DiVA
http://www.diva-portal.org

This is the published version of a paper published in *Classroom Discourse*.

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Walldén, R., Nygård Larsson, P. (2023)
"It can be a bit tricky": negotiating disciplinary language in and out of context in civics classrooms
Classroom Discourse, 14(3): 302-325
https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2022.2084426

Access to the published version may require subscription.

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version:
http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:lnu:diva-131978

Classroom Discourse

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rcdi20

“It can be a bit tricky”: negotiating disciplinary language in and out of context in civics classrooms

Robert Walldén & Pia Nygård Larsson

To cite this article: Robert Walldén & Pia Nygård Larsson (2022): “It can be a bit tricky”: negotiating disciplinary language in and out of context in civics classrooms, Classroom Discourse, DOI: 10.1080/19463014.2022.2084426

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2022.2084426

© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.

Published online: 24 Jun 2022.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 128

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=rcdi20

CLASSROOM DISCOURSE
https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2022.2084426

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

OPEN ACCESS Check for updates

"It can be a bit tricky": negotiating disciplinary language in and out of context in civics classrooms

Robert Walldén and Pia Nygård Larsson

Faculty of Education and Society, Malmö University, Malmö, Sweden

ABSTRACT

This article focuses on how Grade 6 students interactionally make meaning out of subject-related language encountered in civics textbook material by searching for synonyms and engaging in discussions. Employing ethnographically-inspired methods, data was collected through observations and audio recordings of civics teaching in two linguistically diverse classrooms in which the students were taught in the majority language, Swedish. In the article, oral classroom interaction is perceived as a crucial part of the meaning-making social practice in which students' disciplinary literacy is developed. Key analytical concepts are *discursive shifts* and *discursive mobility* – the ability to move between and within different discourses. The results show that the use of online dictionaries promoted decontextualizing processes in which the students unsuccessfully tried to negotiate multiple abstract meanings that, in many cases, were unrelated to the disciplinary content. In other exchanges, the adults gave interactional support by contextualizing the words and expressions in content-relevant ways and pointing out recognizable parts of words. In some cases, the teacher instead drew attention to words that have different meanings, which complicated the content-relevant understanding of the words. Implications for working with subject-related vocabulary in ways which support rather than hinder disciplinary understanding are discussed.

KEYWORDS

Classroom discourse; discourse-bridging interaction; disciplinary literacy; linguistically diverse classrooms; semantic waves

1. Introduction

In this article, we focus on the opportunities afforded to students for negotiating and making meaning of the disciplinary language of social studies in linguistically diverse classrooms in which the majority language is used in teaching. Furthermore, we draw attention to interactional exchanges about the meaning of subject-related vocabulary as a salient part of classroom discourse. More specifically, we highlight how Grade 6 students (12 or 13-year-olds), supported by a teacher and one of the researchers, negotiate disciplinary vocabulary encountered in a civics textbook through interaction and the use of online dictionaries. The students comprised both L1 and L2 learners that received instruction in Swedish. A key concern in such classrooms,

CONTACT Robert Walldén robert.wallden@mau.se Faculty of Education and Society, Malmö University, 205 06, Malmö, Sweden

© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

common throughout Sweden, is the opportunities afforded to the students for participating in and successively appropriating subject-related discourse. There has been an awareness in second-language education of the risks of creating downward spirals through the simplification of content and an over-emphasis on the decontextualized drilling of vocabulary or knowledge about grammar (discussed in Cummins 2000; Gibbons 2006; Hajer and Meestringa 2020; Karlsson, Nygård Larsson, and Jakobsson 2020).

From the perspective of disciplinary literacy, knowledge of subject-related vocabulary and patterns of language is necessary to engage in disciplinary literacy practices (Fang and Schleppegrell 2010). In addition, this linguistic knowledge is gained not through decontextualized processes of reading and writing, but by engaging in social disciplinary practices involving the use of written language (Shanahan and Shanahan 2008). The complex considerations involved in employing a language-focused mode of teaching content knowledge are at the core of this article. We particularly focus on engaging with disciplinary language in social studies textbook material through oral interaction and peer group activities.

Recent research has focused largely on the negotiation of technical language in science classrooms (e.g. Axelsson and Jakobson 2020; Maton and Doran 2017; Walldén 2022; Nygård Larsson and Jakobsson 2020; Uddling 2021). Research into disciplinary literacy in social studies has tended to foreground history (e.g. Matruglio 2021; Shanahan and Shanahan 2008; Walldén 2020; Walldén and Nygård Larsson 2021b). This indicates a need for more research into students' opportunities for developing disciplinary literacy in other areas of social studies teaching. On the topic of engagement with texts in the teaching of civics, a previous article, partly based on the same material as the present undertaking (Walldén 2021), showed that whole-class discussions about the textbook material perpetuated national and Western-centric perspectives on the content that might be particularly problematic in classrooms with large percentages of students from migrant backgrounds. This aligns with international research problematizing the use of social studies teaching material promoting colonial perspectives, including deficit perspectives on life in other countries (Marmer et al. 2010; Mikander 2015; Odebiyi and Sunal 2020). Although these studies raise important points about the national character of social studies subjects, they do not explore the negotiation of disciplinary language.

The purpose of the present study is to contribute knowledge about how subject-related language in civics teaching is negotiated in classroom interactions. In particular, we address the following questions:

(1) What knowledge about language and word meanings is negotiated in discussions about vocabulary from the civics textbook material?
(2) How do discussions about subject-related vocabulary support discursive shifts between everyday and disciplinary ways of using language that clarify the contextual meaning of the word or expression?

In Sweden, civics *(samhällskunskap)* is one of four subjects within social studies, the others being history, religion, and geography. While being historically intertwined, the subjects are taught and assessed with a more disciplinary focus since the 2011 compulsory school curriculum was introduced (discussed in Samuelsson

2014). However, the disciplinary culture among primary school teachers is weak compared to that of secondary schooling (Kristiansson 2017). Civics in particular is often perceived as vaguely defined in relation to the other subjects. Though it has been suggested that civics teaching should focus on the concept of society and analytical thinking related to societal concepts (Blanck & Lödén, 2017), researchers have pointed out that civics lacks a corresponding university discipline (Blanck 2014). Furthermore, an interview study of primary school teachers showed that civics was attributed few distinguishing markers and was primarily perceived as having an assisting role, particularly for geography and history (Kristiansson 2014, 2017). Classroom research on the on-going teaching of civics is generally scarce (discussed in Blanck 2014; Lindh 2019).

2. Learning technical and academic vocabulary in subject teaching

Expanding vocabulary is widely considered one of the most important factors determining academic achievement (e.g. Ardasheva and Tretter 2017; Hirsch 2013; Milton and Treffers-Daller 2013; Nation 2013). However, the promotion of vocabulary learning can be seen from both a general and a disciplinary perspective.

On a general level, teachers need to create opportunities for meaningful input and output (Nation 2013) and promote strategies for guessing the meaning of words, such as retrieving meaning from the context and taking cues from different parts of words such as affixes (e.g. LaBontee 2019). Such strategies can be promoted through language-focused learning activities (Loewen 2014; Nation 2013). Using knowledge about word parts is particularly important in languages such as Swedish, which has a relatively rich morphology and promotes extensive use of compounding; for example, the term 'coffee filter' is orthographically represented as one word in Swedish (*kaffefilter*) (Enström 2020). Another important strategy for L2 students involves using dictionaries and online resources to look up the meaning of unknown words. However, learning to use dictionaries in a competent and effective way requires teacher support (Nation 2013).

The question of vocabulary becomes more complex when seen from the perspective of disciplinary literacy. Crucially, understanding and using field-specific terms have been identified as key components of knowledge building (e.g. Martin 2013). Interpreting disciplinary language means engaging with technical terms that clearly point to the disciplinary field studied (Martin 2001). In order to properly understand technical language, mere definition of terminology is not sufficient; it is also necessary to understand semantic relations to other terms, for example the relationship between *capitalism* and *communism* (Martin 2017). Another challenge is abstract language, involving terms that can have different meanings in different contexts, for example nominalizations such as 'demonstration' (cf. 'demonstrate'). Such shifts between grammatical categories are often encountered in the teaching of social studies (see Martin [1990] 1993) and will be further discussed in a coming section. Furthermore, students need to interpret words found across disciplinary contexts but seldom used in everyday language. This academic language notably includes what Systemic-Functional Linguistics terms relational processes (e.g. 'consist of', 'involve', 'affect', see Halliday et al. 2014). These play a central role in representing logical

relations between technical terms and the role of these terms in subject-specific processes. All of these factors contribute to the increased complexity of learning vocabulary as part of developing disciplinary literacies.

Oral classroom interaction is an important resource for making sense of academic, subject-related language. Previous studies have employed Systemic-Functional Linguistics (SFL) and Legitimation Code Theory (LCT) to describe classroom discourse in terms of *semantic waves*, or as an interactional strategy of bridging everyday and disciplinary discourses (e.g. Macnaught et al. 2013; Nygård Larsson 2018). This research has often found downward shifts, meaning that teachers unpacked technical and abstract discourse, using examples and resources of every-day language, but rarely demonstrated how everyday words and expressions could be re-packed, by upward shifts, into more complex and abstract ways of expressing disciplinary content (e.g. Hipkiss 2014; Maton 2013). Confirming this pattern, previous studies of social studies teaching in Grade 6 have highlighted that disciplinary terms relating to living conditions and history were discussed according to simple verbal definitions (Walldén 2019) or generic visual illustrations (Walldén and Nygård Larsson 2021b) rather than in terms of how they are used in disciplinary texts. Since disciplinary discourse connected to social studies relies heavily on abstraction (e.g. Martin [1990] 1993), the understanding of subject-specific vocabulary is more dependent on the context, such as the particular topic of a disciplinary text.

In various stages of schooling, recent research has highlighted the importance of teachers' awareness of disciplinary language to shape the opportunities for students to engage in disciplinary literacy practices (e.g. Humphrey 2021; Matruglio 2021; Uddling 2021; Walldén 2020). In addition, a study of second-language instruction (Walldén and Nygård Larsson 2021b) has shown the importance of learning disciplinary language in tandem with interpreting challenging disciplinary texts. As pointed out by Martin (2013), technical and academic vocabulary features in texts storing 'the explanations and descriptions constituting the field'. From this perspective, both technical terms and more general features of academic registers are considered subject-related and crucial to successful engagement in disciplinary literacy practices.

While a few previous studies have highlighted teachers' interactional support for providing access to the disciplinary language of civics (e.g. Blanck 2021; Ernst-Slavitt and Morrison 2018) and more language-focused teaching strategies in the teaching of social studies (Zhang 2017), the present study will provide a more detailed analysis of interactional exchanges in civics teaching that also highlights the students' peer group strategies for making sense of disciplinary language.

3. Theoretical framework

Our understanding of disciplinary literacy in the present study is that general literacy skills, such as those strategies for interpreting and learning words discussed in the previous section, interplay with the specific disciplinary literacy skills necessary for acquiring and expressing knowledge in a given disciplinary field (Shanahan and Shanahan 2008; Stålnacke 2012). As Shanahan and Shanahan (2012) point out, general skills, such as categorizing words and listing synonyms, are not sufficient to

develop an understanding of discipline-specific distinctions in vocabulary use. Inspired by the notion of discourse-bridging interaction as a valuable form of contextual scaffolding (see Gibbons 2006; Hammond and Gibbons 2005), our point of departure is that oral interaction is crucial to promote students' negotiation and active use of disciplinary language. As also pointed out by previous research on civics teaching (Ernst-Slavitt and Morrison 2018; Blanck 2021), an important factor is the promotion of functional connections between disciplinary vocabulary and the students' different languages, knowledges, and experiences (Cummins 2000; Hammond and Gibbons 2005). From the perspective of disciplinary literacy, this interaction can highlight the semantic properties of the words used, including semantic relations to connected terms, and their contextual use in a specific knowledge field (Nygård Larsson 2011, 2018).

The discourse-bridging potentials in oral interaction are also highlighted in the semantic dimension of Legitimation Code Theory (LCT), which conceptualizes knowledge-building as a variable combination of contextual dependency and complexity of meaning (Maton 2013, 2014). Contextual dependency refers to the degree to which meaning relates to its context and involves shifts between *concrete* and *abstract* meanings, as well as between *specific* and *general* counterparts (within LCT described as a variable strength of semantic gravity). Complexity of meaning refers to the degree of complex meaning relations and *condensation* of meaning (described in LCT as a variable strength of semantic density). In classroom discourse, dynamic movements and shifts between concrete, specific, general, abstract, and dense meanings have been described and visualized as *semantic waves*, in which the two dimensions (contextual dependency and complexity of meaning) are condensed into one (Maton 2013; Nygård Larsson 2018). A related concept is *discursive mobility*, denoting the ability to move between and within different discourses, and gradually appropriate their inherent, specific ways of thinking, acting, and expressing disciplinary knowledge (Nygård Larsson 2011, 2018). In our analysis of classroom interaction, we use the concepts of discursive mobility and semantic waves to describe the opportunities afforded to the students to move between concrete, specific, general, abstract, and dense meanings, meaning between and within everyday and disciplinary ways of using language, in order to learn the disciplinary content and discourse. In order to highlight these discursive shifts[1] and the opportunities created for discursive mobility, we employ the Systemic-Functional Linguistics (SFL) perspective on language as a resource for meaning-making. We focus on the negotiation of ideational or experiential meaning in the interaction (see Halliday and Mathiessen 2014; Martin and Rose 2007). It follows that we view the discursive shifts and movements between discourses as corresponding to shifts in linguistic *registers* (Martin 2017), for example when a teacher rephrases a students' contribution in a more technical or abstract way (Gibbons 2006; Nygård Larsson 2018). A key concept is the *grammatical metaphor*, denoting the shifts between grammatical categories characteristic of disciplinary language (Halliday [1989] 1993; Martin 2013). For example, a process such as 'declare' can be transformed to a thing ('declaration') and placed into an expanded noun phrase connected to a specific field: 'Universal Declaration of Human Rights'. In addition, processes such as 'bind' (in Swedish,

binda) can shift into qualities ('bound', in Swedish *bunden*) which, in the Swedish language, often form part of single-word compounds (e.g. *regelbunden*, 'rule-bound', cf. *regular*). Grammatical metaphors are a significant feature of the abstract and dense language associated with social studies (Martin [1990] 1993) and are of crucial interest in the un-packing (downward shifts), and re-packing (upward shifts), of abstract language. Thus, they are associated with semantic waves and discursive mobility in disciplinary literacy practices (Macnaught et al. 2013; Maton 2014; Nygård Larsson 2018).

While we agree that general literacy skills pertaining to vocabulary tend to be emphasized at the expense of disciplinary literacy skills (see Shanahan and Shanahan 2012), general knowledge about word formation can be useful in encountering abstract disciplinary language. If students successfully identify part of a compound or a prefix denoting a nominalization, they may be able to approach the meaning of the word (LaBontee 2019; Nation 2013). Therefore, in our analysis, we explore the students' opportunities to negotiate both general knowledge about language and the specific meanings and contextual uses of disciplinary vocabulary.

4. Method and material

In the present study, ethnographically-inspired methods (see Fangen 2005) have been used to document how the students were supported in negotiating the meaning of disciplinary vocabulary in civics teaching. In this section, we describe the participants, material, and analytical approach of the study.

4.1. Participants

The study involved one teacher and 40 Grade 6 students (12 or 13-year-olds) in two different classrooms. The choice of school, located in a socially segregated area,[2] was based on knowledge of the school considering it a pedagogical priority to provide interactional support for students when dealing with content-area texts. Another consideration was that, according to official statistics, 50% of the students had a 'foreign background', meaning they were either born in a country other than Sweden or had both parents born outside Sweden. While we collected no specific information about the students' individual backgrounds or linguistic resources, the teacher gave group-level information confirming that the linguistic diversity reflected the substantial migration to Sweden from different parts of the world and that the most of the students with foreign background were considered second-language learners.[3] The participant teacher was followed because she, as the leader of a team of teachers, was a driving force in developing the school's scaffolding pedagogy with a focus on promoting discussions about subject-related texts and concepts. Thus, the teacher could be presumed to provide rich opportunities for interaction, which aligned with our aim of contributing knowledge about how subject-related language in civics teaching is negotiated in classroom interactions. Furthermore, she had a stated interest in collaborating with researchers.

The chosen location and participants were able to provide exemplary knowledge (see Thomas 2011) of teachers' supporting linguistically diverse students to engage with disciplinary texts and vocabulary when taught in the majority language (Swedish). In other words, we sought to provide particular representations of students' negotiating disciplinary vocabulary, which other researchers and teachers can recognize and make connections to, based on their own practices and contexts (Thomas 2010). Generally, the L2 learners in the study had not recently arrived in the country, but rather had already experienced some years of schooling in Sweden. In accordance with other staff at the school, the teacher stressed the importance of providing support to all students, not just the students with Swedish as a second language. In this article, the term 'linguistically diverse classroom' is used to describe the present classrooms that were shared between L1 and L2 learners of Swedish.

The participant teacher was certified in teaching Swedish, English, and social studies. She was aware of the researcher's interest in classroom discussions about disciplinary texts and concepts. Some preliminary analyses of the material presented in the study were shared with the teacher, which she described as beneficial for her understanding of word comprehension strategies and disciplinary language.

From an ethical standpoint, the study was conducted in accordance with principles advocated by the Swedish Research Council (2017). The first author sought and received written consent from all participants in the study, including written consent from students' caregivers. Students were informed orally before the study began. To ensure the caregivers' comprehension of the nature of the study, including expected publications forms, the possibility to withdraw participation, and the processing of personal data in the form of audio recordings, information was given both in adapted writing and orally during annual progress discussions between the teacher and students' caregivers. Audio recordings and transcripts were stored in secured ways according to the university regulations. As participant observer, the researcher sought the students' continuous assent to participate (see Tracy 2010) by asking their permission to participate in the peer group discussions while recording them and taking photos. From the perspective of relational ethics (Tracy 2010), the researcher strived to act responsibly to the students and the teacher, for example by providing support when the students asked for help (see below) in a way which did not disrupt the direction of the teaching or the teacher's expressed intentions.

4.2. Material

The first author collected the material by way of field notes, transcribed audio recordings (16 hours), screenshots of iPads, and the documentation of teaching material during 16 civics lessons spanning five weeks. During the study, the researcher mostly took the role of observer on the observer-participant cline (see Fangen 2005), seated either at the back of the classroom or, in peer-group activities, next to the students, while taking notes and managing a digital audio recorder. However, in some of the peer-group discussions, the researcher provided some linguistic support when students asked questions about the meaning of disciplinary words and expressions. This occasionally shifted the researcher's role to a more participating role in which the researcher drew on experience of teaching Swedish as a second language. In the results, we highlight parts of these unplanned interactions. In addition, the documentation of the peer group discussions involved

taking screenshots of searches on iPads. These were directly aimed at the iPad screens, not capturing the students. The audio recording was focused on the student groups in which the researcher participated, guided by the teacher's advice on groups with both L1 and L2 learners of Swedish.

The specific instances of interaction focused on in the present study occurred during three lessons (3 hours 40 minutes) centred on a textbook spread, concerning the United Nations and the Declaration of Human Rights, which the teacher considered particularly dense with difficult words. The vocabulary had not been presented or discussed earlier, but the teacher had led a whole-class discussion about headings and images on the relevant textbook spread. In addition, she had briefly explained what the United Nations is and shown a video clip about UNICEF. Both organizations feature on the spread. It follows that the students had some prior knowledge of the content. The peer group activity involved students searching for the meaning of words and negotiating their meaning in peer interaction, marking the only instance observed in which the teacher asked the students to note down and discuss unfamiliar subject-related words. The 40 students were divided into two classrooms and the activity played out similarly in both. However, just one lesson was followed in one of the classrooms. The textbook used in instruction is *Puls Samhällskunskap* (*Pulse Civics*) (Stålnacke 2012), which is part of a high-profile series from a large publisher of textbooks in Sweden. The studied teaching mainly focused on sections concerning globalization, international cooperation, living conditions, and human rights. A more comprehensive view of the teaching is given in another article (Walldén 2021) which focuses on whole-class discussions about the textbook material. Those discussions emphasized visual text features such as headings and images rather than verbal language. Therefore, they were not incorporated in the present article.

4.3. Analytical approach

The transcripts were read through multiple times by both researchers, with a focus on our aim of contributing knowledge about how disciplinary language in social studies is negotiated in classroom interaction. In choosing relevant excerpts for closer analysis, we were interested in the approaches that the students – following the teacher's direction – used to arrive at the meaning of words. The different approaches, such as using online dictionaries or requesting aid from adults, had consequences for the knowledge about language and word meanings negotiated in the discussions (RQ1). Furthermore, we were interested in the interactional support given by the adults, and discursive shifts between everyday and disciplinary ways of using language. This relates to how the discussions about subject-related vocabulary supported discursive shifts between everyday and disciplinary ways of using language (RQ2). Finally, the choice of examples reflects the linguistic challenges in the textbook as perceived by the students, comprising both words and expressions with subject-specific meaning and examples of general academic vocabulary. As can be expected, both categories featured in the register of the civics textbook material and in the words marked as unknown by the students.

In sum, the chosen excerpts exemplify student approaches to negotiating disciplinary vocabulary and the role of interaction in supporting discursive shifts. This is reflected in the two major sections of the findings, *Decontextualizing word meaning according to a thesaurus*

approach (emphasis on RQ1) and *Contextualizing disciplinary vocabulary through interactional support* (emphasis on RQ2). To ensure internal consistency, separate initial readings, analyses, and choices of excerpts were conducted and later conferred upon.

As previously described, we used the concept of *discursive mobility* (see Nygård Larsson 2011) to analyse how the words marked as unknown by the students were negotiated in the oral interaction. In accordance with RQ2, we were interested in occurrences, or non-occurrences, of discursive shifts. This involved possible definitions, as well as downward and upward discursive shifts, including unpacking and re-packing of grammatical metaphors, as part of *semantic waves* (see Macnaught et al. 2013; Maton 2013; Nygård Larsson 2018). As stated in the Theoretical framework section, this entailed SFL-based analysis of the level of register. We were also interested in the teacher's and students' orientation to interpreting words, particularly if it reflected an orientation to general literacy skills for understanding words or to their particular disciplinary context and use. This aligns with RQ1, which concerns the knowledge about language and word meanings negotiated in the discussions about vocabulary from the civics textbook material. Therefore, we have also focused on how the interaction relates to or deviates from the particular knowledge field focused on in instruction.

The transcribed interactions shown in the excerpts presented in this study have been translated from Swedish to English in ways that preserve crucial aspects of the linguistic analysis, such as the occurrences of grammatical metaphors. Since compounding is more prevalent in Swedish than in English, and orthographically different, some compounds have been translated both idiomatically and literally. The excerpts in Swedish are included in Appendix A.

5. Result

In this section, we highlight the interaction of Grade 6 students negotiating subject-related vocabulary encountered in the civics textbook spread. Placed in groups of three or four, the students were asked to individually note down words from the text that they did not understand. The subsequent interaction primarily focused on words marked as unknown by the students. The teacher had asked the students to 'look up' the meaning of the words. For this purpose, she handed out iPads.

5.1. Decontextualizing word meaning according to a thesaurus approach

In the studied interactions, the students generally used the iPads to search on Google for the words and expressions, often leading to definitions from web pages displayed directly in the search results and links to *synonymer.se*, an online thesaurus. In Excerpt 1, a student group was googling the meaning of 'deklaration' (*Declaration*), in the textbook referring to the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). In the excerpt, the word 'förklaring' – not used in the textbook material but encountered by students when searching online – is untranslated from Swedish. The most common meaning of this term is 'explanation', while it can also be synonymous with 'declaration'. In the transcripts, participants are represented by 'S' (students, sometimes numbered), 'T' (teacher), and 'R' (researcher). Quotations marks indicate original language wording.

Excerpt 1. Searching for the word "deklaration" on Google

S1: [Reading from first Google hit on "what's declaration"] Declaration, also called income declaration or self-, what's this word? Is an annual public document for income earners. What's this? [turns to researcher]
R: Declaration, it's like. You know, words can mean different things in different contexts. And income declaration probably does not have much to do with this. So maybe find something else. It's something adults need to do to pay taxes. When they are working.
S1: "Förklaring" [reading from synonymer.se]. /…/ Okay Loka, write like that.
S2: What should we write?
S1: What he said. /…/
R: No, I think you ought to find something else. /…/
T: The word declaration, it's not. It can be a bit, like, tricky because it could mean many different things. But it exists in English, declaration [says it in English].
S2: "Förklaring".
T: Yes, more like that.
S2: Pronouncement ["förklarande"] [reading from synonymer.se /…/ Decree.
T: Exactly. *Decree*, I think it does not make it easier for you. No.
S2: Income data. Eh. Income tax return. Tax return. Description of goods. Customs declaration. [keeps reading from synonymer.se]
T: Look up the English word and check the Swedish translation.
S1: Declaration [uses English pronunciation]
S2: How's it spelled? /…/
T: This is like detective work. You all need to consider. For example, look at the sentence in the book. Can you get a hint from how it's written? Where is it? Here. [points at page 121]. Here are some of the articles in the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights. So, could it be income declaration for telling how much money you have?
Students: No.
T: Right, that can't be it. Now, look at the explanations there and look how it is written here and try to think hmm what it possibly could mean.
S2: [Keeps reading from synonymer.se] Edict. "Förklaring". Declaration. Proclamation. Assertions.
S1: It's like statements. Here are some articles from UN's statements.
S2: How you "förklarar".

When using Google to search for the meaning of *deklaration* (declaration), the students encountered equally abstract terms, such as 'decree' (line 17), 'edict' (l. 31), and the nominalization 'proclamation' (l. 32). Several of these terms, such as 'tax return' (l. 18) and 'income declaration' (l. 2), belong to a different knowledge field within civics. When S1 turned to the researcher for help with an abstract definition of 'income declaration', the researcher encouraged the students to change track by pointing out the contextual meaning of the word (l. 4–7). Instead, one of the students seemed to latch on to the researcher's explanation of the term 'income declaration' (l. 10). In visiting the group, the teacher also pointed out the polysemy of the term: 'it could mean many different things' (l. 12–13). Remarking on the abstract synonyms encountered by the students, she tried to support them in two different ways: by drawing attention to the English term (l. 21), and by asking the students to do 'detective work' by taking cues from how the term was used in the book: 'look how it is written here and try to think hmm what it possibly could mean' (l. 30–31). S2 kept listing synonyms (l. 32–33), while S1 seemed to settle for 'statement' as

a suitable synonym, replacing 'declaration' in his paraphrase of the book: 'some articles from UN's statements' (l. 34). An added complexity in the negotiation of the Swedish terms is the term *förklaring*, encountered in the online search, which in itself is polysemic (discussed above). In the interaction, the teacher affirmed *förklaring* without relating to the common, everyday meaning 'explanation' (l. 15). For this reason, when S2 concluded the exchange with "How you '*förklarar*'" – thus unpacking it as a process (cf. 'explain') – it is unclear whether this reflected an understanding of 'declaration' according to its disciplinary use in the civics textbook (l. 34). Overall, none of the synonyms, including *förklaring*, served to unpack the meaning of 'declare' by bringing it closer to everyday language use. Thus, the discussion did not support discursive shifts that could have contributed to a clarification of the contextual meaning of the word.

The orientation towards word meanings showed what we choose to term a thesaurus approach, decontextualizing the meaning of subject-related words from their use in the relevant disciplinary field. Consequently, students had to negotiate knowledge about several abstract word meanings rather than one. In addition, opportunities for both interpreting disciplinary text and using disciplinary language in spoken interaction were limited. Even when the teacher referred the students to the book, the purpose seemed to be to uncover the meaning of the word rather than to successfully interpret the text. While S1 finally seemed to settle on a suitable synonym, the need to navigate many unrelated abstract word meanings limited opportunities for unpacking the abstract and dense word *declaration* into more subject-related, specific, and concrete meanings.

A thesaurus approach is also evident in Excerpt 2, in which a student requested help to understand the word *bestå*. In isolation, it means 'subsist' or 'endure', but most commonly occurs in the phrasal verb *bestå av*, meaning 'consist of'.

Excerpt 2. Questioning the word "består (av)"

S1: I have one, two, three, four remaining. "Består".
S2: "Består". It's something having a thing inside.
T: Now, hold your horses. Do you agree with this?
S3: No.
T: Read the sentence containing "består". Fetch the book and look it up. Because it can mean different things. /…/ Do you remember where you found the word? No. /…/ If it is just "[består]", then it means one thing. But if its "består av" it's another thing.
S2: Here. "Består av".
T: Okay, great! [reading from the text] UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights consists of "består av" 30 points.
S3: Like contain.
T: Good. But then you need "består av". Because *just* "består" could mean something else.
S2: Contains. Something.

In her initial contribution, using resources of everyday language, S2 successfully paraphrased and unpacked the meaning of *består av* ('consist of'"), a relational process often encountered in academic discourse (l. 2). The verb group contains the particle 'av'. However, the teacher complicated the interaction by pointing out the possibility of a different – and rarely used – meaning of *består* without the particle (l. 7, 13–14, cf.

'subsist', 'endure'). She again referred the students to the text material to ascertain the correct meaning. As was evident in the interaction based on 'deklaration', the students were exposed to polysemy in a way that could muddle gaining knowledge of the word's contextual use. With a slightly more textual approach to the task, for example by instructing the students to mark the unknown word in the text instead of writing down isolated words, uncertainties such as that in Excerpt 2 could have been avoided.

5.2. Contextualizing disciplinary vocabulary through interactional support

In several instances, the teacher and researcher contributed to the interaction in ways that clarified the meaning of the words and expressions marked as unknown by the students. In the example provided below (Excerpt 3), the students turned to the researcher for aid with the term 'standard of living', in Swedish compounded into a single word as *levnadsstandard*.

Excerpt 3. Unpacking the word 'levnadsstandard'

S1: [Reading from first hit on the Google search page] Standard of living ["levnadsstandard"] concerns the level of the inhabitants' economy and living conditions.
T: Yes. And what does that mean? Talk about it. Explain to each other so you'll understand it.
S2: I don't get it.
S3: What did it say?
S1: But please. [speaking in a high voice]
S3: [Reading from the iPad screen] Standard of living concerns the level of the inhabitants' economy and living conditions. [pronouncing hesitantly]. /…/ This is usually measured by gross – What the heck does it say?
S2: Gross domestic. /…/ [students' laughingly trying to articulate]
S3: Yes. You read that. I can't read. This text is too heavy-going. /…/
S2: [calling the teacher]. We don't get it.
T: Wait, I'll get there.
S1: Maybe [saying the researcher's name] can help us. /…/
R: I guess the problem might be that you came across other difficult words when reading about the word. Right?
Students: Yes.
R: Right. But could you unpack it? /…/ If you think about living and standard. They are put together.
S3: It's like how you live.
R: Mm.
S3: The way in which you live.
S1: [Reading from the screen] A synonym is possibilities to consume food, clothing, housing.
S3: Yes, but the how, the way you live. Kind of how you use your things and so on. The way you use your money and spend and so on.
R: Have you heard "standard" in any other context?
S3: Yes, but I can't explain it.
S1: It's like level.
S3: Like the level you live on.
S1: Got it! If it's like the level of having lots of money or the like. /…./
S3: On the level. [writing]
S2: What the heck does it say?
S3: The level you live on.

As in the interaction based on 'deklaration', the students appeared to have difficulty negotiating the definitions encountered when googling the meaning of 'levnadsstandard' (standard of living). While there is no added complexity of polysemy, the definitions and explanations laboriously articulated by the students contained abstract and dense subject-related words such as 'living conditions', 'inhabitants', and 'gross domestic product' (l. 2–3, 10–12). However, the teacher did not seem to recognize the challenge this presented to the students, merely prompting them to explain to each other (l. 4–5). Clearly, peer interaction could not support an understanding of the meaning of the term (l. 13–14). Instead, they turned to the researcher for aid (l. 16), who pointed out the word as a compound: 'They are put together' (l. 21). Focusing on the first part of the word, the root morpheme *levnad*, S3 successfully paraphrased and unpacked it into more everyday and concrete discourse, as 'the way in which you live' (l. 24). Not paying attention to S1's continued reading from the result screen, she elaborated and specified, using resources of everyday language: 'The way you use your money … and so on' (l. 27–28). While this unpacked the grammatical metaphor 'living' in a content-relevant way, it did not show understanding of the compound as a whole. However, when the researcher asked about familiarity with the second part of the word (*standard*) (l. 29), S1 successfully paraphrased it as 'level' (l. 31), enabling S3's subsequent unpacking of the word *levnadsstandard* (standard of living): 'the level you live on' (l. 32). This unpacking supported discursive shifts between every-day and disciplinary ways of using language that clarified the meaning of the term.

In this instance, the interaction involving an adult provided support for learning the meaning of the term. Rather than being restricted to online searches, the students were made aware of the constituents of the word in a way that facilitated their arrival at the desired meaning. The interaction involved both knowledge about compounding and, more implicitly, grammatical metaphors. Although the researcher did not refer the students to the book, the interaction was more centred on field-relevant meanings than previous examples. The likely reason for this is that 'standard of living' relates more closely to social studies than, for example, 'consist of' (common in academic language) and 'declaration' (having several different meanings).

In another observed peer group talk (Excerpt 4), the teacher provided linguistic support of a different sort. The term in question is again 'standard of living'.

Excerpt 4. Elaborating on the word "levnadsstandard"

T: Let's start here with standard of living ["levnadsstandard"]. Amila, you explain what it is. Explain for Zahra. /…/
S1: Standard of living. That you have, like, a place to live. That you have enough food for, like, the family or if you are alone. Well, that you have a life. That you can have an okay way of living.
T: Yes, do you have a high or low standard of living then?
S1: Average.
T: Average. Yes. /…/ Standard of living is like the standard you have in your life. That is, if you have a *high* standard of living, then you make lots of money. You can afford to buy a *house*, a *car,* and nice *clothes* and so on. In Sweden, we have a *high* standard of living. And in *some* countries, you make very little money. You can't afford to buy clothes. And you can't afford to buy what you want. Then you have a *low* standard of living. Okay? Now, you should phrase it so all three of you can understand.

In her explanation, S1 used resources of everyday language to convey an understanding of the term: 'place to live', 'enough food', 'have an okay way of living' (l. 3–5). In her follow-up, the teacher prompted the student to define it as 'high' or 'low' standards of living (*hög eller låg levnadsstandard*) (l. 6). In other words, she requested an expansion of the noun group to show a more precise understanding. Thus, the student's contribution was rephrased, re-packed and elaborated on in a more abstract and content-relevant way. After confirming the students' suggestion of 'average', she followed up using resources of everyday language to give concrete and specific examples of what constitutes 'high' and 'low' standard of living (' . . . you can afford to buy a *house*, a *car*, and nice *clothes* and so on') (l. 9–10), then reiterating the abstract expanded noun groups: 'we have a *high* standard of living' (l. 10–11). With these downward and upward shifts, by unpacking and re-packing the abstract concept of standard of living, the interaction formed a semantic wave, and the teacher displayed and promoted a high degree of discursive mobility, while also clarifying the metaphorical use of 'high' and 'low' in this context. Thus, this exchange involved negotiation of both grammatical and lexical metaphors in a way that connected to the field studied. The field-negotiating approach taken here stands in contrast to the decontextualizing thesaurus approach discussed in the previous section.

Interactional support promoting a more nuanced understanding of a word was also evident in an exchange about 'regular'. The Swedish word, *regelbunden* (approximately 'rule-bound'), is a compound enabled by a grammatical metaphor (from the process *binda*, see Theory section). It is an abstract word, which in itself does not point to any specific disciplinary context. In the textbook material, it occurs in a paraphrase of Article 22 of the UDHR: 'Elections should be held regularly'.

Excerpt 5. Exemplifying the meaning of "regelbunden"

S1: Regular ["regelbunden"]. I think it's like.
S2: Yes, you do it now and then. /…/
S1: [Using an iPad for searching on synonymer.se] Regulated. Repeated. Periodical. Law-bound ["lagbunden"]. On a regular basis.
S2: When you do something regularly, you do it now and then.
S1: Yes. /…/
T: Well. Okay. Now and then. So, if we imagine it like this. If we do something the first week in June. And then I do something the second week in June. And then I do something in September. And then, I do something the day after, again in September. Is this now and then or is it regular?
S2: It is now and then.
T: Mm. because there's a difference.
S2: No, regular it must be like the same day.
T: Something like that. Like, once a month. /…/
S1: What should we write?
S2: That you do something, for example, once a month.

As in the interaction based on 'standard of living' and 'declaration', the students read out abstract definitions – in most cases, grammatical metaphors – encountered when using the iPad (l. 3–4). S2 offered a definition showing some insight of the meaning, unpacking

it into more every-day concrete wording as 'you do it now and then' (l. 5). Picking up on this definition, the teacher gave a lengthy example of an irregular interval – using resources of everyday language to give concrete and specific examples ('. . . do something the second week in June' . . .) – asking the students if it represented 'regular' or 'now and then' (l. 7–10). S2 confirmed it as 'now and then' (l. 11) and offered that 'it must be like the same day' to be regular (l. 13). Thus, through interactional discourse-bridging support, the students approached the meaning targeted by the teacher.

In this case, the teacher put the word into a context to make its meaning clearer, drawing attention to how 'now and then' is not quite the same thing as 'regular'. The movements between reiteration of the term 'regular' and the way it was unpacked in everyday language constituted discursive shifts. However, as in several of the previous examples, the term was not discussed according to how it was used in the textbook material: regular elections as part of universal human rights. As such, the interaction still related quite weakly to the disciplinary context provided by the textbook material and limited students' opportunity to gain knowledge of the contextual meaning of *regularly*. Referring to and clarifying the sentence 'Elections should be held regularly' would offer an opportunity for more specific elaborations and potentially a concluding upward discursive shift, related to the field studied.

6. Discussion

Overall, the results highlight the issue of abstract meanings encountered in social studies textbook material not being adequately contextualized in classroom interaction and ongoing teaching. While previous research has shown the linguistic challenges associated with content learning and interactional strategies for the students' successive appropriation of subject-related discourse (Macnaught et al. 2013; Nygård Larsson 2018), the present study shows that some linguistic challenges are unconducive for opening textual pathways to disciplinary learning. In relation to the knowledge about language and word meanings negotiated in the discussions (RQ1), the findings have shown that the students used a thesaurus approach by using online searches to find out the meaning of words in the textbook material. This strategy was encouraged by the teacher and presented the students with multiple abstract meanings, in many cases unrelated to the content studied. As such, the input from the online thesaurus was incomprehensible and became a detour to making meaning of content-relevant use of the words in the civics textbook. Even when the researcher and the teacher asked students to consider the contextual and disciplinary use of the words, the process of decontextualisation resulting from the orientation to finding and discussing synonyms did not provide opportunities to concretize and elaborate on disciplinary meanings. This shows the limitations inherent in generic literacy approaches to content learning (Martin 2001; Shanahan and Shanahan 2012; Walldén 2022).

In other exchanges (Excerpts 3–5), the teacher and researcher intervened in ways that enabled the students to unpack and contextualize abstract words. Thus, the discussions supported discursive shifts between everyday and disciplinary ways of using language (RQ2). We have shown how the researcher pointed out different parts of an abstract, compounded grammatical metaphor (*levnadsstandard* – 'standard of living'), enabling the students to arrive at the meaning by unpacking the abstract, nominalized language into

a more everyday and concrete discourse ('the way in which you live'; 'the way you use your money'; 'the level you live on'). In another exchange, the teacher's interactional support contextualized the term in a content-relevant way by expanding the noun group ('high or low standard of living'; that is, *hög eller låg levnadsstandard)* and giving specific examples of a high standard of living ('you can afford to buy a *house*, a *car*, and nice *clothes* and so on'). This formed distinct semantic waves (Maton 2014) between concrete meaning as well as more abstract ways of expressing disciplinary meaning. Such discursive shifts are more conducive to appropriation of subject-related words in disciplinary discourse than the simple verbal definitions highlighted in a previous study (Walldén 2019). In accordance with previous research, this points to the crucial role of the discourse-bridging interactional support offered in the social practice of content-learning (Macnaught et al. 2013; Nygård Larsson 2018). It also indicates how some skills related to generic literacy, such as making use of principles for word formation (see LaBontee 2019), can be a resource for making meaning of disciplinary language. For L2 learners, teacher support can be crucial for noticing and reflecting about the meaning of word parts (Nation 2013), including constituents of verb groups ('består av') and compounds ('levnadsstandard'). This is particularly true for single-word compounds which are particularly prevalent in Swedish compared to many other languages (see Enström 2020). It follows that they can be an unfamiliar but important linguistic feature for learners of Swedish as a second language (e.g. Nygård Larsson 2018). However, even in the scaffolding exchanges illuminating different word parts, interaction was focused on uncovering the meaning of words rather than understanding and interpreting them as part of text material storing field knowledge (see Martin 2001). This proved challenging for both words with a subject-specific meaning, (i.e. declaration, standard of living) and those which feature generally in academic language (i.e. consist of, regular). The result would probably have been very different had the teacher encouraged an in-context approach to unknown words, such as highlighting them in the textbook material.

Overall, our results underscore the importance of considering the active mediation of disciplinary texts as an integral part of the on-going practice of teaching (see Gibbons 2006; Hammond and Gibbons 2005). For example, if the meaning of 'regular', in itself not pointing to any particular context, had been negotiated in the disciplinary context provided by the textbook material, it would have been possible to narrow down the interaction to the relevant disciplinary area while considerably expanding the opportunities for discursive shifts; for example, by connecting regular elections to semantically related abstract concepts (see Maton and Doran 2017). Some examples of related concepts in the text material used in the teaching were 'public will', 'voting rights', and 'freedom of speech'. Exploring these terms would have made the semantic difference between 'regular' elections and elections just 'now and then' significant. In addition, in linguistically diverse classrooms, a valuable resource in subject teaching and learning is to relate to students' different experiences and backgrounds in collaborative negotiation of the content and discourse (e.g. Cummins 2000; Hammond and Gibbons 2005). This potential was not consciously used in the classrooms studied despite its evident promise in relation to democratic issues and fundamental human rights of the citizens in different societies.

As with other discourse-bridging strategies, using the students' prior knowledge and experience as resources for negotiating disciplinary discourse would require the civics content, the core aspects, and central perspectives of the subject to be the point of departure (see Shanahan and Shanahan 2012), rather than isolated words that the students, prompted by the teacher, single out as difficult. As pointed out in previous research, decontextualized, language-focused activities may be counterproductive for L2 students by limiting their engagement with the cognitive challenge of disciplinary registers (e.g. Hajer and Meestringa 2020).

A clear implication for teaching is that disciplinary language should be contextualized through the socially-mediated interpretation of disciplinary texts (see Walldén and Nygård Larsson 2021b). In particular, if students are instead asked to do 'detective work' by focusing on the words themselves rather than the disciplinary registers they appear in, it can promote decontextualizing processes, providing high challenges but little support (see Gibbons 2006) in understanding disciplinary discourse. The present study underscores the need for teachers to be aware of disciplinary texts and languages (Humphrey 2021; Matruglio 2021; Nygård Larsson 2018; Uddling 2021). The study also adds to previous research by showing that this should include an awareness of the detours to disciplinary literacy potentially created by students' unnecessary exposure to lexical ambiguity due to words having different meanings in different contexts.

Aside from online searches, the main resource offered by the teacher for understanding the disciplinary language was peer interaction. The necessary role of the adults in supporting the students' understanding of abstract words points to the limits of this approach. In the studied teaching, the support from adults was provided in a haphazard way by the teacher stopping by and intervening or by the students' enlisting the support of the researcher. Instead, a planned approach to the interaction (see Hammond and Gibbons 2005; Nygård Larsson 2018) can be used in which the teacher takes an active role in highlighting subject-specific and academic features of language before handing over responsibility to the students.

Previous classroom studies drawing on the concepts of semantic waves and discursive mobility have shown teachers' proactively supporting the understanding and active use of disciplinary language (Hipkiss 2014; Macnaught et al. 2013; Nygård Larsson 2018) and teaching in which the material used did not seem to provide disciplinary input for discursive shifts (Walldén 2020). The present study gives additional perspectives by pointing out challenges of polysemy in abstract discourse related to social studies and interactional strategies that can support students in making sense of such discourse.

7. Final conclusions

We believe that the results of the present study reflect a common situation in linguistically diverse Swedish classrooms, in which teachers seek strategies through focusing on vocabulary and creating opportunities for interaction. The result of this study highlights the importance of such efforts being informed by a linguistic and textual awareness in disciplinary teaching. Crucially, in the teaching of social studies, this also should include a *contextual awareness*, including the awareness that the meaning of words is dependent on several contexts: the subject-related content, discourse, and disciplinary practice, as well

as the actual text and immediate sentence in which the words appear. In the teaching of civics, it means underscoring what the subject-related words mean in relation to the concept of society or as part of expressing critical thinking about society (Blanck and Lödén 2017). Although words such as 'regular' and 'consist of' constitute examples of general academic language, their meaning is most fruitfully negotiated in the subject-specific contexts and register patterns in which they appear (see Fang and Schleppegrell 2010; Halliday [1989] 1993). This is also true for words such as 'declaration' (deklaration) that have different meanings relating to the different disciplines drawn on in the school subject of civics (e.g. economics, political science) as well as synonyms connected to everyday language ('förklaring'). The complicated task for the students, who were both L1 and L2 learners, to negotiate these different meanings is evident in the findings. The teacher's awareness of the disciplinary context could have a crucial role in enacting a planned approach to classroom interaction that enables students to learn these words in rather than out of context. Such an approach would be valuable for all students, regardless of linguistic background.

Notes

1. Instead of the LCT term semantic shifts, "discursive shifts" is used in this article, in line with the concepts of discursive mobility and discourse-bridging interaction.
2. It is considered one of the most residentially segregated areas in Sweden. The school was located in the socioeconomically disadvantaged part of the area.
3. This categorization is necessary to make for Swedish teachers and school leaders since there is a separate Swedish curriculum for second-language learners.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributors

Robert Walldén (PhD) is Associate Professor of Swedish and Didactics at Malmö University, Sweden. His research interests include content area literacies, text practices, and knowledge-building interaction in second-language education. His research often builds on systemic-functional linguistics, Bernstein's sociology of education and critical discourse analysis. An important aim is to shed light on possibilities for promoting students' awareness of texts and language in ways which enable moving between different content area discourses and looking at them critically. A recent publication is 'Accepting or challenging the given? Critical perspectives on whole-class readings of texts in social studies' (Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 2021).

Pia Nygård Larsson (PhD) is Associate Professor of Swedish as a second language and Education at Malmö University, Sweden. Her research interests include teaching and learning from the perspectives of classroom discourse, disciplinary literacy and multilingualism in various school subjects. Her research often builds on systemic-functional linguistics and Legitimation Code Theory, especially the concepts of semantic waves (Maton 2013) and discursive mobility (Nygård Larsson 2011), for example in the publication '"We're talking about mobility": Discourse strategies for promoting disciplinary knowledge and language in educational contexts' (Linguistics and Education, 2018).

ORCID

Robert Walldén http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2565-8875
Pia Nygård Larsson http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8843-6196

References

Ardasheva, Y., and T. R. Tretter. 2017. "Developing Science-Specific, Technical Vocabulary of High School Newcomer English Learners." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 20 (3): 252–271. doi:10.1080/13670050.2015.1042356.

Axelsson, M., and B. Jakobson. 2020. "Negotiating Science: Building Thematic Patterns of the Scientific Concept Sound in a Swedish Multilingual Lower Secondary Classroom." *Language and Education* 34 (4): 291–310. doi:10.1080/09500782.2020.1740730.

Blanck, S. 2014. *När ämnen möts: En analys av samhällskunskapsämnets funktioner och karaktärer vid ämnesintegrerad undervisning* [When subjects meet: An analysis of the functions and characteristics of civics in subject-integrated teaching]. Lic. Thesis, Karlstads universitet, Karlstad.

Blanck, S., and H. Lödén. 2017. "Med samhället i centrum: medborgarskapsutbildningen och samhällskunskapsämnets relevans [With Society in Focus: Citizenship Education and the Relevance of the Civics Subject]." Nordidactica: Journal of Humanities and Social Science Education (4): 28–47. http://kau.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A1172668&dswid=8457

Blanck, S. 2021. "Teaching About Migration: Teachers' Didactical Choices When Connecting Specialized Knowledge to Pupils' Previous Knowledge." *Journal of Social Science Education* 20 (2): 70–102. https://www.jsse.org/index.php/jsse/article/view/3913/4337

Cummins, J. 2000. *Language, Power, and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Vol. 23. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Enström, I. 2020. *Ordens värld. Svenska ord: struktur och inlärning* [The World of Words. Swedish Words: Structure and Acquisition]. 3rd ed. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Ernst-Slavit, G., and S. J. Morrison. 2018. "Unless You Were Native American. . .everybody Came from Another Country:" Language and Content Learning in a Grade 4 Diverse Classroom." *The Social Studies* 109 (6): 309–323. doi:10.1080/00377996.2018.1539700.

Fang, Z., and M. J. Schleppegrell. 2010. "Disciplinary Literacies Across Content Areas: Supporting Secondary Reading Through Functional Language Analysis." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 53 (7): 587–597. doi:10.1598/JAAL.53.7.6.

Fangen, K. 2005. *Deltagande Observation* [Participant Observation]. Malmö: Liber ekonomi.

Gibbons, P. 2006. *Bridging Discourses in the ESL Classroom: Students, Teachers and Researchers*. London: Continuum.

Hajer, M., and T. Meestringa. 2020. *Språkinriktad undervisning: en handbok* [Language-Focused Instruction: A Handbook]. Stockholm: Studentlitteratur.

Halliday, M. A. K. [1989] 1993. "Some Grammatical Problems in Scientific English." In *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power*, edited by M. A. K. Halliday and J. R. Martin, 69–85. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Halliday, M. A. K., and C. Mathiessen. 2014. *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 4th ed. M. A. K. Halliday, and C. Mathiessen. New York: Routledge.

Hammond, J., and P. Gibbons. 2005. "Putting Scaffolding to Work: The Contribution of Scaffolding in Articulating ESL Education." *Prospect* 20 (1): 6–30.

Hipkiss, A. M. 2014. "*Klassrummets semiotiska resurser: en språkdidaktisk studie av skolämnena hem- och konsumentkunskap, biologi och kemi* [The Semiotic Resources of the Classroom : An Applied Linguistics Perspective on the School Subjects Home and Consumer Studies, Biology and Chemistry]." Doctoral dissertatuib, Umeå: Umeå universitet.

Hirsch, E. D. 2013. "Reading Comprehension Requires Knowledge of Words and the World." *American Education* 27: 10–29. https://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/periodicals/Hirsch.pdf.

Humphrey, S. 2021. "The Role of Teachers' Disciplinary Semiotic Knowledge in Supporting Young Bi/multilingual Learners' Academic and Reflexive Multiliteracies." *Language and Education* 35 (32): 140–159. doi:10.1080/09500782.2020.1772282.

Macnaught, L., J. R. M. Karl Maton, and E. Matruglio.2013. "Jointly Constructing Semantic Waves: Implications for Teacher Training." *Linguistics and Education* 24 (1): 50–63. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2012.11.008.

Karlsson, A., P. Nygård Larsson, and A. Jakobsson. 2020. "The Continuity of Learning in a Translanguaging Science Classroom." *Cultural Studies of Science Education* 15: 1–25. doi:10.1007/s11422-019-09933-y.

Kristiansson, M. 2014. "Samhällskunskapsämnet och dess ämnesmarkörer på svenskt mellanstadium – ett osynligt eget ämne som bistår andra ämnen." *Nordidactica: Journal of Humanities and Social Science Education* 4 (1): 212–233. https://journals.lub.lu.se/nordidactica/article/view/18974/17168 .

Kristiansson, M. 2017. "*Underordnat, undanskymt och otydligt: Om samhällskunskapsämnets relationsproblem inom SO-gruppen på svenskt mellanstadium* [Subordinate, Obscure and Unclear: About the Social Studies Subject's Relationship Problems Within the Social Studies Bloc in Swedish Primary School]." *Acta Didactica Norge* 11: 1. doi:10.5617/adno.2547.

LaBontee, R. A., jr. 2019. *Strategic Vocabulary Learning in the Swedish Second Language Context*. Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet.

Lindh, C. 2019. *I skrivandets spår: Elever skriver i SO* [Tracing writing. Students writing in the context of social studies education]. Phd diss, Malmö: Malmö universitet.

Loewen, S. 2014. *Introduction to Instructed Second Language Acquisition*. London: Routledge.

Marmer, E., D. Marmer, L. Hitomi, and P. Sow. 2010. "Racism and the image of Africa in German schools and textbooks." The International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations 10 (5): 1–12. doi: 10.18848/1447-9532/CGP/v10i05/38927

Martin, J. R. [1990] 1993. "Technicality and Abstraction: Language for the Creation of Specialized Texts." In *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power*, edited by M. A. K. Halliday and J. R. Martin, 203–220. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Martin, J. R. 2001. "Language, Register and Genre." In *Analysing English in a Global Context: A Reader*, edited by A. Burns and C. Coffin, 151–166. London: Routledge.

Martin, J. R., and D. Rose. 2007. *Working with Discourse: Meaning Beyond the Clause*. London: Continuum.

Martin, J. R. 2013. "Embedded Literacy: Knowledge as Meaning." *Linguistics and Education* 24 (1): 23–37. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2012.11.006.

Martin, J. R. 2017. "Revisiting field: Specialized knowledge in secondary school science and humanities discourse." *Onomázein* 111–148. doi: 10.7764/onomazein.sfl.05.

Maton, K. 2013. "Making Semantic Waves: A Key to Cumulative Knowledge-Building." *Linguistics and Education* 24: 8–22. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2012.11.005.

Maton, K. 2014. *Knowledge and Knowers: Towards a Realist Sociology of Education*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Maton, K., and Y. J. Doran. 2017. "Semantic Density: A Translation Device for Revealing Complexity of Knowledge Practices in Discourse, Part 1—wording." *Onomázein Revista de Lingüística, Filología y traducción* SFL: 46–76. doi:https://doi.org/10.7764/onomazein.sfl.03.

Matruglio, E. 2021. "What Two Teachers Took Up: Metalanguage, Pedagogy and Potentials for Long-Term Change." *Language and Education* 36 (5): 463–478. doi:10.1080/09500782.2020.1825477.

Mikander, P. 2015. "Colonialist "discoveries" in Finnish school textbooks." Nordidactica - Journal of Humanities and Social Science Education 4: 48–65. https://journals.lub.lu.se/nordidactica/article/view/19014/17207

Milton, J., and J. Treffers-Daller. 2013. "Vocabulary Size Revisited: The Link Between Vocabulary Size and Academic Achievement." *Applied Linguistics Review* 4 (1): 151–172. doi:10.1515/applirev-2013-0007.

Nation, I. S. P. 2013. *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nygård Larsson, P. 2011. "*Biologiämnets texter: Text, språk och lärande i en språkligt heterogen gymnasieklass* [Texts of biology: text, language, and learning in a linguistically heterogeneous upper secondary class]." Doctoral dissertation, Malmö: Malmö högskola.

Nygård Larsson, P. 2018. "'We're Talking About Mobility:' Discourse Strategies for Promoting Disciplinary Knowledge and Language in Educational Contexts." *Linguistics and Education* 48: 61–75. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2018.10.001.

Nygård Larsson, P., and A. Jakobsson. 2020. "Meaning-Making in Science from the Perspective of Students' Hybrid Language Use." *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education* 18: 811–830. doi:10.1007/s10763-019-09994-z.

Odebiyi, O. M., and C. S. Suna. 2020 "A global perspective? Framing analysis of U.S. textbooks' discussion of Nigeria."The Journal of Social Studies Research 44: 239–248. doi: 10.1016/j.jssr.2020.01.002

Samuelsson, J. 2014. "Ämnesintegrering Och Ämnesspecialisering: SO-Undervisning I Sverige 1980-2014." *Nordidactica: Journal of Humanities and Social Science Education* 4 (1): 85–118. http://kau.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:736194/FULLTEXT01.pdf .

Shanahan, T., and C. Shanahan. 2008. "Teaching Disciplinary Literacy to Adolescents: Rethinking Content Area Literacy." *Harvard Educational Review* 78 (1): 40–60. doi:10.17763/haer.78.1.v62444321p602101.

Shanahan, T., and C. Shanahan. 2012. "What is Disciplinary Literacy and Why Does It Matter?" *Topics in Language Disorders* 12 (1): 7–18. doi:10.1097/TLD.0b013e318244557a.

Stålnacke, A.-L. 2012. *Puls Samhällskunskap Grundbok*. Stockholm: Natur & Kultur.

Thomas, G. 2010. "Changing Our Landscape of Inquiry for a New Science of Education." *Harvard Educational Review* 82 (1): 26–51. doi:10.17763/haer.82.1.6t2r089l715x3377.

Thomas, G. 2011. "A Typology for the Case Study in Social Science Following a Review of Definition, Discourse, and Structure." *Qualitative Inquiry* 17 (6): 511–521. doi:10.1177/1077800411409884.

Tracy, S. J. 2010. "Qualitative Quality: Eight "Big-Tent" Criteria for Excellent Qualitative Research." *Qualitative Inquiry* 16 (10): 837–851. doi:10.1177/1077800410383121.

Uddling, J. 2021. "To Integrate a Language Focus in a Linguistically Diverse Physics Classroom." *Language and Education*. doi: 10.1080/09500782.2021.1933018.

Walldén, R. 2019. "Scaffolding or Side-Tracking? the Role of Knowledge About Language in Content Instruction." *Linguistics and Education* 54: 1–10. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2019.100760.

Walldén, R. 2020. ""It Was That Trolle Thing" Negotiating History in Grade 6: A Matter of Teachers' Text Choice." *Linguistics and Education* 60. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2020.100884.

Walldén, R. 2021. "Accepting or challenging the given? Critical perspectives on whole-class readings of texts in social studies." Journal of Language, Identity & Education. doi:10.1080/15348458.2021.1958685.

Walldén, R., and P. Nygård Larsson. 2021b. ""Can You Take a Wild Guess?" Using Images and Expanding Knowledge Through Interaction in the Teaching and Learning of History." Linguistics and Education 65. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2021.100960.

Walldén, R., and P. Nygård Larsson. 2021b. "Negotiating Figurative Language from Literary Texts: Second-Language Instruction as a Dual Literacy Practice." *L1 Educational Studies in Language and Literature* 21 (Running issue): 1–30. doi:10.17239/L1ESLL-2021.21.01.08.

Walldén, R. 2022. "Focusing on Content or Strategies? Enactment of Reading Strategies in Discussions About Science Texts." In *Classroom Discourse*. doi:10.1080/19463014.2021.2023598.

Zhang, Y. 2017. "Supporting English Language Learners in Social Studies: Language-Focused Strategies." *The Social Studies* 108 (7): 204–209. doi:10.1080/00377996.2017.1354808.

Appendix A. Excerpts in original language (Swedish)

Excerpt 1

S1: [Läser från sökträff på ”va betyder deklaration”] Deklaration, även kallad inkomstdeklaration eller själv- vad är det här för ord. Är en årlig handling där inkomsttagare. Vad är det här? [vänder sig mot forskaren]
R: Det är så att dekla-, vissa ord är ju såna att dom kan betyda olika saker i olika sammanhang. Och det här med inkomstdeklaration har nog inte exakt med detta att göra. Så kanske hitta något annat. Det är något vuxna behöver göra med att betala skatt. När man arbetar.
S1: Förklaring. [läser från synonymer.se] /. . ./ Okej skriv det Loka.
S2: Vad ska vi skriva?
S1: Det han sa.
S2: Deklaration.
R: Nej jag tyckte ni skulle titta på något annat. /. . ./
T: Ordet deklaration är ju inte. Det kan vara lite så här krångligt liksom för det kan betyda många olika saker. Men det finns på engelska *declaration*.
S2: Förklaring.
T: Mer så ja.
S2: Förklarande. /. . ./Kungörelse. [läser från synonymer.se]
T: Precis. Jag tror det är en *kunggörelse* det gör det ju inte lättare för er. Nej.
S2: Inkomstuppgift. Eh självdeklaration. Skattedeklaration. Varudeklaration. Tulldeklaration. [fortsätta läsa från synonymer.se]
T: Slå upp det engelska ordet och se vad den svenska översättningen blir.
T: Declaration.[använder engelskt uttal]
S2: Hur stavar man? /. . ./
T: Det här är som ett detektivarbete liksom. Alla behöver liksom fundera på. Titta till exempel på meningen i boken. Kan man få nåt tips ifrån hur den är skriven? Vart står den nåstans. Här. [pekar på s. 121] Här är några av artiklarna i FN:s deklaration om mänskliga rättigheter. Kan det då vara inkomstdeklaration om man talar om hur mycket man har tjänat?Elever: nej.
L: Nej det kan det inte vara. Så titta på förklaringarna där och titta hur det är skrivet här och försök tänka ut hmm undrar vad det kan tänkas betyda ungefär.
S2: [läser från synonymer.se] Generaluttalande. Förklaring. Deklaration. Proklamation. Bedyranden.
S1: Det är typ som uttalanden. Här är några av artiklarna i FN:s uttalanden. /../
S2: Hur man förklarar.

Excerpt 2

S1: Jag har en, två, tre, fyra kvar. Består.
S2: Består. Det är att någonting har en sak i sig. T: Ja stopp och belägg här nu. Håller du med om det?S3: Nej.
T: Läs meningen där ”består” är. Gå och hämta boken och kolla. För det kan betyda olika saker. / . . ./ Kommer ni ihåg vad ordet var nånstans? Nej. /. . ./ Om det bara är ”består” då betyder det en sak. Men om det är ”består av” så är det en annan sak.
S2: Här. Består av.
T: Ja, okej, bra! [läser från texten] FN:s deklaration om mänskliga rättigheter består av 30 punkter.
S3: Typ som innehåller.
T: Bra. Men då måste man ha ”består av”. För ”består” *bara* det kan betyda nåt annat.
S2: Innehåller. Något.

Excerpt 3

S1: [läser från första träff på goodle-söksida] Levnadsstandard avser nivån på invånarnas ekonomi och levnadsförhållanden.
T: Ja. Vad betyder det då? Prata om det. Förklara för varandra så att ni förstår det.
S2: Jag förstår ingenting. S3: Vad var det det stod?S1: Jamen snälla [talar med ljus röst]
S3: [läser från skärmen] Levnadsstandarden avser nivån på invånarnas ekonomi och levnadsförhållanden [uttalar tvekande] /. . ./ Detta mäts vanligen med bru – Vad fan står det?
S2: Bruttonational. [försöker skrattande artikulera]
S3: Ja, du får läsa. Jag kan inte läsa. Den texten är för svårläst. /. . ./
S2: Vi förstår inte. [directed at the teacher]
T: Vänta jag kommer.
S1: Kanske [säger forskarens namn] kan hjälpa oss. /. . ./
R: Jag tror att problemet är väl att det kom ännu fler ord som man inte förstår när man läser om ordet va.
Elever: Ja.
R. Ja. /. . ./ Men kan ni packa upp det? Om ni tänker på levnad och standard. Det sitter ju ihop.
S3: Det är väl alltså hur man lever.
R: Mm.
S2: På vilket sätt man lever.
S1: [läser från skärmen] En synonym är möjligheter att konsumera mat, kläder, bostad.
S3: Jamen alltså hur på vilket sätt man lever. Ungefär hur man använder sina saker och så. På vilket sätt man använder sina pengar och spenderar och så.
R: Har ni hört standard i något annat sammanhang?
S3: Ja men jag kan inte förklara det.
S1: Det är typ som nivå.
S3: Alltså på vilken nivå man lever.
S1: Jaha nu! Om det är typ nivån att man har mycket pengar och så. /. . ./
S3: På vilken nivå. [skriver]
S2: Vad fan står det där?
S3: På vilken nivå man lever.

Excerpt 4

T: Nu börjar vi med levnadsstandard här. Amila då förklarar du vad det är. Förklara för Zahra. /. . ./
S1: Levnadsstandard. Att man har typ en bostad. Att man har tillräckligt med mat så det räcker till typ familjen eller om man är själv. Alltså att ha ett liv. Att man kan leva på ett okej sätt.
T: Ja har man hög eller låg levnadsstandard då?
S1: Mellan.
L: Mellan. Ja. /. . ../ Levnadsstandaren är ju liksom den standarden du har i ditt liv. Det vill säga. Om man har *hög* levnadsstandard. då tjänar man mycket pengar. Och man har råd att köpa *hus* och en *bil* och fina *kläder* och så. I Sverige har vi en *hög* levnadsstandard. Och i *vissa* länder så tjänar man väldigt lite pengar. Man har inte råd att köpa kläder. Och man har inte råd att köpa det man vill. Då har man en *låg* levnadsstandard. Okej? Då får ni formulera det här så att ni fattar alla tre.

Excerpt 5

S1: Regelbundet. Jag tror att det är typ.
S2: Ja man gör det då och då. /. . ./
S1: [söker på ipad synonymer.se] Regelmässig. Regulär. Periodisk. Lagbunden. Med jämna mellanrum.
S2: När man gör nånting regelbundet gör man det då och då.
S1: Ja. /. . ./

T: Alltså. Okej. Då och då. Så om vi tänker så här om man gör nånting första veckan i juni. Och sen gör jag nånting andra veckan i juni. Och sen gör jag nånting i september. Och sen gör jag nånting dan efter igen i september. Är det då och då eller är det regelbundet?
S2: Då är det då och då.
T: Mm för det finns en skillnad.
S2: Nej regelbundet det måste vara samma dag typ.
T: Ungefär i alla. Typ en gång i månaden. /. . ../
S1: Vad ska vi skriva?
S3: Att man gör nånting till exempel en gång i månaden. /. . ./