

Norwegian Perspectives on Education and Cultural Diversity

Norwegian Perspectives on Education and Cultural Diversity

Edited by

Lars Anders Kulbrandstad,
Thor Ola Engen
and Sidsel Lied

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Norwegian Perspectives on Education and Cultural Diversity

Edited by Lars Anders Kulbrandstad, Thor Ola Engen, and Sidsel Lied

This book first published 2018

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2018 by Lars Anders Kulbrandstad, Thor Ola Engen,
Sidsel Lied and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-0587-1

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-0587-2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section One: Profile and Perspectives

Chapter One.....	2
Education and Diversity: Introduction of a Multidisciplinary Research Group	
Thor Ola Engen, Lise Iversen Kulbrandstad, Lars Anders Kulbrandstad and Sidsel Lied	

Section Two: Diversity, Literacy and Inclusion

Chapter Two	40
Developing Research-based Literacy Teaching Practices for Diverse Schools in Norway	
Lise Iversen Kulbrandstad	
Chapter Three	65
Inclusion of Newly Arrived Students: Why Different Introductory Models can be Successful Models	
Thore-André Skrefsrud	
Chapter Four	83
Missing Recognition? Inclusive Education and Language Minority Students in Norwegian Schools	
Kari Nes	
Chapter Five	103
«It's just in my heart»: A Portrait of a Translingual Young Person as a Writer of Poetry	
Joke Dewilde	
Chapter Six	121
Jim Cummins' Hypotheses on Transfer of Linguistic Skills from the First to the Second Language: A Refutation of a Refutation	
Thor Ola Engen	

Section Three: Diversity, Language and Assessment

Chapter Seven.....	142
Increased Linguistic Diversity in Norway: Attitudes and Reflections	
Lars Anders Kulbrandstad	
Chapter Eight.....	160
Creating Challenging Language Learning Spaces in Multilingual Early	
Childhood Education Contexts	
Gunhild Tomter Alstad	
Chapter Nine.....	183
Standardized Testing Mantling Linguistic Diversity?	
Marte Monsen and Steinar Laberg	
Chapter Ten	202
Assessment of Language Awareness in Multilingual First Grade Students	
Gunhild Tveit Randen	

Section Four: Diversity, History and Religion

Chapter Eleven	224
A Farewell to the World? Non-Western History in Norwegian Curricula	
Morten Løtveit	
Chapter Twelve	244
Memory of Diversity	
Eva Marie Syversen	
Chapter Thirteen.....	264
The Discourse on Religious Literacy and the Implications of Empirical	
Research	
Kolbjørn Kjørven	
Chapter Fourteen	281
Children's Dialogue with Values: Values in Children's Memorial	
Messages in the Aftermath of July 22nd 2011	
Sidsel Lied	

Afterword	303
Jim Cummins	
Contributors.....	307

SECTION ONE:

PROFILE AND PERSPECTIVES

CHAPTER ONE

EDUCATION AND DIVERSITY: INTRODUCTION OF A MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH GROUP

THOR OLA ENGEN,
LISE IVERSEN KULBRANDSTAD,
LARS ANDERS KULBRANDSTAD
AND SIDSEL LIED

The present anthology has contributions from members of Education and Diversity, a multidisciplinary research group at Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences (before January 1st 2017, Hedmark University of Applied Sciences). The chapters of the book deal with the current research topics in the group. This introductory chapter describes some connecting threads by presenting some key concepts and epistemological assumptions of the research group, following its development from cooperation between two researchers with roots in education and linguistics in the early 1980s to the current position, involving more than twenty researchers, now also including religious studies, history, social studies, literature and music. The introduction is followed by a presentation of the articles in the book.

Introduction

The multidisciplinary research group *Education and Diversity* (ED) was formally appointed a strategic research area at the former Hedmark University of Applied Sciences (HUAS) in the late 1990s. Teaching and research activities can, however, be traced back to the early 1980s. At the time, most immigrants to Norway came to find work in industry and thus made their homes in the cities. But when Vietnamese refugees, who had escaped from their home countries by boat and been picked up by

Norwegian merchant ships, were granted residence permits, several established their new homes outside the cities. Some came to the agricultural county of Hedmark, north of Oslo. Very soon an in-service programme for teachers was developed at HUAS, and a few years later a textbook in migration pedagogy for higher education was published (Engen ed. 1985). Since then, Norwegian society has undergone important transformations—and so has Norwegian teacher education. In 1995, 5% of people living in Norway had immigrant family backgrounds, which means that either they themselves have immigrated to Norway or they were born in Norway of two immigrant parents. In 2016, 16% had an immigrant family background (Statistics Norway 1996, 2016). This development has put multicultural and multilingual topics at the top of the agenda and the activities of ED have moved from the periphery to the centre of educational research.

While Norwegian research on the implications of increased cultural and linguistic diversity for education aligns with research elsewhere in overarching questions, theories and methods, there are historical and political circumstances that form a unique context for this research in Norway. Likewise, while the research activities in the *Education and Diversity* group have much in common with research at other universities in the country, there are characteristics in the background of the group, its competence profile and organisation that make it stand out as distinctive.

From the outset, the research agenda of the ED group was influenced not only by international research, but also by theoretical ideas developed by Norwegians—earlier and in other contexts. Some of these ideas originate in Sami¹ school experiences in a Norwegian majority school; others in Norwegian majority experiences in a historical era where the school had a central role in the struggle to relieve Norway from historically rooted, institutionalised Danish cultural influence², in order to transform the country from an inferior semi-colony to a position as an independent state. We will take these aspects of the early history of multi- or intercultural education in Norway as our point of departure.

The early ED research efforts are presented in close relation to these theoretical ideas, since we aim to identify some possibly distinctive Norwegian contributions to the field of multi- or intercultural education. The ED researchers were also, of course, inspired by international research, not least on second language and bilingual education teaching

¹ The Sami population is mostly located in Northern Norway, but small groups of the inter Scandinavian Southern Sami population lives in other counties, included Hedmark County.

² Norway was a Danish colony for four hundred years, ending in 1814 when Norway entered a union with Sweden, which lasted until 1905.

and learning. This influence became more and more evident when membership of the ED group steadily increased and researchers from different academic backgrounds joined the group. In the second part of the chapter, we will therefore present projects and research work from ED researchers and discuss how they communicate with the present international body of research.

Two inspiring pioneers from Northern Norway

Although some noteworthy measures to meet the educational needs of Sami children in the northernmost of the Norwegian counties, Finnmark, had been taken already in the early 18th century (Niemi 2003; Darnell and Hoëm 1996), we will, however, start with the work of Sami teacher, writer and labour party politician, *Per Fokstad* (1890–1973). He entered the field of multi- or intercultural education in 1917 with the publication of well-informed academic arguments against the ongoing Norwegianisation in schools, advocating the use of the mother tongue (Sami) as the language of instruction (Fokstad 1917). Over the following decades, mainly through his academic-political activity, Fokstad gradually built a position as probably the most central voice in the early history of multi- or intercultural education in Norway. His ideas in favour of a transition model for Sami education with the curriculum taught in the Sami language, for at least the first three years of schooling and with Norwegian taught as a foreign language, were for a long time ignored. However, in the preparation of a new Primary Education Act in 1963, Norwegian authorities accepted recommendations of teaching through the Sami language from the committee appointed to examine Sami issues, of which Fokstad was a central member (Darnell and Hoëm 1996; Zachariassen 2012).

At this time, Fokstad had acquired powerful allies also internationally, such as the European Convention on Human Rights (1950), and the UN International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which in article 27 stated that:

In those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with the other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practise their own religion, or to use their own language (United Nations 1966).

The UN covenant did not come into effect until 1976, but in the 1960s and -70s worldwide revitalisation movements anticipated its implementation, by strongly challenging:

[...] the assimilationist conception of citizenship education [...] Indigenous peoples and ethnic groups within the various Western nations—such as American Indians in the United States, Aborigines in Australia, Maori in New Zealand, African Caribbeans in the United Kingdom, and Moluccans in the Netherlands—wanted their histories and cultures to be reflected in their national cultures and in the school, college, and university curricula (Banks 2004, 297)

According to James Banks, these movements were triggered by the Civil Rights Movement in the US and echoed throughout the world. Based on his experiences as a Sami student and teacher, Fokstad had advocated the idea that the history and culture of the Sami people should be reflected in the school curriculum in its own right almost fifty years earlier, and for this reason, the Sami people might have been mentioned among the groups listed by Banks. In any case, Fokstad's persistent efforts deserve to be regarded as a unique contribution to the field of multi- or intercultural education (cf. Zachariassen 2012).

Fokstad's work was published in Norwegian, so it is no wonder why Banks did not know about it. But even among Norwegian mainstream educationalists, few were familiar with his writings until the 1990s, when ED member Lars Anders Kulbrandstad drew attention to it in an article (Kulbrandstad 1992). Indirectly, Fokstad's ideas were nevertheless a major influence to ED from the start, as they were mediated by the work of Anton Hoëm, an educational sociologist also from Finnmark. Based on a series of empirical studies in Sami areas in the 1960s, Hoëm (1978) synthesised his findings in a comprehensive theory of socialisation, which turned out to be a powerful conceptual tool when it came to analysing (minority) students' achievements, motivation structure and identity development in school and kindergarten (for short introductions in English, see Engen 1994, Engen 2009a). And as Hoëm's theory of socialisation, either explicitly or implicitly, also anticipated concepts like cultural capital (Bourdieu), empowerment (Cummins) and recognition (Honneth), his work should too be considered as a distinct Norwegian contribution to the field of multi- or intercultural education (Beck et al. 2010).

Historically, Fokstad's and Hoëm's academic efforts—and in this way also the early research agenda of ED—must be understood in light of the emergence of the Norwegian unitary school, which was founded by the Liberal Party government in 1889, with the aim to grant equal rights and equal possibilities for all students, irrespective of their background. This ambition was realised by opening equal access for all students to the same institution, but at the same time school was also given the nation-building mission of transcending ethnic diversity in the student population through

cultural homogenisation, i.e. Norwegianising (cf. national literacy teaching) (Nes et al. 2002; Engen 2010a). Hence, it is hardly surprising that it had a discriminatory impact on students of Sami and Kven backgrounds, as Fokstad pointed out. As implied by Hoëm's socialization theory, it had similar consequences for all underprivileged groups who did not share the school's value basis, for example students of Forrest Finn, Romani and Roma backgrounds and children from the working class (Engen 1979; Engen 2010b). By identifying the central discriminatory mechanisms involved, Hoëm's theory of socialisation influenced school authorities to formalise the educational rights of Sami students in the National Curriculum of 1973, and to expand them even further by granting them the right to mother tongue education, together with Norwegian as second language instruction and bilingual teaching in the National Curriculum of 1987 (NC87).

The National Curriculum of 1987 and the education of linguistic minority children

In the 1970s and 1980s it gradually became obvious that children of newly arrived immigrant workers from countries like Pakistan, India and Turkey (in the 1970s), and children of refugees with Vietnamese, Chilean and Iranian backgrounds (in the 1980s) fell behind in the Norwegian school (Engen, Sand, and Kulbrandstad 1996; Sætersdal 1979–1985). With the National Curriculum of 1987, these groups of students were granted similar rights as the Sami and the Kvens. For the new language minorities, however, the justification for a new approach was just as much influenced by international experiences with bilingual programmes, like the transition, the maintenance or enrichment models and the immersion and submersion programmes (Baker 2011; Skutnabb-Kangas 1981, 1985; Øzerk 2006). Further, Cummins' hypotheses as to what psychological mechanisms are involved in successful bilingual education, and his identification of the more precise conditions under which certain bilingual education programmes are successful (cf. Cummins, Baker, and Hornberger 2001), were influential (for a detailed discussion, see Engen's chapter in this volume).

The Research activities of the Education and Diversity group

The influence of these international impulses is demonstrated by the previously mentioned edited volume from 1985 (Engen ed. 1985). And as the international theories were interpreted through the lenses of Hoëm's

theory of socialisation, they proved to be well suited also to define an interdisciplinary research agenda. Engen (ed. 1985) not only collected but also indirectly contrasted articles on topics such as migration and culture, racism, bilingualism and bilingual education, and Norwegian language teacher education for diverse classrooms. In the following years, new theoretical ideas partly rooted in Hoëm's work, partly in international research, were developed. The new ideas were strongly related to the distinctive historical experiences associated with Norway's transition from a semi-colony to an independent state. The ideas also proved to be powerful in substantiating a new multicultural religious study subject in teacher education, as well as in primary and secondary school.

The Christianity, Religion and Philosophy subject

As pointed out in the above quote from the Convention on Civil and Political Rights', persons belonging to minorities should not be denied the right to profess and practise their own religion. Although this principle traditionally had been respected in Norwegian schools, the National Curriculum of 1997 took its implementation one step further, by introducing a new subject called Christianity, Religion and Philosophy (CRP). As in the case of the nation building school, one justification for the new subject was to offer all students in the same classroom the same content programme about different religions and beliefs. But in contrast to the nation-building school, the concept of mainstreaming was, within this subject, given a meaning more in line with the principle of inclusion, so that the CRP subject's cultural context was no longer monocultural. On the one hand, all students should be taught about the life interpretation they were familiar with from their home backgrounds; on the other hand they should also be introduced to those world views they met through their schoolmates.

The argument for placing all students in the same mainstream classroom, and for including Christianity, other world religions, beliefs as well as philosophy and ethics in the same curriculum was at one level aimed to facilitate a face-to-face dialogue between representatives of different life view backgrounds within the context of formal socialisation, and to stimulate contact between the groups in the context of informal socialisation. At another level, the CRP subject was constructed to put into practice the OECD assumption (2005) that knowledge about both one's own and the culture of others is a precondition for openness, tolerance and dialogue (for extended discussions, see Engen and Lied 2011; Gravem 2004). Thus, even the CRP subject may be seen as a distinctive contribution to multi- or intercultural education.

In any case, the introduction of the subject in schools motivated colleagues with a background in religious studies and education to join the ED group, bringing with them new research ideas and expanding the space of multidisciplinary. Through several publications, Sidsel Lied gained a central position in the national discourse on the new CRP subject (Lied 2004, 2005, 2009a, b), and also introduced an approach where students were engaged in research work (Lied 2012). Her colleague Ingebjørg Stubø (2012, 2005) published work on the aesthetical dimension of religious art, while Ole Kolbjørn Kjørven (2014), as demonstrated in this volume, has investigated religion teachers' perspectives on literacy.

Around the turn of the millennium, it was by no means obvious that a group dominated by educationalists and linguists should welcome as members researchers with a religion studies background. However, the fundamental principles behind the CRP subject had been prepared by Engen in his book on double qualification and culture comparison (1989, cf. Engen 2009a), and thus a common theoretical ground was found. Not only was the assumption that knowledge about one's own culture and the one of others is a precondition for openness, tolerance and dialogue fundamental to the double qualification framework, with a reference to Park's 1928 article on the marginal man (cf. Engen 1989). The insight that knowledge about the whole is enhanced by increased cognitive awareness and creativity through comparison and contrasting of the parts, was also made familiar through research on bilingual education models and their aims for additive bilingualism, pluralism and enrichment (cf. Cummins in Cummins, Baker, and Hornberger 2001; Baker 1996; Skutnabb-Kangas 1981), and the approaches of contrastive grammar (see Hvenkilde ed. 1980) as well as the theoretical work of Vygotsky. Within the framework of double qualification, ED members also published work specifically related to diversity questions in kindergartens (Skoug 1992; Sand and Skoug 2002, 2003; Skoug and Sand 2003).

The historical roots of the Double Qualification concept

The Double Qualification approach was inspired also by Stein Rokkan's identification of the importance of resistance of peripheral actors belonging to loosely organised counter-cultures to centrally initiated cultural standardisation through the nation-building efforts (Rokkan 1987). This turned out to be central for the emergence of the unitary school. As had been pointed out by Fokstad and Hoëm, the Norwegianising literacy teaching strategy had serious discriminatory consequences for minority students, as it was based on the dominant written language rooted in

Danish. On the other hand, however, the nation building strategy was ambiguous, as literacy teaching in school also occurred in a written variety of Norwegian constructed in the 1850s on the basis of linguistic material collected from regional Norwegian dialects, initially named *Landsmål* (literally: country language), later *Nynorsk* (New Norwegian). In addition, in 1878, the Parliament decided that teachers should adapt their instructional language to the oral language of students when Norwegian-Danish was the medium of instruction, not the other way around. Due to its strong democratic basis, the counter-cultural dimension of the curriculum had to be accepted by the former hegemonic groups. However, the counter-cultural representatives on their side also had to accept a shared central position in the curriculum for the traditionally dominant Danish rooted culture, to which the former hegemonic groups saw no alternative but to build a parallel privately funded school (Engen 2010a).

As *New Norwegian* right from the start was adopted by influential counter-culture authors, scientists and journalists as their preferred written language form, New Norwegian appeared in the school textbooks as early as in the 1860s and to an even greater extent from the 1890s (Vikør 2006; Walton 2006). Through a historical compromise, then, the traditionally dominant strategy of *national* literacy teaching was complemented by a parallel – and in many ways also contradictory – strategy with many of the characteristics of critical literacy teaching (cf. Baker 2001), making a formally accepted dual strategy the foundation for the actual national literacy teaching strategy. In his chapter on language attitudes in this volume, Lars Anders Kulbrandstad demonstrates that this dual impulse is still influential.

The dual strategy gave literacy teaching a strong potential for awareness raising, identity confirmation and cultural liberation for children of certain underprivileged Norwegian ethnic backgrounds (Slagstad 1998, Hodne 1994), described originally by Höem as reinforcing socialisation. More importantly, however, by contrasting local and central cultural elements in the curriculum, students from local as well as central cultural and linguistic backgrounds also had their perspectives expanded, by being exposed to knowledge reflecting other cultures (described by Höem as resocialisation). In addition, the dual process occurred within a context which opened opportunities for cultural comparison in formal as well as informal situations and thus constituted a process which Engen (1989) called integrating socialisation. This kind of socialisation anticipated on most important criteria the CRP subject. Integrating socialisation, Engen argued, would be favourable for the development of openness, tolerance and dialogue, as well as for language learning, awareness raising and

cognitive development. Based on such arguments, Engen suggested that Double Qualification with an inherent potential for Culture Comparison appeared to be a suitable conceptual framework for designing curricula for diverse student groups. In the early 2000s, the Norwegian nation-building experiences also inspired a comprehensive interdisciplinary research project on multicultural nation building, funded by the Research Council of Norway, with researchers from pedagogy, Norwegian language, literature and CRP (see Skaret 2011; Skrefsrud 2016; Kulbrandstad 2009, 2011; Lied 2009a,b, 2012; Engen and Lied 2011; Engen 2009a,b, 2010a,b).

Local and central cultures

In the 1980s and 90s the historically dual strategy argument was re-actualised by the so called Local Communities Pedagogy (Solstad 1978; Høgmo, Solstad and Tiller 1981), which was rooted in the counter cultural tradition and reinterpreted in Hoëm's socialisation theory. These ideas contributed later to the strong position of local cultural curriculum planning introduced in the National Curriculum of 1987. However, the implication of the Local Communities Pedagogy's concept of local culture was that students with the same place of residence also shared a common cultural background. According to Hoëm's theory this was hardly the case either in bi- or trilingual communities, or in communities with a diverse socio-economic composition (cf. also Engen 1975, 1989, 2003). Thus, the local cultural concept of the NC87 might be described as biased, in the sense that it gave some children the advantage of being recognised, based on the (concealed) assumption that their local cultural backgrounds were (inherently) more appropriate or suitable, while others were in danger of being ignored or even suppressed by the school.

In his "content integration" approach, James Banks (2009) suggested that teachers should use examples and content elements from different cultures in their classrooms to illustrate key concepts, principles, generalisations and theories in a subject or a discipline, an idea that has been adopted by several researcher at the university, like Anne Skaret (2011), Eva Marie Syversen (2014), Sidsel Karlsen (2014), and Dyndahl et al (2014).

It was along the same line of reasoning as Bank's that Engen (1989) suggested that an axis from *central* to *local* cultures would be a productive analytical variable when it comes to identifying and selecting relevant curriculum material, provided, however, that the concepts of local and central were expanded to include also (under)privileged positions on variables such as ethnic, social, linguistic and religious background and

gender. However, if majority and minority persons are perceived as representing central or local cultural positions, judged by their ethnicity alone, teachers are invited to ignore the probability that majority persons may well have a local cultural position on variables such as education, religion and gender, and the other way around for persons with a minority background. Admittedly, social and ethnic backgrounds and gender are important independent predictors of school achievement, but as much research demonstrates, they also covariate internally, and in various ways in different contexts. Like Walby, Armstrong, & Strid (2012), Engen therefore argued that *retaining* the distinction between *different forms of inequality* is more important than emphasising each variable independently. Furthermore, like Vertovec (2007), he argued that it was necessary to take sufficient account of the conjunction of ethnicity with a range of other variables and to explore the complexity of the multi-ethnic group context, in order to be able to creatively consider the interaction of multiple axes of differentiation.

While Vertovec primarily argued on behalf of researchers, Engen's point was that schools and teachers are faced with the same kind of challenges when they are expected to balance local and central cultural influences in their curriculum work. He therefore recommended curriculum analyses according to the principle of intersectionality (cf. McCall 2005; Walby, Armstrong, and Strid 2012). In superdiversity, the situation for teachers is even more challenging. As curriculum planning according to influential voices has to be liberated from tradition as well as the prescriptive bonds of authorities, and be delegated to the individual teacher and headmaster, within the framework of common national goals (Krejsler 2007; Qvortrup 2001), it is considered extremely demanding to reach a broad consensus about what the content of school should be.

The recognition of peripheral voices

As mentioned earlier, indigenous peoples and ethnic groups have worked hard to get their histories and cultures – their local (peripheral or marginal) voices – recognised in national cultures and schools (Banks 2004). Today, Brossard Børhaug (2015), with a reference to Lévinas' ethics, argues that peripheral voices should be recognised as a contribution to the definition of an equal human existence (cf. Engen 1989). However, this can be done in different ways, as discussed for example by Cummins and Early (2011), and by ED members Gunhild Alstad (2013), Anne Marit Danbolt and Bente Hugo (2012) and Sidsel Karlsen (2014). How the Double Qualification approach can be helpful in this context has been discussed

by Joke Dewilde and Thor-André Skrefsrud (2015) in a transcultural and translanguaging perspective.

As mentioned above, a person from the majority group may be perceived as representing a central cultural position if he or she is judged by his or her ethnicity alone, overlooking that they may have a local cultural position on variables such as education, religion and gender. For minority persons, it may in some cases be the other way around. The implication of this is that both a central and a local cultural position is related to the cultural or economic power of the groups in question, as pointed out by Bourdieu and Passeron (1964, 1970). Thus, it may be taken for given that Norwegian history represents the central cultural position in the curriculum, while for example African history – at best – will be considered as representing a local cultural position, if present at all. The historian Morten Løtveit (this volume) discusses the peripheral position – or even absence – of non-western issues in recent curricula for the History subject in the Norwegian compulsory school. This relates to the struggle of indigenous peoples and ethnic minority groups within Western societies trying to have their histories and cultures reflected in the school, college and university curricula (cf. Banks 2004). Together with his colleague Liv Susanne Bugge, Løtveit has also carried out research on multicultural awareness among student teachers (Løtveit and Bugge 2015; Bugge and Løtveit 2015). Other ED members like Jørgen Klein and Gerd Wikan from the Social Science department have also been preoccupied with research questions related to the North – South dimension, or more generally with the influence of globalisation on student teachers' competence. Recently, they have conducted a project to gain insight into student teachers' experiences and learning outcomes in international practicum programmes (Wikan and Klein 2015).

Dewilde and Skrefsrud (2016), with a reference to Cummins & Early (2011) and Pratt (1991), have argued that a room for marginal or local voices in the mainstream central cultural classroom may also be opened by including alternative stories. This point has been developed further by Eva Marie Syversen in her chapter in this volume, based on her 2014 doctoral thesis on novels and short stories by Forest Finn writers. Syversen points out that literature of *local* colour, minor literature (local culture), has often been marginalised or left invisible by the hegemonic criticism of high modernity (central culture), as they are considered as mundane, conservative and retrospective. For students of Finn Forrest ancestry, however, this literature, provided it is made available to teachers through research, may have the same awareness raising, identity confirming and culturally liberating function in schools as regional literature had for children of

underprivileged Norwegian backgrounds in the 20th century. In addition also minor literature may stimulate majority and other minority readers to see through stereotypes and become aware of people who are invisible to them in their everyday life (Nussbaum 1997), an argument that is articulated also in Engen (1989). Thus, reading can help develop a deeper understanding of what life can do to human beings and in that way challenge our empathy.

Multilingualism and the teaching and learning of Norwegian as a second language

As indicated earlier, ED members were from the outset influenced by international research on second language learning and bilingual education. This applies to research group members from language studies as well as educational studies, and is exemplified by the fact that the first Norwegian text book on bilingualism and minority education was co-written by the two founding members of the group, Thor Ola Engen and Lars Anders Kulbrandstad (1998). As ‘minority education’ in the title indicates, Sami, national minorities as well as immigrants were discussed in the book. In the 1990s there was a heavy political debate about mother tongue education in Norway, and some researchers from the departments of sociology and social anthropology at the University of Oslo expressed their disbelief in bilingual education. Hence, the Research Council of Norway in 1996 invited experts to a consensus conference on language minority education—inspired by conferences used to achieve consensus among researchers of medicine. Engen and Kulbrandstad took an active part in this conference, which succeeded in reaching agreements concerning immigrant students’ need for competence in both their first and second languages as well as the need for both formal and informal second language education for an extended period of time (Hyltenstam et al eds. 1996).

Bilingualism, followed by multilingualism and later plurilingualism have been key concepts for the research group’s exploration of language issues. An early work is Lars Anders Kulbrandstad’s (1997) study of students with immigrant family backgrounds from Vietnam and Iran and their first and second language use in the context of bilingual language practices and attitudes. The results were presented in the form of language portraits: six of third graders and six of eight graders. In 2013 Gunhild Randen studied language assessment of school beginners by analysing test results in the students’ first and second languages, Russian and Norwegian, claiming that schools need to analyse the whole language repertoire of the

children, not only Norwegian, in order to use test results to plan adaptive teaching (see Randen's chapter in the book).

In recent years, Cummins and Early's (2011) concept of 'identity texts' has been another important key concept and inspiration to explore different ways the student's first languages can be used as a resource in schools and kindergartens although the teacher does not know the language and although the curriculum stresses the teaching of Norwegian. In an action research project working together with second grade teachers Anne Marit V. Danbolt and Lise I. Kulbrandstad (2013) explored how teachers invented a play language together with the students (the polar bear language) as a new way of teaching language awareness in a linguistically diverse classroom. Danbolt (2011) and Danbolt and Hugo (2012) used self-made bilingual word lists as a bridge between home and school in the teaching of literacy, while Gunhild Tomter Alstad (2013) analysed pre-school teachers' work with both formal and informal second language learning, as well as the teachers' different ways of using children's first languages as resources in kindergarten. One of the teachers used Norwegian in teaching all children English, and one organised minority mother tongue teaching in pull-out groups. The kindergarten teacher studied in the third case used a more dynamic approach. She took several opportunities during the day to show interest in all children's language resources and used the resources both to strengthen linguistic minority children's multilingual identities and to stimulate all children's language interest and language awareness (see Alstad's chapter in this book). In an ongoing project Joke Dewilde (see chapter in this book) applies a translanguaging approach in analysing a young refugees' writing in and out of school. Multilingual teaching practices are a common theme also for different ongoing studies involving teachers. Monsen and Randen for example are studying teachers' Internet discussions on what linguistic competence is needed to qualify as a teacher in Norway, while Alstad, Danbolt and Randen analyse teacher beliefs on language learning in diverse kindergartens.

To have a good command of the official language(s) of society is important not only to get access to work life and social life, but also to succeed in schools and for democratic participation. Globally, Norwegian of course is a minority language, spoken by approximately 5.2 million. In Norway it is the majority language, and as such an important learning object for immigrants. As an independent research area Norwegian as a second language was developed nationally in the early 1980s, at the same time as the need for second language teaching increased. At the time, few teachers and teacher educators had experience in taking an outsider's

perspective on the Norwegian language. Although teachers observed that for example children with Vietnamese and Turkish as first languages struggled with different parts of Norwegian, they were uncertain as to how to adapt the teaching to the different needs. Thus, textbooks describing languages contrastively were written (Hvenekilde ed. 1980; L.A. Kulbrandstad and Harder 1982), alongside with research on learner language (e.g. Hvenekilde 1986). Since Norway, Sweden and Denmark were characterised by more or less the same immigration profile, research from Sweden (Hyltenstam ed. 1979; Tingbjörn 1981) and Denmark (Skutnabb-Kangas 1981) constituted important points of departure for the emerging Norwegian research, together with international second language research (e.g. Selinker 1974), research on bilingualism (e.g. Cummins 1984), and on bilingual education (e.g. Baker 1988).

The Nordic approach to second language research, as for example promoted by the Nordic journal, *Nordand*,³ builds on a long tradition of including multilingual perspectives and of using both cognitive and socio-cultural theories. Research in Norwegian as a second language has been described as following three developmental lines: research on learners' language, research on language and culture contact, and educationally oriented research (Golden, L.I. Kulbrandstad, and Tenfjord 2007). As the second language researchers in ED work interdisciplinary and within a teacher education institution, it is the educationally oriented language research which best describes the overall research profile. In addition to multilingual teaching practices, three broad themes can be identified: literacy and assessment, language and culture contact, and classroom studies of learning opportunities. The themes of teacher beliefs and professional development of teachers are connecting threads through most projects.

Literacy has been an important topic for a long time. Lise Iversen Kulbrandstad's PhD dissertation (1996) was the first study to explore second language reading by immigrant adolescents in the Nordic countries, analysing linguistic aspects of their lack of understanding, using different test methods and a combination of theories of second language learning and first language reading. The teaching of second language literacy was later studied in the already mentioned action research project in mainstream classrooms in Oslo (Danbolt and Kulbrandstad 2008, 2012, 2013). Emergent literacy is studied in kindergarten by Alstad and L. I. Kulbrandstad (2017), and in 1st grade by Danbolt (2011). An ongoing

³ ED group member L. I. Kulbrandstad was one of the founders and editors of the first five volumes of *Nordand. Nordic journal of second language research*.

project, *Encounter with texts in the 5th grade*, involving L. I. Kulbrandstad and Anne Golden, University of Oslo, is addressing the well-documented achievement gap in reading between first and second language students. Here teaching and learning in different subject areas are studied: textbook vocabulary, students' textbook reading, and different scaffolding strategies used by teachers. Literacy also is important for the research groups' cooperation with colleagues at the universities of Zambia and Namibia. Danbolt and Dennis Banta are currently working on a project exploring the use of different languages in home-school cooperation in Zambia, and Emma Kirchner's PhD project at Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences is centred on reading engagement of 7th graders in Namibian schools who read in their second language.

The *assessment* of language skills, both for children and adults, is becoming increasingly more important in political discussions in Norway. Gunhild Randen's 2013 PhD on bilingual assessment of school beginners has already been mentioned. Marte Monsen in her 2014 PhD, conducted in-depth-interviews with teachers in lower secondary school about their experiences with reading tests in their multicultural classrooms (see Monsen and Laberg's chapter in this book). Two ongoing projects are addressing the assessment of adult immigrants' writing (Golden and Monsen 2015; Golden, L. A. Kulbrandstad and Tenfjord 2017).

Language and culture contact is another main topic studied by the ED group. Lars Anders Kulbrandstad's folk linguistic work on attitudes towards new language varieties, i.e. attitudes towards foreign-accented speech in digital newspaper articles (2002a), among adolescents (2006), student teachers (2009), and in the general public (2011), marked an opening of this field in Norwegian and Nordic second language research. L.A. Kulbrandstad has also conducted several interdisciplinary studies together with ED colleagues, for example, the first Norwegian quantitative study of minority students' school results (Engen, Kulbrandstad, and Sand 1996). Since 2013, he also has been the Norwegian project leader of the interdisciplinary NordForsk-funded project: *Learning Spaces for Inclusion and Social Justice: Success Stories from Immigrant Students and School Communities in Four Nordic Countries* which includes classroom studies of learning opportunities (Ragnarsdóttir and Kulbrandstad 2015). In this book, the chapters by Skrefsrud and Dewilde report from the project.

Globalisation and the recent migration to Norway also call for changes in the different school subjects in compulsory school, as well as in teacher education. Such changes are also studied by the research group (e.g. L.A. Kulbrandstad 2001, 2008; L.I. Kulbrandstad 2001; Randen, Danbolt, and Palm 2015). In addition, several members have had the opportunity to

contribute with their research-based knowledge in national school and teacher education reforms, since they have been appointed by the Ministry of Education and Research to serve on different committees. Another perspective related to the influence of linguistic and cultural encounters in mainstream teaching, is the study of cultural encounters in fiction. In Anne Skaret's 2011 PhD, literary cultural encounters in picture books and children's reception of these books are explored. L.I. Kulbrandstad (1997) analysed how authors of children books addressed second language learning and multilingualism when they formed lines and described the use of languages other than Norwegian, while L.A. Kulbrandstad (2002b) studied the use of Finnish and Norwegian by a national minority, the Forrest Finns, in a trilogy by an author representing the minority.

Research and professional development for teachers

The relationship between researchers and teachers is, and has been, of special importance for ED. It started in the 1980s when the counties of Hedmark and Oppland asked the university to develop courses in Norwegian as a second language and courses for mother tongue teachers from language minorities. Ten years later, the interplay with school authorities developed into a combination of courses and intervention projects conducted by teachers. With supervision from ED researchers teachers used research as an inspiration to change teaching practices (L.A. Kulbrandstad 1999). This way of promoting research-based language teaching was further developed when the university in 2005 was engaged to conduct a research and professional development project in Oslo. While around 100 teachers and school leaders attended the courses, four teachers were chosen to make changes in their literacy teaching in an action research approach (Danbolt and Kulbrandstad 2008, 2012). In 2013, HUAS again worked in Oslo, this time on professional development in kindergarten aiming at strengthening research-based practices. One thousand seven hundred employees have so far been involved. In a national program of competence development for teachers, Competence for Quality, HUAS was appointed as one of two teacher education institutions to offer a one year in-service-program for second language teachers in compulsory school, and has from the school year 2016-2017 also offered such national programmes for kindergarten teachers and for teachers in adult education.

In the last decade the importance of offering research-based initial teacher education programmes has been acknowledged in Norway (see L. I. Kulbrandstad's chapter in the book). Inland Norway University of

Applied Sciences is a large teacher education institution in the Norwegian context, offering most initial teacher education programmes, a wide range of in-service-programs as well as four master programmes and a PhD in Teaching and Teacher education. Questions of diversity in preparing teachers for future generations have been addressed by ED group members, e.g. Kulbrandstad (2010), Engen (2011), Skrefsrud (2016), and also in projects with student involvement (Kulbrandstad 2009; Lied 2012). More recently also teacher educators themselves have been studied (Randen et al. 2015).

When the Masters' programme in Adapted education was developed in 2005, the Double Qualification and Culture Comparison model played a central role. The programme combines and contrasts the research approaches of special education and multicultural education in one dual approach. The dual perspectives, informed by new theoretical and methodological impulses from Walby, Armstrong, & Strid (2012), Vertovec (2007), Garcia (2011), Creese and Blackledge (2010), Cummins and Early (2011), Bhabha (2004), Deleuze and Félix (1983) and Deleuze and Guattari (1987), resulted in fresh approaches to research themes in school and kindergarten; like inclusion (Nes 2003, 2014.), adaptive education and differentiation (Engen 2009b; Engen and Lied 2011), classroom management (Zachrisen 2009; Andersen 2010), racialisation (Andersen 2015), play in an intercultural perspective (Zachrisen 2015), kindergarten programmes for diversity in rural areas (Andersen et al. 2011), cooperation between school, kindergarten and parents (Sand 1996, 2008) and cooperation between mother tongue and mainstream teachers (Dewilde 2013).

The ED research group has also been strongly engaged in qualifying teachers from language minority groups. For several years the Hedmark University of Applied Sciences offered a bachelor program for bilingual teachers and kindergarten teachers, and was also appointed by the Ministry of Education to chair the group of Norwegian teacher education institutions offering these programmes (Ringen and Kjørven 2009). As part of this programme, the university offered Somali. This engagement led to participation in an international research network, *Diverse teachers for diverse schools* (Kjørven, Ringen and Gagné eds. 2009).

A promising development is the stronger focus on partnerships between teacher education institutions and schools and kindergartens which are emerging in Norway. In recent years the university has entered partnership with several kindergartens, compulsory schools and upper secondary schools in the region. The partnership entails the possibilities of research collaboration, and several ED projects are now being conducted or planned in cooperation with these partner schools and partner

kindergartens. Such partnerships offer a new form of double qualification which is of importance to teacher education since both university campuses and schools and kindergartens are considered teacher education arenas. Traditionally the two arenas' contribution to teacher education has been specialised - either research based theories or practical knowledge. Today a development towards more practically oriented research and more research-based practices are encouraged. Thus, the schools can use the partnership to get access to research-based knowledge in their work on improving teaching and learning for all students as well as professional development of teachers. The teacher education institutions for their part can use the partnership to stay close to students' learning and development and to learn from the current challenges teachers meet in their increasingly diverse classrooms.

Presentation of the book

This introductory chapter has pointed to circumstances that make Norway an interesting case when it comes to multicultural and multilingual perspectives on education in Europe. We have also argued that the multidisciplinary group *Education of Diversity* is of particular interest in the Norwegian context, given the significant contributions from this group to research and policy making in the country over a period of more than three decades. The articles in the anthology reflect the quite diverse research interests of the group members, but we have shown that there are important linking threads between the research activities of the members, not least the close connections to teacher education and to kindergarten and school.

In line with the main areas of ED's research activities, the authors of the remaining 13 chapters present diversity, culture and education in different ways. In section one, Lise I. Kulbrandstad, Thor-André Skrefsrud, Kari Nes, Joke Dewilde, and Thor Ola Engen discuss diversity with an emphasis on literacy, minority students and inclusion, all in the frame of Norwegian school and teacher education. In section two Lars Anders Kulbrandstad, Gunhild Tomter Alstad, Marte Monsen and Steinar Laberg, and Gunhild Tveit Randen put diversity in focus in the light of language and assessment. In the last section Morten Løtveit, Eva Marie Syversen, Ole Kolbjørn Kjørven, and Sidsel Lied approach diversity through the lenses of the school subjects literature, history and religion, or more precisely, by means of historical and value-based perspectives. In the following, we will present each of the chapters in more detail.

Section one: Diversity, literacy and inclusion

Lise Iversen Kulbrandstad opens this section with a chapter on teacher education. Her point of departure is that Norwegian teacher education for the compulsory school is facing a comprehensive reform. In 2017, all programmes were developed into five years integrated master's studies with a stronger emphasis on research-based knowledge. One of the purposes is to qualify prospective teachers for research-based teaching practices. This article looks into the background of the reform and also explores different roles that teachers might be given or take in research. Examples in the discussion are taken from literacy teaching in linguistically diverse schools. Literacy competence in the school language is essential to learning in all school subjects. Hence, seeking new knowledge about how to adapt literacy teaching to new student groups and new contexts must be considered important teacher qualifications. The discussion in the article draws upon research conducted at Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences, as well as the author's experiences from holding central positions in the last reforms. The development of Norwegian teacher education is also discussed in light of international trends.

In his chapter, **Thor-André Skreftsrud** discusses the possible strengths and weaknesses of two different organisational models with regard to the inclusion of newly arrived immigrant students found in the context of attending two primary schools in Norway. Researching the underlying factors that these successful yet different schools have in common, Skreftsrud states that both the use of direct integration and separate reception classes may be effective, depending on the flexible use of the models. Both models are positioned within the framework of inclusive education and social justice, using theoretical perspectives from Rawls, Benhabib and Nussbaum as a theoretical lens. The article contributes to research on newly arrived students by exploring different ways the schools may provide inclusive education for newly arrived students, seeing the students as a heterogeneous group with a variety of needs.

Kari Nes' chapter is in two parts, one exploring the concept of inclusive education, in particular where language minority students are concerned, and one empirical part. Recent survey data from Norway on the education of cultural and linguistic minority students with a non-Western heritage are discussed in an inclusion perspective. Teachers in the study regard non-Western linguistic minority group as far less academically successful and less dedicated to school work than the majority students. Teachers also judge the social skills of this minority group of students to be poorer than the majority's, while the non-Western

students themselves generally report that they like it at school – they like the teacher, their fellow students and even the school subjects better than the Norwegian speaking majority.

Joke Dewilde investigates the young student Khushi as a writer of poetry in and outside of school. The study is a linguistic ethnography of a reception class for late arrivals to Norwegian schools, and includes participant observation, interviews, audio-recordings and the collection of texts. Dewilde applies a translingual understanding of literacy that challenges conventional ways of constructing language as bounded entities and writing as individual products. The analyses of the poems Khushi writes at home show that these are recontextualisations of Bollywood songs, rather than texts she has produced herself. Further, the analyses of the poem written in school show that translation and translingual practices contribute to Khushi's empowerment as a writer of poems in Norwegian. The article concludes by emphasizing the importance of safe writing spaces in school.

Thor Ola Engen's starting point is two recent publications by the Norwegian researchers Melby-Lervåg and Lervåg in which the authors conclude that knowledge and skills acquired in the first language only to a very limited extent can be transferred to the second language. Thus, competence in the first language will hardly be of any help for second language learners' academic learning in the majority school. The findings are contradictory to a comprehensive theoretical framework in the field of bilingual education, developed by Jim Cummins in the 1970s. Through a critical examination Engen demonstrates that the theoretical foundation for their analysis is too weak to give any conclusive evidence as to how home language knowledge affects second language learners' school performance through transfer of knowledge and skills.

Section two: Diversity, language and assessment

The background for **Lars Anders Kulbrandstad's** chapter is the changes in the demographic composition of Norway brought about by the considerable increase in immigration over the past few decades. Because of this a society that traditionally has been quite uniform linguistically is becoming more and more diverse. The article presents two studies of attitudes to and reflections over this growing diversity, based on a survey and follow-up qualitative interviews. The main research questions is to what extent the positive attitude to the use of dialects for which Norway is known, is extended to Norwegian with a foreign accent and to immigrant minority languages. Whereas foreign accented speech appears to be met

with considerable tolerance, there seems to be skepticism to the prospect of immigration leading to new permanent minority languages in the country. The findings are discussed with reference to the concept *monolingual ethos*.

In general, there has been little research on informal educational language environments involving very young emergent bilinguals. **Gunhild Tomter Alstad**'s chapter highlights the issues and complexities which are currently emerging in language pedagogy in kindergarten, drawing on qualitative data from a study of second language practices and beliefs. Illustrated by the pedagogical choices of one Norwegian kindergarten teacher, the chapter demonstrates how informal settings and activities in play are used to promote linguistically and cognitively challenging second language learning opportunities, challenging a view on second language teaching and learning as undemanding and straightforward. In addition, the chapter explores the teacher's recognition of the children's cognitive, social, and educational resources in fostering their multilingual identities, without being proficient in their home languages.

It is acknowledged among test researchers that standardised testing in diverse settings entails threats to the validity of test results and test consequences. Based on an analysis of the National reading tests in Norway and a case study of three teacher teams' beliefs and knowledge about standardised reading tests, **Marte Monsen and Steinar Laberg** investigate bias in standardised testing of minority students. The authors suggest that the Norwegian system of standardised testing is characterised by low awareness of certain aspects of validity, such as negative bias towards bilingual students. They highlight the fact that the national reports from the tests only reveal that the average bilingual student scores lower than the overall average. The authors claim that this information is not only limited and in many ways common sense, but that it may also cause negative attitudes toward bilingual students and their aptitude for learning.

Gunhild Tveit Randen bases her chapter on her PhD study where she investigates the assessment of language awareness in three bilingual students in first grade. The research questions consider how a test made for L1 Norwegian students will work when used on L2 students, and to what extent the results from such a test can be considered valid/useful as a basis for educational planning. Test results in language awareness indicate that the minority students are in danger of developing reading difficulties, while supplementary data show that their reading and writing skills are adequate. Tveit Randen explains this contradiction by illustrating how native-like proficiency in Norwegian is required to perform the test. She then discusses how the nature of language awareness makes it crucial to be