Languaging and language policies among multilingual children and youth groups in Finland and Denmark

Slotte, Anna; Spindler Møller, Janus; From, Tuuli

Chapter Title: Languaging and Language Policies among Multilingual Children and Youth Groups in Finland and Denmark
Chapter Author(s): Anna Slotte, Janus Spindler Møller and Tuuli From

Book Title: Policy and Practice for Multilingual Educational Settings
Book Subtitle: Comparisons across Contexts
Book Editor(s): Siv Björklund, Mikaela Björklund
Published by: Multilingual Matters / Channel View Publications. (2023)
Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/jj.1231861.7

3 Languaging and Language Policies among Multilingual Children and Youth Groups in Finland and Denmark

Anna Slotte, Janus Spindler Møller and Tuuli From

This chapter looks at pupils' languaging and negotiation of language policies in the context of institutional education in Finland and Denmark. The school system in Finland is divided into two monolingual strands as per the two national languages, Finnish and Swedish, whereas Denmark has a monolingual policy promoting standard Danish in schools. Our theoretical perspective is informed by Spolsky's (2004) notion of language policies consisting of the interrelated dimensions of macro-level language management, language ideologies and micro-level language practices. We analyse interviews with pupils in a Finnish-medium school and a Swedish-medium school, video recordings from bilingual workshops in Finland and group conversations with pupils with diverse linguistic backgrounds in Denmark. The results show how the language management policies and monolingual normativity ascribe language-based identities to pupils, shape their ideas of appropriate language practices and determine the value of bilingualism in both contexts.

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to contribute to the understanding of language policies in institutional education from the perspective of children and youth, informed by Spolsky's (2004) popular classification of language policies consisting of language management, ideologies and practices. Finland is a bilingual country with two official national languages, Finnish and Swedish. Of the whole population, 87.3% have registered Finnish as their first language, whereas 5.2% have registered Swedish (Statistics Finland, 2020). The official language statistics in Finland do not recognise individual multilingualism. To provide equal rights for speakers of both national languages, comprehensive education is organised

separately in two monolingual Finnish- and Swedish-medium strands (Basic Education Act 628/1998, 1998). Encounters between Finnish and Swedish speakers in institutional education are thus limited because schools for both language groups (later referred to as bilingual schools) do not exist and only a small proportion of Finnish- and Swedish-medium schools are located in shared facilities, which can be understood as a way to safeguard the right to education in both national languages (e.g. From & Sahlström, 2017; Sahlström *et al.*, 2013).

Different to Finland, Denmark only has one official language, Danish, meaning that Danish is dominant in public sectors. The educational system favours a monolingual regime of (standard) Danish (Karrebæk, 2013) and, in line with this, the use of Danish in the school system is treated as a truism in the national curriculum at the expense of linguistic diversity (Kristjánsdóttir, 2018; Salö *et al.*, 2018). However, a large proportion of the population in Denmark does not have Danish as their first language. As a result of waves of migration from the 1960s onwards, 14% of the population constitute immigrants and their descendants (Danmarks Statistik, 2020).

We pose the following research question: how do children and youth negotiate language policies in multilingual contexts in the frame of institutional language ideologies in the national education systems?

Theoretical Framework

In studying the intersections between formal language policies and everyday language use in local communities, a broad understanding of language policy as multisited and multidimensional has become established. This enables a focus on the interrelations between macro-level language policies and micro-level language practices – in other words, how formal language policies are carried out and negotiated in daily encounters (Bonacina-Pugh, 2012; McCarty, 2015). A focus on children's and youth's everyday realities increases the understanding of language policies as multidimensional constructs and might, for instance, highlight the role of bilingual or multilingual children and youth in reshaping official policies in education (Bergroth & Palviainen, 2017; Boyd & Huss, 2017; Slotte-Lüttge, 2007).

Spolsky (2004) presents language policies as consisting of three interrelated components: language practices, language ideologies and language management. Language practices can be framed as the conventions and patterns of language use in everyday interactions. Shohamy (2006) points out that observation of these practices enables tracing covert and implicit language policies. Language ideologies refer to general beliefs about language, their value and appropriate language use in a particular community. According to Spolsky (2004), there is a two-way connection between

language ideologies and language practices; they both derive from and influence each other. Language management refers to formal documents, proclamations of official policies or other interventions that aim to influence language practices in a specific context.

In this chapter, the most essential underlying formal policy representing language management in Finland is the separation of the national languages in basic education into two monolingual Swedish- and Finnish-medium strands. In Denmark, the essential part is the naturalisation of the Danish language as the language that counts academically in the official curriculum.

We especially deal with language policies in relation to languages (e.g. Finnish, Swedish, Danish, Arabic). We stress that, rather than viewing languages as naturally given entities, we view them as ideological constructions resulting from sociohistoric processes (Heller, 2007; Jørgensen *et al.*, 2011). Sets of linguistic features become named languages because groups of people, for whatever reasons, claim and enforce the right to categorise them as such. So-called 'national' languages are the outcome of processes that, over time, have established a bond between a way of speaking and an ethnic identity (Blommaert *et al.*, 2012). A good example is the ideologically constructed yet almost inseparable bond between being a Dane and speaking Danish. On the level of language management, such constructions may lead to the implementation of monolingual normativity on a national level and to the implementation of 'correct' ways of speaking the national language (i.e. ideologies of purism) (Edwards, 2009).

However, as documented in numerous sociolinguistic studies, communication does not necessarily mean speaking one language at a time (e.g. Pennycook & Otsuji, 2015; Rampton, 2006). Furthermore, the simplistic idea of the Western subject as monolingual and monocultural has been challenged by the linguistic and cultural complexity in contemporary urban environments in the Nordic countries inhabited by speakers with different linguistic backgrounds (e.g. Madsen, 2013; Milani & Jonsson, 2012). In the light of such findings, Jørgensen (2008) suggests that a perspective on languages is replaced with a perspective of languaging (see also García & Li, 2014). Languaging denotes people's use of any linguistic resources they have access to that works to achieve their communicative goals. This covers anything that speakers may produce verbally, whether it contains language resources associated with several languages or not. Speakers with access to more than one language can then orient to a monolingualism norm dictating the use of only one language at a time (see e.g. Slotte-Lüttge, 2005, 2007). They may also orient to a polylingualism norm where they use whatever resources they have access to and estimate that the interlocutors have the potential to comprehend even if some speakers view these resources as not belonging together (Møller, 2019).

Data and Methods

The data used consist of interviews and video recordings of conversations that, to a high degree, have a metalinguistic focus.

The Finnish part of the data was derived from a research project with an interest in locally multilingual education (DIDIA, 2021). The project followed six workshops where two classes with children aged 9–10 years met over 10 months during 2019. One of the classes was from a Swedish-medium school (nine pupils participating) and the other was from a Finnish-medium school (eight pupils participating). The schools are situated in a rural area of a bilingual municipality. Most of the students lived in monolingual homes, but there were also many students from multilingual homes, mostly Finnish and Swedish, but also Finnish or Swedish and another language. When the project began, all the pupils had studied the other language as a subject for some months.

The workshops, which aimed to enhance language-crossing activities and multilingual practices, were organised in collaboration with a school development project and took place in the local community. The workshop leaders, adults of different professions, were asked to use both Finnish and Swedish in eligible ways and to create opportunities for the children to work in language-mixed smaller groups. After the first meeting in the school, the actual three-hour workshops were organised in a bakery, museum, market-garden, greengrocer and restaurant.

The workshops were video recorded with two cameras (one of them with only one) that followed different student groups. For each of the cameras, one wireless microphone was connected and placed on a pupil. The microphones recorded sounds from a long distance and were changed to different pupils during the workshops. The recordings (total 18 hours) were coded with qualitative data analysis software (NVivo) in relation to situations where language was topicalised by the participating children: discussing language, language practices and negotiating how to use language. Afterwards, the coded parts were transcribed with a transcribing programme (InqScribe).

We conducted focus group interviews with three or four pupils ($n = 17$) in both schools before the collaboration between the schools started and after the last workshop. The interviews were organised in the school during the normal school day and were led by one of the authors together with a research assistant. In the interviews, the following themes were discussed: everyday language practices and language attitudes, particularly towards Finnish, Swedish and English, and the workshops. One part of the interview was accomplished using a set of formulated statements about language presented by the interviewer. As comments to the statement, the children were asked to choose a green, orange or red card. The green cards meant that they agreed with the statements, with the red cards they showed disagreement. Afterwards, the interviewer often initiated a small

discussion. The interview that was conducted after the workshops contained a situation where the interviewer showed a video clip from the workshop and asked questions about the language use (see Excerpt 8).

The interviews were audio recorded (total 5 hours 45 minutes) and transcribed in full. As a guideline for the coding, we drew on Spolsky's (2004) distinction between three components of language policy. We paid specific attention to the negotiation about appropriate language practices in different contexts, particularly in relation to the school institution, which we consider as having a significant role in shaping language ideologies and framing the premises for language management.

For the analyses presented in this chapter, we chose sequences from the coded material (almost 6 hours of interviews and 18 hours of video recordings) that particularly contribute to understanding language policies.

The Danish part of the data was from the Everyday Languaging project (Madsen *et al.*, 2016), which was based in a public school situated in a heterogeneous area of Copenhagen. The overall aim of the project was to investigate processes of enregisterment (Agha, 2007) among the participating pupils; that is, how ways of speaking in their daily lives interrelated with interpersonal conduct, social stereotypes, norms for situated use and sociolinguistic classification and how this developed over time. The participating pupils represented many different linguistic backgrounds. In the class, around two-thirds of the pupils had at least one parent who did not have Danish as their first language. This group was followed from their school start in 2010 until 2020. A number of different data types were collected, including ethnographic observation, video and sound recordings, social media interaction and recordings of arranged group conversations. The data used in this chapter were recorded in spring 2018 when the participants were 13–14 years old and came from arranged group conversations. In advance, the project team had written six open-ended questions on pieces of cardboard, such as 'How do you speak in school/at home/ with friends?' In two of the groups, all participants had linguistic minority backgrounds; in both of these groups, practices and ideologies concerning multilingualism were brought up by the participants, which is the reason why we have chosen to work with examples from these conversations. A fieldworker instructed the groups to discuss the questions one by one and they were given a large piece of paper to write down keywords. Then they were left alone to do the task. After approximately 30 minutes, the fieldworkers returned to the room and discussed whatever the participants had written down. Methodologically, the idea was to facilitate a 'space for reflection and dialogue' (Heller *et al.*, 2018: 92) where the participants shared and discussed experiences and general views. The discussions in some cases enabled us to get an understanding of opposite views. In other cases, participants posed new questions spontaneously, such as about 'being bilingual'.

Table 3.1 Transcription key

Key	Meaning
(.)	Short pause (less than 0.2 seconds)
(1.0)	Pause (in seconds)
[	Indicates where an overlap starts
]	Indicates where an overlap ends
text-	Sudden break
((text))	Clarifying comments
(text)	Transcription uncertain
(x)	Inaudible

The interviews were also coded based on Spolsky's notions of language practice, ideology and management and the excerpts presented in this chapter represent the coding results. The transcription key used in the excerpts is provided in Table 3.1

In the following, we discuss nine sequences from the Finnish material followed by five from the Danish data. Then we discuss how the insights gained from the two field sites complement each other and to what degree different types of experiences concerning the regimentation of linguistic diversity may lead to different types of metasociolinguistic positioning.

Reconstructing the Parallel School System: The Finnish Case

Following Spolsky's (2004) thought, the separation of the national languages in Finnish educational legislation can be considered as language management with direct aims to influence language practices in schools. In addition to safeguarding the right to education in both national languages (Finnish and Swedish), the parallel school system has an influence on pupils' language ideologies, identity construction and what kinds of language practices are considered thinkable (see e.g. From, 2020; Slotte-Lüttge, 2005, 2007).

The impact of the parallel school system on pupils' language ideologies and practices comes up both in the interview data and the workshop video recordings. The first video excerpt is from the fifth workshop, where the two classes meet in a local food manufacturer. The workshop leader uses both Swedish and Finnish with the students, switching from one language to another, without repeating everything in the other language. Just before the excerpt begins, the workshop leader (Mia) has given instructions to a group of four students from the Finnish school, primarily addressed to Sebastian who comes from a bilingual home. In this situation, Kira sits close to Sebastian and follows Mia while she is talking. The instructions are given in Swedish and the students topicalise their Swedish knowledge.

Excerpt 1. I just spoke

1	**Venla:**	emmäkää puhu (.) tai no kyl mä puhun sillee niinku- *neither do I speak (.) or well actually I speak like-*
2	**Sebastian:**	se on ollu ruotsinkielises päiväkodis *she has been in a Swedish-speaking childcare*
3	**Kasper:**	onko (.) mä [on ollu a- *has she (.) I [have been a-*
4	**Venla:**	[silloin mä puhuin kotonaki [*at that time I even spoke at home* vähäsen (.) kun mä olin siellä- *a little (.) when I was there-*
5	**Kira:**	miks *why*
6	**Venla:**	[koska [*because*
7	**Sebastian:**	[Kasper [*Kasper*
8	**Venla:**	siks ei sitä voi (.) emmä tiiä (1.0) mä vaa puhuin *because one can't (.) I don't know (1.0) I just spoke*

The topicalisation of language leads to a comment by Venla that she does not speak Swedish either, shortly followed by adding that she actually does (speak some). Before she continues, Sebastian interrupts her and declares to the group that Venla has attended a Swedish-medium childcare, a comment that is interesting for Kasper who reacts by sharing his own experience. Venla comments that when she was in the Swedish-medium childcare, she spoke some Swedish at home too but does not explain the reason further. Seen through Spolsky's lens, we may observe how the explicit policy of monolingual institutions appears in the children's negotiations of languaging. Sebastian's explanation of Venla's Swedish knowledge relating to childcare makes the Swedish-medium childcare a backdrop for Venla's knowledge and use of Swedish, which is further strengthened by Venla's comment where she connects her earlier practice of sometimes speaking Swedish at home to the time when she was in the childcare.

In a recording from another bilingual workshop, the pupils are given the instruction to pair up with someone who is not in the same class in order to 'mix up as much as possible', as the workshop leader said. Later, she repeats the instruction by reminding the pupils to avoid taking a seat next to their own classmates to get 'fully mixed'. Thus, according to the workshop leader, the classes are mentioned as a basis for the seating.

Having found their seats, some pupils from the Finnish-medium school are sitting by the table, with some empty seats between them. As their classmate Venla enters the room, Kira, Ella and Luna start passing on the instruction they were given.

Excerpt 2. Because between us there is supposed to be a Swede

1 **Kira:**   ((talks to Venla and gestures to another table))
             tulepa tähän (1.0) koska meijän välissä pitää olla yks
             ruotsalainen
             *come here (1.0) because between us there is supposed
             to be one Swede*
2 **Ella:**   [nii (.) mäkää mä ja Kirakaan ei saada olla vierekkäin
             [yeah (.) even Kira and I can't be next to each other
3 **Luna:**   [nii
             [yeah
4 **Kira:**   nii me ollaa sit vastapäätä
             so we are then opposite

Kira instructs Venla not to sit in one of the empty chairs because 'between us there is supposed to be a Swede' (line 1). Unlike the instruction given by the workshop leader, in this organising practice the pupil from the other school is categorised by Kira in accordance with their school language. Moreover, the pupils from the Swedish-medium school get labelled as Swedes instead of Swedish-speaking (see From & Sahlström, 2017). The situation ends with an argument on how this instruction should be interpreted and seems to imply that the pupils would primarily favour sitting next to their own classmates.

During the same workshop, Ella from the Finnish-medium school and Vera from the Swedish-medium school sit side by side, as instructed. However, they do not talk to each other but turn in opposite directions to talk to their classmates. Ella has difficulties fitting her chair by the table because of Vera's mispositioned chair, but instead of turning to Vera to solve the issue, she discusses the problem in Finnish with her classmates sitting in the other direction. Vera grasps the problem and moves her chair without asking. Ella responds by thanking Vera in Swedish. This seems to imply that, despite the non-committal stance towards the cooperation, there is a tentative will to show interest towards the bilingual practices.

As noted earlier, the monolingual norm was particularly distinct in school-related discussions with the pupils. The separation of Finnish and Swedish in the school system appears as a form of language management, which has a strong influence on pupils' language ideologies (see Spolsky, 2004). Even if many of the pupils mentioned have come across multilingual practices in their spare time and at home, in school-related topics they primarily categorised their peers as monolingual in relation to their school language.

In the following two excerpts, from interviews after the workshop cooperations, the interviewer opens the discussion by presenting a statement about bilingual schools. The pupils are asked to show a green, orange or red card, whereafter the interviewer asks them to comment on their stance. The first excerpt is from the Swedish-medium school.

Excerpt 3. It takes a very long time

1	**Interviewer:**	ja tycker att svenska å finska barn borde gå i samma skola
		I think that Swedish-speaking and Finnish-speaking children should go to the same school
		((Otto, Rasmus, Vera and Albin show cards))
2	**Interviewer:**	nån som vill kommentera?
		does anyone want to comment?
3	**Otto:**	jag jag
		I I
4	**Rasmus:**	*ja e så hä*
		I'm like this
5	**Otto:**	för då om man frå- gör en matteuppgift
		because then if one is ask- doing a maths exercise
		å säger så här gör man (.) så
		and says that this is how it is done (.) so
		förstår- om man säger de på svenska så
		understands- if it is said in Swedish so
		förstår int finska barnen de
		the Finnish children do not understand it
6	**Interviewer:**	mm
		mm
7	**Otto:**	så måst man [säga de (.) två gånger
		and one must [say it (.) twice
8	**Rasmus:**	[så måst man tala två] språk hela
		[then two languages must be] spoken all
		tiden [liksom
		the time [like
9	**Interviewer:**	[mm
		[mm
10	**Rasmus:**	å [sen tar de jättelång tid
		and [then it takes a very long time
11	**Otto:**	[de blir irriterande
		[and it gets irritating
12	**Rasmus:**	tills man kan börja med uppgiften
		before one can start with the task

For Otto, who presented a red card to show opposition to the idea of Swedish- and Finnish-speaking children sharing schools, potential problems occur with Finnish-speakers' ability to understand instructions given in Swedish. In this case, all content would need to be delivered in both languages, which Rasmus finds time-consuming and irritating. From this point of view, it appears understandable that the pupils do not necessarily see the value in bilingual groups. This might imply that these pupils are aware of Finnish-speakers' often limited proficiency in Swedish. However, we also need to acknowledge that the formulation of the statement presented to the pupils conforms to the idea of two separate language groups and might influence their thinking accordingly.

Interestingly, the monolingual norm seemed to emerge regardless of the pupils' attitudes towards bilingual practices. The pupils in the Finnish-medium school were generally more approving of the idea of bilingual schools but nevertheless had a similar assumption of monolingual individuals as the linguistic norm.

In the following excerpt, Max, a pupil in the Finnish-medium school, ponders the benefits of a bilingual school. This example also begins with the interviewer presenting a statement followed by the children's comments supported by the coloured cards.

Excerpt 4. If, for example, you are friends

1	**Interviewer:**	minusta suomenkieliset ja ruotsinkieliset
		I think Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking
		lapset tulisivat käydä samaa koulua
		children should attend the same school
		((Sebastian shows the green card))
2	**Interviewer:**	okei (.) mitä ä m (.) mmm kerro lisää siitä
		okay (.) what e m (.) mmm tell more about it
3	**Sebastian:**	mun mielest se ois hyvä koska (.) sit jos
		I think it would be good because (.) then if
		vaikka sä oot ruotsinkielisen kaveri
		for example, you are friends with a Swedish-speaking
		ja sit ite puhut su- suomee (.) niin sit sä
		and then you speak Fi- Finnish (.) so then you
		saatat oppii siltä (.) ruotsia paljon
		could learn from them (.) a lot of Swedish
4	**Lauri:**	[nii]
		[yeah]
5	**Sebastian:**	[ja] se saattaa oppii sulta suomea
		[and] they might learn Finnish from you
6	**Interviewer:**	mm
		mm
7	**Sebastian:**	sit osaatte puhuu molemmat molempii kielii
		then you both can speak both languages

In Excerpt 4, Sebastian endorses the idea of a bilingual school because of the potential for mutual language learning. Interestingly, Sebastian presents the other national language as primarily learned through friendship instead of school instruction. This implies the persistence of the monolingual norm of the school institution, particularly regarding curricula and classrooms. In the current educational context, the pupils might intuitively associate the interview question of 'attending the same school' with a co-located school (see e.g. From, 2020; Sahlström *et al.*, 2013). Alternatively, Sebastian's stance underlines an ideology of language as a means of communication and might be influenced by the multilingual practices emerging in the pupils' everyday lives outside school.

In their ideologies and practices, the pupils seemed to rely on a typical view of languages as separate entities (Makoni & Pennycook, 2007), which shows, for example, in their perceptions of multilingual practices emerging in the interviews and workshops. In our data, mixing languages was typically considered peculiar, inconvenient and time-consuming. It can be assumed that, in addition to the general ideological monolingualism in education, the separate school system for Finnish and Swedish speakers has some influence on how children consider bilingual practices in Finland. Almér (2017) found that even children in early childhood education show awareness of the fact that Finnish and Swedish are to be separated in some situations. However, according to previous studies, schoolchildren find ways to challenge the monolingual norm through their ideologies and practices (From, 2020; Slotte-Lüttge, 2007).

In Excerpt 5, from a group interview with pupils in the Swedish-medium school, the interviewer asks the pupils to reflect on the idea of speaking two languages at the same time. This interview took place prior to the workshops.

Excerpt 5. Says the next word in Finnish

1	**Interviewer:**	mm (1.0) kan man prata två språk samtidit
		mm (1.0) can one speak two languages simultaneously
		tror ni
		do you think
2	**Teo:**	[jåå]
		[yes]
3	**Melina:**	[jåå]
		[yes]
4	**Oskar:**	jå
		yeah
5	**Interviewer:**	hu gör man då
		how is it done
6	**Teo:**	nå man ta (.) m ta (.) a si säg (.) säger någo ord å
		well one ta (.) m ta (.) a si sa (.) says some word and
		sen säger man nästa ord på finska å så
		then says the next word in Finnish and so
7	**Interviewer:**	mm (2.0) t hjåå (.) vem brukar prata så
		mm (2.0) t hyeah (.) who usually speaks like that
8	**Melina:**	ingen
		no-one
9	**Teo:**	ingen
		no-one

In the discussion, Teo, Melina and Oskar agree that it is possible to speak two languages at the same time. According to Teo, such a bilingual practice would consist of alternately combining words from both languages. However, when the interviewer asks them to name a person who tends to

speak like this, both Melina and Teo reply that no-one does (see Almér, 2017). Thus, a bilingual practice or translanguaging in the form of simultaneous use of two languages by one person appears more as an abstract idea than a considerable practice against the backdrop of a monolingual norm. Furthermore, when asked to speculate about why some people mix languages, the pupils in the Finnish-medium school came up with ideas related to communication and language proficiency, as shown in Excerpt 6.

Excerpt 6. I must say it in Finnish

1	**Interviewer:**	ööm (2.0) miksi luulette et jotkut sekottaa
		umm (2.0) why do you think that some mix
		kieliä? (2.0) Ella
		languages? (2.0) Ella
2	**Ella:**	no jos on kuuntelijoina suomenkielisiä ruotsinkiel-
		well if the listeners are Finnish-speaking Swedish-
		tai iha minkä tahansa (.) öö niinku vaikka
		speaking- or really anything (.) uh like say
		kakskielisiäki (.)ni ö ni sit (.) et ne
		even bilingual (.) so uh so then (.) so then that they
		my- ymmärtää (.) ne ymmärtää molemmat et (.) jos on
		als - understand (.)understand both that (.) if there
		vaikka suomenkielisiä ja ruotsinkielisiä (.)
		is, for example, Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking
		sekotettuina (.) niin sitten ne senhän pitää puhuu
		(.) mixed (.) so then they should speak
		suomeks sekä ruotsiks että ne molemmat
		both Finnish and Swedish so that they both would
		ymmärtäis
		understand
3	**Interviewer:**	okei (.) Sebastian
		okay (.) Sebastian
4	**Sebastian:**	että (1.0) mä välillä (.) ää puhun erillain jos mä en
		so (1.0) I sometimes (.) speak differently if I don't
		tiedä sitä sanaa ruotsiks (.) ja sit mä s aluks puhun
		know that word in Swedish (.) and then I first speak
		vaikka ruotsiks (.) ni sit mun on pakko sanoo se
		for example, in Swedish (.) so then I must say it
		suomeks koska mä en tiiä miten se on ruotsiks
		in Finnish because I don't know how it is in Swedish

While Ella suggests that a person's motive for mixing languages might have to do with including the audience with varying language proficiencies (with the assumption that Swedish and Finnish speakers do not understand each other's languages), Sebastian, who comes from a bilingual home, suggests that lacking a particular word in Swedish forces one to replace it with a Finnish word – he then speaks 'differently'. Thus, the

motive for a bilingual practice may be to compensate for 'incomplete' proficiency in a particular language. Both views represent a monolingual ideology, where individuals are primarily Swedish or Finnish speakers, and even when having proficiency in both languages, like Sebastian, one should aim to stick to a single language to keep up with a coherent language practice.

A similar monolingual stance among the pupils appears in the following excerpt, where the workshop leader, Mia, has given instructions in Swedish to Kira, a pupil in the Finnish-medium school.

Excerpt 7. Soon she talks

1 **Sebastian:**   se on Kira (.) se ei puhu ruotsii
                 that's Kira (.) she doesn't speak Swedish
                 (9.0)
2 **Kasper:**   Mia (.) Kira ei sit puhu ruotsii
                 Mia (.) Kira doesn't speak Swedish
3 **Mia:**   no (.) koht puhuu
                 well (.) soon she talks
4 **Kasper:**   koht puhuu
                 soon she talks ((laughing))

The instructions are given in Swedish, which leads to a reaction by Sebastian, followed by a repetition by Kasper, who both want to inform Mia that Kira does not speak Swedish. Mia's answer, 'well soon she talks' (line 3), is repeated by Kasper with a laugh. The laugh can be understood as distancing from Mia's reaction, which in turn can be seen as an expression about the possibility to mix languages, where it is not self-evident to keep to a one person–one language format.

The following excerpt is from the interview after the workshops. First, the interviewer showed the students a video clip from one of the workshops, where the workshop leader gave instructions by mixing Swedish and Finnish, switching between the languages, without saying everything in both languages. The interviewer then gave the statement 'I think it has been difficult when the workshop instructors have said some parts in Swedish and some in Finnish' – the pupils were once again supposed to express their opinion of this statement by showing a green, yellow or red card.

Excerpt 8. Most in Finnish and not everything in Swedish

1 **Interviewer:**   [om du tycker att de ha varit jobbigt
                   [if you think that it has been tough/difficult
                   så sätter du upp gröna kortet] (.)
                   then you show the green card] (.)
2 **Otto:**   [om man om man tycker jätte (.) jättejobbit (.) jäh]
                   [if you find it very (.) very tough (.) eh]

3	**Interviewer:**	om du håller med de här påståendet
		if you agree with this claim
4	**Otto:**	jättejobbit
		very tough/difficult
5	**Interviewer:**	mm okej
		mm okay
6	**Otto:**	jobbigast när hon säger mest finska å int
		most annoying when she says most in Finnish and not
		allt på svenska
		everything in Swedish
7	**Interviewer:**	okej (.) jå (.) vaför e det jobbit?
		okay (.) yes (.) why is it annoying?
8	**Otto:**	för att hon säger hh (.) öm saker på finska å sen int
		because she says (.) eh- things in Finnish and then not
		alla saker som hon sa på finska på finska på svenska
		all things that she says in Finnish also in Swedish

In Excerpt 8, inconsistency and imbalance between Finnish and Swedish are presented as making bilingual practices tough, difficult and confusing. Otto expresses difficulties in being able to understand the other language properly. Thus, even if reflecting a monolingual norm, this seems to be not only an ideological stance but also a practical question. In light of our data, the pupils seem to think that, to be included, one must be able to speak and fully understand both languages that are being used in the conversation (see Almér, 2017). Otherwise, they consider bilingual practices reasonable only when the delivered content is identical in both languages.

The next excerpt is from the third workshop. The children sit at tables and the workshop leader, Anni, gives instructions on how to fold paper flowers. While she gives the instructions orally, she does the folding herself in front of the children, meaning that the activity did not depend only on language. Earlier, Anni told the children not to worry if they did not understand, saying 'you'll get to know everything that is important in both languages'. The main parts of the first instructions about folding were presented in Finnish. When Anni was ready, Otto calls to her.

Excerpt 9. Can you say it in Swedish?

1	**Anni:**	jå Otto
		yes Otto
2	**Otto:**	kan du säga de på svenska va man sku göra
		can you say it in Swedish what we were supposed to do?
3	**Anni:**	jå-å
		ye-es
4	**Ella:**	hhmh
		hhmh
5	**Luna:**	mä en tajunnu edes (miten teemme)
		I did not even understand (how we will do it)

6   **Anni:**   noo ei [se mitää (.) tää on semmonen]
            well no [problem (.) this is something]
7   **Ella:**   [ku sä selitit vaan ruotsiks]
                  [because you explained it only in Swedish]
8   **Anni:**   tää on semmonen juttu mikä lähtee kokeilemalla (.) nyt
            this is something that will work out by trying (.) now
            se on outoo jos (.) ruotsinkieliset sanoo voitsä
            it is weird if (.) Swedish speakers say can you
            selittää myös ruotsiksi ja suomenkieliset et sä
            also explain in Swedish and Finnish speakers that you
            selitit vaan nytte ruotsiks (.) mut (.) se johtuu ehkä
            explained it only in Swedish (.) but (.) it might be
            siitä et mä en ollu kauheen hyvä selittämään ku mä
            because I was not very good at explaining when I
            huomasin et mä ehkä ookkaan niin kauheen hyvä
            noticed that I might not after all be very good
            tekemään näitä mut mä istun teidän kanssa niin
            at making these, but I will sit with you so we can
            harjotellaan yhdessä
            practice together

The folding activity seems to be demanding for many of the children and some ask for additional help. After Otto's question to Anni to explain in Swedish, Luna (from the Finnish-medium school) continues by saying that she did not understand what they are supposed to do. She does not mention the language, but Ella, also from the Finnish-medium school, follows up on her comment by mentioning the language 'because you only explained it in Swedish'. Both Otto and Ella topicalise a need for instruction in their language. This can be understood as if the rationality of bilingual practices is judged within a monolingual normativity or from the perspective of someone who only masters one of the languages used in the discussion. Interestingly, the leader does not go into the children's motives of language as the reason for the problems but provides her weak competence in folding as the reason for the unclarity. In the children's interviews, a dominant idea seems to be that participating in bilingual practices requires bilingual proficiency to start with (see Almér, 2017).

To Fit or Not to Fit within a Monolingual Regime: The Danish Case

The first excerpt from the Danish study is from Group 1, consisting of girls Lina, Aida, Aisha and Gül. Gül is not talking in this excerpt but is referred to by Aisha. All the participants have parents who speak a first language other than Danish. The excerpt is from right after the fieldworkers left the participants to discuss the questions. The one they start out with is 'Which ways of speaking do you know?'

Excerpt 10. Like others say Quran

1 **Lina:** hvilke måder at tale på kender I? - what?
which ways of speaking do you know? – what?
2 **Aida:** hvilke måder at tale på kender I
which ways of speaking do you know?
3 **Lina:** ja
yes
4 **Aida:** okay øh
okay eh
5 **Aisha:** øh
eh
6 **Aida:** hvad mener de med det?
what do they mean by that?
7 **Aisha:** jeg kender godt en måde at tale på Gül hun er meget
I know a way of speaking, Gül is very
grim hun ligner mit røvhul
ugly she looks like my asshole
((deltagerne griner))
((the participants laugh))
8 **Aida:** må må jeg lige læse det hurtigt
may may I just quickly read it
9 **Aisha:** (x)
10 **Lina:** det er forskellige måder ligesom andre siger koran
its different ways like others say quran
jeg sværger jeg ved ikke hvad
I swear I don't know what
11 **Aisha:** eller mig det der slang ew jeg sværger jeg topper dig
or me that slang hey I swear I top you
din fucking hund
you fucking dog
12 **Aida:** jeg kender ikke så meget for jeg taler på en meget
I don't know that much because I speak in a very
normal måde så er der nogen som der siger tyve
normal way then there are some people who say twenty
((twenty pronounced with palatalised t))
eller sådan noget
or something like that
13 **Lina:** nej kom til Tåstrup abi
no come to Tåstrup brother
((to and Tåstrup pronounced with palatalised t))

After a phase of clarifying what the fieldworkers mean by the question (lines 2–9) and joking around (line 8), the participants discuss a way of speaking that Aisha categorises as slang in line 11. In connection to this, the participants describe or exemplify a number of features they associate with this way of speaking: Lexically, they point to '*abi*' (brother in Turkish), '*ew*' (hey or similar in Kurdish), '*Koran*' (Quran in Danish), '*jeg sværger*' (I swear in Danish), '*jeg topper dig*' (I top you in Danish, here with the meaning I beat

you up) and 'fucking'. Furthermore, they enhance the phonetic feature of t-palatalisation ([t] pronounced as [tj]). An important point in connection to our argument is that this way of speaking involves language resources associated with Danish alongside a range of other languages – in this excerpt, Turkish, Kurdish and English. Thereby, the example displays that the participants are familiar with alternatives to monolingual normativity.

In connection to the participants' description, it is interesting that two of them actually distance themselves from this way of speaking (Lina in line 10 and Aida in line 12). Seen through Spolsky's theoretical framework, this underlines how the levels of practice and ideology interplay. The participants can describe and mimic a practice in detail and distance themselves from it on the level of ideology at the same time. We know from our fieldwork in general that this way of speaking is well known by our participants and associated with toughness and masculinity as well as a migration background (Hyttel-Sørensen, 2017; Madsen, 2013) and this may be part of the reason why this distancing occurs.

The next excerpt is from the beginning of the discussion in the other group. The questions they read in the excerpt translate into 'How do you speak with your friends?' and 'How do you speak in school?'

Excerpt 11. They view it as gang

1	**Mehmet:**	hvordan taler I med jeres venner? vi taler slang you
		how do you speak with your friends, we speak slang you
		know slang (.) tror jeg det hedder hedder det
		know slang (.) I think it is called isn't it
		ikke slang
		called slang
2	**Isaam:**	det hedder slang
		it's called slang
3	**Mehmet:**	vi taler altså dejligt og vi
		we speak you know lovely, and we
		hygger og ((fnisen)) ((laver sin stemme om))
		are having a good time and ((giggles)) ((changes his voice))
4	**Isaam:**	øh rigsdansk
		eh standard Danish
5	**Mehmet:**	vi taler høfligt og (x) kom fuck det Alexei her
		we speak polite and (x) come fuck it Alexei
		tag et spørgsmål
		take a question
6	**Isaam:**	nej altså vi snakker slang ah
		no you know we speak slang right
7	**Alexei:**	hvordan taler i i skolen?
		how do you speak in school?
8	**Isaam:**	samme måde
		same way

9	**Mehmet:**	neej (.) foran lærerne taler vi sådan -
		noo (.) in front of the teachers we speak like
10	**Alexei:**	foran lærerne snakker vi ikke sådan der
		in front of the teachers we do not speak like this
11	**Mehmet:**	ja [de ser det som] bande
		yeh [they view it as] a gang
12	**Isaam:**	[der snakker vi]
		[there we speak]
13	**Mehmet:**	der snakker vi høfligt og pænt og vi siger
		there we speak polite and nice, and we say
		godmorgen
		((changes his voice)) good morning

In lines 1 and 2, Mehmet and Isaam establish that the way of speaking they associate with communication with friends is 'slang'. We know from fieldwork more generally that this way of speaking corresponds to what the girl group also categorised as slang in Excerpt 10. In line 3, Mehmet mimics another way of speaking. He changes to a more standard-like prosody, a higher pitch and uses the phrase '*vi hygger* , where the expression '*hygge*' (cosiness) is emblematic for (the majority of) Danish culture. Isaam reacts by categorising this as '*rigsdansk*' (standard Danish) in line 4. In this way, the participants summarise a system of two ways of speaking (slang and standard Danish), identify with the first and distance themselves from the other by means of parodic stylisation (Rampton, 2009). Mehmet continues the parody in line 5 but interrupts himself and says 'fuck it', which can be interpreted as a contextualisation cue (Gumperz, 1982) signalling that the parodic performance is over. He then urges Alexei to read out the next question.

From line 8 onwards, the participants interpret the question 'How do you speak in school?' as how they speak in front of the teachers. Alexei and Mehmet both state that they do not use 'slang' in these situations and Mehmet comments that the reason is that the teachers associate this way of speaking with gang activities (line 11). Then Mehmet performs a new parody (line 13), which resembles the way of speaking introduced in line 3 by using a similar prosodic pattern and higher pitch. Again, he mentions speaking '*høfligt*' (polite). In this way, the boys describe how the teachers expect to hear standard Danish and how they cope with this expectation to avoid being labelled derogatively as, for example, gang members. Viewing the example through Spolsky's terminology, they assign the role of language managers with the power to enforce the monolingual ideology of standard Danish to the teachers.

Returning to the girls' group, the next excerpt is a description of a teacher's explicit language management. This excerpt is from when the fieldworkers re-entered the room and discussed the task with the participants. The fieldworker addresses the question 'How do you speak in school?'

Excerpt 12. Then he throws himself on the floor

1   **Thomas:**   hvordan taler I i skolen? det var det sidste
             how do you speak in school? that was the last
2   **Aisha:**   pænt
             nice
3   **Thomas:**   pænt ja
             nice yes
4   **Gül:**   nej
             no
5   **Thomas:**   nej
             no ((questioning intonation))
6   **Gül:**   vi taler grimt i skolen
             we speak in an ugly manner in school
7   **Thomas:**   også i timerne
             also during lessons
8   **Gül:**   når Poul han er der ikke også så siger jeg sådan for
             when Poul he is there, you know then I say like for
             eksempel hvis jeg siger hold kæft så gør Poul sådan
             example if I say shut up then Poul does like
             her
             this ((Gül puts her hands to her heart))
             og så kaster han sig ned på
             and then he throws himself on ((turns her eyes up))
             gulvet og så siger jeg bare rolig Poul du er gammel du
             the floor and then I say relax Poul you are old you
             skal passe på hjertet
             need to take care of your heart

Gül states in line 6 that she sometimes speaks 'ugly' while in school and then turns to describe how a named teacher (here called Poul) reacts if he hears her say '*hold kæft*' (shut up). Poul is the class teacher, so he also has responsibility for the wellbeing of the pupils. Furthermore, he is the teacher who spends most weekly hours with the class. Gül describes how Poul performs a reaction of physical shock through gestures, eyesight and simulated fainting when hearing foul language. She hints that the reaction is excessive by jokingly describing how she urges the teacher to relax and watch his heart. Poul's reaction can be seen as language managing. Based on an ideology prescribing the correct way of speaking in the classroom, he intervenes when he experiences Gül transgressing this norm. In this way, Gül's narrative personifies Poul in the role of language manager of the language ideology of the school.

In fact, Poul is often referred to by the pupils as a key representative for a linguistic norm representing standard Danish. The next excerpt shows how the participants feel that this position may lead to an insufficient view on bilingualism. Noteworthy, the question posed by Aida in line 1 was not formulated by the fieldworkers in advance but put forward on their own initiative when the group had finished discussing the questions prepared by the researchers.

Excerpt 13. A bit Poul-ish

1	**Aida:**	det her lyder måske sådan lidt Poul-agtigt hvordan er
		this perhaps sounds a bit Poul-ish what is
		det at være tosproget? (.) øh (0.3) egentlig som
		it like to be bilingual? (.) eh (0.3) really as a
		person hvordan synes I det er at være tosproget?
		person how do you think it is to be bilingual?
2	**Aisha:**	altså jeg [synes det er meget godt]
		well I [I think it is fine]
3	**Lina:**	[jeg synes det er nemt]
		[I think it is easy]
4	**Gül:**	[jeg synes også det er fint]
		[I also think it is fine]
		(short discussion about where Poul comes from in Denmark is
		left out)
5	**Lina:**	han tror tosproget at være tosproget det er svært
		he thinks bilingual to be bilingual it is tough
		det er det sgu [ikke
		it is bloody [not
6	**Aisha:**	[nej
		[no
7	**Gül:**	han skal altid gøre det som om det er en dårlig ting
		he always has to make it like it is a bad thing
		når han siger det
		when he says it
8	**Aisha:**	og Poul han skal altid tale om Tyrkiet mand
		and Poul he always has to talk about Turkey man
		er vi enige
		do you agree?
9	**Lina:**	ja jeg får psykose
		yeah, I get psychosis
10	**Aisha:**	og det værste der er kun en tyrker
		and the worst thing is there is only one Turk, the
		resten er kurdere
		rest are Kurds

In the first line, Aida frames her question as 'a bit Poul-ish' (the teacher referred to in Excerpt 12) and then asks the other participants how it is to be bilingual. The question points to a language ideology that divides speakers into monolinguals and bilinguals. First, the other three participants describe it as 'fine' and 'easy' (lines 2–4). Then they turn to discuss where Poul's view on bilinguals comes from and how it affects them. In line 9, Lina summarises the discussion by claiming that Poul (wrongly) thinks it is difficult to be bilingual and Gül adds that Poul's actions show his insufficient view on bilingualism. In terms of language ideology, the description of Poul's view and actions can be said to reconstruct an understanding of monolingualism (in the shape of standard Danish) as the

normal and privileged in the school. Remembering the descriptions of Poul's reactions to cursing (Excerpt 12), the participants describe a central representative for the school's institutional language ideology, which represents the correct, normal Danish language and, at the same time, assumes that bilingualism must be a difficult challenge for pupils. This position makes sense in an educational system where the 'normal' (or normalised) pupil is constructed as monolingual and monocultural.

However, the participants object being constructed as different and disadvantaged and challenges the teacher's acts. Aisha accuses Poul of always wanting to talk about Turkey and describe how he overlooks that a range of pupils identify as Kurds (and not as Turks). On the one hand, this description works in the situation to destabilise Poul's assumptions in general. On the other, it points to an important paradox: Poul's role in the class is to promote monolingualism and monoculturalism and to make sure that all pupils are included. Aisha's description points to a strategy where Poul handles this paradox by including phenomena related to countries he believes the pupils have connections to in his lessons. However, according to Aisha, this does not create the effect of inclusion because it is based on the oversimplified assumption that a person's ethnicity can be simply deduced from the nation their families migrated from – what Irvine and Gal (2000) describe as an ideological act of erasure.

We wish to underline that the purpose here is not to critique the teacher. In fact, he is, in our experience, generally well-liked and respected by the pupils. The problem illustrated by the participants should rather be seen as an example of what can happen when teachers are asked to make a regime of monolingualism and monoculturalism work in classes where the pupils have a range of different language backgrounds, national affiliations and migration histories.

In the last excerpt from Denmark, the group of boys explain to the fieldworkers what they talked about in connection to the question 'How do you speak at home?'

Excerpt 14. Mix between kebab and chicken

1 **Isaam:**   og så hvad vi taler derhjemme det er du ved
and then what do we speak at home it is you know
nogen de snakker jeg ved ikke halv dansk halv
somebody they talk I don't know half Danish, half
tyrkisk vil jeg tro
Turkish I believe
2 **Mehmet:**   (x) man laver den der man siger tre ord på det
(x) you do that thing you say three words
tyrkisk så kommer lige et ord på dansk og så er
in Turkish then a word in Danish just comes in
sådan der (.) man laver lige et mix
it's like that (.) you just make a mix

3 **Isaam:**   jeg snakker
                I talk
4 **Mehmet:**   ligesom når man er sulten og spiser shawarma
                like when you are hungry and eat shawarma
5 **Isaam:**   jeg snakker bare [dansk]
                I just speak [Danish]
6 **Mehmet:**   [mix] mellem kebab og kylling
                        [mix] between kebab and chicken
7 **Isaam:**   jeg snakker bare dansk og du snakker halv halv ikke
                I just speak Danish and you speak half-half, right

In line 1, Isaam reports from the pupils' earlier discussion that some claimed that they used 'half Danish, half Turkish' at home. Mehmet elaborates on this in lines 2, 4 and 6, comparing the language use to mixing different types of meat when eating shawarma. Both Mehmet's use of '*lige*' (just) in line 2 and his use of the shawarma metaphor construct the use of Danish and Turkish juxtaposed as a mundane routine activity. An interesting question here is why Mehmet chooses to include the comparison to shawarma at this point of the conversation. The activity of 'mixing languages' was not spelled out when the participants were by themselves. In this light, a likely explanation is that Mehmet assumes this way of using language is new to the two (majority Danish) fieldworkers, and they therefore need a pedagogical introduction. In this way, Mehmet's description displays the knowledge that linguistic features associated with different languages may be routinely combined in interaction and that this may come as a surprise to speakers he believes to represent a Danish monolingual standard ideology. Members of the research group were very careful to never take a normative linguistic stance, but the participants still occasionally ascribed the role of linguistic authorities to them.

Apart from reporting what the other students said earlier, Isaam states that he only speaks Danish at home. In line 7, he sums his and Mehmet's different positions up as 'speaking Danish' and 'half-half'. In other words, he describes how some may orient to a monolingual norm at home, while others orient to a polylingual norm. The two norms are not described as competing or in a hierarchy but simply as two different possibilities for linguistic behaviour.

Discussion

The following discussion derives from the research question: How do children and youth negotiate language policies in multilingual contexts in the frame of institutional language ideologies in the national education systems?

We begin with summarised discussions of the analyses from both contexts separately, after which we proceed to consider how the insights

gained from the two field sites may complement each other. In line with Spolsky (2004), we understand language policies as interactions in highly complex dynamic contexts, where the three interrelated components (language practices, language ideologies and language management) are constantly dependent on each other and a modification of any part may have correlated effects and causes on any other part. This means that more formal macro-level language policies, established ideologies and practical micro-level language practices are carried out and negotiated in daily encounters (Bonacina-Pugh, 2012; McCarty, 2015).

The most significant result from the Finnish case is that the separation of the national languages in school institutions is a backdrop for language ideologies and bilingual practices. They explain pupils' knowledge and use of a language during childcare experiences and explain why pupils interpret the workshop leader's comment of mixing classes as mixing languages and react when a workshop leader does not keep to a one person–one language format – they even comment on the leader's choice to use the 'other' language with a pupil. The school thus becomes a language-managing institution, with an impact on language practices and language ideologies. This monolingual ideology is reflected in the pupils' discourse of appropriate language practices: when the students are asked about their view of a bilingual school, their answers reflect the persistence of the monolingual norm in the classroom, indicating that bilingualism would mean two parallel language ideologies and language use where everybody can take part in teaching in their own language.

Translanguaging in the form of the simultaneous use of two languages by one person appears to be an abstract idea more than a considerable practice against the backdrop of a monolingual norm. A bilingual school would thus create possibilities for language learning in meetings between two monolingual persons. This expressed emphasis of monolingual practice reflects another central aspect that lies near the importance of schools as linguistic lighthouses. Moreover, the children have a pragmatic view of language as a medium of communication in everyday encounters. Bilingual practices are considered time-consuming and irritating, based on a perception that all content should be provided in both languages. This, in turn, is connected to the assumption of the monolingual individual who neither speaks nor understands the 'other' language. The potential to participate to the best of one's ability and learn along the way is not often raised (see Almér, 2017). There are situations in the video excerpts where a translanguaging practice – children using parts from their language repertoire to get understood – potentially could have been a functioning method. Instead, the children mostly keep to one language and thus keep the languages separate.

Summing up the Danish case, we can identify three sets of language ideologies as described by the participants. First, the pupils describe a way of speaking referred to as 'nice', 'polite' and 'standard Danish', that is

closely linked to the linguistic regime enforced by their schoolteachers. Teachers are described as language managers that react to foul language such as swearing. Second, the pupils describe a way of speaking they call 'slang'. This exists especially among peers with migration backgrounds and one of its characteristics is that Danish is juxtaposed with Arabic, Turkish, Kurdish, English and so on. Third, the pupils describe a way of speaking that involves the simultaneous and juxtaposed use of two languages – what the participant Mehmet described as making 'a mix'. This refers to language practices among family members. In other words, the pupils describe how they experience and manoeuvre between monolingual and polylingual language ideologies. They also display knowledge of when to perform polylingual practices and when to hide them strategically. One group describes how 'slang' is to be avoided in front of teachers because teachers relate it to gang activities. Another group describes how they find the focus on their 'bilingualism' annoying because it becomes associated with problematic and disadvantaged positions in the school system.

In the Finnish data, the parallel school system seems to be at the core of shaping linguistic normativity and the monolingual norm whereas, in the data from Denmark, language management is negotiated in relation to linguistic purism (i.e. the standard language of the school) and ways of speaking that are not legitimised by the school system. The experience of the monolingual language ideology in the Danish school system in rather concrete ways leads to experiences among pupils with a migration background of being viewed as disadvantaged, which may result in the strategic hiding of polylingual practices. Being older than the pupils in the Finnish study, the Danish pupils displayed awareness of the school's role in shaping linguistic normativity. They could recognise and discuss the monolingual language ideology and the dominance of standard Danish, and displayed resistance by making a parody of it.

When it comes to the Finnish excerpts, it is important to see them in the bigger picture. In the bilingual workshops, the language policies that the pupils from the Finnish- and Swedish-medium schools encountered were very different from what the pupils are used to during normal school days, where teachers use one language. As Spolsky (2004: 10) put it: 'pupils quickly discover which language choices (and language items, too) are appropriate and which are discouraged' and they also 'learn that the teacher has the privilege of determining who speaks and when and of judging how appropriate is the form of speech to be used, as well as the permitted topics'. Even though a slow change in attitude and understanding towards a more multilingual approach among teachers has been noticed and the classrooms can be assumed to be more linguistically dynamic than previously (Kimanen *et al.*, 2019; Slotte-Lüttge, 2005, 2007; Tarnanen & Palviainen, 2018), it is fair to describe most of the

Swedish- and Finnish-medium schools as dominated by a strong mono-lingual language practice.

The Danish case should be understood in light of the political development in Denmark over the last decades, where people with migration backgrounds are increasingly viewed as a cultural and economic problem for the welfare state (Padovan-Özdemir & Moldenhawer, 2016). In line with this (standard), Danish is generally viewed as the key to societal success and what the participants refer to as 'slang' is stigmatised as the opposite (Hyttel-Sørensen, 2017). The pupils describe how they are familiar with this ideology, to the degree where they have developed daily practices of not using certain ways of speaking in front of teachers. Again, this is in line with Spolsky's thoughts on adaptation to teachers' language ideologies, with the important nuance that participants risk being ascribed identities as unruly pupils as well as the 'non-Danish other' when using slang.

Another important insight from the Danish case is that language-based identity ascriptions do not only occur as reactions to situated language use. This becomes clear in the discussion of being referred to as 'bilingual' in Excerpt 13, where being 'bilingual' becomes associated with a disadvantaged position in the Danish school system. The term 'bilingual' does not in itself imply an insufficient view on bilingualism. In fact, the term '*tosproget*' (bilingual) was instigated in a Danish context in the 1990s by researchers who wished to highlight competences in minority languages as a resource rather than a deficit. However, despite good intentions, the term may still be used with negative connotations if the logic behind it is that the school system is tailored for monolingual and mono-cultural pupils.

The distinction between monolinguals and bilinguals in the Danish case leads to an important point when compared with the Finnish case. A similar stigma does not appear in the discourse of bilingualism in the Finnish data, even though bilingual practices are not necessarily recognised as valuable by the pupils. Moreover, the pupils in our Finnish data conform to the linguistic norm and ideal linguistic subjectivity promoted by the parallel school system and identify with one of the two legitimised language ideologies. None of the pupils treat any of these identities as more attractive than the other, and reported problems in relation to language choice mainly occur if the instructor does not give balanced instructions in both languages, thereby failing to live up to a language policy of double monolingualism. In Denmark, the pupils reacted strongly to being characterised as 'bilinguals'. The point here is that the identities of 'Finns', 'Swedes' and 'bilinguals' are outcomes of the monolingual ideologies of the institutions. When monolingual regimes are enforced in educational systems, they do not only result in language policies and practices but also in categorisations and senses of belonging.

References

Agha, A. (2007) *Language and Social Relations. Studies in the Social and Cultural Foundations of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Almér, E. (2017) Children's beliefs about bilingualism and language use as expressed in child–adult conversations. *Multilingua* 36 (4), 401–424, https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2016-0022

Basic Education Act 628/1998 (1998) See https://finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/1998/19980628 (accessed June 2021).

Bergroth, M. and Palviainen, Å. (2017) Bilingual children as policy agents: Language policy and education policy in minority language medium early childhood education and care. *Multilingua* 36 (4), 375–399.

Blommaert, J., Leppänen, S. and Spotti, M. (2012) Endangering multilingualism. In J. Blommaert, S. Leppänen, P. Pahta and T. Räisänen (eds) *Dangerous Multilingualism. Northern Perspectives on Order, Purity and Normality* (pp. 1–24). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bonacina-Pugh, F. (2012) Researching 'practiced language policies': Insights from conversation analysis. *Language Policy* 11 (3), 213–234.

Boyd, S. and Huss, L. (2017) Young children as language policy-makers: Studies of interaction in preschools in Finland and Sweden. *Multilingua* 36 (4), 359–373.

Danmarks Statistik (2020) *Indvandrere i Danmark 2020 (Immigrants in Denmark 2020)*. See https://www.dst.dk/da/Statistik/Publikationer/VisPub?cid=29447 (accessed May 2021).

DIDIA (2021) DIDIA – Multilingual didactics and dialogs. Diversity, multilingualism and social justice in education. See https://www2.helsinki.fi/en/researchgroups/diversity-multilingualism-and-social-justice-in-education/projects/didia-multilingual-didactics-and-dialogs (accessed 21 June 2021).

Edwards, J. (2009) *Language and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

From, T. (2020) 'We are two languages here': The operation of language policies through spatial ideologies and practices in a co-located and a bilingual school. *Multilingua* 39 (6), 663–684.

From, T. and Sahlström, F. (2017) Shared places, separate spaces: Constructing cultural spaces through two national languages in Finland. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 61 (4), 465–478.

García, O. and Wei, L. (2014) *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gumperz, J.J. (1982) *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heller, M. (2007) Bilingualism as ideology and practice. In M. Heller (ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach* (pp. 1–22). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Heller, M., Pietikäinen, S. and Pujolar, J. (2018) *Critical Sociolinguistic Research Methods. Studying Language Issues That Matter*. New York: Routledge

Hyttel-Sørensen, L. (2017) 'Gangster' or 'wannabe'. Experimental and ethnographic approaches to a contemporary urban vernacular in Copenhagen. Dissertation, University of Copenhagen.

Irvine, J.T. and Gal, S. (2000) Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. Kroskrity (ed.) *Regimes of Language* (pp. 35–83). Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Jørgensen, J.N. (2008) *Languaging. Nine Years of Poly-lingual Development of Young Turkish–Danish Grade School Students*, vols I and II. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen.

Jørgensen, J.N., Karrebæk, M.S., Madsen, L.M. and Møller, J.M. (2011) Polylanguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities* 13 (2), 23–37.

Karrebæk, M.S. (2013) 'Don't speak like that to her!' Linguistic minority children's socialization into an ideology of monolingualism. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 17 (3), 355–375.

Kimanen, A.L., Alisaari, J. and Kallioniemi, A. (2019) In-service and pre-service teachers' orientations to linguistic, cultural and worldview diversity. *Journal of Teacher Education and Educators* 8 (1), 35–54.

Kristjánsdóttir, B. (2018) *Uddannelsespolitik i nationalismens tegn* (*Educational Policy in the Light of Nationalism*). Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag.

Madsen, L.M. (2013) 'High' and 'low' in urban Danish speech styles. *Language in Society* 42 (2), 115–138.

Madsen, L.M., Karrebæk M.S. and Spindler Møller, J. (2016) (eds.) *Everyday Languaging: Collaborative research on the language use of children and youth*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Makoni, S. and Pennycook, A. (2007) Disinventing and reconstituting languages. In S. Makoni and A. Pennycook (eds) *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages* (pp. 1–41). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

McCarty, T.L. (2015) Ethnography in language planning and policy research. In F.M. Hult and D.C. Johnson (eds) *Research Methods in Language Policy and Planning* (pp. 81–93). Malden, MA: Wiley.

Milani, T.M. and Jonsson, R. (2012) Who's afraid of Rinkeby Swedish? Stylization, complicity, resistance. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 22 (1), 44–63.

Møller, J.S. (2019) Recognizing languages, practicing languaging. In J. Jaspers and L.M. Madsen (eds) *Critical Perspectives on Linguistic Fixity and Fluidity: Languagised Lives* (pp. 29–52). New York: Routledge.

Padovan-Özdemir, M. and Moldenhawer, B. (2016) Making precarious migrant families and weaving the welfare nation-state fabric 1970–2010. *Race, Ethnicity and Education* 20 (6), 723–736, https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2016.1195358

Pennycook, A. and Otsuji, E. (2015) *Metrolingualism: Language in the City*. New York: Routledge.

Rampton, B. (2006) *Language in Late Modernity: Interaction in an Urban School*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rampton, B. (2009) Interaction ritual and not just artful performance in crossing and stylization. *Language in Society* 38 (2), 149–176.

Sahlström, F., From, T. and Slotte-Lüttge, A. (2013) Två skolor och två språk under samma tak. In L. Tainio and H. Harju-Luukkainen (eds) *Kaksikielinen koulu – Tulevaisuuden monikielinen Suomi = Tvåspråkig skola - Ett flerspråkigt Finland i framtiden* (*Bilingual school – Multilingual Finland in the future*) (pp. 319–341). Turku: The Finnish Educational Research Association.

Salö, L., Ganuza, N., Hedman, C. and Karrebæk, M.S. (2018) Mother tongue instruction in Sweden and Denmark. Language policy, cross-fields effects, and linguistic exchange rates. *Language Policy* 17 (4), 591–610.

Shohamy, E. (2006) *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. New York: Routledge.

Slotte-Lüttge, A. (2005) Ja vet int va de heter på svenska: Interaktion mellan tvåspråkiga elever och deras lärare i en enspråkig klassrumsdiskurs (*I dunno wha' it is in Swedish: Interaction between bilingual students and their teachers in a monolingual classroom discourse*). Dissertation, Åbo Akademi University.

Slotte-Lüttge, A. (2007) Making use of bilingualism – construction of a monolingual classroom, and its consequences. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2007 (187/188), 103–128.

Spolsky, B. (2004) *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Statistics Finland (2020) *Population Structure*. Helsinki: Statistics Finland. See http://www.stat.fi/til/vaerak/index_en.html

Tarnanen, M. and Palviainen, Å. (2018) Finnish teachers as policy agents in a changing society. *Language and Education* 32 (5), 428–443.