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Abstract

This study aims to investigate **how a primary school in Norway addresses learners with diverse linguistic and cultural background**, in this study referred as culturally and linguistically diverse learners (CLD learners). The study is founded on the premises of multicultural education (MCE) which is considered essential to address the education of CLD learners. Therefore, the scope of the study is based on a five-category theoretical framework comprising: **understanding the concept of multicultural education (MCE), cultural/linguistic incorporation, community participation, pedagogy and assessment**.

The study uses qualitative approach followed by a single case study design, in-depth interviews as data collection tools, purposeful sampling and qualitative data analyses. The qualitative research enabled selecting a primary school that would be information-rich enough to address the research questions. One primary school in Norway with a large number of CLD learners, bilingual and minority language practices and bilingual teachers employed was purposefully chosen to elicit four staff members as interview participants- the principal deputy, two teachers and counselor.

The school experienced certain changes in their organisation and practice in the last couple of years, which had an impact on data analysis in this study. A certain decrease in bilingual practices, mother tongue teaching, and teacher collaboration occurred and participants have opposing viewpoints in relation to theses changes. The main findings show that participants have a different perception of multicultural education; most of the participants were in favor of bilingual teaching and stronger forms of collaboration showing example of benefits of bilingual education; CLD learners experience the underdevelopment of both mother languages and Norwegian; the school shows high appreciation of minority cultures; bilingual teachers are great resources for the school; parental involvement is considered highly beneficial; the classroom pedagogy meets different learning styles but presents a barrier to learners with special educational needs; school’s assessment covers many aspects by using diverse means of obtaining information.

Overall, the school practices various aspects of multicultural education and in that way meets the needs of CLD learners.
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1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study is to address the education of learners from diverse linguistic and cultural background in Norwegian primary school mostly encompassing the learners from first to fourth grade. The study will use the term ‘culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) learners’ to denote the learners who are immigrants, born from immigrant parents and refugees (Statistic Norway, undated a), most of whom have Norwegian as a second language (NSL). Being the main pillar of their education, the concept of multicultural education (MCE) was adopted as the basis for this study. In a simplistic way, Gollnick and Chinn provided a rather all-embracing and penetrating interpretation of multicultural education:

‘Not all students can be taught in the same way because they are not the same. Their cultures and experiences influence the way they learn and interact with their teachers and peers. They have different needs, skills, and experiences that must be recognized in developing educational programs. Each student is different because of physical and mental abilities, gender, ethnicity, race, language, religion, class, sexual orientation, geography and age… Multicultural education is a concept that incorporates the diversity of students and equality in education. Equality ensures that students are provided the same access to the benefits regardless of their group membership (Golnick and Chinn, 2009, p. 4)’.

This definition is placed at the forefront of this study because not only it familiarizes the reader with the notion of multicultural education, but also it represents the researcher’s personal conviction and it could represent a comprehensive educational approach in educating all learners regardless of their diversities and needs.

This study will narrow down the research focus to the multicultural education (MCE) of learners with diverse linguistic and cultural background (CLD learners). It will investigate how one primary school in Norway addresses their diversity by focusing on aspects of multicultural education that are a part of the study theoretical framework discussed later: understanding the concept of multicultural education, cultural/linguistic incorporation, community participation, classroom pedagogy and assessment. Furthermore, the study is underpinned by a qualitative research approach, single case study design, purposeful sampling, in-depth interviews and qualitative data analyses. This chapter aims to set the
background for this study by familiarizing the reader with the historical perspective of multicultural education, as well as its status in Norwegian context, as well as present the main research question and underpinning sub-questions, the need for the study, its purpose, potential beneficiaries, as well as the outline of the dissertation.

1.1 Historical Perspective of Multicultural Education

In order to envision the core of multicultural education (MCE), this section will depict its historical perspective. According to Banks (2004), MCE has its roots in Early Ethnic Studies Movement (EESM) at the turn of the 19th and beginning of 20th century. The scholars of this period, Williams, Wesley, Woodson, DuBois, to mention a few, created knowledge about African-Americans that was incorporated in separate schools and colleges for African-American students. The following phase, intergroup education movement, emerged with the goals of reducing prejudice and creating interracial tolerance between different racial, religious and national groups of students. Unlike ethnic studies that empowered African-American people by promoting ‘Black’ culture and history, intergroup education emphasized interracial harmony, human relations and desegregation. Due to the slow pace of racial desegregation, civil movements of the 1960s and 1970s brought back the focus of ethnic studies reflected in Black pride, separate schools, ethnic-specific curriculum and the employment of African-American teachers (Gollnik and Chinn, 2009). However, it was realized that these programs alone will not promote the positive affirmation of diversity, so ethnic studies expanded into multiethnic studies underpinned by the curriculum and instructional materials that reflected multiple perspectives. Moreover, this phase extended the facets of diversity in multicultural education beyond race and ethnicity by raising the voices of other oppressed minority groups, such as women, gay and lesbian people, persons with disabilities etc., all of whom demanded the recognition of their histories and cultures (Banks, 2004).

Nowadays multicultural education is influenced by the standards developed during the 1990s that created debates between fundamentalists and multiculturalists (Gollnik and Chinn, 2009). On one hand, the fundamentalists argue that ‘history standards should stress what they believed are the foundation of democracy- patriotism and historical heroes.’ On the other
hand, multiculturalists ‘promoted inclusion of diverse groups and multiple perspectives in the standards (p.8)’. The debates of multicultural education regarding the learners with diverse linguistic and cultural background will be presented in the theoretical framework in the next chapter. In order to further understand the background of this study, it is highly necessary to get familiar with multicultural education in Norwegian context.

1.2 Multicultural Education in Norway

Linguistic and cultural diversity is growing in Norwegian society; the immigrants and those born in Norway to immigrant parents comprise 13.1% of Norway's population and speak more than 200 languages (Statistic Norway b, undated). Since the end of the 1960s the composition of Norwegian society has changed with the arrival of many immigrant workers and refugees (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), 2009). Øzerk (2006) claims that the curriculum for minority students during the 1980s was characterized by functional bilingual education, which aimed at developing bilingualism and biculturalism. However, during the 1990s and 2000s legislative and curricula changes resulted in a paradigm shift from functional towards transitional bilingual education, which aims at monolingualism and assimilation. The elements of transitional bilingual education could also be traced in contemporary educational policies.

According to the Education Act (2010), ’Pupils attending the primary and lower secondary school who have a mother tongue other than Norwegian or Sami have the right to adapted education in Norwegian until they are sufficiently proficient in Norwegian to follow the normal teaching of the school. If necessary, such pupils are also entitled to mother tongue instruction, bilingual subject teaching, or both (2-8 & 3-12).’ The act also calls for parents’ councils in schools and promotes students’ grouping underpinned by multicultural diversity stating that if necessary pupils can be divided into groups justifiable to pedagogy that would safeguard their need for social belonging and that would normally not be organized according to level of ability, gender or ethnic affiliation (11-4 & 8-2). What is more, the revised plan for general teacher education states that teachers must be knowledgeable of CLD learners and be able to cooperate with their parents (National Centre for Multicultural Education (NAFO), undated). Furthermore, a strategic plan ‘Equal
Education and Practice’ (Norwegian Ministry of Education and research (NMER), 2007) aims to increase teachers’ competence in using Norwegian as a second language in other subjects, to strengthen multicultural perspective in curricula, develop teaching aids and recruit bilingual teachers.

Nevertheless, many reports reveal the challenging issues in the education of CLD learners. First, there is a great discrepancy between the academic achievement in the national tests between minority and majority pupils (Øzerk, 2003) Moreover, minority pupils experience higher rate of dropout and underrepresentation in higher education. In addition, teachers in general lack sufficient skills for teaching in multicultural classrooms (Ramboll, 2006), 8% of mother tongue and bilingual teachers lack formal education (Ramboll, 2008) and many of them do not feel included in the educational system (Valenta & Berg, 2008; Myklebust, 1993; Mousavi, 2006). Taking everything into account, this study aims to address the multicultural education of CLD learners in Norwegian primary school, so the research question and sub-questions will be generated to guide the aim of the study.

1.3 Research Problem and Sub-questions

The research problem of this study will be presented as the main research question:

*How does a primary school in Norway address learners with diverse linguistic and cultural background?*

In order to delineate the relevant aspects of school’s pedagogies and practices that address CLD learners this study will employ a theoretical framework based on five categories elaborated in the next chapter: **understanding the concept of multicultural education, cultural/linguistic incorporation, community participation, classroom pedagogy and assessment** (Cummins, 2001). Therefore, the five research sub-questions generated would be:
1. **How is the concept of multicultural education understood?**

2. **How are minority languages and cultures included in educating learners with diverse linguistic and cultural background?**

3. **What is the collaboration like among school staff and parents?**

4. **What is the classroom pedagogy like?**

5. **How are learners with diverse linguistic and cultural background assessed?**

The following sections will attempt to justify the need, purpose and potential beneficiaries of this study.

### 1.4 The Need for the Study

The need for this study resides in both global and national (Norwegian) conditions. Many authors contend that ethnic minority pupils experience underachievement compared to majority pupils (Cummins, 2001; Baker, 2006) and that they face over-representation in special education and under-representation in higher education (Baker, 2006; Miles, 2002, Gollnick and Chinn, 2009). What is more, teachers in general lack faith and competence in implementing MCE (Capella-Santanna, 2003; Brandon, 2003; Gay, 2003).

As it was discussed, Norway is confronted with similar issues such as the growing number of children with diverse linguistic and cultural background, their educational under-representation, underachievement and high dropouts, the lack of teachers’ training in multicultural education, the lack of bilingual teachers, as well as the insufficient research in the field of multicultural education (NMER, 2007). That is why this study has a multifaceted purpose in order to deal with the discussed issues.
1.5 The Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study is to provide an all-embracing perspective into the multicultural education of CLD learners. The extensive theoretical framework encompasses various aspects of multicultural pedagogies and practices, and in that way creates a holistic approach to the study phenomenon. Therefore, it will enhance the understanding of some basic concepts and dilemmas, and eventually influence people’s awareness and state of mind regarding multicultural education. Moreover, it will investigate both advantages and challenges encountered in multicultural education, and in that way not only disseminate positive examples and experiences, but also point to the problematic issues and the ways to overcome them. Therefore, many parties could benefit from this study.

1.6 The Beneficiaries of this Study

This study could contribute to teachers, school leaders, educational policy makers, parents, but most of all CLD learners.

First, the study could provide teachers and school leaders with the basis of multicultural education and help them enhance their practices, planning and implementation. Second, it could contribute to policy makers by pointing to immerging issues in multicultural education and in that way influence future policy affairs. Finally, it could benefit the parents, familiarizing them with the main concerns in multicultural education, helping them to understand the whole process of children’s cultural and educational adaptation and the ways they can support their children.

The union of these aspects could lead towards a more inclusive education for CLD learners and improve their overall status of social inclusion and academic achievement. What is more, most of the study’s aspects do not relate exclusively to CLD learners, so this study could have practical implications for all learners regardless of their diversities and needs. Moreover, to my so far research and knowledge, as well as NMER (2007) there is not an extensive research body in the field of multicultural education in Norway. Therefore, this study could enrich the Norwegian empirical research, or even create the basis or a starting point for future research.
Important to mention is that the studied school will receive a copy of the study as well as an additional feedback with possible practical implications, and in that way benefit as an integral participant of the whole research and learning process.

1.7 Outline of the Thesis

This thesis is organized in 5 chapters with underlying topics and subtopics.

Chapter I- Introduction
In this chapter the background of the study is presented, comprising the historical perspective and Norwegian context of multicultural education, the need, purpose and beneficiaries of the study, as well as research main question and sub-questions.

Chapter II- Theoretical Framework and Literature Review
In this chapter the five-category theoretical framework is developed and it will be used in organizing relevant literature. Each of the five categories is elaborated by referring to various theories and empirical studies.

Chapter III- Research Methodology
In this chapter the significant aspects of research methodology will be discussed by referring to both their strengths and weaknesses. The qualitative approach includes a single case study design, interviews as a tool for data collection, purposeful sampling, qualitative data analyses and most relevant ethical issues.

Chapter IV- Data Presentation and Discussion
In this chapter the results will be presented and discussed in the five categories of the theoretical framework. First, the information about the school and participants will be provided. Furthermore, the data will be reviewed and discussed in 5 categories.

Chapter VI- Concluding Remarks
In this chapter the thesis will summarize the previous chapters by evaluating the study in terms of its strengths and weaknesses, providing a holistic perspective into the school’s multicultural education and offering implication for future research and practical implication.
2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to develop a theoretical framework for this study based on five categories, understanding the concept of multicultural education, cultural linguistic incorporation, community participation, classroom pedagogy and assessment. The framework will be expanded by referring to other theories and empirical research within each of the five categories. Developed in that way, it will familiarize the readers and future researchers with the review of relevant literature in multicultural education. In addition, it will be used as the basis for generating research sub-questions, developing interview guide and conducting the data analyses, as well as presenting and discussing the data.

2.2 Theoretical Framework and its Use

The theoretical framework of this study will be composed of five categories: understanding the concept of multicultural education, cultural/linguistic incorporation, community participation, pedagogy and assessment. The first category, understanding the concept of multicultural education will be added to the four remaining categories that represent Cummins’ theoretical framework (Cummins, 2001): cultural/linguistic incorporation, community participation, pedagogy and assessment. According to Cummins’ theoretical framework, minority learners are either ‘empowered’ or ‘disabled’ in their interaction with educators. These interactions are mediated by the roles educators assume in relation to the four aspects that have an impact on learners’ cognitive/academic as well as social/emotional development. Hereby, each of the categories will be presented in the table, briefly explained and further expanded in the following sections.
### TABLE 1: CUMMINS’ THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of Cummins Framework</th>
<th>Educator Role Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/Linguistic Incorporation</td>
<td>Additive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Participation</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Reciprocal Interaction- Oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Advocacy- Oriented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Understand **the concept of multicultural education** will incorporate the concepts considered relevant for the phenomenon, such as multicultural education, the criticism of multicultural education, language, culture, acculturation and culturally relevant pedagogy. It will be used to discuss research participants’ understanding of multicultural education and their influence on the school practice.

**Cultural/linguistic incorporation category** suggests that using native languages and cultures of CLD learners benefits their academic achievement and social development. Educators’ role
can be characterized along an additive-subtractive dimension because ‘educators who see their role as adding a second language and cultural affiliation to their students’ repertoire are likely to empower students more than those who see their role as replacing or subtracting students’ primary language and culture’ (Cummins, 2001, p. 664).

**Community participation category** suggests that involving minority parents in their children’s education results in positive academic consequences. Educators’ role is characterized along a collaborative-exclusionary dimension; the former actively encourages minority parents to participate in home support and classroom activities, and the latter regards the collaboration with parents as irrelevant. This study will add another component in this category - teacher collaboration.

**Pedagogy category** suggests that classroom pedagogy based on positive reciprocal interaction between teachers and learners, flexibility, facilitation, guidance and collaborative learning enables the academic achievement of CLD learners. Educators’ role is characterized along a reciprocal interaction-oriented - transmission-oriented dimension; the former is student-centered characterized by mutual interaction between teachers and learners, whereas the latter is teacher-centered characterized by imparting the knowledge, controlling the interaction and orienting it towards instructional objectives.

**Assessment category** suggests that assessing minority learners should consider their societal and educational background. Educators’ role is characterized along an advocate-oriented - legitimization-oriented dimension; the former scrutinizes critically the societal and educational context within which the child has developed, whereas the latter uses exclusively psychological tests in order to locate the problem within a CLD learner.

**The use of the framework** will include further development by immersing more deeply into each of the five categories. Referring to other authors and both worldwide and Norwegian empirical research within each of the presented categories will create a more complete view of the overall multicultural pedagogies and practices. Developed in this way the framework was used to:

a. generate 5 research sub-questions

b. organize the interview guide into five categories and elicit interview questions within each category
c. organize the data presentation in five categories by the means of coding and categorizing

d. relate the data to the theories and empirical research and accordingly discuss and draw conclusions

e. provide a holistic perspective into the school’s multicultural education

After presenting its foundation and use, the framework will be further developed by immersing more deeply into its five categories understanding the concept of multicultural education, cultural linguistic incorporation, community participation, classroom pedagogy and assessment.

2.3 Understanding the Concept of Multicultural Education

Curtis (1998) argues that we need to examine various perspectives, including our own so the learning could happen in classrooms. Martins (2008, p.203) adds that “the awareness of one’s own assumptions, prejudices and stereotypes is a first step to be able to positively interact and learn from others. In this process lies the essence of intercultural learning”. That is why it is highly significant to examine how the school (the participants) understands the concept of multicultural education, and how their understanding relates to their practices. Therefore, this section aims to present the concepts of multicultural education, language, culture, acculturation and culturally relevant pedagogy in order to address the first research sub-question: **How is the concept of multicultural education understood?**

2.3.1 The notion of Multicultural Education

Although many authors offer their definitions of multicultural education (MCE), there is not a single commonly agreed definition. Therefore, the aim of this section will not be to define MCE, but to shed light on its understanding.

Bennet (2003) describes MCE as teaching and learning underpinned by democratic believes and values that assert cultural pluralism in culturally diverse society. Moreover, Jay and Jones (2005) argue that multicultural education is “the common term used to describe the type of
pluralist education” where “its advocates are seeking for all children receiving an education, pre-K through college” (p.3). According to Gay (2000a) and Ladson-Billings (2003) multicultural education refers to adopting a culturally responsive pedagogy and having trained instructors that facilitate this pedagogy. Many authors (Sleeter and Grant, 1988; Bennet, 2003; Nieto, 2003) add that MCE is not a subject matter but the very education that gives equal opportunities for all students to achieve their maximal potentials and educational excellence.

In addition, Gollnick and Chinn (2009, p.4) define multicultural education as an educational strategy in which students’ ‘cultures are used to develop effective classroom instruction and school environments. It supports and extends the concepts of culture, diversity, equality, social justice and democracy into the school setting.’

Finally, Banks (1999, p.1) seems to offer the most encompassing vision of MCE defining it as ‘an idea, an educational reform movement, and a process whose major goal is to change the structure of educational institutions so that male and female students, exceptional students, and students who are members of diverse, racial, ethnic and cultural groups will have an equal chance to achieve academically in school’. He (2001) also points to the impoverished definition of multicultural education that is reduced to ethnic food nights and the celebration of months of minority populaces.

Although according to its advocates MCE appears empowering, its feasibility and core values are challenged by many opponents.

2.3.2 Criticism of Multicultural Education

Multicultural education (MCE) is a controversial theme in many aspects and therefore it is faced with much criticism.

The opponents of MCE claim that its advocates do not have a commonly agreed definition of the very concept which results in negative impact on its implementation (Thomas et al., 1994; Modgil et al., 1986). They also criticize MCE for ‘not adequately addressing issues of power and oppression that keep a number of groups from participating equitably in society’ (Gollnick and Chinn, 2009 p. 8).
Another argument against MCE is that the underpinning of multiculturalism lies in cultural relativism, a doctrine considering all cultures equal, none of them being superior, nor inferior. D’Souza and Williams (1996) claim that the irony about cultural relativism is that even minority cultures do not accept this doctrine, since each culture considers their own values, norms and believes superior to other cultures. What is more, Glazer (1997) contends that MCE will teach untruths, threaten national unity and civic harmony and will not raise the achievement of minority groups. Glazer (1997) and Webster (1997) continue that MCE strongly emphasizes race and ethnicity, which only creates division rather than inclusiveness; multiculturalism will weaken assimilation, which in the past united immigrants with diverse cultural background into (American) common culture. Therefore, Ravitch (1991/1992) and Stotsky (1001/1992) agree that school’s responsibility is not to preserve and transmit separate cultures but to open children’s mind to new ideas and possibilities while teaching one common (American) culture.

As it could be observed, MCE has multifaceted interpretations both in favor of and against its goals and effectiveness. Since this study narrowed down the focus of MCE to linguistic and cultural diversities, the concepts of language, culture and acculturation need further discussion.

2.3.3 Language and Culture

Many authors offer definitions of language and culture and also concur that they are highly interwoven.

Language is defined as a means of verbal, non-verbal, oral and/or written communication that shapes cultural and personal identity and socializes one into a cultural group (Gollnick & Chinn, 2006). Jay (2003) states that language is a critical tool in developing self-awareness, intellectual and psychological growth, and Sheets adds (2005, p.16) that ‘human language is a cultural tool used to share, convey , and disclose thoughts, ideas, values and feelings through words, signals and/or written language’ and ‘to preserve and sustain a cultural heritage and history.’

Culture is universal, multifaceted and intricate and it may comprise aspects such as values, fundamental ideas, norms, attitudes, behavior styles, language, nonverbal communication,
perspectives, etc. used to explain the world around, guide people’s behavior and solve problems (Sheets, 2005; DeCapua and Wintergest, 2004)’. Cultural practices are shared within and across groups and they represent a dynamic process of adapting to the environment (Gollnick and Chinn, 2009)

These authors also concur that language and culture are interlinked, since language is used as a strong cultural tool to make inferences about what culture represents, intentions, perceptions and ideas of others and in that way contribute to students’ cognitive performance and social adjustment. In pluralistic societies such as Norway, linguistic and cultural diversities are represented in all life spheres and followed by the process of acculturation.

2.3.4 Acculturation

Acculturation ‘comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first hand contact with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups’ (Redfield, Linton and Herskovits, 1936 cited in Berry, 1997). According to Berry (1997) there are 4 types of acculturative strategies: Assimilation, if minority group does not want to maintain their own culture but only interacts with the new culture; Separation, if minority group places a high value on their culture and avoids interacting with others; Integration, if minority group maintains their culture and interacts with the dominant culture; Segregation, if minority groups’ culture is rejected by the dominant culture. A part of acculturative process occurs in educational environment, so it is highly significant to address culturally relevant pedagogy.

2.3.5 Culturally Relevant Pedagogy

An integral part of multicultural education and highly relevant for addressing linguistic and cultural diversities is culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP).

CRP enables teachers to ‘develop the knowledge, skills, and predispositions to teach children from diverse racial, ethnic, language, and social class backgrounds (Weinstein, Curran, & Tomlinson-Clarke, 2003, p. 270)’ and ‘understand the experiences and perspectives students
bring to educational settings and be responsive to the cultures of different groups in designing curriculum, learning activities, classroom climates, instructional materials and techniques, and assessment procedures’ (Kirk-Iand 2003, p. 134, cited in Oran 2003-2009)

Many authors (Pratt, 2008; Ambrosio, 2003; Gay, 2003a; Craviotto & Heras, 1999) concur that CRP will enable students to use their linguistic and cultural potentials, previous experiences in their home and current living countries; give them the opportunity to express and realize different learning styles and collaborative learning, achieving common learning outcomes; all in all to provide richer learning opportunities and common outcomes. That is why Gay (2000b) describes CRP as validating, multidimensional and empowering.

As this section familiarized the readers with the basic concepts of MCE and created the basis for discussing participants’ understanding of MCE, the next 4 sections based on Cummins’ framework will immerse more deeply into the pedagogy and practice of MCE.

2.4 Linguistic/Cultural Incorporation

Cultural/linguistic incorporation refers to what degree native languages and cultures of CLD learners are included in school (Cummins, 2001). Banks (1999, p.14 & 15) refers to the similar notion as content integration, which ‘deals with the extent to which teachers use examples, data, and information from a variety of cultures and groups to illustrate the key concepts, principles, generalizations, and theories in their subject area or discipline.’ In this study mother/ minority language will be used interchangeably to refer to the child’s first language other than Norwegian. This category represents one of the main debates in the field of MCE and will be further elaborated by presenting conflicting interpretations.

2.4.1 Linguistic Incorporation

Using mother languages alongside majority language is quite controversial and confronted in theories and empirical research.

On one hand, Cummins’ common underlying proficiency (CUP) hypothesis and threshold hypothesis (TH) (Cummins and Swain, 1986) argue in favor of using minority languages. The
former (CUP) states that beneath the surface of first (L1) and second language (L2) there is a common underlying proficiency which enables linguistic and cognitive transfer from L1 to L2. Therefore, children learn concepts as they learn L1, and those concepts could be transferred to L2. Moreover, the latter (TH) states that there is a difference between everyday language acquisition which takes 2 years and academic language acquisition which takes 7 years.

Holmen (2006), Cummins (1986) and Gravelle (1996) continue that children’s social and cognitive development is promoted best if they can use their entire linguistic and conceptual repertoire, including the first language and knowledge gained through it. Furthermore, Garcia (2009) argues that teaching in more than one language enhances metalinguistic awareness, divergent thinking and communicative sensitivity, but it also adds to socioeconomic benefits, cultural awareness and identity, as well as social and local interactions. In addition, Krashen (undated) contends that literacy in L1 enhances the literacy in L2 and points to several reviews (Zappert and Cruz, 1977; Troike, 1978; Cummins, 1983; Krashen, 1996 cited in Krashen, undated) showing that bilingual programs are more effective than all-immersion English programs.

On the other hand, some studies evidence the equal/lower levels of performance of learners attending bilingual programs in comparison to the learners attending monolingual programs. Moreover, in some cases the learners attending bilingual programs experienced poor mastery in both languages, semi-lingualism (Cummins, 1986; Tsushima and Hogan 1975; Danoff, 1978; Baker and Kanter 1981; Rossell and Baker, 1996 cited in Krashen, undated).

As refugee learners’ education is concerned, Tannenbaum and Howie (2002) argue that devastating circumstances may affect language and cultural development of young children. However, Baker (2006) contends that the war impact on refugee’s language patterns remains under-researched.

As discussed in Norwegian context section, CLD learners are entitled to curriculum in basic Norwegian, mother tongue education and bilingual subject teaching but only with the transitional purposes until children acquire sufficient level of Norwegian competence. In Norwegian research, Bakken (2003, cited in NMER, 2007) showed that minority language students who received mother tongue education at early age exhibited higher achievement compared to the rest of minority students.
Depending on the use of minority and majority languages, one of the most eminent authors in the field, Baker (2006) draws a difference between weak and strong forms of bilingual education. Weak forms of bilingual education comprise the transitional form, where the language of the classroom moves from minority to majority language, and the societal and educational aim is assimilation and monolingualism; and separatist form where minority language is used in the classroom and its aim is detachment and developing limited bilingualism. On the other hand, strong forms of bilingual education comprise maintenance/minority language form which places the emphasis on mother language and aims at maintenance, pluralism, additive bilingualism and biliteracy; and dual language form which has both mother and second language represented and aims at maintenance, pluralism, additive bilingualism and biliteracy. One of the aims of this study is to provide greater insight into the form of bilingual education practiced in the school and its relation to other aspects of multicultural education.

2.4.2 Cultural incorporation

Apart from language, schools that integrate and value CLD learners’ minority cultures positively influence their education.

Bruner (1986) describes learning as a communal activity and sharing of cultures, and Gravelle (1996, p.8) adds that ‘learners need both the curriculum that motivates and has relevance for them’. If CLD learners develop their multicultural identity, they can easily embrace and follow the norms and customs of both minority and majority societies and cultures. Hernandez Sheets and Chew (2003) argue that the linguistic and cultural match enhances greater communication underpinned by collaborative learning, emotionally and academically comfortable climate and sense of belonging. Moreover, empirical research implies that familiarizing with other cultures reduces the prejudice among majority/monolingual students (Ovando, Collier, and Combs, 2003).

Policies in Norway state that CLD children’s cultures should be appreciated and taken as a resource (cited in NAFO, undated). In Norwegian research Svendsen (2006) showed that the development of multilingual identity in minority language children in Oslo positively influenced their socio-psychological aspects. Hauge (2007) emphasizes that all minority
students in Norway should experience identity affirmation and that schools must treat minority cultures as something resourceful rather than inferior. In order to include minority languages and cultures of CLD learners, school-parent collaboration, but as well teacher collaboration are highly significant.

2.5 Community Participation

Community participation refers to involving the minority parents into children’s education through interaction with the school (Cummins, 2001). This category will add the teacher collaboration and therefore present how Norwegian and bilingual teachers, special teachers, collaborate among each other, as well as how they collaborate with the parents of learners with diverse linguistic and cultural background (CLD).

2.5.1 Teacher Collaboration

The most effective teaching and learning for CLD learners occurs when it is underpinned by good collaboration and planning between the teachers (Department for Education and Skills, 2003).

Creese (2005) presents collaborative modes between English as additional language (EAL) teachers and subject teachers that could be applied to other teaching teams. In partnership mode, both teachers have equal status in greater timetable continuity, where they share educational beliefs and principles, plan and deliver their classes taking both lead and support roles. In support mode, EAL teachers lack the continuity of time and place in the classroom, they try to target as many students as possible without focusing on subject area and they assume more observational and advisory roles. Bourne (2001) and Cable’s study (2004) show that the most common roles of bilingual staff are supporting teachers in classroom activities, providing a link between school and home, being a role model for bilingual pupils and assisting in assessment.

However, many research studies show the hierarchical patterns between subject teachers and bilingual staff, characterized by the dominance and greater authority of subject teachers
(Martin-Jones and Saxena, 1996 cited in Creese, 2005 p.4). Also most Norwegian research (Valenta, Myklebust, 1993; Vedøy, 2008 cited in Kjørven, Ringen and Gagne 2009) point to the challenges mother tongue and bilingual teachers face, reflected in the underestimation and reluctance to cooperate by subject teachers, insufficient time to collaborate with subject teachers due to travelling between several schools, being treated exclusively as interpreters, their feeling of inferiority, etc. Norwegian strategic plans aim to hire more bilingual teachers and provide opportunities for their formal education.

2.5.2 Parental Involvement

Another form of collaboration that might enhance children’s learning outcomes is parental involvement. Gardner (2001, p. 82) contends that ‘Real home-school partnerships help to create positive conditions for learning including mutual support of children, improved self-esteem, confidence, motivation and independence’. Moreover, research studies show that parental involvement has a positive impact on the learners’ performance and academic achievement, increased cognitive competence, enjoyment, attendance and fewer behavioral problems (Melhuish, Sylva, Sammons et al., 2001; Fan & Chen, 2001). In addition, Epstein and Dauber (1991) found that teachers’ active encouragement increases parental involvement, benefits children’s reading achievement and also develops parents’ positive attitude towards school’s good intentions. Parental home support with reading particularly benefits learners’ reading achievement, expressive language skills and language comprehension (Gest, Freeman, Domitrovich & Welsh, 2004).

According to Norwegian research (Baken, 2003; Birkemo, 2000, cited in NMER, 2007) minority parents have very high expectations of their children and their support has a great positive impact on minority students’ achievement but it depends on the relationship between home and school.

Nevertheless, certain challenges arise in involving parents in school activities. Arias and Campbell (2008) concur that the main barriers to parental involvement are school-based, such as undervaluing of parental importance and hostile school environment; parents’ lack of majority language proficiency and low level of formal education which inhibits their
communication with school and providing academic support to their children; discrepancies between school culture and home culture, such as parents’ expectations of teachers. As we discussed in Norwegian context section, policies encourage schools to form parental councils that would protect parental and children’s rights and enhance home-school collaboration. That is why Gardner (2011) advises that the aims of home-school liaison need to be transparent and a part of a whole-school approach.

Apart from outside-class aspects such as these forms of collaboration, in-class aspects, such as classroom pedagogy are also significant.

2.6 Pedagogy

Classroom pedagogy underpinned by positive reciprocal interaction between teachers and learners, flexibility, facilitation, guidance and collaborative learning leads to the academic achievement of CLD learners. Multicultural education and culturally relevant pedagogy include classroom pedagogy which is appreciative of learning styles and collaborative learning.

2.6.1 Learning Styles

According to learning style theory students have their preferred ways or styles of learning and educational curriculum and instructions that match students’ learning styles also increase their academic achievement (Irvine and York, 1995).

Gay (2000b) argues that cultural match in the teaching-learning process is essential in educating CLD children’s. Although there are cultural learning styles that relate different ways of learning to different minority populaces, such as African-American, Hispanic etc. this study will remain on the general notion of learning styles, since the aim is not to investigate particular minority groups and generalize to those groups, but to examine how classroom pedagogy meets different learning styles in general. Therefore, it aims to examine how the classroom pedagogy relates to VAKR perceptually-based learning styles.

Fleming (2001) established VAKR in order to measure the input information by referring to four perceptual references: visual (V), aural (A), read/write (R), and kinesthetic (K). Visual
learners think in pictures and learn best by using visual images such as body language, reading and writing tasks, charts, demonstrations etc. Auditory learners deploy listening to interpret information by the means of pitch, emphasis and speed. Read/write learners prefer learning from printed text. Kinesthetic learners rely on touching and moving, which is the interaction with physical world. Losey (1997) reviewed 8 research studies and pointed to the pedagogical power of learning styles with CLD learners, since their feeling of acceptance and appreciation was higher, their reasoning as well as the scores in writing and reading increased. In order to use learning styles as resources, collaborative learning could be encouraged among CLD learners.

2.6.2 Collaborative Learning

Banner (1997) argues that teachers need to group learners on the basis of their learning style and in that way encourage peer- support, collaborative learning and student independent learning.

The teacher could group together learners who share the same learning style, in that way presenting the material in the same way and enabling the learners to solve the task in the same manner. On the other hand, grouping learners who have different/ complementary learning styles gives a new perspective to learning based on competitive motivation, vitality and higher attention. Gay (2000b) argues that special emphasis should be placed on creating ethnic, racial, gender, social and ability diversity within the group, which will inevitably be underpinned by goals of multicultural education. On the other hand, group homogeneity can be addressed by providing learning tasks that require multiple abilities. In that way pupils can ‘complement each other’s strengths and compensate for each other’s weaknesses (p.167)’. Moreover, the compositions of the group should be constantly changed so all the students will experience different ability configurations.

Diamantes (2002) states that group work in the class will raise cohesiveness and lower competitiveness, especially in mathematics and science classes where he finds individualism and competitiveness particularly emphasized. Moreover, Stevens and Slavin (1995) demonstrate in their study that cooperative learning had positive impact on students’ increased interethnic social interaction, academic achievement and confidence. Gay (2000b) continues that collaborative learning leads to positive racial attitudes, increases minority
students’ achievement and self-esteem. As discussed in Norwegian context, policies leave
greater flexibility to schools in grouping children, but stress that grouping should be based on
diversity in ability, ethnicity and language.

In order for all the discussed aspects to be implemented, quality assessment of CLD learners
in many aspects is necessary.

2.7 Assessment

According to Cummins, the assessment of CLD learners should consider children’s societal
and educational background (Cummins, 2001). Ortiz and Ochoa (2005) claim that CLD
children should be assessed using linguistically and culturally nonbiased and
nondiscriminatory tests and Shepard (1996, cited in Garcia, 2009) adds that their performance
should be seen as a continuum related to second language acquisition and language of
instruction should be adjusted accordingly.

Nevertheless, Garcia (2009) points to the difference between language proficiency and
content proficiency saying that independent assessment is quite complex. Gollnick and Chinn
(2009) contend that many educational and intelligence tests actually measure standard forms
of the language and measure intelligence based on criteria relevant for the dominant society
without accounting for minority cultures. Most of these authors concur that the relevant
aspects of assessing CLD learners are mother/second language proficiency, academic/subject
knowledge, acculturation and special educational needs.

2.7.1 Language Assessment

When assessing language proficiency, the levels of language for social purposes and academic
language are important in both mother and second language, so appropriate support could be
provided. The use of both formal and informal tests (interviews, observations) is advised in
order to evaluate different aspects of language since formal tests might assess only one aspect
of language, for instance vocabulary (Ochoa & Ortiz, 2005; Garcia, 2009). There are several
suggestions in assessment: taking students educational history and literacy factors into
account, comparing learners with their fellow-pupils of similar background, reflecting on the

2.7.2 Cognitive/academic Assessment

Cognitive assessment should be performed in the learner’s strongest language or in the combination of first and second language (Flanagan, Ortiz, & Alfonso, 2007). Academic assessment will depend on the educational history of CLD learner, such as previous language of instruction, as well as the level of second language acquisition (Blatchley & Matthew Y. 2010). Standard tests do not reflect adequately CLD population in linguistic and cultural terms. Garcia, (Garcia, 2009) claims that if tests are translated from the dominant language the meaning content can be lost and can have an impact on the performance, plus bilingual CLD learners might not have the same language proficiency in native language as monolingual CLD learners. For both cognitive and academic assessment additional forms of informal assessment, such as interviews and observations may be conducted to obtain a fuller image.

2.7.3 Assessing Acculturation

Acculturation, the child’s level of adaptation to mainstream culture and consequent educational expectation, should also be taken into consideration. It encompasses ‘language use and preference, social affiliation, daily living habits, cultural traditions, communication style, cultural identity, perceived discrimination, family socialization, and cultural values’ (Schon, Shaftel, & Markham 2008, p.179). According to Ochoa & Ortiz (2005) this information can be gathered from both children and parents by means of interviews, observations and questionnaires.
2.7.4 Special Educational Needs Assessment

Baker (2006) argues that bilingual children are often over-represented in special needs education due to culturally and linguistically biased tests. A distinction between the development of first/second language and physical/learning/behavior difficulty needs to be drawn. Therefore, social, cultural, family, educational and personal information needs to be the basis for the valid and reliable assessment that will decide for the placement in either mainstream or special education. Some of the strategies Baker advises in assessment include:

a. temporary difficulties such as language delays and temporary adjustment problems of immigrants should be distinguished from permanent difficulties; b. diagnosis needs to include wide diversity of measurements and a multidisciplinary approach, involving psychologists, doctors, counselors; c. learners should be assessed in their stronger or both languages; interpreters can have a valuable function.
3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to offer a greater perspective into the study’s research methodology. The study is underpinned by qualitative approach and constructivist paradigm, which seems to have provided the most suitable basis for addressing the phenomena of the study: **How does a primary school in Norway address learners with diverse linguistic and cultural background?** The approach will deploy a case study design, purposeful sampling, interviews as data collection tool and qualitative data analysis. The whole procedure of data collection will be presented and the issues of validity, reliability and ethics will be addressed. The chapter will focus on both strengths and weaknesses of all the methodological aspects.

3.2 Qualitative Approach

According to Hennik (2011, p.10) qualitative research is used for ‘providing in-depth understanding of the research issues that embraces the perspectives of the study population and the context in which they live... for exploring new topics or understanding complex issues; for explaining people’s beliefs and behavior; and for identifying social and cultural norms of a culture or society.’ Moreover, qualitative research is usually underpinned by constructivist paradigm, which aims to understand people’s lived experiences from their own (emic) perspective, acknowledge that reality is socially created and recognize the subjectivity of both researcher and participants (Hennik, 2011; Gall, Gall & Borg, 1996; Rubin and Rubin, 2005). In education research qualitative approach ‘seeks to explain what is happening in educational situations, using the perspectives of those involved’ to ‘understand the complexities of educational process and the nature of teaching and learning’(Burton & Barlet, 2009,p. 18).

In this study the qualitative approach will serve to understand the complexities in educating CLD learners by accounting for the multiplicity of linguistic and cultural diversities, social and classroom interactions, the collaboration among teachers and parents, assessment procedures etc. Furthermore, it will elicit participants’ understanding of multicultural
education and its relation to their beliefs and practices. It will also provide the opportunity for participants’ voices to give a value to certain pedagogies and practices and disseminate good examples, but at the same time point to challenging aspects in multicultural education and their potential overcoming. Qualitative approach in this study is supported by a case study design, purposeful sampling procedure, interviews as data collection methods and qualitative data analysis.

3.3 Case Study Design

This study will employ a case single study design, which was found most suitable to address the complexity of educating CLD learners.

Case study is ‘the in-depth study of one or more instances of the phenomenon in its real-life context that reflects the perspectives of the participants involved in the phenomenon’ (Gall, Gall and Borg, 1996, p. 447). This study will employ a single case study design (Yin, 1994), which examines one particular case in order to give an insight into a specific phenomenon (Punch, 2009; McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). Punch (2009, p.119) adds that case study’s ‘general objective is to develop as full an understanding of this case as possible… to understand the case in-depth, and in its natural setting, recognizing its complexity and its context. It also has a holistic focus, aiming to preserve the unitary character of the object being studied.’

By the overall intent, the design will have the elements of an instrumental case study, which uses descriptive data with the intent to analyze, interpret and theorize about how and why the phenomenon operates in a way it does (Merriam, 1998; Springer, 2009). Furthermore, Gall et al (1996) suggest that the case study should have the focus, one or more aspects/themes/topics on which data collection and analysis will concentrate.

In this study a single case study design will provide a holistic investigation of the phenomenon, the multicultural education of CLD learners, by selecting one primary school as a case. The phenomenon will be narrowed down to five aspects equivalent to the five categories of the theoretical framework, understanding of multicultural education, cultural/linguistic incorporation, community participation, classroom pedagogy and assessment.
3.3.1 Strengths and Weaknesses in Using Case Study Design

Many authors (Springer, 2009; Gall et al, 1996; Hennik, 2011) state that the main advantage of case study is the richness of information as a result of an intensive focus on one case. A single case study design brought about thick descriptions of the case and participants’ perspectives and in that way enhanced the comprehension of the phenomenon and increased the study utility for further research or practical improvements. The importance of having a single case resides in providing an in-depth perspective into each of the 5 aspects of MCE studied, and then performing a holistic cross-analysis of all the aspects, since all of them are highly interwoven with the impact on each other.

On the other hand, relying on a single case creates difficulties to generalize from the results if there is no comparison group or case with similar characteristics (Gall et al, 1996; Springer, 2009), which will be more discussed in the validity and reliability section. Furthermore, Gall et al (1996) argue that case studies could be labor-intensive especially in analyzing and reporting the data. In this study four and a half - hour interview material required time-consuming transcription and extensive data analyses.

3.4 Sampling Procedure

The sampling procedure employed in this study is purposeful sampling, which assumes selecting cases, such as individuals, groups, places, events that are likely to be information-rich in relation to particular phenomenon (Gaul et al, 1996; Cohen and Morrison, 2007; Mcmillan and Schumacher, 2006). For selecting both the case, a primary school, and the interview participants, school’s deputy principal, two teachers and counselor, this study will use a type of purposeful sampling called criterion sampling. Criterion sampling involves the selection of cases ‘that satisfy an important criteria… and most likely would yield rich information’ (Gall et al, 1996, p.184) about the phenomenon. Moreover, sampling involved using gatekeepers, persons of certain knowledge or on a recognized position that can provide the access to the study community (Hennink, 2011).
3.4.1 Selecting the Case

The case in this study is one primary school in Norway and the characteristics considered relevant to address the study phenomenon and yield richer information were:
- having pupils from various cultural/linguistic backgrounds;
- having minority languages used in teaching
- having bilingual teachers employed;

In order to find this type of a school, the researcher consulted the National Centre for Multicultural Education (NAFO), the association with high engagement in Norway’s multicultural education policy and practice. After four schools had been proposed by NAFO, information was obtained from the schools’ official websites and their characteristics were compared against the mentioned criteria. Finally, the school that exhibited the highest correspondence with the criteria was contacted and the agreement to so-operate in the study was reached.

3.4.2 Selecting Interview Participants

The four interview participants in this study are four members of school staff, the deputy-principal, two general teachers in lower grades (1-4) and the counselor. Some of the participants’ characteristics considered relevant to address the study phenomenon and yield richer information were:
- having experience in working with CLD learners
- having different roles
- having different linguistic and cultural background
- participating in mutual collaboration

The gatekeeper for choosing the interview participants was the school leader, who was considered knowledgeable enough of the school organization and staff’s roles. Based on the researcher’s suggestions, as well as the availability and good will of participants, the school leader accepted to be the first participant and successfully chose the remaining three: two general teachers who used to collaborate together in the classroom and the school counselor. The significance of having these four participants will be more evident after presenting their profiles in the following chapter.
3.4.3 Strengths and Weaknesses of the Sampling

The strength of purposeful sampling lies in providing the school that is information-rich not only in its structure and organization, but also in the school staff with long experience in working with CLD learners. Since the research sub-questions cover a broad scope of multicultural education, the engagement of participants with different roles from the same setting enabled a perspective into all five aspects of the phenomenon through different perspectives, and consequently resulted in a holistic approach to the phenomena, vivid and complementary data, and more comprehensible image.

On the other hand, the weakness of purposeful sampling was the difficulty to find a school that was informative of research phenomena. Although there are many schools in Oslo with high percentage of minority children, according to their official webpages very few of them actually practice any kind of bilingual education. The uniqueness of this school prevents the generalizability as there are not many schools with similar features, but on the other hand brings richer data relevant for the phenomenon. Moreover, due to diverse educational backgrounds and occupations of the participants, comparison between their responses was challenging since they were more or less experienced in different areas. However, their responses turned out to be complementary resulting in thick descriptions for all the five aspects studied.

3.5 Methods for Data Collection: in-depth Interviews

This research uses qualitative or the so-called in-depth interviews as the method for data collection.
Hennik (2011) claims that in-depth interviews are used when the researcher seeks to capture people’s individual voices and stories, how people make decisions, their beliefs and perceptions, the meaning they attach to their experiences, and the context surrounding their lives.
By the purpose, these are key informant interviews, which refer to collecting data from individuals who possess certain knowledge, experience and different perspectives relevant for the study phenomena (Gall et al 1996; Lodico, Spaulding & Voegthe, 2010). By the interview format, these interviews are the combination of an interview guide approach and standardized open-ended interview proposed by Patton (1990), in which basic questions can be worded in a predetermined way, while permitting the interviewer more flexibility in probing and exploring certain subjects in greater depth or undertaking new areas of inquiry.

3.5.1 Strength and Weaknesses in Using in-depth Interviews

In this study the advantage of using qualitative key-informant interviews was eliciting participants’ perspectives, disseminating their rich experience and penetrating into the layers of the study phenomenon. The chosen interview format was particularly significant, since it used the advantages of both interview guide approach and standardized open-interview. The flexibility of the former allowed further clarification and deeper exploration of certain topics and at the same time brought about new unanticipated topics, such as confronting opinions regarding bilingual education, special needs assessment, etc. The latter enabled the set of predetermined questions posed to all the respondents in a slightly flexible order, in that way increasing the comparability of their responses and facilitating coding and analyzes of the data.

On the other hand, both of the mentioned formats had their weaknesses. The flexibility of interview guide in sequencing and wording questions may result in different responses and reduced comparability, whereas standardized wording of questions may constrain and limit naturalness and relevance of answers. However, coding, which will be explained in data analyses, turned out to be an effective strategy to decrease comparability disparities and organize the data presentation and discussion. What is more, doing interviews requires a lot of transcription (Hennik, 2011), which was one of the main and most time-consuming challenges encountered by the researcher due to the language barrier in research-participants relation.

Although many authors (Yin 1994, Gall et al, 1996) propose triangulation, using multiple sources of data as an advantage of case study, this research will remain on interviews as a data
collection tool. The only one of the five study aspects that could be observed was classroom pedagogy, and that is why observation was ruled out as the possibility to triangulate. Furthermore, the attempt to employ document analyses, such as relying on school documents, reports, etc. was dismissed since all the documents were available only in Norwegian.

3.6 The Process of data Collection

In order to grasp a fuller image of how the whole process took place, its continuity will be presented by referring to the pilot interview, gaining the access, choosing the participants, conducting the interviews, as well as discussing the challenges during the process.

3.6.1 Pilot Interview

Opie (2010, p.115) proposes doing pilot interviewing, a trial version of the interview before the data collection, in order ‘to eliminate any ambiguous, confusing or insensitive questions, to check the length of the time for the interview and to check that confidentiality and anonymity are maintainable’. A pilot interview was conducted prior the whole process with a Polish teacher of Norwegian as a second language. Due to her experience in teaching Norwegian to Polish learners she was considered sufficiently knowledgeable to discuss the study phenomenon. The pilot interview resulted in quite valuable reflections:
- the pilot-interviewee was unclear with certain questions, so they were modified to enhance the comprehensiveness;
- approximate time for the whole interview as well as for each subtopic was verified;
- the researcher’s feeling and anxiety regarding tape-recording was tested and controlled during the interview.
- many of the examples from the participant’s practice matched the theoretical and empirical perspectives from the theoretical framework, which increased researcher’s self-confidence and helped him anticipate the possibly informative answers from the future participants.
3.6.2 Gaining the Access

Gall et al (1996, p. 458) claim that ‘identifying appropriate sites and working with gatekeepers to obtain necessary permission are critical steps in a case study.’ This study adopted their four-stage strategy in gaining access:

First, identifying people within the field with whom to make initial contact: NAFO was consulted in finding a suitable school for the study.

Second, selecting the best method of communication to deliver the request; after choosing the school, the researcher’s supervisor made a phone call to the school due to formality and potential language barrier.

Third, deciding how to phrase the request; in an informal meeting with the school leader the researcher familiarized the school with the study’s content, procedures, as well as the school’s possible benefits from the study.

Finally, being prepared to address questions and concerns that might arise; the whole process of gaining access went unhindered.

Using gatekeepers not only resulted in the selection of the information-rich case but it also facilitated the process of negotiating, reaching agreement and choosing the interview participants.

3.6.3 Choosing the Interview Participants

Selecting the interview participants was discussed with the deputy-principal based on the approximate criteria suggested by the researcher. Eventually, the four interviews were scheduled; the first interview was with the deputy-principal and the remaining three with two teachers and a school counselor two weeks after the first interview. The participants were provided with the informed consent and interview guide copies in advance so they could get familiarized with the research content, procedures and ethical issues, as well as to reflect on the topics to be discussed.

3.6.4 Conducting the Interviews

The process of doing the interviews was rather pleasant and unobstructed. All of the interviews lasted from forty to ninety minutes resulting in four-and-a-half-hour audio
material. The first interview with the deputy principal provided a lot of information about the case, and the remaining three interviews were conducted 2 weeks afterwards. The second interview was held on one day, and the remaining two on the following day. All of them took place in the school offices during the teaching hours; the participants were once again briefed with the study background, ethical considerations and the topics to be discussed; they were asked for the permission so the conversations could be tape-recorded. The two-week period between the first and remaining three interviews allowed the researcher to reflect on the first interview, get familiar with the case and modify the questions to be more comprehensive and meaningful.

3.6.5 Challenges in the Process

Although there were various positive outcomes in the data collection process, some challenges also emerged but fortunately with no negative impact on the study. First, the time for arranging the interviews was not flexible due to the demanding start of the school year, which resulted in arranging the last three interviews on two consecutive days. This prevented the researcher from reflecting thoroughly on the prior interviews and refining the questions. Furthermore, on the day of the last two interviews, unanticipated changes in class organization occurred with one of the teachers, so this interview lasted shorter than the other three. Nevertheless, the interview resulted in rich data probably due to participant’s fluency in English language and knowledge and experience regarding the phenomenon. Another challenge was the language barrier in overall, since the English language used in interviews was not the first language of either the researcher or the participants. However, the researcher’s personal impression was that only two participants might have had difficulties to fully express their opinion, whereas the other two mainly voiced their opinion with no obstacles.

Being a new researcher, the feeling of anxiety and uncertainty could not have been avoided. Nevertheless, as the interview process started, the participants’ positivity, willingness to collaborate, richness of information provided, etc. made the process more relaxed and constructive.
3.7 Data Analysis

Yin (1994, p.111) argues that choosing the right strategy of analyzing the data will ‘help you to treat the evidence fairly, produce compelling analytic conclusions, and rule out alternative interpretations.’ Therefore, this study will use the combination of two strategies for analyzing data in case studies: relying on theoretical propositions as a primary strategy and examining rival explanations as a secondary strategy. In order to conduct these strategies, it will employ interpretational analyses suggested by Gall et al (1996).

3.7.1 Relying on Theoretical Propositions and Using Rival Explanations

Many authors (Yin, 1994; Baxter and Jack, 2008; Punch, 2009) argue that a case study should be guided by propositions, theoretical orientations guiding the case study analysis and helping to filter the relevant data.

In this study, propositions are equivalent to five aspects of the study developed from the theoretical framework and used to generate research sub-questions, develop interview guide and finally analyze the data. Moreover, the secondary strategy of examining rival explanations aims to define and test rival explanations; therefore the criticism of multicultural and bilingual education will be particularly used in discussing multicultural education in general and cultural/linguistic incorporation.

3.7.2 Interpretational Analyses

In order to relate the data to the theoretical framework this study will use interpretational analyses, which refers to ‘examining case study data closely in order to find constructs, themes and patterns that can be used to describe and explain the phenomenon being studied’ (Gaul et al, 1996, p.466).

First, segmenting the database was performed by compiling the case study data into the computer database. Second, developing categories, which assumes developing a set of categories that adequately encompass and summarize the data, was facilitated by relying on the five-category theoretical framework. Additional 2 categories were added, information about participants and information about the school. Further subtypes in each category were determined also based on the theoretical framework.
Each of the 7 categories was assigned a number from 1-7, which were further used to \textit{code the segments} of the data. The interview guide approach facilitated this process because the interview transcript was based on the theoretical framework. However, since all the categories are interlinked, some information about one category was provided during the discussion about some other category. Therefore, \textit{grouping category segments} with their constant comparison within and across categories was carefully performed in order to encompass all the information provided by the participants. Finally, \textit{drawing conclusions} was conducted first by recognizing the patterns and then by referring to the theoretical framework.

3.7.3 \textbf{Strengths and Weaknesses in Qualitative Data Analysis}

Qualitative analyses resulted in vivid data and valuable interpretations. First, relying on theory enabled more structured and meaningful interview questions, this further facilitated the process of coding and categorizing the segments. Moreover, referring to rival theories supported the confronting opinions of the informants and led to the critical discussion of multicultural education from two opposing viewpoints.

On the other hand, four- and- a- half hour interview material resulted in a large body of data entailing a great amount of time to be processed in the two-month period. Moreover, the structural change in the school, which will be explained in data presentation, presented a barrier in analyzing the data since participants’ comparison of the conditions before and after the changes was inevitable during the interviews. However, it created a fertile basis for critical discussion since the two before and after conditions represented two opposing stands of multicultural and bilingual education and the opposing perspectives of the participants.

3.8 \textbf{Criteria for Judging the Quality of Research Design: Validity and Reliability}

Gall et al (1996) argue that some major proponents of case study suggest a positivist approach in the assessment of the quality and rigor of case study by giving greater value to validity and reliability like in quantitative research. Being one of them, Yin (1994) claims that four tests are commonly used to establish the quality of any empirical social research including case
study: construct validity, internal validity, external validity and reliability will be employed to address the quality of this study.

3.8.1 Construct Validity

Construct validity (Yin, 1994) refers to demonstrating that selected measures reflect the selected aspects of phenomena in the study. Some of the strategies proposed to enhance construct validity are triangulation, establishing chain of evidence or having key informants review draft case study report. As the absence of triangulation was explained, this study will employ establishing chain of evidence, which enables the reader ‘to follow the derivation of evidence ranging from initial research questions to ultimate case study conclusions’ (Yin, 1995, p.105). Many authors (Gibbert, Ruigrok & Wicki, 2008; Gall et al, 1996) propose reporting study circumstances such as the context, environment, order of events, organization access, interview selection approach, activities, members’ perceptions and meanings etc. Most of these aspects were presented in the previous sections. Moreover, the authors suggest involving a peer academic to review the drafts of the study, which was also being conducted during the whole process by the research supervisor.

3.8.2 Internal Validity

Internal validity is concerned with instrumental case studies in which some causal relationships are established. The theoretical framework for this study is mainly based on Cummins’ theoretical framework, which has propositions showing certain causal relationships. One of the strategies proposed to enhance internal validity is pattern-matching, which compares empirically observed patterns with the predicted patterns (Denzin & Lincoln, 1984; Eisenhardt, 1989 cited in Gibbert et al, 2008). That is why Cummins’ framework was extended by going deeper into each of the categories and incorporating other empirical research relevant for each category. Moreover, using rival explanations provides the researcher with the verification of the findings through adopting multiple perspectives (Yin, 1994). Since the topics of multicultural and bilingual education are quite debatable among the authors and practitioners, the rivalry theories such as the criticism of multicultural education, separate underlying proficiency and semilingualism were used to interpret the participants’ opposing viewpoints.
3.8.3 External Validity

External validity ‘deals with the problem of knowing whether study’s findings are generalizable beyond the immediate case study (Yin, 1994, p. 37).’ Yin claims that this is one of the main critics of single case study, as it offers a poor basis for generalization. Nevertheless, he points to the difference between statistical generalization and analytic generalization. The former is used by surveys to generalize from observation to a larger universe or population and the latter is used by case studies in which ‘the investigator is striving to generalize a particular set of results to some broader theory’ (Yin, 1994, p. 37). This study is largely based on the theoretical framework provided by Cummins which already contains certain theoretical propositions and the school represents a non-typical example of a primary school in Oslo due to its bilingual practices. Therefore, the main aim of this study was not to generalize to other cases, but rather to the theoretical framework that was employed.

3.8.4 Reliability

Reliability (Yin, 1994) aims to ensure that if a later investigator followed the same procedures to conduct the same case study all over again, it would result in the same findings and conclusions. One of the prerequisites to achieve this is to document all the steps of the procedure. Therefore, this study employed the strategy proposed by Yin- using a case study protocol, which contains an overview of the case study project, field procedures, case study questions and a guide for the case study report. Prior to data collection the researcher developed a case study protocol with both formal and informal descriptions regarding a case study project (Appendix 4). For instance, apart from general research questions and objectives, the researcher included the useful ideas, tips and means that could be applied during the data collection but as well as data analyses. In that way, going back and forth to different improved versions of the case study protocol, greater consistency and effectiveness in the process of data collection and analyses was yielded.
3.9 Ethical Issues

In order to address the ethical issues I employed some of the measurements offered by Gaul et al (1996) such as informed consent, privacy and confidentiality and adequate data interpretation.

3.9.1 Informed Consent

Informed consent (Appendix 3) is used to familiarize thoroughly the participants with the purpose and content of the study in order to help them gain greater understanding of the study and their voluntary participation (Faden and Beauchamp, 1986). The informed consent containing the research goals, procedures and topics to be discussed was delivered prior to the very interviews, so they would have enough time to decide about their participation and eventually reflect on the topics to be discussed. Before the interview, the researcher briefly went through the consent with the participants in case some additional clarification was necessary.

3.9.2 Confidentiality and Anonymity

Confidentiality and anonymity are concerned with protecting data accessibility and participants’ identities (Social Science Research Ethics (SSRS) a.). First, the phenomenon of this study concerns CLD learners, many of whom belong to vulnerable groups such as religious minorities or refugees (SSRS b.). Therefore, particular care was given not to reveal any culturally or religiously sensitive stories. Furthermore, case study requires ‘thick descriptions’ of the setting and informants (Lodico et al, 2010). Not only did I anonymize the names of informants and school by using pseudonyms, but I also sensibly weighed between reporting the data that reveals identity on one hand and data relevant for analysis on the other hand.

3.9.3 The Adequate Interpretation/Reporting

The adequate interpretation/reporting of data should minimize researcher’s bias and consider risk-benefit ratio. Researcher’s personal bias may influence the data interpretation (Gall et al,
1996; Punch, 2009; Cohen et al.,2007) so both the supporting and counter theories and empirical research of multicultural education were used in analyzing the data. Moreover, the only potential anticipated risk would be creating discomfort in professional relationship between the deputy principal and the rest of the participants due to conflicting opinions. However, the deputy-principal already pointed to the conflicting attitudes within the same school, so the benefits of this case study so far seem to out-weight the risks; as discussed the study appears relevant for the current national context and the school will also benefit from participating in the collaborative learning process by receiving the feedback of the study.
4 DATA PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to present and discuss the data in relation to the theoretical framework. Since the two selected participants are teachers in lower grades, from first to fourth grade, the discussion will mainly refer to the learners in these four grades. First, some general information regarding the school and participants’ background will be presented as relevant for understanding the case and context of the study. Second, it is rather relevant to highlight the structural, organizational and practical changes that occurred in this school in the last two years, since this unanticipated fact certainly had an impact on data analyses. Moreover, data will be presented and discussed in five categories based on the theoretical framework: understanding the concept of multicultural education, cultural/linguistic incorporation, community participation, pedagogy and assessment. In each of the category first participants’ comments will be presented by referring to direct quotation of their speech; afterwards in the same category discussion will be conducted in relation to the theoretical framework; finally, each category will be reflected upon through the prism of Cummins’ framework.

4.2 The Case of a Primary School

The selected school in this study is a primary school that has always been attended by learners from diverse linguistic and cultural background. Nowadays the school composition includes more than 50% of minority children and more than 20 languages, mostly non-European, such as Somali, Urdu, Arabian, etc.

According to participants’ words, the school experienced changes in its structure and practice two years ago. This is something that prevailed in participants’ comments as a constant ‘before and after’ comparison, which certainly had an impact on data analyses in this study. The comparison before and after the changes is presented in the table:
TABLE 2: PRESENTING THE CHANGES IN THE SAMPLED SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEFORE THE CHANGES</th>
<th>AFTER THE CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>language of instruction in the classroom:</strong></td>
<td><strong>language of instruction in the classroom:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilingual teaching; minority languages</td>
<td>dominant language Norwegian language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alongside Norwegian language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>the number of minority language classes:</strong></td>
<td><strong>the number of minority language classes:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8 lessons per week</td>
<td>2-4 lessons per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher collaboration in the classroom:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Teacher collaboration in the classroom:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 bilingual and Norwegian speaking</td>
<td>teachers mostly working independently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers working together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing learners/classes:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Organizing learners/classes:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learners with the same minority language</td>
<td>no grouping based on the same minority language background;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background in the same class; mix-age grouping</td>
<td>no mix-age grouping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogical/methodological program:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pedagogical/methodological program:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Years Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study will tend to include the presentation and discussion of both previous and current state, since they are the bases of the participants’ opposing viewpoints.

4.3 Interview Participants

The profiles of the four participants will provide some of their characteristics crucial for further discussion.

**Reginald** is a school deputy principal, a doctor of history and archeology with the international education, and further training in pedagogy. He has a 35-year experience that
encompasses teaching in special and mainstream schools, working in school administration and being a school leader. He speaks Scandinavian languages, German, English and Italian.

**Rachel** is a general teacher in grades 1-4, with the educational background in preschool education. Her experience includes working as an assistant and teacher in preschools and primary schools. Languages she speaks are Urdu, Norwegian and a little bit of English.

**Julia** is also a general teacher in grades 1-4, with the educational background unrelated to teaching, and teacher education undertook later. Languages she speaks are Norwegian and English, and a little bit of German and French.

**Roberta** is a school counselor, with the educational background in teaching, social pedagogy and migration pedagogy. Her former experience involved teaching in primary schools, and now as a counselor she supports learners, collaborates with teachers, parents and other pedagogical and health professionals. Languages she speaks are Urdu and Norwegian.

After familiarizing with the case and interview participants, the study will present and discuss the data based on the five-category framework comprising understanding the concept of multicultural education, cultural/linguistic incorporation, community participation, pedagogy and assessment.

### 4.4 Understanding the Concept of Multicultural Education

This section aims to focus on participants’ understanding of the concept of multicultural education. Understanding was one component coupled with Cummins’ four-component theoretical framework, since it was highly relevant to see how participants’ understanding influences or relates to school’s practices. Therefore, participants’ understanding of cultural diversities and multicultural education will be presented and discussed in order to answer the first research sub-question: *How is the concept of multicultural education understood?*
4.4.1 Presenting the Understanding of Cultural Diversity

The participants gave various interpretations of cultural diversity by referring to different aspects.

Reginald’s understanding of cultural diversity included different types of foods, costumes, holidays and religions, whereas language was not mentioned as a part of cultural diversity.

On the other hand, Rachel’s first association for cultural diversity was language: ‘my children have to learn their own language, mother tongue is their key for learning another language... if you are very clever in your own language, you can learn another language, and if you are proper in your own culture, then it’s good to learn other culture too...’ She regarded cultural diversity as positive since the cultural exchange in multicultural groups enhanced learning outcomes unlike in mono-cultural groups.

Moreover, in Julia’s words cultural diversity was ‘that people can expose common things and different things in the culture that is open, that several languages are spoken on a daily basis... for example... newsstands have papers in various languages...it’s something that’s visible in society...’

Compared to other participants, Roberta gave the most encompassing interpretation of cultural diversity, saying that ‘culture is language, religion, traditions and how to practice this. And culture is changing all the time, it is not like 50 years ago like when I was a child, it’s changing all the time... when we have children from different cultures so I think that it should be visible in every lesson...’

4.4.2 Discussing the Understanding of Cultural Diversity

As it was presented in the literature chapter, language and culture are highly interwoven as language is considered a strong cultural tool denoting the dynamic aspects of culture such as values, fundamental ideas, norms, attitudes, behavior styles, language, nonverbal communication, perspectives (DeCapua &Wintergest, 2004; Gollnick&Chinn, 2009).

As it could be noticed, a common component of cultural diversities for Rachel, Julia and Roberta was the representation of different languages in school and daily life. Roberta
offered the most encompassing perception of cultural diversity and she also pointed to the ever-changing nature of culture, which could probably be ascribed to her educational background and occupation. On the other hand, in Reginald’s understanding culture and language do not seem necessarily inseparable, since language was not mentioned as a component of cultural diversity. Moreover, during his discussion he was highlighting foods and restaurants of minority populaces, which could denote Banks’ (2001) impoverished definition of multicultural education.

Although the participants have some knowledge about cultural diversity, none of them involves values, fundamental ideas, norms, attitudes, behavior styles. The three participants relate it mostly to linguistic aspect, whereas Reginald does not include language in cultural diversities. These conflicting interpretations regarding whether minority language is a part of culture seem to have an impact on their visions of multicultural education.

4.4.3 Presenting Understanding the Concept of Multicultural Education

Understanding the concept of multicultural education seems to reflect the understanding of cultural diversity.

Reginald commented on CLD learners’ education that: ‘It’s very important that their cultural background is being taken care of… and being developed… that they learn about the Norwegian culture, society and language so that they shall be able to participate in Norwegian society but they shall also be proud of their cultural background, because that’s the fundamental basis they have…”

For Rachel the key point was that children should be aware of and understand different languages and cultures: ‘if they can understand you can say good morning in different languages, they can understand that the same thing can be used in different languages… to give them picture of another culture…”

The first association for Julia was ‘that children are able and allowed to use the language … teachers use various languages in the day to day education…” She stressed that Sami and other minority children need to learn how to read and write in their mother languages.
Roberta provided an all-embracing understanding of MCE: ‘when we have children from different cultures…it should be visible in every lesson… how language is spoken, what is the difference between Norwegian and Camille or Arabic, Urdu… how traditions are practiced at home… and cooperation with parents is very important… the kids from Pakistan I think it’s very important that we have also teachers from Pakistan … I think it is very important for kid’s identity and self-esteem that they see different example, the adults from their country, or culture, or religion...’

4.4.4 Discussing Understanding the Concept of Multicultural Education

According to culturally relevant pedagogy teachers should “understand the experiences and perspectives students bring to educational settings and be responsive to the cultures of different groups in designing curriculum, learning activities, classroom climates, instructional materials and techniques, and assessment procedures” (Kirk-Iland 2003, p. 134, cited in Oran 2003-2009). Berry suggests integrative acculturation as the most empowering, since it maintains minority culture and enables the adaptation to the majority culture.

As in cultural diversity, what represented a common element of multicultural education (MCE) for Rachel, Julia and Roberta was the everyday use of minority languages in teaching, raising children’s linguistic and cultural diversity awareness and increasing literacy in mother languages. Once again, Roberta showed a more extensive interpretation of MCE in comparison to others, since she comprised tradition, parental cooperation, and minority teachers as role models. On the other hand, Reginald does show the appreciation and value of maintaining mother cultures, but interestingly using minority languages in teaching is not an integral element of his understanding of MCE.

Many of the opponents of multicultural education argue that its inefficiency in practical implementation resides in not having a common definition of what MCE represents. Therefore, these clashing opinions might have an impact on school practices.
4.4.5 Pause to Reflect

Apart from Roberta, the rest of the participants seem to have narrow understanding of multicultural education, since none of them includes pedagogical aspects of learning styles, collaborative learning, or incorporating cultural elements in school activities. The most relevant point to highlight is that the use of minority languages is an integral part in Rachel’s, Julia’s and Roberta’s understanding of both concepts, whereas it is absent from Reginald’s understanding of the concepts. These differences in understanding certainly reflect the participants’ conflicting opinions and educational practices that will be revealed in other four categories of Cummins’ framework, particularly in the following section.

4.5 Cultural/linguistic incorporation

Cultural/linguistic incorporation refers to including minority languages and cultures of CLD learners in their education (Cummins 1989). Not only is this a quite debated matter among theorists and practitioners, but it also evokes the conflicting opinions among the participants, especially concerning the changes within the school discussed. In this section, participants’ opinions regarding cultural/linguistic incorporation will be presented and discussed in order to answer the second research sub-question: *How are minority languages and cultures included in educating learners with diverse linguistic and cultural background?*

4.5.1 Presenting Linguistic Incorporation

Participants’ viewpoints regarding the use of minority languages reflect their disagreeing in understanding the concept of multicultural education, as well as reflect the two conditions before and after the changes in school.

**Reginald** described the system of bilingual education in the school: ‘You have grade 1-3 they have some lessons every week where they are split into the languages groups… so then they have their bilingual teacher in their own language… In 4th grade up to the 7th you have
bilingual teachers who are present in some of the lessons and explaining to the kids in their mother tongue if they don’t understand Norwegian.’

For him ‘the right you have to so-called special Norwegian, mother tongue and bilingual, is that to teach in bilingual and mother tongue is a mean to teach Norwegian…’ Moreover, he pointed to the semilingualism of the newcomers, most of whom being refugees: ‘when they come here they have poor vocabulary in both languages, you can imagine if you show them 2 languages parallel … that’s going to be very difficult … the school administration in Oslo is actually sharing my opinion… those who have a good knowledge of their mother tongue…that’s better to develop that language together with Norwegian because they can use mother tongue to understand Norwegian… ’ He attributed CLD learners’ low proficiency in both languages and weak education to war circumstances in their countries of origin. The first benefit of using minority languages that he mentioned was that ‘the pupils will understand Norwegian better, but depending on how good they are in their mother tongue.’ Moreover, he considered it is good for the parents who are not able to provide their children with good knowledge of mother languages, but still the school is not legally able to offer full teaching of mother languages as parents would like.

On the other hand, Rachel, Julia and Roberta discussed the changes that occurred in the schools’ structure and consequently in the use of minority languages. There used to be 2-3 teachers in the classroom practicing bilingual teaching and 6-8 hours of minority language teaching a week. They also agreed that educational authorities were not in favor of teaching in mother languages.

Rachel replied that ‘in this school, we are very fond of children can speak their own language, they can write their own language,’ that many parents are not able to provide their children with mother tongue so ‘that’s why it’s really necessary for this school to give them that they can speak their own language better…and then they can learn better Norwegian too…’ She gave an example of a Pakistani girl who came to school ‘and after six months she begins to talk Norwegian… because she had so much mother tongue language… so I want to have all the newcomers those who can’t speak Norwegian appropriate they have to go to one class with their own language…’ The teacher added that the school provides bilingual books for the newcomers and a site for Pakistani children in Urdu with songs and stories, all created by bilingual teachers. One of the challenges Rachel encounters is when a child does not speak Norwegian and she does not know their minority language.
Furthermore, Julia gave an example how she uses mother languages to teach phonetic aspects of Norwegian by comparing the sounds and letters from different languages. She was more in favor of the previous system since ‘one of the advantages of having proper bilingual education is that children don’t stop learning the subject, they learn the subjects they taught the subjects, learning all the way in the language that they master, it is better.’ She also exemplified the use of mother languages: ‘when we went into a new topic, mother tongue teachers would make... an entry to the subject, what do the children know already....and they used to follow up along as we went... but now we don’t have that, we don’t have any start in mother tongue as we used to, so now it’s mostly in Norwegian...’ She considered that children who do not speak Norwegian will face challenges in new subjects, particularly ‘when it comes to developing the vocabulary, also concepts in the subjects that are central those will be most ailing... for example how nature works.’ Nevertheless, she concluded in an optimistic way that teachers need to use the school potentials and resources to the maximum, that they need to be good at structuring the education and at varying their methods more than the time when minority language used to be the bridge.

Robert pointed to the decrease in mother language teaching: ‘now in first grade we have two lessons a week, and it is reduced after that... two lessons I think is not enough... two years ago we had 4-5 lessons in the first grade, 4 lessons in the second grade and in third grade maybe ten lessons per week.’ She added that it was the easier way for children to learn to speak and write Norwegian if they had techniques and literacy in their mother tongues. What is important to stress is that according to her observation and conversations with parents and teachers ‘children who learned reading and writing in their mother language are doing better than other children...I think now our children they are weak in their mother language, they are weak in Norwegian... often it is the main reason that they can’t speak Norwegian very, very well...’

4.5.2 Discussing Linguistic Incorporation

The changes in school had a strong impact on the use of mother languages, which is the most crucial point that confronts the viewpoints of the study participants. The arguments in favor of bilingual education prevail.
According to many authors and studies using minority languages in teaching CLD learners facilitates their linguistic and cognitive transfer from L1 to L2, enhances their social and cognitive development, metalinguistic awareness, but it also adds to socioeconomic benefits, cultural awareness and identity, as well as social and local interactions (Krashen, undated; Holmen, 2006; Cummins, 1986; Gravelle, 1996).

All of the participants seemed to be in agreement with Cummins’ CUP hypothesis concurring with the fact that mother language can be used for achieving Norwegian competence and teaching subjects. However, Reginald claimed that only children who are already proficient in mother languages should be given mother language/ bilingual teaching in order to acquire Norwegian, which has an assimilating purpose leading towards monolingualism (Berry, 1997). On the other hand, Rachel, Julia and Roberta were more in favor of previous school practices, highlighting the higher effectiveness and benefits of bilingual education. The three of them favored bilingual education in many aspects by providing examples of linguistic, phonetic, literacy and cognitive transfer from L1 to L2, supporting Cummins’ threshold hypothesis by pointing to the difficulty of academic language, claiming that bilingual education brings higher academic performance, etc.

On the other hand, some research demonstrates that children attending bilingual programs have equal or lower achievement compared to the ones attending monolingual programs, or they even experience semilingualism (Krashen, undated). First, Roberta claimed that learners who received mother tongue and bilingual support performed better compared to the learners who did not receive this support, which was in accordance with Bakken’s study in Norwegian context (NMER, 2007). Second, both Reginald and Roberta concurred in semilingualism of CLD learners, but with the difference in its causes; Reginald attributed semilingualism to war circumstances in learners’ countries of origin, and Roberta to the decrease in mother language teaching. Tannenbaum & Howie (2002) add that devastating circumstances may affect language and cultural development of young children, whereas Baker (2006) argues that the war impact on refugee families’ language patterns remains under-researched. Semilingualism in this study needs further investigation before taken as a reason for/against bilingual education.

The Education Act (2010) does not specify under which circumstances CLD learners should be provided mother tongue/ bilingual tuition, which leaves great flexibility to the school for its implementation.
In addition, Baker (2006) makes a difference between strong bilingual education, which aims at maintaining minority language and developing bilingualism and weak bilingual education, which emphasizes second language acquisition and assimilation. Apparently, this school experienced a shift from a strong form towards a weak form of bilingual education, since the number of mother language classes was higher and bilingual teaching was practiced in classes, whereas now the number of mother languages reduced and the dominant language in classroom is Norwegian.

4.5.3 Presenting Cultural Incorporation

All of the participants show high appreciation for minority cultures mainly referring to national holidays and religion. **Reginald** emphasized the importance of minority children taking part in Norwegian culture, and how the school tries to provide the opportunities for different kinds of activities: ‘we must help the parents... to expand their culture and of course the religion is very important, even more here than in their own country’. He said that the school will appreciate and take care of different religions, but at the same children and parents should act according to Norwegian laws. He concluded ‘we want to help them to give their children a good understanding of their culture...’

**Julia** related culture incorporation mainly to holidays: ‘when it’s Ramadan, we talk about Ramadan, when somebody is celebrating Divali we bring that into the class... we also used to do that with smaller minorities, we had quite small group of Indian, various languages... so we also made sure that Indian children had their culture represented.’ Moreover, children would have the understanding of their environment, the way they live, the school culture or if they meet somebody’s parents.

**Roberta** added: ‘We have many cultures here...but it is not so easy when we don’t have adult person who represent the cultures’. Moreover, she gave examples of including holidays, religious festivals etc. such as Id, Christmas, 24th October, Easter, Sami’s national day etc. The counselor continued: ‘we have four religions in primary school, we teach Islam, Christianity, Judaism and Hinduism’, so these subjects include one visit to each of the religious buildings where religious representatives inform children about the religion and its
practice. Roberta added that children who attend kindergartens acquire Norwegian language and culture, but 30-40 % children in the school’s first class had not attended kindergarten, ‘…but minority children need much more to go to the kindergarten to socialize, to learn the language, if they start in the school they have much more difficulties…” Moreover, the counselor adds that many parents realize that their school is not so special anymore since mother teaching is reduced. However, ‘this is better than nothing... we are trying, but one of the problems is that we have not a common platform.’

4.5.4 Discussing Cultural Incorporation

Bruner (1986) describes learning as a communal activity and sharing of cultures, and Gravelle adds that (1996, p.8) ‘learners need both the curriculum that motivates and has relevance for them’. If CLD children develop their multicultural identity, they can easily embrace and follow the norms and customs of both minority and majority societies and cultures. Hernandez, Sheets, and Chew (2003) argue that the linguistic and cultural match enhances greater communication underpinned by collaborative learning, emotionally and academically comfortable climate and sense of belonging.

All the participants seemed to have high appreciation of minority cultures of CLD learners. Reginald was the only one who emphasized the importance of children’s participation in Norwegian culture, whereas others were more focused on minority cultures. Julia and Roberta provided richer examples of cultural incorporation, such as including religious festivals and holidays in school activities, as well as appreciating the cultures of smaller minority groups. Roberta mostly related culture to religion, which seemed to be given a great value in the school as being represented in formal teaching and practical experience as well.

However, cultural incorporation was mainly related to traditions, holidays and religion, since no examples of using minority cultures in everyday teaching and curriculum were mentioned. This might correlate to participants’ understanding of culture already discussed. Also many opponents to multicultural education claim that stressing race and ethnicity create division,
and in this case stressing particular religions might create conflicts with minority religious groups.

4.5.6 Pause to Reflect- Cultural/ linguistic Incorporation through Cummins’ Prism

According to Cummins, educators’ role in relation to cultural/ linguistic incorporation can be characterized along an additive-subtractive dimension. Before the school used to be at the additive part of the dimension since it used to practice bilingual education and add a second language and cultural affiliation. Now, the school appears to have slightly moved from additive end towards the subtractive end, since it seeks to replace learners’ minority languages but maintain minority cultures at the same time. Overall, most of the participants seemed to be in favor of the previous system of bilingual teaching. However, they are still optimistic about the new system hoping to establish a new organization and collaboration in order to contribute to the education of CLD learners.

4.6 Community Participation

Community participation refers to involving minority parents in their children’s education in order to achieve positive academic outcome. This study will add to this category another form of collaboration highly significant for CLD learners’ education- teacher collaboration. Therefore this section will present and discuss the collaboration among teachers, and the collaboration between school and minority parents in order to answer the third sub-question:

What is the collaboration like among school staff and parents?

4.6.1 Presenting Teacher Collaboration

This section will examine the collaboration between teachers highlighting the collaboration with bilingual teachers, but also including special teachers.
Reginald emphasized the independence of bilingual teachers, since having them is not only an advantage due to their bilingualism, but also due to their subject teaching. He continued that a characteristic of Norwegian teachers is to discuss, test, suggest and adjust their teaching pedagogies, but unlike them ‘some bilingual teachers have very strong feelings about the work they are doing... I don’t know if that’s a cultural background but it can be difficult to discuss change in the educational methods for instance ...’ He commented that some of the bilingual teachers are not as strong as teachers with Norwegian educational background. Moreover, he would like to have more teachers from with minority background with education gained in Norway, such as Somali or Arabian, who would be good role models for learners and parents.

On the other hand, Rachel, Julia and Roberta concurred in favor of the previous organization when one Norwegian and two bilingual teachers used to work in the same classroom sharing subject planning and teaching. Now bilingual teachers have more responsibilities with subject teaching and less time for bilingual training. Rachel considered that ‘it was very easy before when we had ... one Norwegian teacher and two language teachers in class...’ Julia added that ‘...especially when it comes to language development, I don’t think it is good enough... I think it should be better...’ Roberta contended that ‘now they discuss the general principles and going to their place, Norwegian teachers are making the subject plan, Somali mathematics...so they are not so much together...’ Moreover, she commented that now minority language teachers do not have the same status as regular teachers, since they are not in charge of classes, collaboration with parents, but only responsible for teaching minority languages 2-4 lessons per week.

Nevertheless, the two teachers seemed quite optimistic and appreciative of the current situation. Rachel said … ‘but we do our best and we have cooperation with other teachers... everybody is happy for their own children.’ Julia added: ‘I have to appreciate that we have bilingual teachers here I think that’s the most important thing ...even if we don’t have as much as cooperation as we used to...’

Special teachers are also important members of the team, since according to Rachel ‘we have to collaborate with that teacher ...because I am not a specialist in special children I have to if I want the best for my children... Roberta continued: ‘there are psychologists, pedagogues, language experts... they also come to the school, assess the children, collaborate with parents, write reports and eventually individual educational plans are created.’
4.6.2 Discussing Teacher Collaboration

School changes not only affected the use of minority languages, but also had an impact on teacher collaboration. Interestingly, once again participants’ opinions clash, but the collaboration with bilingual teachers was considered highly valuable.

**Reginald** insisted on the independence of bilingual teachers in their subject teaching, whereas **Rachel, Julia** and **Roberta** characterized the previous system of collaboration as more beneficial and effective. According to Creese (2005), the previous school organization seemed to be underpinned by partnership mode of collaboration between Norwegian and bilingual teachers, since they shared equal responsibilities and time in the class. The following changes created new patterns which divided the in-class teacher teams; so on one hand, the status of some bilingual teachers received a higher significance, since they became independent in subject teaching, but on the other hand, the collaboration in bilingual practices decreased and some minority language teachers’ roles seem to be reduced to teaching mother language. Collaboration with both special teachers and minority language teachers could be characterized as Creese’s support mode, since the former targeted various learners and assumed observational and advisory roles, and the latter came to school mostly to teach minority languages.

Nevertheless, having bilingual teachers in the school was considered a resource by all the four participants. According to Bourne (2001) and Cable’s (2004) study the most frequent roles bilingual staff performed was supporting teachers, liaising between school and home, being role models for teachers and assisting in assessment. First, participants pointed to the support bilingual teachers provided to Norwegian teachers in various aspects. Second, all the participants praised bilingual teachers’ relation with minority parents, how they involve the parents, interpret and gain their trust. Third, they emphasized the significance of having bilingual teachers as role models in teaching, celebrating minority cultures, etc. Fourth, in the assessment category bilingual teachers’ involvement in assessment will be shown, as they interpret in parental interviews, help in distinguishing between low Norwegian and learning disabilities, etc.

However, according to Norwegian research there are some challenges in collaboration with bilingual teachers. **Roberta** contended that minority language teachers do not have the same status as other teachers. Moreover, **Reginald** commented on bilingual teachers’ inflexibility
in teaching methods, which might be the consequence of their conflicting opinions regarding the new changes and bilingual practices.

4.6.3 Presenting Parental Involvement

Parental involvement seemed to be given a high value in this school and all the participants are satisfied with home-school relationship.

Reginald stated that every school should have a parental assembly strongly represented in the school, however: ‘I tried for a year to establish an assembly, no success at all… I think they don’t want to involve in the system… we’ve tried… we don’t get positive response…’ He added that parents come and ask about their children, classrooms are open so they get involved in school activities, concluding: ‘so I think that the way in which we work with each pupil and each parent on that level is good.’ For him the advantage of parental collaboration was that parents get familiarized with school demands, they get encouraged to continue their education, for instance Norwegian language for mothers, and overall they are facilitated to become a part of Norwegian society.

Rachel confirmed that parents can come and participate in classes, for instance in reading activities they are encouraged to use mother languages. However, she said that some parents are discontented with Norwegian school, so the teacher advises them to improve the collaboration and set good examples in order to increase children’s eagerness and motivation for learning. The teacher is satisfied with parental collaboration because she sees the progress and achievement of children who are supported at home.

Julia replied: ‘I find that we have quite a good system of cooperation with parents… a lot of that is due to our bilingual teachers…’ Moreover, she reported many advantages of involving parents in the school: ‘Benefits are that the parents know what we demand… they follow up school work better… we have a week plan, and I always teach the parents how to use the plan at home … and how to be more involved with the child’s education… we ask them to translate or let the child translate, into their languages that gives them a better understanding of what’s going on in the classroom… those who are not familiar with Norwegian society demands and rights they get it through that as well.’
Roberta added: ‘We are very interested in parents getting involved much more... many parents who cannot speak Norwegian... have never gone to school... if they meet their teachers they ask always, they are very interested that their children are doing well in the school... ’ The counselor’s role is to involve them, especially the parents of children who have social or learning difficulties. She considers that communication with parents is facilitated by bilingual teachers, in gaining trust and dealing with sensitive issues such as informing about children’s special needs, etc.

4.6.4 Discussing Parental Involvement

The authors (Gardner (2011; Epstein & Dauber, 1991) argue that the home-school liaison needs to be transparent and that teachers’ active encouragement of parental involvement has a positive impact on parents’ attitudes towards school and children’s achievement. First, the school seems to maintain an open approach with parents; it is available for in-class participation, formal and informal consultations in order to help parents to understand better the school demands, environment and culture and to empower them to support their children. Second, according to all the participants the school actively encourages parental engagement which has positive impact on learners’ academic performance. Moreover, according to Reginald and Roberta parental involvement is also beneficial for parents themselves, as they get acquainted with Norwegian culture, improve their Norwegian and possibly continue their education.

Gest et al (2004) claim that parental support highly benefits children’s literacy; interestingly once again Rachel and Julia gave an example how they encourage to use their mother languages in order to enhance children’s reading, writing and second language acquisition.

Nevertheless, Arias et al (2008) point to school-based barriers in parental involvement, such as undervaluing of parental importance, parents’ low level of majority language and formal education preventing them from communicating with school and academically supporting their children and discrepancies between school culture and home culture. Some of these barriers were reported by the participants: there are minor cultural diversity clashes which are overcome easily; many parents do not know Norwegian, but bilingual teachers interpret and make links with them. In addition, according to Norwegian Education Act, schools should
have parental assembly, which seems difficult to establish in this school. Although parents are reluctant to involve on the systematic level, the individual collaboration between the school and parents appears to be at a high level.

4.6.5 Pause to Reflect- Community Participation through Cummins’ Prism

According to Cummins educators’ role is characterized along a collaborative- exclusionary dimension, in relation to community participation. Community participation regarding parents in this school seems to be at the collaborative part of the continuum, since the school actively encourages minority parents to participate in home support and classroom activities. However, a decrease in teacher collaboration could be noted, but the skills of bilingual teachers are still considered resourceful and are employed in all the aspects of multicultural education.

4.7 Pedagogy

Pedagogy suggests that classroom pedagogy underpinned by positive reciprocal interaction between teachers and learners leads to the academic achievement of CLD learners. Multicultural education and culturally relevant pedagogy include classroom pedagogy which is appreciative of learning styles and collaborative learning. This section will present and discuss the classroom pedagogy by focusing on the pedagogical program used in this school, ‘Early Years’, which had recently been introduced in this school. It lasts for 90 minutes comprising 6 stages of around 12 minutes each, and it is used for teaching Norwegian language and mathematics 4 days in a week. Early Years will be examined in relation to VAKR learning styles and collaborative learning in order to answer the fourth sub-question: What is the classroom pedagogy like?
4.7.1 Presenting Learning Styles

All of the participants discussed the variety in methods and materials in the Early Years program.

Reginald said that Early Years involves some grouping according to pupils’ abilities and potentials, but that mostly deals with differentiated tasks: ‘you have to have more than 1 possibility when you start teaching, different options, different kinds of tasks for different kinds of kids…’

Moreover, Rachel regards Early Years as a very useful and beneficial method due to its interaction and different types of activities. She gave an example of teaching the alphabet where first the teacher is at the front introducing the topic, then children do activities related to the topic, then go to computers to learn more about the alphabet and in the end they use the letters, make up words or read a book.

In addition, Julia stated that she needs to vary a lot so that everyone can grasp the essence of the tutorial and lesson, since some children are good at talking, some at listening; the school uses technical support such as smart boards, various pedagogic educational programs, but also provides a lot of guidance to children. She continued that Early Years is a very good way to vary the methods and activities and to enhance student-teacher interaction. For instance, ‘the literacy is based on guided reading, where you guide each one into reading through a mixture of learning the picture of the word not just each sound, visual aids and you have to do things as well.’ She described the diversity in structure and activities in Early Years, ‘one is teacher station, where you have a group and you can also have one to one, and then you have a station where you do tasks, written tasks, academic work which is directly linked to the tutorial with the teacher first… and then you have to break up the other tasks, stations, one is for example computer where you go through the educational program, and one can be arts and crafts, modeling, drawing, painting, whatever, depends what your theme is, and in mathematics it’s a lot of construction, geometric twice and tools.’ Julia highlighted variation as the main advantage of this program ‘Variation… it’s a good structure… yeah, I think it’s wonderful because you get this contact more time with your students, you really can guide them what they need… so yes I like the method…’
Roberta contended that this program is recently introduced so it is too early to evaluate its quality. If teachers know they have a child from different cultures or religion, all the possibilities should be used as strength, their identity, self-esteem and pride of themselves.

4.7.2 Discussing Learning Styles

Many authors include learning styles as a part of multicultural education. Student-centered teaching with teacher as facilitator will enable the learners to become active generators of their learning process (Cummins, 2011). Fleming (2001) designed VAKR system of learning styles in order to measure the input information by referring to four perceptual references: visual (V), aural (A), read/write (R), and kinesthetic (K).

First Early Years appears to be student-centered, since only in the first of six stages the teacher is at the forefront of teaching, and the rest five stages comprise teacher’s guidance and learners’ high interaction and involvement. According to the participants, this is what increases the interaction among the learners and enhances language exercise and knowledge exchange. Moreover, it seems to accommodate a range of different learning styles according to VAKR. Early Years seems to address visual, aural, read/write and kinestatic learners due to diverse video and audio technical support, reading and writing activities, as well as manual activities.

Gay (2000b) argues that cultural match in the teaching-learning process is essential in educating CLD children’s. Although all the participants stressed the importance of varying methods and differentiating materials, except Roberta none of them showed the awareness of the cultural match between teaching and learning styles.

According to the participants, Early Years program enhances students’ classroom mobility, teaches them how to learn from each other, increases the interaction necessary for exercising academic language, provides a variety of activities and materials and increases student-teacher interaction and guidance.
4.7.3 Presenting Collaborative Learning

The participants mostly exemplified peer-support and discussed learners’ grouping based on their ability or language background.

Reginald contended that ‘sometimes you group them the way you find most appropriate but not by the language, not in regular classes, then Somalis would sit and talk Somali, we don’t want that, we hope that Norwegian could be the language they have to use and understand each other…’ He added that learners are encouraged to work together, to rely on their fellow-pupils before asking the teachers for support.

Rachel commented on ability grouping during the Early Years: ‘We do it, it’s only 90 minutes they are the same level... it’s easier and they can learn...’ Apart from Early Years, children are not grouped according to their ability during the classes of music, social studies, science, etc. Moreover, she provided an example of peer-support: ‘I had one girl she came from Somalia, last week... but she can’t understand anything... but I am so glad I have 7-8 Somali children in my class so they translate all the time... so I used the children to help them.’

Julia concurred that children are usually grouped regardless of their ability except in some stations of the Early Years. She also groups newcomers with the learners of the same linguistic background, so they could be supported at the beginning. Julia considered the interaction outside Early Years extremely important for language development: ‘it’s important for them to interact, both to learn how to give and take from each other, take turns... focus on the language is extremely important, to talk but not just talk like you do it in school yard, you talk in the class about subjects, about things that you’re going through...it’s different using Norwegian in the school yard... they need to use language academically.’

Nevertheless, both Rachel and Julia expressed their uncertainty regarding Early Years in relation to learners with special needs and low-achieving learners. Rachel commented that ‘sometimes it’s very difficult for us because we have to somebody needs more help but we cannot give them more help... there are so many children in the groups... but those children who are low level... they used to take more time to begin one thing... ’ Furthermore, in Julia’s opinion ‘those with tendencies towards autism or children with behavior difficulties, but also children who are academically challenged... To move from one place to another at exactly same time, that’s not very easy for some of them...’
4.7.4 Discussing Collaborative Learning

According to Gay (2000b) and Education act (2010), children should be grouped based on diversity in ability, ethnicity, language, race and gender. The former structure of the school was not in accordance with this since it grouped learners based on their common linguistic background. The contemporary structure does not organize classes in that way, but discrepancies in attitudes linger. On one hand, Reginald considers that children should not be grouped based on the sharing mother tongue because they will use it instead of practicing Norwegian. On the other hand, both Rachel and Julia rely on peer support and collaborative learning between the newcomers and the fellow-pupils of the same minority language background. Once again Julia exemplified Cummins’ threshold hypothesis, stressing the interaction and collaborative learning as an effective way to practice the academic language that is different from the school yard language.

From participants’ comments, Early Years program includes ability grouping followed by differentiated tasks during Norwegian language and mathematics, as well as mixed ability grouping during the other classes. On one hand this ability grouping enables differentiation of tasks and materials for children on different levels, but on the other hand it could decrease the motivation of lower achieving learners and reduce their knowledge exchange with higher achieving learners.

In addition, both Rachel and Julia concurred that although rich and diverse in activities and materials, Early Years program confronted the learners with special needs and lower achieving learners with some challenges; the structure and time rigidity of each station prevents children with behavior problems to keep the pace with the changes in activity grouping and it also reduces the time for teachers to provide additional support to the students in need.

4.7.5 Pause to reflect- pedagogy through Cummins’ prism

According to Cummins, classroom pedagogy should be based on positive reciprocal interaction between teachers and learners and the educators’ role is characterized along a
reciprocal interaction oriented-transmission-oriented dimension in relation to this pedagogy. The overall pedagogy of Early Years seems to be at the interaction-oriented part of the continuum, since it is teacher-centered only in the first stage, and it encourages learners’ interaction in the following stages, in that way accommodating various learning styles, creating the basis for language practice and differentiating materials. Nevertheless, the lack of flexibility is a barrier for learners who are low achievers or have special needs.

4.8 Assessment

According to Cummins assessing minority learners should take into account learners’ societal and educational background. This part will present and discuss participants’ opinions and attitudes in relation to language, cognitive/academic, cultural background and special educational needs (SEN) assessment in order to answer the fifth sub-question: How are learners with diverse linguistic and cultural background assessed?

4.8.1 Presenting Language Assessment

Participants’ discussion regarding language assessment correlates to previous discussion about minority language incorporation.

Reginald’s comments reflected his viewpoint about using minority languages: ‘we are decided to test the mother tongue of Somali’s... and Arab speaking pupils in the same way we should test their knowledge in Norwegian... to find out where they are with the mother tongue... ’ In his words this assessment will be crucial in entitling mother tongue and bilingual teaching.

Julia gives a high value to both formal and informal ways of testing ‘to see how children’s language develops and how they develop socially... that needs to be regularly assessed... if they are able to use the words we’ve gone through, do they use them actively, can they use them in the other setting... ’ As well as Rachel, she mentioned the assistance of bilingual teachers in assessment, but she also drew the difference between previous and current state:
‘I used to work with several bilingual teachers, and they would assess the child at the start of
the term, and we worked together on their development … but now I’ve been on my own
without bilingual teachers… there is one bilingual teacher… sometimes if she has time I ask
her to test … for example if the child doesn’t seem to have any words in their mother tongue
for a certain topic’

Roberta brought in the tool for assessing Norwegian language in grades 1-4 that is used in
deciding for mother language/bilingual teaching. The tool tests 10 language categories and if
a child is weak (‘risiko’) in 4 categories, they send an application for mother
language/bilingual teaching. Learners who perform well in this test are not entitled to this
teaching. Julia and Roberta concurred that the school uses available reports from previous
education and conversations with parents to inform about mother and Norwegian language
proficiency.

4.8.2 Discussing Language Assessment

Many authors argue that both mother and second language should be assessed by means of
formal and informal assessment. Some of the strategies for ensuring the quality of assessment
are taking students’ educational history and literacy factors into account, comparing learners
with their fellow-pupils of similar background, reflecting on the results consistency across
formal and informal assessment, considering the quality of second language instruction, home
environment and parents’ proficiency in L1 and L2.

As it could be observed, for Reginald the main goal of mother language assessment should be
to determine the entitlement for mother language/bilingual support. On the other hand, Julia
seemed to find assessing mother language rather valuable, since it gave insight into learners’
continuous development. According to both Julia and Rachel, the reduced teacher
collaboration also had an impact on the assessment, since Norwegian speaking teachers used
to rely on bilingual teachers’ assistance. Julia gives a high value to the continuous assessment
of language by means of both formal and informal tests and in different contexts.

Unlike Reginald, Roberta did not include the minority language proficiency as the criteria
for mother tongue/ bilingual support, but only Norwegian language proficiency. The primary
goal of mother language and Norwegian language assessment seems to be deciding for
mother tongue/bilingual entitlement. Interestingly, the Education Act says only that ‘if necessary’ CLD learners have that entitlement, which leaves a great flexibility to schools to interpret and implement the law.

4.8.3 Presenting Cognitive/academic Assessment

Subject assessment does not use the grading system, so informal ways of assessment are employed and some conflicting attitudes also linger.

Rachel mentioned certain types of tests for mathematics and Norwegian language, but since there are no grades the school uses a lot of informal assessing: ‘I can take two or three children every week and talk with them individually then I can ask them did you need help here what do you want next… is it any difficult… do you need more easier or difficult…’

Julia challenged the quality of tests used with CLD children:

‘we use some tests or assessment papers, some of them are quite good but some of them are…because they are mostly in Norwegian, so I don’t get the full picture, I used to have a better picture of the child’s for example where that child needs to build the words, the concepts, and now I have only Norwegian bit to lean on and I don’t know as much I would like to about child’s language, how it learns and how it uses it…we should be more critical and to find one or more tests that are good they can use but I wish that we had a better system for bilingual training, and more cooperation with bilingual teachers …’

4.8.4 Discussing Cognitive/ academic Assessment

Flanagan et al (2007) argue that cognitive assessment should be performed in the learner’s strongest language or in the combination of first and second language. Gollnick and Chinn (2009) continue that many educational and intelligence tests are linguistically and culturally biased. That is why many authors suggest the employment of additional forms of informal assessment, such as interviews and observations, to obtain a fuller image.
Since there is no marking in the lower grades of Norwegian elementary schools, no great rigidity seemed to be placed on academic assessment and many evaluations are performed by the means of informal assessment. However, in Julia’s words the changes in the school had an impact on the quality of assessment. She showed more appreciation for the previous system when both mother and Norwegian language were used in assessing the learners, because the linguistic bias of some tests designed mostly in Norwegian prevents her from having the full image of child’s language and learning development. In conclusion, she called for improving bilingual training and collaboration, which only adds to the previous comments.

4.8.5 Presenting Acculturation Assessment

Getting informed about cultural background appears to be quite significant and well implemented in this school.

Rachel reported that they talk with children and parents to obtain the information about the cultural background, which gets recorded in portfolios, for instance ‘how much they have learned in English... maths, how are they with other children... social aspects...everything... how they are in class... are they neat and clean...’

Julia pointed to the benefit of assessing cultural background: ‘At the beginning of the term we ask about language background and some children may have many language backgrounds...we ask the children what kind of holidays they have... for example when it’s Ramadan, we talk about Ramadan, when somebody is celebrating Divali we bring that into the class...children have the understanding of their environment of the way they live...this is where they’re are growing up...school culture and surrounding around the school.’

Roberta reported various different ways of formal and informal inquiry about the background:

‘We should learn what kind of background, economically, socially, many things... We talk to the parents all the time. Very often when they start in the first grade I have some papers from kindergarten how they speak mother language...Norwegian language, how they are together with other children, social things, or how they cut things, color, motoric skills... but I have
many children who haven’t been to any place... so we talk to the parents all the time and we observe them here...’

4.8.6 Discussing Acculturation Assessment

Schon et al (2008, p.179) argue that cultural aspects should be assessed such as ‘language use and preference, social affiliation, daily living habits, cultural traditions, communication style, cultural identity, perceived discrimination, family socialization, and cultural values’ Ochoa and Ortiz (2005) suggest using different means for obtaining this information from children and parents, such as interviews, observations and questionnaires.

Assessing cultural background and cultural adaptation in this school seems to be given a high value, since participants mention different sources and focus of assessment. The school uses portfolios from kindergartens containing rich information about the child, their language, social competence, motoric skills, and for children who had not attended kindergartens the school uses continuous parental interviews and observation. Moreover, the school prepares their own portfolios based on conversation with both parents and children including the linguistic and learning development, child’s interaction with other children, tidiness etc. Informing about cultural background appears significant not only for the school to incorporate minority cultures in curriculum, but also for learners to gain better understanding of their environment. The school seems to give a great value to cultural background, the multidimensional approach to its assessment and its practical implication in organizing school activities.

4.8.7 Presenting Special Educational Needs Assessment

The assessment of special needs is quite relevant for CLD learners in order to distinguish between low language proficiency and learning disabilities.

Rachel pointed out that assessing children’s special needs is easier when they come from kindergartens with portfolios reporting their special needs. She added it is ‘very clever to have bilingual teachers... So I can see, I have one Pakistani child which is special and I can
understand when I talk with her I ask her do you listen /P/ so tell me did you find anything with /P/ in Urdu… if she couldn’t I can understand.’

Roberta drew the connection between low language proficiency and special needs: ‘When a child can’t speak Norwegian, we have all subjects in Norwegian, very often we feel they are weak also in mathematics, science, in other subjects… pedagogues and psychologists recommend extra help in Norwegian, mathematics, English… If a child is weak in Norwegian, the teachers, special teachers meet to discuss the ways how to support the child, they discuss the methods, materials, etc. before sending the application for extra help…’ Roberta also mentioned how assessment can be performed in both mother and Norwegian with the assistance of mother tongue/ bilingual teacher in order to distinguish between intellectual disabilities and low Norwegian proficiency: ‘… if they can in their mother language the same thing, they are reading better, they are writing better, and bilingual teacher can tell us that he speaks (the child) very well, we are not very worried about that… but if they can’t speak very well in mother language, can’t read, can’t write, it’s a big problem… We say they can’t any language…’

4.8.8 Discussing Special Educational Needs Assessment

Baker (2006) argues that social, cultural, family, educational and personal information needs to be the basis for the valid and reliable assessment that will decide for the placement in either mainstream or special education. Baker gives various suggestions to achieve this.

First, CLD learners should be assessed in their stronger language or both languages, which Roberta mentioned to be performed with the assistance of bilingual teacher, or Rachel supported by giving a phonetic example. Second, a variety of sources of information and multidisciplinary approach should be used, involving psychologists, doctors, special teachers. It was shown that various means of informal assessment, such as kindergarten reports, observation and interviews are used and from Roberta’s words and in teacher collaboration section all the specialists are involved in assessment. What is important, all the steps of pre-referral process are fulfilled before sending the application for special support. Third, interpreters are advised, and Roberta and Rachel emphasized the importance of bilingual teachers in assessing special needs and distinguishing between low language competence and
some learning difficulty. Finally, temporary difficulties such as language delays and temporary adjustment problems of immigrants should be distinguished from permanent difficulties. This aspect is related to semilingualism reported by Reginald and Roberta, but none of the participants mentioned the assessment of these issues, which additionally casts doubt on the validity of semilingualism as an argument against bilingual education in this case.

4.8.9 Pause to Reflect- Assessment through Cummins’ Prism

Assessment of CLD learners should consider children’s societal and educational background. Educators’ role is characterized along an advocator-oriented and legitimization-oriented dimension in relation to assessment. The assessment in this school appears to be advocator-oriented, since it is not exclusively based on psychological tests, but it employs mother languages, different sources of information such as kindergarten reports, interviews with parents, observation, multidisciplinary approach involving different specialists and bilingual teachers. However, the quality of assessment seems jeopardized by the decrease in using mother languages and teacher collaboration.
5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

This study aimed to investigate how one primary school in Norway addresses learners with diverse linguistic and cultural background. In other words, the generated five-category framework enabled the investigation of five aspects of multicultural education (MCE) in this school: **understanding the concept of MCE, cultural/linguistic incorporation, community participation, classroom pedagogy** and **assessment**. The qualitative research facilitated selecting a case of one primary school and interviewing its 4 staff members. To conclude the study, this section will reflect on both study’s strengths and weaknesses, it will present the main findings in a form of holistic perspective into school’s multicultural practices and finally it will offer implications for future research and the studied school’s practices.

5.1 Reflecting on Study’s Strengths and Weaknesses

This extensive study was accompanied by stronger and weaker points in several aspects. On one hand, the comprehensive theoretical framework included various aspects of multicultural pedagogies and practices relevant for CLD learners. In that way it provided a greater understanding of the phenomenon disseminating good practices and creating a useful guideline for practitioners in the field. Moreover, the qualitative approach enabled in-depth analyses of the phenomenon, selecting a suitable school to address research questions, employing interviews to give the voices to its participants. Furthermore, the thoroughly developed theoretical framework enabled clear organization and facilitated data analyses.

On the other hand, the study has a broad focus which requires extensive data collection and data analysis. The weaknesses of study methodology were addressed in the methodology section: the study involves one case that is not typical and therefore not generalizable. In addition, the study does not employ triangulation, various means of data collection, except interviews. Some other challenges were faced along the way such as a short time span to conduct the study, the language barrier between the researcher and participants.
5.2 Main Findings: Holistic Perspective into the Schools’ Multicultural Education

This section will provide a cross-analysis of the 5 categories in order to provide a holistic perspective into the school’s multicultural education and in that way highlight the main findings.

First of all, the participants’ did not show a broad understanding of MCE. Their conflicting understanding was mostly based on the use of minority languages, which evidently had an impact on the four categories of Cummins’ framework.

A decrease in minority language classes and bilingual practices was evident. Participants were more supportive of the previous system contending that bilingual teaching enhances linguistic and cognitive transfer. The only learners who are to receive mother language and bilingual support are the ones already strong at their mother tongue but weak at Norwegian. Moreover, CLD learners were reported to experience semilingualism, but its cause was not in the scope of this study. Nevertheless, mother language teaching and some kind of bilingual support was still provided due to the resourcefulness of bilingual teachers. Minority cultures are given a high value and appreciation mainly comprising national holidays and religions of CLD learners.

The school changes not only affected the use of mother languages, but also the patterns in teacher collaboration. Teacher teams comprising Norwegian and bilingual teachers that used to work together in the classroom were split, which led to the decrease in collaboration and bilingual practices. Although bilingual teachers’ status was raised by assigning them more responsibility in subject teaching, three out of four participants appeared discontented with the changes. However, the roles of bilingual teachers are rather versatile and valuable and the participants showed optimism in establishing new ways of collaboration to support CLD learners. In addition, the culture of home-school relationship was described as rather satisfactory by all the participants, the school was eager to engage the parents in school activities and home support. Although individual collaboration was satisfactory, the parents are still reluctant to join the parental assembly.

The school uses a pedagogical program ‘Early Years’, which was praised by all the participants. Its diverse activities and differentiated material enabled the teachers to vary their methods and address learners’ different learning styles. Moreover, collaborative learning
proved to be efficient for accommodating newcomers, enhancing learners’ language development and overall interaction. However, due to its structure and time rigidity, this program represents a challenge to learners with special needs and low achievement.

All the aspects of assessment seem to be highly met. The school employs the means of both formal and informal assessment, including educational history portfolios, observations and the interviews with parents and learners. Moreover, bilingual skills of the teachers are used in many aspects of assessment. However, a decrease in the use of mother languages and teacher collaboration also affected the quality of the overall assessment.

Although a certain decline in bilingual practices and collaboration occurred, this school could be characterized as a school that practices multicultural education and empowers learners with diverse linguistic and cultural background. It provides certain forms of minority language/bilingual teaching, it exhibits high appreciation of minority cultures, it considers bilingual teachers as resources by giving them equal teaching status and employing their bilingual skills, it develops a good home-school culture with learners’ parents, it creates a variety in its classroom pedagogy and gives a high value to all the aspects of assessment.

5.3 Implications for Future Research and School Practices

The comprehensive theoretical framework created the basis for five areas of research that could be explored in greater depth; that is the five sub-questions of this study. In particular, the areas that need greater research are semilingualism of CLD learners, the effect of bilingual practices on their SLA and academic achievement, cultural congruity between teaching, learning styles and forms of collaboration between Norwegian speaking and bilingual teachers and culturally sensitive assessment.

As far as school practices are concerned, there are several points that this study would like to suggest in order for the school to improve its practices. First, agreeing upon the mostly acceptable foundation of what multicultural education represents in the school environment; Second, more time and opportunities for teacher collaboration in order to use bilingual resources; third, reaching common criteria for assigning CLD learners mother language/bilingual teaching.; fourth, strengthening teachers’ skills in using Norwegian as a
second language in subject teaching; Fifth, incorporating more minority cultures’ elements into everyday class activities; Sixth, developing more quality and culturally responsive assessment tool.
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7 Appendices
APPENDIX 1: NORWEGIAN SOCIAL SCIENCE DATA SERVICE
APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. Understanding the concept of multicultural education
   How do you understand cultural diversities?
   How do you understand multilingual education?

2. Cultural/linguistic incorporation
   How do you include minority languages?
   How do you include minority cultural elements?
   What are the advantages of using minority languages/cultures?
   What are the challenges of using minority languages/cultures?

3. Community participation
   What is the teacher collaboration?
   How do Norwegian speaking teachers collaborate with bilingual teachers?
   What are the usual roles of bilingual teachers?
   What are the advantages/challenges in their collaboration?
   How are parents involved in children’s education?
   What are the advantages/challenges in their collaboration?

4. Pedagogy
   In what way the teaching matches pupils’ ways of learning?
   How do you group children in classroom activities?
   How do you encourage children to work together?
   What are the advantages and challenges in these kinds of interaction?
5. **Assessment**

How do you assess Norwegian and mother language?

How do you assess subject knowledge?

How do you get information about cultural and social background?

How do you assess special educational needs?

What are the advantages and challenges in assessment?

6. **Concluding remarks**

What is the most important thing to improve in your school practices?

Do you have any suggestions how the school can do it?
APPENDIX 3: INFORMED CONSENT

The researcher/institution: postgraduate student Milan Tosic; University of Oslo (UiO), Department of Special Needs Education; P.O.Box 1140 Blindern, 0318 Oslo

The purpose of the study: A postgraduate dissertation paper in the field of multilingual and multicultural education: Pedagogies and Practices that Meet Children’s Linguistic and Cultural Diversities. The study will discuss the topics such as the use of mother languages and cultures in teaching, collaboration among teachers and parents, classroom pedagogy/interaction and assessment procedures. The aim is to disseminate positive examples, to provide additional knowledge in the field of multilingual/multicultural education and help schools improve their practice in multilingual/ multicultural classrooms.

Procedures: The study duration is from 15th August – 15th December and the data is supposed to be collected in September. Up to four informants will be asked to participate in semi-structured interviews and they could include school leaders, Norwegian speaking or/and if possible bilingual teachers experienced in multilingual/cultural practices. The choice of informants will depend on school’s suggestion, availability and good will of the participants. Potential informal observation to get acquainted with the school environment and follow-up interviews might be proposed if necessary. The informants will be asked for the permission for tape-recording, and the audio materials will be destroyed after the transcription.

Possible benefits: the school/teachers will participate in the whole learning process and be able to reciprocally share their experiences and improve their pedagogies and practices;

Confidentiality: Your identity in this study will be treated as confidential. Your names will be anonymized- substituted by other names. The only person who has the access to the data is the researcher.

Participation: You are free to choose whether or not to participate in this study. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled if you choose not to participate. Potential follow-up interviews might be proposed if necessary and will occur on a voluntary basis as well.

The project is approved by Norwegian Social Science Data Services.
Reference: Dr. Jorun Buli-Holmberg, UiO; jorun.buli-holmberg@isp.uio.no +4748119059
Sincerely yours, Milan Tosic; UiO, Department of Special Needs Education; P.O.Box 1140 Blindern, 0318 Oslo; +4791256322

Authorization: I have read and understand this consent form, and I volunteer to participate in this research study.

Participant Signature: Date:
Researcher Signature: Date:
# APPENDIX 4: A DRAFT OF CASE STUDY PROTOCOL (suggested by Yin, 1994)

## CASE STUDY PROTOCOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An overview of the case study project</th>
<th>How does a primary school address CLD learners?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topics investigated: Cultural/linguistic incorporation, teacher collaboration, home-school liaison, classroom interaction, learning styles, collaborative learning and assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field procedures</th>
<th>Finding the gatekeeper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selecting the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Making an initial contact with the assistance of the supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Making an appointment for the initial conversation with school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sending informed consent prior the interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conducting the interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcribing the interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study questions</th>
<th>Transcribe the interviews immediately after the conduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write down personal comments and observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start the process of coding while transcribing the interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Search for similarities, differences and patterns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A guide for case study report</th>
<th>Case study report based on 5 categories of the theoretical framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>understanding the concept of multicultural education,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cultural/linguistic incorporation, community participation, pedagogy and assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data presentation and discussion within each theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The use of direct quotations in presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referring to the literature (theoretical framework) in discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>