UiT The Arctic University of Norway

Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education

English as an additional language (EAL) for newly arrived students in Norway

A systematic review

Darartu Abdallah Badry

Mastergradsoppgave i engelsk språk ved lektorutdanningen trinn 8-13, ENG-3982, mai 2024

i

Abstract

This thesis aims to map out current research trends on teaching English as an additional language to newly arrived students, and investigate how this research can shed light on English teaching practices in mainstream and sheltered classrooms in Norway. This is seen in light of the linguistically enriched classrooms in Norway where other languages besides Norwegian can be of use to learn English. These aims will be answered through a systematic review adapted from Rose et al. (2021). The twelve selected studies have been compartmentalized into six categories: (i) multilingual practices, (ii) perception, (iii) teacher qualification, (iv) preparedness, (v) educational language policy, (vi) inclusion and exclusion. Some studies can be placed in more than one category as they aim to investigate several things. Majority of studies report on multilingual practices, but only three of these studies investigate concrete pedagogical practices, namely translation, translanguaging and trilingual writing practices. Overall, many studies indicate that mastery of English is a prerequisite for participation in Norway. However, with existing educational policies and pedagogical practices, changes are required to afford newly arrived students equal opportunities of participation in education and societal life. Given the limited research available on English for newly arrived students, more research needs to be conducted within this field in order to gain insight into how better practices can be developed.

Acknowledgments

At last, five elevating years at UiT has passed. It has been a privilege to dive into several topics and meaningful conversations. Firstly, to my supervisor, Christopher Loe Olsen, whom I would like to express my deepest gratitude to. I am forever grateful for your guidance and challenges.

To my partner, friends, and colleagues, thank you for your encouragement and for holding me accountable. This thesis would not have been possible without your continuous support.

Acronyms

EAL – English as an additional language

LK20 – Kunnskapsløftet (Knowledge Promotion)

SF – studieforberedende utdanningsprogram (general studies)

VGS – videregående opplæring (upper secondary education)

YF - yrkesfaglige utdanningsprogram (vocational education programmes)

MER - Ministry of Education and Research

NDET - Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training

SSB - Statistics Norway

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

1 Introduction

There has been a seminal shift in how additional languages are perceived in the context of teaching English as an additional language (EAL) as languages beyond Norwegian are present in Norwegian classrooms. In the wake of this shift, this thesis aims to investigate current research on English as an additional language (EAL) for newly arrived students and how current research highlight teaching practices in mainstream and sheltered classrooms. The pre-existing knowledge of the English language or formal education as a whole may distinctively vary for newly arrived students. With growing immigration to Norway, and immigrant students making up 15% of the student population in upper secondary education (Statistics Norway, 2024), it is imperative to investigate the relationship between existing educational practices and policies and the needs of newly arrived students.

> Speakers lacking the legitimate competence are *de facto* excluded from the social domains in which this competence is required, or are condemned to silence. What is rare, then, is not the capacity to speak, which, being part of our biological heritage, is universal and therefore essentially non-distinctive, but rather the competence necessary in order to speak the legitimate language which, depending on social inheritance, re-translates social distinctions into specifically symbolic logic of differential deviations, or, in short, distinction. (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 55)

The core curriculum (Ministry of Education and Research [MER], 2017) in Norwegian schools highlight the importance of language skills in a continuously diversified society that seeks to understand not only its own identity, but also the formation of different identities and their side-by-side coexistence. Language skills in a multilingual and multicultural context is an essential tool which enables the individual the ability to understand their surroundings, as well as how to be an active citizen in that society and consequently create relations to others and further develop its democratic values. By extension, language skills are to be considered a linguistic capital that functions as a cultural capital. Moreover, it is an essential tool in order to facilitate opportunities of participation. One of the official languages in Norway, also the majority language, Norwegian, will provide such an opportunity. Which is why, amongst others, that newly arrived citizens must, naturally, quickly start the process of acquiring the majority language and adapt to the culture (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training [NDET], 2022a).

Similarly, the English language holds a strong position as students in Norwegian educational institutions have received a formal English instruction from first grade since L97 (Ministry of Church Affairs, Education and Research, 1996). Whilst it may be a necessary tool to meet the opportunities and challenges in a continuously globalized interwoven world, it could be challenging for non-Anglo students with immigrant backgrounds (Thomas & Breidlid, 2015). Further, the different contextual differences for newly arrived students or students with immigrant background can be an influencing factor as the students' educational background may range from illiteracy to high proficiency in English.

The different circumstances and the inherent and pre-existing knowledge that newly arrived students already have of English can be considered as insufficient as it does not match the official and implied achievement levels that they are being assessed in. The contemporary measurements and instructions expect that students should master at a specific level in spite of the unrealistic parameters that are beyond their current proficiency. As a result, newly arrived students are expected to perform at a level that is inconsistent with what is within the student's current realm of knowledge and limits their potential.

1.1 Research questions

The aims described at the beginning of this thesis will be achieved through two research questions:

> **RQ1** What are the current research trends on teaching English as an additional language to newly arrived students in Norwegian educational institutions?

> **RQ2** How can current research on EAL for newly arrived students highlight current English teaching practices in mainstream and sheltered classrooms?

These RQs will be investigated through a systematic review of existing research on EAL for newly arrived students in Norway. The methodological approach is adapted from a systematic review conducted by Rose et al. (2021). The chosen methodology will be further presented in Section 3.

The first research question attempts to map out the existing research on newly arrived students in English as an additional language. For this reason, RQ1 is of explorative nature. Because of the possibly different linguistic repertoires of this student group and experience

with the English language, it is more fitting to use EAL instead of other paradigms such as English as a foreign language (EFL) or English as a third language (L3).

The second research question is formulated on the basis of the differently organized classrooms, namely sheltered and mainstream, that newly arrived students can be placed in. A sheltered classroom organization separates a group of students from the larger student population. This can, for example, take form as introductory programs for newly arrived students. On the other hand, the mainstream class is the intended class that the students will be transferred to after the introductory programs. A more in-depth description of classroom organization for newly arrived adult and adolescent students will be provided in Section 2.1 and Section 2.2.1.

Since the selected studies in this review account for experiences from different classrooms, RQ2 seeks to organize and compare these experiences. The present thesis is first and foremost limited to a Norwegian context in order to create an outline of current trends with regard to newly arrived students in the English subject.

The Norwegian context, like many other European countries, is unique in that the students must simultaneously acquire the host country's language and English or other foreign languages (Eurostat, 2022). Additionally, insight into trends may create an overview of existing practices and challenges, which can further function as a foundation for facilitating good teaching practice. Subsequently, this can highlight how existing policies constrict English instruction for newly arrived students.

This thesis is structured into six sections. The present section has introduced the aim of this thesis. Section 2 is dedicated to relevant terminologies and the current state of English instruction for newly arrived students in order to portray the current framework. Relevant literature and theories will be applied in this section. In Section 3, the chosen methodology, systematic review, will be described and the rationale for choosing this method will be explained. Section 4 will present findings for RQ1 and RQ2. After that, Section 5 will discuss the main findings. Finally, Section 6 will naturally conclude the thesis.

2 Theoretical background

2.1 Newly arrived students and the right to education

Newly arrived students, also referred to as *elever med kort botid* in Norwegian, as implied by the terminology are a student group who have immigrated to Norway and resided in the country for a short period. There is no official and shared document that explicitly states how long the student is considered to be newly arrived. However, extracting information from the student's right to adapted Norwegian instruction for newly arrived students at upper secondary education, newly arrived students are categorized as those who have lived in Norway for less than six years (NDET, 2020). Naturally, as a result of migration this student group is relatively diverse as it is made up by many different language backgrounds. The students' existing linguistic and cultural repertoire may vastly differ from the new country which they have immigrated to.

Every child in Norway is afforded the right, as well as the obligation, to compulsory education (Opplæringslova [Education Act], 1998, § 2-1)[1]. The compulsory education, primary and lower secondary education which the local municipality is responsible for, is ten years of education. After students have concluded their compulsory education, they have the right to receive a certificate of completion (Forskrift til opplæringslova [Regulations for the Education Act], 2006, § 3-37) which is used to apply to upper secondary education and training, organized by the county. This educational path is not compulsory; however, it is common as it leads to necessary certificate for higher education or trade certificate from vocational programs. Additionally, the rights of young people that is *ungdomsrett* affords students up until the age of 24 the right to upper secondary education if they have certificate from compulsory education or an equivalent accredited certification (Education Act, 1998, § 3-1). Because of this, the right to education goes beyond the obligatory and primary education and extends to other educational institutions that leads to different higher education programs and career paths.

Similarly, the fundamental rights to education (United Nations, 1948) must also be afforded to individuals that immigrate to Norway. Every municipality in Norway must be able to meet

---

[1] A translated unofficial English version of Opplæringalova (1998) does exist, but for the sake of legality this thesis will only refer to the official Norwegian version.

the rights of newly arrived students and arrange and facilitate educational programs that maintains the rights of the individual student. Existing documents highlight the importance of an immediate educational instruction from day of arrival. At the beginning, the content of the education may deviate from what is typically expected of a complete educational offer. However, these demands and rights need to be met within one month after the child's initial arrival (NDET, 2024).

§2-1 of the Education Act (1998) states that when it is plausible that compulsory school age children, ages 6-16, will reside in the country for more than three months, they are granted the right and obligation to be enrolled in compulsory education. Only legally residing applicants under the age of 18 have the right to primary compulsory education (Education Act, 1998, § 4A-1).

Newly arrived students can also be granted the right to upper secondary education (Education Act, 1998, § 3-1), but this right depends on their residency permit and age. Minors who legally reside in the country whilst waiting for their residence permit and are expected to stay in the country for more than three months are entitled to upper secondary education. Likewise, applicants who turn 18 years old during the school year are permitted the right to finish the school year they are enrolled in.

Similarly, integration laws (Integreringsloven [Integration Act], 2020) generally require that adult, ages 18-55, refugees and immigrants are as soon possible enrolled in compulsory Norwegian and social studies instruction as the law aims for "… early integration into the Norwegian society and to achieve financial independence" and "… ensure that immigrants acquire good Norwegian language skills, knowledge about Norwegian societal life, formal qualifications, and a lasting connection to the labor market" (author's translation, [Integration Act], 2020, § 1). In combination with, or alongside this, municipalities must also be prepared to organize introduction programs. The contents of such programs may vastly differ as it must be tailored to the individual's needs (see Dahl et al., 2018). To keep in line with the aims of the law, participants have the right and obligation to have competence assessment and career guidance ([Integration Act], 2020, § 10, §11) in order customize the contents of the program according to the objectives for the individual participant. For some participants, it may to be to receive necessary certificates to enter the workforce, whilst others aim to continue their education. For this reason, the content of introduction programs for adults and other sheltered programs for adolescent students may differ as it is adapted to the individual student's needs.

2.2 Newly arrived students and immigrant-background students in educational institutions

2.2.1 Sheltered teaching

The Education Act (1998, §8-2) states that students cannot be organized into groups or classes based on their academic capabilities, ethnicity, or gender. The rationale behind such prohibition can be closely related to the purpose of dividing students into classes or groups where their right to social belonging must be facilitated, additionally to prevent segregation and discrimination. However, there are exemptions to this in §2-8 and §3-12 (Education Act, 1998) for newly arrived students and minority language students who are not yet proficient enough in the majority language to follow a regular classroom instruction. Such sheltered organizations are usually the first encounter newly arrived students have with the Norwegian educational system, which aims to "… teach the student Norwegian as fast as possible" (author's translation, NDET, 2022a) in order to transfer and integrate into a mainstream school and class. Municipalities and counties can organize a separate educational instruction for newly arrived students either as its own group, classes, or school (Education Act, 1998, § 2-8, § 3-12), for example; Kristiansand municipality has a reception school, *mottaksskole*, grades 1.-10, that is solely dedicated to receiving minority language students who have moved to Norway (NAFO, n.d.). In the current published version of the new Education Act, which will come into effect August 2024, the rights of introductory education are now formulated in their own section, § 3-7 and § 6-6 respectively (Opplæringslova [Education Act], 2023). Moreover, the new law suggests that there will be more room for sheltered organizations within the mainstream classroom that are based on academic levels if it is believed that the student(s) have more to gain from such sheltered instruction (Education Act, 2023, § 14-2).

Alternatively, within the same school, classes can be organized differently, such as reception groups or classes. Accordingly, such programs may take many different forms as there are several factors which organizers must consider (NAFO, n.d.). Unlike introduction programs for adults, the aforementioned sheltered offers are voluntary, and the student or parent have the right to decline and instead enroll in a mainstream class (NDET, 2022a).

The social factors related to students' needs to be surrounded by their peers is apparent through the organization of the so-called combination class, *kombinasjonsklasse*, a collaboration between the municipality and the county. Upper secondary age students, ages 16-24, who, for different reasons, do not have necessary prerequisites from compulsory

education for upper secondary education can enroll in a combination class which is located at an upper secondary school (NAFO, 2024). Such educational organizations and extensions of the student's right and access to compulsory education signals preparatory needs which facilitate and better equip students to meet the requirements of the program that they wish to enroll in upper secondary education.

After, or alongside these different classroom organizations, the main intended objective is that students will be transferred to mainstream classes or schools. As implied by the terminology the mainstream classroom is, for lack of better word, what is traditionally referred to as the ordinary classroom where students have not been sheltered into different classes or groups based on their academic capabilities. Depending on the individual students' needs and rights regarding special education and adapted education, all forms of instruction take place in the same class, meaning that students are not separated into individual groups based on their academic proficiencies. Nonetheless, Beiler (2021) reports on such compartmentalized class organizations in a Norwegian upper secondary school. In addition to mainstream classroom organizations, English classes were also organized through an accelerated class made up of 10th grade students who, due to high achievement in English, have been admitted to the vg1 subject one year earlier. Additionally, a sheltered class for newly arrived students who, due to low achievement the year before, repeat the vg1 English course. The sheltered class was not an introductory class but can still be understood as sheltered as it separates a few selected students from the larger student population.

2.2.2 Curriculum in the English subject

Norwegian students formally start acquiring English as early as the first grade. Although the Norwegian language policies and practices has been described as favoring monolingualism as opposed to multilingualism (Sener, 2023; Alstad & Sopanen, 2021; Tishakov & Tsagari, 2022), the educational policies illuminate the English subject's role and relevancy. The subject is accredited as, "… an important subject when it comes to cultural understanding, communication, all-round education and identity development" (NDET, 2019). Such descriptions position the English subject as a gateway to intercultural understanding, meaning that the diversity in the English-speaking world allows for greater access to different cultures. Access to a world beyond the Norwegian borders is meant to promote tolerant and freethinking citizens that can look within themselves and others in order to develop and understand their identity, and its interaction with others. Consequently, the subject's purpose

goes beyond only learning the language, but to use the language as a tool to become active citizens in a democratic society.

Students also receive English instruction during the differently organized reception classes for newly arrived students as it is one of the compulsory subjects in order to receive a certificate from lower secondary education. Additionally, depending on the students individually adapted educational plan, when newly students are enrolled in mainstream classes, they are assessed in the same competence aims as their fellow classmates who may have received English instruction since first grade. In spite of the existence of an adapted Norwegian curriculum for newly arrived minority language students, no such equivalent curriculum is available for newly arrived students who do not yet have necessary prerequisites to currently conquer the English subject they are enrolled in.

The results below from English national test in 8th grade (SSB, 2023b), as summarized in Table 1, show a clear result variation between immigrant and immigrant-background students compared to other student groups.

Table 1. English national test results (SSB, 2023b).

	Mastering level results from 2023 English national test in 8th grade				
	1	2	3	4	5
Both boys and girls					
Immigrants	19,3	19,2	36,5	15,7	9,3
Norwegian-born to immigrant parents	9,1	17,9	43,3	20,5	9,1
Other students	9,5	17	42,7	20,5	10,4
Boys					
Immigrants	19,9	21,3	35,8	14,4	8,5
Norwegian-born to immigrant parents	10,3	19,3	43,2	19,3	8
Other students	8,8	17,1	42,5	21,4	10,2
Girls					
Immigrants	18,7	17,1	37,2	17,1	10
Norwegian-born to immigrant parents	7,9	16,6	43,5	21,7	10,4
Other students	10,2	16,8	42,9	19,6	10,5

A probable explanation for the performance variations between these student groups can be extracted from Beiler's (2022) utterance, "[t]he problem is not the students' competence in

English, but the lack of accordance between the students' language education and the language policy expectations for the English competence of upper secondary students" (author's translation, 2022, p. 19-20). This means that the measurement variables in these tests, as well as general competence aims, are currently not aligned with the student's language learning process – it is outside of the students' zone of proximal development (Vygosky, 1978). Therefore, such tests will especially benefit anglo-students who have not only received the required educational instruction, but are also possessors of the dominant culture, as this is used as the benchmark for the national tests (Thomas & Breidlid, 2015; NDET, 2022b).

Completion rates for upper secondary education within five/six years, 2016-2022

- Other population: Vocational 72,7 | General studies 90,7 | All programmes 83,2
- Norwegian-born to immigrant parents: Vocational 62,9 | General studies 85,7 | All programmes 79,7
- Immigrants: Vocational 54,8 | General studies 79,5 | All programmes 65,1

■ Vocational education programmes ■ Programmes for general studies
■ All education programmes

Figure 1 – Completion rates for upper secondary education, 2016-2022 (SSB, 2023a).

Figure 1 presents completion rates for upper secondary education across vocational and general studies, according to the students' immigrant status. In upper secondary education, it has been reported that completion rates are lower among immigrant students (Instebø et al., 2021; Meld. St. 21. (2020-2021), p. 14). The results are particularly explained by the contextual differences between the student groups as, (i) academic and linguistic capabilities, (ii) the short stay, and (iii) prior experience with formal education. These factors greatly affect completion rates among immigrant students. Additionally, age of immigration is used as an influencing factor with regards to marks from compulsory education (Kalcic & Ye, 2023). Students who arrived before the age of six, on average, score better than those whose age of

arrival is later. This should be understood in the context of education, the later the arrival, the later the introduction to the Norwegian educational system.

2.2.3 Multilingualism in the English classroom

Increased immigration to Norway challenges environments where Norwegian and English are the dominant languages. Newly arrived students, who have not yet developed enough proficiency in neither of the languages, are dependent on making use of their existing linguistic repertoire to learn new languages.

> Status and power differences among languages are perhaps inevitable in situations involving migration, but it is important for educators to be aware that they and their students may reproduce these hierarchies in the classroom, even if students are working multilingually. (Beiler, 2020, p. 25)

As such, educational settings dominated by two majorized languages must be able to meet the multilingual classroom, as the presence of several languages pose challenges with regards to each languages position in the language hierarchy of which languages are preferred and maintained, and which languages are implicitly or explicitly silenced.

The idea of multilingualism is incorporated in the policy for core values and principles in Norwegian education as it states that, "[a]ll pupils shall experience that being proficient in a number of languages is a resource, both in school and society at large" (MER, 2017, p. 7). This signals an overarching value of students' existing and growing linguistic repertoire as not only a resourceful tool during their education, but also an element in society at large. Likewise, the most recent curriculum (LK20) has additionally adopted and extended the use of "other languages with which the pupil is familiar in language learning" (NDET, 2019) to upper secondary education. This signals a paradigm shift as such competence aims was only present in primary and lower secondary education in the previous curriculum LK06 (NDET, 2013), which aimed to identify common similarities between English and the student's native language and use this as a language learning instrument.

The terminological shift from native language (LK06) to other languages the student is familiar with or knows (LK20) illustrates all languages available in the student's linguistic repertoire, regardless of its status and proficiency, as a learning tool in English. There is also an additional value put on Norwegian and English, which students receive formal instruction in from first grade. Additionally, during lower secondary education, students can choose a

foreign language with French, Spanish and German as the more commonly offered language subjects. For this reason, the construction of the Norwegian curriculum is inherently built on and towards multilingualism where more than two languages are viewed as valuable.

In the case of newly arrived students, the individual student may know more than one language as their educational path may vastly differ with some students having had acquired other languages in their country of transit before their arrival to Norway (Christensen, 2019). Ergo, those who do not yet know either Norwegian or English will simultaneously acquire both languages.

However, despite the emphasized value on multilingualism, the student's first meeting with the Norwegian education system regardless of its organizational structure is often characterized as having monolingual traits with strong emphasis on Norwegian and Norwegian as the preferred language of instruction or support during English instruction (Beiler, 2020, 2021). On the other hand, previous studies have documented that Norwegian teachers generally express a favorable view towards multilingualism and its benefits (Haukås, 2016; Dahl & Krulatz, 2016; Lorenz et al., 2021; Burner & Carlsen, 2022) whilst other studies have reported a steadfast instructional enforcement that often prohibits the use of students' native language(s) or does not explicitly facilitate a teaching environment that embraces multilingualism (Iversen, 2017). Other studies have also reported that English teachers do not feel adequately qualified to create multilingual practices in their English lessons (Dahl & Krulatz, 2016).

The question of multilingualism in the English classroom does not only become a topic relevant to language learning as "… there is the demand to create learning conditions where all learners have opportunities for equal and meaningful participation and where multilingual learners can profit from drawing on their previous linguistic and cultural knowledge as valuable resources for learning" (Lorenz et al., 2021, p. 12), but also related to an intercultural ideology which aims to develop pedagogical practices which do not further, implicitly or explicitly, disregard cultural bodies which are currently at an existential crossroad as Christensen (2019) describes it.

2.3 Educational and career paths with English

Additionally, the aforementioned values regarding language and the English subject further draw the line to different educational and career paths. An increasing number of study programs and courses at higher educational institutions have English as the instructional language and English syllabus (HK-dir, 2022). Naturally, language practices in many Norwegian higher educational institutions can therefore be regarded as facilitating for paralellingualism, meaning that alongside the official language(s) in Norway, English is also promoted and preferred as the main foreign language (Faingold, 2023). However, it should be noted that due to the early formal teaching of English and its steadfast societal presence, its status as a foreign language is debatable within a Norwegian context. Additionally, language proficiency in English is a prerequisite for students who wish to attend university and other institutions for education beyond the secondary education. Moreover, employment rates in Norway are in accordance with OECD (2023a) average after attainment from vocational secondary education or post-secondary non-tertiary education. On the other hand, it has been documented that the higher the degree attainment, the higher the wage (OECD, 2023b). As a result, the earnings and the needs of the job market is an influencing factor in choosing higher education.

The overarching documents regarding the English subject highlight the necessity of multilingual competence, particularly English competence, also after educational attainment, as the subject "… shall prepare the pupils for an education and societal and working life that requires English language competence in reading, writing and oral communication" (NDET, 2019). This may also be further connected to the objectives of the Education Act (1998) as the education must facilitate the education in such way that it, "… opens doors for the world and the future …" and "… develop knowledge, skills and attitudes to master their own lives and to participate in the work life and society" (author's translation, 1998, § 1-1). It may then be interpreted that English language competence is an essential tool that goes beyond the student's current educational program. The need for work-related English is particularly showcased in the documents and policies regarding the division between English SF, for general studies, and English YF, for vocational programs. The most recent curriculum LK20, reformed the English subject in the sense it signaled a need for English that is targeted towards the different vocational programs – emphasizing the need for specific language competence in the working life.

Accordingly, the use and need for the English language does not end after attainment of secondary education, as presented above. Hellekjær (2009, 2016) has previously reported on Norwegian university students' weak reading proficiency and how some university-educated workers rely on their English language knowledge from secondary education. This indicates that they have not developed necessary academic language competence which is required in higher education and in work life. Consequently, it becomes crucial to put further emphasis on newly arrived students who have started learning English late or have yet to attain the necessary achievement levels for their grade. Likewise, for newly arrived adult students in introduction programs which may not focus on the development of English at all (Dahl et al., 2018; Krulatz & Dahl, 2021).

> In a country like Norway, the focus on learning the national language may have severe consequences not only for minority language maintenance, but also for whether learning English is seen as necessary or even desirable. This perspective in turn can effectively exclude refugees from many areas of society, by limiting access to employment and higher education, for example. (Dahl et al., 2018, p. 109)

The present section has outlined relevant terminologies and discussion with regards to English as an additional language for newly arrived students. The next section, Section 3, will present the chosen methodology.

3   Methodology

The presented research questions in Section 1.1 seek to investigate the current trends in research on EAL for newly arrived students in Norway and how these studies can give insight into teaching practices in mainstream and sheltered classrooms. For this reason, a systematic review has been selected as this methodological approach allows for a systematic selection, with set requirements, and systematic investigation of selected studies. Therefore, the selected methodology can be understood as a way, "… to find out what is already known from pre-existing research about a phenomena, subject or topic; new primary research to provide answers to questions about which existing research does not provide clear and/or complete answers" (Newman & Gough, 2020, p. 3).

This thesis has adopted Rose et al. (2021) as guide for systematic review with regards to how to conduct a systematic review and how to structure the methodology and findings sections.

3.1   Requirements

The following requirements were applied to collect data sample:

1. Must be an empirical research
2. Must be peer reviewed
3. Must be about newly arrived students or immigrants or minority language students
4. Must be about ELA for lower or upper secondary aged students or English teachers at this level
5. Must be in Norway
6. Must be about mainstream or sheltered classroom.

The rationale for requirements 1-2 relates to validity of the study, as well as a requirement from articles to contain its own data collection. Furthermore, this gives insight to which types of studies have been conducted with regards to EAL for newly arrived students. For this reason, papers were immediately excluded if they did not contain an explanation of the methodological approach. Although this thesis consistently uses the term newly arrived, it is extended to immigrants and minority language students, in requirement 3, as several terminologies can be used to refer to this student group. Requirement 4 automatically excludes primary school age students as this is not of interest in the present thesis. Lastly, requirements 5-6 further exclude studies which are not relevant since this systematic review is limited to a Norwegian context.

In order to thoroughly review the Norwegian context, only studies in this context are reviewed. As this exponentially filters the research results, studies in Norwegian have also been included. To trace trends, there is no set year of publish so long as it was published up until January 2024. The absence of a start date may be used to trace change in trends with regards to curriculum reform from LK06 to LK20.

3.2 Database and search strategy

The literature search and the interest for the thesis subject initially sprung out of a personal and professional interest which led to articles from Burner and Carlsen (2019) and Beiler (2022) in the non-peer reviewed Norwegian pedagogical journal *Bedre Skole*. These articles were used as an introduction to the topic and existing research. For this reason, the search phase began with a broad approach that later on developed to a narrower and more specified search which only sought after studies on EAL for newly arrived students in educational contexts in Norway. Additionally, the mentioned requirements limit which studies were further selected.

The following databases were used: Oria, Web of Science and Bielefeld Academic Search Engine (BASE). The search was conducted both in Norwegian and English using Boolean operators; OR, AND and NOT with keywords such as 'newly arrived,' 'recently arrived,' 'immi*,' 'minori*,' 'English,' 'Norw*,' and 'multilingual'. This resulted in 139 hits across all three databases. Some of these were duplicates, thus the same papers reappeared several times on the same database and across the three databases.

Again, only peer reviewed articles and peer reviewed chapters in books were selected. Books, reports, master thesis and PhD dissertations were excluded. Hits which were not related to education or language learning were filtered out. Afterwards, keywords, abstracts and contents of several research papers were scanned in order to further investigate if they met the aforementioned inclusion criteria. In total twelve studies were included.

3.3 Limitations

The present limitations of this paper must be addressed. Firstly, the exclusion of what Rose et al. (2021) refers to as grey literature, meaning published and unpublished research found on mediums beyond research journals. The use of the mentioned databases naturally constricts which studies and papers are made available, whereas a more varied representation would naturally require a more varied literature selection, for example official documents, books,

educational forums and so on. Additionally, the keywords applied may be receptive to susceptibility as the author may have not caught other relevant keywords. For this reason, the present systematic review is built on a few studies and cannot be used to generalize. Nevertheless, this limitation was necessary in the interest of reliability and validity, as well as to prevent and limit biased research and literature selection.

A natural shortcoming of the thesis is the presence of individual bias, as the circumstances does not allow for more than one author in the systematic review process. It must also be made explicit that this thesis may contain confirmation bias, as the author works at an upper secondary educational institution with newly arrived students. Regardless, efforts are put in place to prevent the side effects of such biases, it must be blatantly stated that the individual authors' beliefs and perceptions may consciously or subconsciously affect the thesis.

4 Findings

The present section seeks to present relevant findings for the research questions from Section 1.1. Section 4.1 will take an extensive look at relevant findings for RQ1 from the twelve selected studies. Afterwards, strengths and limitations of the selected research will be evaluated and discussed in Section 4.2 and 4.3. Lastly, Section 4.4 will present relevant findings for RQ2 with the mainstream and sheltered classroom in mind.

4.1 Current trends on teaching EAL to newly arrived students in Norwegian educational institutions

The first section of findings relates to RQ1:

- What are the current research trends on teaching English as an additional language to newly arrived students in Norwegian educational institutions?

Due to the nature of the methodological requirements and the narrowness of the present research question, the literature search was not confined to any particular period. All research available up to January 2024 as presented in Section 3 was eligible. This was a deliberate choice as the author was aware of the scarce research on newly arrived students in the English classroom as the search yielded the earliest papers to a decade ago (Surkalovic, 2014; Dahl & Krulatz, 2016). In total, twelve studies were selected. All studies, with the exception of two (Dahl et al., 2018; Krulatz & Dahl, 2021) which were chapters in a book, were published in peer reviewed journals. Both books which contain chapters from Dahl et al. (2018) and Krulatz and Dahl (2021) are both described as having undergone external peer-review. All studies were conducted in Norway with systematic data collection with different methods and covering different aspects of the overarching main topic.

After the selection process, a total of twelve research papers were selected. The contents of the selected research material are formulated into the following categories:

- Multilingual practices (Beiler & Dewilde, 2020; Beiler, 2020, 2021; Krulatz & Iversen, 2020; Burner & Carlsen, 2022)
- Perception (Dahl et al., 2018; Burner & Carlsen, 2022)
- Teacher qualification (Dahl & Krulatz, 2016; Burner & Carlsen, 2022)
- Preparedness (Surkalovic, 2014; Dahl & Krulatz, 2016)

- Educational language policies (Thomas and Breidlid, 2015; Krulatz & Dahl, 2021; Beiler, 2023)
- Inclusion and exclusion in education (Hilt, 2017; Krulatz & Iversen, 2020)

Table 2. Studies on EAL for newly arrived students in Norway

Study	Year	Topic	Keywords
Surkalovic	2014	Preparedness	Not listed
Thomas & Breidlid	2015	Educational language policies	Anglobalization, English testing, Norway, national tests, Bourdieu, documentary analysis
Dahl & Krulatz	2016	Teacher qualification, preparedness	English teachers, competence, pedagogical language knowledge, multilingual, teacher education
Hilt	2017	Inclusive and exclusive education	Inclusive education, immigrant students, minority language, systems theory, exclusion
Dahl et al.	2018	Perception	Not listed
Beiler	2020	Multilingual practices	Not listed
Beiler & Dewilde	2020	Multilingual practices	Translation, writing, translingual practice, mediational strategy, English as an additional language, newly arrived students
Krulatz & Iversen	2020	Multilingual practices, inclusive education	Multilingual practice, inclusive classrooms, immigrant learners, identity texts
Beiler	2021	Multilingual practices	Translanguaging, markedness, language education, multilingualism, monoglossic ideologies, raciolinguistic ideologies
Krulatz & Dahl	2021	Educational language policies	Dominant language constellation, English, Norway, majority language, Norwegian, refugee education, refugee integration
Burner & Carlsen	2022	Perception, teacher qualification, multilingual practices	Teacher perceptions, multilingual practices, newly arrived students, migrant students, introductory programmes
Beiler	2023	Educational language policies	English teaching, immigrant students, sheltering, anglonormativity, decoloniality, Norway

In the following sections, the selected studies will be synthesized according to the ascribed category. The listed categories and keywords of each study has been visualized in Table 2. The content and keywords of at least three studies can be placed in more than one category. For this reason, these studies will reappear in different sections with different focus.

4.1.1 Studies reporting on multilingual practices

Five studies (Beiler, 2020, 2021; Beiler & Dewilde, 2020; Krulatz & Iversen, 2020; Burner & Carlsen, 2022) have been categorized as reporting on multilingual practices. All five studies have been synthesized in Table 3.

Table 3. Studies reporting on multilingual practices

Study	Participants	Context	Data sources	Aims/objectives	Conclusion
Beiler (2020)	Teachers (N = 2) Students, grades, ages 13-16 (N = 22)	Introductory classes at lower secondary school	Field notes, video of classroom instruction, audio recordings (conversations), screen recordings, photographs (school), student texts, feedback videos, tasks, language portraits, school policy documents, video recordings, audio recording and interview notes.	"… how teachers and students draw on and position students' multilingual resources in English writing instruction…" (Beiler, 2020, p. 11)	Multilingual translanguaging practices are present in both introductory classes, however which language was selected from the student's linguistic repertoire varied for reasons such as formal literacy. For the most part, translanguaging with minority languages was used as a supportive tool. Norwegian was frequently used during teacher instruction as it was reasoned as more typologically similar to English and English instruction's double goal to also teach students Norwegian, the overarching goal of the entire program.

Beiler & Dewilde (2020)	Teachers (N = 2) Students, ages 13-16 (N = 22)	Introductory classes at lower secondary school	Field notes, classroom audio recordings, screen recordings, student texts, language portraits, video recordings, audio recordings and interviews	"RQ1: Which strategies do students employ to verify or improve the quality of their translation for English writing? RQ2: Which orientations do students display to translation as part of English writing?" (Beiler & Dewilde, 2020, p. 536)	Translation strategies is compartmentalized as either linguistic or mediational strategy, whilst the students' orientations towards translation is categorized as affirmation or avoidance.
Krulatz & Iversen (2020)	Teacher (N = 1) Students, ages 12-16 (N = 14)	Center for Intensive Norwegian Language Learning	Language use questionnaire, student reflection logs, students' identity texts, lesson plans and teacher's notes and reflections	"(1) Implement instruction that builds upon students' existing cultural and linguistic resources through explicit acknowledgment and inclusion of students' HLs. (2) Increase the relevance of Norwegian and English language lessons and maximize multilingual students' identity investment. (3) Expand multilingual competence through explicit focus on disciplinary and academic language,	The project successfully achieved its three objectives. The multilingual practices of writing trilingual identity texts, which not only due to the content of the assignment, encouraged students to not only write three texts in three different languages but translanguage within the same text. Thereby, actively facilitating an inclusive multilingual practice that seeks to not only develop English and Norwegian, but also strengthen the student's multilingual identity and acknowledge the

Author (Year)	Participants	Setting	Data	Research Questions	Findings
				specifically, on the structure of academic texts." (Krulatz & Iversen, 2020, p. 376)	available linguistic repertoires as useful in English writing instruction.
Beiler (2021)	Teacher (N = 1) Students (N = 54)	Accelerated class (N = 1), mainstream class (N = 1), sheltered class (N = 1)	Field notes, video and screen recordings, texts, language portraits, and teacher and student interviews	"RQ1: In what ways is translanguaging marked in the teaching and learning of English as an additional language for linguistically majoritized or minoritized students? RQ2: How does such marking apply across an accelerated, a mainstream, and a sheltered English class?" (Beiler, 2021, p. 115)	Two patterns of translanguaging are the most prominent: (i) marked bilingual and majoritized English-Norwegian and (ii) minoritized translanguaging. (i)Present in all three settings, but especially restricted and monitored in the accelerated and mainstream classes. However, more permissible for students with low proficiency level in English in mainstream and sheltered classes. (ii)Not suppressed by the teacher, nor facilitated. Often times treated as a deviation from the collectively shared majoritized language. More prominent in Kurdish-speaking student in the accelerated class.

Burner & Carlsen (2022)	Teachers (N = 21)	Introductory school	Questionnaire, classroom instruction, interviews	"RQ: How do teachers perceive and work with multilingualism at a school for newly arrived students?" (Burner & Carlsen, 2022, p. 36)	Teachers hold generally positive views of multilingualism and the benefits of applying the student's first language(s) (L1). However, there is a sequential monolingual perception and approach that is evidently present in the English teachers' practices. Because of this, there is a discrepancy between the participants' presumably positive perceptions of L1(s) application, their multilingual knowledge and the revealed practices and beliefs of language instructions as depicted by the two interviewees.

As seen in Table 3, four studies (Beiler, 2020, 2021; Beiler & Dewilde, 2020; Krulatz & Iversen, 2020), with the exception of one (Burner & Carlsen, 2022), at the minimum report on multilingual writing practices in the English classroom. Four studies were conducted in entirely sheltered classes or schools for newly arrived students (Beiler, 2020; Beiler & Dewilde, 2020; Krulatz & Iversen, 2020; Burner & Carlsen, 2022). Beiler (2021), on the other hand, investigates multilingual practices across three different classroom organizations: one accelerated class, one mainstream class and one sheltered class for newly arrived students, all taught by the same teacher.

4.1.2 Studies reporting on perception

The second category identified relates to perception as presented in Table 4. Although none of the two selected studies (Dahl et al., 2018; Burner & Carlsen, 2022) explicitly define perception. Perception, based on the content of each paper, can be understood as attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of teachers. Conducting research on such individual elements can give insight into pedagogical practices.

Dahl et al. (2018) reports on the perception of the role of English in adult refugee education, as well as the perceived and set institutional learning goals and the adult students' own learning goals. However, only findings related to perception of English will be relevant. On the other hand, Burner and Carlsen (2022) examine teachers' perceptions of multilingualism at a secondary level introductory school. Be that as it may, the educational path of each newly arrived student varies, the two selected studies provide insight into how the perceived outcomes or expectations of adult refugees and school age students after the reception or introduction program can shape teachers' perceptions of English, multilingualism and language learning.

Table 4. Studies reporting on perception

Study	Participants	Context	Main data sources
Dahl et al. (2018)	Teachers (N = 7)	Refugee introduction program	Interviews, survey
	Program administrators (N = 2)		
	Adult refugee students, ages 19-45 (N = 40)		
Burner & Carlsen (2022)	Teachers (N = 21)	Introductory school	Questionnaire, classroom instruction, interviews

Out of all the selected studies, Dahl et al. (2018), alongside Krulatz and Dahl (2021), is the only study that explicitly reports on a wide age range and adult newly arrived students. As previously mentioned, the curriculum in the introduction program for recent adult immigrants first and foremost emphasize competence development in Norwegian language and culture in order to foster integration into the Norwegian society and working life. Since the inclusion of English instruction in these programs is not mandatory, the meagre presence of English instruction becomes paradoxical in relation to its crucial role during and after primary and secondary education. Albeit Dahl et al. (2018) does not depict English instruction in the classroom it still presents tangible evidence with regards to the English language's subordinate position compared to Norwegian. The vast majority of students express that it is indeed important to learn English, and equally position both languages as important. However, with regards to employment, both the interviewees, teachers and refugee education coordinators, and the students notably perceive the Norwegian language in a superior position as it is viewed as a prerequisite for acquiring a job and integrating to the new culture. For all intents and purposes such perceptions are primarily in line with the monolingual views in the overarching policies for introduction programs for adult refugees. These views can further affect the perception of the English subject as a whole as those who wish and need to complete a lower or upper secondary education only aim for a passing grade (Dahl et al., 2018).

Burner and Carlsen (2022) mainly found positive perceptions of multilingualism where the student's previously acquired language(s) is recognized as a learning tool. Having said that, the teacher and coordinators qualifications in Dahl et al. (2018) was not a topic of discussion, Burner and Carlsen (2022) found that among their participants there was a generally high presence of formal teacher qualifications and experience with teaching newly arrived students, as well as the heightened presence of continuing education among teachers and the principal in order to elevate competence in a field that relates to the needs to newly arrived students. Comparatively, the positive perceptions may correlate with their perceived insight of multilingualism. However, as in the above-mentioned study (Dahl et al., 2018), there is an explicit systematic ranking of Norwegian as the more desired and prioritized language. An English teacher expresses a prevailing hierarchy amongst her colleagues and the transfer requirements to mainstream schools (Burner and Carlsen, 2022, p. 43). As in the expressed perceptions of which language is necessary for employability in Norway, the newly arrived students' Norwegian competence at an introductory school are highly considered when

students are to be transferred to a mainstream school. As an extension, Norwegian instruction is highly stressed and omnipresent during English lessons as one teacher expresses that the English lesson is used as an opportunity to expand the student's exposure to Norwegian. In line with some of the participants at the refugee education program (Dahl et al., 2018), an English teacher also expressed a linear perception of language learning (Burner & Carlsen, 2022). The teacher in question suggests that simultaneously learning Norwegian and English as a more burdensome challenge for the student's language learning process.

4.1.3 Studies reporting on teacher qualification

Dahl and Krulatz (2016) and Burner and Carlsen (2022) report on teacher qualification to teach English in a multilingual classroom from two entirely different contexts. The former study can be categorized as large-scale as it attempts to reach as many English teachers as possible whilst Burner and Carlsen (2022) is restricted to a single introductory school, but also examines qualifications beyond only teaching English.

Dahl and Krulatz (2016) applied a mixed method collecting both quantitative and qualitative data. The former was conducted through a national digital survey sent to around 150 primary and lower secondary schools in selected cities. It resulted in a total of 176 respondents, with the majority (n=152) of participants residing in major cities in Norway and the remaining 24 from other unspecified cities. This group of participants were asked four questions in total. This section will only present questions and results related to teacher qualification. The qualitative data was collected through interviews with four teachers from two different schools. Both schools had a considerable amount of minority language students and one of the schools was an introduction school. Additionally, the selected interview informants were purposely selected because of their experience teaching multilingual students (Dahl & Krulatz, 2016, p. 7-8).

The second question in the digital survey was an open question related to qualification to work with multilingual students, either through a course as part of their education or conference. Although some participants report having attended many different pedagogical and language courses, as well attaining degrees on different levels the vast majority of teachers, 80.1%, responded that they lacked necessary education or training to work with this student group (Dahl & Krulatz, 2016, p. 7-9). On the other hand, the participants in the other study held the belief "… that they are to a great extent or a very great extent competent to teach at an introductory school" (Burner & Carlsen, 2022, p. 40). Moreover, more than half of

the participants have academic backgrounds relating to multilingualism and/or SLA. The two interview subjects, English teachers, also revealed that they either had or were pivoting towards a continuing education within the mentioned fields.

The third question, a preemptively formulated multiple-choice question, posed by Dahl and Krulatz (2016) relates to the participants' belief of what type of knowledge, skills and resources are needed. Majority of participants, respectively 84.7% and 83.5%, selected items about teaching strategies in the multilingual classroom and access to resources for adapted education, whilst items about speaking the student's native language or only being a good teacher were less popular (Dahl & Krulatz, 2016, p. 8, 10). Additionally, the findings from the second data collection, interviews, is in line with survey respondents who expressed knowledge of relevant theories about multilingualism. The interview participants particularly highlight Norwegian and the student's native language, with the right support, is an affordance in English acquisition, and vice versa. Likewise, participants in Burner and Carlsen (2022) hold positive views of usage of L1(s) to learn new languages, but as previously stated these views were not necessarily sustained during English instruction.

4.1.4 Studies reporting on preparedness

Two studies have been identified as reporting on preparedness to teach English as a third language in the multilingual classroom in Norway (Surkalovic, 2014; Dahl & Krulatz, 2016) in two different contexts, as presented in Table 5. Both articles are written in Norwegian. Surkalovic (2014) investigates to what degree their teacher education prepares pre-service teachers to teach English to students who do not have Norwegian as their native languages. Correspondingly, the aspect of preparedness presents preparedness with regards to the content of teacher education programs and the curriculum and needs of their future students. In addition to teacher qualification, Dahl and Krulatz (2016) examines to what extent English teachers feel prepared to teacher in a multilingual and multicultural classroom.

Table 5. Studies reporting on preparedness

Study	Participants	Context	Main data sources
Surkalovic (2014)	Pre-service teachers (N = 94)	Teacher education program grade 1.-7.	Questionnaire
		Teacher education program grade 5.-10.	
Dahl & Krulatz (2016)	Teachers (N = 180)	Mainstream schools, introductory school	Questionnaire, interviews

The earliest study's, to the author's knowledge, Surkalovic (2014), focal point is not on the individual students' own perception or experience of preparedness, but rather to which extent the curriculum for teacher education programs prepares future teachers to teach in a multilingual English classroom because "… many of the multilingual students learn Norwegian as a second language and English as a third language, a third language perspective is a competence that is necessary for a future English teacher…" (author's translation, Surkalovic, 2014, p. 5).

The data collection was conducted through a physical written questionnaire, consisting of five open questions with the end-goal of collecting both quantitative and qualitative data (Surkalovic, 2014, p. 6-7). The participant group was made up by first year students in grades 5.-10, second year students in grades 1.-7. and 5.-10. and grades 1-7., in addition to fourth year students from both study programs.

Overall, the participants expressed limited understanding of the language situation in Norway with regards to many of the official minority languages. Despite the considerable exposure to foreign minority languages as residents in a metropolitan city, less than a third of the participants (n = 66) were either unable to list any native languages or native languages beyond English, official languages in the Nordic or officially recognized minority languages (Surkalovic, 2014, p. 9, 13). This reflects a narrow understanding of languages and linguistic typology. Additionally, the participants had difficulties identifying the shared properties of all languages. However, in the last question, majority of participants (n = 80) unanimously agreed that an English teacher must have knowledge of other languages beyond English and

Norwegian. Therefore, the positive perception of multilingualism in this context corresponds with multilingual educational policies, and the arguments are of didactical and pedagogical nature. The remaining participants (n = 12) who responded to the question were under the belief that linguistic knowledge of only English and Norwegian for an English teacher in Norway was sufficient. Surkalovic (2014) attributes the different responses within the participant groups related to their study program and their progression in the respective study program.

At the time research was conducted, the second-year students enrolled in 5.-10. had completed an English course, whilst the first-year students had not yet partaken in practicum. Additionally, Surkalovic (2014) points to insufficient prior knowledge of languages before the students enroll in higher education. Lastly, gaps between students at 5.-10. and 1.-7. may be explained by the fact that Norwegian is a compulsory subject for pre-service teacher in 1.-7., whilst it is not for students at 5.-10 (Surkalovic, 2014, p. 5, 15).

Whilst Surkalovic (2014) asked participants questions related necessary language competence expected of the future teachers, Dahl and Krulatz (2016) draws attention towards in-service teachers. Majority of participants responded that they feel fairly prepared to work with this student group, however 33% respond that they are not prepared (Dahl & Krulatz, 2016, p. 9). As previously mentioned, many did however express that they did not feel sufficiently qualified to teach multilingual students. Consequently, this is reflected in their positive response to an offer to receive more education and training in multilingualism and the needs of non-Norwegian students. The majority of respondents requested more education on relevant research and theories, in addition to experience with selected methods, strategies and activities that they can be transferred to their pedagogical practices (Dahl & Krulatz, 2016, p. 8, 10). This may be seen in relation to how many participants, in the third question, valued knowledge about teaching strategies, access to adapted education, as well as knowledge about second language acquisition theories, recent studies and aspects of multilingualism. Similarly, their belief of what is necessary is reflected in their expressed needs and desires for more education and training on working in a multilingual classroom.

4.1.5 Studies reporting on educational language policy

The three selected studies, as presented in Table 6, reporting on educational language policies with each studying applying a different research paradigm namely, Anglobalization (Thomas & Breidlid, 2015), Dominant Language Constellation (DLC; Krulatz & Dahl, 2021) and Anglonormativity (Beiler, 2023).

Table 6. Studies reporting on educational language policy

Study	Participants	Context	Main data sources	Paradigm
Thomas & Breidlid (2015)	Students	Upper secondary level	Documentary analysis, interviews	Anglobalization
Krulatz & Dahl (2021)	Teachers and program administrators (N = 9) Students, adults (N = 20)	Introduction Program	Website analysis, interviews, survey	Dominant Language Constellation
Beiler (2023)	Teacher (N = 1) Department head (N = 1) Students (N = 11)	Accelerated class, mainstream class, sheltered class at upper secondary school	Field notes, classroom video recordings, classroom audio recordings, language portraits, narrative descriptions, interview audio recordings	Anglonormativity

Both Thomas and Breidlid (2015) and Beiler (2023) examine language education policies through the lens of the predominantly Anglo views and undertones perpetuated in these documents. The former study positions the systemic testing of English and constitutes that the English language's overall elevated status may be an accessory to language disparity between different student groups, namely immigrant students from non-European countries and students from the Anglosphere or Europe. On the other hand, Beiler (2023) examines the side effects of existing official and local policies, namely the English curriculum and sheltered classroom instructions. The third study (Krulatz & Dahl, 2021) examines the gap between official, desired or needed DLCs and existing impediments that prevent newly arrived refugees from attaining English. In simple terms, DLC, a concept within multilingualism, is understood as a constellation of languages that are regarded as the most important languages.

Secondly, DLC is not about all languages available in the linguistic repertoire, but an evaluation and ranking of the most important languages to meet the necessary linguistic needs. There are many different variables that affect what constitutes DLC, and it may therefore change due to contextual factors (Dahl & Krulatz, 2021, p. 114-115).

4.1.5.1 National tests

Each year at the beginning of the school year, 5th and 8th grade students complete a national test in reading, mathematics, and English. On a micro level the teachers can use the test results adjust their pedagogical and didactical practices, whilst on a macro level schools and municipalities can use improve the quality in the education. Reading and numeracy are basic skills that is not restricted to a subject has been a policy since LK06, whilst national tests in English tests students according to the requirements in the subject curriculum (NDET, 2022b).

Thomas and Breidlid (2015) connect the establishment of the national tests to the so-called PISA-shock that transpired after Norway participated. However, these international tests do not measure English competence and based on this and document analysis of NDET, the authors found no documents that clearly formulated the reasonings behind national tests in English (Thomas & Breidlid, 2015). Additionally, the contents of these tests may contain weaknesses, such as the cultural framework for these tests, that create confusion. Similarly, these normative practices are also present in the English subject, as illustrated by some student interviewees (Thomas & Breidlid, 2015, p. 364).

Some of these tests, such as the national tests, are fundamentally compulsory. However, students with special education or minority language students with adapted language instruction can be exempted from taking this test. Consequently, the test results may be susceptible to inaccuracy as students' whose English proficiency is not in accordance with the official measurements may be excluded (Thomas & Breidlid, 2015). These weaknesses may be substantiated by SSB differentiation between where immigrants are from or where Norwegian-born students' immigrant parents are from. English results in the lowest level (level 1), students from or have immigrant parents from Asia, Africa, Latin America, Oceania (excluding Australia, New Zealand, Europe outside EU28/EEA) are over-represented compared to students their counterparts from EU/EEA, USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand (Thomas & Breidlid, 2015, p. 361). The test's favorable measurements towards those who already possess English proficiency is also detectable as those as 'Others', i.e.

Norwegian students, score poorly in compared to their Anglo counterparts with EU/EEA, USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand background.

4.1.5.2 Educational and career opportunities for adult refugee students

The present study (Krulatz & Dahl, 2021) sourced its data collection through two methods. The first data collection aims to create a general illustration of the majority communal DLC and expressed DLCs by governing bodies. The former consists of a language assessment of relevant official websites for refugees in Norway and the different language requirements or instruction in higher educational institutions and a selection of vacant positions. Likewise, the latter is a language analysis of fourteen government and non-government websites relevant for refugees. Majority of the selected websites were available in both Norwegian and English, and six websites available in languages other than English and the official languages in Norway. Only three websites were available in non-European languages: one local website for Voss municipality, one Norwegian language learning website and lastly Norwegian Organisation for Asylum Seekers (NOAS) (Krulatz & Dahl, 2021, p. 116-118).

In the selected higher education programs, Krulatz and Dahl (2021) found that although Norwegian was the more prevalent language of instruction, good English proficiency was nonetheless necessary across most programs as English texts were listed in the reading lists. The authors', "… conclude that individuals whose DLCs diverge from the dominant DLC consisting of Norwegian and English are potentially denied access to both university-level education and well-paid, prestigious jobs" (Krulatz & Dahl, 2021, p. 126). English is more amplified the more prestigious the degree is, i.e. master's degree and PhD hence juxtaposing English proficiency with a more profuse access to educational and career paths, which is further connected to social mobility (Krulatz & Dahl, 2021, p. 120).

Drawing on Dahl et al. (2018), the second data source is interviews with teachers and coordinators at two refugee education programs and questionnaires with adult refugee students at the same programs. As with the website analysis, the participants responses are utilized to map what constitutes DLC according to the interviewees, the refugee program, the needs of the local community and the adult students (Krulatz & Dahl, 2021, p. 116). Based on the students' self-reports about linguistic repertoire and languages they have used at school throughout their life. Naturally, as the students are enrolled in a Norwegian language program Norwegian had a central position in the DLC, in addition to other languages that the students

know or have had contact with. Moreover, English also holds a strong position with the exception of five participants who place it outside of their DLC.

On the other hand, the interviewees held a more homogeneous view of DLC languages. The participants expressed that only Norwegian was necessary in refugee education as it is the only language skill required to enter the workforce. Additionally, according to local employments needs for refugees only required proficiency in Norwegian (Krulatz & Dahl, 2021, p. 124). On a final note, there is a clear discrepancy between the overall DLC from the language analysis, as well as the students' own DLCs, and teachers and administrators' set DLC for refugee students. The systematic frameworks and practices for refugee education conjointly reinforce a one-language dominancy and put more weight on the refugee student's early entry into the workforce.

4.1.5.3 Subject requirements and sheltered instruction

Collecting data through various methods, as seen in Table 6, Beiler (2023) examines two aspects within policies that regulate English instruction. Firstly, the English curriculum in upper secondary education is standardized and applies for all students, regardless of the newly arrived students' prior proficiency or lack thereof. As follows, students who do not have the necessary predispositions run the risk of not passing the subject as the "… educational language requirements do not simply reflect 'real-life' demands" (Beiler, 2023, p. 114). The mismatch between the student's own language learning process and the curriculum requirements is signaled by a student as she explains learning French during lower secondary school as easier than English since she "didn't learn the language" (Beiler, 2023, p. 111) in the same way she has learned French. At the beginning of lower secondary education students must select a foreign language subject, since it is a new subject there are no prior requisites as is the case in English.

The second policy examined relates classroom organizations. In the present study (Beiler, 2023), an upper secondary school in Southeastern Norway organized a sheltered English instruction that allowed students that did not receive a passing grade to repeat the subject. This is not an official policy required by schools, but rather a challenge solved on a local level. Moreover, the school, which is now a mainstream school, previously did organize an entirely separate 3-year general studies classes for minority language students who would not benefit from the instruction in a mainstream class. Despite the new organization, the language department head at the school explains the rationale behind the partial return to sheltered

instruction to the inherent and currently out-of-reach expectations present in a mainstream class. The motive for strengthened sheltered English instruction is not only related to adapted language development but seen in light with the importance of secondary education attainment, which gives students opportunities in further education and career (Beiler, 2023, p. 104-105). As a result, the school has attempted to navigate its way through the official Anglonormative policies put in place as existing measurements of English proficiency. However, this automatically places students in an ascribed and minoritized role that is deficient in fixed proficiency norm for that particular grade.

Beiler (2023) also observed the students' participation during English class in a sheltered English class and a mainstream class. The sheltered class had six students, whilst the mainstream class had five newly arrived students from Ethiopia, Latvia, the Netherlands, Poland, and Thailand (Beiler, 2023, p. 102). The conducted observations were not of the same students across different classroom organizations, it is nonetheless useful to gain insight into students' participation in different classes. The author observed no vocal participation from the four remaining students in the mainstream class. At the same time, the reason for this may be many, students in the sheltered classroom explain their previous lack of oral engagement in the mainstream class as a result of their insufficient English competence compared to their majorized counterparts (Beiler, 2023, p. 106-107). Moreover, one participant in the sheltered class extends this linguistic polarization to two other students from Hungary and Iran who are both placed in the same group as the Norwegian students because of their good English proficiency. Most notably, Beiler asserts the student's utterance, "… one from Iran but she knew like very perfect English …" (Beiler, 2023, p. 107) as one that embodies English proficiency as more European and similarly an implied surprise with the "but". Such challenges are also confirmed by the interviewed teacher. The students' observed engagement is explained by the affordances that can be facilitated with such classroom organizations as the sheltering aspect allows for more room for adapted education. Even so, the Anglonormative norms in the curriculum are still present, its overall physical presence is weakened through the more adapted education and the physical representation of bodies that also needed more English instruction.

4.1.6 Studies reporting on inclusion and exclusion in education

Two studies report on inclusive and exclusive practices (Hilt, 2017; Krulatz & Iversen, 2020).

Hilt (2017) exclusively investigates how inclusion and exclusion of newly arrived students, in introductory classes, manifests in two upper secondary schools, Northside and Southside. Upon research this study is not limited to EAL, however since it includes utterances from English teachers and is about newly arrived students it qualified during the selection process. Northside is a general studies school and, depending on the subject, students were either placed in a basic or advanced class. Likewise, Southside, a vocational school, also had an intermediate class (Hilt, 2017, p. 590). Majority of data collected consist of interviews with teachers and students and a total of 48 hours of classroom observations. For the sake of relevancy, only elements relevant to the English subject will be presented.

In the context of the organization of introductory classes, inclusion and exclusion are two closely intertwined terms. Inclusion is understood as the set elements for participation, and exclusion as elements that either fall outside of the scope or unmet elements for participation (Hilt, 2017, p. 587). As mentioned in Section 2.2.1, the Education Act (1998), in mainstream classes, forbids arrangements based on academic capabilities. However, the law has made exemptions in order to develop segregated introductory offers which will prepare newly arrived students to transfer to a mainstream class. This organizational variant is described as "… an exclusion incorporated as inclusion, making visible a limit to inclusion in the mainstream system" (Hilt, 2017, p. 592). Students are included in the sense that they may receive a more adapted education which will prepare them to meet the requirements of a mainstream education, as well as peers with similar proficiency in English and other subjects. As a consequence, students can develop the necessary elements for inclusion which are needed in a mainstream class. However, this may not always be the case as students, even after transfer, may not fulfill necessary requirements in order to participate in class as presented by other studies in this section.

Even though students may not be explicitly excluded by teachers or their peers, existing achievement levels which the student is unable to fulfill functions as an element of exclusion. Especially when the student cannot match the necessary competence needed to participate. As described by studies in Section 4.1.5. These normative structures and the depiction of minority language students as deficient of the necessary cultural capital is reiterated by an English teacher in an introduction class:

> They have no references, you know, no matter what you are talking about in English class that is not about grammar and things […], if it is Bruce Springsteen or Queen Elizabeth, you know, history, it is in a way…completely empty, there is nothing there, science fiction, it is just…I was trying to explain what a science fiction movie is […] And they are so polite, so they just sit there and nod and smile, but I could see that they did not make sense of it. (Hilt, 2017, p. 591)

On the other hand, Krulatz and Iversen (2020), as presented in Table 3, connect the trilingual identity text project as a multilingual practice which can foster inclusion in a multilingual classroom as it facilitates for a learning environment where students can make use of their linguistic repertories and foster "… literacy development and enhances learning opportunities by increasing learners' sense of belonging and responsibility" (Krulatz & Iversen, 2020, p. 375). Such practices must not only be understood as an element of inclusion during language learning, but also a practice which at its core cover the core values of Norwegian education related to identity and cultural diversity (MER, 2017). Additionally, trilingual texts may function as a tool to develop and strengthen student's formal and academic skills in their home language(s). As a result, a student's linguistic repertoire beyond Norwegian and English is not only used as a tool to learn and understand other languages, but also languages which, like Norwegian and English, must be actively used and developed continuously.

4.2 Evaluating the research

Section 4.1 has sought to present the twelve selected studies with regards to RQ1 on which current trends can be found in research on EAL for newly arrived students. Based on the content of each study, six categories have been compartmentalized with some studies belonging to more than one category as the study can be understood as having several objectives. Following Rose et al. (2021), the following two sections will critically review the selected papers (see Table 2) with regards to their contents and the strengths and limitations of the methodological approaches in the selected studies.

As presented in Table 3, five of the twelve selected studies focus on multilingual practices. This is closely connected to studies reporting on teacher qualification and preparedness. However, research within this field is sparse as the research that has been conducted clearly depicts the contemporary situation of EAL for newly arrived students. Yet, the existing research highlights inadequate preparation and qualification to teach English in a multilingual classroom where individuals are already proficient in other languages than Norwegian.

The selected studies cover a variety of participants with students, teachers, and administrative staff in educational programs. Out of the twelve studies presented only three are about concrete pedagogical implementations in the classroom, such as translation (Beiler & Dewilde, 2020), trilingual identity texts (Krulatz & Iversen, 2020) and translanguaging (Beiler, 2021). More research is needed here in order to develop more concrete research-based practices that teachers can make use of. Additionally, more research is also necessary with regards to English and introduction programs for adult students in order to examine discrepancies that may consequently appear as a result of restricted access to learn and develop formal language skills in English.

4.3 Strengths and limitations of selected research

Table 7, on the next page, presents the different methods applied in the twelve studies.

Table 7. Methodologies of studies on EAL for newly arrived students in Norway

Study	Approach	Participants	Time	Main data source
Surkalovic (2014)	Mixed	94	15 minutes[2]	Questionnaire
Thomas & Breidlid (2015)	Qualitative	27	Not stated	Documentary analysis, interviews
Dahl & Krulatz (2016)	Mixed	180	4 hours[3]	Questionnaire and interviews
Hilt (2017)	Qualitative	21	48 hours[4]	Interviews, classroom observations, field conversations
Dahl et al. (2018)	Qualitative	49	6 hours[5]	Interviews, survey
Beiler (2020)	Linguistic ethnography	24	3 months	Field notes, video of classroom instruction, audio recordings (conversations), screen recordings, photographs (school), student texts, feedback videos, tasks, language portraits, school policy documents, video recordings, audio recording and interview notes.
Beiler & Dewilde (2020)	Linguistic ethnography	22	3 months	Field notes, classroom audio recordings, screen recordings, student texts, language portraits, video recordings, audio recordings and interviews
Krulatz & Iversen (2020)	Action research	14	4.5 weeks	Language use questionnaire, student reflection logs, students' identity texts, lesson plans and teacher's notes and reflections
Beiler (2021)	Linguistic ethnography	54[6]	4 months	Field notes, video and screen recordings, texts, language portraits, and teacher and student interviews

---

[2] For each student (Surkalovic, 2014, p. 6).

[3] 1 hour for each interviewee, N = 4 (Dahl & Krulatz, 2016, p. 8).

[4] This only includes observations. Time spent on interviews is not stated. The schools were visited for 7 months (Hilt, 2017, p. 589).

[5] 40 minutes for each interviewee, N = 9 (Dahl et al., 2018, p. 111).

[6] Minority language speakers, N = 14 (Beiler, 2021, p. 114-115).

Krulatz & Dahl (2021)	Mixed	29	Not stated	Website analysis, interviews, survey
Burner & Carlsen (2022)	Mixed	21	2017-2018	Questionnaire, classroom instruction observations, interviews
Beiler (2023)	Nexus analysis	13	4 months	Field notes, classroom video and audio recordings, language portraits and interviews

As seen in Table 7, questionnaire and interviews are the most commonly used methods to collect data. Majority of the studies utilized fewer methods for data collection, whilst other studies had a more extensive approach towards data gathering ranging from field notes to audio and video recordings. The rationale behind the magnitude of data sources may be understood as sources that can be used to gain insight, supplement the main data source(s), verify and to compare. This may be seen in relation with the fact that many studies applied an ethnographic approach (see Hilt, 2017; Beiler, 2020, 2021, 2023; Beiler & Dewilde, 2020). Some studies (Dahl et al., 2018) do not explicitly note on which approach was applied, however based on the content of the methodological approach, it can be understood as a qualitative study. Moreover, time spent on data gathering or when data, such as documents, was extracted is not reported on in some studies (see Krulatz & Dahl, 2021; Thomas & Breidlid, 2015). In that manner, the categorization in Table 7 is an extraction from available descriptions. Future studies should state approach and time more clearly.

4.4 Teaching English in mainstream and sheltered classrooms

This section of findings relates to RQ2:

- How can current research on EAL for newly arrived students highlight current English teaching practices in mainstream and sheltered classrooms?

In this section English teaching practices in the mainstream and sheltered classroom in the selected studies will be presented. As seen in Table 8, the organizations can take many different forms, but for the sake of simplicity they can be divided into two main categories: (i) mainstream instruction and (ii) sheltered instruction. As presented in the different studies in Table 2, many studies use the term introductory class or school when referring to sheltered classroom organizations for newly arrived students on lower or upper secondary education level. This should not be confused with introduction programs for adults over the age of 18 as it is reported in Dahl et al. (2018) and Krulatz and Dahl (2021). It should also be noted that ten studies are conducted in sheltered settings (see Table 8) and not mainstream classes. Three studies can also be placed in both a mainstream and sheltered context. This may be a shortcoming resulted by possibly narrowed search strategies applied during the literature search. Other elements such as age, languages represented, and location of the study has also been reviewed in Table 8. The rationale behind this is to highlight representation of different participant groups, which not only includes students but also teachers and other staff at educational institutions. Languages represented showcases the multilingual context, which also includes not only native languages but also other languages the students already know of. Location of the school has been included as one study (Dahl et al., 2018) suggests that geographical placement can be a factor that affects the composition of the student population, teachers, education, opportunities and the individual school's resources.

Nevertheless, the next section will report on English teaching practices in mainstream and sheltered classrooms.

Table 8. Classroom organizations in the selected studies

Study	Classroom organization	Age	Languages represented	Location
Surkalovic (2014)	Teacher education program	Pre-service teachers	Not stated	Oslo
Thomas & Breidlid (2015)	Upper secondary level	Upper secondary age	Not stated[7]	Oslo
Dahl & Krulatz (2016)	Primary and lower secondary education, reception school	Teachers	Not stated	Oslo, Bergen, Trondheim, Stavanger/Sandnes, Tromsø, and more.
Hilt (2017)	Introductory classes	Upper secondary age	Not stated[8]	Not stated
Dahl et al. (2018)	Introduction program	Teachers and students 19-45	Amharic, Arabic, Belin, Dari, Fur, Oromo, Saho, Somali, Tigre and Tigrinya	Rural community
Beiler (2020)	Introductory classes	13-16	Albanian, Arabic, Cantonese, Cebuano, English, French, German, Greek, Hindi, Italian, Japanese, Mandarin, Norwegian, Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Somali, Spanish, Swahili, Tagalog, Thai,	Not stated

---

[7] Eight countries are represented through the participants' parents' country of origin (Thomas & Beiler, 2015, p. 363).

[8] In total, ten countries are represented in the two introduction classes (Hilt, 2017, p. 590).

			Turkish, Urdu, and Vietnamese	
Beiler & Dewilde (2020)	Introductory classes	13-16	24[9]	Not stated
Krulatz & Iversen (2020)	Center for Intensive Norwegian Language Learning	12-16	Albanian, Arabic, Bosnian, Cebuano, English, Greek, Polish, Romanian, Russian, Somali, Tagalog, Turkish, Vietnamese and Visayan[10]	Oslo
Beiler (2021)	Accelerated class, mainstream class and sheltered English class	10th grade and up	Unknown[11]	Not stated
Krulatz & Dahl (2021)	Introduction program	Teachers and students	Not stated	Rural community
Burner & Carlsen (2022)	Introductory school	Teachers	Albanian, Arabic, Bosnian, Serbian, Kurdish, Polish, Russian, Somali, Thai and Tigrinya	Urban area
Beiler (2023)	Sheltered English class, mainstream class	Department head, teacher and students	Not stated[12]	Southeastern Norway

---

[9] See Beiler (2020).

[10] Five participants have two home languages (HL) (Krulatz & Iversen, 2020, p. 377).

[11] Minority language speakers, N = 14 (Beiler, 2021, p. 114-115).

[12] Newly arrived students from ten different countries, N = 13 (Beiler, 2023, p. 102).

The main objective of all sheltered classroom organizations, namely introductory or reception class, is that newly arrived students transfer to a mainstream class. The mainstream class, similarly, to the sheltered class for newly arrived students, is composed of a diverse group of students with different backgrounds and proficiencies in English (Beiler, 2021, 2023). Unlike the sheltered class, the mainstream class is also made up of students who have the majorized language, Norwegian, as their native language and students who possess other necessary capitals needed in the mainstream classroom in Norway. Similarly to the objectives of introduction programs for adult immigrants, introductory classes function as preparatory and integrational program to quickly transfer to mainstream classes. Subsequently, the latter classroom organization is seen as more representative for the Norwegian society, and students should then receive education and instruction in necessary prerequisites for this classroom. As seen in Table 8 only two studies explicitly investigate newly arrived or minority language students in the English mainstream class (Beiler, 2021, 2023). Thomas and Breidlid (2015) mention that the interviews were conducted at upper secondary level. However, this is not necessarily synonymous with the mainstream class as the organization of sheltered English classes is possible for students who are not enrolled in introductory classes as seen in Beiler (2021, 2023). Instead, the insight into the organizational level can be an indicator of the students' ages and the curriculum. This may suggest a terminological shift in the selected research where from Hilt (2017) and onwards have clear reference to the study group and the classroom organization. On the other hand, the three studies before 2017 (Surkalovic, 2014; Thomas & Breidlid, 2015; Dahl & Krulatz, 2016). Dahl and Krulatz (2016) mention reception school one time as this is not referenced to throughout the paper. However, it must be stated that this examination is not an indicator that earlier do not actively make use of terminologies on student groups and classroom organization as each study must be interpreted within its own context and time. For instance, Dahl and Krulatz (2016) and Surkalovic (2014) mainly focus on multilingualism in the context of preparedness and qualifications to teach in such classes. Regardless of terminological differences, these concepts can be further transferred to different classroom organizations and student groups as the purpose is to meet the needs of the multilingual classroom. Consequently, the scare research on mainstream classes and absence of concretized classroom organization can make it challenging to fairly illustrate different teaching practices in the mainstream classes. Alternatively, teaching practices in the

mainstream classroom can be extracted from experiences from sheltered classrooms as their manifestation is the result of insufficient instruction from mainstream classrooms.

English teaching practices in the accelerated and mainstream classes with minority language students in Beiler (2021) reveal less occurrences of translanguaging practices in these classes compared to the sheltered class. Beiler (2021) describes the mainstream and accelerated classroom as particularly dominated by monoglossic ideologies as even the majorized bilingual translanguaging of English-Norwegian was rare. The leeway to translanguage was relatively restricted, instead the students were advised to describe unfamiliar words in English rather than resort to the Norwegian word and ask for permission to use Norwegian. In this manner, translanguaging in the accelerated class is rare and monitored. The monolingual practices in this classroom can be understood in the context of their high achievement in English. Likewise, Norwegian was not encouraged in the mainstream class. However, since the mainstream class is made up of different proficiency levels, depending on the students' level during teacher-student interactions the students were allowed to resort to Norwegian when they could not express it in English (Beiler, 2021). This signals a firm separation between English and the student's linguistic repertoire, and, albeit rare, if translanguaging is to appear Norwegian is the preferred language. Nonetheless, minoritized translanguaging was not suppressed nor encouraged by the English teacher in the accelerated and mainstream class (Beiler, 2021), the absence of this in and of itself moralizes only-English as the achievement mark for high language proficiency. Although use of minoritized languages did not result in negative reactions from teachers, Beiler (2021, p. 124) notes an incident were students associate the use of such languages as a suspicious act. Language policing as described from teachers in Hilt (2017) is thus further transferred to students when they police each other's use of other languages beyond Norwegian and English. The scarce presence of minoritized translanguaging should be understood as a side effect of both the lack of explicit efforts on minoritized translanguaging, but also set and desired inclusion criteria regarding which languages are used. Through the use of minoritized languages, students immediately run the risk of being positioned as the Other as it deviates from the majorized languages. Such segregation does not always need to be explicitly stated or practiced but may appear as consequences of silent and existing policies and practices which signal what is and is not desired. One participant, Shirin, in particular "… stood out for asserting her right to make language choices based on her identity and to reject others' language policing and racialization" (Beiler, 2021, p. 129). Although the student is not categorized as a newly

arrived student, her experiences attest to a flaw within the education system that can explicitly or implicitly prevent or discourage students from using minoritized languages. Comparatively, unlike the trilingual writing project in Krulatz and Iversen (2020), the non-explicit focus on utilizing and developing the student's existing linguistic repertoire risks weakening multilingualism as a resource in and outside of school (MER, 2017).

On the other hand, affords students the opportunity to be placed in a classroom that is adapted to their academic level. For example, four newly arrived students who were initially enrolled in the introductory class made a partial transfer to the accelerated class (Beiler, 2021, p. 115). This suggests that the students had such high English proficiency that it was more in accordance with the accelerated class than the initial transfer class, mainstream. Despite of this, educational backgrounds and Norwegian proficiency, and not English, are the main factors for newly arrived students' placement in introductory programs and transfer to the mainstream class. Although, students may not have necessary proficiency in Norwegian, high achievement levels in subjects such as English creates an opportunity to fulfill an inclusion criterion required by the overarching policies.

On the other hand, the full immersion to a mainstream English classroom may be counterproductive for newly arrived students who do not yet have the necessary prerequisites to partake in the classroom in the same way as their peers (Beiler, 2021, 2023). Introductory classes are not in the same way as mainstream classes necessarily prevented from smaller organizations according to subject levels. As a consequence, the transfer to a mainstream class may run the risk of relocating the student to an environment they do not have sufficient language prerequisites to meet the official achievement levels for their grade. When there is a set overarching and regulating achievement policy for the English subject, the student is placed in a context which is near impossible and unrealistic to achieve.

Similarly to adapted education for students with high English proficiency, sheltered English instruction either in the form of a sheltered repeat English course (Beiler, 2021, 2023) or as introductory class (Hilt, 2017; Beiler, 2020; Beiler & Dewilde, 2020; Krulatz & Iversen, 2020; Burner & Carlsen, 2022) gives room for a more tailored education. Additionally, opportunities of participation can be better facilitated when the overall language instruction is adapted to the student's level. Nevertheless, sheltered instruction has to equally prepare the students for the official requirements that they are assessed by. The policies for introductory

classes may also limit hours spent on English instruction as seen in Beiler (2020) with nine hours of Norwegian and only two hours of English.

4.4.1 Cultural reference

Even though development of Norwegian language skills is the core reason behind the sheltered organization, it may be argued that "Newly arrived students are placed in segregated classes in order to catch up, not just due to lack of language skills, but also a lack of sufficient learning strategies and subject content knowledge" (Hilt, 2017, p. 591). Consequently, the mainstream classroom becomes the benchmark for what is desired and accepted. Thus, Hilt (2017) highlights introductory classes' role as a form of reeducation as a way to form individuals into what the greater society requires. In the case of the English classroom, regardless of its organizational structure, references are often made to the Westen English-speaking world, as referenced through Bruce Springsteen, Queen Elizabth and science fiction (Hilt, 2017, p. 591). As a consequence, the inherent expectation for students to know about these Western figures and concepts presupposes the majority culture in the West as a test for cultural knowledge. Thomas and Breidlid (2015) connect that such expectations of cultural reference in English national tests puts children who have grown up in a different environment and culture at disadvantage as the contents in the tests may not only require language proficiency, but also proficiency in the major culture. A teacher in Thomas and Breidlid (2015) reasons the weighted focus on UK and US culture as consequence of the tight relationship between the different nations. Additionally, the teacher views these non-Norwegian nations as capable of producing more culture compared to other nations (Thomas & Breidlid, 2015, p. 365). However, this constricted inclusion of majority cultures from a few nations in the English subject, risks having "… nothing about the Muslims and Arabs as if the British had nothing to do with us" (Thomas & Breidlid, 2015, p. 364), as uttered by a student. Such utterances suggests that the English subjects heavily focus on the English-speaking world does not account for its colonial history in other nations.

5 Discussion

In this section relevant findings from the twelve studies will be discussed. To keep in line with the research questions, Section 5.1 through 5.3 of the discussion will relate to the current trends and teaching practices in sheltered and mainstream classes, drawn from the compartmentalization in Section 4. For this reason, relevant findings with regards to current EAL trends (RQ1) and English teaching practices in mainstream and sheltered classroom (RQ2) for newly arrived students will be discussed interchangeably.

The present discussion is first and foremost limited to the findings from the twelve selected papers in this systematic review. For this reason, the findings discussed are not transferrable to other contexts as they have been confined to the categories compartmentalized by the author. Nor should this discussion be regarded as representative for all EAL research trends and teaching practices for newly arrived students in Norway. It must also be noted that not all findings will be discussed, instead relevant findings which are of interest and need further elaboration will be discussed. Additionally, other possibly relevant studies which have not been selected, due to the limitations from the set requirements or limitations during the search process, further limits this discussion.

5.1 Language perception and multilingual practices in multilingual classrooms

In Section 4.1.1 and Section 4.1.2 findings with regard to perception and multilingual practices have been presented. The five identified studies on multilingual practices (Beiler, 2020, 2021; Beiler & Dewilde, 2020; Krulatz & Iversen, 2020; Burner & Carlsen, 2022) are for the most part conducted in sheltered classrooms, but for the sake of simplicity this section will account for all classroom organizations as multilingual practices should be present in all classrooms. Moreover, perception does not only relate to perception of multilingualism (Burner & Carlsen, 2022), but also language perception of English in introduction programs for adults (Dahl et al., 2018). For this reason, the content of introduction programs for adults, with regards to English, must be discussed in light of the language's position in education and working life.

The topic of multilingualism in English classrooms in Norway is a discussion that goes beyond classrooms with newly arrived students. Applying existing policies in education and teacher education programs, the basis for every classroom must be understood as a

multilingual and multicultural environment. This may also be seen in relation with growing immigration and Norwegian-born children to immigrant parents. For this reason, examination of perceptions on English and multilingualism, as well as the manifestation of multilingual practice is of particular interest across all language classrooms. Such analyzation may concretize how multilingual practices that make full use of student's linguistic repertoire can emerge in pedagogical language practices.

Perception and beliefs regarding multilingualism amongst English teachers in Norway can be understood as relatively unified. In this review, English teachers are for the most part positive in their stance towards multilingualism, however discrepancies often appear when their multilingual beliefs and practices are further examined. This unharmonious manifestation may be understood as a consequence of insufficient knowledge of multilingualism and how to apply theories and tools in their pedagogical practices (Dahl & Krulatz, 2016). These gaps can appear through a monolingual favoritism where Norwegian is the preferred language of support during English instruction. This monolingual approach does not resemble the student's linguistic repertoire as other languages are also available for translanguaging and runs the risk of moralizing Norwegian and English as the more suitable languages and minority languages as unfit for educational contexts (Iversen, 2017). The presence of such approaches can be seen in relation to the overarching aim to develop Norwegian proficiency and Norwegian as the main language of instruction in Norwegian schools.

Moreover, Calafato (2021) connects the absence of other languages in the English instruction as a result of the well-established English instruction since the first grade. Consequently, students are expected to be proficient in English. Additionally, arguments can be made for Norwegian because of its position as more typologically similarly to English. However, this argument is also used against teaching students English and Norwegian simultaneously (Burner & Carlsen, 2022).

Whilst minoritized languages may not be sufficiently utilized in the English classrooms, the organization of English instruction, in comparison to other classrooms, is weakly positioned for adult students in the introduction programs investigated by Dahl et al. (2018) and Krulatz and Dahl (2021). This diminished estimation of English as useful resource for further education and working life does not only position Norwegian as the more favorable language but does so at the cost of English, which in turn can extend the students opportunities as seen through job advertisements and university programs that require English language skills

(Krulatz & Dahl, 2021). As such, to devaluate a language that holds such a strong position in Norway is to limit adult immigrants from opportunities accessible to their peers.

Consequently, the heightened focus on only Norwegian language skills and to acquire necessary certificate for work runs the risk of reproducing social and economic gaps between those who possess necessary linguistic capital and those who do not. In Section 4.1.2 and Section 4.1.5.2 findings indicate a discrepancy between opportunities available by knowing English and the absence of English instruction and perception of its role for adult immigrants. Furthermore, the access to higher educational attainment can be seen in relation to SSB's variable on parents' level of education. When investigating the student's education these are influencing factors on the student's achievement levels and educational attainment. These effects are visible early on as stated by Grendal (2022), "[r]results from primary and secondary education suggest that seeds which reproduce social differences start early and are already clearly visible at the beginning of primary education" (author's translation, Grendal, 2022). Similarly, as presented in Section 4.1.5.1, country background to immigrant students and Norwegian-born students to immigrant parents is an influencing factor.

In the case of English national tests, students with backgrounds from countries beyond the Anglosphere are overrepresented in low level scores. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to account for the possibly many factors behind such scores, but the scores can, as discussed by Thomas and Breidlid (2015), be interpreted in relation to the student's country background. For this reason, country background can put many student groups at a disadvantage as the language and education they received or grew up with is in contrast to the European model. Consequently, the absence of English instruction in adult introduction programs stands in stark contrast to the values championed for students in the Education Act (1998) and core curriculum (MER, 2017). Instead, it could possibly put an already vulnerable student group at further disadvantage for generations to come because of restricted access to social mobility.

With the exception of two studies from adult introduction program (Dahl et al., 2018; Krulatz & Dahl, 2021) and an interview with the head of a language department (Beiler, 2023), none of the twelve studies reviewed extensively investigate discourses about English in introductory programs amongst non-pedagogical staff. Existing discourses can be extracted from interviews with teachers and administrators in Dahl et al. (2018) and Krulatz and Dahl (2021). These interviews reveal that the devaluation of English is a perception shared by many, despite their awareness of English's position in Norway. Furthermore, this form of

language devaluation in such programs is suggested to be an element of hinderance, as it in the long term potentially risks restricting access to opportunities. Although the program is individually tailored, such cases are telling for how agents of the government, that is teachers and administrators, put policies in force. On the other hand, the head of the language department in Beiler (2023) indicates, through the local policy solution, that a deficiency is present within the national policies on proficiency achievement expected of minority language students. Not only do these performance expectations influence the student's experience of mastery during English instruction and their overall language development, but it also functions as an element that prevents students from fully completing vg1. Thus, if the student is not able to pass the subject their road to completing upper secondary education may potentially take longer, or potentially demotivate students to drop out of their studies. For this reason, English in Norwegian education is not only a language that offers opportunities, but it is also a subject that students must pass in order to receive necessary certificate from upper secondary education.

Similarly, Bergström (2024) investigates discourses on English in the Swedish equivalence to introductory programs for upper secondary age students, Language Introduction Program (LIP). These discourses are seen through the lens of Foucault's governmentality. Whilst the studies reviewed, as seen above, have not investigated a variety of non-pedagogical staff, Bergström (2024) examines how discourses manifest among non-pedagogical staff, such as principals, counselors, mentors and so on, in LIP. Each country and each region have their own policies to follow, and as such their practices may differ. However, the Swedish context because of geographical proximity and similar ideologies and practices in the Nordic Model in education (Blossing et al., 2014). These discourses cannot be transferred to account for possible discourses in the Norwegian context, however the Swedish context can be used to understand and expand how different discourses arise. Consequently, in Bergström (2024), these governmental bodies in this organization have an active role in the content and organization of LIP, as well as the guidance of students with regards to their individual educational plan and future ambitions. Similarly, to the Norwegian context English is regarded as a difficult subject and is devalued in favor of Swedish, despite of the important position that English holds in the society. For this reason, discourses in Bergström (2024) position English as a language that is possibly unattainable for newly arrived students and as a language that is first and foremost necessary at higher levels in society (Bergström, 2024, p.

31). The presumption here, as in the case of adult students, is that students should first and foremost prioritize the majority language and seek opportunities within these confined lines.

On the other hand, these limitations can also manifest through non-pedagogical staff's encouragement to choose vocational programs instead of theoretical programs in upper secondary education (Bergström, 2024). Although none of the reviewed studies in this thesis present such discourses, it can be understood from the heightened focus on Norwegian and entering the workforce for adult students. Thus, the priority becomes to acquire enough Norwegian skills to contribute to society. This may not only be understood as a practice necessary to integrate and acquire financial independency, but also as an element which could potentially disfavor immigrant students as it does not account for skills necessary for higher education, and the opportunities offered from such institutions. This assumes that the English subject and theoretical programs are too challenging for students, whilst vocational programs are more within the student's reach. As such, the student's career and educational opportunities, despite challenges that naturally appear in a new country, are regarded as "set and unfixable" (Bergström, 2024, p. 30). This can be seen in relation to the overarching educational policies, which do not rightfully account for the discrepancies between the student's current level and the level they are expected to perform at, regardless of their prior educational experience and experience with English. Discourses regarding expected educational and career opportunities for Swedish students and adult students in Norway are two closely related discourses that set precedent for what is expected and desired from newly arrived students as opposed to students who are already holders of necessary capital required in order to afford different opportunities.

In the case of newly arrived students in Norway, studies on specific multilingual practices focus on translation practices (Beiler & Dewilde, 2020), translanguaging (Beiler, 2021) and multilingual writing practices (Beiler & Dewilde, 2020; Krulatz & Iversen, 2020). Krulatz and Iversen (2020) stand out as the only study that implements concrete multilingual practice in the English classroom. Such tangible practices through action research can actualize multilingual practices which can be applied and adapted by other teachers. On the other hand, other studies on multilingual practices can give insight into how multilingual practices can be facilitated and incorporated as a core teaching approach that is present regardless of the content of the assignment or instruction. However, it remains that majority of the studies relevant to multilingualism can be described as obtaining a more broad and explorative

approach as they generally examine how multilingual practices manifest in the classroom or teachers' perceptions of multilingualism (Surkalovic, 2014; Dahl & Krulatz, 2016; Beiler, 2020; Burner & Carlsen, 2022). Additionally, the studies on translation, translanguaging and trilingual identity texts are first and foremost studies on writing instruction. For this reason, studies on multilingual practices of other language elements in the classroom are scarce, as, for example, oral multilingual practices must be extracted from articles on writing practices.

The noticeable absence of specific activities and materials, as discussed above, indicates that more investment is needed in such research. Additionally, this scarcity on multilingual practices for newly arrived students can also be understood as a limitation that appears as a result of research search limited to a specific student group. Instead, studies that do not directly translate to sheltered classrooms or newly arrived students should be equally examined as they may provide insight into multilingual practices which can be adapted to each classroom. For instance, at primary school level Schipor (2022) examines tree types of multilingual practices by two teachers (Schipor, 2022, p. 9-15). The background for a few of these multilingual practices can be related to the theoretical input on multilingualism that the teachers received during a training program which took place prior to this, as well as their own pedagogical evaluation and experience. For example, language portraits did not only function as a tool for linguistic reflection, but also as a practice that can build relationships between students, students-teachers, as well as a method to include the student's parents as a collaborative partner (Schipor, 2022). Language portraits have been utilized in three of the twelve studies (Beiler, 2020, 2021; Beiler & Dewilde, 2020) as a method to collect data on students. However, it may also be a useful activity that is implemented early on in the English instruction as it can set the precedent for valuing the recognition and utilization of student's linguistic repertoire as a resourceful tool. Additionally, it gives the teacher insight to how students value and position different languages which can be further used as a foundation for how different languages can be supported and developed alongside majorized languages as seen from the trilingual identity texts in Krulatz and Iversen (2020). Similarly, Krulatz et al. (2018) examine an identity text project at linguistically diverse primary and secondary schools. However, explicit occurrences of student's linguistic repertoire in written text were not as equally present as in Krulatz and Iversen's study (2020). As a result, such project developments and theoretical instruction on multilingualism as described in these three pedagogical implementations (Krulatz et al., 2018; Krulatz & Iversen, 2020; Schipor, 2022) can further develop research-based pedagogical practices.

5.2 Qualification and preparedness to teach in a multilingual classroom

In this section findings from Section 4.1.3 and Section 4.1.4 will be discussed. Two studies have been identified as examining qualification (Dahl & Krulatz, 2016; Burner & Carlsen, 2022), and two other studies investigate preparedness (Surkalovic, 2014; Dahl & Krulatz, 2016) to teach English in a multilingual classroom. Elements regarding qualification and preparedness are closely related. Studies identified in both categories report not only on the participants official qualifications to teach in a multilingual classroom, but also investigates to what extent the participants themselves or the authors' regard them as prepared to teach English in a multilingual context.

The gap between positive beliefs and actual competence and practices in a multilingual classroom can, as seen in Section 5.1, be reduced through competence development. A more recent longitudinal study conducted by Krulatz et al. (2024) examines to what degree professional development (PD) on multilingualism in two English teachers at primary level affect their beliefs and practices after workshops. A similar longitudinal study by Lorenz et al. (2021) found that positive beliefs were indeed developed after PD workshops, however multilingual practices were for the most part not readily practiced and encouraged. On the other hand, Krulatz et al. (2024) found considerable differences between the participant which were attributed to their educational and language background as the participant who had most recently finished with their education and grew up in a bilingual home had an overall better score than the participant who grew up in a monolingual Norwegian home and had a MA in Norwegian linguistics (Krulatz et al., 2024).

Similar language profiles are observable in two English teachers in Burner and Carlsen (2022) with one teacher having L1 Norwegian and the other teacher with L1 Arabic-Kurdish. However, the teacher's non-Norwegian L1 is not necessarily synonymous with acceptance of use of other languages than Norwegian during English instruction as Norwegian still held a strong position. Moreover, the sequential view of language learning was present as the development of Norwegian proficiency took a more prioritized role (Burner & Carlsen, 2022). Although, the findings and conclusions drawn from this study are limited to this context it indicates that individual factors are not necessarily beneficial one their own, as these agents can also reproduce monolingual approaches. Instead, the present discussion identifies a gap with regards to a longitudinal investigation on TD and concrete multilingual practices in lower and upper secondary level.

The uncertainty of making use of linguistic repertoires beyond the majority languages is also reported on during teacher education programs. Similarly to in-service English teachers (Dahl & Krulatz, 2016), pre-service English teachers feel they do not have necessary knowledge and experience required to teach in multilingual classrooms (Neokleous & Karpava, 2023). As reflected upon in Surkalovic (2014), this uncertainty may be understood in the context of the contents within teacher education programs.

Although an examination of the contents, with regards to multilingualism, in different teacher education programs is beyond the scope of this thesis, it is worth to briefly discuss how governing policies lay the foundation for preparedness to teach English in a multilingual classroom. For the sake of relevancy, only the national guidelines for lower and upper secondary teacher education (UHR, 2017) will be discussed. The guideline, in addition to the official regulations does not explicitly refer to multilingualism or students' linguistic repositories. Instead, the facilitation of multilingual practices can be extracted from the terminological use of 'diversity' as the professionally oriented courses in pedagogy and didactics must prepare and develop pre-service teachers' ability to meet the requirements of the standard diverse classroom in Norway. The terminology may entail various interpretation, but the guideline is clear in its statement that the Norwegian school is diverse, and that consequently this diversity is an important factor for how students learn and how teachers and schools organize their education (UHR, 2017, p. 12). It must then be understood that pedagogical practices will be correspondingly affected by the country's diverse state. Thus, one may argue that the use of student's diverse languages, beyond the majorized languages, is a valuable prerequisite, rather than an impediment, for their language learning. Such beneficial practices have been reported in Section 4.1.1 through translation, translanguaging and trilingual texts. Additionally, the utilization and acknowledgement of such languages in educational settings may lay the foundation for a pedagogical practice that seeks to cultivate linguistic diversity rather than discard it in favor of monolingual ideologies.

Ultimately, the defense for multilingualism can be reasoned from national guidelines, however interpretation of official documents does not adequately explain why some pre-service English teachers are not prepared to meet linguistically diverse classrooms with multilingual practices (Surkalovic, 2014; Neokleous & Karpava, 2023). Therefore, it is worth to further investigate the more concrete content of teacher education programs in different higher educations. Additionally, the parallel experience of unpreparedness to teach English to

linguistically diverse classrooms among pre- and in-service English teachers must be considered by future studies.

5.3 Educational policies as factors of inclusion and exclusion

In this section educational policies with regards to the English subject will be discussed as elements of inclusion and exclusion of newly arrived students. As presented in Section 4.1.5, Beiler (2023) and Thomas and Breidlid (2015), investigate educational policies through paradigm of Anglonormativity and Angloglobalization respectively. From these studies the heightened focus on English in Norwegian education can be understood as elements of colonization, which disadvantages certain bodies. Thomas and Breidlid (2015) critically analyze the popularity of English in education in and of itself, whilst Beiler (2023) examines how the set educational policies with regards to expectations from achievement levels and classroom organizations can disadvantage newly arrived students with insufficient English proficiency. Whilst these studies identify challenges present in educational institutions where English is a compulsory subject, Krulatz and Dahl (2021) problematize that the non-compulsory inclusion of English in adult introduction programs is not harmonious with English requirements present in higher education programs and job advertisements. In combination with Hilt's (2017) examination of the introductory class, these policies, as well as the variants of classroom organizations can be understood as elements of inclusion and exclusion.

In Beiler (2023) local discourses regarding the organization of English instruction is presented through an administrative staff. The organization of a sheltered English instruction for students who had not passed the subject the prior school year, can be understood as a local discourse of governing policies. An administrative staff at the school suggests that it is not the student's academic capabilities, as they partake in other subjects, that is the deficient element, but rather the organizational structures. Even though, the official assessment framework still stands for newly arrived students, the placement of students with low proficiency in English in a contrastively proficient classroom risks to further exclude the student as they do not have the necessary proficiencies required for inclusion. Consequently, this negatively impacts the student's opportunities to master and their self-image (Beiler, 2023, p. 103-104). Thus, the school's establishment of a sheltered English instruction can be understood as an effort to overcompensate for the gaps in national policies, as well as adapt and find solutions for local challenges. In such contexts, the mainstream classroom, although it is a place for all and is the

set and favored classroom, is not able to meet the needs of all students if the desire is that newly arrived students, like all students, must be given the opportunity for adapted education in English and pass a compulsory subject which is required in order to receive a upper secondary diploma or craft certificate.

As discussed above, a possible policy solution is to repeat the subject where the second round of English instruction is first and foremost made up of minority language students. Likewise, schools can also offer the subject over two years. Although such solutions give more room for content within the instruction, as it does not entirely focus on passing the subject after the first year, it can be challenging to convince students to willingly agree to this if they wish to continue their studies without an additional subject to concern themselves with. Moreover, it requires resources which schools may not have access to. Alternatively, minority language students enrolled in general studies have the opportunity to allocate 280 hours from elective program subjects over the span of three years (NDET, 2023). This only applies for general studies as students enrolled in vocational programs have compulsory program subjects in their educational plan and cannot allocate hours from these subjects. Since this solution is voluntary and given that hours are taken from other program subjects, students must later take the subject(s) as *privatist*. As such, this individual prioritization may come with financial consequences. These two solutions are one of many possible solutions within the current framework, however they require significant amounts of resources, and one must also consider that students have other subjects that may be equally as challenging as English.

In the new Education Act (2023), as mentioned in Section 2.2.1, it may be understood that there is room for sheltered instruction, because of academic levels, within the mainstream classroom. It seems then that adapted English instruction for students with insufficient English proficiency is more plausible through a more explicit emphasis on when sheltered instruction is allowed or necessary. On the one hand, this facilitates adapted education. However, it undeniably shelters and segregates the students from the larger student group in the classroom. Paradoxically, if such sheltered instructions are to be organized it further substantiates gaps in the English curriculum since the sheltered instruction does not exempt the student from the official expected achievement measurements.

Although overarching policies give support to the importance of knowing many languages the hierarchical evaluation of languages, as seen through teaching practices and perception, risks to police and devaluate other minority languages in the classroom. As such, giving a

preferential treatment to Norwegian in English instruction, even if the goal is to learn both languages, signals other languages as subordinate to the majorized languages. These views are not only present in which languages are utilized in learning, but also which languages are generally used in the classroom. For instance, the use of other languages beyond the shared languages, Norwegian and English, are by some teachers viewed as an element of exclusion of other students (Hilt, 2017). As such, other languages are only permissible when students need it as a support during instruction. While such language policies attempt to prevent exclusion of the overall student group, it does not consider the students experienced exclusion during English and Norwegian instruction if they do not have sufficient proficiency to understand the instruction. Moreover, it stigmatizes languages and the development of relationships between students on the basis of a shared language. Additionally, when the use of other languages is thought of as an element of exclusion it risks to police such occurrences. As such, proficient Norwegian or English speakers are freely given the room to express themselves in a language they master, whilst other speakers, per such language policy, are prohibited, policed and discouraged to do the same, as speakers of other languages must prioritize inclusion of all and ascribe to the dominating ideology which favors majorized languages. This may be understood through how "[e]pistemic exclusion occurs when an individual is denied the opportunity to contribute as an epistemic agent" (Wee et al., 2023, p. 17), as students are prevented from participation. Such language policing should also be seen in relation to monolingual practices in English instruction as it further perpetuates the same languages as the more desirable languages for learning and social inclusion.

A student who only uses Norwegian or English can be understood as a student who fulfills such inclusion criteria. On the other hand, such policing risks to signal to students that occurrence of minoritized languages is not desired and excludes other students. As such, students begin to police each other and perceive the use of minoritized language as threat since it excludes other students who do not understand the language (Beiler, 2021). Although the intention is that students shall feel inclusion through the usage of a shared language, overarching policies and practices which favor majorized languages create policing agents, within the student population, that may further uphold such ideologies.

5.4 Pedagogical implications

The presented and discussed findings of English as an additional language for newly arrived students present several pedagogical implications highly relevant for teachers, school leaders, teacher education programs and policy makers. It is imperative to understand how different challenges come to light when certain student groups are not able to meet necessary requirements. Newly arrived students, like many other students, cannot be held accountable for insufficient English proficiency that is not in accordance with the expected requirements in Norway. Instead, this must be understood as a gap within a policy which does not fully account for and acknowledge student's differing experience with English and education. As such, it seems necessary to pivot the responsibility away from the student and onto the school system and its inherently flawed policies.

All findings from Section 4 have several implications for teachers. The findings present both achievements and challenges with teaching English to newly arrived students. These findings may function as a support for teachers in multilingual classrooms, as well as a critical insight into existing practices and solutions. Moreover, they may contribute to change how English teachers approach language instructions altogether in multilingual classrooms. These findings may implicate more pedagogical awareness towards the teacher's own practice and attitudes towards monolingual instruction. Through awareness and investment in multilingual practices, teachers can facilitate for a practice that is in accordance with the core values in Norwegian education.

The present findings suggest that school leaders, both on municipal and county level, can implement necessary local policy solutions. Accordingly, they are an important collaborating partner for teachers. In order to meet the needs of their teachers and student groups, school leaders need resources and policies that account for challenges which may arise in sheltered and mainstream classrooms. Although school leaders are limited by several factors it is imperative that they use their positions to actively combat the pedagogical and structural challenges which are present at the local schools.

Even though only one study exclusively reports on pre-service teachers (Surkalovic, 2014), it is made evident through several studies that teachers seek and need further education and competence development in multilingualism. This suggests that the content of teacher education programs and teacher educators must meet the needs of the multilingual classroom.

Furthermore, pre-service teachers must be made aware of both challenges and opportunities pertaining to multilingualism during their teacher education.

The existing policies as indicated by the findings does not meet the needs of newly arrived students with little or no experience with English as it risks to further incapacitate a vulnerable student group. As seen in Beiler (2021, 2023), local solutions can be made to afford the students an opportunity to repeat English and further increase their chance to either pass the subject or develop sufficient language proficiency to partake in the mainstream instructions. However, this suggests a gap in the overarching policies, and as a consequence it is necessary to further develop nationwide policies which will not be negatively affected by the individual school's ability or access to resources for such solutions.

5.5 Suggestions for future research

Before the discussion in this thesis is concluded, suggestions for future research for EAL for newly arrived students will be presented. The suggestions will consist of suggestions for future systematic reviews on this topic, as well as general suggestions based on the twelve studies reviewed and discussed.

Future systematic reviews on EAL for newly arrived students in Norway should aim to apply requirements beyond the ones present in this thesis, for example, by including doctoral dissertations. This could result in more hits by including papers of different nature. Additionally, as a result of the scarce research available, it is suggested that future systematic reviews are not only confined to research conducted in a single country. Given that similar introduction programs in Sweden exist, the research should aim to, at the very least, expand literature search to a Nordic context. Inclusion of different countries with different policies may allow for a comparative analysis. Moreover, such inclusion can contribute to necessary discussions and developments necessary to improve the current English instruction practices for newly arrived students and minority language students with insufficient experience with English.

As previously identified in the discussion section, future research on EAL for newly arrived students in Norway should seek to investigate concrete multilingual practices rather than a general investigation of multilingual practices. Three studies examined in this thesis, for the most part, examine writing practices. For this reason, more studies are needed on different writing practices in multilingual classrooms, as well as other language elements beyond

writing. In addition, a more specific implementation either through pedagogical development or concrete activities is necessary in order to examine to what degree such implementations effect practices. Furthermore, studies of longitudinal nature are also needed in this field. Lastly, a document analysis of teacher education programs is needed in order to map an outline of its contents in relation to multilingualism and its pertaining contents.

6 Conclusion

In this thesis, existing research trends on English as an additional language for newly arrived students in Norwegian educational institutions have been examined. The contents of the selected research papers outline the current trends into six categories; (i) multilingual practices, (ii) perception, (iii) teacher qualification, (iv) preparedness, (v) educational language policy and (vi) inclusion and exclusion. Upon further examination, many categories are intertwined. Thus, some studies can be naturally placed in more than one category.

The twelve reviewed studies, all together, paint a dysfunctional educational system which disfavors newly arrived students with little or no experience of English. Likewise, students who have received English instruction in their home country, in comparison to the official achievement levels to their grade, can be regarded as having insufficient English language competency as the content of the English instruction may vary from the two countries. For this reason, students who have little or no experience with similar educational culture and policies, as in Norway, are inherently treated as deficient agents lacking necessary capital required in the Norwegian educational system.

Overarching educational policies promote multilingualism as the standard in English classrooms in Norway. However, in the studies reviewed, pedagogical practices highlight challenges with applying these core values into worthwhile multilingual practices that are present throughout the English instruction. In the multilingual classroom Norwegian is positioned as the preferred language of support. Particularly in the case of newly arrived students, it is suggested that English instruction is also utilized to teach students Norwegian.

On an ending note, knowing many languages is a resource not only to learn new languages, but also as an element to actively participate in society. With the value added on English, and multilingualism, the Norwegian educational system should seek to further facilitate equal opportunities of participation in school and societal life for newly arrived students.

Works cited

Alstad, G. T., & Sopanen, P. (2021). Language orientations in early childhood education policy in Finland and Norway. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy, 7*(1), 30–43. https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1862951

Beiler, I. R. (2020). Negotiating Multilingual Resources in English Writing Instruction for Recent Immigrants to Norway. *TESOL Quarterly, 54*(1), 5–29. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.535

Beiler, I. R., & Dewilde, J. (2020). Translation as Translingual Writing Practice in English as an Additional Language. *The Modern Language Journal, 104*(3), 533–549. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12660

Beiler, I. R. (2021). Marked and unmarked translanguaging in accelerated, mainstream, and sheltered English classrooms. *Multilingua, 40*(1), 107-138. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2020-0022

Beiler, I. R. (2022). Elever med senere start i engelsk: lokalt handlingsrom og språkpolitisk [Students with delayed English Instruction: local agency and language politics]. *Bedre Skole, 34*(4), 19-22. https://www.utdanningsnytt.no/files/2023/03/08/BS0422-WEB.pdf

Beiler, I. R. (2023). Anglonormativity in Norwegian language education policy and in the educational trajectories of immigrant adolescents. *Language Policy, 22*(1), 95–117. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-022-09632-5

Bergström, J. (2024). English as a gatekeeper: power through discourses in a language introduction program. *Journal of Applies Language Studies, 18*(1), 21-44. https://doi.org/10.47862/apples.136066

Blossing, U., Imsen, G., & Moos, L. (2014). Nordic Schools in a Time of Change. In U. Blossing, G. Imsen, & L. Moos (Eds.), *The Nordic Education Model: 'A School for All' Encounters of Neo-Liberal Policy* (pp. 1-14). Springer.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Polity Press.

Burner, T., & Carlsen, C. (2019). "I mix all the språk" – om engelskopplæring i flerspråklige klasserom [«I mix all the languages» - on English education in multilingual

classrooms]. *Bedre Skole, 31*(4), 35-39.
https://www.utdanningsnytt.no/files/2020/07/08/UTD-BedreSkole-0419-WEB.pdf

Burner, T., & Carlsen, C. (2022). Teacher qualifications, perceptions and practices concerning multilingualism at a school for newly arrived students in Norway. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 19*(1), 35-49. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1631317

Calafato, R. (2021). Teachers' reported implementation of multilingual teaching practices in foreign language classrooms in Norway and Russia. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 105*, 103401, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103401

Christensen, I. R. (2019). Verdig = vanlig og norsk: Nyankomne ungdommers verdighet i introduksjonsklasser [Worthy = ordinary and Norwegian: Newly arrived teenagers dignity in introduction classes]. In I. R. Christensen & Å. Valen-Sendstad (Eds.), *Menneskeverd - en utfordring for skole og samfunn* [Human dignity – a challenge for schools and society] (pp. 36-62). Cappelen Damm Akademisk

Dahl, A., & Krulatz, A. (2016). Engelsk som tredjespråk: Har lærere kompetanse til å støtte flerspråklighet? [English as a third language: Do teachers have competence to supportmultilingualism?] *Acta didactica Norge, 10*(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.5617/adno.2397

Dahl, A., Krulatz, A., & Torgersen, E. N. (2018). The Role of English as a Foreign Language in Educating Refugees in Norway. In S. Shapiro, R. Farelly & M. J. Curry (Eds.), *Educating Refugee-background Students: Critical Issues and Dynamic Contexts* (pp. 107-121). Multilingualism Matters.

Eurostat. (2022, September 23). *What language are studied the most in the EU?* https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-eurostat-news/-/ddn-20220923-1

Faingold, E. D. (2023). *Language Rights and the Law in Scandinavia: Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Iceland, the Faroe Islands, and Greenland*. Springer International Publishing AG.

Forskrift til opplæringslova. (2006). *Forskrift til opplæringslova [Regulations for the Education Act]* (FOR-2006-06-23-724). Lovdata. https://lovdata.no/dokument/SF/forskrift/2006-06-23-724

Grendal, O. N. (2022, September 21). *Slik henger utdanning sammen med foreldrenes utdanningsnivå [This is How Education is Related to the Parent's Educational Level]*, Statistics Norway. https://www.ssb.no/utdanning/utdanningsniva/artikler/slik-henger-utdanning-sammen-med-foreldrenes-utdanningsniva

Haukås, Å. (2016). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 13*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2015.1041960

Hellekjær, G. O. (2009). Academic English Reading Proficiency at the University Level: A Norwegian Case Study. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 21*(2), 198-122. https://nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/item/200

Hellekjær, G. O. (2016). Arbeidsrelevante engelskferdigheter - et udekket behov i norsk høyere utdanning [Work-related English competence – a unfulfilled need in Norwegian higher education]. *Uniped (Lillehammer), 39*(1), 7–23. https://doi.org/10.18261/issn.1893-8981-2016-01-02

Hilt, L. T. (2017). Education without a shared language: dynamics of inclusion and exclusion in Norwegian introductory classes for newly arrived minority language students. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 21*(6), 585–601. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2016.1223179

HK-dir. (2022). *Tilstandsrapport for høyere utdanning 2022 [Status report on higher education 2022]* (report nr. 9/2022). Norwegian Directorate for Higher Education and Skills. https://cdn.sanity.io/files/dc7vqrwe/production/a3acfc921d19889fc421706d4465c34de64e804c.pdf?dl=

Instebø, D., Foss, E. S., & Fazli, N. (2021). *Innvandrere – hvordan går det med dem i utdanningsløpet? [Immigrants – how are they doing in the educational pathway?]* Statistics Norway. https://ssb.brage.unit.no/ssb-xmlui/handle/11250/3040210

Integreringsloven [Integration Act]. (2020). *Lov om integrering gjennom opplæring, utdanning og arbeid [Act relating to integration through Education, Training, and Employment]* (LOV-2020-11-06-127). Lovdata. https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/2020-11-06-127

Iversen, J. (2017). The Role of Minority Students' L1 when Learning English. *Nordic Journal of Modern Language Methodology, 5*(1), 35-47. https://doi.org/10.46364/njmlm.v5i1.376

Kalcic, M., &Ye, J. (2023, December 14). *Innvandrere i Norge 2023: Utdannigsløp blant innvandrere og norskfødte med innvandrerforeldre [Immigrants in Norway 2023: Educational pathway among immigrants and Norwegian-born with immigrant parents].* Statistics Norway. https://www.ssb.no/utdanning/utdanningsniva/artikler/utdanningslop-blant-innvandrerne-i-norge

Krulatz, A., Steen-Olsen, T., & Torgersen, E. (2018). Towards critical cultural and linguistic awareness in language classrooms in Norway: Fostering respect for diversity through identity texts. *Language Teaching Research, 22*(5), 552–569. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817718572

Krulatz, A., & Iversen, J. (2020). Building Inclusive Language Classroom Spaces through Multilingual Writing Practices for Newly-Arrived Students in Norway. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 64*(3), 372–388. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2018.1557741

Krulatz, A., & Dahl, A. (2021). Educational and Career Opportunities for Refugee-Background Adults in Norway: A DLC Perspective. In L. Aronin & E. Vetter (Eds), *Dominant Language Constellations Approach in Education and Language Acquisition* (pp. 109-128). Educational Linguistics

Krulatz, A., Christison, M., Lorenz, E., & Sevinç, Y. (2024). The impact of teacher professional development on teacher cognition and multilingual teaching practices. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 21*(2), 711–727. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2022.2107648

Lorenz, E., Krulatz, A., & Torgersen, E. N. (2021). Embracing linguistic and cultural diversity in multilingual EAL classrooms: The impact of professional development on teacher beliefs and practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 105*, 103428. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103428

Meld. St. 21. (2020-2021). *Fullføringsreformen – med åpne dører til verden og fremtiden [Completion reform – with open doors to the world and the future].* Ministry of

Education and Research.
https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/581b5c91e6cf418aa9dcc84010180697/no/pdfs/stm202020210021000dddpdfs.pdf

Ministry of Church Affairs, Education and Research. (1996). *Læreplanverket for den 10-årige grunnskolen [Curriculum for the 10-year compulsory school]*.
https://www.nb.no/items/f4ce6bf9eadeb389172d939275c038bb?page=0

Ministry of Education and Research [MER]. (2017). *Core curriculum – values and principles for primary and secondary education*. Laid down by Royal decree. The National curriculum for the Knowledge Promotion 2020.
https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/verdier-og-prinsipper-for-grunnopplaringen---overordnet-del-av-lareplanverket/id2570003/

Neokleous, G., & Karpava, S. (2023). Comparing pre-service teacher attitudes toward the use of students' home language(s) in linguistically diverse English as an additional language classrooms in Norway and Cyprus. *Frontiers in Education, 8*, 1-13
https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1254025

Newman, M., & Gough, D. (2020). Systematic Reviews in Educational Research: Methodology, Perspectives and Application. In O. Zawacki-Richter, M. Kerres, S. Bedenlier, M. Bond & K. Buntins (Eds.), *Systematic Reviews in Educational Research: Methodology, Perspectives and Application* (pp. 3-22). Springer VS.

Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training [NDET]. (2013). *Læreplan i engelsk (ENG1-03)* [Curriculum for English]. https://www.udir.no/kl06/ENG1-03#

Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training [NDET]. (2019). *Læreplan i engelsk (ENG01-04) [Curriculum for English]*. Established as regulations. The National curriculum for the Knowledge Promotion 2020.
https://data.udir.no/kl06/v201906/laereplaner-lk20/ENG01-04.pdf?lang=eng

Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training [NDET]. (2020, October 6). *Hva er nytt i norsk for språklige minoriteter med kort botid i Norge – videregående opplæring [What is new in Norwegian for minority language students with short stay in Norway – upper secondary education]*. https://www.udir.no/laring-og-trivsel/lareplanverket/fagspesifikk-stotte/nytt-i-fagene/hva-er-nytt-i-norsk-for-spraklige-minoriteter-med-kort-botid-i-norge--videregaende-opplaring/

Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training [NDET]. (2022a, April 4). *Innføringstilbud til nyankomne minoritetsspråklige elever [Introduction program for newly arrived minority language students]*. https://www.udir.no/laring-og-trivsel/minoritetsspraklige-og-nyankomne/minoritetsspraklige/innforingstilbud-til-nyankomne-minoritetsspraklige-elever/

Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training [NDET]. (2022b, August 19). *Rammeverk for nasjonale prøver [Framework for national tests]*. https://www.udir.no/eksamen-og-prover/prover/rammeverk-for-nasjonale-prover2/

Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training [NDET]. (2023, May 2). *B12. Styrket opplæring i norsk og engelsk [B12. Increased instruction in Norwegian and English]*. https://regbok.udir.no/35004/3344/35042-1014319.html

Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training [NDET]. (2024, February 15). *Regelverk for nyankomne barn og elever [Regulations for newly arrived children and students]*. https://www.udir.no/laring-og-trivsel/minoritetsspraklige-og-nyankomne/minoritetsspraklige/regelverk-for-nyankomne-barn-og-elever/#a173416

OECD. (2023a). *Education at a Glance 2023: OECD Indicators*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/e13bef63-en

OECD. (2023b). "Norway", in *Education at a Glance 2023: OECD Indicators*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/fe27b3c6-en

Opplæringslova [Education Act]. (1998). *Lov om grunnskolen og den vidaregåande opplæringa [Act relating to Primary and Secondary Education and Training]* (LOV-1998-07-17-61). Lovdata. https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1998-07-17-61

Opplæringslova [the Education Act]. (2023). *Lov om grunnskoleopplæringa og den vidaregåande opplæringa [Act relating to Primary Education and Secondary Education and Training]* (LOV-2023-06-09-30). Lovdata. https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/2023-06-09-30?q=oppl%C3%A6ringslov

Rose, H., McKinley, J., & Galloway, N. (2021). Global Englishes and language teaching: A review of pedagogical research. *Language Teaching, 54*(2), 157–189. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000518

Schipor, D. (2022). Jeg Gotta Like Spille Fortnite, Men I Never Win the Game: Implementing Multilingual Pedagogies in a Norwegian Primary School. *Languages (Basel), 7*(2), 1-26. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7020147

Sener, M. Y. (2023). Living with Multiple Languages, Being Forced to be Monolingual: Turkish Skilled Migrants in Norway. *Language, Discourse & Society, 2*(22), 9-22. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10278521

Statistics Norway [SSB]. (2023a, June 12). *Completion rates for pupils in upper secondary education*. https://www.ssb.no/en/utdanning/videregaende-utdanning/statistikk/gjennomforing-i-videregaende-opplaering

Statistics Norway [SSB]. (2023b, November 9). *Marks and national tests, lower secondary school*. https://www.ssb.no/en/utdanning/grunnskoler/statistikk/karakterer-ved-avsluttet-grunnskole

Statistics Norway [SSB]. (2024, February 14). *Upper secondary education*. https://www.ssb.no/en/utdanning/videregaende-utdanning/statistikk/videregaende-opplaering-og-annen-videregaende-utdanning

Surkalovic, D. (2014). Forbereder grunnskolelærerutdanningen engelsklærere for undervisning i engelsk som tredjespråk i Norge? [Does primary teacher education programs prepare English teachers to teach English as a third language in Norway?] *Acta didactica Norge, 8*(2), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.5617/adno.1129

The National Centre of Multicultural Education [NAFO]. (n.d.). *Organisering av opplæringen for minoritetsspråklige elever i grunnskolen [Educational organization for students with a minority language in cumpolsory education]*. OsloMet. https://nafo.oslomet.no/grunnskole/organisering/

The National Centre of Multicultural Education [NAFO]. (2024, March 5). *Organisering av opplæringen for minoritetsspråklige elever i videregående [Educational organization for students with a minority language in upper secondary education]*. OsloMet. https://nafo.oslomet.no/videregaende/organisering-vgs/

Thomas, P. & Breidlid, A. (2015). In the shadow of 'Anglobalization' national tests in English in Norway and the making of a new English underclass. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 10*(3), 349-368. https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2015.1041963

Tishakov, T., & Tsagari, D. (2022). Language Beliefs of English Teachers in Norway: Trajectories in Transition? *Languages, 7*(2), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7020141

Universitets- og høgskolerådet (UHR). (2017). *Nasjonale retningslinjer for lektorutdanning for trinn 8-13 [National guidelines for lektorprogram grades 8-13].* https://www.uhr.no/_f/p1/i4d4335f1-1715-4f6e-ab44-0dca372d7488/lektorutdanning_8_13_vedtatt_13_11_2017.pdf

United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press.

Wee, H. L., Karkkulainen, E. A., & Tateo, L. (2023). Experiences of Epistemic Injustice among Minority Language Students Aged 6–16 in the Nordics: A Literature Review. *Education Sciences, 13*(4), 367, 1-22. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13040367