



# PLURIDENTITIES

## WORKING PAPER 3

### Work package 4



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement n° **101178914**. The document represents the views of the authors only and is their sole responsibility. The European Research Executive Agency (REA) and the European Commission are not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

# Document Control Sheet

Project Title	Protecting and stimulating plurilingual identities in learners in Europe via inclusive policies and classroom practices
Deliverable	D4.3
Work Package	WP4
WP leader	KU Leuven
Number of pages	27
Delivery date	15 December 2025
Dissemination level	Public Use
Main authors	Eva Olsson, Liss Kerstin Sylvèn, Marta Segura Hudson, Margaux D'Hulster, Kaat Buelens, Kris Van den Branden, Jill Surmont

# Copyright

© Pluridentities consortium, 2025.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) License. This means that reuse is allowed provided appropriate credit is given and any changes are indicated.

## Acknowledgements

Pluridentities is an interdisciplinary research project that received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement n° 101178914. Please see <https://www.pluridentities.com/> for more information.

The project partners are a multidisciplinary group of research teams consisting of linguists, teacher trainers and political scientists. The members of the consortium are based in Belgium (Vrije Universiteit Brussel and KU Leuven), The Netherlands (University of Amsterdam), Sweden (University of Gothenburg), Spain (University of Cordoba) and Aruba (University of Aruba). The content of this document is the result of the work developed by the partners in the context of the project.

## Disclaimer

Neither the Pluridentities consortium nor the European Commission shall be liable for any consequences stemming from the reuse.

# Table of Contents

<b><i>Problem statement</i></b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b><i>Methodology</i></b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b><i>Results</i></b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b><i>Conclusions</i></b> .....	<b>22</b>
<b><i>References</i></b> .....	<b>26</b>

# Problem statement

## *Conceptual and theoretical background*

Language and identity are key concepts in the theoretical framework underpinning the Pluridentities project. They are understood as deeply interconnected and dynamically shaped across contexts. Rather than viewing identity as fixed, identification is foregrounded; the ways in which individuals relate to categories such as “multilingual,” “Swedish,” or “European,” and how these relationships shift over time (Cummins, 2015; Janssens, 2019). Language functions not only as a communicative resource but also as a symbolic marker of belonging, linking individuals to groups and cultural communities (J. Li et al., 2022). Within this perspective, plurilingual identities, or *pluridentities*, emerge through the interaction of linguistic capital, the learning environment, language policy, and technology. Schools therefore constitute central sites in which plurilingual identities can be supported, shaped, or transformed (Cummins, 2000).

Among the components shaping plurilingual identities, linguistic capital plays a central role. It refers to the perceived value of a person’s full linguistic repertoire, including home languages, additional languages, and registers (Bourdieu, 1986; Finegan, 2012). Broad linguistic repertoires can provide social, cultural, and economic opportunities (J. Li et al., 2022; López Blanco, 2025). In school settings, the extent to which linguistic capital is recognised can influence how individuals understand their linguistic resources and how they position themselves within local, national, or broader European communities.

Understanding these processes is particularly relevant in the light of European policy goals that position plurilingual competence as central to lifelong learning and intercultural dialogue (Council Resolution, 2008; Council Recommendation, 2018). Supporting learners’ full repertoires has been shown to strengthen identity building, enhance motivation, and contribute to educational equity (Cummins, 2000; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2010), while also broadening learners’ horizons and enriching attitudes toward linguistic diversity (Okal, 2014).

One specific pedagogical approach intended to embed multilingualism in classroom practice is Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), in which an additional language is used to teach non-linguistic content. Research suggests that CLIL can support language proficiency, cultural awareness, cognitive engagement, and motivation (Coyle, 2008; Graham et al., 2018; San Isidro Agrelo, 2019; Bulté et al., 2022). Multilingual pedagogies such as translanguaging also enhance metalinguistic awareness and belonging (Cenoz & Gorter, 2015; Lorenzo et al., 2019; Van Raemdonck, 2024). However, the degree to which these approaches are adopted varies significantly across educational contexts.

### *The Swedish context*

Swedish schools operate within a linguistically diverse context shaped by national minority languages, migration, and the strong presence of English. Programmes inspired by CLIL have been part of the Swedish educational landscape for several decades; they are offered by a relatively small proportion of schools and vary considerably in how they are organised (Sylvén, 2019; Olsson, 2025). Terminology differs across contexts (e.g., English-medium instruction, international profiles), but these initiatives share CLIL's core principle of integrating content and language learning by using an additional language for subject teaching.

Although multilingualism is a prominent feature of schooling in Sweden, relatively little is known about how teachers and students understand their multilingualism, identify with different social categories, and value various languages in relation to their future. These questions are relevant across educational settings, as both CLIL and non-CLIL environments engage with diverse linguistic repertoires. However, research has rarely examined how experiences in these different instructional contexts may relate to linguistic or social identification, nor is there much quantitative evidence on how students and teachers in Sweden conceptualize their multilingualism, sense of belonging, or attitudes toward practices such as translanguaging or learning additional languages.

### *Aims and research questions*

This study aims to offer initial empirical insights into how multilingualism and identity are experienced and shaped in Swedish schools, and how different instructional contexts, including both CLIL and non-CLIL settings, may relate to the development of plurilingual orientations and attitudes.

The study addresses the following research questions:

1. What differences are there, if any, between CLIL and non-CLIL teachers and students in how they identify as monolingual, bilingual, or multilingual individuals?
2. What differences are there, if any, between CLIL and non-CLIL participants in their broader social identifications (e.g., as Swedish, European, or other)?
3. What differences are there, if any, between CLIL and non-CLIL teachers and students in their attitudes toward multilingualism, including:
  - the languages they regard as important for the future,
  - their views on translanguaging, and
  - their orientations toward learning additional languages?

## Methodology

### *Participants*

The Swedish sample consists of responses from seven schools: four CLIL schools (three upper secondary, one lower secondary) and three non-CLIL schools (one upper secondary and two lower secondary). In total, 423 students (242 CLIL, 181 non-CLIL) completed the survey, along with 18 teachers (9 CLIL, 9 non-CLIL) from the same schools.

Schools were recruited through a convenience sampling approach, primarily based on existing professional contacts. Principals or teachers at ten schools were invited to participate, including both CLIL and non-CLIL institutions. Seven schools agreed to take part. For the remaining schools, the timing of the data collection proved challenging. The survey became ready for distribution shortly before the end of the Swedish school year, a period when teachers and students experience high workload demands. Since Swedish schools close in early June, the late timing likely reduced both school-level willingness and individual participation rates.

The target population for the student survey consisted of learners aged 15 to 18 in lower and upper secondary education. As all participating students were at least 15 years old, parental consent was not required under Swedish ethical guidelines. All participants were informed about the purpose and procedures of the study, and anonymity and voluntary participation were ensured in accordance with national ethical standards.

### *Surveys*

Both the student and teacher surveys were based on the instruments developed within the Pluridentities project but adapted linguistically and contextually for the Swedish setting.

The student survey comprised five sections: (1) background information, (2) sense of identification and belonging, (3) multilingualism at school, (4) language learning motivation, and (5) use of technology in language learning. The survey included over 100 items, primarily closed-ended questions using Likert scales (e.g., from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*) and frequency scales (e.g., *never* to *constantly*). Additional nominal questions captured demographic information, and several open fields allowed students to list their linguistic repertoire or provide other contextual details. Before distribution, the student survey was piloted with a small group of learners, who completed the questionnaire while commenting aloud, allowing the research team to identify ambiguities and refine item wording.

The teacher survey followed a similar structure but included four sections: (1) background information, (2) identification and belonging, (3) multilingualism in school and classroom practices, and (4) use of technology in teaching. It also contained more than 100 items, mainly in closed format. A small group of teachers tested the survey and provided feedback on content and clarity. The surveys were translated into Swedish and adapted for the national context before being prepared in Qualtrics and distributed digitally.

### *Data collection*

Data collection took place in two phases in 2025: from mid-May to mid-June, and, for some schools, again at the beginning of September due to end-of-year timing constraints.



Teachers accessed the questionnaire via a dedicated link and were asked to share a separate student link or display a QR code in the classroom.

Students completed the survey at school, typically during lesson time or during allocated assembly periods, depending on local organisation. Teachers completed the survey independently at a time convenient to them. Administering the surveys digitally in school settings enabled participation across schools with differing schedules and routines.

### *Method of analysis*

To address the research questions guiding this initial analysis of the quantitative data, a subset of survey items was selected for examination. Items were chosen based on their relevance to linguistic identification, social identification, and attitudes toward multilingualism.

The following questions from the Swedish student survey were included in the analysis:

#### **Identification** as mono- bi- or multilinguals:

How do you identify? As monolingual, bilingual or multilingual

#### **Identification** as Swedes, European or other:

How much do you identify as a European? (Scale 1-10)

#### **Attitudes towards multilingualism**, including:

- Important languages for the future

Which languages do you think will be important for you in the future? (Several languages could be mentioned)

- Translanguaging

Do you sometimes use two or more languages interchangeably?

A. At school I sometimes deliberately use more than one language to understand something better.

B. At school, I sometimes deliberately use more than one language to help others

understand something.

C. At school, I enjoy the lessons better when I get to use more than one language.

- Learning other languages

How do you feel about learning other languages?

A. Learning other languages is important to me.

B. In language lessons, the teachers appreciate that I have learned the language/language skills outside school.

C. Knowing many languages helps you see thing in a different way.

Corresponding items from the teacher survey, covering the same themes, were included:

**Identification** as mono- bi- or multilinguals:

How do you identify? Mono- bi- or mutlingual

**Identification** as Swedes, European or other:

How much do you identify as a European? (Scale 1-10)

Do you see yourself as.... (several options)

**Attitudes towards multilingualism**, including:

- Important languages for the future

A. The main language of instruction is very important for students' academic careers

B. Immigrant languages are important assets for students' future professional careers

C. The main reason why multilingual students fail in school is lack of competence in the language of instruction

- Translanguaging:

At this school the use of students' home languages is... (several options)

SPSS (version 29.0.2.0) was used for statistical analyses. Descriptive statistics and independent-samples t-tests were conducted to compare responses between CLIL and non-CLIL students. As the size of the teacher sample did not allow for reliable inferential testing, only descriptive statistics were applied to the teacher data.

### *Limitations*

While the study offers important insights into students' and teachers' perceptions of multilingualism and identity in Swedish schools, several limitations should be acknowledged. As mentioned, the timing of the data collection created practical challenges, because the survey was distributed shortly before the end of the school year; participation at both school and individual levels may have been affected, which limits the representativeness of the sample.

As the surveys were completed independently, it was not possible to control for inattentive or playful responding, and the length of the questionnaire may have influenced some participants' engagement. These factors may affect the reliability of a subset of the responses.

It is also important to note that this working paper presents an initial analysis of a broader dataset. More detailed statistical analyses will follow, and the quantitative findings will be interpreted alongside the qualitative interview data collected within the project, allowing for a more comprehensive understanding of multilingualism and identity in Swedish schools.

## Results

This section presents findings from the student survey followed by results from the teacher survey.

## Student Survey

### Linguistic Self-Identification

A large majority of students identified as either bilingual or multilingual. They were found in both CLIL and non-CLIL groups (see Table 1), indicating high levels of language awareness and multilingual exposure among Swedish students in general.

**Table 1**

#### *Student Linguistic Self-Identification*

Identification	Non-CLIL	CLIL	Total
Monolingual	17	10	27
Bilingual	76	90	166
Multilingual	88	137	225
<b>Total</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>418</b>

### European Identity

Students rated their identification as European on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 10 (very much) (see Table 2). Overall, the mean identification was 7.9.

However, non-CLIL students identified as European significantly more strongly ( $M = 8.43$ ,  $SD = 2.27$ ) than CLIL students ( $M = 7.07$ ,  $SD = 2.93$ ),  $t(\sim 381) \approx \text{value}$ ,  $p < .001$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.512$ , indicating a medium effect size.

This result may at first sight appear counter-intuitive, but it is possible that CLIL students who are multilingual to a great extent identify with a more global identity

(or with a non-European identity), rather than merely a European identity. Qualitative analyses from focus-group interviews may help contextualize this finding.

**Table 2**

*Students' Identification as European (0–10 Scale)*

Group	<i>n</i>	Mean	SD	SEM
Non-CLIL	169	8.43	2.27	0.17
CLIL	214	7.07	2.93	0.20

**Note.** Difference between groups significant at  $p < .001$ ,  $d = .512$

### Geographical and Cultural Identities

Students could select multiple identity options. The most common identity combination in both groups was **Swedish, Scandinavian, and European** (33% non-CLIL; 25% CLIL).

Two patterns stood out:

- **Only Swedish** was selected by 28% of non-CLIL students but only 8% of CLIL students.
- **Other** was selected by 21% of CLIL students but only 2% of non-CLIL students, with Indian, Middle Eastern, Arabic, Asian and African among the most common identifications mentioned.

For all remaining identity combinations, group differences were small (see Table 3).

**Table 3**

*Students' Geographical/Cultural Identification (Multiple Responses Possible)*

Category	Non-CLIL		CLIL		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Only Swedish	46	28	17	8	63	17
Only Scandinavian	0	0	2	1	2	0.5
Only European	3	2	8	4	11	3
Swedish & European	6	4	14	6	20	5
Swedish & Other	5	3	10	5	15	4
Swedish & Scandinavian	23	14	19	9	42	11
Swedish, Scandinavian & European	53	33	55	25	108	29
Swedish, European, Scandinavian & Other	12	7	10	5	22	6
Scandinavian & European	0	0	3	1	3	1
European & Other	3	2	15	7	18	5
None of the above	1	0.5	4	2	5	1
Other	4	2	46	21	50	13
Don't know	5	3	14	6	19	5

**Note.** Missing: CLIL = 25, non-CLIL = 20.

### Translanguaging Practices

Students rated three statements about their use of more than one language in school on a 5-point Likert scale.

1. Using more than one language to understand content:

- Non-CLIL:  $M = 3.03$
- CLIL:  $M = 3.13$
- No significant difference

2. Using more than one language to help others understand:

- Non-CLIL:  $M = 2.85$
- CLIL:  $M = 3.13$
- Significant difference,  $p = .036$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.225$  (small effect)

3. Enjoying lessons more when more than one language can be used:

- Non-CLIL:  $M = 2.51$
- CLIL:  $M = 2.86$
- Significant difference,  $p = .007$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.287$  (small effect)

Taken together, CLIL students appear more positively inclined toward translanguaging practices, particularly in terms of supporting peers and enjoying language-flexible lessons.

### Attitudes Toward Learning Additional Languages

Students responded to three statements regarding the importance of learning additional languages. For the statement "*Learning other languages is important to me,*" CLIL students reported significantly stronger agreement ( $M = 3.52$ ) than non-CLIL students ( $M = 3.24$ ),  $p = .036$ , Cohen's  $d = .229$ , indicating a small effect.

For the statement "*During language lessons teachers appreciate the fact that I have acquired language skills outside of school,*" group means were similar (CLIL:  $M = 3.43$ ; non-CLIL:  $M = 3.27$ ), and the difference was not statistically significant.

For the statement *“Knowing many languages helps me see things from different perspectives,”* CLIL students again expressed significantly stronger agreement ( $M = 3.53$ ) than non-CLIL students ( $M = 3.19$ ),  $p = .003$ , Cohen’s  $d = .321$ , indicating a small-to-medium effect. These findings suggest that CLIL students hold more positive and more expansive beliefs about the cognitive and personal value of multilingualism.

## Teacher Survey

### Participants

The teacher survey was completed by 37 individuals. After data cleaning, 18 valid responses remained. Half of the teachers ( $n = 9$ ) worked in CLIL schools and half ( $n = 9$ ) in non-CLIL schools. Fourteen participants reported having a university-based teacher education, whereas the remaining four indicated alternative forms of education (one lower secondary education, one master’s degree, and two unspecified).

All non-CLIL teachers and five CLIL teachers were born in Sweden. Among the CLIL teachers, four were born outside Sweden: two elsewhere in Europe, one in an American country, and one in an Asian region.

Teachers represented a range of subject areas, including languages (Swedish, English, Spanish, French), STEM subjects, and the humanities. Teaching experience ranged from 2 to 33 years ( $M = 19.7$ ), indicating that the sample consisted primarily of highly experienced teachers.



## Linguistic Self-Identification

Teachers were asked whether they identified as monolingual, bilingual, or multilingual. No teacher identified as monolingual. Across both groups, eight teachers identified as bilingual and five as multilingual; five responses were missing (three non-CLIL, two CLIL). No notable differences emerged between CLIL and non-CLIL teachers regarding linguistic identification (see Table 4).

**Table 4**

*Teachers' Linguistic Self-Identification (CLIL and Non-CLIL)*

Identification	Non-CLIL	CLIL	Total
Monolingual	0	0	0
Bilingual	4	4	8
Multilingual	2	3	5
Missing	3	2	5

## European Identity

Teachers rated how strongly they identified as European on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 10 (very strongly). Reported values ranged from 5 to 10 as illustrated in Table 5. Means were similar across groups (non-CLIL:  $M = 7.8$ ; CLIL:  $M = 7.9$ ), with no teacher selecting a value below 5.

Table 5

*Teachers' Identification as European (1–10 Scale)*

Score	Non-CLIL	CLIL	Total
5	0	1	1
6	2	1	3
7	1	0	1
8	0	2	2
9	2	2	4
10	1	1	2
Mean	7.8	7.9	7.8
Missing	3	2	5

### Geographical and Cultural Identities

Teachers could select multiple identity options (e.g., Swedish, Scandinavian, European, or other). None identified exclusively as Swedish or exclusively as European. The most common combinations were **Swedish and European** ( $n = 6$ ) and **Scandinavian, Swedish, and European** ( $n = 6$ ) (see Table 6).

One non-CLIL teacher additionally identified as a *global citizen*. Four CLIL teachers selected “other,” specifying a regional Swedish identity, a national identity linked to a European country or an American country, and a specific region in Asia.

**Table 6***Teachers' Geographical/Cultural Self-Identification (Multiple Responses Possible)*

Identity Category	Non-CLIL	CLIL	Total
Only Swedish	0	0	0
Swedish and European	4	2	6
Only European	0	0	0
Only Scandinavian	0	0	0
Scandinavian and Swedish	0	1	1
Scandinavian, Swedish, European	3	3	6
Scandinavian and European	0	2	2
Other	1	4	5

**Note.** "Other" includes regional, national, transnational, or global identifications.

### Language Policies at School

Teachers were asked whether their school had a language policy. A large majority (n = 13) responded that they did not know. Five teachers indicated that their school had a language policy; of these, four worked in CLIL schools and one in a non-CLIL school.

This general lack of awareness may reflect the presence of national-level language regulations in Swedish educational governance (e.g., home language rights, minority language status, and foreign-language syllabi), which may reduce the perceived need for school-level policies. In CLIL schools, however, where English is

used as a language of instruction, the need for explicit clarification of English–Swedish language roles may be greater.

### Use and Value of Home Languages

As illustrated in Table 7, figures indicate that none of the teachers reported school rules prohibiting the use of home languages. One non-CLIL teacher reported that home languages were actively integrated into teaching, whereas eight teachers (four in each group) indicated that home languages were valued at the school.

**Table 7**

#### *Teachers' Attitudes Towards Home Languages at School*

*Use of home languages at school is ...*

Response	Non-CLIL	CLIL	Total
Not allowed	0	0	0
Tolerated	1	3	4
Valued	4	4	8
Actively integrated	1	0	1

### Language of Instruction and Perceived Future Importance

As expected, CLIL schools used English—or English alongside Swedish—as the language of instruction, whereas non-CLIL schools used Swedish. CLIL teachers were more likely than non-CLIL teachers to believe that competence in the school's instructional language(s) would be important for students' future careers.

Teachers in both groups reported that competence in immigrant languages would be beneficial for students' future professional lives.

### Perceptions of Language Competence and School Failure

Responses to the statement *The most important reason why multilingual students fail in school is lack of competence in the language of schooling* (see Table 8) indicated a generally moderate stance. Teachers did not reject the idea that language competence might play a role in school failure, but strong agreement was rare. Most non-CLIL teachers positioned themselves in the middle of the scale, while CLIL teachers tended to lean slightly more toward agreement. The overall pattern suggests a cautious view: teachers acknowledged that limited language competence may contribute to school failure, but they were hesitant to present it as a primary or sole explanation.

**Table 8**

*Teachers' agreement with the statement: "The most important reason why multilingual students fail in school is lack of competence in the language of schooling"*

Response	Non-CLIL	CLIL	Total
Totally agree	0	1	1
Agree to a great extent	1	0	1
Neutral	4	1	5
Agree to some extent	1	5	6

## Conclusions

### Connecting the Results to the Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

The findings from both the teacher and student surveys provide initial empirical insight into how plurilingual identities, linguistic capital, and multilingual pedagogical orientations manifest in Swedish CLIL and non-CLIL contexts. These patterns align with, but also complicate, theoretical expectations drawn from the plurilingual and identity-oriented frameworks underpinning the Pluridentities project.

### Plurilingual identification and linguistic capital

Across both teacher and student groups, the overwhelming majority identified as bilingual or multilingual. This supports theoretical accounts that conceptualize identity as layered, dynamic, and tied to individuals' full linguistic repertoires rather than to monolithic categories (Cummins, 2015; Janssens, 2019). For students especially, the high prevalence of multilingual self-identification suggests that Swedish schools—CLIL and non-CLIL alike—operate within a linguistic ecology in which plurilingualism is both recognized and normalized.

This aligns with the notion of *linguistic capital* (Bourdieu, 1986): students appear to understand their diverse linguistic resources as meaningful assets, rather than as peripheral to school learning. The fact that monolingual identification was rare across all groups underscores the relevance of plurilingual frameworks to Swedish educational contexts more broadly, extending beyond specialized CLIL programs.

### Broader social identifications and belonging

The results for European, national, and regional identification offer a more differentiated picture. While teachers in both instructional contexts expressed similarly strong European

identification, students displayed significant between-group differences, with non-CLIL learners identifying more strongly as European than their CLIL peers. However, this does not necessarily mean that CLIL students are less internationally oriented, rather that they identify with areas outside of Europe to a larger extent.

Students' substantial use of "Other" identifications—particularly among CLIL learners—also resonates with frameworks emphasizing the fluidity and multiplicity of identity categories (Li et al., 2022), suggesting that diverse linguistic and cultural reference points coexist within Swedish classrooms.

### **Attitudes toward multilingualism and translanguaging**

Both teachers and students recognized the future relevance of multilingualism, including home and immigrant languages, echoing European policy aims that promote plurilingual competence as integral to mobility, social cohesion, and intercultural dialogue (Council Recommendation, 2018). Teachers' valuing of immigrant languages aligns closely with theoretical claims that recognition of learners' full repertoires strengthens educational equity and supports identity affirmation (Cummins, 2000).

The student results on translanguaging provide additional nuances. CLIL students reported significantly more positive attitudes toward using multiple languages to support peers and to enhance their enjoyment of lessons. This supports theories that multilingual pedagogies can foster metalinguistic awareness, belonging, and cognitive engagement (Cenoz & Gorter, 2015; Lorenzo et al., 2019). The tendency of CLIL students to appreciate language-flexible approaches may reflect the more explicit presence of an additional instructional language, which may make cross-linguistic practices more visible and normalized.

### **Attitudes toward learning additional languages**

The results concerning the perceived importance of learning other languages further support the interpretation that CLIL environments may foster orientations aligned with plurilingual identity development. CLIL students expressed significantly stronger agreement with statements about the personal value of learning additional languages and the role of

multilingualism in enabling multiple perspectives. These findings are consistent with conceptualizations of plurilingual identities as dynamic, reflective, and grounded in meaningful engagement with diverse linguistic resources (Cummins, 2000; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2010).

The belief that “knowing many languages helps me see things from different perspectives,” endorsed more strongly by CLIL students, aligns specifically with theories emphasizing the cognitive and intercultural affordances of plurilingualism (Cenoz & Gorter, 2015; J. Li et al., 2022). It also resonates with European policy discourse that positions multilingual competence as foundational for intercultural dialogue and democratic participation (Council Recommendation, 2018).

At the same time, the lack of group difference regarding whether teachers value language learning outside of school suggests that institutional recognition of students’ linguistic capital remains uneven. This mirrors broader critiques that Swedish schools—CLIL and non-CLIL alike—do not consistently leverage students’ full linguistic repertoires (Sylvén, 2019). Together, these findings reinforce the view that plurilingual orientations in Sweden are shaped by an interaction of pedagogical, structural, and sociocultural factors rather than by instructional context alone.

### **The role of the Swedish language ecology**

The absence of explicit school language policies—reported by most teachers—must also be interpreted within Sweden’s broader linguistic landscape. As noted in the theoretical background, Swedish schools are shaped by national regulations governing home languages, minority languages, and foreign language teaching. This may reduce the perceived need for local policy development, but it also highlights a structural gap: without explicit support for multilingual pedagogies, CLIL and non-CLIL schools may rely heavily on teachers’ individual interpretations of how to engage with students’ repertoires.

This aligns with critiques in CLIL literature emphasizing that successful content-and-language integration requires clear pedagogical models, teacher preparation, and alignment with local language ecologies (Sylvén, 2019). The variation detected among



teachers' beliefs, as well as CLIL students' differentiated identity patterns, indicates that instructional context interacts with broader social and linguistic forces rather than determining outcomes on its own.

### **Synthesis with respect to the research questions**

Overall, the findings can be synthesised as follows:

#### **1. RQ1 (Linguistic identification).**

Both teachers and students overwhelmingly identified as bilingual or multilingual, with minimal differences between CLIL and non-CLIL groups. This suggests that plurilingual identities are widely distributed across Swedish schools and not confined to CLIL settings.

#### **2. RQ2 (Broader social identification).**

Teachers across contexts displayed similar patterns of European and cultural identification, whereas student identities diverged more strongly, with non-CLIL students identifying more strongly as European and CLIL students exhibiting greater variation. These findings highlight the contextual and relational nature of identification processes.

#### **3. RQ3 (Attitudes toward multilingualism).**

Teachers and students in both contexts valued multilingualism and immigrant languages for future careers. CLIL students reported more positive attitudes toward translanguaging practices than non-CLIL students, consistent with theoretical claims about the role of multilingual environments in facilitating metalinguistic awareness and belonging.

Taken together, the results support a view of Swedish schools as linguistically rich and dynamic environments in which plurilingual identities develop through interactions among linguistic resources, instructional practices, and broader sociocultural conditions. While CLIL appears to shape some attitudes and practices—particularly regarding translanguaging—the findings suggest that plurilingual orientations extend across both CLIL and non-CLIL contexts. These insights provide empirical insights into the complex interplay between

identification, linguistic capital, and pedagogical context in shaping pluridentities in contemporary Swedish education.

## References

- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.
- Bulté, B., Surmont, J., & Martens, L. (2022). The impact of CLIL on the L2 French and L1 Dutch proficiency of Flemish secondary school pupils. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 25(9), 3151–3170. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.2018400>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2015). *Multilingual education: Between language learning and translanguaging*. University Press.
- Council of the European Union. (2008). *Council Resolution of 21 November 2008 on a European strategy for multilingualism (2008/C 320/01)*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2008:320:TOC>
- Council of the European Union. (2018). *Council Recommendation of 22 May 2018 on key competences for lifelong learning (2018/C 189/01)*. [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32018H0604\(01\)](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32018H0604(01))
- Coyle, D. (2008). CLIL—A pedagogical approach from the European perspective. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 1200–1214). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3\\_92](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_92)
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2015). Intercultural education and academic achievement: A framework for school-based policies in multilingual schools. *Intercultural Education*, 26(6), 455–468. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2015.1103539>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2010). *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Multilingual Matters.
- Finegan, E. (2012). *Language: Its structure and use (6th ed.)*. Wadsworth.
- Graham, K. M., Choi, Y., Davoodi, A., Razmeh, S., & Dixon, L. Q. (2018). Language and content outcomes of CLIL and EMI: A systematic review. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, 11(1), 19–38.
- Janssens, R. (2019). Language policies versus language practices: A new language conflict? In G. Caliendo, R. Janssens, S. Slembrouck, & P. Van Avermaet (Eds.), *Urban multilingualism in Europe* (pp. 13–36). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501503207-002>
- Li, J., Xu, M., & Chen, J. (2022). A Bourdieusian analysis of multilingualism in a poverty-stricken ethnic minority area: Can linguistic capital be transferred to economic capital? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 43(2), 122–139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1733585>
- López Blanco, J. D. (2025). Do languages open doors? A theoretical model of linguistic capital and (im)mobility and its application in Spanish youth migration. *Journal of*

- Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 51(3), 565–582.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2024.2359676>
- Lorenzo, F., Granados, A., & Ávila, I. (2019). The development of cognitive academic language proficiency in multilingual education: Evidence of a longitudinal study on the language of history. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 41, Article 100767. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.06.010>
- Okal, B. O. (2014). Benefits of multilingualism in education. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 2(3), 223–229. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2014.020304>
- Olsson, E. (2025). A comparative study of CLIL implementation in upper secondary school in Sweden and students' development of L2 English academic vocabulary. *Language Teaching Research*, 29(1), 7–32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211045000>
- San Isidro Agrelo, F. X. (2019). The multi-faceted effects of CLIL: A literature review. *NEXUS (AEDEAN)*, 2019(1), 33–49.
- Sylvén, L. K. (2019). *Investigating content and language integrated learning: Insights from Swedish high schools*. Multilingual Matters.
- Van Raemdonck, M. (2024). *Beyond one language: An intervention study in supporting teachers to create multilingual policies in secondary classrooms* [Doctoral dissertation, Ghent University]. <http://hdl.handle.net/1854/LU-01J9KFR26JJHEXNW6KW6E90XGM>