Journal of Teacher Education and Educators
Volume 8, Number 1, 2019, 35-54

In-service and Pre-service Teachers' Orientations to Linguistic, Cultural and Worldview Diversity

(Received March 10, 2019 - Approved April 25, 2019)

Anuleena Kimanen[1], Jenni Alisaari[2] and Arto Kallioniemi[3]

Abstract
Culturally and linguistically responsive education takes the learners' diverse identities and languages into account in many ways. This article explores the orientations that emerge when pre-service and in-service teachers evaluate their preparedness to conduct certain culturally and linguistically responsive practices. Exploratory factor analysis was conducted on survey data from 181 respondents. In general, teachers' orientations towards culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy were positive. Three orientations were identified: orientation to culture, to language and learning, and to affirming identities, with the last being the strongest. Gender, training on multicultural education and current professional status had a significant influence on respondents' orientations. The results give valuable information for developing teacher education to better respond to the needs of those teaching diverse learners.

Keywords: Culturally responsive education; linguistically responsive education; teachers; task perception

Introduction

'In classrooms, curriculum and pedagogy are the mirrors in which children see themselves reflected and through which they construct images of themselves as thinkers, learners, and users of language' (McCarty, 1993, p.191).

In today's world, cultural and linguistic diversity in classrooms is more and more common. For example, in the country focused on in this study, Finland, migration has been growing remarkably in recent years: the number of children with an international background has doubled during the last decade. In 2016, 40% of the children of non-Finnish origin were first generation, but most of the second-generation children were under school age. (Official Statistics of Finland, 2016.) At the moment, 7.1% of people speak a language other than one of the three official languages of Finland (Finnish Swedish or Sami), and represent all the current growth in population. (Official Statistics of Finland, 2018). However, in Finland, as well as in many other countries, the PISA results have shown that students from a migrant background do not perform as

[1] Anuleena Kimanen, Correspondent author, Faculty of Theology, University of Helsinki E-mail: anuleena.kimanen@helsinki.fi, ORCID-ID: 0000-0003-0049-826X
[2] Jenni Alisaari, Faculty of Education, University of Turku. ORCID-ID: 0000-0003-4096-1888
[3] Arto Kallioniemi, Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Helsinki. ORCID-ID: 0000-0002-1581-7617

well as native speakers. In Finland, even positive background factors do not bring the same kind of the support for the second-generation migrants as they do for native Finns (Harju-Luukkainen et al., 2014; Kirjavainen & Pulkkinen, 2017; Vettenranta et al., 2016). One reason for this finding might be that students are not encouraged or even allowed to use their home languages to support their learning at school (see, e.g. Alisaari, Heikkola, Commins, & Acquah, 2019), even though such use would be beneficial for optimal learning outcomes (see, e.g. Ramirez, 1992).

To respond to this challenge, the Finnish core curricula for basic and upper secondary education were renewed in 2014 and in 2015. They introduced new perspectives into the Finnish school context, such as linguistically responsive teaching and cultural competences as a learning goal. The new curricula require every teacher to take into account the challenges language poses for learners and the fact that all students should be able to use their whole linguistic repertoire as a resource for learning. (National Agency for Education, 2014; National Agency for Education, 2015.) The Finnish curricula see diversity from pluralistic perspectives, and cultural diversity is explicitly mentioned both in the general parts of the curriculum and in many subjects (Zilliacus, Holm, & Sahlström, 2017).

The changes in classrooms and curricula strongly reflect the pressing need for educators to adapt to these circumstances to ensure the maximum learning and empowerment of their pupils, that is, they need to implement culturally and linguistically responsive practices (Cummins, 2001). What are educators prepared to do in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms in terms of advocating for their students? Teachers face a great number of expectations and requirements as to what to develop in their work, and developing cultural and linguistic responsiveness is only one of them. According to Kelchtermans (2009), every teacher has a personal interpretive framework, a set of cognitions or mental representations that shape the way they look at teaching, give meaning to it and act as professionals. This framework consists of professional self-image, self-esteem, job motivation, task perception and future perspective. Among them, task perception is crucial when teachers decide what they want to devote their efforts to because it defines what one has to do to be a proper teacher, to have the feeling that one is doing well as a teacher.

The aim of this article is to explore the orientations that emerge when teachers evaluate their preparedness to conduct certain culturally and linguistically responsive practices, in other words, the task perception related to these practices. The research questions in this article are as follows: What are Finnish pre-service and in-service teachers' orientations towards linguistically and culturally responsive pedagogy? What is the relationship between gender, training related to cultural diversity, length of career and professional status and these orientations? The answers to these questions will add to our understanding about how linguistically and culturally responsive pedagogies should be approached in pre-service and in-service teacher training.

Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

Culturally responsive teaching

Culturally responsive teaching is an old concept, and it is strongly connected to Geneva Gay (e.g. Aronson & Laughter, 2016). According to Gay (2010), culturally responsive teaching means using the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them. Moreover, it is validating, comprehensive (teaching the whole child), multidimensional, empowering, transformative and emancipatory. The validating and affirming qualities arise from acknowledging the legitimacy of diverse cultural heritages (also as curricular content), building bridges between home and school experiences, using a variety of instructional strategies connected to different learning styles, teaching students to know and praise their own and one another's cultural heritages, and incorporating multicultural information and material into all school subjects. Gay also stresses that cultural differences should be seen as assets instead of deficits.

Similar pedagogies have also been called culturally relevant, sensitive, congruent and reflective (Gay, 2010; Aronson & Laughter, 2016). We prefer the term responsive because it is both widespread and includes advocating for diverse learners. As Nieto and Bode (2012) explain: first, differences brought into the classroom by pupils have to be recognised; second, the possibility that pupils' identities affect their experience of the school has to be acknowledged; and third, provisions must be made for those diverse identities. Nieto and Bode also underline the fact that culturally responsive teaching is important for all pupils. Everybody benefits from broadening their horizons and learning intercultural skills.

In various studies analysed by Gay (2010) and Aronson and Laughter (2016), culturally responsive education has been shown to positively affect learning outcomes. Even when higher test scores have not resulted within the scope of the study, improvements with respect to student motivation, interest in content and confidence have been reported. These affective domains often correlate with better test results, though. In Finland, a concern about the school success of migrant students has recently been a point of focus in educational discussions (Kirjavainen & Pulkkinen, 2017). Culturally responsive education could help to improve the learning outcomes of and provide educational equity for all students. In the Finnish curriculum for basic education, teaching is intended to 'support the pupils' own cultural identity construction and growth as active participants in their own culture and community and interest toward other cultures' (National Agency of Education, 2014, 16). Further, teaching should 'strengthen the respect of cultural diversity, promote interaction within and between cultures and thus create the foundation for culturally sustainable development' (National Agency of Education, 2014, 16). These are laudable goals and set the context for the work that needs to be done moving forward.

Linguistically responsive teaching

Linguistically responsive teaching is a framework introduced by Lucas and Villegas (2011, 2013). According to them, linguistically responsive teachers understand that language, culture and identity are deeply intertwined, and language is situated within the wider socio-political context. Linguistically responsive teachers value linguistic diversity as an asset in their classrooms, and they encourage their students to use their entire linguistic repertoire as a resource for learning. Furthermore, linguistically responsive teachers understand that language plays an important role both in acquiring and applying knowledge, as well as in communication. Thus, they need to pay attention to the challenges language poses and how language is used in different subjects. Additionally, teachers must be aware of the kind of language skills the students need in order to be able to understand and follow an assignment given to them in class and to develop their academic language skills. (Cummins, 2001; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; 2013; Schleppegrell, 2016.)

Linguistically responsive teachers also possess a certain pedagogical knowledge and skills (Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2013). These consist of knowing their students' backgrounds, identifying the linguistic issues that are likely to be challenging for their learners, classroom discourse and tasks, knowing and applying key principles of second language learning, and scaffolding instruction to promote ELL students' learning. Linguistically responsive teaching is for the benefit of every student: nobody speaks the language of schooling from their birth – everybody has to learn the academic register of language when they start school. In order to succeed in school, all learners need guidance on how to produce and interpret the spoken and written texts of different subjects (Beacco et al., 2015).

Ramírez (1992) reported an important study on the benefits of using students' home languages in instruction: the more years that students had been instructed both in their home language and in the target language, the better they were in their academic and target language skills. Thus, the less time that students spent in majority language instruction, the better they became in the majority language. Further, parents were also more involved with their children's schoolwork when the students spent more years in bilingual instruction.

Previous studies have shown that the practices in schools are still highly monolingual (Tarnanen, Kauppinen, & Ylämäki, 2017; Taylor, Bernhard, Garg, & Cummins, 2008). A previous study conducted among Finnish teachers (N=820) indicated that Finnish teachers' beliefs regarding multilingualism were relatively positive, but their beliefs about implementing multilingual practices in their classrooms were contradictory: only one-fourth of the teachers advocated use of the students' entire linguistic repertoire, while over a third of the teachers forbid students from using their home languages during lessons. The rest of the teachers allowed their students to use their home languages only occasionally. (Alisaari et al., 2019.) The same teachers were, however,

highly knowledgeable about language learning: over 80% of them knew about the main principles affecting language learning, and 71% of them regarded supporting their students' learning in linguistically challenging situations as their duty (Alisaari, Heikkola, & Acquah, 2019). The Finnish curriculum for basic education states that "attitudes towards languages and linguistic communities are discussed, and the key role of language in learning, interaction, collaboration, identity building and socialization has to be understood. -- [Further,] every adult is a linguistic model and also a teacher of the language of their subjects." (National Agency for Education, 2014, 28.) Given the above findings, this will require explicit attention in teacher preparation and development.

Affirming identities

Teachers' pedagogical practices send important messages to students in terms of how students see their possibilities now and, in the future (Norton, 2013). The main idea behind culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogies is to affirm students' identities. Thus, it is important to investigate just what is meant by identities and how they are affirmed. Identities reflect how 'a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future' (Norton, 2013, p. 4). Students develop their identities through daily interactions with other people (de Jong, 2011). These interactions can be called identity negotiations (Cummins, 2001). Language as a medium of socialisation has an important influence on the identity construction process (Phinney & Ong, 2007), and it is also the means by which people express 'who they are, where they belong, and their ways in and views of the world', that is, their identities (de Jong, 2011, p. 30).

Teachers' and students' interactions with one another influence both students' orientation and self-esteem as well as their school success: if teachers affirm their students' identities, students will feel validated and will be more likely to engage themselves in learning and put an effort into assuring their academic success (Cummins, 2001; de Jong, 2011). According to Cummins , 'the interactions that take place between students and teachers and among students are more central to student success than any method for teaching literacy, or science or math' (p. 1).

Students are active agents in their identity negotiations: identities develop through social interaction, and if students feel that their identities are devalued, then they either accept or resist such a process in order to affirm their basic human rights. (Cummins, 2001; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2008). Importantly, power relations and the ways in which cultures and languages are perceived in society affect the ways teachers and students negotiate the identities (Cummins, 2001). Schools send powerful messages, for example by means of the curriculum, regarding what is viewed as desirable, and educators have to reflect on which identities are being affirmed at school. For example, the idea

of schools as communities that should merely reproduce the monocultural and monolingual normality of educational decision-makers is racist and stigmatising (Blackledge, 2003; Norton, 2013). On the other hand, the 'two-languages-two-cultures' ideology fails to acknowledge that many students negotiate multiple, dynamic identities (de Jong, 2011, p. 195.)

Sometimes students from diverse backgrounds need to hide their linguistic and cultural identities in order to be accepted in mainstream classrooms: nothing they have learned before is valuable at school, and their learning should occur in 'an experiential vacuum' (Cummins, 2001, p. 2). This may lead to a situation where students tend to avoid further devaluation of their identities and withdraw from interaction at school. Students should instead be viewed as producers and contributors of knowledge and encouraged to use their funds of knowledge and share what they have learnt outside the school (de Jong, 2011; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992). Teachers should make students' voices heard and include their experiences, knowledge and skills within their daily learning experiences in order to affirm their identities (de Jong, 2011). When teachers ensure that their students' linguistic and cultural experiences and identities are affirmed, not devaluated, they allow their students' voices to be heard (Cummins, 2001; de Jong, 2011).

Multilingual students should be encouraged to use their whole linguistic repertoire to learn and demonstrate their knowledge, since this would affirm their linguistic learning identities (de Jong, 2011). Student empowerment builds on respect, trust and reflection of experiences and identities, and it may challenge and change the power relations that exist in society (Cummins, 2001).

Culture and cultural identity also include religion and religious identity, and their non-religious counterpart, which can be called non-religious worldviews. According to van der Kooij, de Ruyter and Miedema (2013), the notion of worldview, derived from the German concept *Weltanschauung*, is widely used for this purpose, especially in the field of religious education. Worldviews can refer to organised (e.g. Christianity, Humanism) and personal worldviews (van der Kooij, de Ruyter, & Miedema, 2013), and both are relevant factors concerning daily life in school.

A special feature of religious or worldview diversity is that a widespread discourse of neutrality is in place that assumes that by removing any signs of religion from the school's public space, it will become a neutral space, one suited for all students. Pierik and van der Burg (2014) call this kind of neutrality exclusive neutrality. Rissanen, Kuusisto and Kuusisto (2016) have shown that student teachers need guidance in order to question the neutrality of their own secular viewpoints. In the thinking of some Swedish and Finnish school principals, making adjustments for cultural diversity is more self-evident than for religious diversity (Rissanen, in press). However, in a survey among Finnish teachers and student teachers, two orientations were found in addition to a secularist perspective supporting the abolition of religion from a

school's public space: religiously responsive and equal visibility approaches. The difference between these two approaches is that religiously responsiveness means having an understanding attitude towards catering to pupils' religious needs, like providing rooms for prayer, exemptions from and adjustments of school activities, and gender-based groupings, whereas the equal visibility approach calls for giving equal attention to diverse festival traditions and making allowances for religious symbols. (Niemi, Kimanen & Kallioniemi, 2019).

Besides subject lessons, school celebrations are an important field in which identities are constructed. According to an interview study by Niemi, Kuusisto and Kallioniemi (2014), perceived Finnishness was a major feature of school celebrations, although it was defined in many different ways by the interviewees. The contents of 'Finnishness' in school celebrations and the place of (Lutheran) Christian religion in such Finnishness was under negotiation. It is also evident that the need to increase the inclusivity of the school celebrations is an explicit concern. In our view, being able to recognise and discuss different aspects of traditions and celebrations is an important prerequisite for renewing school culture.

There are a few studies where identity issues have emerged in the findings of the study, sometimes even unexpectedly. For example, Leeman and Ledoux (2005) conducted a survey relying initially on a dichotomy between 'culturalist' and 'pluralist' views, with the latter stressing pluriformity of all kinds, not only cultural pluralism. In the results, however, other kinds of clusters emerged, including an 'enquiring attitude' and 'attention to culture', 'care and concern for each other' and 'equal opportunities'. These were related to identity, learning and inter-group as well as inter-individual relationships. In a study by Edelmann (2006), teachers' differing orientations emerged. The interviewed Swiss teachers were categorised into four main groups: for some, cultural and other types of diversity was an enrichment; while some focused on language, others claimed to recognise pupils as individuals without specific reference to their backgrounds, and still others did not consider cultural diversity as having any impact on their practice. In the following, we will look at the orientations that emerge from the responses of both pre-service and in-service teachers in a Finnish context concerning in particular affirming identities through culturally and linguistically responsive practices. In the Finnish curriculum for basic education, "pupils are guided to identify the cultural meanings of the environment and to build their own cultural identity and positive environmental relationship. Pupils learn to know and appreciate their living environment and its cultural heritage as well as their own social, cultural, religious, world-view and linguistic roots. They are encouraged to consider the importance of their own background and its place in the chain of generations." (National Agency of Education, 2014, 21.) As with the sections described above, the curriculum provides a firm basis for advancing the work of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching.

Methodology

This quantitative study explores the relevance of responsive practices in teachers' task perception, using a survey designed to measure them. The data presented in this article were collected as part of a larger survey conducted at the beginning of teacher training interventions carried out by a teacher training development project. The questionnaire was designed to reflect the goals and desired practices of the project, namely, developing teachers' intercultural and inter-worldview reflectivity and linguistically and culturally responsive pedagogy. This article focuses on the part of the survey that inquired about linguistically and culturally responsive practices.

A survey developed to measure teachers' beliefs and practices on linguistically and culturally responsive pedagogy (Vigren, Alisaari, Heikkola, Acquah & Commins, 2019) was taken as the basis for the questionnaire, and it was further developed to fit the purposes of this study. The original survey was based on the theoretical framework for linguistically responsive teaching proposed by Lucas and Villegas (2011, 2013), and culturally responsive pedagogy proposed by Ladson-Billing (1995) and Gay (2010), and the essential practices for culturally responsive pedagogy proposed by Teemant (2018). The items were developed by an international team of professors, assistant professors and university teachers from two universities in Finland, and it was pilot tested with a small number of teachers who commented on the wordings and the length of the survey.

For the purposes of the present study, some (but not all) items concerning linguistically responsive practices were left out because they were not addressed in the courses or workshops where the survey was conducted. Additionally, some further items were designed to highlight the addressing of cultural issues and affirming identities in classroom as well as co-operation and sharing concerning cultural diversity with colleagues (items 12–15 and 7). The survey question concerning these practices was formulated to match Kelchtermans's (2009) idea of task perception: 'Among the many demands concerning the work of a teacher or a student counsellor an educator often experiences as the most relevant about certain tasks as they consider them as central in their role and important in reaching the educational goals. (If you do not work as a teacher or a counsellor at the moment, you may reflect on how ready you would be to use your time and energy to fulfilling these tasks properly.) To what extent do you experience the following tasks as relevant?' A five-level Likert scale was employed to measure the degree of relevance.

The three training interventions were carried out during spring of 2018, and 181 respondents in all filled in the online survey at the beginning of the course they attended. The first group of respondents (n=35, 19.3%) consisted of students of theology and education in an optional university course addressing worldview diversity in school contexts. All the students were asked to consider themselves as future educators in the survey, although not all of the theology students were studying in teacher programmes.

The second group of participants (n=43, 23.8%) consisted of guidance and counselling students taking a compulsory university course focusing on, among other things, intercultural and inter-worldview issues. The third group (n=103, 56.9%) consisted of teachers, student counsellors and head teachers who were attending two training days addressing cultural and worldview diversity in school contexts. For them, attendance was also either mandatory or strongly recommended by their supervisors based on their responsibilities in the field of pedagogical development. Thus, it may be concluded that the sample did not consist exclusively of those who had a previous commitment to the subject. Participation in the study was voluntary, but the courses and training days gave the participants time to answer the survey questions.

The gender distribution was uneven, as 13.9% of the participants were male, 85.1% female and 1.1% other, or else they preferred not to say. The participants also mostly represented the linguistic majority, as 96.1% of them spoke Finnish as their first language. Some of the student teachers or counselling students had some previous experience working as teacher or counsellors, and 26.7% of them had less than one year of teaching or counselling experience. Also, the questionnaire inquired about the current position of the participants. Acknowledging that the respondents may in fact have several roles simultaneously, such as working as a classroom teacher and a specialized subject teacher, or studying while working as a teacher, the respondents were asked to choose their primary duty from the list / among the options provided. The distribution is displayed in Table 1.

Table 1.
Current Positions of The Participants

Current position (primary duty)	N	%
Student	65	35.9
Classroom teacher	29	16.0
Subject teacher	39	21.5
Student counsellor, special needs education teacher, Finnish as second language teacher or teacher of newly arrived migrants	34	18.8
Principal	14	7.7
Total	*181*	*100.0*

The table shows that approximately one-third of the participants were students, some of whom were not yet in or did not plan to apply to teacher education programmes. Nonetheless, all of them were asked to consider themselves as future edu-

cators. The teachers formed three approximately equal groups: classroom teachers, subject teachers and those educators who teach smaller groups or otherwise form more intimate relationships with their pupils (student counsellors, special needs education teachers, Finnish as second language teachers and teachers of newly arrived migrants). In addition, a small group of principals participated.

In the statistical analysis conducted with SPSS, the participants' statements concerning preparedness to respond to cultural diversity in teaching work were analysed via exploratory factor analysis. Principal component analysis and direct oblimin rotation were used. The conditions for factor analysis were met, with Bartlett's test yielding a chi-square value of 967.3 (p=.000), and Kaiser-Meyer Olkin's test yielding a value of .837. To obtain a clear interpretation of the factors, three rotations were conducted. The three-factor solution gave the clearest form of interpretation, with the factors explaining the total variance present in the data. Three scales were formulated on the basis of the factor analysis to describe these factors. Variables with a loading of over .40 were calculated using the scales. In contrast, variables that had side loadings of over .30 were not calculated using the scales. Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each scale. ANOVA was calculated with different scales as a dependent variable, and the length of teaching experience or the current position of the participant as separate factors. Furthermore, an independent samples t-test was calculated with different scales as dependent variables and with gender and previous studies in multicultural education treated as separate independent variables.

Results

When investigating the participants' orientations towards culturally and linguistically responsive teaching as a result of the exploratory factor analysis, three factors emerged (Table 2). We labelled them as orientation to culture, orientation to language and orientation to affirming identity, based on their characteristics.

Table 2.
Loadings of The Items on The Three Factors

Item	Factor		
	1	2	3
12. Point out different perspectives when worldview, value or cultural issues are addressed in any subject	0.81		
15. Bring forth issues that in our culture are considered self-evident to be discussed among colleagues	0.78		
14. Reflect on observations concerning cultures and worldviews together with colleagues	0.76		
5. Recognise and resist oppressive practices (for example sexism, racism, homophobia and gender-related discrimination)	0.65		(-0.33)
4. Build learners' intercultural competence, i.e. the will and ability to understand people different from themselves	0.64	(0.37)	
13. Address school festival traditions and their background with learners	0.60		
6. Guide in collaboration, interaction and dialogue among all learners	0.45		
10. Support learners to see themselves as capable agents as they use language while studying all school subjects		0.81	
9. Draw attention to how language is used in all subjects and in counselling		0.78	
8. Encourage learners to use their multilingualism in different school subjects		0.72	
7. Enable diverse ways to demonstrate what the learners have learnt		0.63	
11. Promote two-way collaboration between home and school by inviting the families to become part of school activities		(0.32)	0.61
1. Use learners' prior knowledge, skills and abilities as a resource for learning			0.60
3. Connect teaching or counselling with learners' experiences from the environment in which they grow up			0.57
2. Support the construction of learners' identities (an identity consists of gender, worldview, ethnicity, language, sexual orientation, ability and socio-economic background)			0.44

Orientation to culture consisted of a willingness to address cultural traditions and

symbols both in relation to subject contents and festival traditions. The items also contained preparedness to bring forth cultural assumptions to be discussed among colleagues and to guide all the learners to engage in interaction and dialogue, indicating a commitment to community building. Also, the items 'resist oppressive practices' and 'build learners' intercultural competence' loaded strongly on this factor, although they also had a small side-loading effect. Orientation to language included attention to learners' linguistic resources and the role language plays in acquiring and applying knowledge. This orientation indicated a commitment to foster learning. Orientation to affirming identity focused on fostering learners' identities and using their funds of knowledge as learning resources. Orientation towards the pupils' backgrounds was also visible as a means of promoting collaboration between home and school on this factor, although it too had a small side-loading effect. However, there was no explicit aim to make diversity visible in the school community in this orientation.

Sum variables were formed based on the three above-mentioned factors. Items 4, 5 and 11 had side-loadings, so they were excluded. The means of the sum variables are presented in Table 3. Orientation to language and orientation to culture were approximately equal among the participants. Orientation to affirming identities had the highest mean, indicating that the participants considered this factor to be the most relevant. There was a significant difference between the orientation to affirming identities and the orientation to culture (t= 5.6, df= 170, p=0.000) and between the orientation to affirming identities and the orientation to language (t = 6.9, df = 170, p= 0.000).

Table 3.
Orientations to Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Pedagogy

Scale	Mean	Sd	alfa
S1. Orientation to culture	4.1	.6	.8
S2. Orientation to language	4.0	.6	.8
S3. Orientation to affirming identities	4.4	.5	.5

In order to answer the research question concerning the relationship between background factors (gender, training related to cultural diversity, length of career and professional status) and the orientations to culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy, we examined the differences between background factors and the sum variables. Certain differences were found. First, there was a significant difference between female and male participants in their orientation to affirming identities (t= 2.6, p=.001, df=170). Female participants considered affirming identities more relevant (M=4.4, Sd=.5) than did male participants (M=4.1, Sd=.6). Second, there was a significant

difference between participants who had attended training related to cultural diversity (M=4.5, Sd=.4) and those who had not (M=4.3, Sd=.5) in their orientation to affirming identities (t=2.6, *p*=.001, df=167). Length of career did not have a significant influence on any of the sum variables.

Current professional status proved to have an almost significant influence both on orientation to culture (*p*=.050) and affirming identities (*p*=.028). The group comprised of school counsellors, special education teachers, Finnish as second language teachers and teachers in preparatory classes considered orientation to affirming identities more relevant (M=4.6, Sd=.4) than did pre-service teachers (M=4.3, Sd=.5). In contrast, pre-service teachers (M=4.4, Sd=.5) considered orientation to culture more relevant than did subject teachers (M=4.0, Sd=.7).The means of the individual items (Table 4) make it possible to see the relevance of those tasks that were excluded from the sum variables, as well as certain details in the comparison of the tasks. It can be noticed that the highest means had to do with items concerning community building (6. providing opportunities for collaboration, interaction and dialogue between the teacher and the students, 5. recognise and resist oppressive practices, and 4. build learners' intercultural competence). The task experienced as being the least relevant was 13, addressing the school's festival traditions and their backgrounds with the learners. These results indicate that the respondents saw themselves not so much as cultural knowledge teachers, but that they were quite committed to fostering group spirit among their pupils.

Table 4.
Means and Standard Deviations of Individual Items

Item	Mean	Sd
1. Use learners' prior knowledge, skills and abilities as a resource for learning	4.5	.06
2. Support the construction of learners' identities (an identity consists of gender, worldview, ethnicity, language, sexual orientation, ability and socio-economic background)	4.3	.08
3. Connect teaching or counselling with learners' experiences from the environment in which they grow up	4.3	.07
4. Build learners' intercultural competence, i.e. the will and ability to understand people different from themselves	4.6	.06
5. Recognise and resist oppressive practices (e.g. sexism, racism, homophobia and gender-related discrimination)	4.6	.06
6. Guide in collaboration, interaction and dialogue among all learners	4.7	.06
7. Enable diverse ways to demonstrate what the learners have learnt	4.5	.06
8. Encourage learners to use their multilingualism in different school subjects	3.7	.09
9. Draw attention to how language is used in all subjects and in counselling	3.9	.09
10. Support learners to see themselves as capable agents as they use language while studying all school subjects	4.2	.08
11. Promote two-way collaboration between home and school by inviting the families to become part of school activities	3.8	1.0
12. Point out different perspectives when worldview, value or cultural issues are addressed in any subject	4.4	.08
13. Address school festival traditions and their background with learners	3.7	1.0
14. Reflect on observations concerning cultures and worldviews together with colleagues	4.0	.09
15. Bring forth issues that in our culture are considered self-evident to be discussed among colleagues	3.9	.09

Discussion

All the orientations discovered by this study had high means, indicating that in the participants' task perceptions, they were rather more central than peripheral. This is in line with previous research conducted in the Finnish context, where teachers showed positive orientations towards multilingualism (Alisaari et al., 2019).

There was a significant difference between the participants' orientation to affirming identities and the other orientations. This might be explained by the possibility that the participants experienced themselves not so much as culture and language teachers, but that affirming identities was more in line with the constructivist learning theory that has been dominant in teacher education and the curricula for decades. The theory

emphasises learners' previous experiences and creating a positive relationship between the teacher and the learner (National Board of Education, 2004, 2014; Toom & Husu, 2016). Furthermore, until recently issues related to cultural and linguistic diversity have not been much present in Finnish teacher education and teachers are not sufficiently informed to teach diverse learners (Tarnanen, Kauppinen, & Ylämäki, 2017). This result on the need to emphasise the relevance of affirming identities is also somehow in line with a previous study by Leeman and Ledoux (2005), where it came about somewhat unexpectedly.

Although identities seem to be important for all teachers, education specifically addressing cultural diversity seemed to enhance the relevance even more. This is in line with previous studies, where the results have indicated the same positive effect of training on teachers' beliefs and attitudes regarding multilingualism (Alisaari et al, 2019).

For teachers who had more intimate relationships with their pupils due to their professional status, affirming identities was more relevant than for pre-service teachers. For pre-service teachers, however, orientation to culture was more relevant than for subject teachers. Since about half of the preservice teachers were theology students, it is not surprising that their preparedness to teach about symbols and traditions was (at an almost significant level) higher. Instead, they did not have as much experience in creating personal relationships with the pupils and their identities, whereas especially for teachers who usually teach small groups it is a central part of their professionality.

Conclusion

This article investigated the orientations that Finnish pre-service and in-service teachers have to culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. From the data, three orientations emerged: orientation to culture, orientation to language and orientation to affirming identities. Statistically significant impacts were revealed between certain background factors and orientations. For females, affirming identities was more relevant than for male participants. Further, participants who had received training in cultural diversity considered affirming identities more relevant than those who had not, and so did small-group teachers when compared to pre-service teachers. In general, the participants were quite committed to fostering group spirit but a bit less to teaching cultural literacy.

There are some limitations to the study. The sample was not coincidental and it was rather small, as the main aim of this study was an exploratory examination of the orientations. There was also some ambiguity regarding the contents of the orientations. Based on the results, we are not able to conclude whether the orientation to affirming identities means publicly valuing diverse identities in classrooms or if it only means that they are recognised in private interaction with the learners. The dimension between individual and collective recognition of diversity also emerged in a study by

Edelmann (2006), and it could be further elaborated on in future studies.

Although Löytty (2004) argues that Finnish basic education produces citizens that are considered 'normal' and 'common', thereby diminishing their diversity, our results show that diversity is positively valued among pre-service and in-service teachers. However, we have to be cautious when interpreting the results since the positive answers may reflect the perceived desirability of those practices more than the respondents' task perceptions. The results of some previous studies have shown that teachers' beliefs and practices are not always in accordance, namely teachers' beliefs being more positive than their real practices (Alisaari & Heikkola, 2017; Borg, 2006). Thus, future studies should investigate how teachers' classroom practices are related to culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. This could be done by, for example, observing the practices. Further, in this study the participants were not asked to compare any other practices with culturally and linguistically responsive practices. This could also explain the high means for all three orientations, and a possible topic for future study could entail comparing the tasks related to culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy and the tasks not related to promoting diversity among learners.

Based on the results of the current study, the implications for teacher education are as follows: education on cultural and linguistic diversity enhances the relevance of related practices in teachers' task perception. Attention to teachers' preparedness to implement a culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy could also have an impact on other areas of teachers' professional self-understanding: self-image, self-esteem, job motivation and future perspective (Kelchtermans 2009). In today's diverse classrooms, teachers who see responding to cultural and linguistic diversity as a central part of their work might be more motivated and confident in their work and committed to their career. The positive orientations to culture, language and supporting identities may also be considered a first step toward full cultural and linguistic responsiveness, improving commitment to all three orientations.

Recently, in many societies, attitudes towards diversity have become more polarised. Teachers have a significant role in influencing the attitudes in future society by the work they do in today's classrooms: 'A genuine commitment to helping all students succeed academically requires a willingness on the part of educators, individually and collectively, to challenge aspects of the power structure in the wider society' (Cummins, 2001, p. vii).

References

Alisaari, J. & Heikkola L. M. (2017). Songs and poems in the language classroom: Teachers' beliefs and practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 63, 231–242. DOI: /10.1016/j.tate.2016.12.021

Alisaari, J., Heikkola, L. M. & Acquah, E. O. (2019). Opettajien käsitykset kielellis-

esti vastuullisesta opetuksesta [Teachers' perceptions of linguistically responsive teaching]. Manuscript in progress.

Alisaari, J., Heikkola, L. M., Commins, N., & Acquah, E. O. (2019). Monolingual ideologies confronting multilingual realities. Finnish teachers' beliefs about linguistic diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 80, 48-58. DOI: 10.1016/j.tate.2019.01.003

Aronson, B. & Laughter, J. (2016). The Theory and Practice of Culturally Relevant Education: A Synthesis of Research across Content Areas. *Review of Educational Research* 86(1), 163–206.

Blackledge, A. (2003). Imagining a monocultural community: Racialization of cultural practice in educational discourse. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education, 2*(4), 331–347.

Beacco, J. C., Fleming, M., Gouiller, F. Thürmann, E. & Vollmer, H. (2015). *The language dimension in all subjects. The handbook for curriculum development and teacher training.* Council of Europe. Language Policy Unit.

Borg, S. (2006). Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice. London, UK: Continuum.

Cummins, J. (2001). *Negotiating Identities: Education for Empowerment in a Diverse Society.* Second Edition. Los Angeles: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Edelmann, D. 2006. Pädagogische Professionalität im transnationalen sozialen Raum. Eine Studie über Sichtweisen und Erfahrungen von Primarlehrpersonen in Bezug auf die kulturelle Heterogenität ihrer Schulklassen. In G. Allemann-Ghionda and E. Terhart (hrsg.) *Kompetenzen und Kompetenzentwicklung von Lehrerinnen und Lehrern* (pp. 235–49). Weinheim: Beltz.

Gay, G. (2010) *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Harju-Luukkainen, H., Nissinen, K., Sulkunen, S., Suni, M., & Vettenranta J. (2014). *Avaimet osaamisen tulevaisuuteen. Selvitys maahanmuuttajataustaisten nuorten osaamisesta ja siihen liittyvistä taustatekijöistä PISA 2012 - tutkimuksessa* [Keys to the future of knowledge. Study on the competence and background factors of young people with an immigrant background in the PISA 2012 study]. University of Jyväskylä. Finnish Institute for Educational Research. https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/handle/123456789/44290

de Jong, E. J. (2011). *Foundations for Multilingualism in Education from Principles to Practice.* Philadelphia: Caslon Publishing.

Kelchtermans, G. (2009). Who I am in how I teach is the message: self-understanding, vulnerability and reflection. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice* 15:2, 257–272, DOI: 10.1080/13540600902875332

Kirjavainen, T. &, Pulkkinen, J. (2017). Takaako samanlainen tausta samanlaisen

osaamisen? Maahanmuuttajataustaisten ja kantaväestön oppilaiden osaamiserot PISA 2012 -tutkimuksessa. [Does a similar background guarantee similar competence? Differences in Finnish PISA 2012 results for native and immigrant students]. *Kasvatus* 48(3), 189−202.

Kooij, J. C. van der, Ruyter, D. J. de & Miedema, S. (2013). "Worldview": The Meaning of the Concept and the Impact on Religious Education. *Religious Education* 108(2), 210–228, DOI: 10.1080/00344087.2013.767685

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal 32*(3), 465–491.

Leeman, Y., and Ledoux, G. (2005). Teachers on intercultural education. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice* 11(6), 575–89. doi: 10.1080/13450600500293258

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M (2011). A framework for preparing linguistically responsive teachers. In Lucas, T. (Ed), Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: *A Resource for teacher educators* (pp. 55–72). NY: Routledge.

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A.M. (2013). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: Laying the foundation in preservice teacher education, *Theory into Practice 52*(2), 98–109.

Lucas, T., Villegas, A. M., & Freedson-Gonzalez, M. (2008). Linguistically responsive teacher education: Preparing classroom teachers to teach English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education* 59(4), 361–373.

Löytty, O. (2018). Erikoisen tavallinen suomalaisuus. [Especially ordinary Finnishness]. In M. Lehtonen, O. Löytty & P. Ruuska (Eds.). *Suomi toisin sanoen* (2nd ed.) (pp. 31–54). Tampere: Vastapaino.

McCarty, T. L. (1993). Language, literacy, and the image of the child in American Indian classrooms. *Language Arts 70*, 182–192.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge: A qualitative approach to developing strategic connections between homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice* 31, 132–141.

National Agency of Education (2014). *Perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelman perusteet* [Finnish Core Curriculum for Basic Education]. Määräykset ja ohjeet 2014:96. Retrieved on 23rd March 2017 from: http://www.oph.fi/download/163777_perusopetuksen_opetussuunnitelman_perusteet_2014.pdf

National Agency of Education (2015). *Lukion opetussuunnitelman perusteet.* [Finnish Core Curriculum for Upper Secondary Education]. Määräykset ja ohjeet 2015:48. Retrieved on 23rd March 2017 from: http://www.oph.fi/download/172124_lukion_opetussuunnitelman_perusteet_2015.pdf

Niemi, P.-M., Kimanen, A. & Kallioniemi, A. (2019) Including or Excluding Religion and Worldviews in Schools? Finnish Teachers' and Teacher Students' Perceptions. Manuscript in peer review.

Niemi, P.-M., Kuusisto, A. & Kallioniemi, A. (2014). Discussing school celebrations

from an intercultural perspective – a study in the Finnish context. *Intercultural Education.* 25:4, 255-268, DOI: 10.1080/14675986.2014.926143

Nieto, S. & Bode, P. (2012). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson/Allyn&Bacon.

Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and Language Learning. Extending the Conversation*. 2nd Edition. Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Official Statistics of Finland (2016) *Families* [e-publication]. Annual Review 2016. Helsinki: Statistics Finland. Retrieved on 2nd February 2019 from: http://www.stat.fi/til/perh/2016/02/perh_2016_02_2017-11-24_tie_001_en.html

Official Statistics of Finland (2018) *Population structure* [e-publication].

Helsinki: Statistics Finland. Retrieved on 13th April 2019 from: http://www.stat.fi/til/vaerak/2018/vaerak_2018_2019-03-29_tie_001_en.html

Phinney, J. S. & Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and Measurement of Ethnic Identity: Current Status and Future Directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 54(3), 271–281.

Pierik, R. & van der Burg, W. (2014). What is Neutrality? *Ratio Juris* 27(4). https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/raju.12057

Ramírez, C. M. (1992). Executive summary. *Bilingual Research Journal 16*, 1–62.

Rissanen, I., in press. School principals' diversity ideologies in fostering the inclusion of Muslims in Finnish and Swedish schools. *Race Ethnicity and Education.*

Rissanen, I., Kuusisto, E. & Kuusisto, A. (2016). Developing Teachers' Intercultural Sensitivity: Case Study on a Pilot Course in Finnish Teacher Education. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 59, 446–456.

Schleppegrell, M. J. (2012). Academic language in teaching and learning: Introduction to the special issue. *The Elementary School Journal,* 112(3), 409–418.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2008). Human rights and language policy in education. In S. May, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., Vol. 1) (pp. 107–119). New York: Springer.

Tarnanen, M., Kauppinen, M., & Ylämäki, A. (2017). Oman äidinkielen tekstitaidot monikielisyyttä rakentamassa – näkökulmia kielille annettuihin merkityksiin ja kielten käyttöön In S. Latomaa, E. Luukka, & N. Lilja (Eds.) *Kielitietoisuus eriarvoistuvassa yhteiskunnassa* [Language Awareness in an Increasingly Unequal Society]. AFinLAn Vuosikirja 75, 278–297. Retrieved on 15th December 2017 from: https://journal.fi/afinlavk/article/view/60559

Taylor, L. K., Bernhard, J. K., Garg, S., & Cummins, J. (2008). Affirming plural belonging: Building on students' family-based cultural and linguistic capital through multiliteracies pedagogy. *Journal of Early Childhood Education, 8*(3), 269-294. DOI: 10.1177/1468798408096481

Teemant, A. (2018). Sociocultural theory as everyday practice: The challenge of K-12 teacher preparation for multilingual and multicultural learners. In J. P. Lantolf, M.

E. Poehner and M. Swain (Eds.) *The Routledge handbook of sociocultural theory and second language development* (pp. 529-550). New York, NY: Routledge.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Toom, A., & J. Husu. (2016). Finnish Teachers as 'Makers of the Many': Balancing between Broad Pedagogical Freedom and Responsibility. In H. Niemi, A. Toom, and A. Kallioniemi (eds.) *Miracle of Education: The Principles and Practices of Teaching and Learning in Finnish Schools,* pp. 41–56. 2nd revised ed. Rotterdam: Sense.

Vettenranta, J. Välijärvi, J., Ahonen, A., Hautamäki, J., Hiltunen, J., Leino, K., Lähteinen, S., Nissinen, K. Nissinen, V., Puhakka, E., Rautopuro, J. & Vainikainen, M.-P. (2016). Huipulla pudotuksesta huolimatta. PISA 2015 -ensituloksia [Despite the drop, at the top. The first PISA 2015 results]. Publications of the Ministry of Culture and Education 2016:41. https://ktl.jyu.fi/pisa/ajankohtaista/PISAjulkistaminen-2015

Vigren, H., Alisaari, J., Heikkola, L. M., Acquah, E. O. & Commins, N. L. (2019). Teaching migrant students: Attitudes and beliefs of Finnish school teachers. Manuscript in progress.

Zilliacus, H., G. Holm, & F. Sahlström. (2017). Taking steps towards institutionalising multicultural education – The national curriculum of Finland. *Multicultural Education Review* 9(4), 231–48. DOI:10.1080/2005615X.2017.1383810