguistic ethnographic approach to language policy: creating conditions for co-designs*. Presented at the CoDesigns: Envisioning Multi-sited Language Education Policies, 20-22 June 2016, University of Jyväskylä, Finland.
- Martin-Jones, M., & Jones, K. (2000). *Multilingual literacies: reading and writing different worlds* (Vol. 10). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- May, S. (1999). *Critical multiculturalism: rethinking multicultural and antiracist education*. London: Falmer Press.
- May, S. (2001). *Language and minority rights : ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language*. Harlow: Longman.
- May, S. (2012). *Language and minority rights: ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- May, S. (2014a). Disciplinary divides, knowledge construction, and the multilingual turn. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 7–31). New York: Routledge.
- May, S. (2014b). Introducing the ‘Multilingual Turn’. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 1–6). New York: Routledge.
- May, S. (2014c). Justifying Educational Language Rights. *Review of Research in Education*, 38(1), 215–241. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X13506694>
- May, S. (Ed.). (2014d). *The multilingual turn: implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education*. New York: Routledge.
- May, S. (2016, May). *Superdiversity and multilingualism: a useful connection (or not)?* Presented at the Wednesday Seminar, 3 May 2016, MultiLing, University of Oslo.
- Melby-Lervåg, M., & Lervåg, A. (2011). Cross-linguistic transfer of oral language, decoding, phonological awareness and reading comprehension: a meta-analysis of the correlational evidence. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 34(1), 114–135. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9817.2010.01477.x>
- Menken, K. (2009). No Child Left Behind and its effects on language policy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 29, 103–117. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190509090096>
- Menken, K. (2013). Restrictive Language Education Policies and Emergent Bilingual Youth: A Perfect Storm With Imperfect Outcomes. *Theory Into Practice*, 52(3), 160–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2013.804307>
- Menken, K., & García, O. (Eds.). (2010). *Negotiating language policies in schools: educators as policymakers*. New York: Routledge.
- Menken, K., & Kleyn, T. (2010). The long-term impact of subtractive schooling in the educational experiences of secondary English language learners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(4), 399–417. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050903370143>
- Meyer, M. (2001). Between theory, method and politics. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (1st ed., pp. 14–31). SAGE Publications, Ltd.
- Midré, G. (2010). Dataprogrammer i kvalitativ forskning: Administrativ bistand eller positivistisk tvangstrøye? [Software in qualitative reserach: administration help or positivist straightjacket?]. *Sosiologisk Tidsskrift*, 18(03). Retrieved from <http://www.idunn.no/ts/st/2010/03/art04>
- Miller, E. R. (2011). Indeterminacy and Interview Research: Co-constructing Ambiguity and Clarity in Interviews with an Adult Immigrant Learner of English. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(1), 43–59. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amq039>
- Miller, E. R. (2014). *The language of adult immigrants: Agency in the making*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- Ministry of Church Affairs, Education and Research. (1995). *NOU 1995: 12 Opplæring i et flerkulturelt Norge [Education in a Multicultural Norway]*. Oslo: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dokumenter/nou-1995-12/id140252/>
- Ministry of Church Affairs, Education and Research. (1997). St.meld. nr. 14 (1997-98) Om foreldremedverknad i grunnskolen [White Paper Nr. 14 (1997-98) On parental involvement in school]. Retrieved from <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-14-1997-98/id191428/>
- Ministry of Education and Research. (2006a). *Framework plan for the content and tasks of kindergarten*. Oslo: Author. Retrieved from http://www.udir.no/globalassets/filer/barnehage/rammeplan/framework_plan_for_the_content_and_tasks_of_kindergartens_2011_rammeplan_engelsk.pdf
- Ministry of Education and Research. (2006b). *Kunnskapsløftet. Læreplan for grunnskolen og videregående opplæring [Knowledge promotion. Curriculum for primary and secondary school]*. Oslo: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.norway.gr/pagefiles/372262/kunnskapsloftet.pdf>
- Ministry of Education and Research. (2010). *NOU 2010: 7. Mangfold og mestring. Flerspråklige barn, unge og voksne i opplæringssystemet. [Diversity and competence. Multilingual children, youth and adults in the educational system]*. Oslo: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/kd/dok/nouer/2010/NOU-2010-7.html?id=606151>
- Ministry of Education and Research. (2013). Meld. St. 24 (2012–2013). Fremtidens barnehage. [White Paper 24 (2012–2013). Kindergarten of the Future] [Stortingsmelding]. Retrieved 21 January 2014, from <http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/kd/dok/regpubl/stmeld/2012-2013/meld-st-24-20122013.html?id=720200>
- Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of Knowledge for Teaching: Using a Qualitative Approach to Connect Homes and Classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141.
- NAFO. (2011). *Hjem-skolesamarbeid. Rapport fra prosjekt 2009-2011. [Home-school cooperation. Project report 2009-2011]*. Oslo: NAFO - Nasjonalt senter for flerkulturell opplæring.
- Nelson, K. (1998). Meaning in Memory. *Narrative Inquiry*, 8(2), 409–418. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.8.2.12nel>
- NESH. (2006). *Guidelines for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences, Law and the Humanities*. Oslo: NESH. Retrieved from <http://www.etikkom.no/English/NESH/guidelines>
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107–110, 20 (2002). Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html>
- Nordahl, T. (1998). *Brukerperspektiv på skolen: elever og foreldre om skole og relasjoner : delrapport 3 fra forskningsprosjektet 'Skole og samspillsvansker' [User perspective on school: pupils and parents on school and relations: report 3 from research project 'School and cooperation difficulties']* (Vol. 12d/98). Oslo: NOVA.
- Nordahl, T. (2000). *Samarbeid mellom hjem og skole: en kartleggingsundersøkelse [Cooperation between home and school: a survey]* (Vol. 8/00). Oslo: NOVA.
- Nordahl, T. (2004). *Makt og avmakt i samarbeidet mellom hjem og skole [Power and powerlessness in home-school cooperation]*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Nordahl, T. (2015). *Hjem og skole: hvordan etablere et samarbeid til elevenes beste? [Home and school: how to establish cooperation in the pupils' best interest?]* (2. utg.). Oslo: Universitetsforl.

- Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: extending the conversation* (2nd ed.). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Norton, B. (2014). Identity, Literacy, and the Multilingual Classroom. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 103–122). New York: Routledge.
- Norton, B. (2016). Identity and Language Learning: Back to the Future. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(2), 475–479. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.293>
- Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 9–31. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587803>
- Ochs, E., & Capps, L. (2001). *Living narrative: Creating lives in everyday storytelling*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- OECD. (2012). *Let's Read Them a Story! The Parent Factor in Education*. PISA, OECD Publishing. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264176232-en>
- Olson, K. (2007). Lost opportunities to learn: The effects of education policy on primary language instruction for English learners. *Linguistics and Education*, 18(2), 121–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2007.07.001>
- Oslo Municipality. (2017a). *Andel minoritetsspråklige elever i kommunale grunnskoler - 2016/2017 [Share of minority language students in municipal schools - 2016/2017]*. Oslo: Author. Retrieved from <http://statistikkbanken.oslo.kommune.no/webview/>
- Oslo Municipality. (2017b). *Statistikk om befolkning [Populational statistics]*. Oslo: Author. Retrieved from <http://statistikkbanken.oslo.kommune.no/webview/>
- Otsuji, E., & Pennycook, A. (2010). Metrolingualism: fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 7(3), 240–254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710903414331>
- Parker, I. (2005). *Qualitative psychology: introducing radical research*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Phillipson, R., & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1996). English Only Worldwide or Language Ecology? *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3), 429–452. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587692>
- Pihl, J. (2001). Paradoxes of inclusion and exclusion in Norwegian educational reforms in the 1990s. *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Spesialpedagogikk*, 1, 14–33.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1988). *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Poveda, D. (2004). Shared experiences and narrative positionings in the classroom. *Narrative Inquiry*, 14(2), 395–419. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.14.2.11pov>
- Pran, K. R., & Holst, L. S. (2015). *Rom for språk? [Space for language?]*. Oslo: Ipsos. Retrieved from http://www.sprakradet.no/globalassets/sprakdagen/2015/ipsos_rapport_rom-for-sprak_2015.pdf
- Punch, K. F. (2009). *Introduction to research methods in education*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Reese, E., Sparks, A., & Leyva, D. (2010). A Review of parent interventions for preschool children's language and emergent literacy. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 10(1), 97–117. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468798409356987>
- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and discrimination: rhetorics of racism and antisemitism*. London: Routledge.
- Ricento, T. (2000). Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4(2), 196–213. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00111>

- Ricento, T. (2006). Language Policy: Theory and Practice - An Introduction. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An Introduction to language policy: theory and method* (Vol. 1). Maldon, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Ricento, T., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the Onion: Language Planning and Policy and the ELT Professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3), 401–427.
- Richards, L. (2009). *Handling qualitative data: a practical guide*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. LA: Sage Publications.
- Rogers, R. (2002). Between contexts: A Critical Discourse Analysis of family literacy, discursive practices, and literate subjectivities. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 37(3), 248–277.
- Rogers, R. (2003). *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Family Literacy Practices: Power in and Out of Print*. Mahwah, N.J.: Routledge.
- Rogers, R. (2005). Storied Selves: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Adult Learners' Literate Lives. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39(3), 272–305.
<https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.39.3.2>
- Rogers, R. (2011a). Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis in Educational Research. In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education* (2nd ed., pp. 1–20). New York/Abingdon: Routledge.
- Rogers, R. (2011b). The sounds of silence in educational tracking: a longitudinal, ethnographic case study. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 8(4), 239–252.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2011.601632>
- Rogers, R., Malancharuvi-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., Hui, D., & Joseph, G. O. (2005). Critical Discourse Analysis in Education: A Review of the Literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(3), 365–416. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543075003365>
- Roy, L., & Roxas, K. (2011). Whose deficit is this anyhow? Exploring counter-stories of Somali Bantu refugees' experiences in 'doing school'. *Harvard Educational Review*, 81(3), 521–542.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in Language Planning. *NABE Journal*, 8(2), 15–34.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464>
- Ryen, E., & Simonsen, H. G. (2016). Tidlig flerspråkighet – myter og realiteter [Early multilingualism - myths and realities]. *NOA - Norsk som andrespråk*, 31(1–2).
- Ryen, E., Wold, A. H., & Pastoor, L. de W. (2005). 'Det er egen tolkning, ikke direkte regler'. Minoritetsspråklige elvers morsmåloppføring og bruk av morsmål. [It is one's own interpretation, not direct rules. Minority language pupils' mother tongue tuition and use of mother tongue]. *NOA Norsk Som Andrespråk*, 21(1–2), 39–66.
- Ryen, E., Wold, A. H., & Pastoor, L. de W. (2009). 'Det er egen tolkning, ikke direkte regler'. Minoritetsspråklige elvers morsmåloppføring og bruk av morsmål ['It is one's own interpretation, not direct rules']. Minority language pupils' mother tongue tuition and use of mother tongue]. In R. Hvistendahl (Ed.), *Flerspråkighet i skolen [Multilingualism in school]* (pp. 139–166). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Sand, T. (Ed.). (1997). *Flerkulturell virkelighet i skole og samfunn*. Oslo: Cappelen akademisk forl.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Whose Text? Whose Context? *Discourse & Society*, 8(2), 165–187.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926597008002002>
- Schiffrin, D. (2006). *In other words : variation in reference and narrative* (Vol. 21). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schwartz, M., & Palviainen, Å. (2016). Twenty-first-century preschool bilingual education: facing advantages and challenges in cross-cultural contexts. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 19(6), 603–613.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1184616>

- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2004). *Nexus analysis: discourse and the emerging internet*. London: Routledge.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2005). Lighting the stove. In Ruth Wodak & P. Chilton (Eds.), *A New agenda in (critical) discourse analysis : theory, methodology, and interdisciplinary* (Vol. v. 13, pp. 101–117). JBenjamin.
- Scott, K. M., Brown, J. M., Jean-Baptiste, E., & Barbarin, O. A. (2012). A Socio-Cultural Conception of Literacy in African American Families. In B. H. Wasik (Ed.), *Handbook of Family Literacy* (pp. 239–254). Hoboken: Taylor & Francis.
- Silverman, D. (2013). *Doing qualitative research: a practical handbook*. Los Angeles, Calif.: Sage.
- Slany, K., & Pustulka, P. (2016). Children, parents and institutions in the mobility maze. *Central and Easter European Migration Review*, 5(1), 5–12.
- Smolicz, J. (1981). Core values and cultural identity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 4(1), 75–90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.1981.9993325>
- Sorknes, B. (2013). *Samarbeid hjem – skole. Hvordan opplever og forstår foreldre og kontaktlærere hjem – skole samarbeidet? [Home-school cooperation. How do parents and teachers understand home-school cooperation?]* (MA Dissertation). Hedmark University College, Hedmark. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/11250/223897>
- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2012). Family language policy – the critical domain. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(1), 3–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2011.638072>
- Statistics Norway. (2014). *Elevar med morsmåloppføring og særskilt norskopplering [Pupils with Mother-tongue Tuition and Special Norwegian Language Instruction]. [Statistical table published on 12 December 2014]*. Oslo: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.ssb.no/utdanning/statistikker/utgrs/aar/2014-12-12?fane=tabell&sort=nummer&tabell=210353>
- Statistics Norway. (2016). *Immigrants and Norwegian-born to immigrant parents, 1 January 2016*. Oslo: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.ssb.no/en/befolkning/statistikker/innvbef>
- Statistics Norway. (2017). *Nøkkeltal for innvandring og innvandrere [Key Figures on Immigration and Immigrants]*. Oslo: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.ssb.no/innvandring-og-innvandrere/nokkeltall/innvandring-og-innvandrere>
- Street, B. (1985). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Street, B. (Ed.). (2005). *Literacies across educational contexts: Mediating, learning, and teaching*. Philadelphia: Caslon Press.
- Szuber, A. (2008). *Polish Immigrant Adolescents Learning English in Chicago: Linguistic Context and Challenges, Learning Opportunities, and Vocabulary Skills*. PhD dissertation, Harvard University, Boston.
- Talmy, S. (2010). Qualitative Interviews in Applied Linguistics: From Research Instrument to Social Practice. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 128–148. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000085>
- Talmy, S. (2011). The Interview as collaborative achievement: Interaction, identity, and ideology in a speech event. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(1), 25–42. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amq027>
- Tangen, R. (2013). Balancing Ethics and Quality in Educational Research—the Ethical Matrix Method. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 0(0), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2013.821089>

- Tannen, D. (1981). *Spoken and written language : exploring orality and literacy*. Norwood/NJ: ABLEX.
- Tannen, D. (2007). *Talking voices : repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, K., & Hakuta, K. (2012). Education and bilingualism. In J. P. Gee & M. Handford (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Tollefson, J. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality : language policy in the community*. London: Longman.
- Tollefson, J. (2006). Critical Theory in Language Policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An Introduction to language policy: theory and method* (Vol. 1, pp. 42–59). Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publ.
- Tomasello, M. (2003). *Constructing a language: a usage-based theory of language acquisition*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Tomasello, M. (2008). *Origins of human communication*. MIT press Cambridge. Retrieved from <http://mitpress2.mit.edu/books/chapters/0262515202index2.pdf>
- Tomasello, M., Carpenter, M., Call, J., Behne, T., & Moll, H. (2005). Understanding and sharing intentions: The origins of cultural cognition. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 28(5), 675–690.
- Trevena, P., McGhee, D., & Heath, S. (2016). Parental Capital and Strategies for School Choice Making: Polish Parents in England and Scotland. *Central and Eastern European Migration Review*, 5(1), 71–92.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: a plea for diversity. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (1st ed., pp. 95–120). SAGE Publications, Ltd.
- Velasco, P., & García, O. (2014). Translanguaging and the Writing of Bilingual Learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37(1), 6–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2014.893270>
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024–1054. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701599465>
- Wagner, J. T. (2004). Fishing Naked: Nordic Early Childhood Philosophy, Policy, and Practice. *YC Young Children*, 59(5), 56–62.
- Wagner, J. T., & Einarsdottir, J. (2006). Nordic ideals as reflected in Nordic childhoods and early education. In J. Einarsdottir & J. T. Wagner (Eds.), *Nordic childhoods and early education: Philosophy, research, policy, and practice in Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden* (p. 1–12.). Greenwich: IAP.
- Wei, L. (2012). Language policy and practice in multilingual, transnational families and beyond. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(1), 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2011.638507>
- Weizman, Z. O., & Snow, C. E. (2001). Lexical output as related to children’s vocabulary acquisition: Effects of sophisticated exposure and support for meaning. *Developmental Psychology*, 37(2), 265.
- Wesely, P. M. (2016). When school language and home language differ: One parent’s lived experience. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 0(0), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1217192>
- Widdowson, H. G. (1995). Discourse Analysis: A Critical View. *Language and Literature: Journal of the Poetics and Linguistics Association*, 4(3), 157–72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/096394709500400301>

- Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *Text, context, pretext: critical issues in discourse analysis* (Vol. 35). Malden, Ma.: Blackwell.
- Wodak, R. (2000). From conflict to consensus? The co-construction of a policy paper. In P. Muntigl, G. Weiss, & R. Wodak (Eds.), *European Union discourses on un/employment: an interdisciplinary approach to employment, policy-making and organizational change*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (1st ed.). SAGE Publications, Ltd.
- Wodak, R., & Weiss, G. (2005). Analyzing European Union discourses. In Ruth Wodak & P. Chilton (Eds.), *A New agenda in (critical) discourse analysis : theory, methodology, and interdisciplinary* (Vol. v. 13, pp. 121–135). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Wortham, S., & Gadsden, V. (2006). Urban fathers positioning themselves through narrative: An approach to narrative self-construction. In A. De Fina, D. Schiffrin, & M. Bamberg (Eds.), *Discourse and Identity* (pp. 314–341). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wortham, S., Mortimer, K., Lee, K., Allard, E., & White, K. D. (2011). Interviews as interactional data. *Language in Society*, 40, 39–50.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000874>
- Wright, W. E. (2013). Bilingual Education. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism* (pp. 598–619). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Yahya, R. (2015). Bridging home and school: Understanding immigrant mothers' cultural capital and concerns about play-based learning. *Early Years*, 1–13.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2015.1110786>
- Zhang, H., Chilton, P., He, Y., & Jing, W. (2011). Critique across cultures: some questions for CDA. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 8(2), 95–107.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2011.558683>
- Øzerk, K. (2008). Tospråklig opplæring og funksjonell tospråklighet [Bilingual education and functional bilingualism]. In T. Sand (Ed.), *Flerkulturell virkelighet i skole og samfunn* (2. utg, pp. 85–102). Oslo: Cappelen akademisk forlag.

8 APPENDICES

8.1 Research ethics documentation

8.1.1 Approval from the Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD)

Jarmila Moan
Institutt for pedagogikk Universitetet i Oslo
Postboks 1092 Blindern
0317 OSLO

Vår dato: 17.02.2015 Vår ref: 41942 / 3 / HIT Deres dato: Deres ref:

TILBAKEMELDING PÅ MELDING OM BEHANDLING AV PERSONOPPLYSNINGER

Vi viser til melding om behandling av personopplysninger, mottatt 29.01.2015. Meldingen gjelder prosjektet: 41942 On language and literacy: narratives from multilingual homes
Behandlingsansvarlig Universitetet i Oslo, ved institusjonens øverste leder
Daglig ansvarlig Jarmila Moan

Personvernombudet har vurdert prosjektet og finner at behandlingen av personopplysninger er meldepliktig i henhold til personopplysningsloven § 31. Behandlingen tilfredsstiller kravene i personopplysningsloven.

Personvernombudets vurdering forutsetter at prosjektet gjennomføres i tråd med opplysningene gitt i meldeskjemaet, korrespondanse med ombudet, ombudets kommentarer samt personopplysningsloven og helseregisterloven med forskrifter. Behandlingen av personopplysninger kan settes i gang.

Det gjøres oppmerksom på at det skal gis ny melding dersom behandlingen endres i forhold til de opplysninger som ligger til grunn for personvernombudets vurdering. Endringsmeldinger gis via et eget skjema, <http://www.nsd.uib.no/personvern/meldeplikt/skjema.html>. Det skal også gis melding etter tre år dersom prosjektet fortsatt pågår. Meldinger skal skje skriftlig til ombudet.

Personvernombudet har lagt ut opplysninger om prosjektet i en offentlig database, <http://pvo.nsd.no/prosjekt>.

Personvernombudet vil ved prosjektets avslutning, 01.10.2017, rette en henvendelse angående status for behandlingen av personopplysninger.

Vennlig hilsen

Katrine Utaaker Segadal
Hildur Thorarensen

Kontaktperson: Hildur Thorarensen tlf: 55 58 26 54
Vedlegg: Prosjektvurdering

Personvernombudet for forskning

Prosjektvurdering - Kommentar

Prosjektnr: 41942

Utvalget informeres skriftlig og muntlig om prosjektet og samtykker til deltakelse. Informasjonsskrivet er godt utformet.

Personvernombudet legger til grunn at forsker etterfølger Universitetet i Oslo sine interne rutiner for datasikkerhet. Dersom personopplysninger skal lagres på privat pc/mobile enheter, bør opplysningene krypteres tilstrekkelig.

En forskningsassistent vil være databehandler for prosjektet. Universitetet i Oslo skal inngå skriftlig avtale med vedkommende om hvordan personopplysninger skal behandles, jf. personopplysningsloven § 15. For råd om hva databehandleravtalen bør inneholde, se Datatilsynets veileder: <http://www.datatilsynet.no/Sikkerhetinternkontroll/Databehandleravtale/>. Personvernombudet ber om kopi av avtalen for arkivering (sendes: personvernombudet@nsd.uib.no).

Forventet prosjektslutt er 01.10.2017. Ifølge prosjektmeldingen skal innsamlede opplysninger da anonymiseres. Anonymisering innebærer å bearbeide datamaterialet slik at ingen enkeltpersoner kan gjenkjennes. Det gjøres ved å:

- slette direkte personopplysninger (som navn/koblingsnøkkel)
- slette/omskrive indirekte personopplysninger (identifiserende sammenstilling av bakgrunnsopplysninger som f.eks. bosted/arbeidssted, alder og kjønn)
- slette lydopptak

Vi gjør oppmerksom på at også databehandler må slette personopplysninger tilknyttet prosjektet i sine systemer. Dette inkluderer eventuelle logger og koblinger mellom IP-/epostadresser og besvarelser.

8.1.2 Consent letter – in Norwegian

Forespørsel om deltakelse i forskningsprosjektet

”On language and literacy in children: narratives from multilingual homes”

Bakgrunn og formål

Formålet med denne studien er å kaste lys over hvordan foreldre med polsk landsbakgrunn bosatt i Norge ser på flerspråklighet hos sine barn og barnas deltakelse og muligheter for språklig utvikling i den norske skolen. På et overordnet plan skal dette bidra til økt kunnskap om den bredere konteksten for språk- og leseutvikling hos barn med et annet morsmål enn norsk. Studien inngår i et doktorgradsarbeid ved Institutt for pedagogikk, Universitetet i Oslo, som gjennomføres av stipendiat Jarmila B. Moan under veiledning av professor Vibeke Grøver og professor Ivar Bråten. Doktorgradsprosjektet er et sideprosjekt i et internasjonalt forskningsprosjekt om språklæring og tekstforståelse i førskolealderen.

Hva innebærer deltakelse i studien?

Det skal benyttes intervju med enten mor eller far, eventuelt begge foreldre sammen i hver familie, dersom begge har lyst til å delta i studien. Intervjuet vil vare omtrent en time. Spørsmålene vil dekke bakgrunnsinformasjon om deg som deltaker, samt hvordan du opplever å være polsk innvanderer i Norge, hvordan du ser på flerspråklighet hos ditt barn og hvordan du oppfatter ditt barns deltakelse og muligheter for språklig utvikling i den norske skolen. Intervjuene skal tas opp på lydbånd. Jeg vil også ta notater underveis i intervjuet.

Hva skjer med informasjonen om deg?

Alle personopplysninger du gir behandles konfidensielt. Kun personer direkte involvert i prosjektet vil ha tilgang til personopplysninger. Alle lydopptakene og annen innsamlet informasjon, som for eksempel skriftlige intervjunotater, oppbevares på UiOs passord-beskyttede dataområdet. Alle deltakere i studien blir anonymisert i all publisering og vil dermed ikke kunne gjenkjennes. Navneliste med koblingsnøkkel skal oppbevares adskilt fra øvrige data for å ivareta konfidensialitet.

Prosjektet skal etter planen avsluttes innen 1.oktober 2017. Alle personopplysninger, inkludert lydbånd, slettes etter dette.

Frivillig deltakelse

Det er frivillig å delta i studien, og du kan når som helst trekke ditt samtykke uten å oppgi noen grunn. Dersom du trekker deg, vil alle opplysningene du har gitt om deg bli slettet.

Dersom du ønsker å delta eller har spørsmål til studien, ta kontakt med Jarmila B. Moan:

e-post: j.b.moan@iped.uio.no

Mobiltelefon: 99 42 66 14

Studien er meldt til Personvernombudet for forskning, Norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig datatjeneste AS.

Samtykke til deltakelse i studien

Jeg har mottatt informasjon om studien, og er villig til å delta.

(Signert av prosjektdeltaker, dato)

8.1.3 Consent letter – in Polish

Zapytanie o udział w projekcie naukowym

“On language and literacy in children: narratives from multilingual homes”⁷

Założenia i cele

Celem badania jest rzucenie światła na zagadnienie, jak mieszkający w Norwegii rodzice pochodzenia polskiego zapatrują się na wielojęzyczność swoich dzieci oraz ich uczestnictwo i perspektywy rozwoju językowego w szkole norweskiej. Dalej ma się ono przyczynić do zwiększenia wiedzy o kontekście rozwoju umiejętności czytania i rozwoju językowego wśród dzieci, których językiem ojczystym nie jest język norweski. Badanie wchodzi w skład pracy doktorskiej tworzonej przy Instytucie Pedagogiki Uniwersytetu w Oslo, które przy wsparciu promotorów prof. Vibeke Grøver i prof. Ivara Bråtena przeprowadza stypendystka Jarmila B. Moan. Projekt doktorski jest podprojektem większego, międzynarodowego projektu naukowego, dotyczącego nauki języka i rozumienia tekstu w wieku przedszkolnym.

Co wiąże się z uczestnictwem w badaniu?

Do badań posłużą wywiady z matką lub ojcem dziecka, ewentualnie obojgiem rodziców. Każdy wywiad trwać będzie około jedną godzinę. Pytania dotyczyć będą podstawowych informacji o uczestnikach badania, tego, jak odczuwają bycie polskim imigrantem w Norwegii, jak postrzegają wielojęzyczność swojego dziecka i jak odbierają jego uczestnictwo i perspektywy rozwoju językowego w szkole norweskiej. Wywiady będą nagrywane, podczas ich trwania będą też sporządzane notatki.

Co stanie się z informacjami na Twój temat?

Wszystkie uzyskane od Ciebie informacje będą opracowywane w sposób poufny. Dostęp do nich będą mieć wyłącznie osoby bezpośrednio zaangażowane w projekt. Wszystkie nagrania i inny zebrany materiał, jak np. notatki, będą przechowywane w systemie komputerowym i zabezpieczone hasłem dostępu. Wszyscy uczestnicy badania zostaną zanonimizowani w każdym rodzaju publikacji tak, by niemożliwe było ich rozpoznanie. W celu zachowania poufności, lista nazwisk uczestników wraz z odpowiadającym jej kluczem będzie przechowywana oddzielnie od pozostałych danych.

⁷ „O języku i czytaniu: opowieści z wielojęzycznych domów”

Planowane zakończenie projektu przypada na 1. października 2017 roku. Wtedy to wszystkie dane osobowe, włącznie z utrwalonymi na nagraniach, zostaną zniszczone.

Dobrowolne uczestnictwo

Uczestnictwo w badaniu jest dobrowolne. Można wycofać się z niego w dowolnym momencie, bez konieczności podania przyczyny. W przypadku wycofania się z projektu wszystkie podane przez uczestnika informacje zostaną natychmiast usunięte.

Jeżeli wyrażasz ochotę na wzięcie udziału w badaniu bądź masz jakieś pytania, skontaktuj się z Jarmilą B. Moan:

e-mail: j.b.moan@iped.uio.no

tel.: 99 42 66 14

Badanie zostało zgłoszone do norweskiego inspektoratu ochrony danych osobowych (Personverneombudet for forskning, Norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig datatjeneste AS).

Zgoda na uczestnictwo w badaniu

Uzyskałem/-ałam niezbędne informacje o badaniu i wyrażam chęć wzięcia w nim udziału.

(Podpis uczestnika, data)

8.2 Interview guide

Briefing and biodata

- children's names, age
- parents' education and occupation in Poland/Norway
- arrival in Norway and reasons for migration

Migration experience

- How was it for you to come to Norway and be completely new to the country?
- How is for you to live here now?
- How is it for you to be Polish in Norway?
- How do you see the Polish community in Norway?
- How do you see the Norwegian society?
- How do you see your and your family's future in Norway?

Multilingualism / L2 learning experiences

- How was it for you to learn Norwegian?
- What are your home language practices? Including:
 - children's bilingualism (their Polish and Norwegian)
 - L1 support at home
- How do you feel about bilingualism / your children's bilingualism?
- How is it to parent bilingual children?
- Is there anything that worries you about your children's bilingualism?

Experience with Norwegian educational institutions

- How was it when your children entered the Norwegian preschool/school?
- How do you feel about the educational opportunities your children have to learn and develop their Polish skills?
- How do you feel about the educational opportunities your children have to learn and develop their Norwegian skills?
- How is your communication with your children's preschool/school?
- Is there anything you are concerned about when it comes to your children's education or language learning opportunities in Norway?

Debriefing

8.3 *Transcription conventions*

- . falling intonation
- ? rising intonation
- ! animated tone of voice
- (.) micro-pause
- « » direct speech
- @ laughter
- (()) transcriber comment / description
- :: elongation of preceding sound
- self- or other-interruption
- XXX (upper case) loudness
- Italics* instances of code-switching between Polish and Norwegian

PART II

The Articles

- Article I Bubikova-Moan, J. (2017). Constructing the multilingual child: the case of language education policy in Norway. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 14(1), 56–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2016.1190389>
- Article II Bubikova-Moan, J. (in review). Negotiating learning in early childhood: narratives from migrant homes. Revised and resubmitted to *Linguistics and Education*.
- Article III Bubikova-Moan, J. (2017). Reported parent-teacher dialogues on child language learning: voicing agency in interview narratives. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1313192>

Errata

- *Correction: error in the title of Article III*

Location in text	Original text	Corrected text
<i>Page viii</i> <i>Cover page of PART II</i> <i>Cover page of Article III</i>	Reported dialogues on child language learning: parental agency in interview narratives	Reported parent-teacher dialogues on child language learning: voicing agency in interview narratives

- *Information only (no changes in text)*

Article II has been published in *Linguistics and Education* upon minor proofing changes. It has the following reference:

Bubikova-Moan, J. (2017). Negotiating learning in early childhood: Narratives from migrant homes. *Linguistics and Education*, 39, 26–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2017.04.003>