



Savaloja Pinja

Home language as a factor of social justice in schools

Bachelor's thesis
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
Intercultural Teacher Education
2021

University of Oulu
Faculty of Education
Home language as a factor of social justice in schools (Pinja Savaloja)
Bachelor's thesis, 37 pages
August 2021

Research in the field of education has proven that home language involvement in education is not only important for the development of student's identity, but also has significant benefits for learning (Yuvayapan, 2019). This thesis aims to understand what multilingual pedagogies are in place in schools and why these are the practices the schools have chosen.

This thesis was conducted as a literature review of previous studies done on the topic of home language practices in schools. The literature on this topic is quite limited and many of the articles used in this thesis are case studies of specific schools. Due to this, the scope of this literature review is small, but it also works as an overview of existing literature and approaches it from a comparative point of view. The thesis uses Nieto's (2018) model of multicultural education as a reference point to identify and compare the different practices schools have.

The overview of case studies suggests that although the benefits of home language involvement in classrooms are clear in research, the practices still remain mostly monolingual. The monolingual practices are in most of the cases due to insufficient training and support provided for the educators as well as due to the negative attitudes towards home language exhibited by teachers. This review points to the need of further research on the topic as well as a need for increased provision of information and resources for schools about multilingual practices.

Keywords: home language, multilingual education, social justice, school

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Social justice	4
2.3 Social justice in education.....	5
3. Language and social justice in education	9
3.1 Language practices in education	9
3.1.1 <i>Monoculturalism</i>	10
3.1.2 <i>Tolerance</i>	12
3.1.3 <i>Acceptance</i>	15
3.1.4 <i>Respect</i>	17
3.1.5 <i>Affirmation, solidarity and critique</i>	19
4. Conclusion	21
5. Discussion	24
5.1 Multilingual pedagogy: a reality or a utopia?	25
References.....	27

1. Introduction

Language has long been held as an important part of identity and as a defining feature of a society (Lønsmann, 2020). In the context of education, language is often thought as a subject, whether that is a mother tongue or a foreign language education. With the increase in immigration in some areas of the world, language has now received increased attention as a tool to integrate foreign language speakers into the dominant society (Alisaari, Heikkola, Commins & Acquah, 2019; Allen, 2006; Rodríguez-Izquierdo, 2021). This is not a completely new interest as there is evidence of language being used as an assimilation tool back in the 19th century as well (Gebhard, 2017). In recent decades, social justice approach to education has gained more interest among researchers and previously normal practices of a classroom are now being re-evaluated (Adams & Love, 2009; He & McKenna, 2005; Nganga, 2016). Plenty of research is also available on second language learning methods, teacher attitudes towards students with linguistically diverse backgrounds, and good multilingual pedagogies (Grant, Yoo, Fetman, & Garza, 2021; Gupta, 2019; Irby et al., 2018; Mary & Young, 2020; Slaughter & Cross, 2021). However, relatively little attention is given to students' language as a social justice factor in schools (Piller, 2016).

My interest towards this topic was first ignited when I was studying abroad. Not being a native English speaker, I had to face the reality of how my language identity impacted my experiences both in education and in everyday life. As my studies progressed further, I became more familiar with social justice issues faced by the students and the staff in education sector. The decision to combine language and social justice viewpoints to research their impact on education was inspired by Ingrid Piller's (2016) book *Linguistic diversity and social justice*, which discusses how linguistic injustice is visible in different areas of life as well as how the role of English as a lingua franca of today's society has affected the way people view languages.

With the inspiration from Piller (2016), this thesis aims to explore, from the standpoint of social justice, how schools treat their linguistically diverse student populations. As mentioned earlier, plenty of research has been done on teacher attitudes towards students' home-languages and on different language policies that are in place (Carbonara & Scibetta, 2020). Similarly, a plethora of research is available on good multilingual teaching strategies (Irby et al., 2018; Slaughter & Cross, 2021). However, relatively little is known about actual multilingual teaching strategies in practice (Beiler, 2021), which is why my main research question is:

1. What kind of multilingual pedagogies are used in practice?

This question aims to answer how linguistic diversity is acknowledged and treated in schools. There are a few different terms that can be used to research language diversity in education, some of which include multilingualism, linguistic diversity, bilingualism, plurilingualism as well as home language (Cenoz, 2013; Piller, 2016; Wesely, 2018). Often these terms are referring to immigrant students' languages and minority languages, although the terms could also be used to refer to general diversity of languages in all of the student body (Piller, 2016). In this thesis I have used the term home language, as it is often used in a purpose of comparing or pitting the home and school languages against each other (Wesely, 2018). Home language is used as a term to refer to a language or languages that students use with their family and close community (Connaughton-Crean & Ó Duibhir, 2017). Home language is usually a minority language within a specific context (Connaughton-Crean & Ó Duibhir, 2017). However, this may not always be the case, and home language can also refer to a language that is spoken by the majority of the population but that is not the official language of schooling (Nyaga & Anthonissen, 2012). As the purpose of my thesis is to research how linguistic diversity is addressed in schools, home language was the most suitable term.

This thesis was conducted as a literature review and the information depicted in this thesis was gathered from multitude of international peer reviewed academic articles, books and other sources which provided useful information on the topic (Rowley & Slack, 2004). The nature of this literature review is best described as a narrative literature review. This method aims to provide an overview of the existing literature, and exhibit the findings in a way that showcases the possible issues and trends related to the topic (Efron & Ravid, 2019). I began my literature review by narrowing down my chosen topic, organising my thoughts by developing mind maps, and eventually posed my final research question.

After posing the research question, I started searching for topical articles with search terms such as: home language involvement, home language practices, multilingual habitus and monolingual habitus. All these searches were further specified to the field of education to ensure their relevance to the review. The articles included in this literature review are diverse both in the locations of the studies as well as in the educational policies they follow, as the articles contain schools from multiple different countries. Due to the nature of my research question, many articles used in the third chapter of this thesis are case studies of schools. This has enabled me to have a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of what practices schools have adopted and why exactly are these practices in place in these specific schools. The multitude of reliable sources is integral when discussing the reliability of the written thesis (Rowley & Slack, 2004). This thesis has used recent, peer reviewed articles about multilingual practices in schools. However, the research evidence is

insufficient, and majority of the articles are case studies. With the acknowledgement of this fact, this thesis offers a descriptive review of multilingual practices in schools and addresses the need for further research.

Following the choice of articles, I began to search for similarities between the multilingual practices mentioned in the articles. To aid in my attempt to understand multilingual practices in schools, I have used Nieto's (2018) model for multicultural education. The model (Nieto, 2018) has offered me guidelines on which to rely whilst attempting to identify differences between different schools on their practices and reasonings. This model will be introduced fully in a later chapter of this thesis. With the help of this model, I began to arrange the articles to different groups based on their similarities. After this was done, the findings of the literature review were collected and are presented in the third chapter of this thesis.

This thesis has been divided into five chapters, with the first one giving background information on the research methods used for this thesis. Second chapter introduces and defines what social justice is. The chapter begins with theoretical definitions and then moves on to introduce one model of observing social justice in educational practices. Third chapter focuses on case-studies done in different schools and explores their approaches to linguistic diversity. The fourth chapter will give a conclusion of the findings of this literature review. Lastly the clash between research, policy, and practice regarding linguistic diversity in education will be discussed, with suggestions to further research opportunities.

2. Social justice

Social justice can be thought as a way of providing all humans a chance to an equal life, through ‘equal economic, political and social rights and opportunities’ (Coghlan & Brydon-Miller, 2014, p. 708). This certainly is one way to approach social justice, but the term social justice is a complicated one. Individuals might have a general sense of what social justice may include, but rarely are these ideas reflective of the complex nature of the term. The lack of simple definition is also visible in the literature concerning social justice, where multitude of academic articles and books are written without properly defining the term (Piller, 2016). Social justice is a central concept in this thesis as students’ home language can act as a factor in placing students in unequal positions in schools (Piller, 2016). Therefore, it is important to consider linguistic diversity of the student population as a social justice issue, and why it is also important to understand what is meant by social justice. To fully understand the reasoning for variety of definitions of social justice, there is a need to understand the development of the term and the concept. The next parts will introduce some approaches to social justice and how it is visible in practice.

The roots of social justice can be traced back to the principles of many religions and philosophers of ancient times. Plato for example states that an individuals’ life should not be determined by the class they were born into and in Christianity it is a fundamental doctrine to help those who are less fortunate (Written by Ornstein, 2017). The modern development of social justice began in the 18th century during the Enlightenment era, as Europe’s political structure was changing from monarchy to more democratic way of governing (Thrift & Sugarman, 2019). This also changed the social hierarchy of individuals, bringing forward new issues in politics, economics and in social settings (Jackson, 2005). During 18th and 19th century, social justice was mostly seen as *distributive justice* (Thrift & Sugarman, 2019), meaning that predominantly social justice was understood as equal distribution of goods and rights (Morrison, 2021). However, at this time, the idea of social justice did not yet apply to every citizen, but only to those seen as socially suitable to receive these rights (Thrift & Sugarman, 2019). The concept of social justice grew in popularity after the World Wars, as the nations were trying to rebuild their societies (Thrift & Sugarman, 2019). This is also the time when social justice started to receive more diverse definitions (Thrift & Sugarman, 2019) and began to reflect the ideas of social justice that are prevalent today.

In general, three different main perspectives and principles can be found from modern definitions of social justice: justice based on equality, justice based on equity and justice based on merit.

Equality based approach to social justice defines it as everyone having a right to receive equal opportunities as well as material and non-material goods (Ruitenberg & Vokey, 2010). This is the approach most similar to that of a distributive justice, meaning that everyone is treated similarly (Morrison, 2021). In education this would reflect on the teaching practice as everyone having access to same education, having all the same resources as well as requirements and having the teacher share the time between students equally (Smith, 2012). In this scenario, students would receive same treatment and resources, which could lead to different outcomes in academic achievements (Smith, 2012).

The equitable approach emphasises the different needs of people and thus also the allocation of goods is different from person to person (Ruitenberg & Vokey, 2010). Justice based on equity aims to diminish social inequalities, which in education could for example mean that the students would be offered additional help if they needed it (Smith, 2012). The differentiation based on the students' needs would likely lead to a situation where the academic achievement gap would be smaller between different students (Smith, 2012).

Merit based understanding, also called harmony-based justice, shares opportunities and goods according to individual's talents (Ruitenberg & Vokey, 2010). This has long been a popular approach in education and parts of it remain as such to this day. For example, sorting students into different classes or academic paths according to their individual talents is a form of justice based on merit. In this approach, students' natural inclinations are the determining factors in what opportunities and goods they get.

2.3 Social justice in education

Although social justice is often applied to practice via above-stated approaches, in reality social justice cannot be understood simply as it being or not being in effect. In practice, social justice often manifests as a scale (Cunningham, 2019). Nieto (2018), for example, has identified five different levels for multicultural education: monoculturalism, tolerance, acceptance, respect and affirmation, solidarity, and critique.

In monocultural education, the whole education as an institution is built around the culture that is deemed dominant (Nieto, 2018). In this context, dominant culture does not necessarily mean the culture that the majority of the population is part of, as was often the case in colonised countries (Nyaga & Anthonissen, 2012). In this model of education, the main goal is to rid the students of their own culture and language in order to aid the assimilation into the dominant culture (Nieto,

2018). These procedures are not viewed as oppressive nor racist by the dominant culture, but as something that is done to benefit the students (Nieto, 2018).

The second level of Nieto's (2018) model is tolerance. Although the goal for the education system in this level is the same as in the first level, which is the assimilation of students into the dominant culture, this level shows some level of tolerance towards cultural differences. This means that languages, beside the lingua franca of the school, are tolerated but only until the students are able to use the dominant language of the school. Toleration in this context has a negative connotation and it describes that the school's atmosphere towards students using non-dominant languages is excluding and oppressive. The schools in this level might also include some social justice topics to their curriculum, but social justice issues are not acknowledged in school and students' differences in academic achievement are attributed to home conditions or natural talent rather than to social justice issues (Nieto, 2018).

According to Nieto (2018) in the third level the importance of one's own culture is acknowledged, and the school community is encouraged to accept everyone as they are. In this level, the use of home languages is allowed in the school, although this policy might not always be included in the teaching practices. The teachers are encouraged to learn more about multicultural education strategies and their implementation to the practice. This can include training in how to organise multilingual pedagogies in lessons or how to organise bilingual programmes. Due to the school accepting everyone's differences, they also intervene in clashes between students and address the issues that have risen. Although the school has taken steps to address social justice issues, both in the curriculum and in the practice, some oppressive practices may remain as they are not recognized as such (Nieto, 2018).

In Nieto's (2018) respect level, the cultural differences of the students are respected, and the practices of the school are based around multiculturalism. This means that the topics as well as the study materials used in the school are not solely focused on the dominant culture's viewpoint or originate from the dominant culture, but that they also discuss other perspectives and are made by authors from various backgrounds. Teachers are well versed on multiculturalism and the practices of the multicultural education, and the school offers the possibility of bilingual education throughout schooling. Students are not divided into separate groups based on their perceived abilities and are all learning the same topics. In this level the students' home languages are included in the classroom practices and all students are encouraged to develop their linguistic repertoires by learning additional languages (Nieto, 2018).

In the highest level of Nieto's (2018) model, the cultural differences of students are acknowledged and accepted, as are the inevitable clashes that these differences between students create. Although clashes are seen as unavoidable and thus should be accepted as part of everyday schooling, the students' identities are still respected. However, despite the respect and solidarity that is given to the students' identities, they are encouraged to view their own as well as others' cultures critically. Criticality is used as a base for all education in this level, starting from the chosen study materials and ending with the students learning techniques (Nieto, 2018).

Table 1

Nieto's (2018) multicultural education model

Level	Description
Monocultural education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revolves around dominant culture • Quick assimilation • Social injustices are not acknowledged
Tolerance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differences accepted, until assimilated • Some cultural acknowledgement • Staff has marginal knowledge about multicultural education
Acceptance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptance of differences is encouraged • Some practices may still be oppressive and excluding • Staff is encouraged to learn more about multicultural education
Respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curriculum is based on multiculturalism • Bilingual programs are in place • Staff is well versed in multicultural education • No tracking
Affirmation, solidarity and critique	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural differences are acknowledged • All cultures are faced with respect and criticality • Use of different languages is allowed and encouraged • Second language learning is encouraged • Students are actively participating in the decision making in school

Nieto (2018)

Although the model (Nieto, 2018) is not specified to only include language, the levels demonstrate the practical state of social justice in education, and the model will be used in further chapters as a tool to identify how schools take notice of linguistic diversity and integrate it into their practices. Factors such as staff attitudes, multilingual resources available in the classrooms and in the schools, multilingual practices as well as training available for the teachers will be used as identifiers for the different levels.

3. Language and social justice in education

Language is an important part of individual's identity and as such can also be an integral part of social justice issues. When looking at language as a social justice issue, the focus is on the power imbalance between different languages. The power imbalance between languages changes from one area and one situation to another (Piller, 2016). This can lead to a situation where some languages are viewed as being less valuable to the society and as such the speakers of those languages are not treated the same as the speakers of dominant languages. This unequal treatment is visible in multiple ways, such as derogatory comments, unequal opportunities given to individuals and oppressive policies and practices (Dakin, 2017; Ollerhead, 2019; Souto-Manning, 2016). For example, in schools the oppressive attitudes can be visible in how students' language repertoire is appreciated. This could mean that a student who speaks English as a native tongue is regarded more highly in terms of future possibilities they have for a career than a student who might speak several languages, but who does not have the same level of command over English as the first student.

Despite of this, language is not always considered explicitly to be a factor causing social justice issues, unlike race, ethnicity, religion, gender, and sexuality are (Hultgren, 2020; Piller, 2016). This is due to views that language is not directly causing social justice issues but rather used as a decoy to distract the researchers' attention away from the other causes (Hultgren, 2020). However, language is often heavily intertwined with these other factors (Piller, 2016), and thus should not be dismissed completely as a factor of social justice. Language as a term is often used as a reference to language bound to a nation or to an ethnic group (Lønsmann, 2020). However, language can also be seen as complex and dynamic entity, which includes the way in which language is spoken, who uses it and in which context (Piller, 2016). These in turn impact language policies and the way in which different languages are viewed and treated (Lønsmann, 2020; Piller, 2016).

3.1 Language practices in education

Despite many governments and organisations framing the use and maintenance of home language as an important goal (Dakin, 2017; Hornberger & Vaish, 2009), the practices to accomplish this are varying in both their implementation as well as in their success. However, home language is often seen as a dualistic entity. On one hand, research has acknowledged that the maintenance of home language is beneficial both for the individual as well as for the society in the long run (Gilham & Fürstenau, 2020). On the other hand, home language is often also seen as something that hinders the

learning of dominant language and thus also the integration into society (Cunningham, 2020). This chapter will use Nieto's (2018) multicultural education model as a reference point to identify problematic and beneficial practices in schools. The following chapters will introduce different case studies, that have researched what multilingual practices schools have. These case studies are organised to five groups according to Nieto's (2018) model and are presented in the same order as Nieto's (2018) levels, beginning with those studies belonging to the monocultural level and ending with those studies belonging to the affirmation, solidarity and critique level.

3.1.1 Monoculturalism

Monocultural education, and in this context monolingual education, has long been the dominant way to organize schooling. This has especially been the case in European education systems, where nations are established around certain languages and cultures, which are then held as the dominant ones (Hornberger & Vaish, 2009). As is monocultural education's goal, the students should be assimilated into the dominant culture as soon as possible with little regards to the practices used to accomplish that goal (Nieto, 2018). For this level, I have identified two contexts where monolingual practices have been visible in schools. These articles describe schools that were in order in the past and thus are no longer existing in the similar form as they are described in these articles.

For this level, the articles that described monolingual practices are studying Canadian residential schools, which were in operation from 1880's to 1990's (Gebhard, 2017). These schools can be categorised as schools with colonial backgrounds, as the children who attended these schools were those with Canadian first nations heritage. The children were separated from their families and forced to attend boarding schools (Gebhard, 2017). In these schools, the students were continuously subjected to mental and physical abuse and many eventually died due to the negligent behaviour exhibited by the staff (Young, 2015). The children were required to give up their own culture, including its practices, the traditional clothes, their given names as well as their languages (Gebhard, 2017; Miller, 2021; Young, 2015).

Similar monolingual practices can be found from other studies describing colonial education models. For example, in the United States the Native Americans faced similar destinies to those of Canadian First Nations' people. Boarding schools were again the most popular choice to aid in the assimilation to the dominant culture, as this allowed the staff to implement strict rules over the children's behaviour (Margolis, 2004; Robbins et al., 2006; Veerbeek, 2021; Vitale IV, 2020). Interesting notion that rose from some of the studies is that sometimes the children who were sent to

these schools did not view their experiences mainly as oppressive or abusive (Robbins et al., 2006). The former students viewed the schools as places that offered them a home, food and education rather than as places that had taken them away from their own families (Robbins et al., 2006).

The impacts of monolingual education are well researched and documented today. For example, with Canadian residential school survivors and their communities, there are clear indications of adverse mental health outcomes (Gone et al., 2019). Some of the mental health issues include posttraumatic stress disorder, depression, and self-harming behaviour (Burrage, Momber & Gone, 2021; Gone et al., 2019). Besides mental health problems, the students of these schools often also report feeling a loss of identity (Burrage, Momper, & Gone, 2021), which implies that besides individual impacts there are also cultural and societal consequences caused by the monocultural education model. As the children who attended the Canadian residential schools lost their ability to communicate on their native tongue and were foreign to the practices of their cultures, they were not always successful at re-establishing the connection to their families and communities (Burrage, Momber & Gone, 2021). Not only did this cause harm to the individual and their families, but also to the whole cultures as they lost the ability to pass on their cultural heritage to the younger generations. This also helps to understand why some former students of these schools did not view the schools as places that were harming them. As the students lost the connections to their home communities, the values of school replaced them and made the students view the oppressive and neglectful practices in somewhat positive light (Robbins et al., 2006). The destructive phenomenon that followed the monocultural education model has also been called cultural genocide (Burrage, Momber & Gone, 2021).

These destructive methods in both countries were applied to practice with the excuse of helping the children to achieve a better life by educating them to be civilized members of the society and Christianity (Kosc, 2020; Woods, 2013). However, as often is the case with social justice issues, the answer might not be that simple. In this particular case, there is a need to remember that we are talking about colonization and that there were tensions between the settlers and the Native Americans regarding the possession of land and resources (McCue & Parrott, 2016; Surface-Evans, 2016). Thus, it is likely that residential schools were used both to “civilize” as well as to dismantle American indigenous communities to gain more power over the land and resources that had previously belonged to them.

During the writing of this thesis, there does not seem to be many schools that would practice purely monolingual education, where no form of home language use would not be allowed. It certainly is

possible that these schools do exist but have not yet gained the attention of academic researchers nor the public interest.

3.1.2 Tolerance

Although monolingual education might seem to be a practice of the past, it is still visible in schools today in a form of tolerance. For example, in the United States it is still a common practice to have English-only policies in schools (Brantmeier, 2007; Hamm-Rodríguez & Morales, 2021) (Mackinney & Rios-Aguilar, 2012). English-only policy, or any other specific language-only policy, refers to the policy of school being solely a place where the dominant language is used, excluding classes specifically reserved for foreign languages (Hamm-Rodríguez & Morales, 2021; Young, 2014). In a study conducted in the United States by Brantmeier (2007), which focused on one school, the staff as well as the students were found enforcing the monolingual policy with negative and derogatory attitudes. The school's atmosphere and comments aimed towards the speakers of other languages, effectively create a space where no other languages but that of the status quo are spoken (Brantmeier, 2007). Brantmeier's (2007) study reported students of majority languages passing down orders to the speakers of minority languages to stop using other languages. These orders and comments about stopping the use of other languages did not only limit to the language use in schools, but also to the minority language use in general (Brantmeier, 2007). These comments reflect the linguistic and cultural power imbalances that are in place in the school as well as in the society. The singular language policy seems to be a manifestation of this imbalance, but it is also reproducing the power structures between majority and minority language users by emphasising that only one language is "worthy" of being spoken in school. Although the clashes between students were clearly visible in the study, the administrative personnel in the school did not acknowledge the discrimination and clashes between students as something that would arise due to the imbalance in cultural and linguistic power structures (Brantmeier, 2007).

Whereas in the previously described US schools that followed state mandated English-only policies, Spanish schools follow national curriculum, as well as European Union recommendations for preservation of heritage languages (Reese, Silva, Antúnez, & del-Arco, 2021). These policies have allowed space for the second dominant language, Catalan, to be used in schools (Reese et al., 2021). However, this is not necessarily the case with other non-dominant languages and as such most schools still uphold singular language policies (Reese et al., 2021; Rodríguez-Izquierdo, 2021). Similar language policies and views can be found from French schools, where the value of dominant language is clearly present in the everyday practices of the schools. Young (2014) has

conducted a research of home language practices of 46 schools in France and the general consensus in many of these schools seems to be that home languages are to be upheld by the home. These notions were repeated by the Spanish teachers (Reese et al., 2021), which indicates that the school's priority is to integrate the students into the dominant society by having them learn the dominant language as soon and well as possible (Hélot & Young, 2018; Reese et al, 2021; Young, 2014). These beliefs have caused the staff to see home languages as disruptive and problematic to the students learning, and as such the students are discouraged using them in school grounds or are only allowed to use them in certain situations (Rodríguez-Izquierdo, 2021; Young, 2014). For example, in the study conducted by Young (2014), the teachers reported that the home language use was allowed during recess, but to allow minority languages into classrooms would be absurd. Similarly, Rodríguez-Izquierdo (2021) found teachers banning home language use in the classroom as they viewed it as hindering the students' ability to learn the majority language.

Besides only viewing home language as a hindrance to the majority language learning, the views of home language as a problem can also be related to assessment. As assessment is usually done in dominant language, teachers may view home language as an obstacle for students to score high academically (French, 2019; Rodríguez-Izquierdo, 2021). Due to this, the schools rarely supported home language studies nor showcased much appreciation for linguistic diversity. At least this was not mentioned explicitly in the articles. Some schools did offer the possibility for the students to attend home language classes, but they were often organised after school and as voluntary clubs (Reese et al., 2021). The appreciation for linguistic diversity was visible in tokenistic manner, where schools might have a signage in the lobby showcasing the different languages present in the schools, but these signs of appreciation were not often extended to practice (Reese et al., 2021).

The view of language as a problem is not solely held by the French, Spanish nor the US teachers, especially when the students are not yet fluent in the dominant language. This has led many countries to establish separate language prep schools or classes, where the students can be placed before they enter the general classrooms (Gynne, 2019; Ollerhead, 2019; Rodríguez-Izquierdo, 2021). However, younger children tended to be viewed in much more positive light regarding their capability to assimilate to the dominant culture and to learn the language (Brentmeier, 2007). This meant that in some cases they were placed in regular classroom, where the teacher did not necessarily speak the students' home language or only few words of it, and in a short period the students would be expected to lose their home languages and adopt the dominant one in class (Reese et al., 2021; Rodríguez-Izquierdo, 2021). This is also called submersive language education (Reljić, Ferring & Martin, 2015). In a study conducted by Reese et al. (2021), a teacher reported

that when young students were subjected to the submersion programs, they would get frustrated, scared and would often begin crying due to not understanding or not being understood. In Rodríguez-Izquierdo's (2021) study, a teacher was also observed using a submersion program. However, the teacher reported using some minority languages at the beginning of the program, but in few weeks the teacher had moved to completely monolingual teaching (Rodríguez-Izquierdo, 2021).

As these examples from three different countries showcase, monolingual habitus is still very prevalent in today's education systems, and it is actually considered to be the dominant model (Menken & Sánchez, 2019). In majority of the cases, the reasoning for upholding singular language practices is due to teacher attitudes of viewing home languages as a hindrance for learning (Rodríguez-Izquierdo, 2021). However, as the research has proven that there are clear benefits for allowing students to utilize their home languages (Yuvayapan, 2019), one would either have to assume that the teachers exhibiting these attitudes are either unaware of the benefits or there is an underlying reason for them to not utilize multilingual pedagogies. One such reason could be the feeling of losing control or viewing home language use as an exclusive practice towards other students and staff (Brantmeier, 2007; Young, 2014). As teachers are not usually familiar with the students' home languages, they feel uncomfortable allowing such dialogue to exist as they cannot control the content of it, which could include off topic discussions or mocking of another person (Young, 2014). Thus, they feel it is easier and more inclusive to ban the use of other languages in the classroom.

Although many of these examples focus on the newly arrived students who are not yet familiar with the dominant language, the general atmosphere of the schools depicts practices that would seem to exclude home languages from the school even if the students were fluent in the dominant language as well. However, it has to be mentioned that among the schools that practice singular language policies, there are schools that are closer to monocultural education or acceptance level, others that are more firmly on the tolerance level and some that are harder to distinguish belonging clearly to any of these levels. Same is applicable to the variation within the schools themselves. Some members of the staff can be seen to be more tolerating or accepting of non-dominant language use, whereas other members are very strict with the dominant language policy. This variation is a theme that is visible within all the levels discussed in this thesis, and as such some of the schools referenced in certain level may exhibit traits from other levels as well.

3.1.3 Acceptance

When moving from a monolingual habitus to a more multilingual one, the importance of staff's knowledge regarding multilingual education becomes clearer. This reality became especially visible in multiple studies done in the Finnish context (Alisaari, Heikkola, Commins, & Acquah, 2019; Kimanen, 2018; Tarnanen & Palviainen, 2018). The Finnish national core curriculum received its latest reform in 2016, and as one of its goals for basic education the development of cultural competence was mentioned (Opetushallitus, 2016). This goal included the objectives to view cultural and linguistic diversity as positive resources, to approach diversity with acceptance but also with criticality, as well as for the teachers to support the students' home language development (Opetushallitus, 2016). Based on the national policy, Finnish schools could be expected to be placed either at the respect level or even at the highest level of Nieto's (2018) model. However, the policy does not always transfer to the practice, and this ended up being the case with many Finnish schools as well.

In general, Finnish teachers seem to mostly have a positive outlook on students' home-languages in a sense of resource for learning and allowed students to use their home languages in the classroom (Alisaari et al, 2019). They also acknowledged that language is an essential part of one's identity and that it can also be a part of social justice issues (Alisaari et al, 2019). However, some teachers also emphasised that learning the language of schooling was essential for the students' future and as such viewed the home language use as a hindrance to learning (Alisaari et al, 2019; Tarnanen & Palviainen, 2018). Despite the majority of the teachers viewing home-language as an important resource, it was rarely used deliberately and continuously in the teaching practices (Alisaari et al, 2019; Tarnanen & Palviainen, 2018). Some small indications of appreciating linguistic and cultural diversity were visible, such as having flags and a world map with pins identifying where students were originally from (Tarnanen & Palviainen, 2018). Although, this small sign of appreciation can also be considered as being problematic, as some students who are linguistically and culturally diverse may have been born in Finland or are from areas that are maybe not officially recognised in the map (Tarnanen & Palviainen, 2018).

The reason for identifying the Finnish schools from these articles as belonging to the appreciation level, was due to the lack of purposeful suppression of home-languages as well as the general accepting atmosphere of the schools. Although they do lack the key part of this level, which is having multilingual practices in place, the articles also reported that majority of the teachers had not received training to include these practices into their classrooms (Alisaari et al, 2019). As training is identified as an important resource for the teachers to implement multilingual pedagogies in

practice (Alisaari et al, 2019; Gilham & Fürstenau, 2020; Nieto, 2018), it is likely that with the already positive attitude towards linguistic diversity the staff would have adopted multilingual teaching strategies and thus further cemented their place on the acceptance level.

The importance of education and training is again highlighted by the fact that there were barely any articles describing practices that belong to the acceptance level. One school that could be identified as belonging to this level is from the United States. The school is described as having welcoming atmosphere towards students' home languages, but that the view of English as a dominant language of school had caused many students to avoid using their home languages (Rowe, 2018). A second-grade teacher, who was familiar with multilingual pedagogies, decided to try and change the atmosphere of her class to a more accepting and safer one by organizing multilingual writing workshops (Rowe, 2018). The students were encouraged to write stories as well as translate others' stories into their home languages (Rowes, 2018). This did seem to encourage students to be more aware of the linguistic diversity in the class and some students were truly enthusiastic about being able to use their home language in the school (Rowe, 2018). However, it was clear that the students who were part of minority language speakers were apprehensive about bringing up their linguistic diversity in the class. For example, the class had a large student population who spoke Spanish as their home language, meaning that they were able to rely on their peers to use an "unusual" language at the school whereas the other students may have been the only speakers of a specific language and thus did not feel comfortable sharing this part of their personality with others (Rowe, 2018).

This example demonstrates well the beginning stages of moving from monolingual habitus to more multilingual one. Based on the description of the school and the answers provided by the author (Rowe, 2018), it does not seem as if there has been larger push in the school to apply more multilingual pedagogies to practice. However, the school acknowledges the linguistic diversity of its student population, does not seem to suppress home language use and has offered supporting measures also to the parents to communicate with the school despite possible language barriers (Rowe, 2018). From the article it is not visible whether the staff in the school has received any professional development training regarding multilingual pedagogies, but at least the teacher whose class was depicted in the article (Rowe, 2018) had knowledge about translanguaging and how to support students home language use in the classroom. For this level it is also common that some oppressive practices remain in place (Nieto, 2018). Although this is not explicitly clarified in the article (Rowe, 2018) but based on the description of the school, it does appear that there might not have been that many multilingual practices in place, other than the ones described by this particular

teacher in her classroom. This observation was later confirmed by the author herself in a reply to a question whether other teachers in the schools had similar practices in place:

'Not that I know of [...], although there were a few other teachers who I know spoke some Spanish with their students. [...] this was a project I designed and worked on individually' (L. Rowe, personal communications, July 20, 2021).

Despite the general lack of action taken by other teachers to facilitate multilingual pedagogies, the other positive factors depicted previously created an atmosphere where it was possible for a teacher to move away from monolingual ideology and start applying more multilingual pedagogies to practice.

3.1.4 Respect

As previously mentioned, there were not many articles focusing on the acceptance level. Often research might have started when the school has exhibited traits from the tolerance level and the follow up interviews and observations have taken place after some time, giving the school the opportunity to reach the respect level. For example, two studies (Ascenzi-Moreno, Hesson & Menken, 2016; Menken & Sánchez, 2019) follow eleven New York schools after they participated on professional development training aimed for advancing multilingual practices in diverse classrooms. Before participating on the training, the schools followed mainly English-only policies or had a monolingual habitus (Ascenzi-Moreno et al, 2016; Menken & Sánchez, 2019), and would have been categorised as belonging to the tolerance level. During the training, the staff participated into seminars where the view of language as a resource was highlighted and different multilingual practices were introduced (CUNY-NYSIEB, n.d.).

One study (Menken & Sánchez, 2019) found that at first the teachers in these schools only used few selected methods, but as they grew more comfortable with the new approach to linguistic diversity, they began to apply more multilingual practices. The students were encouraged to start using their home languages in the classrooms and the schools also started acquiring multilingual materials, such as books for the library, for the students to use freely (Menken & Sánchez, 2019). The students' home languages were also visible in the classrooms via multilingual word boards placed around the classroom and via the teacher preparing instructions in all the languages present (Menken & Sánchez, 2019). However, a teacher in Menken & Sánchez's (2019) study reported that in the beginning the students felt uncomfortable using their home languages in the classroom. This

was likely due to the reason that the students were used to the power imbalance of languages in the school. Due to being used to perceiving their home languages as something that was unsuitable to be used in the school, the students' apprehension at the early stages of starting to apply multilingual pedagogy into classroom practice is understandable. As the students saw that the teacher was genuinely trying to promote home language usage in the classroom, they became more comfortable in using their home languages and even offered to help the teacher to learn some phrases and words (Menken & Sánchez, 2019). Besides just the staff beginning to learn the students' home languages, some of the schools had also increased parental involvement in the classrooms, to help students to gain awareness of other cultures and languages (Ascenzi-Moreno et al, 2016). Other schools decided to establish language clubs for the students to attend as an after-school activity and some had established or planned to establish new bilingual programs (Ascenzi-Moreno et al, 2016).

According to the staff interviews (Ascenzi-Moreno et al, 2016; Menken & Sánchez, 2019), the schools seem to have moved from tolerance level to the respect level within six years of their participation to the linguistic diversity training. Major factor in this shift being successful seems to be the change in attitudes towards linguistic diversity exhibited by the staff. In the beginning home languages were seen as bothersome and something that required extra resources, whereas by the end of the training program most of the staff in these schools found linguistic diversity to be a normal state that can support learning (Ascenzi-Moreno et al, 2016). Another factor which was mentioned to be of great value for the success of applying multilingual pedagogies to practice, was the collaboration between different teachers (Ascenzi-Moreno et al, 2016; Menken & Sánchez, 2019). Other teachers' practices worked as an inspiration for other teachers to also start applying multilingual pedagogies to their classrooms. The educators were able to see how multilingual teaching practices worked in action, what their benefits were and although at the beginning only few of the teachers had adopted such practices by the end of the research period most of the staff had taken an interest in trying them in their own practice (Ascenzi-Moreno et al, 2016; Menken & Sánchez, 2019). The professional support and collaboration between different teachers and other professionals have been shown, in multiple cases (Davison, 2006; Giles & Yazan, 2020; Premier & Parr, 2019), to be beneficial for the professional development of the staff. The cooperation can take a form of dedicated times for meeting with each other and sharing ideas, sharing resources between teachers, informal discussion during breaks or observing other teachers' practices (Ascenzi-Moreno et al, 2016; Premier & Parr, 2019). Although it is difficult to pinpoint exactly what has made these schools successful in their transition from monolingual to multilingual, it is evident that the training they have received along with the change in attitudes have acted as important supporting factors.

3.1.5 Affirmation, solidarity and critique

Although this level might feel similar to the previous one, there is a key element which makes a distinction between the two. Whereas in the previous level it was important for the school and the staff that the different cultures and languages were respected, in this level the attention is on the criticality (Nieto, 2018). This level has set high standards for multilingual and multicultural practices in general and as such it has not been possible to identify a single school that could belong to this level, other than the one Nieto (2018) herself has used as an example. Some possible reasons for this are that there are not many schools that have been able to reach this level of social justice in their practices or that due to the general lack of research on this topic, such schools have not been selected to be the focus point of a study. Another reason why I have not felt comfortable to appoint any specific school for this level is due to the fact that a lot of articles have done very focused studies, which offers in depth information of the topic but also hinders the opportunity to see the whole picture. For example, if an article has focused on teaching practices in a classroom, they have not necessarily included information about the overall atmosphere of the school, what the curriculum is like and what other practices are in effect at the school.

Nieto (2018) has described the school belonging to this level as having equality among all students. This means that there are no ability groups nor separate classrooms for students who might have special educational needs or whose English is not yet on par with the students of similar age. Due to the goal of equality among students, all students are allowed to participate on so called advanced lessons if they are interested in the subject. The school has also placed a heavy emphasis on community participation in school affairs, meaning that both the parents and the students are actively impacting the school's practices. However, what really sets this school apart from many others is that there are no bilingual programs in place despite the school having many multilingual students. The school uses its three majority language groups to carry out lessons and hand out information, no language is prohibited in school area and all students are required to learn additional languages (Nieto, 2018). As the name of this level suggests, criticality is something that is emphasised as a philosophy for all members of the school. It is embedded into the curriculum, to the teaching and learning practices and to the learning resources (Nieto, 2018). For example, the students are taught to view their own cultural practices, as well as others, in a respectful but critical way. Due to the critical approach, it is inevitable that there will be clashes between different members of the school community (Nieto, 2018).

Many of the practices introduced in this brief description of the school are indeed already in place in many schools. Practices such as inclusion have gained interest throughout the world and are

already in practice in many countries (Moberg, Hautamäki, Kivirauma, & Lahtinen, 2015; Rotatori & Alquraini, 2014) Even the defining feature of this level, criticality, has started to gain more attention as a pedagogical tool. For example, in Finland the national core curriculum has recently placed an emphasis on developing students critical thinking in subject matters (Opetushallitus, 2016). However, as was visible in the examples of schools given in previous levels, multilingual pedagogies are often lacking from the schools. Sometimes this can be seen to be a part of general lack of inclusive and critical practices, such as the school portrayed in the first level where the main goal was to assimilate students into the dominant culture as soon as possible (Gebhard, 2017). However, in other levels there were also examples of schools where the general practices were inclusive, but the language practices were lacking in comparison (Rowe, 2018).

4. Conclusion

The first research question that this thesis attempted to answer was “What multilingual practices schools depict?” The answer to this question is dependent on which schools we are observing. However, as Nieto’s (2018) model offered a structure for this question, we can find common attributes that schools belonging to a certain level have. In monolingual education, I was able to observe that the schools had a singular language policy, which they enforced with heavy repercussions, such as abuse in multiple forms (Gebhard, 2017; Young, 2015). In tolerance level, home language was often viewed as a hindrance to learning and assimilation (Brantmeier, 2007). Home language was also not regarded as highly as the dominant language (Brantmeier, 2007; Rodríguez-Izquierdo, 2021). This quickly led the students to start using the dominant language in majority of the situations faced in schools (Reese, Silva, Antúnez & del-Arco, 2021; Rodríguez-Izquierdo, 2021). The schools in acceptance level exhibited generally positive attitudes towards linguistic diversity, but these attitudes did not necessarily transfer to practice and instead showed as an indifference towards home language use (Alisaari, Heikkola, Commins & Acquah, 2019). However, as Rowe’s (2018) study shows, this environment can allow educators to implement multilingual pedagogies in their classrooms. When this level is compared with the respect level, there is a clear shift in the atmosphere of the schools towards linguistic diversity. Schools that were allocated to the respect level had a supportive and encouraging atmosphere towards home language use in schools (Ascenzi-Moreno, Hesson & Menken, 2016; Menken & Sánchez, 2019). They also used multilingual pedagogies in the classroom regularly and offered bilingual programs as well as home language teaching (Ascenzi-Moreno, Hesson & Menken, 2016; Menken & Sánchez, 2019).

As was visible in the chapter three, which discussed the case-studies, some levels had more schools appointed to them than others. The monolingual education was only visible in historical examples, whereas acceptance and respect both had few examples from today’s education systems. Outliers in this thesis seemed to be the tolerance level, which had a majority of cases appointed to it, and affirmation, solidarity and critique, which had none appointed to it. This contrast between the number of articles placed to different levels is likely due to the lack of research done on the topic, leading to fewer articles being available of different practices. Of those articles that were available, majority described practices belonging to the tolerance level, indicating that this approach to linguistic diversity is prevalent in today’s schools. On the other end of the spectrum was affirmation, solidarity and critique, which did not have other articles besides Nieto’s (2018) own example of a school. As said previously, this is partly due to the lack of research done on the topic.

However, besides the lack of research also the research type that I used in this thesis could have impacted my decision to not appoint any schools to that level. As I used mostly case studies of schools, the limitation is that, although they offered in depth information about the language practices of specific classes and teachers, they did not necessarily offer insight into larger practices of the school. Due to this, I did not feel comfortable appointing any schools to this level, which practices Nieto (2018) has described with great detail. This means that although my thesis did not find any schools belonging to this level, it does not mean that there are no schools which could belong to the highest level of Nieto's (2018) model.

The reasons for schools choosing different approaches to home language practices are varied. However, in general, there were two factors which could be observed in majority of the cases: attitudes and staff training. There was a clear change in staff and students' attitudes when moving from the first level to the highest. In the schools that belonged to the monolingual level, attitudes towards home language were condescending and oppressive (Gebhard, 2017). Similar attitudes were visible in the tolerance level, where teachers reported viewing home language as a hindrance and disruptive to the flow of the class (Rodríguez-Izquierdo, 2021). In the two highest levels, the staff attitudes were clearly more positive and encouraging, with the teachers viewing language as an important resource for further learning (Ascenzi-Moreno, Hesson & Menken, 2016; Nieto, 2018). These clear differences in attitudes would indicate that staff attitudes play a significant role in what practices schools decide to adopt.

Another factor impacting the language practices of a school, was the training the staff had received. In lower levels of Nieto's (2018) model schools were described as having little to no training on multilingual practices and this was also evident in the schools allocated to these levels in this thesis. The schools where the staff had not received much or any training generally also did not have any multilingual practices in place (Brantmeier, 2007; Reese, Silva, Antúnez & del-Arco, 2021). The schools where the staff had received training on multilingual practices were also more likely to adopt these practices to their schools (Ascenzi-Moreno, Hesson & Menken, 2016; Menken & Sánchez, 2019). Attitude change and training seem to go hand in hand, as became visible from the case studies of Ascenzi-Moreno, Hesson and Menken (2016), which showcased how the teachers' attitudes had changed during and after the training they had received to help with the transition from monolingual to multilingual pedagogy. In the beginning the staff attitudes were similar to those described by the teachers of tolerance level, but throughout the training the attitudes started to become more accepting and positive (Ascenzi-Moreno, Hesson & Menken, 2016). Surprisingly, language policies of nations or states had a smaller impact on the practices of the schools than I had

anticipated. In many cases, the administrative policies were aligned with acknowledging linguistic diversity of the student body as a resource rather than as a hindrance (Opetushallitus, 2016; Reese, Silva, Antúnez & del-Arco, 2021). However, staff attitudes seemed to play more significant role on what practices were present in the classrooms (Alisaari, Heikkola, Commins & Acquah, 2019; Reese, Silva, Antúnez & del-Arco, 2021).

5. Discussion

Linguistic diversity is a complex and important part of individuals' identity and as this thesis has shown, it can also be a polarising topic. With the help of Nieto's (2018) model, I was able to categorize the schools presented in this thesis based on the linguistic practices they depicted.

However, it is important to also state that the use of Nieto's (2018) model does have some implications to the reliability of the study. The major factor in this is that the model (Nieto, 2018) is not designed to study the sole position of language in schools. Due to this, in some cases I had to interpret the model (Nieto, 2018), and make a decision based on my own interpretation of the model on whether a school belonged to a certain level or not. This can hinder the reliability of a study, and in the future a more comprehensive model of language's position in school should be used in order to limit the need for interpretations. Despite the limitations related to Nieto's (2018) model, there are also clear advantages of using it in this literature review. The model (Nieto, 2018) provided a base for the comparison and categorization of different practices schools had. And although mentioned as a possible limitation, the fact that the model (Nieto, 2018) also included other factors into its requirements for different levels, shows that a language is not a separate entity when researching the level of social justice in schools. As such, the model reinforces Piller's (2016) notion of how language should be considered as integral part of social justice, as it is intertwined with many aspects of individuals' lives. The final benefit of the model is, that it allows for acknowledgement that multilingual pedagogy is not either practiced or not practiced in schools, but rather can be implemented as a scale. With some practices being more supportive of home language use and development, whilst other practices may still remain unfair and oppressive.

Besides Nieto's (2018) model, also the impact of the research method has to be discussed. Narrative literature review draws from a variety of articles and offers a comprehensive understanding of previously done articles on the topic (Efron & Ravid, 2019). However, the method has also received criticism over its lack of clarity on choosing articles, which may lead to more biased and subjective conclusions (Efron & Ravid, 2019). I have attempted to minimise this risk by offering information on how and why I have chosen the articles to this literature review. I have also used Nieto's (2018) model in the categorisation of the articles, which should further minimise the risk of producing subjective findings. However, whilst I believe that my study has followed the guidelines for reliable research, as I am a first-time researcher, there is a need to acknowledge that my inexperience on the matter could have impacted the literature review. This could be visible in the way in which I have

searched for articles, the way in which I have written, as well as the way in which I have used the research method.

Lastly, the criticality needs to also be extended to the resources used in this literature review. Most of the resources are published within 2010 and 2021. This factor impacts the reliability of the literature review positively. However, there is also another factor that needs to be taken into account when considering the reliability and the quality of this literature review. Although the articles included in this literature review are studying home language involvement in education, they have differences in focuses and contexts in which the studies were done. These differences lead to questions of whether the studies are comparable and whether they reflect the true nature of the schools they have examined. Many of the articles involved in this literature review are conducted as case studies, and as such they provide in depth information of the schools they have examined. Due to this, the articles have offered good insight into the practices of schools as well as to the reasonings of why certain practices were in place in certain schools. These factors were taken into account during the literature review and the findings seem to support the conclusion that although the articles had their differences, they still shared a great deal of similarities that justified their inclusion to this review.

5.1 Multilingual pedagogy: a reality or a utopia?

Based on the finding of this thesis, it does seem that multilingual pedagogies can be viable options as classroom practices for schools with linguistically diverse student populations. Research has shown that supporting students' home language development supports learning in all areas of the curriculum (Yuvayapan, 2019). And as this thesis has shown, multilingual pedagogies can be conducted well by both monolingual teachers as well as those with previous knowledge of the students' home languages (Garcia & Wei, 2013). However, any new pedagogical practice that is being adopted by educators requires planning and effort in order for it to be successful. Multilingual pedagogies are not any different in this sense, and there are factors that have to be taken into account and addressed when schools are planning to start using multilingual pedagogies. As was shown previously, policies alone are not always enough to change the traditional practices of schools. Due to this, schools should be offered professional training, further resources and practical examples of how multilingual pedagogies work in practice. This can encourage educators to adopt some of these practices to their own practices and start the journey to more linguistically just practices. In addition to training, staff should also be granted the opportunity to collaborate with and

observe other teachers. Collaboration with other teachers and professionals can ease the feeling of losing control when applying a new pedagogy to practice (Ascenzi-Moreno, Hesson & Menken, 2016). One more factor, which can cause educators to be vary of applying multilingual pedagogies to practice is the question of assessment. As assessment is in many cases regulated by a district or national policies, teachers may feel that including multilingual pedagogies to classroom is either intervening with it and lowering students' abilities to perform well, or they are unsure how to include multilingualism into assessment (French, 2019; Rodríguez-Izquierdo, 2021). There is no simple solution to this, as assessment might not be on the hands of a teacher or school. Therefore, this concern would require larger push for awareness among those responsible for designing assessment goals. However, educators can still promote multilingual pedagogies in their own classroom practices, and as they are known to benefit students' learning, they can actually help students to perform better academically. Although, this is not the main goal for using multilingual pedagogies, it is still worth mentioning.

As the research on home language practices in schools is somewhat scarce, I hope that my thesis has been able to offer some clarification into what is meant by multilingual pedagogies in practice and why it is important to research them. As this study has shown, majority of the schools still seem to practice language practices belonging to the tolerance level. Whether this is the reality or a distorted view due to the lack of research done on this topic is still unclear, and as such provides an opportunity and need for further research. This need for further research is also backed by the fact that although in the administrative levels language practices can be promoting languages as resources and encourage their integration into the classroom dialogue, schools do not always act on these policies. Hopefully in the future more articles will focus on multilingual practices present in classrooms and provide us with in depth case studies of different schools to observe what the language practices are and whether they align with administrative language policies. This is also something that I personally am interested in pursuing in my master's thesis. As there are not many articles written of this topic in the Finnish context, I hope that I will be able to conduct my research as a combination of interviews and observations in different schools around Finland.

Although not always seen as meaningful to social justice, in this thesis language has proven to be integral part of individuals' identity and a meaningful factor of social justice experienced in schools by students. Thus, language should not be overlooked when discussing socially just practices in schools.

References

- Adams, M. & Love, B. J. (2009). In Skubikowski, K., Wright, C., & Graf, R. (Eds.), *Social Justice Education: Inviting Faculty to Transform Their Institutions* (pp. 3-25). Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>
- Alisaari, J., Heikkola, L. M., Commins, N., & Acquah, E. O. (2019). Monolingual ideologies confronting multilingual realities. Finnish teachers' beliefs about linguistic diversity. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 80, 48-58. 10.1016/j.tate.2019.01.003
- Allen, D. (2006). Who's in and Who's out? Language and the Integration of New Immigrant Youth in Quebec. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 10(2-3), 251-263. Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>
<http://www.informaworld.com/openurl?genre=article&id=doi:10.1080/13603110500256103>
- Ascenzi-Moreno, L., Hesson, S., & Menken, K. (2016). School Leadership along the Trajectory from Monolingual to Multilingual. *Language and Education*, 30(3), 197-218. Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=> <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2015.1093499>
- Beiler, I. R. (2021). Marked and Unmarked Translanguaging in Accelerated, Mainstream, and Sheltered English Classrooms. *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 40(1), 107-138. Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>
- Brantmeier, E. J. (2007). "Speak Our Language...Abide by Our Philosophy": Language & Cultural Assimilation at a U.S. Midwestern High School. *Forum on Public Policy Online*, 2007(2) Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>
- Burrage, R. L., Momper, S. L., & Gone, J. P. (2021). Beyond trauma: Decolonizing understandings of loss and healing in the Indian residential school system of Canada. *Journal of Social Issues*, , 1. 10.1111/josi.12455
- Carbonara, V., & Scibetta, A. (2020). Integrating translanguaging pedagogy into Italian primary schools: implications for language practices and children's empowerment. *International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism*, , 1-21. 10.1080/13670050.2020.1742648
- Cenoz, J. (2013). Defining Multilingualism. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 33, 3-18. 10.1017/S026719051300007X

- Coghlan, D., & Brydon-Miller, M. (2014). *The SAGE encyclopedia of action research* (Vols. 1-2). London, : SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781446294406
- Connaughton-Crean, L., & Ó Duibhir, P. (2017). Home language maintenance and development among first generation migrant children in an Irish primary school: An investigation of attitudes. *Journal Of Home Language Research*, 2(0), 22. doi: 10.16993/jhhr.29
- Cunningham, C. (2019). 'The Inappropriateness of Language': Discourses of Power and Control over Languages beyond English in Primary Schools. *Language and Education: An International Journal*, 33(4), 285-301. 10.1080/09500782.2018.1545787
- Cunningham, C. (2020). When 'Home Languages' Become 'Holiday Languages': Teachers' Discourses about Responsibility for Maintaining Languages beyond English. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*, 33(3), 213-227. Retrieved from:
<http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>
- CUNY-NYSIEB. (n.d.). Our vision. Retrieved from: <https://www.cuny-nysieb.org/our-vision/>
- Dakin, J. (2017). Incorporating Cultural and Linguistic Diversity into Policy and Practice: Case Studies from an English Primary School. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 17(4), 422-436. Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2017.1368142>
- Davison, C. (2006). Collaboration between ESL and Content Teachers: How Do We Know When We Are Doing It Right? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(4), 454-475. 10.2167/beb339.0
- Efron, S. E. & Ravid, R. (2019). *Writing the literature review: A practical guide*. The Guilford Press.
- French, M. (2019). Multilingual Pedagogies in Practice. *TESOL in Context*, 28(1), 21-44. Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>
<https://doi.org/10.21153/tesol2019vol28no1art869>
- Garcia, O., & Wei, L. (2013). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Basingstoke]: Palgrave Pivot. Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>

- Gebhard, A. (2017). Reconciliation or Racialization? Contemporary Discourses about Residential Schools in the Canadian Prairies. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 40(1) Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>
- Giles, A., & Yazan, B. (2020). "You're Not an Island": A Middle Grades Language Arts Teacher's Changed Perceptions in ESL and Content Teachers' Collaboration. *RMLE Online: Research in Middle Level Education*, 43(3) Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19404476.2020.1724045>
- Gilham, P., & Fürstenau, S. (2020). The relationship between teachers' language experience and their inclusion of pupils' home languages in school life. *Language and Education*, 34(1), 36-50. 10.1080/09500782.2019.1668008
- Gone, J. P., Hartmann, W. E., Pomerville, A., Wendt, D. C., Klem, S. H., & Burrage, R. L. (2019). The impact of historical trauma on health outcomes for indigenous populations in the USA and Canada: A systematic review. *American Psychologist*, 74(1), 20-35. 10.1037/amp0000338
- Grant, L. T., Yoo, M. S., Fetman, L., & Garza, V. (2021). In-Service Teachers' Perceptions of Their Preparation to Work with Learners of English. *Educational Research: Theory and Practice*, 32(1), 62-71. Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>
- Gupta, A. (2019). Principles and Practices of Teaching English Language Learners. *International Education Studies*, 12(7), 49-57. Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>
- Gynne, A. (2019). 'English or Swedish Please, No Dari!' -- (Trans)Languaging and Language Policing in Upper Secondary School's Language Introduction Programme in Sweden. *Classroom Discourse*, 10(3-4), 347-368. Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=> <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2019.1628791>
- Hamm-Rodríguez, M., & Morales, A. S. (2021). (Re)Producing Insecurity for Puerto Rican Students in Florida Schools: A Raciolinguistic Perspective on English-Only Policies. *Centro Journal*, 33(1), 112-131. Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>
- He, M. F., & McKenna, M. (2005). Culturally responsive approaches to reading. In Hoosain, R. & Salili, F. (Eds.), *Language in multicultural education* (pp. 273-290). Connecticut: Information Age Publishing Inc.

- Hélot, C. & Young, A. (2018). *Imagining Multilingual Education in France: A Language and Cultural Awareness Project at Primary Level*. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853598968-004>
- Hornberger, N., & Vaish, V. (2009). Multilingual Language Policy and School Linguistic Practice: Globalization and English-Language Teaching in India, Singapore and South Africa. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 39(3), 305-320. Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=http://www.informaworld.com/openurl?genre=article&id=doi:10.1080/03057920802469663>
- Hultgren, A. K. (2020). Introduction: Global English and Social Justice. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 19(3), 1-9. 10.35360/njes.573
- Irby, B. J., Lara-Alecio, R., Tong, F., Guerrero, C., Sutton-Jones, K., & Abdelrahman, N. (2018). Implementation of Research-Based ESL Strategies with Lower Grade Middle School ELLs in the Science Classroom: Findings from an Experimental Study. *Tesl-Ej*, 22(1) Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>
- Jackson, B. (2005). The Conceptual History of Social Justice. *Political Studies Review*, 3(3), 356-373. 10.1111/j.1478-9299.2005.00028.x
- Kimanen, A. (2018). Approaching Culture, Negotiating Practice: Finnish Educators' Discourses on Cultural Diversity. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 13(4), 334-347. 10.1080/17447143.2018.1546309
- Kosc, K. M. (2020). "Caring for Our Affairs Ourselves": Stockbridge Mohican Women and Indian Education in Early America. *American Indian Quarterly*, 44(4), 434-476. 10.5250/amerindiquar.44.4.0434
- Lønsmann, D. (2020). Language and Social Justice: Using Language as a Lens for Investigating Inequalities. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 19(3), 68-80. 10.35360/njes.578
- Mackinney, E., & Rios-Aguilar, C. (2012). Negotiating between Restrictive Language Policies and Complex Teaching Conditions: A Case Study of Arizona's Teachers of English Learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 35(3), 350-367. Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2012.734545>

- Margolis, E. (2004). Looking at discipline, looking at labour: photographic representations of Indian boarding schools. *Visual Studies*, 19(1), 72-96. 10.1080/1472586042000204861
- Mary, L., & Young, A. (2020). Teachers' Beliefs and Attitudes towards Home Languages Maintenance and Their Effects. (pp. 444-463). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter, Inc. Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>
- McCue, H. & Parrott, Z. (2016). *Canadian aboriginal reserves*. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/place/Canadian-aboriginal-reserves>
- Menken, K., & Sánchez, M. T. (2019). Translanguaging in English-only schools: From pedagogy to stance in the disruption of monolingual policies and practices. *TESOL Quarterly*, 53(3), 741-767. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.513>
- Miller, J., Residential Schools in Canada (2021). In *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from: <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/residential-schools>
- Moberg, S., Hautamäki, J., Kivirauma, J., & Lahtinen, U. (2015). *Eriyispedagogiikan perusteet* (3. uud. p. ed.). Jyväskylä: PS-kustannus. Retrieved from: https://oula.finna.fi/Record/oy_electronic_oy.9914529573906252
- Morrison, A. (2021). The Foundations of Distributive Justice: A Morphogenetic Analysis of Gomberg and Fraser. *Sociology*, 55(2), 227-242. 10.1177/0038038520947305
- Nganga, L. (2016). Theoretical foundations of global and social justice education. In Nganga, L. (Ed.), *Social Justice Education, Globalization, and Teacher Education* (pp. 1-6). Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>
- Nieto, S. (2018). *Language, Culture, and Teaching: Critical Perspectives*. New York, NY: Routledge. Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>
- Nyaga, S., & Anthonissen, C. (2012). Teaching in Linguistically Diverse Classrooms: Difficulties in the Implementation of the Language-in-Education Policy in Multilingual Kenyan Primary School Classrooms. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 42(6), 863-879. Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2012.707457>

- Ollerhead, S. (2019). Teaching across Semiotic Modes with Multilingual Learners: Translanguaging in an Australian Classroom. *Language and Education: An International Journal*, 33(2), 106-122. 10.1080/09500782.2018.1516780
- Opetushallitus. (2016). *National core curriculum for basic education 2014*. Helsinki: Finnish National Board of Education. Retrieved from: https://oula.finna.fi/Record/oy_electronic_oy.9915511543906252
- Ornstein, A. (2017). Social Justice: History, Purpose and Meaning. *Society*, 54(6), 541-548. 10.1007/s12115-017-0188-8
- Piller, I. (2016). *Linguistic diversity and social justice. an introduction to applied sociolinguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from: https://oula.finna.fi/Record/oy_electronic_oy.9917655868506252
- Premier, J., & Parr, G. (2019). Towards an EAL community of practice: A case study of a multicultural primary school in Melbourne, Australia. *Australian Journal of Language & Literacy*, 42(1), 58-68. Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>
- Reese, L., Silva, P., Antúnez, S., & del-Arco, I. (2021). Linguistic and Cultural Rights of Immigrant Students in Catalonia: Perspectives and Practices of Educators in Four Elementary Schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 24(2), 224-241. 10.1080/13670050.2018.1456511
- Reljić, G., Ferring, D. & Martin, R. (2015). A Meta-Analysis on the Effectiveness of Bilingual Programs in Europe. *Review of educational research*, 85(1), 92-128. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654314548514>
- Robbins, R., Colmant, S., Dorton, J., Schultz, L., Colmant, Y., & Ciali, P. (2006). Colonial Instillations in American Indian Boarding School Students. *Educational Foundations*, 20(3-4), 69-88. Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=http://www.caddogap.com/periodicals.sh>
- Rodríguez-Izquierdo, R. M. (2021). Monolingual ideologies of Andalusian teachers in the multilingual schools' context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism*, , 1-13. 10.1080/13670050.2021.1918627

- Rotatori, A. F., & Alquraini, T. A. (2014). *Special education international perspectives: practices across the globe* (First edition ed.). Bingley, England: Emerald. Retrieved from: https://oula.finna.fi/Record/oy_electronic_oy.9917609546506252
- Rowe, L. W. (2018). Say It in Your Language: Supporting Translanguaging in Multilingual Classes. *The Reading Teacher*, 72(1), 31-38. 10.1002/trtr.1673
- Rowley, J. & Slack, F. (2004). Conducting a literature review. *Management research news*, 27(6), 31-39. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1108/01409170410784185>
- Ruitenbergh, C. & Vokey, D. (2010). Equality and justice. In Bailey, R., Barrow, R., Carr, D. & McCarthy, C (Ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Philosophy of Education* (pp. 401-414). Retrieved from: https://oula.finna.fi/PrimoRecord/pci.cdi_askewsholts_vlebooks_9781446206973
- Slaughter, Y., & Cross, R. (2021). Challenging the Monolingual Mindset: Understanding Plurilingual Pedagogies in English as an Additional Language (EAL) Classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(1), 39-60. Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>
- Smith, E. (2012). Key issues in education and social justice. [Kindle paperwhite version]. Retrieved from: Amazon.com.
- Souto-Manning, M. (2016). Honoring and Building on the Rich Literacy Practices of Young Bilingual and Multilingual Learners. *Reading Teacher*, 70(3), 263-271. 10.1002/trtr.1518
- Surface-Evans, S. (2016). A Landscape of Assimilation and Resistance: The Mount Pleasant Indian Industrial Boarding School. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, 20(3), 574-588. 10.1007/s10761-016-0362-5
- Tarnanen, M., & Palviainen, Å. (2018). Finnish teachers as policy agents in a changing society. *Language & Education: An International Journal*, 32(5), 428-443. 10.1080/09500782.2018.1490747
- Thrift, E., & Sugarman, J. (2019). What is social justice? Implications for psychology. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 39(1), 1-17. 10.1037/teo0000097
- Veerbeek, V. (2021). To (L)Earn Their Place in Society: Student Scrip and a Capitalist Education at Sherman Institute. *Aspeers*, (14), 33-53. Retrieved from: <http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?>

- Vitale IV, F. (2020). Counting Carlisle's Casualties: Defining Student Death at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School, 1879-1918. *American Indian Quarterly*, 44(4), 383-414.
10.5250/amerindiquar.44.4.0383
- Wesely, P. M. (2018). When school language and home language differ: one parent's lived experience. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21(8), 929-942.
10.1080/13670050.2016.1217192
- Woods, E. (2013). A Cultural Approach to a Canadian Tragedy: The Indian Residential Schools as a Sacred Enterprise. *International Journal of Politics, Culture & Society*, 26(2), 173-187.
10.1007/s10767-013-9132-0
- Young, A. S. (2014). Unpacking teachers' language ideologies: Attitudes, beliefs, and practiced language policies in schools in Alsace, France. *Language Awareness*, 23(1-2), 157-171.
10.1080/09658416.2013.863902
- Young, B. (2015). "Killing the Indian in the Child": Death, Cruelty, and Subject-formation in the Canadian Indian Residential School System. *Mosaic: A Journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Literature*, 48(4), 63-76. 10.1353/mos.2015.0054
- Yuvayapan, F. (2019). Translanguaging in EFL Classrooms: Teachers' Perceptions and Practices. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(2), 678-694. Retrieved from:
<http://pc124152.oulu.fi:8080/login?url=>