Petter Immanuel Lund

How do the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum in LK20 enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning?

This thesis is worth 30 study points

Summary

The premise of this thesis is that the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum in *Læreplanverket for Kunnskapsløftet 2020* (LK20) contain a form of plurilingualism (see this thesis ch. 1.1). This thesis is a document analysis of the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum in LK20 (see this thesis ch. 4). This thesis seeks to demonstrate that the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum (a.k.a. *curriculum in English*) in LK20 enhances a plurilingual approach to language learning by

1. *foregrounding plurilingualism in multilingualism* (see this thesis ch. 5.2.1),
2. *softening the borders between languages* (see this thesis ch. 5.2.2),
3. *using metacognition in language learning framed by plurilingualism* (see this thesis ch. 5.2.3), and
4. *providing the opportunity to develop the identity of pupils through language learning* (see this thesis ch. 5.2.4).

Since this thesis is a document analysis it is limited to the documents. How teachers will interpret these documents will be influenced by their beliefs about language learning. Hence it would be interesting to see further research into teachers' beliefs about language learning as well as research into how plurilingual approaches to language learning manifest themselves inside and outside of the classroom.

Contents

Foreword

This thesis assumes some knowledge of multilingualism and plurilingualism, the *Common European Framework of Reference for Language: Learning, Teaching, and Assessment (2001)*, English grammatical terms, Norwegian language, and the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum (a.k.a. curriculum in English) in *Læreplanverket for Kunnskapsløftet 2020* (LK20). It would be of help to the reader to have a copy of LK20's core curriculum and English subject curriculum at hand. The chapter on analysis is designed around the literary flow of the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum. This document makes use of hyperlinks for efficiently navigating within the the document (e.g., ch. 1.1) and for referencing the online version of the core curriculum and English subject curriculum among other webpages.

1 Introduction

In recent years, Norwegian curricula makers have drawn on the *Common European Framework of Reference for Language: Learning, Teaching, and Assessment (2001)* (CEFR) in creating the Norwegian curricula for the subject of English and foreign languages. A central concept contained in the CEFR is *plurilingualism*. The plurilingualism of the CEFR seems to have been used in the making of *Læreplanverket for Kunnskapsløftet 2020* (LK20). This thesis explores *how the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum in LK20 enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning.* The subject of English serves as the point of departure for this thesis.

   The thesis is *not* about teaching or learning from a plurilingual perspective to language learning since these have yet to be fully developed. However, this thesis discusses some practical applications of the plurilingualism of the core curriculum and English subject curriculum.

1.1 The Connection between the CEFR, Plurilingualism, and Norwegian Curricula

Læreplanverket for Kunnskapsløftet 2020 is the teachers' authoritative text. Norwegian curricula have the legal status of regulation (forskrift) (Speitz, 2018, p. 38; Kjelaas & Ommeren, 2019, p. 7 cite Opplæringslova ch.11 and ch.13). Therefore, it is an authoritative text from which teachers shall plan, execute lessons, and evaluate the pupils. In the Nordic and Germanic traditions, the "lærerplanen" is a written document by the governing authorities meant to control what is happening in the classroom (Gundem, 2018, p. 16). "Lærerplanen" is translated as "curriculum". The curriculum is an integral part of implementing the day's political ambitions. Hence, all teachers must know the curriculum. It is therefore essential to know what the text of the curriculum says and understand its influences.

   The foundation of Norwegian curricula is the Education Act (Opplæringslova). *Læreplanverket for Kunnskapsløftet 2020* (hereafter LK20) explicitly states the relationship with the Education Act in the section *about the core curriculum*: "The core curriculum of the curriculum elaborates on the *core values in the objectives clause in the Education Act* and *the overriding principles for primary and secondary education and training*" ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a](#); my emphasis). The core curriculum is an elaboration of values and set principles for education in the Norwegian school. If plurilingualism is to be found in the core curriculum, then plurilingualism can

be understood as being an elaboration of the core values of the Education Act and an overriding principle for education in the Norwegian school.

This thesis makes use of the English translation of the text of LK20. However, since LK20 is a regulation (forskrift), it must follow the rules for legal texts. Norwegian Law is written in Norwegian and then translated into English. The Norwegian text is authoritative if there are discrepancies between the Norwegian text and the English translation. "Oversettelene er ikke offisielle versjoner av regelverket; de er kun for bruk I informasjonsøyened, Dersom det ikke er samsvar mellom norsk og engelsk teskt, er det den norske versjonen som gjelder" ([Lovdata, 2021]). Therefore, the text of LK20 is authoritative in school. The English translation is there as a help to understand the Norwegian text.

There are, however, influences from further afield. LK20 seems to draw on *The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching and Assessment (2001)* (hereafter referred to as CEFR) in its competence aims in the English subject curriculum [(see this thesis ch. 4.2)]. The CEFR is a product of the Council of Europe (hereafter CoE) of which Norway is a member. "The Common European Framework provides a common basis for the elaboration of *language syllabuses*, *curriculum guidelines*, examinations, textbooks, etc. across Europe" (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 1, my emphasis). The CoE has no connection to the political and economic construct of the European Union (EU), although some goals may be the same (e.g., peace in Europe; the CoE's logo resembles the EU's). The connection between the CEFR and the Norwegian curricula for the subject of English and foreign languages began in the 1990's.

Reform 94 (R94) begins to show some influence of the Council of Europe (CoE) in that it contains van Ek's *Scope* (Ek & Council of Europe, 1986) definitions: linguistic competence, sociocultural competence, and social competence (Fenner, 2020, p. 33). There are, however, no explicit acknowledgments of the CoE's influence. Speitz (2018, p. 44) points out the Council of Europe's influence "in the [Norwegian] curriculum both for English and foreign languages in upper secondary education (R94) and for primary and secondary education (L97)." So, it is important to sketch the CoE's influence in subsequent Norwegian curricula for the subject of English and foreign languages.

Læreplanverket 97 reveals more influence of the CoE by using the concept of *plurilingualism* as put forward by the CoE. Definitions of multilingualism and plurilingualism are discussed later in [chapter 2.1]. L97 has the first known reference to plurilingualism (Fenner, 2020, p. 33). Fenner cites the L97: "In this way the mother-tongue subject and the foreign language subjects have a common

view of language in which language teaching is not only practicing skills but developing *Bildung*, socializing and developing language awareness and cultural awareness" (Fenner, 2020, p. 33; Fenner's translation). By this, Fenner demonstrates that L97 connects one language with another, which is a concept from plurilingualism.

The Knowledge Promotion (Kunnskapsløfte LK06/13) draws even more on the CoE. LK06/13 competence aims align with the CEFR (Fenner, 2020, p. 34). The language competence of the CEFR has its roots in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which is closely linked to the plurilingualism of the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 4). The Norwegian curricula makers for the subject of English and foreign languages continue to draw on the CoE and the CEFR.

LK20 acknowledges its connection with the CEFR with the link to *aktuelle nettsider* in the English subject curriculum (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020b). The close connection with the CEFR warrants investigation into plurilingualism in the English Subject curriculum. This thesis uses the term *English subject curriculum* instead of *curriculum in English* since the latter is misleading (see this thesis ch. 4.2). Multilingualism and plurilingualism seem to be found in the core curriculum (see this thesis ch. 4.1.2). The term "core curriculum" is defined as "central concepts, methods, ways of thinking, areas of knowledge and forms of expressions in the subject" (Fenner's translation, 2020, p. 37). The significance of the core curriculum is that it informs all other subjects. Thus, any findings relating to plurilingualism are grounds for enhancing plurilingual approaches to language learning.

For example, the English subject curriculum's section of *language learning* states: "Language learning refers to identifying connections between English and other languages the pupils know, and to understand how English is structured" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020i). The idea that there is a connection between English and other languages seems to be evidence for plurilingualism. The Core Elements of *language learning* seem to "includes aspects of language awareness and language learning in a plurilingual perspective" (Speitz, 2018, p. 43). English is the initial second language Norwegian pupils learn and consequently prepares them for future language learning (Speitz, 2018, p. 43). These seem to be hints of plurilingualism in LK20. An analysis of the core curriculum and English subject curriculum comes later.

"The Council of Europe hopes" to promote "plurilingualism and pluriculturalism" (Council of Europe, 2020, p. 11). Plurilingualism and pluriculturalism are closely related since it is impossible to divorce language from culture or *vice versa*. Since they are two sides to the same coin, this thesis will examine whether the core curriculum and English subject curriculum enhance plurilingual approaches to language learning, which will inevitably have implications for cultural understanding.

The plurilingualism promoted by the CoE in the CEFR and other documents finds expression in previous Norwegian curricula for the subject of English and foreign languages and as well as in LK20. Does not analyze the curriculum concerning foreign languages nor the subject of Norwegian, only the English subject curriculum. This presupposition provides the rationale to analyze the relevant sections in the core curriculum and English subject curriculum to demonstrate how LK20 enhances a plurilingual approach to language learning.

1.2 Research Question

The Norwegian curricula makers have drawn on the CEFR and will probably continue to do so in the future. Therefore, it is vital to understand central concepts in the CEFR and see how they have been used in the LK20. Plurilingualism is a central concept in the CEFR that seems to be specifically used by the makers of LK20. It is, therefore, a premise in this thesis that LK20 contains plurilingualism. Therefore, this thesis seeks to answer the research question: *How do the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum in LK20 enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning?*

1.3 Overview

To answer the research question, plurilingualism must be defined, the relevant documents analyzed, and the findings discussed and conclusion presented. Chapter 2 presents theoretical perspectives and research on plurilingualism, which are used in chapter 4 to look out for plurilingualism in the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum and used as points of discussion in chapter 5.

Chapter 3 presents the method of the analysis and the advantages and disadvantages of the method. Grounded theory is used as inspiration for the design the analysis. Chapter 4 presents the analysis of the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum. Specific paragraphs in the core curriculum and English subject curriculum that pertains to the research question are analyzed. The analysis of the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum ends with a presentation their respective findings. The findings of both documents are listed at the end of chapter 4.

The discussion in chapter 5 presents the main findings of chapter 4, discusses them in the light of the theoretical perspectives from chapter 2 and reflecting on practical implications, and ending with a conclusion and remarks on the method used. Chapter 6 is a meta-reflection where I end with some personal remarks about awareness and reflection of my own teacher's beliefs.

2 Theoretical Perspectives and Research on Plurilingualism

Plurilingualism is a vast field and to explore all perspectives is beyond the scope of this thesis. This thesis limits itself to four perspectives on plurilingualism:

- Multilingualism and plurilingualism (ch. 2.1)
- Plurilingualism, language, and communicative language competence (ch. 2.2)
- Plurilingualism and metacognition (ch. 2.3)
- Plurilingualism and identity development (ch. 2.4).

These perspectives serve as items to look for in the core curriculum and English subject curriculum analysis. Chapter 5 uses these perspectives as points of discussion.

2.1 Multilingualism and Plurilingualism

Why use the term plurilingualism when so many use the term multilingualism to described the same phenomenon? Different authors use the terms multilingualism and plurilingualism to refer to the same concept. This thesis presupposes that the core curriculum and English subject curriculum of LK20 contain the CEFR's concept of plurilingualism. I adopt the CEFR's terminology and definition of multilingualism and plurilingualism to show the link between the CEFR and LK20. Hence this thesis uses the term plurilingualism. The Council of Europe defines multilingualism and plurilingualism as:

- multilingualism' refers to the presence in a geographical area of more than one 'variety of language' i.e. the mode of speaking of a social group whether it is formally recognised as a language or not;
- 'plurilingualism' refers to the repertoire of 'varieties of language' which individuals use, and is therefore the opposite of monolingualism; it includes the language variety referred to as 'mother tongue' or 'first language' and any number of other languages or varieties.

  (Council of Europe, 2021)

Multilingualism describes a social phenomenon, while plurilingualism describes a phenomenon that concerns the individual. This distinction between the individual and the social is the grounds for a distinction in terms. It is possible to problematize by challenging whether it is possible to distinguish between society and the individual. I use the terms "plurilingual subject", "plurilingual individual", or "plurilingual person" interchangeably while others may not. Plurilingual persons exist in multilingual societies, and multilingual societies consist of plurilingual persons.

Some do not use the distinction between society and the individual. Krulatz, Dahl, & Flognfeldt (2019) merge the CEFR's definitions of multilingualism and plurilingualism into one they call multilingualism.

> Plurilingualism refers to knowledge of multiple languages by an individual, whereas multilingualism is defined as a societal phenomenon when languages coexist with a community. In this book, however, we use the term multilingualism to cover both phenomena, and we focus in particular on multilingual students learning English in a classroom setting in Scandinavia. (Krulatz et al., 2019, p. 11)

Although they use the term multilingualism to cover both the societal and individual, they no less understand that multilingualism has a social and individual aspect. However, for them, the term multilingualism serves their purpose.

Kramsch, for instance, uses the term multilingual instead of plurilingual. "Under 'multilingual' subject, I include people who use more than one language in everyday life …" (Kramsch, 2009, p. 17). Kramsch could have used the term "plurilingual" but opts for the term "multilingual". Herdina & Jessner (2002, p. 52) suggest "multilingualism … can be defined as the command and/or use of two or more language by the respective speaker." Again, they use the term "multilingualism", which for them seems to encompass both the individual and the societal elements. Pavlenko (2005, p. 6) suggests "bi- and multilinguals [are] speakers who use two or more languages or dialects in their everyday lives – be it simultaneously (in language contact situations) or consecutively (in the context of immigration)." In these quotes, the focus is on the individual and their use of their repertoire of languages. However, the term *multilingual* can describe someone who uses many languages, which is similar if not the same concept as *plurilingualism* in the CEFR.

The Norwegian word for plurilingualism is "flerspråklighet" and multilingualism is translated as "mangespråklighet" ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2011](#), p. 5; cf. Council of Europe, 2001, p. 4). In Norwegian schools, immigrants are sometimes referred to as plurilingual (Svendsen, 2009). The term is used to describe those who are not a part of the in-group, in this case, ethnic Norwegians. The people in the Norwegian school do not necessarily mean to use the term pejoratively. However, in this context, plurilingualism describes an immigrant versus a native, monolingual person. This distinction is predicated on a "monolingual bias" (Sickinghe, 2016). It is this bias that plurilingualism deconstructs. Jenser and Kramsch describe plurilingualism (they use the term multilingualism) as "part of a general revolution against monolingualism and what it stands for …"

(2015, p. 7). We will not get into the nitty-gritty of their argument but only note that plurilingualism is not just knowing more languages but revolutionizing our concept of language and its implications.

Terms, especially new ones, take their time to find their form. Hammarberg (2010) and Kemp (2009) point out that bilingualism, multilingualism, and plurilingualism are often used to describe the same concept by different authors in different contexts. Whatever word is used, it is essential to understand what concept is being described by it. The difference in form does not necessarily mean a difference in meaning. Different word forms can have the same meaning depending on how it is used in a specific context. However, it is exceedingly expedient to have a consensus concerning which word forms to use for specific meanings.

"Most of the references to plurilingualism in the CEFR are to 'plurilingual and pluricultural competence'" (Council of Europe, 2020, p. 27). Plurilingualism and pluriculturalism are two sides to the same coin. Even though they cannot be divorced from each other, it is possible to differentiate them. The CEFR distinguishes plurilingual competence and pluricultural competence: "The pluricultural profile differs from the plurilingual profile (for example: good knowledge of the culture of a community but a poor knowledge of its language, or poor knowledge of a community whose dominant language is nevertheless well mastered)" (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 133). This thesis will use the concepts and terms multilingualism and plurilingualism as defined by the CoE with the acknowledgment that there will necessarily be pluricultural implications. This paper will use the term plurilingual since it is the term used by the CEFR.

2.2 Plurilingualism, Language, and Communicative Language Competence

Plurilingualism has implications for understanding what is meant by languages and how to use language. These definitions of multilingualism and plurilingualism are the ones found in the CEFR as well. "The CEFR distinguishes between multilingualism (the coexistence of different languages at the social or individual level) and plurilingualism (the dynamic and developing linguistic repertoire of an individual user/learner)" (Council of Europe, 2020, p. 30). Multilingualism refers to language as a societal phenomenon, while plurilingualism refers to language as a phenomenon pertaining to the individual. The tension between the two is that both exist simultaneously. For instance, a group speaks, reads, and writes Norwegian and English. That is a multilingual description. However, the individual's Norwegian and English are constantly changing through experiencing different languages they encounter.

A *single* repertoire of 'varieties of language' is used by the individual (Council of Europe, 2021). The languages English, German, French, Norwegian, Danish, etc., are collectively described as a single repertoire from which the individual draws on to communicate. Plurilingualism focuses on the repertoire of 'varieties of language' of *the individual*. Each individual has their own single repertoire of 'varieties of language', and draws on it in the manner they see fit to communicate.

The individual *uses* a repertoire of *varieties of language*. The individual uses no *one language* but *a repertoire of languages.* There are no two same uses of the same *language*, albeit similarities between the instances of communication. The belief that the individual fundamentally uses a varieties of language challenges monolingualism. Monolingualism can only envision one language per individual. Plurilingualism describes the individual using a repertoire of varieties of language. There are many ways to speak a language. For example, in Notodden, where I live, there is an unmistakable "Notodden" way of speaking, and 10 minutes down the road, there is an unmistakable "Heddal" way of speaking. Conventionally called dialects, they can also be called "varieties of language" that are mutually intelligible – for the most part! A speaker of one dialect has knowledge of the other. What is meant then by 'varieties of *language'* or what is a then 'a language'?

A definition of language is necessary for understanding the concept of plurilingualism. Blommaert uses the term multilingualism to describe a concept very close to what this thesis calls plurilingualism but can also be used to describe how the term *language* is used in this thesis. Blommaert states:

> … multilingualism should not be seen as a collection of 'language' that a speaker controls, but rather as a complex of specific semiotic resources, some of which belong to a conventionally defined 'language', while others belong to another 'language'. The resources are concrete accents, language varieties, registers, genres, modalities such as writing – ways of using language in particular communicative settings and spheres of life, including the ideas people have about such ways of using their language ideologies. (Blommaert, 2010, p. 102)

Blommaert's definition of multilingualism focuses on the individual but could also be applied to society. Weber and Horner (2018, p. 3) and Jessner and Kramsch (2015, p. 2) use Blommaert's definition of multilingualism. Multilingualism as defined as "a complex of specific semiotic resources" is a *single* "a *complex* of specific semiotic resources". There is not "collection of 'languages' that a speaker controls" (Blommaert, 2010, p. 102). The complex of specific semiotic

resources resides in the individual. In this way, Blommaert's definition and the definition of the Council of Europe ('varieties of language') are similar. The advantage of Blommaert's definition is that it has the power to describe language more accurately. Language itself can be described as "a complex of specific semiotic resources," too. This description of language emphasizes language as a communicative resource – plurilingualism views language as a resource for communication.

These complexes are not stable but dynamic. It is that these resources "some of which belong to a conventionally defined 'language', while others belong to another 'language'" (Blommaert, 2010, p. 102). The choice of linguistic resource is up to the user of these linguistic resources. For instance, a Norwegian speaker could inadvertently use Swedish, German, and English words in a Norwegian sentence, for example: "Er det noe *fårgan* (Swedish) angående det som er *kaput* (German)*, gutta*boys* (boys = English)?" In this way, the linguistic resources of an individual's repertoire are in constant flux, and their complexes of specific semiotic resources (think *language*) are dynamic. It is impossible to speak of *one of these complexes* as if it exists by itself, uninterrupted by other linguistic resources in the brain. Any snapshot of a process in process will be but a glimpse of what was happening when the snapshot was taken. The best way to observe plurilingualism is to observe it in action – the repertoire of a complex of specific semiotic resources not fixed but fluid. Consequently, plurilingualism can describe every person since everyone uses their repertoire of specific semiotic resources to communicate, which constantly changes according to the context and situation of each person.

For Blommaert, *linguistic resources* are "accents, language varieties, registers, genres, modalities such as writing – ways of using language in particular communicative setting and spheres of life, including the ideas people have about such ways of using their language ideologies" (2010, p. 102). Individuals use *linguistic resources* for communication; they are the building blocks of what could be conventionally called *a language.* As important as language ideologies are, it is outside of the scope of this thesis to discuss them. This thesis uses the term *linguistic resources* as Blommaert defines them.

It makes sense then to define the term *language* as "a complex of specific semiotic resources". It is difficult to speak of a *fixed* complex of specific semiotic resources since it is up to the individual to draw on their particular linguistic resources to develop a stable enough complex with which to communicate. However, each context in which an individual communicates is different. There is a different complex of specific semiotic resources used in each context to

communicate in that context. Any perception of a stable complex would perhaps be an ideological imposition to maintain some kind of *fixedness* to that complex.

One way of understanding the perceived *fixedness* of language is through *spatial repertoires*. *Spatial repertoires* are "available and sedimentary resources that derive from the repeated language practices of the people involved in the sets of activities related to particular places" (Pennycook & Otsuji, 2014, p. 166). For Pennycook and Otsuji, the *fixedness* comes from the repeated use of specific linguistic resources. In whatever way one conceptualizes the *fixedness* of language, it is important that one does just that. Even if the only reason for the *fixedness* of language is due to an ideological imposition, however, the *fixedness* of languages must be taken seriously because it manifests itself in the world.

The *fluidity* of language must also be taken seriously. The fluidity of language makes language difficult to define. A phenomenon like translanguaging or code-mixing is evidence of the fluidity of language. The individual uses different linguistic resources in different constellations depending on the context, their ability to construct a meaningful communication, and knowledge of the linguistic resources necessary to communicate. The *fluidity* of language makes the phenomenon impossible to define as a fixed entity (e.g., English, German, Norwegian, etc.). Any definition of language must wrestle with the *fluidity* of the way language is used by individuals.

There are a few pitfalls two watch out for: first, to define language as *only* fixed; second, to define language as *only* fluid. How to synthesize the *fixedness* and *fluidity* of language is difficult and perhaps unnecessary altogether. Language is used by the individual, so it is more useful to ask about the competency of the individual to use language to communicate. It is perhaps more useful to investigate *how* individuals use language than *what* language is. For example, Searle suggests "speaking a language is performing speech acts, acts such as making statements, giving commands, asking questions, making promises, and so on; and more abstractly, acts such as referring and predicating" (Searle, 1969, p. 16). Thus, it makes more sense to speak of *linguistic competence*.

An individual's ability to draw on their repertoire of linguistic resources is a form of linguistic competence. The CEFR suggests a definition of linguistic competence: "Linguistic competences include lexical, phonological, syntactical knowledge and skills and other dimensions of language as system, independently of the sociolinguistic value of its variations and the pragmatic functions of its realisations" (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 13). The CEFR also uses the term "communicative language competence" (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 9) to describe a language competence that allows the individual to act powerfully through their language competence. Viewing language as a

resource does not mean all languag*es* (note the plural form!). The valuable resources are those that can be used to act in a particular context. Not all linguistic resources are of equal value because each context demands different linguistic resources. It makes sense, therefore, to differentiate the valuable linguistic resources from the less valuable ones. However, this thesis uses the CEFR's definition of *linguistic competence* communicative language competence interchangeably and brings up the issue of value where relevant. The value of those linguistic resources are only valuable in relation to the context in which they can realize advantage for their user.

2.3 Plurilingualism and Metacognition

Plurilingualism and metacognition are two peas in a pod. A plurilingual approach to metacognition in language learning raises awareness of prior linguistic knowledge. Being able to make oneself aware of prior linguistic knowledge could be a form of linguistic competence. Linguistic competences "include lexical, phonological, syntactical knowledge and skills and other dimensions of language as system, independently of the sociolinguistic value of its variations and the pragmatic functions of its realisations" (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 13). For example, the phonemes /s/ and /z/ are linguistic resources. However, Norwegian does not have a voiced /z/ but only the voiceless /s/, while English has both, e.g., dogs /z/ vs. cats /s/ (Rugesæter, 2018, p. 125). The correct use of each phoneme in their respective contexts is linguistic competence, and being made aware and reflecting on the similarities and dissimilarities between English and Norwegian phonetics is a metacognitive skill. There are lexical, phonological, and syntactical similarities and differences between the complexes of specific semiotic resources known as Norwegian and English. Raising awareness between them may be enhanced by a plurilingual approach to metacognition.

John Flavaell (1979, p. 906) defined metacognition "as knowledge and cognition about cognitive phenomena." Simplistically put, metacognition is *thinking about thinking*. Knowledge and cognition are the operative words. Prior knowledge is key to cognition as it is the foundation of future learning (Haukås, 2018a, p. 13). All knowledge that is involved in metacognition is prior knowledge since it is that knowledge that is the object of reflection from where to create new knowledge. Reflecting on prior knowledge is a part of the construction of new knowledge. Awareness and reflection on this process make it possible to draw on that knowledge to create strategies for future learning. Metacognition has become of interest for teachers of language.

Haukås' defines metacognition in language learning as "an awareness of and reflection about one's knowledge, experience, emotions and learning in the context of language learning and

teaching" (Haukås, 2018a, p. 13). "Awareness" and "reflection" are the operative words. A plurilingual approach to metacognition may enhance awareness of and reflection about one's own linguistic resources. In the context of language learning, the individual can develop an awareness of their own linguistic resources. Plurilingualism thus has the potential to enhance "the awareness of and reflection about one's linguistic knowledge … in the context of language learning and teaching" (Haukås, 2018a, p. 13).

Metacognition and plurilingualism together also provide a rationale for translanguaging. Translanguaging can be seen as evidence of plurilingualism in action since it is the conscious and unconscious practice of mixing what are conventionally called *languages* for communication. From a plurilingual perspective, the term *translanguaging* can be misleading. It seems to denote a ridged boundary between "languages". The prefix "trans" is Latin for "across" and "languaging" is a verbalized substantive from the noun "language". A plurilingual view would simply say that this is someone using their *repertoire of complexes of specific semiotic resources* (language) and rearranging these complexes and mixing up the specific semiotic resources to communicate in that context. We can call this *code-mixing.* Plurilingualism is diversity, which has its opposite in unity. However problematic the term "translanguaging" is, the meaning of the term does not reside in the term *but in the way it is used.* Translanguaging can be described as "the deployment of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named (and usually national and state) languages" (Otheguy et al., 2015, p. 281). Using different specific resources to communicate in different contexts is a plurilingual approach to metacognition in language learning: "… crosslinguistic awareness is considered a desirable and trainable trait" (Jessner & Kramsch, 2015, p. 4).

There are no borders in the brain when it comes to knowing different languages. The CEFR was early in affirming that there were no separate compartments for languages:

> … the plurilingual approach emphasises the fact that as an individual person's experience of language in its cultural contexts expands, from the language of the home to that of society at large and then to the languages of other peoples (whether learnt at school or college, or by direct experience), *he or she does not keep these languages and cultures in strictly separated mental compartments*, but rather builds up a communicative competence to which all knowledge and experience of language contributes and in which languages interrelate and interact. (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 4; my emphasis)

Recent evidence supports the CEFR's claim (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 31). There seems now to be broad agreement that are no separate storage spaces in the brain for different languages. Haukås and Speitz (2018, p. 309) point out that different pedagogies, such as EuroComGerm (Hufeisen & Marx, 2007), Awakening to language (Candelier, 2017), and Focus on Multilingualism (Cenzo & Gorter, 2011), have different approaches but all "acknowledge that the brain does not have separate storage rooms for each language; languages are connected in complex ways and influence one another (Haukås & Speitz, 2018, p. 309; see also Bialystok, 2001; Herdina & Jessner-Schmid, 2002). The whole "complex of specific semiotic resources" resides as a repertoire in the same space in the brain, and therefore there are no separate languages in the brain.

A plurilingual approach to metacognition focuses on raising *awareness* of and *reflection* about prior linguistic knowledge for future language learning. Some view awareness and reflection of linguistic knowledge as metalinguistic activity (Gombert, 1992, p. 13; Jessner-Schmid, 2018, p. 31). Metalinguistic awareness can be defined as "an individual's ability to focus attention on language as an object in and of itself, to reflect upon language, and to evaluate it" (Thomas, 1988). To become aware, the language learner needs "to explore similarities and differences between languages and cultures, to reflect on their knowledge and abilities, and to explore how they can try out, monitor and evaluate various learning strategies" (Haukås, 2018a, p. 21). Anderson (2002, p. 3) states that "the metacognitive ability to select and use particular strategies in a given context for a specific purpose means that the learner can think and make conscious decisions about the learning process." The "particular strategies" could also be replaced with "specific semiotic resources". This is in accordance with English subject curriculum's *core element* on language learning: "Language learning refers to developing language *awareness* and *knowledge of* English as a system, and the ability to use language learning strategies" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020c, my emphasis).

Raising awareness of and reflecting on linguistic structures is metacognitive and inherently plurilingual. In any application of plurilingualism, there will necessarily be "*an awareness of and reflection about* one's knowledge, experience, emotions and learning in the context of language learning and teaching" (Haukås, 2018, p. 13, emphasis original). Drawing on other complexes of specific semiotic resources to construct meaning to communicate allows for flexibility in language learning. A language learner who uses a plurilingual approach to metacognition may have the potential to enhance their future language learning.

2.4 Plurilingualism and Identity Development

Theories on identity are as numerous as the sand of the sea. Here we will pick one of the grains of sand and briefly outline its form. An influential theory of identity in second language acquisition (SLA) is the feminist poststructuralist view of identity. Although not the only definition available, it is a working definition of identity used by influential scholars in SLA, such as Claire Kramsch (2009) and Bonny Norton (2013).

Poststructuralism "depicts the individual (i.e., the subject) as diverse, contradictory, dynamic and changing over historical time and social space" (Norton, 2013, p. 4). Poststructuralism has its opposite in essentialism. In essentialism, the essence is made up of its accidence (to use Aristotelian language), or in other words, to describe the subjects by its predicates. The essence is the sum of its predicates. For essentialism, the essence is singular, harmonious, immutable, etc. In such a scheme, the identity of the individual would then be fixed, monolingual, national, etc. In essentialism, identity exists *a priori*. Identity as fixed, immutable, and *a priori* is in part what poststructuralism strives to subvert. Identity in poststructuralism is constructed and continuously being developed – there is no essence since there is no stable object to analyze. Identity is difficult to define since the definition tends to be essentialist. Grammatically speaking, a narrative presents a subject to be defined by its predicates; this gives the illusion that the subject is definable.

Norton explains that "… poststructuralist theories of identity are liberating not only in destabilizing essentialist notions of identity but in challenging dominant theories of knowledge and text, while provide powerful conceptual tools that help to expose the partiality of claims to truth" (Norton, 2013, p. 5). The individual is in continuous development. Any restrictions on this development can be seen as impositions of other identities. It liberates the individual from binary distinctions by affirming them in their expressions. Language and identity are connected.

Weedon, a feminist poststructuralist, argues that

[l]anguage is the place where actual and possible forms of social organization and their likely social and political consequences are defined and contested. Yet it is also the place where our sense of ourselves, our subjectivity, is *constructed*." Subjectivity is "the conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions of the individual, her sense of herself and her ways of understanding her relation the world. (Weedon, 1997, p. 32)

Norton (2013) uses the term *subjectivity* interchangeably with *identity,* while Kramsch (2009, p. 25) distinguishes the two. This thesis follows Norton while acknowledging that there are other views. This *subjectivity*, i.e., *the subject*, is constructed by the individual and social forces. In other words,

the subject (or individual) is constructed through their negotiation with others and the world through language.

> New experiences, for instance, those associated with moving to a new country *and learning a new language*, can cause shifts and changes in identity – that is, in the self-image we create as a result of the interaction of our inner self and the world around us. (Krulatz et al., 2019, p. 102; my emphasis)

Language learning is an experience that can change identity, but the language being learnt is specifically important in that identity development. Different languages may signal certain positive or negative identities depending on the culture of the language learners. For example, Received Pronunciation (RP) signals intelligence for some Norwegians (Bøhn & Hansen, 2018, p. 292), while other variants of English spoken in the United Kingdom may not. Variants of American English are often signal "informality and social attractiveness" (Bøhn & Hansen, 2018, p. 292). Being able to speak RP makes one smart, and speaking American makes one cool. It is not uncommon for Norwegian students to develop these identities to seem more intelligent or cool than they are in their Norwegian selves. Some Norwegian students also desire to speak with a Norwegian accent to retain what they consider to be their Norwegian identity (Bøhn & Hansen, 2018, p. 292). This research illustrates the development of an individual's identity through language learning and highlights the relationship between language and identity.

Language learners experience "acting and being acted upon through symbolic forms" (Kramsch, 2009, p. 27). Kramsch's use of the phrase "symbolic forms" covers all possible fields of language. The emphasis is on the symbolic *form,* not the content being conveyed – as crucial as it is, it is not in focus here. The experience of acting through symbolic form impresses on the self by "heightened perceptions of taste, sight, touch, sounds triggered by the material nature of the language itself" (Kramsch, 2009, p. 29). The use of the symbolic forms is simultaneously acting through the symbolic form; acting through symbolic forms is also being acted upon by those symbolic forms being used. In other words, using language is a physical experience that has physical consequences. Language development is, in part, identity development.

The language learner's perception of language affects language learning, and in turn, their development thought that language they are learning. Learning the words of a new language conforms to the perceptional categories of the learner's mind and body – to some degree – and influences those perceptional categories too. The new words do not only point to something but also take on other meanings known only to the learner themselves. "These subjective meanings do

not just supplement the objective, conventional signs referring to objects in the real world, they transform them in new enchanted ways" (Kramsch, 2009, p. 30). Both the objective meaning and the subjective meaning of the language studied are experienced by the language user, which in turn, those experiences may develop the learner's identity.

Language learners perceive language through similitude and analogy (Kramsch, 2009, pp. 30–36). One word of a familiar language seems similar to a word in the language being learned. One word's meaning may be mapped analogically onto a new word in a different language. For instance, Kramsch uses Makine (a French-speaking Russian author) to illustrate that he mapped the Russian word *derevnya* (village) onto the French word *village* (village). Although they refer to the same thing, a Russian *dervnya* conjures a different picture in Mikine's mind, while a French *village* is not a Russian *dervnya*. Much like a Norwegian *bygda* is not the same as a German *Dorf*. For example, Norwegian learners of English may imagine a *bygd* when they use the German *Dorf.* The language learner may give the word an analogical meaning to what they s Kramsch notes that "[t]he first thing we notice is that for language learners ... meaning does not necessarily flow from thought to word, from word to thought" (Kramsch, 2009, p. 31). The subjective experience of using the new symbolic form does something to the language learner.

Another example would be our names. For instance, our names are us, just as our eyes and hands are us (Kramsch, 2009, p. 32). Although our names refer to objective realities, the experience of our names is who we are. My name is just as much a part of me as my body. Hearing my name in Norwegian and in English refer to the same objective body – me – but *for me* my name in Norwegian *Petter* [pʰətˤr] is someone other than my American name *Petter* [pʰədˤɹ] (I do not alter the orthography of my name to accommodate American pronunciation). I cannot recognize the written *Pedder* as referring to me, although that is how it is commonly pronounced. In a sense, I am a different person when I use American English than when I use Norwegian.

The use of the symbolic forms is the use of the body. The symbolic forms are not mediated through the body as if they existed outside of the body and only to find a conduit in my body, but rather they are the movements of the body; symbolic form is the body in motion. The self cannot be extracted nor set in opposition to the body, but rather the self is integral to the body. In this scheme, it is not possible to think of the mind *and* body but rather the mind as body and the body as mind: best thought of as "self". The implications are far-reaching. Feelings associated with the body, and the power of reason associated with the mind, can no longer be separated. So, what I

feel must be taken as seriously as what I think. In language learning, the subjective experiences of new symbolic forms must be recognized as affecting the self.

The use of symbolic forms happens in and through the body, i.e., the identity of the subject is performed or acted in the world. The subject is simultaneously the instrument and agent of their expressions – i.e., action or performance of symbolic forms. The self is expressed as the symbolic system it uses. For the sake of this thesis, we will look at language as symbolic form and system. Language is defined as a repertoire of complexes of specific semiotic resources used by an individual. So, language and the self cannot be separated nor can language and the body be separated. To learn new linguistic resources is to develop the self in some way. In other words, to use language is to manifest identities. This may have consequences on theories of agency, but those discussions are outside of the scope of this thesis. The semiotic life of a word is inscribed in its user's body (Kramsch, 2009, pp. 40–41). Symbolic form manifests itself in the body, and this experience changes the body of the language user.

Kramsch (2009) argues that the symbolic self is the real self, the embodied mind. Signs are interpreted as conventional meanings and subjective meanings. Virtual reality is the reality that is experienced by the self (Deacon, 1997, p. 452). Kramsch comments, "the virtual reality Deacon refers to here is the world of the symbolic" (2009, p. 44). The symbolic self, however subjective its experience, is the reality experienced by the self. In this way, the subjective reality experienced by the individual is the objective reality for that individual. "Both historical and the imagined are real, as they get inscribed in the flesh-and-blood reality of the language users' embodied minds" (Kramsch, 2009, p. 44). The signifying-self uses symbolic forms as symbolic action in the body. It is not the content that matters, as crucial as that is, but the form that that content takes as symbolic action.

This symbolic action is the action of the body, i.e., the embodied-self. Contrary to Descartes, Damasio, in his *Descartes' Error* (1994), demonstrates no strict separation between the body and the mind. Without getting into the details of the argument, Damasio argues that the mind integral to the body and is affected by emotion. The rational and the emotional are more closely linked than previously thought. When the subject uses language, it is acting symbolically and meaningfully in and through their body. It is not possible to dichotomize *the use of language* and *the body* because the body uses language. They are one with each other. The subject changes when using language and especially when learning a new language. New identities are created and negotiated by the subject through learning other semiotic resources. The more semiotic resources the subject knows,

the more symbolic actions, i.e., identities, the plurilingual subject can manifest. Poststructuralist views of identity and plurilingualism go hand in hand; perhaps this could be called a plurilingual poststructuralist view of identity.

The subject is not static but a subject-in-process (Kristeva, 1986, pp. 99–100). The subject continually develops through interacting with the world, and for our purposes, develops through the use of language. In other words, the subject is always in a state of construction. The subject is continually in a process of construction. The question of developing the individual is nothing new. Pedagogues have long pondered how to develop the identities of children in the German tradition called *Bildung.* There are several theories on *Bildung,* but this thesis limits itself to Wolfgang Klafki's categories of *Bildung*. For Klafki, there are three types of *Bildung*: material, formal, and categorical. *Bildung* is primarily concerned with identity development and can be enhanced by a plurilingual approach to language learning.

The focus of materiel *Bildung* is the material studied, whether that be texts, cultural artifacts, knowing a language, etc. (Klafki, 1996, pp. 172-178). A plurilingual approach to language learning focuses on, among other things, communicative competence. A plurilingual approach to material *Bildung* could emphasize the communicative aspect of knowing a language or providing a pedagogy for teaching and learning other languages and cultures as valuable resources.

Materiel *Bildung* in English education would be concerned with knowing specific literary canon, e.g., Shakespeare, Dickens, etc. The aim would be to have the material as a common reference in the larger society as cultural capital.

Formal *Bildung* is concerned with the process of learning, group work, projects, etc. (Klafki, 1996, pp. 178-185). Formal *Bildung* in English education would be concerned with the process of identity and linguistic development of the learner. A plurilingual approach to language learning in formal *Bildung* would emphasize the identity development process of learning other languages and cultures. A poststructuralist view of identity could serve both materiel and formal *Bildung* as it emphasizes a continual development of identity.

Categorical *Bildung* puts material and formal *Bildung* in a dialectical relationship (Klafki, 1996, pp. 185-195; Fenner, 2020, p. 19). The material studied will form the pupil, and then the pupil with a new horizon of understanding reinterprets the material studied. For example, the study of the English language will influence the development of the pupil's knowledge of linguistic resources and future language learning and can then use this new knowledge to further his or her study of English. The acquisition of the English language is a concern. The awareness and reflection about

the *process* of acquiring English is a part of developing the pupil's identity, for communication, awareness of linguistic and cultural diversity, language learning skills, etc. Klafki's categorical *Bildung* fit within a plurilingual poststructuralist view of identity.

Plurilingualism affects the material and the process of formation. For instance, a plurilingual approach to language learning has communicative language competence as an aim, provides a rationale for metacognition in language learning, and provides the opportunity to use other languages in learning, for example, English. A plurilingual approach to language learning uses other languages to learn a specific language. Approaching language learning like this provides the opportunity to see the value of other languages as resources while also realizing the diversity of languages and cultures. Plurilingual subjects as social actors have "... broader and more complex understanding of people and events can increase their opportunities for reflection on self and others and for a reappraisal of commonly held assumptions and beliefs" (Kramsch, 2009, p. 125). A plurilingual approach to language learning and categorical *Bildung* may allow pupils to reexamine previously held beliefs about language and culture, thus acquiring communicative language competence while developing their identities as plurilingual subjects. Plurilingualism would be the subject mediated through the subject of English. Teachers of English are not teachers of English primarily, but language teachers who use English to teach language. There are a few more ways plurilingualism and categorical *Bildung* can be used together.

A plurilingual approach to language learning in the subject of English uses prior linguistic knowledge to help construct new linguistic knowledge. While prior linguistic knowable is not the primary focus of teaching and learning, it is nonetheless made visible and treated as a resource in language learning. Becoming aware of one's own prior linguistic knowledge has the potential for perceiving that knowledge as a resource for language learning. Experiencing one's own prior linguistic knowledge as a resource can provide the opportunity to perceive yet unknown languages as potential resources or as resources in and of themselves. Recognizing all linguistic knowledge as a resource may challenge previously held beliefs about the worth of other languages.

Using language is like using a tool, but the difference is that a language cannot be put away without leaving some affecting its user. "Since it cannot be spoken or written without engaging the body of the speaker/writer, its use leaves cognitive and affective traces in the user's perceptual make-up and in his or her sense of self" (Kramsch, 2009, p. 41). The experience of a language is a perceptual one and therefore affects one's perceptive categories (Kramsch, 2009, p. 27). In a way, using language can change how we perceive the world and ourselves. A plurilingual approach to

language learning in the subject of English has the potential to develop the pupil's identity by providing them with opportunities to experience a host of symbolic forms.

A plurilingual approach to language learning can serve teachers of English by applying plurilingualism to English didactics. Didactics operate at the intersection of theory and practice (Fenner, 2020, p. 7). Aase defines subject-specific didactics as:

> … all the reflections which can be related to a subject and the teaching of this subject, and which can enhance the knowledge of the nature and the rationale of the subject, and lead to increased knowledge of how the subject can be learnt, taught and developed. (Aase et al., 1998, p. 7; Fenner & Skulstad, 2020, p. 9)

Plurilingualism can provide English didactics with fresh reflections about English as a subject and the teaching of English as a school subject. A plurilingual approach to language learning in the subject of English can enhance the knowledge of English as a language and provide the rationale for English as a subject in school. Plurilingualism can lead to increased knowledge of how the subject of English is learnt, taught, and developed. It does this by using other languages in learning and teaching English. Plurilingualism helps develop English as a global language instead of a language of one nation. These are just a few words about the possibilities of plurilingualism and English subject didactics. Fundamentally, plurilingualism provides the rationale for developing language didactics that "depicts the individual (i.e. the subject) as diverse, contradictory, dynamic and changing over historical time and social space" (Norton, 2013, p. 4).

A plurilingual approach to English subject didactics provides the pupils and teachers with materials and tools to provide the pupils with opportunities to develop their identity. Plurilingualism also provides an opportunity for English subject didactics to evolve with time. A plurilingual approach to language learning and categorical *Bildung* may allow pupils to become a plurilingual subject – if they are not one already.

Plurilingualism emphasizes linguistic competence instead of competence in a specific language. An example of this is found in the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 13): "Linguistic competences include lexical, phonological, syntactical knowledge and skills and other dimensions of language as system, independently of the sociolinguistic value of its variations and the pragmatic functions of its realisations." It is important to note that any definitions derived from the CEFR should be considered a suggestion as the Council of Europe is not a governing body like the European Union. Another definition of linguistic competence is "a language user's system of

linguistic knowledge" (Krulatz et al., 2019, p. 31). It then follows that linguistic competence would be an aim in identity development.

Language learning is an essential skill in the 21st century. In this globalized and interconnected world of ours, people meet a wide variety of differing and dynamic complexes of specific semiotic resources – whether in the gaming world, social media, forums, etc. The specific linguistic resources need to be learned in order to communicate appropriately in each context. Language learning happens through interacting in language. The specific language is vital in language learning to the degree that using that language can create identities that can act powerfully. The importance of the language used is dependent on the context. However, whichever language is being taught, it should be taught in a way that makes the pupil aware of and reflects on their own process of language learning, as stated, for example, in the CEFR:

> The methodological message of the CEFR is that language learning should be directed towards enabling learners to act in real-life situations, expressing themselves and accomplishing tasks of different natures. Thus, the criterion suggested for assessment is communicative ability in real life, in relation to a continuum of ability (Levels A1-C2). (Council of Europe, 2020, p. 29)

The aim of language education is *communication*, not mastery of a language. The CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 5) states: "[t]he responsibilities of educational authorities, qualifying examining bodies and teachers cannot simply be confined to the attainment of a given level of proficiency in a particular language at a particular moment in time, important though that undoubtedly is." The aim is life-long language learning. The development of language learning in English comes through learning English as a language. Language learning is learning the linguistic resources necessary to communicate. The critical element is language learning for communication.

A plurilingual approach to language learning in the subject of English intersects with *Bildung*, didactics, and linguistic competence aims to develop the pupils' identity as a plurilingual subject. "The more language s one knows, the more one can see the world from different perspectives, communicate with a diversity of people, and expand one's understanding of oneself and others" (Jessner & Kramsch, 2015, p. 5). Identity development is linked to language learning and the use of those languages learned.

3 Method

A document study is chosen to answer the research question: *how do the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum in LK20 enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning.* The content of the core curriculum and English subject curriculum is analyzed concerning the research question. The analysis is a close reading of select sections of the relevant documents. Document studies usually accompany other qualitative research methods (Bowen, 2009, p. 28). It is beyond the scope of this thesis to conduct interviews of teachers and school administrators seeking to find how they interpret the documents. Admittedly, this is the weakness of any conclusion reached by this thesis. However, the research question does not necessitate interviews or other data other than the relevant documents.

A more pressing issue for this thesis is the sufficiency of the details within the documents analyzed. Insufficient detail to answer the research question could be a potential problem (Bowen, 2009, p. 31). Although this could be a possibility, I have selected the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum because it seems that there is plurilingualism in those documents. As this may be the case, only a close reading of the text will reveal if these hunches are correct or to what degree they are correct or not.

Document analysis ought to draw on many different documents. For instance, the research question of this thesis could perhaps be better answered by comparing all the previous Norwegian curricula for the subject of English and foreign languages. This approach would have given a more detailed description of the development of plurilingualism in the Norwegian curricula. However preferable this may sound, it exceeds the scope and space of this thesis. With that said, this thesis does analyze both the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum, which are two different kinds of documents within LK20. So, in my defense, there is some diversity of documents analyzed in this thesis. However, it is this selection that gives rise to the next methodological issue.

A methodological weakness in document analysis is "bias selectivity" (Yin, 1994, p. 80). The documents selected and which paragraphs, sentences, phrases, words, etc. selected in those selected documents have their reason in some kind of belief. "… [T]he researcher/analyst relies on skills as well as intuition and filters data through an interpretive lens" (Bowen, 2009, p. 36). The researcher must be transparent as possible at every turn. The data of the documents are then analyzed to see what descriptions of plurilingualism can emerge.

"Content analysis is the process of organizing information into categories related to the central question of the research" (Bowen, 2009, p. 32). It is to extract data by "… sampling on the

basis of concepts that have proven theoretical relevance to the evolving theory" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 176). For example, instead of having a heading labeled "metacognition" and then producing all the instances and explaining them underneath that heading, using, for instance, the heading "Identity and Culture" and analyzing the term "language(s)" to find instances of "metacognitions", "language competence", "multilingualism", etc. The analysis is guided by the research question while also allowing the text to speak for itself. So, the structure of the analysis follows the structure of the core curriculum and English subject curriculum, respectively.

The advantage of this method is that the overlap of categories is not a problem. Also, it shows how categories, particular words and phrases, and terms inform each other in the immediate context in which they find themselves. Yet another advantage is that it is easier to reference later and see how specific sections, e.g., "Identity and Culture" in the core curriculum, enhances a plurilingual approach to language learning. It takes the form of a commentary on the text, allowing the text to decide the structure of the analysis while being guided by the research question.

The disadvantage of allowing the text to decide the structure is that it does not necessarily provide a clear structure making it difficult for the reader. Alternatively, one could list instances of what is believed to be evidence for or against plurilingualism in LK20 under terms as headings. The strength of using terms as headings is clarity for the reader. The terms are listed, and the data is presented under the heading. The disadvantage of this method is the overlapping of categories; not everything can be neatly organized under headings. Some data exists in a space between categories. Categories are not as clear-cut as one would have hoped. However, this is not a big problem. It is important to recognize that data can theoretically be rearranged *ad infinitum*: i.e., separated into ever-smaller categories. Simultaneously, the researcher must recognize that it is up to them to delineate how small of categories they need and give reasonable justification for their choices.

A difficulty with allowing the research question to guide the analysis is that it limits the explanation of the text. The analysis is focused on only one element. The text has more to say than it is possible to explain. However, it is not possible to say everything there is to say about a text. More often than not, there is more than one concept residing in a single sentence. The research question acts like a guide leading the researcher to investigate only certain concepts to be analyzed. Being guided by the research question is no problem, but it should at least be admitted that using the research question as a guide excludes other data by design.

This thesis seeks to describe *what* the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum are saying. The "what" is referred to as "data". The data are the building blocks for constructing groups that may be developed into themes. The aim of coding is threefold: 1. to extract the data from the text, 2. to reduce the amount of material, and 3. to facilitate the generation of ideas (Tjora, 2018, p. 197). Coding of the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum is 1. to describe what the texts are saying, 2. to shed irrelevant data and retain relevant data, 3. the relevant data goes on to be the building blocks for creating themes. The relevant material must emerge from the text. The method of coding this text will be a close reading that examines words, key phrases, sentences, and paragraphs pertaining to the research question. Tjora provides two questions to decern a good code from a bad one:

> Q1: make the code *before* coding? If yes, then it's *a priori* coding – not good, make new code. If no, it is potentially a good code: go to Q2. (Tjora, 2018, p. 203)
>
> Q2: What does the code *alone* say? If the code is thematizing a data segment (saying something *about* the text), then make new code. Does it reflect concrete content (*what* is said): good code! (Tjora, 2018, p. 203)

This process describes what the empirical data in the text is saying (not about it) (Tjora, 2018, p. 203). The connection between the empirical data is shown through the close reading of the text. The product is codified empirical data, which will then be grouped. The controlling feature of the groups is the internal agreement between the empirical data as they emerge from the codified empirical data as they pertain to the research question. Words are in *italics* are emphasized for clarity.

"Thematic analysis is a form of pattern recognition within the data, with emerging themes becoming the categories for analysis" (Bowen, 2009, p. 32). Grouping the data thematically is done inductively by recognizing the commonalities between the data that pertains to the research question. The test to group data into groups consists of: 1. internal consistency, and 2. differentiation from other groups (Tjora, 2018, p. 209). These themes are developed as they pertain to the research question.

Once the main themes are in place, there is a discussion of concepts. Here the themes of the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum are compared with the four perspectives on plurilingualism:

- Multilingualism and plurilingualism (ch. 5.2.1)
- Plurilingualism, language, and communicative language competence (ch. 5.2.2)

- Plurilingualism and metacognition
- Plurilingualism and identity development

For a theory to have the status of theory, it must be falsifiable and to be able to be tested (Bowen, 2009, p. 38; Tjora, 2018, p. 266). The development of that theory must be transparent and open for assessment. The theory that is developed seeks to answer the research question.

4 An Analysis of the Core Curriculum and the English Subject Curriculum in LK20

The core curriculum (ch. 4.1) and the English subject curriculum (ch. 4.2) are analyzed separately. The findings of the two documents are gathered and listed at the end of the chapter (see this thesis ch. 4.3). The analysis seeks to answer the question *how do the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum in LK20 enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning?*

4.1 An Analysis of the Core Curriculum

The analysis begins with a description of the core curriculum (ch. 4.1.1).These are the themes analyzed in relation to the core curriculum:

- Multilingualism and plurilingualism (ch. 4.1.2)
- Communicative language competence (ch. 4.1.3)
- Plurilingualism and metacognition (ch. 4.1.4)
- The all-round person and language learning (4.1.5)
- Plurilingualism in paragraph 3 in the section on identity and cultural diversity (ch. 4.1.6)
  - Language proficiency (ch. 4.1.6.1)
  - Language identity (ch. 4.1.6.2)
  - The ability to use language (ch. 4.1.6.3)
    - The ability to use language to think (ch. 4.1.6.3.1)
    - The ability to use language to create meaning (ch. 4.1.6.3.2)
    - The ability to use language to communicate and connect with others (ch. 4.1.6.3.3)
  - Language and metacognition (ch. 4.1.6.4)
  - Multilingualism as the foreground for plurilingualism (ch. 4.1.6.5)
  - Linguistic diversity (ch. 4.1.6.6)
  - Plurilingualism (ch. 4.1.6.7)

The findings of the analysis are presented at the end of the analysis of the core curriculum (ch. 4.1.7).

4.1.1 What Is the Core Curriculum?

"The core curriculum of the curriculum elaborates on *the core values in the objectives clause in the Education Act* and *the overriding principles for primary and secondary education and training.*" ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a](#); my emphasis). The Core Curriculum has two distinctive attributes: 1. an elaboration of core values in the objectives clause int eh Education Act and 2. contains overarching principles for education.

"The core curriculum of the curriculum elaborates on the core values in the objectives clause in the Education Act" ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a](#)). The core curriculum is an elaboration of "core values" found in the Education Act (Opplæringslova). The core curriculum is an elaboration on Norwegian law. The values in the core curriculum find their justification in the Education Act. If plurilingualism is to be found in the core curriculum it could be said to be an elaboration of the core values of the Education Act.

The "principles" are described as "overriding principles for primary and secondary education and training." ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a](#)). In short, these principles are "principles *for* ... education and training" ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a](#)). These principles are "overriding ... for primary and secondary education and training" ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a](#)). The term "overriding", I suggest, could be better translated to "overarching" since the core curriculum functions like an umbrella governing the particular subject curriculum (e.g., Norwegian curriculum, foreign language curriculum, etc.). The principles of education elaborated in the core curriculum govern the educational practices for primary and secondary education and training. The core curriculum elaborates the principles for education in the Norwegian school.

However, the term "core curriculum" connotes something different than "an overarching principle". Merriam-Webster defines core curriculum as "an arrangement of a course of studies that combines under basic topics material from subjects conventionally separated and aims to provide a common background for all students". In contrast, the Norwegian title is *Overordnet del* which connotes an overarching principle that governs, for example, the values and principles for education in the curriculum. Nevertheless, the core curriculum does just that: it elaborates on values and principles for education. When the English translation conflicts with Norwegian text, the Norwegian text is authoritative.

The core curriculum is an authoritative text. "This core curriculum has the status as regulations together with the rest of the curriculum, and must be read in light of the Education Act and other relevant provisions applying to teaching and training in schools and training

establishments." (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a). LK20, includes both the core curriculum and English subject curriculum, "has the status of regulation" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a). The section limits itself to the core curriculum while acknowledging that the English subject curriculum and the rest of LK20 also have the status as regulation.

The core curriculum "must be read in the light of … other relevant provisions applying to teaching and training in schools and training establishments" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a). The core curriculum is not a standalone document but should be read in the light of other documents. This is in part the justification for investigating plurilingualism in LK20 since there is a body of literature on plurilingualism and language learning. It is legitimate to read the core curriculum and the rest of LK20 in the light of plurilingualism.

The core curriculum is important for the research question of this thesis since it is an elaboration of the core values of the objectives clause in the Education Act and contains overarching principles for education in the Norwegian school. A plurilingual approach to language learning must be grounded in plurilingual values and principles of Education. The findings of the analysis find their significance in that they are authoritative for the Norwegian school.

4.1.2 Multilingualism and Plurilingualism

This section presents particular examples and possible examples of multilingualism and plurilingualism as defined in the CEFR. For instance, "[t]he Norwegian Constitution lays down the principle that the central authorities must make it possible for the Sami to protect and develop the Sami languages, culture and societal life, a principle that is addressed in the Education Act" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a).

The core curriculum elaborates on the values of the Education Act. The values found there safeguard the "Sami languages, culture and societal life …." The principle is that the authorities have the responsibility to protect the Sami and develop Sami language, culture and societal life. The plural noun "languages" is a part of a cluster of three nouns determined by the noun "Sami". Language, culture, and societal life are not separable entities, although they are distinguishable. Nonetheless, language, culture, and societal life are the object of protection and development. While it is impossible to disconnect language from culture and societal life, it is outside of the scope of this thesis to analyze them. This thesis will analyze the plural noun "languages" while acknowledging implications for culture and societal life. Again, "languages" is plural. There is a plurality of Sami languages that exist in the political domain and geography of Norway. The

protection and the development afforded Sami languages is "a principle that is addressed in the Education Act." This acknowledges the Sami languages as within the political and geographical domain of Norway. The section *about the core curriculum* (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a) seems to be an instance of the kind of multilingualism suggested by the CEFR. It would seem that multilingualism is perhaps a value in the core curriculum as an elaboration on the Education Act. For example,

> The Sami curriculum applies in the municipalities that are part of the administrative area for Sami languages. The same curriculum also applies to pupils who have the right to be taught in one of the Sami languages in the rest of Norway. Pupils in the rest of Norway who have the right to learn a Sami language must follow the Sami curriculum in the Sami subject. (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a)

The Norwegian state oppressed the Sami languages in the past. Sami languages are now legally recognized languages, protected, and developed. There are administrative areas for Sami languages. The phrase "in the rest of Norway" delimits the political and geographical boundaries. Sami languages are acknowledged as existing in Norway. Sami-speaking pupils in Norway have the right to be taught in their Sami language. Norway as a geographical area contains a variety of languages that find themselves in the population.

The section on *Core values of the education and training* elaborates on the core value that learning Sami languages for the Sami is protected: "The Sami school shall ensure that the pupils receive education and training based on Sami values and the Sami languages, culture and societal life" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020j). Again, the term "Sami languages" is presented as something that exists in the boundaries of Norway. Language, culture, and societal life are interconnected, and that learning, e.g., Sami, would develop the cultural identity and societal life of that individual. A plurilingual approach to language learning would use Sami languages where it is relevant for language learning.

The weakness of these examples is that it relies exclusively on the examples of "Sami languages" to demonstrate multilingualism. Sami languages are legally recognized languages with a history of being oppressed by the Norwegian state. The idea of protecting and developing the Sami languages could also be a manifestation of monolingualism in that Sami languages should be protected and developed to be a thing by itself living alongside Norwegian. However, Sami languages do live alongside Norwegian, and this is something the core curriculum acknowledges. In

this sense, the core curriculum deals with a multilingual situation, and therefore describes Norwegian society as multilingual.

It may be possible to glean evidence of plurilingualism from the section on *the purpose of the education*: "All forms of discrimination shall be combated*"* ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020p](#)) and the section on *human dignity*: "All pupils shall be treated equally, and no pupil is to be subjected to discrimination" ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020k](#)). This thesis limits itself to language. No language is to be discriminated against. However, not discriminating against specific languages is not the same as giving all languages equal legal status. Strictly, this is no evidence of plurilingualism, although it could be angled to support plurilingualism as much as plurilingualism could mitigate discrimination based on language. Plurilingualism views languages as a resource which affords all languages the possibility of being valuable. It is more difficult to discriminate against different languages from one's own if they are seen as resources and not obstacles to be overcome – a plurilingual approach to language learning views language as a resource that could mitigate language discrimination.

However, the strength of this example is that it highlights the ethical potential in a plurilingual approach to language learning. Plurilingualism has the potential to promote equality between languages which helps mitigate discrimination. The connection between plurilingualism and the statements against discrimination in the *purpose of education* and *human dignity* is an ethical one. The section on *about the core curriculum* describes Norway as a multilingual space. The core curriculum seems to contain multilingualism and plurilingualism.

4.1.3 Communicative Language Competence

This thesis presupposes that there is plurilingualism in LK20 since the Norwegian curricula makers have drawn on the suggestions of the CEFR and CoE [(see this thesis ch. 1.1)](#). The weakness of this approach is that it is predicated on circular argumentation. It presupposes plurilingualism to be in the text, then interprets it through the lens of plurilingualism, and concludes that the text enhances a plurilingual approach to language learning. However, all interpretation takes an *a priori* point of departure. The best thing an interpreter can do is make known their point of departure to make it clear. In this case, the point of departure for interpretation is plurilingualism. The strength of this approach is its honesty.

An honest point of departure is the justification for reading plurilingualism into places where it is not explicitly concerned with plurilingualism. For example, the core curriculum states in the section on the *purpose of the education*: "The pupils and apprentices shall develop knowledge, skills

and attitudes so that they can master their lives and can take part in working life and society"
(Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020p). There is no explicit mention of plurilingualism in this statement.
However, reading the quote from the *purpose of education* through the lens of plurilingualism
makes it possible to understand this text as enhancing a plurilingual approach to language learning.

The function of the core curriculum is to provide an elaboration on the core values of the
Education Act and principles of education for the Norwegian school (Utdanningsdirektoratet,
2020a). In this way, whatever is stated in the section on the *purpose of education* applies all
teaching and training, including the subject of English. Language teachers must then interpret what
this means for their specific subject. For me, one such category of interpretation is plurilingualism.
One perspective on plurilingualism is to view language as a resource that individuals develop to
participate in the economy of their particular context. Language is not restrained to its nation or
physical borders, particularly not in the information age. Hence, communicative language
competence is imperative to live and work in today's world. "Communicative language
competences are those which empower a person to act using specifically linguistic means" (Council
of Europe, 2001, p. 9).

The purpose of education is to develop the pupil's "knowledge, skills and attitudes". Read in
the light of plurilingualism, "knowledge, skills and attitudes" could be interpreted as "linguistic
knowledge, language skills and positive attitudes towards other languages". This reading seems to
support the evidence of communicative competence.

Admittedly, this would be my construction of what I believe to be in the text. Although this
interpretation is woefully subjective to the point of twisting the text to serve my own ends, it is yet
not entirely problematic either. The generality with which the original statement is formulated
allows for my interpretation. At any rate, it is possible to interpret the section on the *purpose of
education* through the lens of plurilingualism with the acknowledgment that there are many
different perspectives one could take too.

A plurilingual reading makes sense of the purpose clause of the section on *the purpose of
the education* "so that they can master their lives and can take part in working life and society"
(Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020p). A plurilingual approach to language learning is concerned with
communicative competency, among other things. The purpose of linguistic competency is to
empower the individual to "master their lives" and "can take part in working life and society." In
this way, the *purpose of education* of the core curriculum could be seen to enhance a plurilingual
approach to language learning by promoting communicative language competence.

4.1.4 Plurilingualism and Metacognition

Plurilingualism and metacognition in language learning seem to be contained in the core curriculum. For example, "[i]n a time when the population is more diversified than ever before, and where the world is coming closer together, language skills and cultural understanding are growing in importance" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l).

"[T]he population" refers to the population of Norway, which has mainly been homogenous but now diversifying. "[W]here the world is coming closer together" refers to effective modes of travel and the effect of internet communication. Online, other languages become immediately accessible. The effect of diversity and our diverse society in Norway highlights the necessity of communicative competence. Communication is done through *language*.

"Skills" is the noun and "language" is the modifier. The emphasis is on the *skill* of the language, that is, the ability to use the language. "Understanding" is the noun and "cultural" is the modifier. The emphasis is on the *understanding* of other cultures. "Language skill and cultural understanding" are competency aims. In a sense, "language skills and cultural understanding" may be regarded as a single subject since language and culture are inseparable yet distinguishable concepts. The emphasis of this thesis limits itself to "language skills" while acknowledging that language skills and "cultural understanding" may go hand in hand.

The term "language skills" appears only here in the core curriculum. Although the precise formulation does not appear in the English subject curriculum, there are references in the section on *Basic Skills* (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020o) to "oral skills in English …", "reading skills in English …", "digital skills in English …", while opting for the phrase "writing proficiency in English" when it came to writing. The term *language* in *language skill* is undefined. However, in the subject of English, the English language is the language used to develop *language skills. Language skills* refer to using language for speaking, reading, writing, and using digital tools; in other words, it is concerned with *how to use language*.

"By reflecting on learning, both their own and others', the pupils can gradually develop an awareness of their own learning processes" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020m).This is a case of metacogntition for learning in gernal. This can be applied to the "laguage skills". Since the core curriclulum descirbes Norway as multilngual (see this thesis ch. 4.1.2) it makes sense then to understand the development of "language skills" as a plurilingual appraoch to language learning.

Awareness of and reflection about prior language skills is necessary for using language in different ways. If this is the case, metacognition for language learning is in view. The term

"language skills" is not found in one particular but can be applied to all languages. For instance, it is possible to practice writing in Norwegian and transfer that writing knowledge to write in English, at least to some degree. A metacognitive language skill could be to make aware of and reflect on the similarities and differences between writing Norwegian and writing English. At any rate, the term "language skills" seems to be evidence of metacognition framed in plurilingualism.

4.1.5 The All-Round Person and Language Learning

There is a possible, albeit improbable, mention of plurilingualism in the section on *the purpose of the education* ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020p](#)): "Education and training shall provide insight into cultural diversity and show respect for the individual's convictions." The purpose of education and training is to provide "insight into cultural diversity". Language and culture are not separable. To gain insight into linguistic diversity is to gain insight into cultural diversity and *vice versa*. In a sense, the education and training may have plurilingual and pluricultural approaches to providing insight into cultural diversity. Providing "insight into cultural diversity" could be evidence of developing the pupil's development and language learning. However, this reading is a stretch since it does not explicitly deal with language or language learning. Nevertheless, the core curriculum is also to be applied in the subject of English, where pupils meet other cultures clothed in the English language.

> However, the following sentence is more revealing:
>
> The teaching in school shall develop the all-round person and give each pupil the opportunity to learn and develop their skills and abilities. This process occurs when the pupils acquire knowledge about and insight into nature and the environment, language and history, society and working life, art and culture, and religion and worldviews.
>
> ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020m](#))

There is much to say about these sentences, but I will look specifically at the development of the all-round person. The development of the all-round person is a translation of the Norwegian word *danning,* which is a translation of the German word *Bildung*. The translation "all-round person" is inadequate. Cambridge dictionary defines the term "all-round" as "used to say that a person has many different types of skills and abilities" ([Cambridge Dictionary, 2021](#)). The impression given is that *Bildung* is only concerned with technical skills." It is the responsibility of the one teaching in the school to develop the all-round person. Therefore, the development of the all-round person is a pedagogical question.

Precisely what the antecedent of the demonstrative pronoun "this" is unclear. Does it refer back to "shall develop the all-round person" or "give each pupil the opportunity to learn and develop their skills and abilities"? Are they the same process? The result is confusion and moves interpretation into conjecture. However, the proceeding sentence begins "[t]his all-round education ..." which refers back to "this process". If this is correct, then what is in view is the processes of development of the all-round person, of which the acquisition of knowledge and insight into language and history play a part.

The phrase "language and history" appears only once (here) in the core curriculum and not once in the English subject curriculum. What can be said about the noun *language* in this context is that it is connected with the noun *history* by the conjunction "and". Together "language and history" make up a single grammatical unit. What is meant by "language and history" is uncertain. In the process of the development of an all-round person, the pupil "acquire knowledge about and insight into ... language and history ...."

A plurilingual approach to language learning may enhance the process of development of the all-round person, and the demand for a pedagogy that develops the all-round person through the acquisition of knowledge and insight into "language and history" enhances a plurilingual approach to language learning. As this may be the case, plurilingualism does not directly deal with history, but it does deal with language and the process of development of the all-round person.

4.1.6 Plurilingualism in Paragraph 3 in the Section on Identity and Cultural Diversity

The third paragraph in the section on *identity and cultural diversity* seems to have the clearest references to plurilingualism. However, it is not all plain sailing. There is a mixed bag with clear and obscure phrases and words. Nonetheless, an analysis of this paragraph will produce evidence of multilingualism and plurilingualism. The paragraph reads:

> The teaching and training shall ensure that the pupils are confident in their language proficiency, that they develop their language identity and that they are able to use language to think, create meaning, communicate and connect with others. Language gives us a sense of belonging and cultural awareness. In Norway, Norwegian and the Sami languages, South Sami, Lule Sami and North Sami, have equal standing. The Norwegian language comprises two equal forms of Norwegian bokmål and nynorsk. Norwegian sign language is also recognised as language in its own right in Norway. Knowledge about the linguistic diversity in society provides all pupils with valuable insight into different forms of expression, ideas

and traditions. All pupils shall experience that being proficient in a number of languages is a resource, both in school and society at large. ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l](#))

This paragraph will be analyzed using subheadings to categorize the different findings. The analysis follows the structure of the text. It would be helpful for the reader to have a copy of this paragraph close at hand.

4.1.6.1 Language Proficiency

The firsts sentence contains a form of *communicative language competence* [(see this thesis ch. 2.2)](#). "The teaching and training shall ensure that the pupils are *confident in their language proficiency*…" ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l,](#) my emphasis). The emphasis is on the pupils' *confidence* "in … language proficiency". "Language" is singular without the article. It is not a specific language(s) but proficiency in *language*. The term *language* seems to be used in a broad sense but is not defined, which leads me to read the term *language* in an abstract way, thus referring to languag*es* (note the plural form!).

The emphasis is on *proficiency* in language. Synonyms for "proficiency" could be skills or ability. "Language proficiency" could be reformulated as "proficiency in language". "Language proficiency" has to do with the competency of using language. The pupils are to be confident in their *proficiency* in language. It is the responsibility of the teaching and training to ensure that the pupils are confident in their use of language. The reference to "language proficiency" seems to be evidence of communicative language competence.

Each language subject must incorporate it into their principles of language learning and learning outcomes. Language *proficiency* is related to language *competency*. The aim is to use language and be proficient at using it. Communicative language competence is predicated on language proficiency. It is the responsibility of the teaching and training that the pupils are confident in their language proficiency. In other words, the pupils should *feel* confident in all the proficiency in the languages they use. A plurilingual approach to teaching and training in the subject of English has the possibility to enhance language proficiency and make pupils more confident. The advantage of plurilingualism is that it views all languages in their linguistic repertoire as resources. Proficiency in using language is a form of *communicative language competence.* Valuing the whole linguistic repertoire of the pupil may give them confidence in their language proficiency. In this way, "language proficiency" could be seen as evidence for plurilingualism.

4.1.6.2 Language Identity

The second part of the first sentence is ambiguous. "The teaching and training shall ensure … that they [the pupils] develop their language identity…" ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l](#)). The singular noun "language" is used adjectivally to describe "identity". Neither the term "language" nor the term "identity" is defined. "Language identity" is an ambiguous term used only here in the core curriculum and not once in the English subject curriculum. At any rate, language identity would be something that can be developed by the individual and society, i.e., a dynamic identity just as language could be seen as dynamic. However, this gets us no closer to what "language identity" means in the context of the section on *identity and cultural diversity*. It is up to the reader to read their personal beliefs into the phrase "language identity". Ambiguity in the text is precarious at best and meaningless at best.

For instance, reading with a one nation one language ideology of "language identity" could make it mean Norwegian language identity, as opposed to, for example, Urdu or Arabic language identity. This reading could make it possible that teaching and training ensure that different languages keep in their own space, or at least it makes it possible to leverage this definition to bereave non-Norwegian students of help with Norwegian since they should develop their own "language identify". While this is a more nefarious reading, it is not outside of the possibilities of interpretation. It is possible to argue that the rest of LK20 make this reading impossible. However, it is not outside the realm of possibility that a reader would use certain texts out of context as a pretext for justifying certain pedagogical practices – consciously or unconsciously.

It is also possible to have a plurilingual reading of the phrase "language identity". The term *language* could be defined as a repertoire of complexes of specific semiotic resources used by the individual [(see this thesis ch. 2.2)](#). In this sense, the individual could identify with the language he or she uses. From a plurilingual perspective, language and identity are dynamic. Language is dynamic because it is used in a specific context; the context is never the same. So, language is adapted according to the context. This reading would at least make sense of the verb "develop". The pupils are to "develop their language identity". In this case, "language identity" would have to be dynamic or at least mutable for it to develop. The meaning of the term "language identity" is beholden to the interpreter's beliefs and only restrained by the verb "develop". It could then be argued that "language identity" is developed by the individual pupil and aided by the school.

The term "language identity" is ambiguous, making it necessary for a reader to read their own beliefs into the term. It seems to me that people will read meaning into words even when it is

not justified. However, reading the term in its context alone reveals its meaninglessness. What is meant by "language"? What is meant by "language identity"? The sentence is also careful not to make teaching and training responsible for developing the pupils' "language identity". "The teaching and training shall ensure" that the pupils develop their own "language identity". The core curriculum is ambiguous in its use of the term "language identity" and seems not to want to be responsible for its development. In this document, it does not make sense and cannot be used as evidence for plurilingualism – although it is tempting to read plurilingualism into the term.

4.1.6.3 The Ability to Use Language

The third part of the first sentence seems to give some evidence of plurilingualism as well as some ambiguous statements. "The teaching and training shall ensure … that they [the pupils] are able to use language to think, create meaning, communicate and connect with others" ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l](#)). The focus is on using language to do things.

"The teaching and training shall ensure … that they [the pupils] are able to use language …" Language is to be *used* to do different things. Teaching and training shall ensure the pupils are *able* to use language. The focus is on *the use* and *ability* of the pupils to use language, not using specific languages. The point of language learning in this context is to be able 1. to think [(ch. 4.1.6.3.1)](#), 2. create meaning [(ch. 4.1.6.3.2)](#), 3. communicate and connect with others [(ch. 4.1.6.3.3)](#). The term *language* is not defined, which opens up the possibility for using the pupils' prior linguistic knowledge to achieve these aims. Any approach to language learning must ensure that the pupils are able to use language. The term *language* conveys a *resource view of language* and that the individual has command of these resources, at least to some degree. This section seems to broadly enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning, albeit in a small way. We turn now to analyzing what it means to uses language "to think, create meaning, communicate and connect with others," respectively.

4.1.6.3.1 The Ability to Use Language to Think

"The teaching and training shall ensure … that they [the pupils] are able to use language *to think* …" ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l](#), my emphasis). The first use of the term *language* is connected to thinking and thinking to language. The phrase "to use language to think" is regrettably ambiguous and appears only here in the core curriculum and not once in the English subject curriculum. It is not clear what this means. The meaning of the phrase would have to be imposed for it to have

meaning. Nevertheless, there are some things to be discerned about the phrase "able to use language to think" from its greater context.

The phrase "create meaning" comes immediately after: "… they [the pupils] are able to use language to think, create meaning, …" Thinking and creating meaning share similarities in that both are internal actions taken by the individual. The following phrase, "able to use language to … communicate and connect with others", has a social dimension. The structure of the sentence starts by locating the use of language in the individual and moves outward toward society.

Perhaps, at best, the phrase "able to uses language to think" provokes its reader to think about using language to think. This reading asserts the place of metacognition in language learning. However, what it means "able to use language to think" remains a mystery. Words and phrases that do not make sense in their context are susceptible to being given meaning by an uncritical reader. At any rate, this cannot be cited as clear evidence for plurilingualism nor against it.

4.1.6.3.2 The Ability to Use Language to Create Meaning

"The teaching and training shall ensure … that they [the pupils] are able to use language to … create meaning …" ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l](#)). The term "create meaning" is only found here in the core curriculum and not in the English subject curriculum. However, in the English subject curriculum, the verb "create" is often connected to creating text. It is possible to argue that creating a text is using language to create meaning. However, "to use language to … create meaning" is more than just writing texts. The following phrase reads: "to … communicate and connect with others". In this context, language is used to create meaning to "communicate and connect with others."

In this context, "language" is a resource that is used to create meaning. Again, the noun "language" is singular. As a term, "language" is also left undefined. It is a point of frustration for the author of this thesis that specific terms in LK20 are not clear. At any rate, it is possible to say something about the term "language" by the way it is used in the sentence. First, the individual creates meaning through language. The teaching and training shall ensure that the pupils are *able to* use language to create meaning. This kind of phraseology could lead to the understanding that the term "language" could refer to all pupil's linguistic knowledge. Linguistic knowledge would be the resources of which the pupil would use to construct meaning. To create meaning through language requires an awareness of and reflection on prior language knowledge. The presupposition is that there is no separate room for each language but that all languages a pupil commands find

themselves existing in and among themselves within the pupil. If this is the case, it would be evidence of plurilingualism and could enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning.

4.1.6.3.3 The Ability to Use Language to Communicate and Connect with Others

 "The teaching and training shall ensure … that they [the pupils] are able to use language to … communicate and connect with others" ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l](#)). The paragraph moves from language being used and acted upon to language being the subject of the sentence. The individual uses language to communicate with and connect with others. Language is for communication and connecting with other people. The generality of the statement makes it easy to apply broadly to any situation where there are people.

However, there is an element of *communicative language competence* in this section. The purpose of using language is to communicate and connect with others. There is no language specified and there is no preoccupation with correctness of how to speak or write, only that the pupil is about to use language to communicate. The emphasis is on communication. If the pupil is able to use their linguistic resources (see this thesis ch. 2.2) in a way that communicates, the pupils has used language appropriately. This can be seen evidence supporting a plurilingual approach to language learning.

4.1.6.4 Language and Metacognition

"Language gives us a sense of belonging and cultural awareness" ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l](#)). The quote is a statement about *language*. "Language gives us …" is a normative claim. Why could it not have been formulated "language *can* give us …"? The noun "language" is also singular. It could have been phrased differently; for example, "other languages" or "learning other languages" would have made more sense. What is meant by "language" is unclear.

Nonetheless, the core curriculum in Lk20 claims that language gives us two things: 1. a sense of belonging, and 2. cultural awareness. In the previous sentence, language is used by *the individual* to think, create meaning, and communicate and connect with other people. In this sentence, *language* does something to us.

Firstly, "a sense of belonging" is a phrase used four times in the core curriculum to describe the pupils' connection to a society and the development of their identity. For instance, the phrase "a sense of belonging" is used in the previous paragraph: "Common reference frameworks are important for each person's *sense of belonging* in society" ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l](#)). The

individual belongs to a society. Belonging to a society has to do with identity. Language is what gives this sense of belonging to a society. The core curriculum seems to connect "language" with "a sense of belonging", which would be to connect language with identity. It could then be possible to connect Norwegian language to Norwegian identity or any language with an identity. If this is the case, this would be evidence against anything plurilingualism stands for (see this thesis ch. 2.1). However, *how* language gives a sense of belonging is unclear. Understanding language as a subject in its own right could restrict a plurilingual approach to language learning.

Secondly, in the core curriculum, "cultural awareness" is a phrase used only here in the core curriculum and not once in the English subject curriculum. But what is "cultural awareness"? Well, it can be defined as "that which language gives", which is just as meaningless nonsense. A better phrase would have been "awareness of other cultures" or "awareness of one's own culture" – perhaps both. That would have at least made more sense. To be generous, "cultural awareness" could be defined as being aware of different cultures – admittedly, this definition is not found in the text but is my imposition.

The phrase "language gives us … cultural awareness" affirms that language and culture are not separable although distinguishable. Language is the gateway to cultural awareness. For example, learning another language could give cultural awareness. It would seem that even knowing their own language gives the pupils cultural awareness. The absoluteness of the claim "language gives us … cultural awareness" problematizes what it means. It is common knowledge that not all who have language have cultural awareness. Even a plurilingual person is not necessarily culturally aware. However, learning another language can give us an awareness of our own and other cultures. The difference is that "learning other languages" is done by the pupil, while the core curriculum boldly states that language does something to us, *viz.* gives us cultural awareness. How this works is not clear.

On seeing the word "awareness" in "cultural awareness", it is tempting to think of it in metacognitive terms. As it is in the core curriculum, it is language that gives cultural awareness as opposed to the pupil making themselves aware through a process of reflection on their own prior knowledge. It does not seem like a probable interpretation that, in this instance, the core curriculum enhances a metacognitive approach to cultural awareness. In my view, despite the word "awareness", this does not seem to be an instance of metacognition.

In summary, "[l]anguage gives us a sense of belonging and cultural awareness" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l) does not make much sense. However, it seems to make an effort to

associate language with identity and being culturally aware. What this means or how this works is not clear. This quote from the section on *identity and cultural diversity* (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l) does not provide evidence of plurilingualism, but neither does it provide evidence against it. It may be tempting to read plurilingual and metacognitive elements into the text, but the text alone does not allow for this reading.

4.1.6.5 Multilingualism as the Foreground for Plurilingualism

The previous sentences in the section on *identity and cultural diversity* have described how individuals use language and how language does this to individuals. The subsequent three sentences have to do with the geographical spread of different languages in Norway.

> In Norway, Norwegian and the Sami languages, South Sami, Lule Sami and North Sami, have equal standing. The Norwegian language comprises two equal forms of Norwegian bokmål and nynorsk. Norwegian sign language is also recognised as language in its own right in Norway. (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l)

In some sense, this seems to be an acknowledgment of multilingualism. Plurilingualims and multilingualism as defined by the Council of Europe (2021):

- 'multilingualism' refers to the presence in a geographical area of more than one 'variety of language' i.e. the mode of speaking of a social group whether it is formally recognised as a language or not;
- 'plurilingualism' refers to the repertoire of 'varieties of language' which individuals use, and is therefore the opposite of monolingualism; it includes the language variety referred to as 'mother tongue' or 'first language' and any number of other languages or varieties.

The acknowledgment of the presence of Norwegian and Sami languages in Norway's geographical and political area can be described as multilingualism, as defined above.

The term "language" is now plural "languages" and described as "Norwegian and Sami languages" and "Norwegian sign language". There is not one Norwegian language or one Sami language, but Norwegian *languages* and Sami *languages*. Norwegian and Sami languages are made up of varieties of Norwegian and Sami. There is an inherent plurality in Norwegian and Sami languages.

"In Norway", Norwegian and Sami languages have "equal standing". The prepositional phrase "in Norway" describes the geographical boundaries and political jurisdiction of LK20. This is an acknowledgment of a variety of languages and the existence of those languages in the

geographical area of Norway. This is multilingualism, as defined by the Council of Europe. Where these verities of languages are to be found, it will be incumbent for the teachers of language to use Norwegian and Sami languages in the classroom.

There is no mention of *other languages* as opposed to the English subject curriculum (see this thesis ch. 4.2.5, ch. 4.2.6, and ch. 4.2.7). Norwegian and Sami languages are recognized languages, and yet not even all recognized languages are represented. A hierarchy of languages seems to emerge, where Norwegian languages give Sami languages special rights while leaving others out. Alternatively, it could be seen as recognizing the previously oppressed Sami languages' rights. The recognition of pasted wrongs against disadvantaged languages could be the start of recognizing the rights and equality of more languages. The recognition of Norwegian and Sami languages is evidence for multilingualism and a perhaps willingness to pursue multilingualism as a policy in the future. A multilingual society necessitates a plurilingual approach to language learning.

4.1.6.6 Linguistic Diversity

Having established that there are varieties of languages in Norway, the following sentence moves to focus on the individual. "Knowledge about the linguistic diversity in society provides all pupils with valuable insight into different forms of expression, ideas and traditions" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l).

The noun "knowledge" is the subject of the sentence which "provides all students … insight". The statement is absolute. Knowledge is what provides insight for all pupils. The pupils are not active, but instead, knowledge is active in the pupils. The passivity of the pupils in gaining insight seems peculiar. The text seems to convey that knowledge is something that automatically gives insight into different things. How does knowledge do this? Can knowledge do anything?

The claim "knowledge … provides all pupils with … insight …" is absolute. The verb "provides" is not modified to be nuanced. The absoluteness of the claim problematizes its meaning. It would seem that this knowledge would always, in all cases, provide insight without fail. Failing to have "insight into the different forms of expression ideas and traditions" would come down to not having the "knowledge about the linguistic diversity in society". The absoluteness of the claim is difficult to take seriously. Knowledge does nothing for us, but we can do things with knowledge.

It is possible to read "knowledge … provides all pupils with … insight" as declaring the importance of "knowledge about the linguistic diversity in society". Without this knowledge, there is no insight into "different forms of expression, ideas and traditions." Then this is not an absolute

statement about what this knowledge does but a declarative statement about the necessity of this knowledge for all students if there are to have insight into "different forms of expression, ideas and traditions" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l). It then claims that Norwegian society is linguistically diverse.

The context of the phrase "linguistic diversity in society" makes it possible to read it as a reference to the varieties of languages in Norway. It could also be understood as "linguistic diversity in society" in general. The phrase "linguistic diversity" appears only once in the core curriculum, while the phrase "linguistic and cultural diversity" appears once in the section on working on text in English in the core elements of the English subject curriculum. The core elements deal with the development of the "knowledge … of linguistic … diversity" through working with texts (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020i), while the core curriculum deals with the values and principles of education. The core curriculum seems to claim that society is inherently linguistically diverse. It seems possible to understand the phrase "linguistic diversity in society" as "other languages in society". The core curriculum may be promoting knowledge of other languages found in Norwegian society. The context for this statement comes after the statement about the linguistic diversity of Norwegian and Sami, and not "other languages" in general. Linguistic diversity in Norwegian society provides the conditions for a plurilingual approach to language learning.

4.1.6.7 Plurilingualism

The following sentence in the section on *identity and cultural diversity* seems to support the claim of a plurilingual approach to language learning: "All pupils shall experience that being proficient in a number of languages is a resource, both in school and society at large" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l). In the opening phrase "*[a]ll pupils* shall experience …", the modifier "all" is not necessary. It would suffice to use the plural "pupils". In this context, the modifier "all" emphasizes that no pupil is to be left out.

The modal verb "shall" is used as an imperative in this context. The core curriculum is legally a regulation (Kjelaas & Ommeren, 2019, p. 7; Speitz, 2018, p. 32; Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a; cf. Opplæringslova ch. 11 and ch. 13), which provides the potency for the imperative. The core curriculum commands that the school and educator provide all pupils with the experience "that being proficient in a number of languages is a resource, in both school and society at large." The phrase "shall experience" is also not dogmatic, i.e., it is not the teacher who tells the student, but the teacher should provide an arena for a subjective experience. The school is not to dogmatically

teach that being proficient in a number of languages is a resource, but that being proficient in a number of languages should be experienced by all pupils in the Norwegian School. This experience is something to be had *in Norwegian society*, which presupposes that Norwegian society is a multilingual society. The multilingual nature of Norwegian society makes a plurilingual approach to language learning desirable and even, perhaps, necessary.

The conjunction "that" indicates a subordinate clause with its own subject and predicate. The content of the subordinate clause is the content of the experience all pupils shall have in the Norwegian school. The subject is "being proficient in a number of languages". Being proficient in a number of languages is a form of communicative language competence. It is not only knowing a few languages but being proficient in them. The phrase "a number of languages" does not specify which languages specifically, which opens up the possibility to allow the use of all languages to create the experience that speaking a number of languages is a resource. Why the phrase "other languages" is not used in this context, while it is in other places, is not clear. Also, the phrase "*number* of languages" emphasizes the plurality of languages of the individual. This seems to be evidence of plurilingualism. This phrase opens up for more than just legally recognized languages to be used in the Norwegian school. Nonetheless, it means the same, as far as I can see.

The sentence continues: "… that being proficient in a number of languages *is a resource, both in school and society at large.*" It is not just knowing a number of languages but being proficient in them, which is a resource. Language proficiency is a resource "both in school and society at large." The phrase "both in school and society at large" describes the largest possible context. Since this is a document written to and for the Norwegian school, it emphasizes that proficiency in a number of languages is a resource not only on the school campus but also off-campus in everyday life. Proficiency in a number of languages is described as a resource in school and society at large. All pupils are to experience that being proficient in a number of languages is a resource, in and out of school. The school is to bring the world into the classroom and the classroom out into the world where the pupil can experience that being proficient in a number of languages is a resource.

4.1.6.8 Findings in Paragraph 3 in the Section on Identity and Cultural Diversity

This is a list of the findings in the section on *identity and cultural diversity* that seem to enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning:

- Language proficiency (ch. 4.1.6.1)
- The ability to use language to create meaning (ch. 4.1.6.3.2)

- The ability to use language to communicate and connect with others (ch. 4.1.6.3.3)

- Multilingualism as the foreground for plurilingualism (ch. 4.1.6.5)

- Linguistic diversity (ch. 4.1.6.6)

- Plurilingualism (ch. 4.1.6.7)

This is a list of finding in sections on the *identity and cultural diversity* which are not necessarily enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning.

- Language identity (ch. 4.1.6.2)

- The ability to use language to think (ch. 4.1.6.3.1)

- Language and metacognition (ch. 4.1.6.4)

These finding are not antithetical to a plurilingual approach to language learning, only that they are not evidence that supports it.

4.1.7 Findings in the Core Curriculum

This is a list of findings in the core curriculum that seem to enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning:

- Multilingualism and plurilingualism (ch. 4.1.2)

- Communicative language competence (ch. 4.1.3)

- Plurilingualism and metacognition (ch. 4.1.4)

- The all-round person and language learning (4.1.5)

- Language proficiency (ch. 4.1.6.1)

- The ability to use language to create meaning (ch. 4.1.6.3.2)

- The ability to use language to communicate and connect with others (ch. 4.1.6.3.3)

- Multilingualism as the foreground for plurilingualism (ch. 4.1.6.5)

- Linguistic diversity (ch. 4.1.6.6)

- Plurilingualism (ch. 4.1.6.7)

The findings in the core curriculum find their significance in that the core curriculum is an elaboration of the core values of the objectives clause in the Education Act and principles of education in the Norwegian school. The findings together seem to enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning. It would seem that the core curriculum's values and principles for education enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning.

4.2 An Analysis of the English Subject Curriculum

The analysis begins with a description of the English subject curriculum (ch. 4.2.1). These are the themes analyzed in relation to the English subject curriculum:

- Language and perspectives on the world and ourselves (ch. 4.2.2)
- Speaking several languages (ch. 4.2.3)
- Multilingualism (ch. 4.2.4)
- Language learning and other languages (ch. 4.2.5)
- Metacognition, and English and other languages (ch. 4.2.6)
- Language learning and other languages (ch. 4.2.7)

Presentation of findings are found at the end of the analysis of the English subject curriculum (ch. 4.2.8).

4.2.1 What is the English Subject Curriculum?

The official title of what I call the *English subject curriculum* is actually *curriculum in English*. This translation is misleading as it seems to refer to a translation of the entire Norwegian curriculum (LK20). Google Translate translates the Norwegian title *Lærerplan i Engelsk* into English as *Curriculum in English* (Google, 2021a). *Lærerplan på engelsk* would be the back-translation of *curriculum in English.* The English translation does not take the preposition "in" properly into consideration. The title *curriculum in English* is misleading. Hence this thesis uses the term *English subject curriculum* instead of *curriculum in English*.

English subject curriculum is the authoritative document (styringsdokument) and has the status of regulation (forskrift) (see this thesis ch. 1.1). The English subject curriculum specifically governs the competence aims and assessment criteria for the subject of English in the Norwegian school.

4.2.2 Language and Perspectives on the World and Ourselves

The English subject curriculum states in the section on *relevance and central values*: "Knowledge of and an exploratory approach to language, communication patterns, lifestyles, ways of thinking and social conditions open for new perspectives on the world and ourselves" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020n). The immediate context is concerned with developing the pupils' understanding of the world to prevent prejudice (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020n).

There is much to be said for "language, communication patterns, lifestyles, ways of thinking and social conditions", but it is outside of the scope of this thesis to analyze each term. So, this analysis will limit itself to the term *language* found in this context with the acknowledgment that the language and the other terms influence each other. There are also two subjects of the sentence, "knowledge of …" and "an exploratory approach to …", which together they "open for" (notice the plural form of the verb). Since they "open for …" together, it is possible to analyze them separately while acknowledging that they work together to "open for new perspectives on the world and ourselves."

"Knowledge of … language …" opens for "new perspectives on the world and ourselves" ([Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020n](#)). The term *language* is singular, referring to language(s) in general. The singular form *language* can function as an abstract noun referring to all languages. This reading is justified in this context since it is used to signify the function of languages. There is no abstract language existing in the world of the forms (to borrow Platonic language); the only language that exists is that which is used. In this way, the term *language* refers to languag*es* (note the plural form!).

However, there is no specific language in mind in this context. The English subject curriculum being written in English may indicate that the knowledge of English in some way opens new perspectives on the world and ourselves. However, even in the English subject curriculum, there is ample room for using other languages in addition to English to open new perspectives on the world. How this works is not explained, but it does open and enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning.

"An exploratory approach to language …" opens for "new perspectives on the world and ourselves." The term *language* is again singular, referring to languag*es* in general (note the plural form!). In the exploration of *language*, which is something done by the pupil, the pupil's perspectives on the world change, and so do their perspectives on themselves. In the subject of English, the pupils can explore English and other languages to open new perspectives on the world and of themselves. The aim of exploring language is to gain new perspectives on the world and of one's self. This exploratory approach to language could also enhances a plurilingual approach to language learning.

Both the "knowledge of … language" and "an exploratory approach to language" serve to open for new perspectives on the worlds and ourselves, albeit in different ways. The "knowledge of … language" emphasizes the value of knowledge, while "an exploratory approach to … language"

emphasizes acting on that knowledge. Together they "open for new perspectives on the world and ourselves." In the immediate context, being open for new perspectives can be understood as preventing prejudice, something many propionates of plurilingualism would be for. Together that the two phrases make for solid evidence for plurilingualism and enhances a plurilingual approach to language learning.

4.2.3 Speaking Several Languages

In the subject of English, the Norwegian school is to use several languages. Again, the immediate context is concerned with preventing prejudice (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020n). "The pupils shall experience that the ability to speak several languages is an asset at school and in society in general" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020n). This sentence in the *relevance and central values* is strikingly close to the one in the core curriculum's section on *identity and cultural diversity*: "All pupils shall experience that being proficient in a number of languages is a resource, both in school and society at large" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l). The differences are non-substantial and are basically formulated in the same way. For example, the syntax of the sentence is nearly the same.

Understanding language proficiency as a resource is not to be pounded into the pupils' brains but a reality to be experienced. It is not about telling the pupils that speaking several languages is an asset but having them experience it. This experience must be had in the society in which the pupils live. The description of Norway as having a variety of languages in its territory is a multilingual description of Norway. Multilingualism foregrounds any plurilingual approach to language learning. To immerse pupils in an experience where speaking serval languages is a resource is a plurilingual approach to language learning.

As opposed to the formulation in the core curriculum's section on *identity and cultural diversity,* the English subject curriculum specifies the proficiency of being able to speak several languages as an asset. Even in the subject of English, one of the aims is to allow for the speaking of several languages if it is seen as an asset. This experience could be that the pupils observe it passively or they themselves actively speak and thereby experience that speaking several languages, English and other languages, is an asset. Opening up for experiencing speaking other languages than English in the subject of English enhances a plurilingual approach to language learning.

The term "asset" means "a useful quality or skill" (Cambridge dictionary, 2021) and is used to describe "speaking several languages". In other contexts, the term "asset" may take on more

monetary connotations. The term "asset" may convey being able to speak several languages as of monitory value. In discussions on plurilingualism, it is not uncommon to speak of language as a resource that can be thought of as a markable skill (see this thesis ch. 2.2). Whatever the case, what is emphasized is that the *ability* to speak several languages is desirable.

Being able to experience several languages being spoken is not confined to the classroom but also to be had in "society in general." The school is responsible for using the classroom and the society in general as the arena where the pupils shall experience that speaking several languages is an asset. The boundaries between English and other languages are softened by requiring pupils, in the subject of English, to experience that to speak several languages is an asset. As the context is concerned with preventing prejudice, the "asset" view of language is designed to see the value of other languages. The use of serval languages in the subject of English enhances a plurilingual approach to language learning by promoting the ability to speak several languages as an asset.

4.2.4 Multilingualism

There is a mention of the term *multilingual* in the English subject curriculum: "They shall build the foundation for seeing their own identity and others' identities in a multilingual and multicultural context" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020i). The immediate context is concerned with intercultural competence through "working with texts in English" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020i). The Norwegian context is described as multilingual and multicultural. Multilingualism is the foreground for a plurilingual approach to language learning. In this context, the pupils are to develop their "foundation for seeing their own identity and others' identities". Identity development is in focus. The context is a multilingual Norway. The pupils' perception of others in Norway must be grounded in multilingualism. Multilingualism foregrounds a plurilingual approach to language learning in the subject of English.

4.2.5 Language Learning and Other Languages

What is meant by "language learning" and "other languages" in the English subject curriculum? The term "language learning" is connected to the term "English and other languages" in the section on *language learning*.

> Language learning refers to developing language awareness and knowledge of English as a
> system, and the ability to use language learning strategies. Learning the pronunciation of
> phonemes, and learning vocabulary, word structure, syntax and text composition gives the

pupils choices and possibilities in their communication and interaction. Language learning refers to identifying connections between English and other languages the pupils know, and to understanding how English is structured. (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020i).

There are two definitions of what the term "language learning" refers to. It is outside the scope of this thesis to resolve this. However, the analysis of these definitions does provide evidence of plurilingualism in the English subject curriculum despite the confusing sentences.

The first definition is: "language learning refers to developing language awareness and knowledge of English as a system, and the ability to use language learning strategies." The term "language learning" is used in the context of the subject of English and includes more languages than just English. Language learning refers to three things *1. developing language awareness*, *2. developing knowledge of English as a system*, and *3. The ability to use language learning strategies.*

The term "language awareness" only appears once in the English subject curriculum and not once in the core curriculum. However, the phrase "developing language awareness" is also found in the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 172). The CEFR defines "language awareness" as "... a general consciousness of linguistic phenomena (relationship with the native language or other languages present in the classroom environment)" (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 172). This definition seems to fit the term "language awareness" in the English subject curriculum. However, the definition from the CEFR and is not actually contained within the text of the English subject curriculum. "Awareness" is often a word denoting metacognition (e.g., Haukås, 2018, p. 13). Teaching and learning English should develop language awareness. However, what is meant by "language awareness" is not necessarily straightforward, but it provides some evidence for plurilingualism and metacognition. There is *language* and it seems that one can become *aware* of it and reflect on it. The term *language* in this context seems to indicate langua*ges* (note the plural form!) in general.

The phrase "developing ... knowledge of English as a system..." seems to be a goal of learning the English language. Language learning also refers to "developing ... the ability to use language learning strategies". Note that there are not "English language learning strategies" but generic "language learning strategies". Language learning in the subject of English develops the ability to use language learning strategies through learning English. The use of language learning strategies in the subject of English is evidence of plurilingualism.

The second definition is: "Language learning refers to identifying connections between English and other languages the pupils know, and to understanding how English is structured." It is

not all languages but limited to the languages the pupils know. Identifying the connections between English and other languages presupposes that there are connections between English and other languages. As obvious as this sounds, it is an admission that there is no hard border between languages. There is a raising of awareness of other languages in the classroom for language learning. For example, an instance of language learning is seeing the connection between English and other languages in the classroom. This practice of comparing similarities and dissimilarities can be replicated in learning other languages (see this thesis ch. 2.3). Comparing languages for language learning is strong evidence for plurilingualism and enhances a plurilingual approach to language learning.

4.2.6 Metacognition, and English and Other Languages

There is evidence of metacognition and plurilingualism in many competence aims; for example, after year 2: "The pupil is expected to … find words that are common to English and other languages with which the pupil is familiar" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020e).

The pupils are the ones doing the "finding" of common words. For this to work, there must be words for the pupils to find, and the pupils have the capability to find words common to English and other languages they are familiar with. The languages to be used to find commonality are "… other languages with which the pupil is familiar". Notice the plural "languages"; there is no limit to the languages the pupil can use, or the teacher may use as an example. The only limiting factor is the languages that the pupils are familiar with. What does it mean to be familiar with a language? There is no definition given. What it means is up to the teacher. However, there is a difference between knowing a language and being familiar with it. Vg 1 competence aims limit the use of the other languages the pupils *know* (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020d; see this thesis ch. 4.2.7). The teacher may use all the languages the pupils are familiar with.

The pupil is the one who is to find the common words between the languages familiar to him/herself and English. Finding the similarities between languages is a process of becoming aware of words that are common to different languages and reflecting on those similarities. There is a metacognitive element in that the pupil becomes aware of prior knowledge of words in familiar languages; and that the pupils find other common words between English and those languages with which they are familiar. Finding similar words between English and a familiar language is also a reflection on the knowledge of words in familiar languages and finding words in those languages are common to English. The level of reflection is advanced in the next grade bracket.

The use of English and other languages in the subject of English, after year 4: "The pupil is expected to … discover and play with words and expressions that are common to both English and other languages with which the pupil is familiar" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020f). Instead of "find" the text expands to "discover and play with words and expressions that are common …." The infinite verbs "discover and play" point to an exploratory view of language learning. The verb "discover" may point to a view of language that is "out there", as opposed to something to be contracted within one's self. The pupils are expected to have the competency of discovering and playing with words and expressions common to English and other languages. The emphasis of other languages seems to soften the borders between languages, while retaining conventional understanding of language. The purpose of the discovery and play is competency unto itself, which is necessary to have in order to graduate to the next step.

Raising awareness of the common features of English and other languages is imperative for the Norwegian school. These languages are those which are familiar or known by the pupil. English and other languages become a part of the pupils' expanding repertoire of language varieties (Council of Europe, 2020). There is an intentional move to make the pupils more and more aware of the commonalities between familiar languages from year 2 to year 4. Making the pupils aware of similarities and dissimilarities for language learning makes ample room for a plurilingual approach to metacognition for language learning (see this thesis 2.3). The competence aims for years 2 and 4 is the point of departure for year 7.

4.2.7 Language Learning, and English and Other Languages

The competence aims at 7th, 10th, and Vg1 are concerned with language learning through English and other languages. Language learning, in the subject of English, is a skill to be learned through English. Language learning is the goal, not learning the English language *per se*. In this section, the competence aims of years 7, 10 and Vg1 are analyzed in that order.

After year 7, "[t]he pupil is expected to … explore and talk about some linguistic similarities between English and other languages that he or she is familiar with and use this in his or her language learning" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020g).

The competence aims shift from "discover and play" to a more advanced "explore and talk about". The pupils must be competent to explore and talk about "some linguistic similarities". The phrase "words and expressions" is superseded by the phrase "linguistic similarities". Linguistic similarities ought to be a topic of conversation. Perhaps it is obvious, but there is an admittance to

there being linguistic similarities between English and other languages. The ability to become aware of and reflect on linguistic similarities and differences is metacognitive and seemingly predicated on a view of language that makes it possible and desirable to do this. A plurilingual approach to language learning is served by raising awareness of and reflection about prior linguistic knowledge of the languages the pupils are familiar (see this thesis 2.3).

To "explore and talk about linguistic similarities between English and other languages" have plurilingual and metacognitive elements "… and [the pupils] use this in his or her language learning." Notice the phrase "language learning" and not "learning the English language". The assumption is that languages share certain commonalities and that one's languages reside in one's self. Language is something constructed by the individual in a society and then used by that individual. At the end of year 7, The pupil is expected to be able to explore and talk about *some of* the languages he or she is familiar with (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020g).

The pupil is to "use this … in his or her language learning" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020g). Pupils are expected to use similarities found between English and other languages for language learning. The emphasis is on *language learning*, not the learning of English. Year 10 builds on the pupils' ability to use the knowledge of linguistic similarities in language learning.

After year 10, "[t]he pupil is expected to be able to … explore and describe some linguistic similarities and differences between English and other languages he or she is familiar with and use this in his or her language learning" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020h).

The competence aims for after year 10 uses much of the same phraseology as the previous competence aim. However, the phrase "explore and talk about" in year 7 is changed to "explore and describe" in year 10. The pupils are to explore and describe not just the linguistic similarities, but both "linguistic *similarities* and *differences* between English and other languages …" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020h; my emphasis). To raise awareness of linguistic similarities and dissimilarities and reflecting on them for language learning is a metacognitive skill (see this thesis 2.3). Pupils are expected to use this skill for language learning. From here, the pupil is to be ready for Vg1.

After the Vg 1 vocational education program, "[t]he pupil is expected to be able to … use knowledge of similarities between English and other languages he or she knows in language learning" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020d). "Knowledge of similarities" replaces "explore and describe some linguistic similarities …", and notice that "and differences" is dropped from the previous competence aim. At this point in the pupil's development, they should be able to find,

discover, play with, explore, talk about and describe linguistic similarities and differences between English and other languages and use that for language learning. The Vg1 vocational education program builds on this expectation.

It is also no longer "English and other languages that the pupils' are familiar with". The term "familiar" is changed to "know", limiting the possible languages to what the pupils know. However, it is not clear what it means to know a language. In this context, it would seem to be more than being familiar with a language. The teacher is left to interpret what it means to *know* a language. At any rate, the pupils are expected to be able to use the knowledge of the similarities between English and languages they know in language learning. The pupil is to use prior language knowledge in language learning.

After Vg 1 program for general studies, "[t]he pupil is expected to be able to … use knowledge of similarities between *English and other languages* with which the pupil is familiar in language learning" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020c). The pupils are expected to use their previous set of abilities to "… use knowledge of similarities ... in language learning." Knowledge of differences would be probably more than one could count. The relevant knowledge is the knowledge of the similarities between English and other languages.

In contrast to the Vg1 vocational program, the competence aim after the Vg1 program for general studies retains the term "familiar". Using languages familiar and known to the pupils expands the limit of what languages the teacher and pupils can use in language learning. The English subject curriculum is quite specific, that this knowledge is used for language learning.

The competence aims in 7th, 10th, and Vg1 contain elements of plurilingualism. They are all concerned with using prior linguistic knowledge in language learning. The English language is the vehicle for learning language learning strategies for future language learning. The progression of using *English and other languages* only increases in expectation of language competency from 7th grade through to Vg1, both vocational and general studies. The competency aims in the English subject curriculum from 7th grade through to Vg1 enhances a plurilingual approach to language learning by expecting pupils to use prior linguistic knowledge in language learning.

4.2.8 Findings in the English Subject Curriculum

This is a list of findings in the English subject curriculum that seems to enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning:

- Language and perspectives on the world and ourselves (ch. 4.2.2)

- Speaking several languages (ch. 4.2.3)
- Multilingualism (ch. 4.2.4)
- Language learning and other languages (ch. 4.2.5)
- Metacognition, and English and other languages (ch. 4.2.6)
- Language learning and other languages (ch. 4.2.7)

These findings in the English subject curriculum find their significance in that they govern the competence aims and assessment criteria in the subject of English.

4.3 Findings in the Core Curriculum and the English Subject Curriculum

This is a list of the findings in the core curriculum:
- Multilingualism and plurilingualism (ch. 4.1.2)
- Communicative language competence (ch. 4.1.3)
- Plurilingualism and metacognition (ch. 4.1.4)
- The all-round person and language learning (4.1.5)
- Language proficiency (ch. 4.1.6.1)
- The ability to use language to create meaning (ch. 4.1.6.3.2)
- The ability to use language to communicate and connect with others (ch. 4.1.6.3.3)
- Multilingualism as the foreground for plurilingualism (ch. 4.1.6.5)
- Linguistic diversity (ch. 4.1.6.6)
- Plurilingualism (ch. 4.1.6.7)

This is a list of the findings in the English subject curriculum:
- Language and perspectives on the world and ourselves (ch. 4.2.2)
- Speaking several languages (ch. 4.2.3)
- Multilingualism (ch. 4.2.4)
- Language learning and other languages (ch. 4.2.5)
- Metacognition, and English and other languages (ch. 4.2.6)
- Language learning and other languages (ch. 4.2.7)

The combined findings in the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum seem to enhance plurilingualism and a plurilingual approach to language learning. The core curriculum and the English subject curriculum have different attributes, which makes for a different kind of data. Both have the status of regulation (forskrift), making them authoritative documents (styringsdokumenter) for the Norwegian school (see this thesis ch. 1.1). Core curriculum is an

elaboration of the core values of the objective clauses in the Education Act and contains overarching principles for primary and secondary school (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a), which makes it applicable to all fields. The English subject curriculum governs the competence aims and assessment criteria in the subject of English.

5 Discussion and Conclusion

This thesis has pursued to answer the question: *how do the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum in LK20 enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning?* This research question arises from the history of Norwegian curricula makers for the subject of English using the suggestions from the Council of Europe and CEFR (see this thesis ch. 1.1). The CEFR suggests plurilingualism as a tool to promote unity between people (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 2). Since Norwegian curricula makers for the subject of English have increasingly drawn on the CEFR, it is reasonable to presuppose that LK20 contains plurilingualism or some form of it. Since the point of departure for this thesis is the subject of English, the scope of the thesis is the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum. It is then reasonable to ask: *how do the core curriculum and English subject curriculum in LK20 enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning?* Theoretical perspectives and research on plurilingualism were presented to orient the discussion around plurilingualism (see this thesis ch. 2). In order to answer the research question, this thesis analyzed the core curriculum (see this thesis ch. 4.1) and English subject curriculum (see this thesis ch. 4.2) respectively to ascertain the content of the respective documents as they pertain to plurilingualism (see this thesis ch. 4.3).

5.1 Main Findings

The main findings of this thesis are that both the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum contains a form of plurilingualism. The core curriculum and the English subject curriculum have attributes that distinguish them from one another. The different attributes make for different kinds of usages of plurilingualism in the respective documents. Both documents have the status of regulation (forskrift), making them authoritative documents (styringsdokumenter) for the Norwegian school (see this thesis ch. 1.1). Core curriculum is an elaboration of the core values of the objective clauses in the Education Act and contains overarching principles for primary and secondary school (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a), which makes it applicable to all fields. The English subject curriculum governs the subject of English and sets out the competence aims. Since they have different attributes, they contribute differently to the research question. Together they make for powerful tools to enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning in general and specifically in the subject of English. However, fundamentally this is based on the presupposition of there being plurilingualism in both the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum.

The findings in the core curriculum findings are: *multilingualism and plurilingualism* (ch. 4.1.2); *communicative language competence* (ch. 4.1.3); *plurilingualism and metacognition* (ch. 4.1.4); *the all-round person and language learning* (ch. 4.1.5); *language proficiency* (ch. 4.1.6.1); *the ability to use language to create meaning* (ch. 4.1.6.3.2); *the ability to use language to communicate and connect with others* (ch. 4.1.6.3.3); *multilingualism as the foreground for plurilingualism* (ch. 4.1.6.5); *linguistic diversity* (ch. 4.1.6.6); and *plurilingualism* (ch. 4.1.6.7) enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning by elaborating on values that support plurilingualism and plurilingual principles of language education. The core curriculum enhances a plurilingual approach to language learning by providing the values necessary to implement plurilingualism and plurilingual principles for teaching and training in language. Although the scope of the thesis is a plurilingual approach to language learning, it is essential to note that the scope of application for plurilingualism is more extensive than just language learning.

As the core curriculum is an elaboration of the core values of the objectives clauses in the Education Act, it will be drawn on for the development of future teaching and learning methods. For instance, the core curriculum views language as a resource. Viewing language as a resource is a value expressed in the section on *the ability to use language* (ch. 4.1.6.3), which emphasizes the equality of languages and cultures by viewing them as resources. Desiring equality for the previously disadvantaged is in part motivated by moral outrage at the inequality of the previously disadvantaged in years past. Promoting the resource view of language could be used to advance language rights in the future.

> While the pursuit of language rights often stems from moral outrage in the face of exclusion and inequity, exclusive reliance on morality at the expense of systematic assessment of costs and benefits risks making current conceptualisations of language rights irrelevant to policy makers. (Bruthiaux, 2009, p. 73)

With this in mind, the core curriculum presents the equality between language through promoting linguistic diversity (see this thesis ch. 4.1.6.6) and viewing language as a resource (see this thesis ch. 4.1.6.7). All languages can be seen as future economic resources.

The core curriculum is also an elaboration of the principles of education in the Norwegian primary school. For instance, multilingualism foregrounds a plurilingual approach to language learning in all fields of education (see this thesis ch. 4.1.4). Describing Norway as multilingual can be interpreted as a principle for education as it describes as multilingualism is normative for Norway, and thus a plurilingual approach to language learning is necessary. The all-round person and

language learning provides a foundation for using plurilingual approaches to language learning to develop the pupils' language skills and identity through language learning (see this thesis ch. 4.1.5). These can be interpreted as examples of principles of education.

Together, the core values of the objectives clause in the Education Act and the overarching principles of education elaborated on in the core curriculum enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning by providing values that promote plurilingualism and plurilingual principles of education. At the very least, the core curriculum contains a form of plurilingualism. The significance of the core curriculum's plurilingualism is that it is a regulation for the whole school which means that plurilingualism may gain more influence in the coming years. The English subject curriculum seems to have a particular focus on plurilingualism.

The findings in the English subject curriculum are: *language and perspectives on the world and ourselves* (ch. 4.2.2); *speaking several languages* (ch. 4.2.3); *multilingualism* (ch. 4.2.4); *language learning and other languages* (ch. 4.2.5); *metacognition, and English and other languages* (ch. 4.2.6); and *language learning and other languages* (ch. 4.2.7), which seem to enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning in the subject of English. The English subject curriculum defines competence aims and assessment criteria. The main aim of the English subject curriculum is to develop an all-round person through learning English and other languages (e.g., see this thesis ch. 4.2.2 and ch. 4.2.3). The English subject curriculum enhances a plurilingual approach to language learning by using other languages to learn English, focusing on language learning instead of only on English, etc. The English subject curriculum contains plurilingualism.

The core curriculum and the English subject curriculum contain plurilingualism. Combined, they enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning in different ways. The core curriculum informs the values and principles of education for the subject of English, thus strengthening a plurilingual approach to language learning in the subject of English. Though there are many particular and perhaps isolated examples of partial instances of plurilingualism, it is the sum of the whole that makes a case for the presence of plurilingualism. The main finding of this thesis is the demonstration of plurilingualism in the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum. It is from this conclusion that it is possible to answer the research question: *how do the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum in LK20 enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning?*

5.2 Discussions and Practical Implications of the Main Findings

This section discusses some of the findings in the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum in light of theoretical perspective and research on plurilingualism.

- Multilingualism and plurilingualism (ch. 5.2.1)
- Plurilingualism, language, and communicative language competence (ch. 5.2.2)
- Plurilingualism and metacognition (ch. 5.2.3)
- Plurilingualism and identity development (ch. 5.2.4)

Each point of discussion ends with some of my reflections on practical implications. As a new teacher, I found it helpful to reflect on what I could do in the classroom with my students. It is in the implications where the *how* of the research question is answered for me. Based on the following discussions, a succinct answer to the research question is provided in the conclusion (ch. 5.3).

5.2.1 Multilingualism and Plurilingualism

Multilingualism and plurilingualism are two sides to the same coin. Any discussion of plurilingualism must be foregrounded in multilingualism. Multilingualism is concerned with the context in which the individual finds themselves, while plurilingualism describes the individual. There are no plurilingual subjects in a monolingual world, just as there are not genuinely monolingual subjects in a multilingual society. Naturally, the context must be laid out before any meaningful discussion of plurilingualism can be had.

While the term "multilingualism" is not used in the core curriculum, the idea as described by the Council of Europe (2021, n.d.) comes clearly to the fore. Nevertheless, the term "multilingual … context" appears in the English subject curriculum *working with texts in English* (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020i). According to the Council of Europe (2021, n.d.), "'multilingualism' refers to the presence in a geographical area of more than one 'variety of language' i.e. the mode of speaking of a social group whether it is formally recognised as a language or not …" The core curriculum and the English subject curriculum describes the presence of more the one "variety of language" in Norway (see this thesis ch. 4.1.2 and ch. 4.2.4).

The core curriculum foregrounds plurilingualism by describing Norway as a multilingual society (see this thesis ch. 4.1.6.5). This normative description agrees with several descriptions of the contemporary world (Blommaert, 2010, pp. 6–8; Krulatz et al., 2019, pp. 11–12). Describing the contemporary society as multilingual could make it seem that a multilingual society is normative as

opposed to a monolingual society being normative. Describing Norway as multilingual could be viewed as a revolution against a vision of a monolingual society as Jesner and Kramch describe plurilingualism (they use the term "multilingualism") as "part of a general revolution against monolingualism and what it stands for …" (2015, p. 7). In this view, there would be a revolutionary element within the core curriculum and English subject curriculum in LK20. If there is any revolution in LK20, it would be pretty modest. The languages mentioned are only those languages with legal status (e.g., Norwegian and Sami). There is no mention of "other languages" in the core curriculum, while there is an abundance of instances of the terms "other languages" in the English subject curriculum (see this thesis ch. 4.2.5, ch. 4.2.6, and ch. 4.2.7).

The core curriculum is perhaps not revolutionary, in Jesner's and Kramch's understanding. However, instead, it foregrounds a plurilingual approach to language learning in that the teacher and pupils need to realize that there are other languages in society at large that influence their language learning and, therefore, the teaching of English in Norway. The recognition of other languages can be seen as advancing plurilingualism. The multilingualism of the core curriculum constricts multilingualism to legally recognized languages (see this thesis ch. 4.1.2). Set in a positive light, this could set a precedence for future curricula to include other previously disadvantaged languages. Set in a negative light, the core curriculum's multilingualism is actively restricting the rights of other languages. Whatever the case may be, the plurilingualism of the core curriculum can fit nicely into the aforementioned definition of multilingualism as defined by the Council of Europe (2021, n.d.). For the core curriculum, the appearance of recognized Norwegian and Sami languages is an instance of multilingualism (see this thesis ch. 4.1.6.5).

The English subject curriculum is more overt in its claims on multilingualism: "They shall build the foundation for seeing their own identity and others' identities in a multilingual and multicultural context" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020i; see this thesis ch. 4.2.4). The term "multilingual" can be understood as something the greater context is; to place oneself in a multilingual context means to see oneself as first plurilingual. The depiction of the individual seems to fit a poststructuralist view of identity (see this thesis ch. 2.4 and ch. 5.2.4). Poststructuralism "depicts the individual (i.e., the subject) as diverse, contradictory, dynamic and changing over historical time and social space" (Norton, 2013, p. 4). There is much to be said concerning a poststructuralist view of identity, but it will suffice to point out the *continuousness* of perpetual development of identity and language for the individual. The identity of the pupil develops as long

as he or she lives. The multilingual and multicultural context in which the pupils find themselves is diverse and everchanging; so, they too must be diverse and everchanging.

The term "plurilingualism" describes the individual. Plurilingualism as suggested by the Council of Europe:

> 'plurilingualism' refers to the repertoire of 'varieties of language' which individuals use, and is, therefore, the opposite of monolingualism; it includes the language variety referred to as 'mother tongue' or 'first language' and any number of other languages or varieties. (Council of Europe, 2021, n.d.)

It should be noted that the word "plurilingualism" is not used in the core curriculum nor in the English subject curriculum. However, the idea that to which it refers is to be found there. For instance, "[a]ll pupils shall experience that being proficient in a number of languages is a resource, both in school and society at large" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l; see this thesis ch. 4.1.6.7). The concern is for the individual pupils' personal experience of language and language proficiency. The focus is plurilingual as it focuses on the individual in a multilingual context

The individual is plurilingual, while the context for the plurilingual individual is multilingual. The individual uses a single dynamic repertoire of "varieties of language", further defined as complexes of specific semiotic resources. In this sense, *language* used by an individual is inherently dynamic and diverse since a diverse and everchanging individual uses it in an everchanging context, *viz*. a multilingual context. The English subject curriculum commands that the pupils shall build the foundations for seeing their own identity and the identity of others as dynamic and diverse (see this thesis 4.2.4).

This view of identity means that plurilingual and pluricultural competence are necessary for developing one's own identity and understanding the identities of others. The CEFR states:

> Plurilingual and pluricultural competence refers to the ability to use languages for the purposes of communication and to take part in intercultural interaction, where a person, viewed as a social agent has proficiency, of varying degrees, in several languages and experience of several cultures. (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 168)

The close connection to the CEFR is not unexpected; rather, this connection is presupposed due to the increasing influence CEFR has had on Norwegian curricula makers of the subject of English since the 1990s (see this thesis ch. 1.1).

The plurilingualism of the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum in LK20 seem to align with much contemporary thinking on plurilingualism. The main difference is that the core

curriculum and English subject curriculum explicitly understand language as existing somehow outside oneself. For example, the core curriculum states: "Language gives us a sense of belonging and cultural awareness" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l; see this thesis ch. 4.1.6.4). This quote clearly states that language is a subject, and it is doing something apart from being connected to an individual or group of people. For plurilingualism, language is something used; language is itself not the subject.

Multilingualism foregrounds plurilingualism in the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum in LK20. A plurilingual approach to language learning is enhanced by describing Norway as a multilingual context. The core curriculum and English subject curriculum describe the individual as plurilingual, which justifies plurilingual approaches to language learning. In short, *the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning by foregrounding plurilingualism in multilingualism*

5.2.1.1 Practical Implications

First, a cautionary word from Moore (2006, p. 136) "Plurilingualism is not an asset *per se* when children are not encouraged in the school situation to rely on their different languages and language knowledge as positive resources." The place of the teacher is to help their pupils become aware of and reflect on their own plurilingualism and their Norwegian context as multilingual. Haukås and Speitz (2018, p. 311) suggest examples of plurilingual teaching and learning. The pupils can mediate another culture's values or behavior, evaluate a talk in English or another language, and then present it to the class (Haukås & Speitz, 2018, p. 311).

The English subject curriculum states that after year 7: "The pupil is expected to … explore and talk about some linguistic similarities between English and other languages that he or she is familiar with and use this in his or her language learning" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020g). Exploring the linguistic similarities between English and other languages is a reasonable justification for plurilingual approaches to language learning (see this thesis ch. 4.2.7).

The teachers could first give an example of finding similarities and dissimilarities between English and other languages and then have the students follow suit (Haukås & Speitz, 2018, p. 311). Any metalinguistic exercise is a meta-cultural reflection. It is essential to be culturally sensitive and remember that I have a particular cultural vantage point, just as I have a particular language as my point of departure. It is essential to be aware of one's own language and culture to understand another language and culture.

Translanguaging while teaching or mixing one's language to create a learning experience for the pupils' language learning may provide stimuli for language learning – or at least be a role model to show that it is ok to mix one's languages. It is crucial to diversify the linguistic and cultural environment for the pupil's language learning (Haukås & Speitz, 2018, p. 311). For instance, teachers could use Bonny Norton's Global Storybook Portal (2021) to access other languages and cultural artifacts. The teachers could also construct a lesson around collective projects, activities, and operations (Haukås & Speitz, 2018, p. 311). For instance, debate in English about other languages, topical issues, media projects, etc. (Haukås & Speitz, 2018, p. 311). These are positive ways that the core curriculum and English subject curriculum enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning. However, there remain pitfalls as well.

The core curriculum states: "All pupils shall experience that being proficient in a number of languages is a resource, both in school and society at large" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l). This statement could backfire and be potentially harmful to minority groups. Plurilingualism could also be used against minority languages. They may lose out on their rights as they may be seen as not a marker of identity but only resources to be uses – or discarded – according to the whims of the market and politicians. Since there are no borders, there are no permanent identities by which to classify others. The removal of all borders undercuts all identities – also the weak ones. With no borders, there is no framework for perceiving a group. Law cannot protect those who do not exist. Extreme versions of plurilingualism may jeopardize vulnerable groups by erasing all borders.

On the other hand, moderate versions of plurilingualism may aid previously disadvantaged groups, such as the Sami and others. The context of language learning is a multilingual world with its plurilingual persons. The awareness of plurilingualism may help non-recognized languages in Norway to be recognized for their potential value as potential resources society can draw on. Having a resource view of languages could help develop positive attitudes toward other languages. The plurilingualism of the core curriculum and English subject curriculum in LK20 enhances a plurilingual approach to language learning.

5.2.2 Plurilingualism, Language, Communicative Language Competence

The plurilingualism of core curriculum and the English subject curriculum does not have a clear definition of *language* but, nevertheless, lays out the aim of *communicative language competence* (see this thesis ch. 4.1.3 and ch. 4.1.6). Using language to do things is communicative language

competence, and does seem to presuppose a view of language as a resource to communicate with. This may be an instance of plurilingualism in the core curriculum.

Plurilingualism "… should not be seen as a collection of 'language' that a speaker controls, but rather as a complex of specific semiotic resources, some of which belong to a conventionally defined 'language', while others belong to another 'language' …" (Blommaert, 2010, p. 102). This view of language decentralizes by putting the center of language the individual. Consequently, there is not category such as English nor Norwegian but only an individual's "complex of specific semiotic resources", which is dynamic since it is changed to fit the communicative needs of the individual's context. There are no borders between languages because there are no *languages,* only repertoires of complexes of specific semiotic resources used by individuals. To speak of *a language* would be to speak from an ideological perspective that presupposes different languages. While others find obliterating boundaries between borders unhelpful many still advocate for a "softening of borders" between languages (e.g., Cenzo & Gorter, 2013; Haukås & Speitz, 2018, pp. 308–309).

The core curriculum states: "All pupils shall experience that being proficient in a number of languages is a resource, both in school and society at large" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l). The phrase "a number of languages" presupposes that there are other languages; otherwise, there would be no mention of more languages. However, the boundaries between the language could be seen to be softening in that it should be experienced that being proficient in a number of languages is a resource. A similar statement is found in the English subject curriculum.

The English subject curriculum states: "The pupils shall experience that the ability to speak several languages is an asset at school and in society in general" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020n). The phrase "several languages" also presupposes boundaries between languages to distinguish one from another. The boundaries between English and other languages are softened by requiring pupils in the subject of English to experience several languages being spoken, not just English, as an asset. Using the experience of other languages as an asset promotes plurilingualism as it may challenge previously held beliefs about speaking serval languages as unfavorable.

Both the core curriculum and English subject curriculum soften the borders between languages. Although a moderate application of plurilingualism, it is still an application of plurilingualism. However, it is unclear whether the core curriculum or the English subject curriculum views language as a repertoire of complexes of specific semiotic resources used by an individual. These resources can be defined as "… concrete accents, language varieties, registers, genres, modalities such as writing – ways of using language in particular communicative setting and

spheres of life, including the ideas people have about such ways of using their language ideologies" (Blommaert, 2010, p. 102).

The core curriculum uses the phrase "is a resource" to refer to being proficient in a number of languages (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l; see this thesis ch. 4.1.6.7). The core curriculum does not define *language* but seems to use the term *language* in a more conventional sense. For instance, being proficient in language (whatever that means?) is a resource. The English subject curriculum uses the phrase "asset" to refer to the ability to speak several languages (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020n; see this thesis ch. 4.2.3). The English subject curriculum also does not define *language* but asserts that it is an asset to speak several languages. It could be possible to use Blommaert's definition of linguistic resources to add to what is meant, but only just as far as communication goes. Both the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum do not give a coherent definition of language.

However, the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum seem to view language in terms of *the ability to communicate*. The section on *language learning* comes the closest to a definition: "Learning the pronunciation of phonemes, and learning vocabulary, word structure, syntax and text composition gives the pupils choices and possibilities in their communication and interaction" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020i; see this thesis ch. 4.2.5). Although not defining language *per se,* it does delineate language as something an individual uses to communicate. In this sense, language and communicative competence come together. "Communicative language competences are those which empower a person to act using specifically linguistic means" (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 9). The plurilingualism of the core curriculum and English subject promote communicative language competence – although a coherent definition of language is lacking.

For instance, the core curriculum states: "The teaching and training shall ensure that the pupils are confident in their language proficiency…" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l; see this thesis ch. 4.1.6.1). Each language subject, e.g., English, must ensure pupils are confident in their *language* proficiency, not a specific language. However, the core curriculum does not define language, which makes the term language defined by the reader's prior beliefs (Haukås, 2018b, pp. 344–345). It is the responsibility of the teaching and training that the pupils are confident in their language proficiency. In other words, the pupils should *feel* confident in all the proficiency in the languages they use. The emphasis on the *confidence* of one's language proficiency fits well with what the CEFR calls plurilingual and pluricultural competence:

Plurilingual and pluricultural competence refers to the ability to use languages for the purposes of communication and to take part in intercultural interaction, where a person, viewed as a social agent has proficiency, of varying degrees, in several languages and experience of several cultures. (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 168)

The core curriculum enhances a plurilingual approach to language learning by imploring teachers to ensure their pupils are confident in their language proficiency. In essence, *the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning by softening the borders between languages.*

5.2.2.1 Practical Implications

The plurilingualism of the core curriculum and English subject curriculum allow for and enhance the use of other languages in the classroom in general and in the subject of English particularly. The use of other languages in the subject of English is not only encouraged but also is a competency aim in itself. Plurilingualism "opens possibilities to learn languages in a more efficient way because some language competences are general and can be taught in one languages while being reinforced and transferred to other languages" (Cenzo & Gorter, 2013, p. 596). Communicative language competence is to be perused.

For example, texts containing specific cultural references could be employed to stimulate communicative language competency. Plurilingual and pluricultural activities (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 168) could be used to advance language competency. For example, have the learners discuss and translate "They would go to the park on the 4th of July", paying specific attention to the word "would" into Norwegian, home language, or another language they are learning at school. Since the sentence does not have a specific context, it is probable that the learners would provide a context to validate their translation. A discussion about how words find their meaning in their context could raise awareness of the importance of context when evaluating the meaning of words. The teacher then provides the Norwegian translation "De pleide å dra til parken på 4. juli"; and asks, for example, about the tense of the verb "pleide". Compare this translation with Google Translate's translation "De skulle reise til parken 4. juli" (Google, 2021b) and discuss the differences between "skulle reise" and "pleide" in relation to "would". More advanced learners could write an assignment describing the differences using grammatical terminology. Raising awareness of one's own language and culture through engaging in other languages and cultures may provide the opportunity to develop communicative language competence.

Comparing alphabets could also be of use in developing communicative language competence. One could also make use of charts comparing the proto-Canaanite alphabet, Phoenician alphabet, Hebrew alphabets, Greek alphabets, Latin alphabets, and contemporary English alphabet (e.g. UsefulCharts, 2021). Comparing similarities and dissimilarities in a historical perspective allows the teacher and pupils to observe the interconnectedness of the different scripts that have evolved to become the script this thesis is written in. The alphabet is a place where cultures and language intersect. Orthography before the invention of the printing press (A.D. 1440) was not standardized. For example, there were a diversity of Latin scripts throughout the centuries (e.g., Knight, 1996, pp. 312–313). Personally, this raises questions concerning how communicative language competence was understood before standardization of orthography and grammatology could be enforced through the printing press. Plurilingualism challenges "the academic gate-keeping based on writing and print literacy (themselves policed by schools and educational institutions)" (Jessner & Kramsch, 2015, p. 7).

5.2.3 Plurilingualism and Metacognition

The English subject curriculum's plurilingualism raises awareness of prior language knowledge by providing an opportunity for the pupils to reflect on their prior language knowledge (see this thesis ch. 4.2.6). This awareness of prior language knowledge is used for language learning (this thesis ch. 4.2.5, ch. 4.2.6, and ch. 4.2.7). Hence the use of other languages to develop language learning. However, this presupposes that using other languages *can* facilitate language learning. There is mounting evidence for this claim (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 32; Haukås & Speitz, 2018, p. 309). The significance of plurilingualism is that it provides the rationale to use metacognition in language learning. Haukås' defines metacognition in language learning as "an awareness of and reflection about one's knowledge, experience, emotions and learning in the context of language learning and teaching" (2018, p. 13, emphasis original). Being aware of one's own repertoire of dynamic complexes of specific semiotic resources means that one can reflect on them to learn other complexes of specific semiotic resources. In other words, being aware of one's own language makes it possible to reflect on that language in order to learn other languages.

The English subject curriculum seems to imbibe this when it states that after year 2: "The pupil is expected to … find words that are common to English and other languages with which the pupil is familiar" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020e; see this thesis ch. 4.2.6). Its focus is plurilingual in that it is concerned with the pupil's prior knowledge of familiar languages and metacognitive in that

it is concerned with making the pupil aware of their prior knowledge of familiar languages for their language learning. It is my view that plurilingualism provides the theoretical rationale for using metacognition for language learning. Plurilingualism holds that there are no boundaries between language in the individual since language resides in the brain and that there are no separates in the brain for the different languages (Haukås & Speitz, 2018, p. 309). Language residing in the brain may influence each other as long as the individual is aware of this prior knowledge – especially if this prior knowledge is reflected on for language learning. Jessner and Kramsch (2015, p. 4) state concerning plurilingualism: "… crosslinguistic awareness is considered a desirable and trainable trait". Plurilingualism is solid ground to use metacognition for language learning. Both plurilingualism and metacognition seem to be espoused by the English subject curriculum.

The English subject curriculum intentionally develops the pupil's awareness of other languages (see this thesis ch. 4.2.6) to use English and other languages for future language learning (see this thesis ch. 4.2.7). In these contexts, plurilingualism is not limited to legally recognized languages only, as it is in the core curriculum (see this thesis ch. 4.1.2). It could be argued that this is a "purer" form of plurilingualism, as it is not limited by laws but expanded by the English subject curriculum. It is this form of plurilingualism that provides the use of metacognition in language learning. It seems that LK20 is in line with thinking on plurilingualism and metacognition. In summary, *the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning by using metacognition in language learning framed by plurilingualism*.

5.2.3.1 Practical Implications

The English subject curriculum states: "The pupil is expected to … explore and talk about some linguistic similarities between English and other languages that he or she is familiar with and use this in his or her language learning" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020g). LK20 can enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning by using metacognition, such as espoused by Haukås (2018a). The teacher is responsible for being an example of metacognition in language learning, i.e., to model, explain, and create an environment for reflective discussions on language and culture (Haukås, 2018a, p. 18).

The English subject curriculum opens up for metacognitive strategies that can be applied to language learning. For example, Anderson's (2002) metacognitive strategy for language learning suggests five elements: 1. preparing and planning for learning, 2. selecting and using learning strategies, 3. monitoring strategy use, 4. Orchestrating various strategies, and 5. evaluating strategy

use and learning (Haukås, 2018a, pp. 18–19). These strategies could be used to serve the ends of the English subject curriculum.

Parallel texts and translation could be used to develop metacognitive abilities for language learning. A parallel text is a text with translations of that text next to it. Parallel texts can be anything from retail items to novels. For example, the teacher has the learners compare stories from Global Storybooks Portal (2021). These are short stories with varying degrees of difficulty. The learner could compare the stories between Norwegian with English and other languages.

Language teachers need to know their subject and how to be "language models" for their pupils (Haukås, 2018a, p. 21). For example, a teacher could use parallel texts and translations to compare and contrast similarities and dissimilarities between languages. For instance, the teachers could present these short level 1 sentences from the Global Storybook Portal (2021) "Jeg liker å lese." vs. "Jag gillar att läsa." vs. "I like to read." vs. "Ich lese gerne." asking the learners to point out the similarities and dissimilarities. Discussing the examples could be a way of stimulating learner's awareness of language structures. The learner can reflect on the experience of the discussion and reflect on possible strategies for further language learning. It is also possible to peruse the Global Storybooks Portal for languages yet unknown to the learner or teacher to explore possible connections with prior knowledge of language.

5.2.4 Plurilingualism and Identity Development

The core curriculum and the English subject curriculum use language to develop the identity of the pupils in the Norwegian school (see this thesis ch. 4.1.5 and ch. 4.2.2). This section discusses plurilingualism and identity development and core curriculum and the English subject curriculum.

The core curriculum states: "The school's mission is the education and all-round development (*Bildung*) of all pupils" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020m). This development is concerned with linguistic and cultural knowledge of other languages and cultures to get along with other people with other languages and cultures. There seem to be a mention of this in the English subject curriculum in the section on *working with texts in English*: "They shall build the foundation for seeing their own identity and others' identities in a multilingual and multicultural context" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020i). The "all-round development of all pupils" includes the development of their own and other's identity. The Norwegian school is concerned with the development of their pupils called "all-round development" or "*Bildung*". Identity development is a part of the Norwegian school's mission.

A plurilingual approach to language learning in the subject of English intersects with *Bildung*, didactics, and linguistic competence aims through developing the pupils' identity as a plurilingual subject. "The more languages one knows, the more one can see the world from different perspectives, communicate with a diversity of people, and expand one's understanding of oneself and others" (Jessner & Kramsch, 2015, p. 5). The English subject curriculum promotes language learning through the use of other languages (see this thesis ch. 4.2.7), which develops the pupils' identity through language learning. It should be noted that the CEFR and LK20 seem to exhibit similar goals of unity through know other languages and cultures (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 2; Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l; see this thesis ch. 4.1.6). At any rate, language learning has the potential to develop the individual's identity. For example, in Norway, a plurilingual individual would be able to see themselves as European and Norwegian or Nordic.

The English subject curriculum states: "The pupils shall experience that the ability to speak several languages is an asset at school and in society in general" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020n). For some pupils, these experiences could be new.

> New experiences, for instance those associated with moving to a new country and learning a new language, can cause shifts and changes in identity – that is, in the self-image we create as a result of the interaction of our inner self and the world around us. (Krulatz et al., 2019, p. 102)

Although not as dramatic as moving from one country to another, meeting new languages or re-experiencing old ones can result in a shift in identity. The English subject curriculum seems to opt for giving the pupils new experiences to develop their language and identity. A change of attitude toward a language is a change in identity since it is a change of behavior. I take it that identity and behavior can be understood as being the same or, perhaps, behavior can be understood as manifesting an identity.

However, not all experiences of language are necessarily positive, nor is every development of one's identity healthy. Both plurilingualism and the core curriculum seem to suppose that all experiences of language are necessarily good. There may be instances where the individual does not want to identify with their home language for various reasons or be shown to know that language since it signals something negative or could incur negative responses from others. As this may be the case for some, it does not discredit plurilingualism but rather a call to temper the revolutionary rhetoric of some proponents.

In the core curriculum, there are odd uses of the term "language". For example, the core curriculum states: "Language gives us a sense of belonging and cultural awareness" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020l). "Language" in this quote is a disembodied language, which is antithetical to plurilingualism's understanding of language as being used to communicate – not something that is abstract and has the ability to act in and of itself. Kramsch (2009) argues that the symbolic self is the real self. "Both historical and the imagined are real, as they get inscribed in the flesh-and-blood reality of the language users' embodied minds" (Kramsch, 2009, p. 44). For Kramsch (2009), language cannot be but embodied as it is the symbolic system used to express oneself.

The English subject curriculum connects language and identity by stating: "Knowledge of and an exploratory approach to language, communication patterns, lifestyles, ways of thinking and social conditions open for new perspectives on the world and ourselves" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020n). The phrases "knowledge of … language" and "an exploratory approach to language" serve to open new perspectives on the world and ourselves, albeit in different ways. The "knowledge of … language" emphasizes the value of knowledge, while "an exploratory approach to … language" emphasizes acting on that knowledge. Together they "open for new perspectives on the world and ourselves." Identity development of the pupils is in view. Knowledge of language opens the world for us and us to the world. In some sense, this could be seen as developing one's identity through language in the world.

Weedon (1997, p. 21) argues that "[l]anguage is the place where actual and possible forms of social organization and their likely social and political consequences are defined and contested. Yet it is also the place where our sense of ourselves, our subjectivity, is *constructed*." The core curriculum and English subject curriculum use the term "construct" when developing an identity. However, language learning is seen as something that develops an identity in the language learner (see this thesis ch. 4.1.6.7).

It is difficult to know what is meant by languages in a post-structuralist sense: diversity, contradiction, etc. The term "plurilingualism" in itself becomes problematic since it emphasizes a plurality of language, which presupposes boundaries between languages. Poststructuralism holds to diversity and contradictions in identity. In this sense, my definition of plurilingualism as *a repertoire of complexes of specific semiotic resources used by the individual*, is diverse and contradictory in that it erects a system for that which resists boundaries. My definition risks breaking down language *reductio ad absurdum*. The core curriculum and English subject curriculum do not have a

radical view of language but a more traditional one. Norwegian is a language with a hard border, as does English and other languages.

The core curriculums and English subject curriculum in LK20 enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning by providing pupils and teachers with an opportunity to develop their identities through language learning. Although the core curriculum and English subject curriculum view identity more traditionally, there seem to be elements of the English subject curriculum that tend toward a more plurilingual poststructuralist view of identity. In effect, *the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum enhances a plurilingual approach to language learning by providing the opportunity to develop the identity of pupils through language learning.*

5.2.4.1 Practical Implications

The CEFR suggests that plurilingualism could be used "to achieve greater unity among its members and to pursue this aim by the adoption of common action in the cultural field" (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 2). The LK20 seems to draw on the CEFR's suggestion. The core curriculum and the English subject curriculum in LK20 provide the school with the opportunity to teach language and culture in a way that allows for greater unity between other languages and cultures.

The English subject curriculum (see this thesis ch. 4.2.5, ch. 4.2.6, and ch. 4.2.7) uses the phrase "English and other languages" to prepare the way to go beyond *English didactics* into something that could only be called *language didactics*. The subject of English is *language* and not specifically English. Aase defines subject-specific didactics as:

> … all the reflections which can be related to a subject and the teaching of this subject, and which can enhance the knowledge of the nature and the rationale of the subject, and lead to increased knowledge of how the subject can be learned, taught and developed. (Aase et al., 1998, p. 7; Fenner & Skulstad, 2020, p. 9)

The subject of English would serve as the point of departure for a reflection on language, enhance the knowledge of the nature and rationale of language as a subject, and lead to increased knowledge of how language can be learned, taught, and developed.

Plurilingualism resists boundaries between languages. In its most extreme form, plurilingualism is antithetical to boundaries between languages. The softening or obliteration of borders between languages threatens (or liberates, depending on your perspective) specific language didactics, such as English didactics, German didactics, French didactics, etc., in favor of *language* didactics. The teachers of English, German, French, etc., become *language* teachers

rather than teachers of their respective languages. What one can gain from this is greater skill in learning future languages, viewing other languages as resources, and developing one's own identity.

The European Language Portfolio can be used to make the pupils aware of their plurilingual status. The Norwegian ELPs online at The Norwegian National Centre for Foreign Languages in Education ([Høgskole i Østfold, 2021](#)). Haukås and Speitz (2018, pp. 312–313) notes: "I can descriptors are language specific, whereas strategy pages include several languages and thus enhance transfer between languages and plurilingual reflection." Reflecting on one's plurilingual status can also help develop one's identity as a plurilingual subject in a multilingual context.

Now a brief practical reflection on Klafki's categorical *Bildung* in the subject of English. It is through learning English that the pupil develops their language skill. The choice of language is important, since it leaves traces of itself in the user (Kramsch, 2009, pp. 27, 41) and is used to expand their horizon of understanding reinterpret the world (Klafki, 1996, pp. 185-195; Fenner, 2020, p. 19). Learning new languages will be learned through previously known languages. What languages we learn color how we see the world and ourselves. A word of caution, too much of one language may result in the loss of other linguistic resources. A plurality of languages ought to be present in each school and an emphasis could be placed on using other languages in the subject of English. The texts the pupils engage with and create and the language they communicate with will development their identity. Therefore, using plurilingual texts and using other languages in communication may help develop the pupils into plurilingual subjects, if they are not one already.

5.3 Conclusion

The intention of this thesis was to answer the research question: *How do the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum in LK20 enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning?* The analysis [(see this thesis ch. 4)](#) and discussion of findings [(see this thesis ch. 5.1](#) [and ch. 5.2)](#) have shown that the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum in LK20 enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning in four main ways:

1. *by foregrounding plurilingualism in multilingualism* [(see this thesis ch. 5.2.1)](#)*,*

2. *by softening the borders between languages* [(see this thesis ch. 5.2.2)](#)*,*

3. *by using metacognition in language learning framed by plurilingualism* [(see this thesis ch. 5.2.3)](#)*, and*

4. *by providing the opportunity to develop the identity of pupils through language learning* (see this thesis ch. 5.2.4).

This thesis is a document analysis. Teachers of English (or *language?*) will interpret the core curriculum and English subject curriculum differently. How will teachers of English interpret the core curriculum and English subject curriculum? What kind of ideologies are consciously or unconsciously at play in their interpretation? Or what historical or cultural forces are at work in their interpretation? It is my hope to see future research into teacher's beliefs about language learning. It will also be exciting to see, in the coming years, how plurilingual approaches to language learning manifest themselves in and outside of the classroom.

5.4 Methodological Limitations

There are several limitations of the methods used in this thesis, many of which are noted in chapter 3. One of the limitations is that the analysis is that the documents analyzed are translations of the Norwegian text. The Norwegian text is authoritative when there is a conflict between the English and Norwegian texts. However, the reality is that most teachers and administrators will just look at the English because they need to make a lesson quickly. How the text is used is up to each individual.

The research question "*how do the core curriculum and the English subject curriculum in LK20 enhance a plurilingual approach to language learning*" already presupposes there being plurilingualism in LK20. The question runs the risk of imposing plurilingualism into the text to find what it is looking for. However, all interpretation has an *a priori* point of departure.

"Selective bias" is also an issue when doing a document analysis (Yin, 1994, p. 80). The texts selected could be based on a conscious or unconscious bias for plurilingualism while avoiding those texts that would subvert my thesis. At any rate, decisions have to be made, and time limits any exhaustive analysis.

Document analysis is usually accompanied by other qualitative research methods (Bowen, 2009, p. 28). A document analysis alone tends to be weak evidence since texts can be interpreted in many ways – although not all interpretations are possible. Any conclusion reached needs to be taken with a grain of salt.

As the design of this thesis is based on grounded theory, a hermeneutical challenge arises. Grounded theory supposes that the data emerges as empirical data, or is the emergence of the empirical data set a projection of our interpretive framework? The form the data take for me is my

interpretation of the data. There is no emergence of empirical data but only the action of the interpreter to assemble the data into a meaningful pattern for him or herself. In interpreting texts, there is no final say, only contributing to a discussion. I hope that I have been able to contribute in some small way to the coming discussion on plurilingualism and LK20 and its subsequent implications.

6 Personal Reflections

First, a word of caution from Haukås (2018, p. 347): "… it cannot be denied that there is often a gap between what [teachers] believe they should be doing and what they actually do." For all my reading, writing, and discussing for this thesis, it does not mean it will result in action. I have the words "Be doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving yourselves" (James 1:22) ringing in my ears. I cannot help but stop and think how I will actually implement all that I have learned about language learning. Without practicing a plurilingual approach to language learning, I will have deceived myself into thinking that taking all this education was actually worth it. Now, my learning has everything to do with what I do with the words I have studied and nothing (or very little) to do with my instructors – who have all been of superior quality. Again, this is a reminder to myself: practice what you have learned.

Kramsch (2009) has made the biggest impression on me. Perceiving the self as a signifying-self that is embodied has made me reflect on the nature of language, identity development, my own identity as a plurilingual subject in action, and more. Reflection on her work has led me to ponder language as embodied – and even as the Self. Admittedly, I am not clear in my own thinking about how language is to be defined or how to understand language as symbolic form, which is the manifestation of the self. However, what these reflections have done is unearthed my beliefs about language learning.

I supposed that there were hard borders between languages, although I am very much aware of the phenomena of dialects. Even here in Notodden, Norway (where I live) people have a distinct Notodden way of speaking, and 10 minutes down the road, there is a distinctive Heddal way of speaking. The dialectical variation between Notodden and Heddal could easily be called two separate languages. The only reason to call both varieties Norwegian is because of the political power that defines the varieties as such. However, this is an ideological imposition only possible by the application of power. Political power, not linguistics, defines the boundaries of languages. Linguistically speaking, there are soft boundaries between languages – some say none – which open for using other languages in my English class.

In the same vein, I view myself as a language teacher first and secondarily as an English teacher. I am not primarily teaching them English but modeling language learning and metacognition in language learning. The significance of this is that it liberates language learning from specific language subjects. As a teacher of religion and KRLE, using English and other languages serves to deepen learning in those fields too.

As language and culture are inextricably linked, any teacher of language is also a teacher of culture. Religion and language as school subjects intersect in culture. For me, this is an excellent opportunity to teach both culture and language. I frequently mix English, Norwegian, and other languages with which I am familiar in my teachers, everyday communication, in my journaling, and more. It comes naturally to me to use my whole repertoire of complexes of specific semiotic resources. I have learned to embrace myself as a plurilingual subject.

References

Aase, L., Lorentzen, S., Streitlien, Å., & Tarrou, A.-L. H. (1998). Fagdidaktikk. Universitetsforlaget.

Anderson, N. J. (2002). The Role of Metacognition in Second Language Teaching and Learning. ERIC Digest. ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, 4646 40th Street N. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED463659

Bialystok, E. (2001). Bilingualism in Development: Language, Literacy, and Cognition. Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, J. (2010). The sociolinguistics of globalization. Cambridge University Press.

Bøhn, H., & Hansen, T. (2018). Norms and Variation in English Language Teaching: Classroom Implications. In H. Bøhn, M. Dypedahl, & G.-A. Myklevold (Eds.), Teaching and Learning English (1st ed., pp. 286–302). Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Bowen, G. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. Qualitative Research Journal, 9, 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Bruthiaux, P. (2009). Language rights in historical and contemporary perspective. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 30(1), 73–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630802510139

Cambridge Dictionary. (2021). All-round. Cambridge Dictionary. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/all-round

Cambridge Dictionary. (2021). Asset. Cambridge Dictionary. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/asset.

Candelier, M. (2017). "Awakening to Languages" and Educational Language Policy. In J. Cenzo, D. Gorter, & S. May (Eds.), Language Awareness and Multilingualism (pp. 161–172). Springer International Publishing.

Cenzo, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). Focus on Multilingualism: A Study of Trilingual Writing. The Modern Language Journal, 95(3), 356–369.

Cenzo, J., & Gorter, D. (2013). Towards a Plurilingual Approach in English Language Teaching: Softening the Boundaries between Languages. TESOL Quarterly, 47(3), 591–599.

Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Council of Europe. https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages

Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Teaching, Learning, Assessment (Companion Volume). Council of Europe.

Council of Europe. (2021). Council of Europe Language Policy Portal. Language Policy.

    https://www.coe.int/en/web/language-policy/home

Damasio, A. (1994). Descartes' Error: Emotion, Reason, and the Human Brain. Putnam Books.

Deacon, T. (1997). The Symbolic Species. W. W. Norton.

Ek, J. A. van & Council of Europe (Eds.). (1986). Objectives for foreign language learning. Manhattan

    Pub. Co.

Fenner, A.-B. (2020). The historical development of English as a school subject. In A.-B. Fenner &

    Skulstad, Aud Solbjørg (Eds.), Teaching Englihs in the 21st Century (2nd ed., pp. 17–42).

    Fagbokforlaget.

Fenner, A.-B., & Skulstad, A. S. (2020). Introduction. In Teaching English in the 21st Century (2nd

    ed., pp. 7–13). Fagbokforlaget.

Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive–

    developmental inquiry. American Psychologist, 34(10), 906–911.

    https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906

Gombert, J.-É. (1992). Metalinguistic Development. Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Google. (2021a). Google Oversetter. Google Oversetter.

    https://translate.google.no/?hl=no&sl=no&tl=en&text=l%C3%A6replan%20i%20Engelsk&op
    =translate

Google. (2021b). Google Oversetter. Google Oversetter.

    https://translate.google.no/?hl=no&sl=en&tl=no&text=They%20would%20go%20to%20the
    %20park%20on%20the%204th%20of%20July&op=translate

Gundem, B. B. (2018). Perspektiv på læreplanen. Fagbokforlaget.

Hammarberg, B. (2010). The Language of the Multilingual: Some Conceptual and Terminological

    Issues. IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 48(2–3), 91–

    104.

Haukås, Å. (2018a). Metacognition in Language Learning: An Overview. In Å. Haukås, C. Bjørk, & M.

    Dypedahl (Eds.), Metacognition in Language Learning and Teaching (pp. 11–30). Routledge.

Haukås, Å. (2018b). Teachers' Beliefs about Language Instruction. In Teaching and Learning English

    (1st ed.). Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Haukås, Å., & Speitz, H. (2018). Plurilingual Learning and Teaching. In H. Bøhn, M. Dypedahl, & G.-A.

    Myklevold (Eds.), Teaching and Learning English (1st ed., pp. 303–321). Cappelen Damm

    Akademisk.

Herdina, P., & Jessner, U. (2002). A Dynamic Model of Multilingualism: Perspectives of change in psycholinguistics. Multilingual Matter.

Høgskole i Østfold. (2021). Forsiden—Fremmedspråksenteret. Fremmedspråksentret. https://www.hiof.no/fss/index.html

Horner, K., & Weber, J.-J. (2018). Introducing Multilingualism (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Hufeisen, B., & Marx, N. (2007). How can DaFnE and EuroComGerm contribute to the concept of receptive multilingualism. Receptive Multilingualism, 307–321.

Jessner, U., & Kramsch, C. J. (2015). The multilingual challenge: Cross-disciplinary perspectives (Vol. 16). Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

Jessner-Schmid, U. (2018). Metacognition in Multilingual Learning: A DMM Perspective. In Å. Haukås, C. Bjørk, & M. Dypedahl (Eds.), Metacognition in Language Learning and Teaching (pp. 31–47). Routledge.

Kemp, C. (2009). Defining Multilingualism. In L. Aronin & B. Hufeisen (Eds.), The Exploration of Multilingualism (pp. 11–26). John Benjamins.

Kjelaas, I., & Ommeren, R. van. (2019). Legitimering av flerspråklighet—En kritisk diskursanalyse av fire læreplaner i språk. 5-31. https://ntnuopen.ntnu.no/ntnu-xmlui/handle/11250/2618384

Knight, S. (1996). The Roman Alphabet. In P. Daniel T. & W. Bright (Eds.), The world's writing systems (1st ed., pp. 312–332). Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C. (2009). The Multilingual Subject. Oxford University Press.

Kristeva, J. (1986). Revolution in Poetic Language. In T. Moi (Ed.), The Kristeva Reader (pp. 89–136). Columbia University Press.

Krulatz, A., Dahl, A., & Flognfeldt, M. E. (2019). Enacting Multilingualism (2nd ed.). Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Lovdata. (2021). Oversatte lover—Lovdata. https://lovdata.no/register/loverEngelsk

Moore, D. (2006). Plurilingualism and Strategic Competence in Context. International Journal of Multilingualism, 3(2), 125–138.

Norton, B. (2013). Identity and Language Learning: Extending the Conversation (2nd ed.). Multilingual Matter.

Otheguy, R., Ofelia, G., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. Applied Linguistics Review, 6, 281–307.

Pavlenko, A. (2005). Emotions and Multilingualism. Cambridge University Press.

Pennycook, A., & Otsuji, E. (2014). Metrolingual multitasking and spatial repertoires: "pizza mo two minutes coming." Journal of Sociolinguistic, 18, 161–184.

Rugesæter, K. (2018). Phonological competence in English among Norwegian pupils and implications for the teaching of pronunciation in the English classroom. In A. Hasselgreen, I. Drew, & B. Sørheim (Eds.), The Young Language Learner: Research-based Insights into Teaching and Learning (2nd ed., pp. 119–130). Fagbokforlaget.

Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge University Press.

Sickinghe, A.-V. (2016). Discourses of Multilingualism in Norwegian Upper Secondary Schools. University of Oslo.

Speitz, H. (2018). National Currucula and International Perspectives. In H. Bøhn, M. Dypedahl, & G.-A. Myklevold (Eds.), Teaching and Learning English (1st ed., pp. 38–49). Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. Sage.

Svendsen, B. A. (2009). Flerspråklighet i teori og praksis. In R. Hvistendahl (Ed.), Flerspråklighet i skolen (pp. 31–60). Universitetsforlaget.

Thomas, J. (1988). The role played by metalinguistic awareness in second and third language learning. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 9(3), 235–246. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.1988.9994334

Tjora, A. (2018). Kvalitative Forskingsmetoder (3rd ed.). Gyldendal Akademisk.

University of British Colombia. (2021). Global Storybooks Portal: Literacy for all. Global Storybooks Portal. https://globalstorybooks.net/

UsefulCharts. (2021). Evolution of the Alphabet. UsefulCharts. https://usefulcharts.com/blogs/charts/evolution-of-the-english-alphabet

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2011). Det felles europeiske rammeverket for språk: Læring, undervisning, vurdering. https://spraksenteret.osloskolen.no/siteassets/vgs/det-felles-europeiske-rammeverket-for-sprak.pdf

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2020a). About the core curriculum (Core curriculum). https://www.udir.no/lk20/overordnet-del/om-overordnet-del/?lang=eng

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2020b). Aktuelle nettsteder – engelsk (ENG01-04).

> https://www.udir.no/laring-og-trivsel/lareplanverket/fagspesifikk-stotte/aktuelle-
> nettsteder/aktuelle-nettsteder-engelsk/

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2020c). Competence aims after Vg1 programme for general studies

> (ENG01-04). https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04/kompetansemaal-og-
> vurdering/kv6?lang=eng

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2020d). Competence aims after Vg1 vocational education programmes

> (ENG01-04). https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04/kompetansemaal-og-
> vurdering/kv5?lang=eng

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2020e). Competence aims after Year 2 (ENG01-04).

> https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04/kompetansemaal-og-vurdering/kv1?lang=eng

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2020f). Competence aims after Year 4 (ENG01-04).

> https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04/kompetansemaal-og-vurdering/kv2?lang=eng

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2020g). Competence aims after Year 7 (ENG01-04).

> https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04/kompetansemaal-og-vurdering/kv3?lang=eng

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2020h). Competence aims after Year 10 (ENG01-04).

> https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04/kompetansemaal-og-vurdering/kv4?lang=eng

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2020i). Core elements (ENG01-04). https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-

> 04/om-faget/kjerneelementer?lang=eng

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2020j). Core values of the education and training (Core curriculum).

> https://www.udir.no/lk20/overordnet-del/opplaringens-verdigrunnlag/?lang=eng

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2020k). Human dignity (Core curriculum).

> https://www.udir.no/lk20/overordnet-del/opplaringens-verdigrunnlag/1.1-
> menneskeverdet/?lang=eng

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2020l). Identity and cultural diversity (Core curriculum).

> https://www.udir.no/lk20/overordnet-del/opplaringens-verdigrunnlag/1.2-identitet-og-
> kulturelt-mangfold/?lang=eng

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2020m). Principles for education and all-round development (Core

> curriculum). https://www.udir.no/lk20/overordnet-del/prinsipper-for-laring-utvikling-og-
> danning/?lang=eng

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2020n). Relevance and central values (ENG01-04).

> https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04/om-faget/fagets-relevans-og-verdier?lang=eng

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2020o). The basic skills (Core curriculum).

   https://www.udir.no/lk20/overordnet-del/prinsipper-for-laring-utvikling-og-

   danning/grunnleggende-ferdigheter/?lang=eng

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2020p). The purpose of the education (Core curriculum).

   https://www.udir.no/lk20/overordnet-del/formalet-med-opplaringen/?lang=eng

Weedon, C. (1997). Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory (2nd ed.). Blackwell.

Yin, R. K. (1994). Case study research: Design and methods (2nd ed.). Sage.