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Abstract

This research study explores pupil experiences of co-teaching within a bilingual international primary school in Hong Kong. The majority of pupils are first language Cantonese speakers, studying in an English and Putonghua bilingual programme. Within Hong Kong, the historical context and political situation following the change of sovereignty, has shaped educational policy and views about valued languages, shaping the practices of the school and therefore pupil experiences of language learning. The school supports pupil language development through a bilingual programme (one teacher, one language), supported by co-teaching (in English and Putonghua). The aims of the study were to understand how co-teaching is understood and enacted by co-teachers to support pupil language learning identities.

Two co-taught classrooms were the focus of the research (one in Year 3 (Y3) and one in Year 5 (Y5)). Research data for this case study were collected through formal classroom observations over a five-month period, pupil interviews (three from each class) and interviews with the two co-teachers of each class. A broad sample of pupil language experiences was collected as part of a questionnaire to all pupils in Y3 and Y5. Questionnaire data served as an opportunity for data triangulation and rich, detailed analysis. Qualitative data analysis consisted of open coding to find emerging themes, these themes then becoming the focus of the discussion.

The findings of the study revealed that enactment of co-teaching is shaped by teacher perceptions of their classroom roles. An identity of a co-teacher, for example, was found to facilitate mutual understanding and respect for shared practices that further supported pupil language development. Co-teaching enactment, perceived teacher language valuations and English language dominance within the classroom were all found to shape pupil language learning identities. The study also found that the co-teaching model, Team Teaching, was effective in teaching and learning because of the opportunities for pupil translanguaging, and because it positions the classroom languages with equal status, supporting pupil investment and motivation to learn. Since co-teaching model effectiveness was not the focus of this study, it is recommended as an area of further research.
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Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

The research presented in this thesis is concerned with the language and literacy policy of an international bilingual school in Hong Kong. The policy is enacted through a co-taught model, in which each class has two native speaking teachers, one English and one Chinese. An initial study (Section 1.7) found that co-teachers enact the policy from a range of pedagogical positions, since the school offered little guidance about how co-teaching was understood or practised to be effective for all pupils. The research focuses on examples of these enactments and the consequences for pupils’ language learning and identities, in order to inform the development of school policy and practice.

The thesis is presented in seven chapters. The Chapter 1 sets the scene, detailing the context of Hong Kong language policy as well as the school context. Chapter 2 reviews the literature on learning in a bilingual context, co-teaching and identity within this context. It also outlines the theoretical framework that has been adopted in this research. Chapter 3 discusses the research design, methods and ethical issues that were identified and how they were addressed. Chapters 4 and 5 present the findings of the research and a discussion of the main findings from the research follows in Chapter 6. The final chapter, Chapter 7, discusses the contribution to knowledge as well as the study’s limitations and recommendations.

This chapter begins with the context of this research, which includes the historical context of language policy in Hong Kong, both before and after the change in sovereignty in 1997. The contextual background to the school is introduced, including a description of the school language policy, followed by the rationale for this thesis and its aims.

1.2 Research Context

The school in which the research was located is a Private Independent School (PIS). Within the context of Hong Kong these schools were set up under the Private Independent Schools initiative to help combat the shortage of school places. As part of this initiative, the school was allocated land and a capital grant to set up a non-profit private school. One of the conditions of this initiative is that at least 70% of the pupil population have to be permanent Hong Kong residents. For this school the number of local Hong Kong pupils has fluctuated between 92-98%. The school has complete freedom over choice over curriculum, admission criteria, and management approach. Ten percent of school fees by ordinance of the Private Independent School initiative, are offered as scholarships (British Council, 2007). At this school, these scholarships are awarded to pupils with the highest academic achievement. School fees are high for private schools in Hong Kong, which means places are only accessible to the most affluent families and this is true of the school in which this research was located.

The school curriculum follows the International Baccalaureate Programme from the Primary Years Programme (PYP), Middle Years Programme (MYP) and the
Diploma Programme (DP). The school is bilingual with pupils learning English and Putonghua. For many of the parents, the international outlook, curriculum, as well as the bilingual education, offer pupils important opportunities in university choice and future employability, both within China and abroad.

The primary school bilingual programme is a co-taught model that offers bilingual instruction with the aim of all pupils becoming bilingual and biliterate (Teachers Handbook, pp.18). The school mission seeks to promote and develop a pride in Chinese heritage while ensuring pupils have a strong bilingual foundation (School Mission Statement, 24/04/18). Every class has two teachers for all subjects, one of whom is a first language Chinese (Putonghua) teacher, the other a first language English teacher. All lessons are therefore bilingual with pupils working interchangeably in each language as they interact with each teacher. As pupils transition into the high school in Year 7, the medium of instruction moves to English, with the exception of Chinese language and Chinese history. Chinese history is an extension of the language course, and is not officially part of the IB Programmes. This additional subject represents a school decision to offer pupils a better understanding of their Chinese heritage.

Teachers within the primary school are expected to work in partnership with their co-teachers. It is the school leadership that determines which teachers are paired together and whether they will stay together each subsequent year. On arrival to the school as a new co-teacher, teachers are introduced to their partner and given time to draw up a working agreement, which outlines how they will resolve conflicts, should they arise. The teacher induction programme does not include any information about co-teaching practices or how co-teaching can be used to support student language development.

Hong Kong’s co-official languages are English and Chinese, both are widely used throughout the city. In the context of Hong Kong, Chinese means written Modern Standard Chinese and spoken Cantonese (Poon, 2010). The spoken form of Modern Standard Chinese is known as Putonghua in Hong Kong (Mandarin in other places). The requirement of the school to have a minimum of 70% of its pupils as permanent Hong Kong residents means that the home language background for most of the pupils at the school is Cantonese. The term ‘Cantonese’ has two meanings, it is the collective term used to describe the dialects spoken in Guangdong and Guangxi provinces, but it is also the term used to describe any one of these dialects (Groves, 2010). Within the context of this research, Cantonese is the term used to describe the Hong Kong variety of Cantonese. The linguistic diversity of Hong Kong is further supported by domestic helpers that are present in homes throughout Hong Kong. The majority of these domestic helpers speak English rather than Cantonese. For the pupils at the school this means that English is a community language even if not used at home, while exposure to Putonghua is likely restricted to school use only. As part of the admissions policy for a pupil entering into Y1 (aged 5 years), pupils are expected to have proficiency in at least one of the classroom languages (Putonghua or English). Proficiency is determined through an informal interview between the child and the teacher to ask them about themselves, as well as an observation of them playing in a small group of their peers, in the target languages, facilitated by the teacher (language proficiency Section 2.2.2). Pupils are expected to be able to respond to the teacher and their peers as part of these interactions in at least one of the target languages to be considered proficient for entry into the school. For the majority of the Cantonese first language pupils this was achieved through attendance at a bilingual kindergarten. Language
input for Putonghua in Hong Kong can be particularly challenging, especially in terms of literacy. Hong Kong uses traditional Chinese script and Pinyin, a combination only found otherwise in Taiwan. This limits the amount and availability of resources that can be used in teaching and learning Putonghua. It also means that pupils are trying to learn a language that is not used regularly in the wider community. Pupils are regularly supported with translations, either from the teacher, Google translate or their peers depending on the linguistic competence of those around them. The classroom therefore represents a fluid multilingual environment.

The school tries to fulfil two roles, on the one hand it is an international school, teaching an international curriculum. The secondary school prepares pupils for exams in English and pupils graduate and attend English medium universities all over the world. This internationalism, or as Yemini (2019) describes a ‘purposeful attempt to link with the broader world mainly through connections with other countries, languages….’ (pp.25), is desirable to the parents of the school as well as to Higher Education Institutions, where these pupils apply. On the other hand, the school is keen to acknowledge the Chinese heritage of the pupil population and the position of Hong Kong as part of China. The school has to carefully balance its local context and pupil population with its desire to be recognised as an international school.

1.3 Historical Context of Language in Hong Kong

The historical linguistic context of Hong Kong and China more widely is connected to language use and the cultural identity of its speakers. A brief understanding of the history of Cantonese and Putonghua is an important context to this study since many of the tensions between these two recognised dialects are just as pertinent today as they have been historically. Language histories have shaped how each language is valued and the context of it use, shaping the language identities of many Hong Kong and Chinese citizens.

Hong Kong evolved from a small fishing village into an international financial centre in the last 170 years. In this time, there have been two changes in sovereignty, one in 1842 following the first Opium War and more recently in 1997. The historical, political and economic development has had a significant influence on the language of Hong Kong in addition to national changes to the written language. Prior to 1842, Hong Kong was a monolingual community of local Chinese, speaking Cantonese. The official writing system, was Baihua. The introduction of British colonists, led to the introduction of a second monolingual community of British people speaking English (Poon, 2010). The prominence of English, being perceived as a key to economic prosperity further divided the community (Kan and Adamson, 2010).

After the Second World War there was a large influx of Chinese refugees fleeing civil war. Due to this growing population, the Hong Kong government established Chinese Medium Instruction (CMI) schools alongside the already established English Medium instruction (EMI) schools but they were not given strong government support (Kan and Adamson, 2010). In 1963, a report by the Education Commission recommended that more schools should be set up to support the learning of Cantonese speaking pupils. Ten years later a second report, a Green Paper (Board of Education, 1973) again called for more CMI schools, but there was
no public support for this as it was perceived by parents that English was the language of social advancement. As Lin (1997) notes:

‘he majority of public discourses in Hong Kong reflect an implicitly asserted and imposed, politically and economically defined hierarchy of values on languages. Cantonese is placed at the bottom of such a hierarchy…’ (pp.433).

The language hierarchy to which Lin (1997) refers can be seen in every day practices within Hong Kong. Chinese textbooks are written in standard written Chinese (Putonghua) rather than Cantonese (Boyle, 2001). Children are taught from a young age ‘conversion rules’ with regard to word choice and lexicon items to enable them to ‘correctly’ articulate themselves in written form (Bruche-Schulz, 1997).

1.3.1 Government Interventions in Language Instruction

Since the late 1970s the Chinese government have initiated many reforms with a view to increasing its participation in international trade as part of the global economy. This further increased the status of English across China (Tong and Shi, 2012). A streaming policy was proposed in the Education Commission Report No.4 (Education Commission, 1990). It referred to the medium of instruction within schools as a way of resolving ‘mixed-code’ and ultimately raising the standards of English proficiency:

‘the use of mixed-code is quite common in many of our classrooms……in some cases, this can lead to time being wasted on translation of English texts in class and, worse still, learning being reduced to rote memorization (Education Commission, 1990, pp.100).’

This term ‘mixed-code’ is used alongside both code-switching and switching-code to describe the phenomenon of changing languages during speech. Within Hong Kong, mixed-code is the preferred term, but the connotations of this suggest that it is a result of confusion on the part of the speaker (see Translanguaging Section 2.3.1). During the 1980s schools were either English Medium Instruction (EMI) or Chinese Medium Instruction (CMI) schools, but the reality was that they were largely mixed-code.

The streaming policy re-classified schools, requiring them to adopt one medium of instruction rather than mixed-code. Parents in Hong Kong want to send their children to attend EMI schools to enhance life chances and social mobility (Morrison and Lui, 2010). English is therefore what social anthropologist, Lave (1988) would refer to as a symbolic resource, a language of power, and educational and socioeconomic advancement (Lin, 1996). The reality for the schools that remained EMI was that pupils would not be able to access the instruction (Education Commission, 1990, pp.104). The Education Commission put forward a framework to resolve this conflict. Pupils were streamed based on their language abilities into one of three categories based on the results of a Medium of Instruction Grouping Assessment (MIGA).

Schools were then grouped into three types – CMI, EMI or bilingual schools. The results of the MIGA were shared with schools and parents. Parents had free choice of school and therefore medium of instruction, but the results of the MIGA informed them of their child’s suitability (Education Commission, 1990). Schools too had the choice of instruction, but with the MIGA results of their pupils, they were able to
make an informed choice to meet pupil needs (Education Commission, 1990). The streaming policy was implemented in 1994 with a 3 year roll out, and planned to be fully operational by 1997. The policy came to a halt however, in 1998, just one year after the handover, when it was replaced with the compulsory CMI policy (Poon, 2010).

The compulsory CMI policy meant that all schools needed to change to CMI. A total of 100 schools were approved to continue with EMI, however, each of these schools were found in more affluent districts (Boyle, 2001). The policy was met by opposition from parents, leading to policy revision later that same year, which further exempted 14 schools from the policy. This meant 70% of Hong Kong schools were now CMI, up from just 12% (Poon, 2010). International schools were part of the exemption, sparking an increase in demand for school places, a demand that has not subsided. The notion of hegemonic languages is therefore one source of potential disadvantage for pupils and this is problematized within the research.

1.4 Current Policy on Bilingual Education in Hong Kong

As explained in Section 1.3, Hong Kong has never been linguistically homogeneous. Chinese is an umbrella term used to describe many different dialects (He, 2006; Xiao, 2006). Chinese, within the context of Hong Kong, means written Modern Standard Chinese (traditional characters) and spoken Cantonese. According to the mid-decade bi-census the proportion of the population over age five who can speak Cantonese 88.9%, English 4.3% and Putonghua (Mandarin) 1.9% (Hong Kong Government, 2016).

The current language policy of Hong Kong was shaped in early 2001, by the Standing Committee on Language Education and Research (SCOLAR). They conducted a language review of schools and the wider community with the view of raising language standards. The findings suggested that Hong Kong should be biliterate and trilingual, a policy aim that still exists today. SCOLAR (2003) recommendation was based on three findings:

1. Language ability is linked to social and academic development, both of which are needed for economic prosperity
2. Current success of Hong Kong is partly attributed to linguistic competence, bridging the gap between the English-speaking, global business community and Chinese-speaking merchants and traders (SCOLAR, 2003, pp.3)
3. Enhancing both English and Chinese will meet future challenges of increasing globalisation

The report recommended that basic competencies for each Key Stage should be set for both English and Chinese (Cantonese). At Key Stage 3, 4 and 5 these competencies should reflect the level of English and Chinese that would be needed to function in an entry level job (SCOLAR, 2003). The Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority (HKEAA) was commissioned by the Education Department to develop the Basic Competency Assessment (BCA) to monitor pupils’ language ability in both languages. This was achieved by 2006 for pupils in Key Stage 1 -3. Since Putonghua Chinese was only introduced into schools in 1998, the report stated that it was too early to develop competencies in this language, but noted that the existing workforce now needed to upgrade their Putonghua proficiency to meet the growing demand in the workplace (SCOLAR, 2003, pp.10).
The report also made recommendations for university entrance, stating that:

‘pupils going on to further studies should have the necessary Chinese and English language competencies to benefit from higher education programmes conducted in either of the two languages’ (pp.7).

In the same year, the Ministry of Education recommended the launch of Chinese-English bilingual education in tertiary institutions, with 5-10% of courses being delivered bilingually (Tong and Shi, 2012). As part of the review pupils, teachers and parents across 52 schools in Hong Kong were surveyed. Based on self-perception, less than 50% of pupils were strongly motivated to learn both English and Chinese and only 25% had the motivation to learn Putonghua (SCOLAR, 2003, pp.11). The report concluded that to achieve biliterate and trilingual pupils, the two major foci should be to specify clear and realistic competencies in each language and secondly, to create a more motivating language environment (pp.2). As part of the approach to help to motivate pupils, it recommended pupils learn in their mother tongue and called for a medium of instruction policy review by the government.

International schools, such as the one in this study, are not mandated on medium of instruction in the way that government schools are. This means that none of the findings of SCOLAR and their reports had to be implemented within the international private education sector, which has allowed the continued growth of EMI and bilingual (English and Putonghua) schools without Cantonese. The perceived social mobility associated with learning English and more recently Putonghua (Section 1.3.1) has fuelled the growth of the private education sector in Hong Kong. The cost of private education, further embeds the notion of an elite education associated with income and higher social class (Tong and Shi, 2012).

1.5 Contextual Background of the School

As noted above, the majority of the pupils entering the school are first language Cantonese speakers. Within the primary school, there are a total of 538 pupils. On admission to the school the requirement is that pupils have a minimum level of proficiency in at least one of the two languages taught. Figure 1.1 shows the declared home languages of pupils on entry to the school.
Pupils entering the school in Year 1 come from one of a number of bilingual kindergartens within Hong Kong. These kindergartens are owned and operated by the same group which owns and operates the school in this study. This ensures that pupils meet the entry requirement of language competence and this is likely reflected in the language profile of the pupils given above, with high numbers of pupils declaring English and Putonghua as home languages. On the admissions form, home and first language are terms that are used interchangeably and are defined within the language policy of the school as the ‘pupil’s best language(s)’ (Section 1.5.1 below). With strong competition for places at international schools and in particular bilingual schools, my experience is that parents declare the home languages that they think will support an application to the school. Evidence of this can be found in the initial study (Section 1.7 below).

1.5.1 School Language Policy
School language policy aims to support pupils to become bilingual and biliterate in Putonghua and English. This sentiment is supported in the philosophy statement which appears at the start of the school language policy. Partial sentences within the excerpts have been underlined for emphasis of points discussed.

![Figure 1. 2 Excerpt one from school language policy](image)

Competence in more than one language, refers to Putonghua and English as the two languages of the school. The final sentence about ‘personal and cultural identity’ could be seen to make assumptions about pupil cultural identity. These assumptions can become part of the figured world of the pupils (Chapter 2 discussion). It could also represent a school curriculum goal, to move children towards an identity as a bilingual pupil. This too, could be problematic for pupils that are multilingual.

The policy continues:

![Figure 1. 3 Excerpt two from school language policy](image)
It is clear from the philosophy statement that the curriculum aim is for pupils to identify themselves as bilingual in English and Chinese, in the same way that the school recognises its own identity as a bilingual school. There is no mention of a different goal for pupils who come to the setting with a home language that is not one of the languages of the school. There is also no mention of Cantonese specifically, just Chinese which could refer to Cantonese or Putonghua. The policy moves on to specify the language of instruction:

**Languages of Instruction**

The school’s aim is for a student to become bilingual and biliterate in both English and Chinese. All teachers are language teachers.

Figure 1.4 Excerpt three from school language policy

This suggests that the value of English and Chinese within the school comes from the academic outcomes of being bilingual and biliterate. This aim meets the demands of the parents who select this bilingual, international school. Teachers are responsible for developing these languages as part of their practice, but missing from the text is any information about how teachers are to support language learning to be effective for all pupils. Cantonese is not mentioned under ‘languages of instruction,’ instead, in the section that follows, ‘other languages used in school’ details the role of Cantonese.

**Other Languages Used in School**

Chinese and English are the official languages in Hong Kong. However, the Chinese dialect Cantonese is commonly spoken in Hong Kong, including by many of our families. Cantonese is therefore used in class where necessary and possible to explain concepts, support understanding and make connections between languages. This may also be possible with some other languages. Cantonese is a common social dialect within the school.

Figure 1.5 Excerpt four from school language policy

Placing Cantonese under a separate heading of ‘other languages’ signifies that Cantonese has less value than Putonghua and English which are seen here in terms of their value as academic languages. This view is further compounded by the use of the term ‘dialect’ and ‘social language’ to describe the language spoken by the majority of the pupils.

The policy does recognise that Cantonese is the language of the majority of the pupils at the school and it states that Cantonese can be used ‘where necessary’ and ‘where possible’ in class. ‘Where necessary’ suggests that the preference is for it not to be used, unless necessary and ‘where possible’ reflects the reality, which is that pupils do not have the academic vocabulary in Cantonese to explain or understand the concepts they are learning, having never been taught in Cantonese and that it is unlikely that the Chinese teacher will be able to speak Cantonese since most teachers are from Mainland China and their first language is Putonghua.
The final section of the policy is headed ‘Mother Tongue’. In this section, mother tongue is defined as either the ‘students’ best language’ [sic] or the ‘language spoken at home’:

![Figure 1. 6 Excerpt five from school language policy](image)

Defining mother tongue as either a pupil’s best language or the language spoken at home is confusing. As was seen in the language profiles of the pupils within the primary school above (Figure 1.1), many of the pupils speak more than one language at home. The idea that mother tongue is a pupil’s best language means that a pupil’s mother tongue may change over time, particularly as they are attending a bilingual programme in what is likely to be two additional languages. Referring to mother tongue as the pupil’s best language masks the complexities of bilingualism, within this trilingual context.

The references within the policy excerpts that refer to pupils conceptualizing in their mother tongue, represents a requirement of being an accredited international school.

The policy state that:

![Figure 1. 7 Excerpt six from the school language policy](image)

Having defined mother tongue, the policy switches to referencing ‘first language’. It draws on the work of Cummins (Chapter 2.2.2 discussion) and his definition of additive bilingualism, but there is a misunderstanding here of the term, since the priority for Putonghua and English within the school’s bilingual, biliterate goals without mother tongue is more likely to lead to subtractive bilingualism. It is interesting to note that as part of Appendix 2 within the language policy – Pupil Language Profile, pupil home languages are referred to as ‘first languages’ in which Cantonese is included as a language and not a dialect:
First language is not defined by the policy and instead is used synonymously with both mother tongue and home language without justification. Cantonese is referred to as a ‘social language’ a ‘language’ and a ‘dialect’. Chapter 2 will note that these terms are also contested in the literature. The complexities of understanding Chinese within the context of Hong Kong, can be seen to be reflected within the policy.

1.5.2 International Curricula
As an International Baccalaureate (IB) authorised school, it is a requirement that the school has a place for mother tongue, even if it is not explicitly taught. Standard A7 from the IB Standards and Practices requires that the school:

‘places importance on language learning, including mother tongue, host country language and other languages’ (IB Standards and Practices, 2016)

Offering pupils the opportunity to conceptualise in their mother tongue during lessons, even if they do not choose to do so, meets the requirement of the IB Standards and Practices for mother tongue. This is a competing pressure for the school, where parents do not want their children to speak Cantonese.

1.5.3 Social and Moral Education
As noted in the Research Context (Section 1.2) the school mission seeks to promote and develop a pride in Chinese heritage. One of the ways the school seeks to do this is through the partial implementation of the new core subject of National and Moral Education that was introduced in 2012 by the Hong Kong government. This new core subject encourages schools to nurture five core values: Perseverance, Respect for Others, Responsibility, National Identity and Commitment. This curriculum has been partly taken up by the school despite being exempt from the requirement to do so under the PIS initiative. Pupils learn to sing the National Anthem in Mandarin and sing this daily as part of assemblies and as part of the flag raising ceremony. The National and Moral education is believed to enhance pupil’s sense of national identity and develop political loyalty (Ho, 2011).

The learning objectives for National Identity state that:
All pupils within Hong Kong government schools are expected to develop this sense of national identity, an identity that is inseparable from that of China. The school in which the research takes place has taken up this aim too, both within these practices and in its mission statement. Pupils therefore have an assumed identity and heritage connected to China on joining the school, irrespective of nationality of home language.

1.6 My role Within the School

At the start of this research I had been a teacher for 15 years and working in international education for the last 5 years. I had been at this school for just one year in the role of Diploma Coordinator within the upper part of the Secondary School. My responsibility was for the pupils in the final two years of compulsory education prior to university entrance. It was this role within the Diploma Programme where my initial study focused. At the start of my third year at the school, I was appointed Curriculum Director, a role which gave me overview of the curriculum from Primary Year 1 through to Year 12. As part of this role I observed teachers in all sections of the school teach on an ongoing basis throughout the year. My role within the school was unique, being the only whole-school role. This gave me an opportunity to look at pedagogical practices across the school, from Y1 where pupils enter the bilingual programme, through to secondary, where pupils transition into an EMI programme. My position in the school at the time of the research afforded me a unique opportunity to be in classrooms as co-teaching was enacted by teachers and this is therefore where the research for this thesis resides.

1.7 Initial Study

The initial study was concerned with pupil marginalization within the final two years of the Diploma Programme. This initial study lead to one of the aims of this present study, as well as helping to inform the context. It is therefore useful to include a brief overview of the findings of this initial study as part of this introduction and how the findings shaped the aims addressed in the present study. The initial study focused on a group of eight linguistically diverse pupils in Y11 (aged 17-19 years), that had been removed from the Diploma Programme as they were considered ‘at risk’ of not being able to meet the passing criteria. This happened every year for a small group of pupils. In most cases, these pupils were struggling to access the curriculum and
were regarded as second language learners in both English and Putonghuwa. The requirements of the Diploma Programme meant that they had to take at least one language as their first language. If they couldn’t fully access this first language course their overall grades were low and they would be removed from the programme. My observation at this time (2014), was that pupils who were removed became increasingly unmotivated and less likely to attend school. The study therefore focused on this pupil marginalization and underachievement. In studying to understand this dilemma, I was interested in the linguistic diversity of the pupils and their attitudes to these languages and their use within school and whether this enabled or constrained their learning within the classroom. During the parent and pupil ‘at risk’ meetings about attainment, the pupil concerned would often act as a translator (Cantonese – English) between the staff and the parents, a skill that I felt should be celebrated, but within the school context, had no place. My initial study sought to acknowledge pupil language diversity through the use of an e-portfolio in which pupils could choose the language of its content, celebrating language diversity and redefining achievement.

The findings from the initial study highlighted the differential value of language, experienced by these pupils. It is therefore problematic to assume that culture is independent, common and immutable. To understand these pupils’ accounts and reluctance to draw on their language diversity in the e-portfolio, I examined the school language policy and found that there was no guidance for primary teachers about how co-teaching was understood or practiced to be effective for all pupils. I was aware that the linguistic capital and associated identities of the pupils are enabled and constrained by institutional practices, such as bilingual co-teaching. My research concerns for the main study were now focused on understanding the enactments of co-teaching and their consequences for pupil language learning and identity. The enactment of the co-teaching model and the ways in which it enables and constrains the linguistic diversity of pupils within the classroom will impact a pupil’s sense of belonging and therefore their future achievement.

As Chen et al, (2010) note, spoken languages and their associated identities are complicated by a hierarchical order assigned based on their perceived economic, cultural and political importance as well as the sociohistorical and cultural relationships of the countries where these languages are spoken (p.7). Parents at the school recognise the growing importance of Putonghua, connected to Hong Kong’s history and future. As Chen et al (2010) argue ‘the prestige, usefulness and desirability of the Chinese language has expanded with the forces of globalisation’ (p.9). The historic issues of power and social stratification connected to language are therefore highly pertinent today. As Rogoff (1995) notes, events cannot be divided up as units of time, instead: ‘the present extends through the past and future and cannot be separated from them’ (p.272). This is clearly seen in the sociolinguistic situation in Hong Kong today, where past notions of a language hierarchy influence school practices.

### 1.7.1 Aims of Study

The aim of this study was to explore how co-teaching practices within the primary school shaped pupil experiences and identities as bilingual learners. Within Hong Kong, the national changing view of valued languages connected to its historical context and the political situation following the handover, and the dissonance this
creates with the language of the pupils and their families all shaped educational policy and views about what was valued. The research therefore paid attention to the value accorded to each of the school’s languages and how it shaped what was made available to learn. Since the initial study found that there was no guidance on how co-teaching should be understood or practiced to be effective for all pupils, this study focused on different co-teaching enactments to understand teacher practice as well as their perception of this practice. Pupil experiences of co-teaching were captured with the aim of understanding how institutional practices mediated their identities as bilingual learners within the co-taught classroom. The chosen research questions for this thesis are introduced in Section 2.7.

1.7.2 Summary of the Study
This study took place over a two-year period. Two co-taught classrooms were the focus of the research, one Y5 and one Y3 class. During the period of research, observations of co-teaching were carried out both formally (observing lessons in Unit of Inquiry and Mathematics over a five month period) and informally (observing one or more lessons each week as part of my school role, for the duration of the research period). There was on-going dialogue with pupils and teachers throughout the research process recorded in a research journal. Teachers and pupils (three from each class) were then interviewed at the end of the research process to understand perceptions of co-teaching (as a teacher or as a learner), and to understand how school policies had shaped pupil and teacher identities within the bilingual classroom.

1.8 Conclusion
This chapter has identified the cultural context of Hong Kong, outlining past policy changes in education in relation to language. The current policy of bilingual education has been outlined with a view to contextualising the school in which the research takes place. The school has been introduced, including its language policy along with some of the important findings of the initial study that have shaped the direction of this thesis and the rationale for its study.
Chapter 2 Literature review

2.1 Introduction

The literature review is divided into seven sections. It begins with an outline of the theoretical framework for this study. Wenger’s social learning model follows from this, where aspects of learner identity are explored. The theme of learner identity is picked up again in more detail, later in Section 2.6. Key definitions associated with language learning are discussed in the sections on bilingualism (bilingual education, bilingualism in Hong Kong and bilingualism in children). A discussion of co-teaching in bilingual contexts follows this. The chapter closes with the identification of the research questions for this thesis.

2.1.1 Sociocultural Framework

Traditional theories of language learning and language acquisition, show a clear distinction between the individual and social processes. This can be seen clearly in the debates around the definition and use of the term language acquisition. Central to the debate is the question surrounding the age at which the child is acquiring the second language, as opposed to simultaneously acquiring two languages (Nicholas and Lightbown, 2008). Tomlinson (2008) argues for a continuum, making the distinction between language acquisition and language development which he argues happens after acquisition. Tomlinson (2008) defines language acquisition as the ‘initial stage of gaining basic communicative competence in a language’ (p.3), suggesting that language is something to be acquired, moving it from the external to the internal. Tomlinson (2008) goes on to define language development as the ‘subsequent stage of gaining the ability to use the language successfully in a wide variety of media and genre for a wide variety of purposes’ (p.3). In this view, language acquisition resides in the head, while communication and language use reside within social context. In this view of mind, language mirrors a given external reality that is acquired through a process of transmission and receipt (Bredo 1999; Lave and Wenger 1991). There is a tacit belief in representationalism (Bredo, 1999), in which symbols are received and encoded. With this belief, there is no process of meaning-making, instead knowledge represents how the world really is and this is transmitted to pupils. Representationalism separates language from culture, social relations, identity and situated social practice (Lin, 1997) since they are viewed as having no impact on language learning.

Larsen-Freeman (2015) makes the case for moving from the term language acquisition to language development, mitigating the need to use the term acquisition. Larsen-Freeman’s (2015) arguments for switching terms are aligned with my sociocultural perspective on language learning. She argues that the term ‘acquisition’ implies a commodified view of language learning, akin to the symbol processing view argued above, that does not recognise language as dynamic. Language learners are participating in their learning. Construing the world socioculturally, assumes that there is no direct access to the world, and so language is instead viewed as a means of social coordination and adaptation (Bredo, 1999). Individual knowledge does not mirror reality, and language acquisition does not precede its use in social contexts but instead is negotiated within these contexts. As Ellis and Larsen-Freeman (2006) note ‘language use, social roles, language
learning and conscious experience are all situated socially, negotitated, scaffolded and guided’ (p.572).

Larsen-Freeman (2015) suggests that the use of the term language development, rather than acquisition has other benefits too. Acquisition suggests a process that is irreversible, whereas development allows for the possibility of decline. The complexities of language learning and in particular bilingual language development, means that linguistic ability can move in both directions, it is not as simple as acquiring the language (Section 2.2), language learning is never complete, there is no end point, since languages are shaped by each person and their interactions. Language only has meaning in the context of its use (Murphy and Hall, 2008), and is inseparable from social interactions in which it is derived. It is a mediational semiotic means (Wertsch, 1991) or cultural tool that transforms individual action and bridges between these actions and cultural, historical and institutional settings. Language learning as a semiotic process is therefore attributable to participation in socially mediated activities (Lantolf, 2000). As Halliday (1993) argues, meaning making is a distinctive characteristic of human learning, and is an essential condition for knowing, through the process of participation. It therefore makes no sense to suggest there is an end point in learning a language, since language is unbounded. For these reasons, this research will use the term language development as the preferred term to language acquisition, since it is more closely aligned to a sociocultural understanding of the world.

Lin (1997) too notes, language learning and language use is much more than information processing it involves the transformation of social relations and social identity. Lave and Wenger (1991) expand on this idea of identity transformation in their social learning model based on their studies of apprenticeship learning. This was later, further developed by Wenger (1998). Lave and Wenger (1991) suggest that learning takes place as individuals participate and negotiate meanings and identities within their social worlds. Wenger (1998) emphasizes learning as situated within different physical and social contexts, distributed across people and tools within a community of practice.

This view of learning, as situated within practice and involving a change in identity, is congruent with my sociocultural understanding of the world. For this reason, this research will draw on Wenger’s social learning theory in seeking to understand classroom interactions and language choices made by pupils as they negotiate their participation within the bilingual classroom.

2.1.2 Communities of Practice

Wenger (1998) defines a community of practice (p.125) as a group of people who share a concern and a set of problems, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area through interactions on an ongoing basis. Over time they develop a common knowledge, practices, approach and a common sense of identity (Hart et al, 2013). Wenger (1998) conceptualizes learning as encompassing four elements: meaning (learning as experience), practice (learning as doing), community (learning as belonging), and identity (learning as becoming). He argues that learning is much more than symbol processing, it is identity transformation. Within the co-taught language classroom, this conceptualisation of learning,
recognised the duality of participation and identity. Lave and Wenger (1991) use the term ‘legitimate peripheral participation’ to characterise this learning and to broaden the traditional view of apprenticeship to one where participation and identity transform as part of this community (p.11). Legitimate peripheral participation is seen as a relational and evolving process that enables participation within a community. Within the co-taught language classroom, pupils could belong to multiple communities of practice, as they participate in language learning. As language learners within this bilingual setting, pupils are granted or denied legitimate peripheral participation, transforming their participation within the community and with it their evolving identities as language learners.

Participation within a community of practice is where understandings are negotiated. Learning is therefore viewed as distributed among participants. Collective expertise is transformed through participation and shared experience. Lave and Wenger (1991) argue that participants join a community of practice as newcomers, where learning takes place through modified forms of participation. There is knowledge but it is undefined. Lave and Wenger (1998) argue for a centred view of master-apprentice relations which leads to an understanding that mastery resides in the organisation of the community of practice (of which the master is a part) and not the master (p.94). The newcomer enters the community of practice at the periphery and over time moves closer towards full participation as they gain knowledge of the community, and adopt the view of themselves as a community member. According to Lave and Wenger (1991) legitimate peripheral participation, ‘provides a way to speak about the relations between newcomers and old timers, and about activities, identities, artifacts and communities of knowledge and practice’ (p.29).

Lave and Wenger (1991) note that ‘hegemony over resources for learning and alienation from full participation are inherent in the shaping of legitimacy and peripheral participation in its historical realisations’ (p.42). In other words, although having access to a wide range of resources is crucial for newcomers, power relations within the community of practice can allow or prevent legitimate peripheral participation (Morita, 2004). While acknowledging that power relations within a community of practice exist, Lave and Wenger (1991), by their own admission, left the issue largely unexplored (Lave and Wenger, 1991, p.42). According to Davies (2005) legitimate peripheral participation requires unequal power relations in the form of a hierarchy. She notes that ‘individuals do not have access to communities based solely on their desire to be a part’ (p.557) Davies refers to this as a process of ‘gate-keeping.’ While Lave and Wenger (1991) distinguish between those on the periphery and those who are full community members, Davies advocates for a hierarchy, arguing that ‘those within a community of practice are extremely aware of those at the top, and the power that those few wield over the other members’ (pp.571-572). Fuller and Unwin (2004) support this view, arguing that legitimacy and peripherality are intertwined in complex ways.

Fuller et al (2005) also note the unequal power relations that exist within communities of practice. Rather than see these power relations as a hierarchy, they see them as dynamic, challenging Wenger’s (1998) view of legitimate peripheral participation as ‘catching up’ and instead ‘placing emphasis on change through cultural reproduction’ (p.64). Fuller et al’s (2005) research found that as part of the process of Legitimate Peripheral Participation, full community members were also learning from newcomers, thus allowing the newcomer to be an expert for periods of time (p.64). In this way, the process of moving from Legitimate Peripheral Participation, they argue, is not linear. Fuller and Unwin (2004) also argue that it
should be seen with more fluidity, challenging the assumption that ‘expertise is equated solely with status and experience within the workplace’ (p.32). Within the bilingual co-taught classroom, fluidity in participation is a more useful concept as pupils draw on their expertise in each of the classroom languages, taking on different roles that enable or constrain their participation within each of the communities. A pupil from a first language Putonghua background may be considered as having expertise in the segments of teaching that take place in Chinese, but perhaps considered a newcomer in English. The concept of fluidity is therefore a useful concept within the bilingual classroom.

Lave and Wenger's (1991) work on communities of practice has been widely applied to the language classroom. Morita (2004), in her study of second language learners in a Canadian university, warns about making assumptions that individual pupils behave according to their abilities or cultural preference (p.598). Instead, she argues that teachers should question the roles and status of pupils within the classroom that shape their participation. Data from this multiple case study showed a reciprocal relationship between an individual pupil's participation and competence (p.596). Where pupils were unable to participate in discussions, they developed an identity as a less competent member of the class, making further participation more difficult. Pacheco and Brown’s (2022) study of 9th grade biology classrooms, substantiate this claim, arguing that newcomer emergent bilinguals’ experience demonstrate a misalignment between social competence and personal experience which constrained meaning-making. Morita (2004) argues that ‘the local classroom context – the social, cultural, historical, curricular, pedagogical, interactional and interpersonal context – is inseparable from learner’s participation’ (p.596). Takuya (2020) also recognised the importance of local classroom context on learner participation. In his qualitative study of international pupils in a Japanese as a foreign language classroom, he found that social support within the classroom impacts both their subject and language learning. Morita (2004) notes that participation is not always problem free, but rather co-constructed learner agency and positionality provide sites of struggle through power relations within the community of practice.

Billett (2003) also argues that the way in which individuals engage in activities (and therefore in a community of practice) is mediated by their ontogenies or personal histories (p.139). It is the individual’s agency, as shaped by this personal history that has led to particular identities that influence their interactions with the social world (pp.133-134). Similarly, Lantolf and Pavlenko (2001) state that ‘agency is never a property of a particular individual’ instead it is a ‘relationship that is constantly co-constructed and renegotiated with those around the individual and with the society at large’ (p.148). As Morita’s (2004) multiple case study of second language learners at a Canadian university found, individuals attempt to shape their own learning and participation through their agency and identity negotiation.

Learner agency, as exercised through participation can also be seen through non-participation or resistance. As Wenger (1998) notes:

‘We not only produce our identities though the practices we engage in, but we also define ourselves through the practices that we do not engage in. Our identities are constituted not only by what we are but also by what we are not.’ (p.164)
Norton Peirce et al (1993) note the complex reasons for non-participation in an English as a Second Language classroom, such as shifting identities and unique investments in the target language. Morita (2004) also details the complexity behind pupil non-participation, asserting that in addition to an individual's linguistic competence, other issues such as, 'culture, identity, curriculum, pedagogy and power' (p.596) can also mediate agency and participation.

Despite the wide-ranging language contexts in which communities of practice have been studied, language can be seen to play a role of more implicit importance within Wenger’s (1998) work. In his discussion about negotiation of meaning, in which he identifies a community of practice as mutual engagement, joint enterprise and shared repertoire, he states that negotiation of meaning ‘may involve language, but is not limited to it’ (p.53). Tusting (2005) however, argues that:

‘language is one of the principal means by which meaning is reified, and the joint repertoires Wenger refers to which build up in practice have many linguistic elements; his list (1998, p.83) includes “routines, words, tools, ways of doing things, stories, gestures, symbols, genres, actions, or concepts”, most of which can be either partly or entirely linguistic in nature’ (p.40).

For Tusting (2005), language plays a central role in everyday activity within communities of practice. She helpfully extends our understanding of the role of language, as meanings are negotiated within communities. She concludes that understanding the processes by which communities of practice are constituted and maintained requires attention to be paid to the role of language. Within the bilingual classroom, when pupils choose to use each of their languages and the ways in which they respond and interact with each other will therefore be important. Tusting (2005) further argues, that language use both constructs and internalises social relationships and is therefore linked to our identities as community members (Section 2.6.2).

Another useful concept to emerge from Wenger’s (1998) communities of practice, is that they do not operate in isolation. He presents what he believes are two connections between communities of practice: ‘boundary objects’ and ‘brokering’ (p.105). He defines boundary objects as, ‘forms of reification around which the communities of practice can organise their interconnections’ and brokering, as the ‘connections provided by people who can introduce elements of practice into another’ (p.105). Wenger (1998) believes that these two forms of connection allow the practices (participation and reification) of different communities to extend beyond the boundaries of a community of practice (Filstad et al, 2020). In other words, the individuals within a community of practice and their artifacts do not only belong to that community of practice. Wenger (1998) terms this boundary connection ‘multi-membership’, in which we all belong to multiple communities of practice. He uses the concept of multi-membership to argue that identity is more than a single trajectory, instead, he argues it should be seen as a ‘nexus of multi-membership’ (p.159).

Within a nexus of multi-membership, pupils may enact identities differently, for example through their use of different languages within the co-taught setting. Pupils bring their lived experience of multi-membership into the evolving cultural situations in Hong Kong schools and these identities shape how they are positioned and how they position themselves within these communities. No assumptions can be made, therefore, on pupils’ behalf about how they experience themselves within
the culture and the communities of which they are members. Each individual person’s activity, thoughts and feelings are shaped by the sociocultural context, which is simultaneously shaped by the individual’s activity. These multiple identities can clash or reinforce aspects of themselves in what Wenger (1998) calls a process of reconciliation. Wenger argues that the demands of reconciliation can be significant, challenging the individual’s identification with different communities of practice within their lives. Identification works through association and dissociation. A child knowing and being competent as a linguist outside of school and perhaps being positioned as lacking in linguistic competence within school could lead to dissociation and marginalization within school settings. I will return to the role of language within communities of practice in Section 2.6 as part of a discussion of learner identity.

2.2 Bilingual Education

Social learning and communities of practice in this study are situated within the bilingual (multilingual) classroom setting. There is no single agreed definition of bilingualism or multilingualism. The order of language acquisition, level of proficiency and frequency of their use have all been suggested, but none of these fully embrace the complexities of every case (De Bot and Jaensch, 2015). Henn-Reinke (2012) acknowledges this complexity, arguing that it extends beyond learning new grammar and vocabulary, instead it is ‘linked to identity, status and usage……..speakers must learn to function in multilingual environments’ (p.1). In other words, not only do bilingual individuals need to learn to speak each of their languages, they also have to learn to function within the context of their use. Cenoz and Genesee (1998) also note the additional complexity that comes from the status of each language, in addition to the languages’ roles within society. There are many factors that combine to influence how fully an individual can learn each of the different languages. Moradi (2014) suggests that rather than trying to define each aspect of this complexity, it might be better to regard language learning as a continuum in which at one end you have the monolingual speaker and at the other a person who has learned two (or more) languages in childhood and who is described as having equal native like fluency (p.147).

There have been many attempts to define and classify bilingualism and multilingualism based on a person’s degree of fluency or competence in each language or by the age of the person or the context in which they have learned the languages (formal or informal, for example). As there is not one definition that can adequately capture the complexity of language learning across contexts, attempts have been made to categorise and classify language learning based on cognitive, developmental and social dimensions separately (Moradi, 2014). Hall’s (2001) broad definition of bilingualism captures pupil language learning at school in terms of English and Chinese:

‘pupils who live in two languages, who have access to, or need to use, two or more languages at home and at school. It does not mean they have fluency in both languages or that they are competent and literate in both languages’ (p.5).

In bilingual and multilingual settings, language choice and attitudes are inseparable from politics, language ideologies and interlocutors’ view of their own and others’
identities (Pavlenko and Blackledge, 2004; Chan and Clarke, 2014). Consequently, research in this area will need to pay attention to school practices and structures, which legitimize language identity for some and marginalize that of others. I will return to this discussion on the complexity of defining bilingualism later, in Section 2.4 Bilingualism in Children.

2.2.1 Language and Culture

One of the many factors that are thought to influence how fully a bilingual or multilingual individual can learn a language is through an understanding of the target culture. Henn-Reinke (2012) suggests that for language learning to be effective, efforts must be made by the school to represent the culture of the target language as part of the taught curricula (p.199). Norton Pierce (1995) refers to this as ‘acculturation’ (p.11). Weger-Guntharp (2006) also argues for acculturation through a discussion of the advantages of access to a native language teacher that enables pupils to experience correct pronunciation and tone (p.37). Henn-Reinke (2012) concludes that it is critical to language development that pupils work directly with teachers who are native or fluent in the target language (p.203) as part of an acculturation approach to language learning. Acculturation, whether through native language instruction or as part of the taught curricula emphasises the importance of the social aspect of language learning. Boreham and Morgan (2008) emphasize learning as embedded in cultural contexts implying the simultaneous transformation of social and individual practices in line with my sociocultural perspective. Lave (1988) too discusses the pitfalls of the functionalist tradition, which equates culture and mind, treating ‘culture’ as a context. For Lave, it is problematic to assume culture is independent and held in common, since it is seen as static. She argues that such a view denies the cultural character of activity and therefore cognition. This research challenges the view of culture as immutable and shared by all, while acknowledging that behaviours are shaped by social structures in what could be regarded as cultural scripts (Murphy, 1995).

Bourdieu (1993) suggests a notion of ‘linguistic’ or ‘cultural capital,’ arguing that some pupils possess a cultural background (home environment) and disposition (attitude, motivation, support from parents, social advantage) that allows them to engage comfortably with the school-learning environment. His concept of symbolic capital is also useful in understanding how value is ascribed to languages, as in a wider system of cultural transformation and exchange, language assets serve as exchange commodities or ‘transubstantiated’ forms of economic capital (Grenfall, 2012). However, Hunter (2000) criticises the use of the term symbolic capital arguing that it creates a barrier to social inclusion rather than facilitating unity within communities. Symbolic capital advantages some pupils over others that do not have this linguistic or cultural capital. Bernstein (1971) too noted that speech affects educational attainment. He suggested that within the educational system elaborated speech patterns are used during lessons which is a disadvantage to pupils who have a restricted speech code. Within the school in which this research takes place, linguistic and cultural capital are the reasons cited for school choice. As noted in Section 1.2, the international curricula and bilingual medium of instruction are thought to offer advantage to pupils on leaving school for future employability.

Schumann (2006), in his discussion of acculturation, focuses on the social rather than individual variables in language learning, referring to ‘groups’ of learners to separate second language learners learning the target language and those who already have the target language. He argues that the shorter the ‘social distance’ between the second language group and the target group the better the chance of
facilitating acculturation. Social distance refers to the level to which a language learner, as a member of a social group, becomes a member of the target language group (Yuca, 2015). Schumann (2006) identifies eight factors that he believes control this social distance. These have been summarised below:

1. **Social dominance**: do the two languages have equal status (politically, culturally and economically) within the community? This is particularly relevant within the Hong Kong context with the positioning of Cantonese in the school language policy as a social language. Changing political agendas connected to medium of instruction within local school systems, represent how languages are valued socially, culturally and economically, all of which shape the social dominance of languages.

2. **Integration pattern**: how readily does the first language group want to integrate into the target language group? This is an interesting concept within the classroom setting, since there are three language backgrounds to consider and only two of those are considered target languages. Since both Cantonese and English are community languages, pupils have regular exposure to them, which could deem those pupils that speak them, the first language group and Putonghua the target language. However, this does not adequately capture the unique and complex language identities of the pupils within this study, or the fact that many of the pupils have two target languages.

3. **Enclosure**: how many social facilities and spaces the two groups share? Given the complex language identities noted above, enclosure is interesting within the school context in terms of which spaces can be used to speak in each language. The nature of some co-teaching models (Section 2.5) necessitates the use of one language only. Social spaces could therefore extend to imagined spaces, as children work in groups in one of the target languages, while sharing the same physical space with others.

4. **Cohesiveness**: how cohesive is the first language group in terms of intra-group contacts? The common goals and interests of the pupils in learning each of the target languages might be better framed as investment (Section 2.6.1), since the notion of first and target language groups, as already discussed, does not fit well within this linguistic context.

5. **Size**: the smaller the group of first language speakers the greater the chance of contact with the target language. Notwithstanding the comments above about separating pupils into these two language groups, there are a greater number of pupils fluent in English as opposed to Putonghua, which may encourage linguistic development in English as opposed to Putonghua.

6. **Cultural congruence**: how similar are the two cultures?

7. **Attitude**: how positive is the attitude of the first language group towards the target language group? Within the context of this research attitudes to all three of the school languages will be important in understanding the context of their use and pupil motivation to learn each of the languages.

8. **Intended length of residence**: how long will the first language group remain in the environment of target language? Within the classroom setting, as already noted in Section 1.2, the pupils are in a bilingual programme, as they
transition into the secondary school the medium of instruction changes to English. Pupils are likely to be aware of this transition.

Schumann (2006) argues that the larger the social distance the greater the constraint on language learning. Socioculturally the extent to which acculturation occurs will be different for each pupil based on his or her experiences. As Rogoff (1995) notes,

‘culture itself is not static but is formed from the efforts of people working together, using and adapting tools provided by predecessors and in the process creating new ones’ (p.16).

Wenger (1998) too argues that culture is a ‘composite repertoire created by the interaction, borrowing, imposing, and brokering among its constituent communities of practice’(p.291), culture then implies belonging as a subjective experience.

2.2.2 Language Proficiency

The work of Cummins is drawn on within the school language policy (Section 1.5.1), despite its intent for use in a monolingual setting. The key ideas are therefore presented here along with some of the challenges that these ideas present. Cummins’ (1981) study of Canadian bilingual children, distinguished between two types of language proficiency: Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). BICS refers to the speaking and listening skills of individuals who learn through social participation with others, in other words, through informal communication. CALP is the skills and knowledge required to think and work academically within the target language. More recently, Sibanda (2017) drew on this work to try to understand the complexity of language learning within South African primary schools, noting as Cummins (1981) did that BICS language proficiency develops much more quickly than CALP. According to Cummins (1981) it takes two years in an immersion programme, whereas CALP can take between seven and ten years depending on an individual’s mother tongue fluency.

Cummins’ perspective on language has dominated language minority education (Anstrom et al, 2010), and this is perhaps one reason why the school in which this research takes place draws so heavily on Cummins’ work as part of their policy on language. This research takes the view that these terms, and therefore school language policy, might lead to an oversimplification of bilingual learners, not least because the BICS/CALP hypothesis is meant for monolingual English contexts and not the context of a multilingual classroom with bilingual instruction, as in this research context.

Cummins (2000) embeds BICS and CALP within a Common Underlying Proficiency model of bilingualism, drawing on the metaphor of an iceberg. The Dual Iceberg Model is represented by two icebergs that are connected below the surface of the water, but above the water they appear to be separate and distinct. The two icebergs represent the two languages spoken which are visibly different (Bligh, 2014) but underneath the surface they are joined, at the level of CALP (Sibanda, 2017).

The relevance of the Common Underlying Proficiency model in bilingual education is debated in the literature. Goodrich and Lonigan (2017) for example found that for
language minority children of preschool age in a Spanish classroom the Common Underlying Proficiency model was relevant for code related skills but less relevant for language skills. Their findings are supported by other studies in language classrooms (Goodrich, Lonigan and Farmer, 2003; Lindedsey et al, 2003). They each support the view that where orthography is the same, code related skills such as decoding, allowing a child to apply their knowledge of letter sound and patterns to correctly pronounce written words is transferrable. Where orthography is different, as is the case for English and Chinese, code related skills are not found to be transferrable (Bialystok, Luk and Kwan, 2005; Luk, 2003). In addition, Chinese does not use inflectional morphemes, which express grammatical features such as plurality and tense (Yang, Cooc, and Sheng, 2017). This adds an additional complexity to a bilingual programme that teaches concepts simultaneously in two languages. Children in this research context must master at least one new language (dependent on home language background) which has a different orthography and grammatical conventions to their home language, and in addition, simultaneously learn lesson content.

Distinguishing language proficiency using BICS and CALP has been criticised for promoting a 'deficit theory' attributing academic failure to pupils of low academic proficiency (Rolstad, 2017). The hierarchical distinction in language proficiency as argued by Cummins (1981) does not address the complexity of language learning as understood within a sociocultural framework. Sociocultural theory conceptualises language learning as a 'developmental process mediated by semiotic resources' (Wertsch, 1991). These semiotic resources include written materials, the environment, gestures and classroom discourse, each of which mediates individual participation and what is made available to learn. Rather than distinguishing between language learning within a formal and informal setting, Gee (2014) argues that this is misleading 'since there is no such thing as decontextualized language' (p.9). Learning a language in a formal setting can only be further developed by using it socially. Rolstad (2017) supports this claim, seeing children's language as resources that should be viewed as rich and complex. How they interact with, and use these resources is negotiated as part of their agency. As Tomiwa (2019) notes, 'learners bring to interactions their own personal histories replete with values, assumptions, beliefs, rights, duties and obligations’ (p.148).

### 2.2.3 Mother Tongue and Language Dominance

Pupil individual histories as an influencing factor in language development can also be seen in the literature on the value of mother tongue development. Mother tongue language is most often defined as the birth language or as the language spoken at home. Using this definition, an individual may have more than one mother tongue language. Parental and caregiver language input in the home can be an important source of linguistic development and may influence a child’s language dominance (Rodriguez et al, 2021). Language dominance is defined as ‘a construct covering many dimensions of language use and experience including proficiency, fluency, cultural identification, and frequency of use, among others’ (Gertken et al, 2014, p.210). As Conteh (2003) notes, bilingual individuals may know two languages, but their ability in each of these languages can vary greatly.

Mother tongue language(s) as central to all other language learning, is prevalent in the literature on bilingual education. Liu (2004) and Xu (2003) cited in Tong and Shi (2012) contend that: ‘Chinese-English bilingual education threatens the status of mother tongue and culture, as well as impeding the development of critical thinking skills’, (p.170). They argue that once the mother tongue language of the pupil has
developed, they are then more able to learn a second language. Gao et al’s (2005) study substantiated this, and found that ‘when maintaining their native language and cultural identity, pupils developed deeper appreciation of the target language and culture’ (p.171). In an English and Chinese (Putonghua) bilingual classroom, such as the one in which this study is located, how each pupil positions themselves in terms of their cultural identity and their connection to each of the target languages, therefore influences individual language development.

Tong and Shi (2012) suggest that language development is connected to the age at which pupils begin to learn the language. Pupils who start to learn English before the age of twelve have a more positive attitude towards the language than those who start to learn after this time. They attribute this finding to an ‘additive’ view of bilingual learning, that is, the co-existence of two languages and cultures, in which the individual has opportunities to draw on each language, in different contexts, developing and valuing both languages (Tong and Shi, 2012). Importantly, one of the two co-existing languages in additive bilingualism is the pupil’s mother tongue.

Evidence for this view was also found in Gao et al’s (2005) study of bilingual English and Chinese pupils, which found that the negative attitude towards English learning in pupils who began to learn English after the age of 16 was a result of having already developed a strong native identity. They concluded that if the new culture and language conflict with what has been learned already, pupils are less likely to be able to learn it. In this case, subtractive bilingualism is more likely. Subtractive bilingualism denotes a situation in which the new culture and language replaces that of the learner’s heritage. Cummins (1984) hypothesized that subtractive bilingualism was more likely if the individual had not reached a threshold of linguistic proficiency in their first language. So, while there is much debate around the definition and categorisation of bilingualism, the literature is united in an understanding that bilingual education should not be promoted at the expense of the pupils’ mother tongue (He, 2006; Ma, 2010; Hancock, 2012; Tong and Shi, 2012; Oh, 2014).

2.2.4 Heritage Language Learners

The concept of heritage language learners is also relevant to this study. Hornberger and Wang (2008) define heritage language learners as:

‘individuals with familial or ancestral ties to a language other than English who exert their agency in determining if they are heritage language learners of that language’ (p.6).

The majority of Hong Kong pupils speak Cantonese at home (mother tongue), but are expected to learn a different form of Chinese outside of the home, a language that, using the above definition, could be considered a heritage language. This definition highlights language learner agency as they negotiate language hegemony, local ideologies and their own individual histories (Wu and Leung, 2014). However, the definition is Anglo-centric assuming that the medium of instruction is English.

Definitions of heritage language learners, are therefore contested within the literature. Weger-Guntharp (2006) compared the background characteristics of pupils considered heritage language learners with those considered non-heritage language learners, they concluded that the classification of heritage learners may mask the diversity of characteristics across learners within each classification (p.34).
Garcia (2005) criticises the term, arguing that it reduces an individual's identities to that of a single heritage, restricting the potential to appreciate bilingualism and biliteracy (p.601). This notion of a single heritage can be seen in the mission statement from the school in which this study takes place, it states that part of its aim is to combine: ‘international perspectives and Chinese heritage’ (school website, 2019) through their bilingual language programme.

Wu (2014) warns against this type of imposed identity and calls for a critical examination of the diversity of Chinese languages. Wu (2014) notes that attributing Putonghua as a common heritage language to all ethnic Chinese can hinder a pupil’s full participation. Wiley (2014) too, asserts that any attempt to apply a single label to a complex language situation, is problematic. This is further supported by Baker and Jones (1998) who argue:

‘The danger of the term heritage language is that, relative to powerful majority languages, it points more to the past and less to the future, to traditions rather than to the contemporary.’ (p.20)

Hornberger and Wang (2008) stress the importance of family or ancestral connections to heritage language, but the complexity of Chinese, with its many different variations is problematic, as it assumes that one should have a single heritage language. Ethnically Chinese speakers of Chinese may be speakers of many different Chinese dialects. The majority of participants in this research speak two or more varieties. Under these definitions, they would be heritage language speakers of more than one dialect or language.

Languages and dialects are usually distinguished from each other, in that languages are said to be mutually unintelligible. Groves (2010) notes however, that despite Putonghua and Cantonese being mutually unintelligible, Cantonese is, for political reasons, including the unifying influence of the standard written script, considered a dialect rather than a language. Within the context of the school, pupils could therefore be considered to be trilingual or multilingual. The majority of the pupils speak Cantonese at home and learn two additional languages at school, English and Putonghua.

Cantonese is considered a dialect of Chinese, whereas Putonghua is considered standard. ‘Standard’ or ‘proper’ language is used as a social distinction, which isolates and marginalizes members of different communities. Fairclough (1989) describes the unequal power distribution that leads to the distinction of ‘standard’ and ‘non-standard’ dialects. Within the school language policy, Putonghua is seen as the ‘proper’ form of Chinese, and Cantonese, while acknowledged as a dialect and the home language of the majority of pupils, is only used in social contexts outside of learning. The hegemonic views of standard and non-standard languages are therefore seen to circulate as part of the school culture. In viewing language learning socioculturally, language hegemony can manifest in the learners’ participation and engagement with each of their languages since context does not exist independently of interaction (Young and Miller, 2004).

Using definitions carefully is important, since how we define language learners helps to shape the status of the learner and their languages, both of which mediate
participation and therefore identity within the language classroom. Within the context of this study, heritage language learner will therefore be defined as:

A bilingual or multilingual language learner with familial or ancestral ties to at least one of their languages, who exert their agency in determining that they are a heritage language learner of one or more of these languages.

The identities of heritage language learners are constructed and shaped as they build connections to the languages and cultures of which they are a part. Val and Vinogradova (2010) argue that in order to understand the complexities of these processes of negotiation, heritage language learner identities should be discussed through two important and interrelated concepts: language as ‘cultural capital’ (Section 2.2.1) and ‘subject positioning’. Subject positioning describes a learner’s personal understanding of self as an expression of agency. This is a useful concept within the bilingual co-taught classroom, where pupils have choices about the languages they choose use and when they use them. Both could be considered as an expression of agency.

Subject positioning occurs as heritage language learners categorise themselves as belonging or not belonging to different groups (Oakes, 2001). Val and Vinogradova (2010) go on to argue that an identity of belonging can be associated with variables such as ‘ethnicity, nationality, cultural background, age, gender and class’ (p.6). As noted earlier (Section 2.1.2), Wenger (1998) conceptualises learning as belonging, with pupils developing a common sense of identity as part of a community of practice. Within the co-taught classroom, it will be noteworthy to consider how heritage language learners position themselves within the communities of practice as part of their learning and whether the identified variables play a role in this positioning and sense of belonging to their different communities.

2.3 Bilingualism in Hong Kong

As discussed in Section 1.2, Hong Kong has two official languages, English and Cantonese. The written form of Cantonese is not accepted and instead Modern Standard Chinese is the only form of written Chinese accepted or used in formal writing (Poon, 2010). Snow (2008) notes that while written Cantonese has developed a number of attributes that are associated with a standard language, without active promotion through education, the status of Cantonese within Hong Kong will remain unchanged.

There is much debate in the literature as to whether Cantonese supports or hinders the language proficiency of Hong Kong people in Putonghua. There is a belief that Cantonese ‘spoils’ a pupil’s ability to learn written Putonghua with any accuracy (Bruche-Schultz, 1997). Bray and Koo (2004) also argue that using Cantonese as a medium of instruction is not conducive to learning Standard Written Chinese. These arguments stem from the understanding that when speaking and writing in Modern Standard Chinese (Putonghua) the written and spoken form match each other word for word. When speaking in Cantonese and writing in Modern Standard Chinese the two forms vary greatly, requiring conversion rules to transfer grammar structures and vocabulary and in some instances spoken words do not have a written form (Wang and Kirkpatrick, 2012). On the other hand, there is also evidence in the literature to suggest that the close linguistic distance of the two languages aids

This research takes the view that each pupil is different and brings to the classroom different experiences that will enable and constrain their language learning. For some the close linguistic distance between the two languages may support them in learning Putonghua, but for others it may represent a challenge. As already argued above, there are many different contributing factors that affect how readily an individual can learn a language. In addition, within the school context, although the majority of pupils speak Cantonese as their home language, the experiences of each child can be very different. Some pupils will have been introduced to reading from an early age in Chinese and this could have been with or without Pinyin. Some pupils will have learned to read in English despite the home language being Cantonese, and so may not have been exposed to Chinese script. It is therefore too simplistic to argue that all pupils learning Putonghua will experience the same challenges or advantages in learning the language.

The issue of mother tongue value is pertinent to any discussion about languages in Hong Kong. There is also evidence in the literature to suggest learning a second language is greatly enhanced if pupils feel their mother tongue is valued (Morrison and Lui, 2010; Hancock, 2011; Tong and Shi, 2012; D’Warte, 2014). This is an important consideration in the context of this research given that only two of the pupil languages (English and Putonghua) are taught and used formally within the classroom. As Lin (1996) asserts: ‘although it is the mother tongue of only a minority, English is both the language of power and the language of socioeconomic advancement: that is, a dominant symbolic resource in the linguistic market in Hong Kong’ (p.53). Lin (1996) uses the term ‘societal bilingualism’ to describe the sociolinguistic situation: two monolingual communities, the ruling English speaking and the Cantonese majority, separated not only linguistically, but culturally, socially and economically (Lin, 1996; Morrison and Lui, 2010; Poon, 2010; Evans and Morrison, 2018). Within Hong Kong access to professional training programmes in fields such as medicine, architecture and law require proficiency in English, six out of the eight government funded universities in Hong Kong are also English medium instruction (Wang and Kirkpatrick 2012) emphasizing a social separation through linguistic and symbolic resources.

The Hong Kong governments Streaming Policy adopted in 1994 (Chapter 1) further strengthened this social divide. Linguistic Society of Hong Kong (1992) described the streaming policy as elitist and socially divisive. More recently, a study of first year university pupils in Hong Kong, concluded that pupils from English Medium schools have greater opportunities for educational advancement and therefore social mobility (Evans and Morrison, 2018. p.1017). Lee and Leung (2012) suggest that the low status of Cantonese in all aspects of education and curriculum continues to undermine the linguistic and cultural identity of the Hong Kong people.

The Hong Kong government’s most recent policy is one of trilingualism (English, Cantonese and Putonghua) and biliteracy (English and Putonghua). According to the 2016 by-census results, 51.9% of people age 5 years and over are bilingual (English and Cantonese). Since Hong Kong’s return to China, the status and use of Cantonese and Putonghua have inevitably grown, but proficiency in English has remained the key to socioeconomic status and advancement (Evans and Morrison,
It is for this reason that parents today still favour English Medium instruction schools.

Wang and Kirkpatrick (2012) report that many teachers in Hong Kong schools expressed difficulties in using Putonghua as the medium of instruction since the pupils have little exposure to the language, especially at home. In contrast to this, Xiao’s (2006) study of heritage language learners (of Putonghua) found that a home language background in Chinese did not necessarily mean that the learners acquired the reading and writing skills more quickly than non-heritage learners. What is not clear from either study is the specifics of the home language situation. In Hong Kong for example, many Chinese home language background pupils may speak Cantonese (Chinese) at home, and consider this their first language, while at the same time being exposed to reading and writing in English. This can be because of the difficulty in finding texts with Pinyin or because English is faster to learn.

Home language for Hong Kong pupils is further complicated by the presence of domestic helpers that are prevalent in Hong Kong homes. Many children in Hong Kong are raised by live-in, foreign domestic helpers. These domestic helpers are predominantly women from the Philippines and Indonesia. Reden and Wolf (2014) note that the Philippines has one of the highest numbers of English-speakers worldwide and that it is their ability to speak English fluently that is attractive to families looking for domestic help in Hong Kong. The same study found that 82% of helpers, reported speaking to their employers’ children in English. Where domestic helpers are employed as the sole caregiver to children in the home, this can have implications for language learning and exposure. Where this is the case, the child may experience a shift in language dominance. Tang and Yung (2016) found that employing a foreign domestic helper positively impacted on subject test scores in English but not Chinese for school-aged children. The study concluded that domestic helpers were, in supporting the child’s education, providing relative language exposure to English. Tse et al’s (2009) study of grade four pupils in Hong Kong noted that 42% of families have a domestic helper. Children in Hong Kong who live with a domestic helper are therefore likely to have increased exposure to English. Dulay et al (2017) substantiated these findings concluding that foreign domestic helpers in Hong Kong support the development of English language through the provision of an English speaking home environment, the same study also found that Chinese character development and recognition was disadvantaged in such cases.

2.3.1 Translanguaging

Multilingual speakers develop knowledge of how and when to use their languages depending on the social context of the conversation, the conversation content and the people involved (Park, 2013). As noted earlier, (Section 1.3.1) within Hong Kong the preferred term for moving between languages in this way is mixed-code. There are conflicting views within the literature about the relationship between the terms mixed-code (or code-switching outside of Hong Kong) and translanguaging. Both terms involve a bilingual individual using more than one language within a multilingual context (Goodman and Tastanbek, 2021).

Some researchers hold the view that the two terms are not the same since they are based on different understandings of the bilingual brain. They argue that code-switching is the alternation between languages at specific points in the conversation governed by grammatical, as well as interactional rules (Wei, 2018).
Translanguaging, in contrast to this, is the process of meaning making, with a focus on how the individual uses different linguistic, cognitive and semiotic resources (Wei, 2018; Otheguy et al, 2015). Other researchers have argued that translanguaging is a range of different practices, of which one is code-switching (Goodman and Tastanbek, 2021; Sayer, 2013).

Translanguaging is a term that first came into use in the 1980s to identify and validate the pedagogical practice in English-Welsh bilingual classrooms (Park, 2013). Language planning within these bilingual (English Welsh) classrooms combined the two languages in a systematic way as part of the same classroom activities. Translanguaging was therefore used to support the bilingual language learners in making meaning, shaping their participation and deepening their understanding of each language and its use, alongside content knowledge (Park, 2013). This conceptualisation of translanguaging is therefore relevant to this study. Co-teaching with two language teachers enables pupils to move freely between their linguistic repertoires in both English and Putonghua. How teachers plan and prepare for language learning within this context, is a focus of this study. Wei (2011) argues that translanguaging creates a space for bilinguals to bring together ‘different dimensions of their personal history, experience and environment, their attitudes, beliefs and performance’ (p.1223). This understanding of translanguaging, recognises that all experiences are mediated in some way, and is congruent with a sociocultural stance. The pedagogical practices outlined above, in the bilingual English Welsh classroom, were used to support language acquisition of a second community language, alongside further development of the mother tongue. This study looked at the same practices of language learning, but in a classroom context in which, for most pupils, neither language is the pupils’ mother tongue, therefore representing a gap in the literature.

2.4 Bilingualism in Children

Language choice within a formal educational setting as well as choice in informal settings, for example the home, both have implications for pupils’ language development. Growing up in a bilingual environment, does not guarantee that a child will become bilingual, instead they may only retain a passive knowledge of one language, the minority language and become fluent in the majority language (MacLeod et al, 2022). It is reported in a number of studies that up to a quarter of children in potentially bilingual environments do not become bilingual (Pearson, 2007; Pearson, Fernandez, Lewedag and Oller, 1997; De Houwer, 2015).

Bilingual children may have different exposure to each of the languages being learned depending on the languages of the home and of the community. The language backgrounds of the pupils within the bilingual setting of the school therefore need to be considered as part of the participant selection. While this study focuses on pupils learning English and Chinese, the home languages of the parents and therefore each participant’s exposure to each of the target languages is significant.

Romaine (1995) draws on the social dimension of language learning in an attempt to define bilingualism in children. She categorises different types of bilingual child depending on the languages of each of the parents, whether they are the same or different to each other, and to the dominant language of the community. This work is helpful in identifying the importance of language exposure both at home and within
the community, but on the other hand, it masks within it the complexity of this exposure. One parent, one language for example can mean different things in a family home depending on work arrangements and who is the primary care giver. This difficulty in defining bilingualism in children, highlights the complexity of pupil language backgrounds within a bilingual setting and suggests caution is needed when applying definitions to groups of bilingual pupils.

The effects of the language environment on a child’s language development has been widely studied in many different linguistic communities. As Rodriguez et al (2021) argue, bilingualism is a dynamic process to which many economic, social and educational factors may bring specific contributions. These studies highlight this dynamic process as part of each child’s language development. MacLeod et al (2022), for example, identified three factors that influence whether a child will become bilingual: input, language status and the age of acquisition of each of the languages. Pearson (2007) argues for five key factors which overlap with those identified by MacLeod et al (2022). These factors are: input, language status, access to literacy, family language use and community support (which includes schooling).

2.4.1 Language Input

Of the five factors identified by Pearson (2007), it is argued that input is the most significant since without it, no learning can take place. MacLeod et al (2022) argue that input (exposure) is a dynamic factor that can vary across time. It is linked to the roles of the parents and their commitment to using the minority language at home. Lambert and Taylor (1996) support this claim, arguing that input is linked to the socioeconomic status of the parents. Where parents are from a low socioeconomic status, they were found to encourage their children to learn a second language (English) in order to succeed educationally, whereas a parents from a high socioeconomic background encouraged home language maintenance and saw additive bilingualism as the best outcome. Conversely, Oller and Eilers (2002) work, arguing that children with professional parents perform better in their second language than children from working class families, with no difference in attainment between groups in their first language.

Input or language exposure is vital to language development, there is a complex range of factors that influence language development and these are multiple and overlapping. Input for example, has been shown to be influenced by the socioeconomic status of parents, although the nature of this influence is inconclusive and is therefore perhaps better framed as parent attitudes to the target language, which inevitably will be heavily influenced by socioeconomic status as well as many other factors. De Houwer (2004) for example, found that despite input being fundamental to language development, attitudes, values and social circumstances all influenced the amount of input that was available and how much input was needed. This point will be considered in the analysis in Chapter 6.

2.4.2 Language Status

Language status can influence exposure to the target language as well as attitudes towards the language. Pearson (2007) argues that children need a greater amount of input in the minority language due to its status. Conversely, the status of the dominant language provides a background presence through media and the community environment which provides input in the dominant language. This factor is particularly significant within the Hong Kong context since status, in addition to
dominance, could be taken to mean attitudes towards the varying varieties of Chinese and their status as languages or dialects within the community. Hegemonic language ideologies or cultural language valuations arise by virtue of power relations in society in which the language resources of certain social groups become elevated above those of others, conferring potential social advantage.

Groves (2010) highlights the importance of attitude in language attrition, which can affect the identity of a community. She notes that within Hong Kong the status of Cantonese has played an increasing role within society since the handover in 1997 which has included an increase in written Cantonese output. Snow (2008) notes that written Cantonese is becoming a symbol of identity for young people, a trend that I have noticed in particular as part of the recent protests of 2014-2019. Despite this trend, written Cantonese is not accepted or taught and as noted in an earlier discussion, there is concern from some, that formal writing in Cantonese undermines a pupil’s ability to learn and write in Standard Modern Chinese (Bray and Koo, 2004). These attitudes that circulate as part of the school community (parents, teachers, peers) enable and constrain aspects of pupil identities as bilingual or trilingual language learners within the classroom and at home. Pupils that are first language Putonghua speakers have their language and associated identities legitimised within the bilingual classroom that recognises Putonghua as a desirable learning outcome, whereas Cantonese first language speakers are denied access to their language and identities.

In a sociocultural analysis these cultural language valuations are reflected in political structures, such as mandated educational policies (Section 1.1.3) and taken up in institutional policies and practices attributing value differentially to pupils’ language resources and by association and dissociation extend identities of language competence and incompetence to pupils. Pupil agency plays a key role here as pupils negotiate these identities and their participation in each of the language communities.

### 2.4.3 Access to Literacy

Access to literacy was argued by Pearson (2007) to be a separate factor influencing language development of bilingual children. Within Hong Kong, access to literacy could be considered as part of language status which influences acquisition, given its unique and politicised status. As noted earlier (Section 2.3) Hong Kong uses a unique combination of Pinyin and traditional characters when learning Putonghua. This has reduced the availability of literary resources in Chinese for children to access, which has likely impacted on language input as well as reading literacy.

The literacy situation of Hong Kong that is unique as far as learning Putonghua is concerned, is further complicated by the everyday use of Cantonese. For example, all signage in Hong Kong is written bilingually, with Chinese traditional characters and the English pronunciation alongside. The English pronunciation is written in Pinyin, but rather than Pinyin that directly translates the traditional characters, the Cantonese pronunciation is given (Danielewicz-Betz, 2014). There is therefore a mismatch for pupils learning Putonghua with what is written in Chinese and what is given as a pronunciation.
2.4.4 Family Language

Family language use in the minority language is argued to be an important source of language support for children (Rodriguez et al, 2021). This language support can look very different for different children, depending on the language resources of caregivers at home. Pearson (2007) for example, notes that if both parents speak the minority language at home and have limited ability in the dominant community language, they will be more likely to be able to provide the bilingual learner enough input to become bilingual. Where only one parent speaks the minority language or where both parents are bilingual, it is less likely that there will be sufficient exposure to the minority language.

Within Hong Kong, most pupils have some exposure to both Cantonese and English within the community, although the amount of exposure at home can vary significantly depending on the language background of the parents. Exposure to Putonghua, for most children is limited to schooling since it is not a prominent community language and is not the family language for the majority of pupils. Support for language development from home is likely to be closely tied to language attitudes towards each of the target languages as well as the languages spoken at home. For most of the pupils at the research school parent attitudes towards language learning are likely to be positive since they have selected to send their children to a bilingual school in English and Putonghua. This does not however, guarantee a positive attitude toward learning and using Cantonese.

2.4.5 Community Support

Schooling is listed as Pearson’s (2007) final factor (community support) influencing language development for bilingual children. The community is thought to create opportunities for language exposure and helps to motivate children to learn the language. Within the school, community support from school provides opportunities to learn both Putonghua and English, but there are no formal opportunities to learn or use Cantonese. This missed opportunity may, for some children, influence their ability, interest and motivation in learning the other languages of the school programme.

These five factors identified by Pearson (2007) offer a starting point to understand the complexity of competing demands and influences on the children at the school as they navigate their way to becoming bilingual or in some cases trilingual. In addition to these contributing factors, perhaps pupil identity as a learner within their individual context would be a nice addition to unfolding each child’s language learning journey. A further discussion of learner identity can be found in Section 2.6.

2.5 Co-teaching in a Bilingual Context

Co-teaching as a practice has its roots in Special Educational Needs supporting a western philosophy of inclusion for pupils who may have previously been excluded from the classroom setting. Co-teaching is defined as ‘a mode of instruction in which two or more educators or other certified staff members share responsibility for a group of pupils in a single classroom’ (Hanover Research, 2012). This shared responsibility is for all aspects of the learning for example collaborative planning, teaching and assessment. It means that teachers can change lessons to meet their
children’s needs, and therefore improve the quality of instruction that is delivered (Dillon and Gallagher, 2019).

Shared responsibility does not mean equal responsibility at all times, for all activities, instead, effective co-reaching is seen to be flexible and responsive to pupil needs within context. Lehman et al (2018) argue that shared responsibility as co-teachers illustrates the value of learning from each other, as well as the importance of cross-cultural inquiry. They argue that collaboration opens up the possibility of dialogue, where meaning making and interaction can occur in two languages. This type of collaboration can be impeded however, if individual teaching roles are not clear or if the co-teachers do not have experience in collaborative co-teaching approaches (Rao and Yu, 2021).

There are six recognised models of co-teaching, which have been named and identified in the literature (Conderman and Hedin, 2013):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One teach, one observe</td>
<td>One teaches and one observes pupil or teacher for a purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One teach, one drift</td>
<td>One teaches and one assists/supports individual pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel teaching</td>
<td>Material presented simultaneously to half the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station teaching</td>
<td>Both teach one group of pupils at a time, pupils then rotate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative teaching</td>
<td>One teaches a larger group, other teaches group needing specialized attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team teaching</td>
<td>Teachers work together to deliver content to whole class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. 1 Adapted from Conderman and Hedin (2013)

The most prevalent form of co-teaching is one teach, one float (Hanover Research, 2012), which allows individual pupils to be supported within an inclusive environment, while also requiring less planning time prior to the lesson. As Beninghof (2012) notes, whatever form co-teaching takes, it can only be effective with active engagement from both teachers for the duration of the lesson. The application of co-teaching to language learning is more recent. In 1999, Bahamonde and Friend (1999) proposed the possible benefits that could come from applying a co-teaching approach to bilingual language learning. In particular, they discussed the possible merits of its application to bilingual classrooms, arguing that in current practice, teachers can sometimes default to the majority language, sending contradictory messages to pupils about the value of English over their native language. They proposed that co-taught classes would allow teachers to enrich the curriculum related to the pupils’ native culture and that it would increase minority language learners sense of value by ensuring that announcements and other information could sometimes occur in the pupils’ native language. This increased sense of value and participation within the classroom community is essential to each learner’s learning trajectory since it encompasses each individual’s history and participation within these communities (Wenger, 1998). Learning involves the process of transforming knowledge and context to define an identity of participation.
(Wenger, 1998) where pupils are able to reposition themselves as successful language learners.

Within the school in which this research takes place, one teach, one float is the most common model used across all language classrooms in Y1 - Y6. As is discussed as part of the methodology (chapter 3) co-taught case study classroom were selected for study based on the model used. One class selected relied almost entirely on one teach, one float while the other was unusual in that they drew on all models in teaching at different times, in what appeared to be intuitive ways of working together.

There has been a growing number of studies that support co-teaching with the language classroom. The majority of these studies however, are found in contexts where minority language pupils are supported by an additional teacher in the mainstream classroom with the purpose of supporting language development of the dominant host country language (Davila, 2017; Schwartz and Gorbatt, 2017; Relaño Pastor and Poveda, 2020) rather than with the purpose of all pupils becoming bilingual, such is the context of this research.

The literature argues many of the benefits of co-teaching, such as the increased number of pupil-teacher interactions during each lesson due to the reduction in pupil: teacher ratio. Yoon (2008) suggests that teachers are more able to accommodate for cultural differences within classroom activities, and this encourages pupil participation as they 'felt more at home' (p.517). These pupils experienced a sense of belonging and were able to participate in an active manner in the classroom activities. There are a number of reported pedagogical benefits too, for example the fact that there are two teachers in a classroom offers more than one perspective on the learning which could support differentiation as well as improving content knowledge, classroom management strategies and curriculum adaptation techniques (Im and Martin, 2015). Farrand and Deeg (2021) argue that the various co-teaching approaches, allow the educators in each team, to draw on their own skills, knowledge and background in different ways, to meet the student needs. Davila (2017) argues that co-teaching within a bilingual context, gives access to sophisticated linguistic and academic content, while Rao and Yu (2021), in their study of foreign language learners in China, found improvements in language proficiency of students in co-taught rather than single teacher classrooms.

Implementation of co-teaching is not without its challenges. As a teacher transitions to the co-taught classroom they may find it intimidating particularly in the early stages of building a relationship with their co-teaching partner. Beninghof (2012) argues against being too prescriptive about how teachers should engage in co-teaching, stating that there are multiple factors at play within the co-teaching environment that cannot be prescribed in a manual as each situation is different. Davila (2017) substantiate this claim, noting that top-down decision making can inhibit the development of a positive co-teaching relationship. It is widely accepted in the literature that this relationship, between the two teachers is the most significant contributing factor in the success of co-teaching practices (Beninghof, 2012; Malian and McRae, 2010; Davila, 2017). To enhance positive relationships, time must be given to develop these relationships as well as time for planning and co-reflection (Dillon and Gallagher, 2019). Sanders-Smith (2021) notes the inevitability of conflict between co-teaching teams, which she suggests should be accepted or even embraced, since it leads to greater understanding of each teacher and their practice, strengthening the team. She therefore argues that co-teaching roles are interchangeable and require a high degree of trust, where teacher
expertise is constantly negotiated. Co-teaching relationships are therefore complex and dynamic. Within a multilingual setting, differences in understanding with regards to language use and pedagogical approaches to content and language teaching, can pose significant challenges (Davila, 2017).

Teachers, as part of a co-teaching pair, are therefore engaged in identity negotiation, as they claim, assign and reject identities in relation to their co-teacher (Reeves, 2009). This relational nature of identity means that an individual’s identity is co-constructed by others. For teachers new to co-teaching, there are necessary changes to their instructional practice that they have not been trained or prepared for. For example, the teachers at my school, expecting to teach content through the Primary Years Programme framework, find that they are also language teachers. This change necessitates adaptations to pedagogical practice, from practice focused on subject content to one that pays attention to the language learning of pupils. In addition, teachers have to negotiate an identity as a co-teacher with dual responsibility for the pupils within the class. Classroom planning for which teachers previously had autonomy, now becomes a process of negotiation. This negotiation can be further constrained through the linguistic resources of the teachers, where only one of the teaching pair can communicate in both classroom languages. Studies in this area have shown that this negotiation can only be supported by a positive co-teaching relationship, where both teachers feel empowered and supported by their teaching partners (Dillon and Gallagher, 2019; Rytivaara, 2012).

Relaño Pastor and Poveda’s (2020) study of language contexts in which the goal was for migrant children to transition into the dominant language, found a number of hierarchies existed between content and home language teachers as well as support staff and migrant heritage languages. Lehman et al (2018) however, in their study of co-teaching within the context of a museum, found that co-teaching offered a non-hierarchical framework for language teaching. Teachers within this context were trained in co-teaching to specifically help to develop the relationship between teaching pairs and cultivate shared ownership so they were both equally invested as language teachers. Where hierarchies exist, they threaten positive working relationships and therefore the effectiveness of the co-teaching practice.

The language of instruction within the co-taught classroom, which includes when and how each language is used as part of the co-teaching methodology, can enable and constrain pupil identities as language learners. Schwartz and Gorbatt (2017) in their study of second language learners within a Hebrew classroom, argue that ensuring balance between the two classroom languages is the key to pupil integration into the bilingual classroom. Dillon and Gallagher (2019) however, argue against language separation, noting that while one language one person has been shown to work well in some contexts, within the bilingual classroom it can lead to children passively waiting for translations (p.14). Instead of using a one language approach, Dillon and Gallagher (2019) argue the importance of translanguaging. This is defined as ‘the act performed by bilinguals of accessing different linguistic features or various modes of what are described as autonomous languages, in order to maximise communicative potential’ (Garcia, 2009, p.140). Repetition of content in the two classroom languages is therefore not seen as an effective practice for language development. Translanguaging gives pupils access to their language resources and may therefore encourage participation. In addition, Su (2021) found that having two co-teachers with different language backgrounds added the opportunity for culturally relevant teaching that supported intercultural reflection and the dual development of language and culture.
Within the co-taught classroom setting of this research, the majority of the pupils are learning two languages, neither of which are the home languages of all the pupils (Section 3.4 pupil language profiles). This is a unique research context, with these pupils language profiles in mind. As already noted, where co-teaching has been researched outside of the special education classroom and instead used to support language development, the research has been conducted in classrooms with a dominant language group, rather than dual language development for pupils who speak a third language. How the co-teaching is enacted to support these pupils and the language learning intentions is therefore of interest to this study. The value accorded to each pupil’s language diversity could influence their language learning trajectory as well as their identities and will therefore be an interesting understudied aspect of this research.

2.6 Identity

The school language policy (Section 1.5.1), states an intention to develop pupil linguistic and cultural identities in Chinese. This assumed identity is therefore important to this research, in particular because this research takes the view that pupil language and identities are shaped together through their participation in practice. As argued by Lin (1996), the low status of Chinese within the schooling system undermines the linguistic and cultural identity of Hong Kong pupils and their confidence in the value of learning Chinese. As already argued (Section 2.2.1), Culture is not a stable set of beliefs or values that reside inside people. Instead, culture is located in the world, in ideas, practices, institutions and artifacts (Markus and Kitayama, 2010) all of which shape learner experience and therefore identity.

For Wenger (1998), identity is inseparable from practice and is therefore integral to learning. Competence and belonging evolve together as learning is a transformation of identity (Wenger, 2008). How these ‘persons-acting’ behave within their cultural identities can legitimize or marginalize their way of being. How these cultural scripts are ‘taken up’ by each individual is argued to be different. Individuals take on these identities through their participation (Lave, 1988). The mind is agentive and each individual’s experiences and histories are unique. This influences each individual’s ability to resist or to comply with social norms, and crucially what is made available to them as learners.

2.6.1 Identity as Belonging

Pupil participation and non-participation in classroom activities could represent pupil experience of belonging. Teachers too can intentionally or unintentionally position pupils in positive or negative ways through their approach to teaching and how they interact as co-teachers. Wu and Leung (2014) found that Cantonese pupils within the Mandarin heritage language classroom were hindered from participating fully due to an assumed default knowledge of Mandarin. Since signs of belonging can be detected through speech and actions, it will be important to listen carefully to the dialogue of the classroom and observe pupil and teacher participation in activity. Yoon (2008) in a study of English language learners highlights the importance of native speaking pupils in the classroom in engaging or disengaging with non-native speakers. Within the context of this research, how different varieties of Chinese within the classroom valued or recognized will be important in mediating pupil identities and participation.
Participation shapes pupil identities and belonging. Norton Peirce (1995) terms this access ‘investment’. It tries to capture the view that the relationship between the language learner and the social world constantly changes through the process of mutual constitution. For Hong Kong pupils’ this is linked to their historical and political history. Pupils engage in learning as a means of acquiring symbolic or material resources. The role of language is constituted by the learner’s social identity, since our trajectory of identity includes the past as a context in which we determine what becomes significant in learning (Wenger, 1998). An investment in the target language is an investment in the learner’s social identity. It is through language that a learner negotiates their identity and gains or is denied access within a community and to different communities (Norton Peirce, 1995; Norton, 1997; Potowski, 2001).

As noted earlier, peripheral participation, which enables an evolving competency in the shared repertoire and joint endeavour of a community, may become central to an individual’s identity (Wenger, 1998). Our identities and forms of belonging shape our communities, which in turn shape our participation and what is made available to learn (Wenger, 1998). Meaning is not pre-existing, rather it is a constant process of negotiated meaning, which is how we experience the world (Ivinson and Murphy, 2007). Identity shapes and is shaped by forms of action, which involves the dynamic interplay of cultural tools, and the sociocultural and institutional context (Penuel and Wertsch, 1995). Each learner’s trajectory is a transformation of a history of participation (Holland et al, 2008). Language learners’ development is therefore grounded in the learners’ participation in social practice and their continuous adaptation to the multiple identities within the communities that they inhabit (Chan and Clarke, 2014). Learning thus implies not only the specific activities, but also the social community in which a sense of belonging and identity are formed.

Wenger’s (1998) processes of identity formation, illuminates the duality of language and identity. Wenger (1998) makes sense of the process of identity formation through three distinct modes of belonging, which are relevant to this research. The first is ‘imagination’ in which connections of the world through our experience are made, our sense of place within the world stems from this, described by Holland et al (2008) through the notion of the relational self. This picture of the world is constructed in part by individual engagement in language learning as part of the bilingual classroom activities (Trent et al, 2013). Through imagination, pupils are also able to draw on tools within the community, such as resources, role models and stories, to envision new possibilities for themselves in the future (Hooper, 2020). How languages are valued and the role that each language plays within the classroom is therefore likely to be significant to learners multilingual identities.

The second of Wenger’s (1998) modes of belonging relevant to this research is, ‘alignment’ in which we participate in activities in order to fit within communities. Within the co-taught language classroom this could be following rules about when and how it is okay to use each of the classroom languages. It could also be how pupils use their agency to engage in learning, using the two classroom languages. Pupil participation as well as non-participation will therefore be important.

The final mode of belonging is ‘engagement’ where active involvement leads to the negotiation of meaning. This could be as part of the formal activities of the classroom or informally through conversation or creating artifacts that facilitate activity. Pupils are expected to complete their work using both of the classroom languages. In
addition there will be informal opportunities within the classroom setting to engage in each language.

For pupils at my school, identity, as proposed by Wenger (1998), is likely to be very different for each pupil. It is particularly pertinent to our pupils, some of whom, regardless of inheritance and language, do not consider themselves Chinese but Hong Kongese. A pupil’s language identity and the cultural artifacts they embrace will shape how they are positioned by others, and how they position themselves as learners within the community (Dressler, 2010). Institutional practices such as co-teaching shape how these modes of belonging become constitutive of identity thus enabling and constraining their experience of belonging.

**2.6.2 Identity Within the Language Classroom**

Learning transforms who we are and what we do and so is an experience of identity (Wenger, 1998). Holland et al (1998) define identities as unfinished and ‘caught in the tensions between past histories that have settled in them and present discourses and images that attract them’ (p.4). In other words individuals bring with them a sense of self and this sense shifts through further participation in practice. All new experiences are mediated in some way by our past. Collett (2019) in her study of emergent bilinguals within an elementary school context argues that learning and identity are both outcomes of participation. However, she goes on to argue that any research into identities requires an investigation of ‘repertoires, behaviours, structures and routines that define social interaction’ (Collett, 2019). Collett (2019) is not explicitly arguing that all new experiences are mediated by the past, however, implicitly, a study of an individual’s behaviours and the structures and routines of social interaction, would, it could be argued, necessitate an understanding of past experiences. As Cowie et al (2010) assert, all learning involves a change in identity, since a person’s identity is enacted at all times, spaces and relationships, emerging through our interactions.

Holland et al.’s (1998) ‘figured world’ provides a way of understanding how the social and cultural ways of being and knowing shape the school setting, and which practices endure and embrace individuals, such as hegemonic language values. Figured worlds, is broadly defined by Holland et al (1998) as: ‘socially produced, culturally constituted activities’(pp.40-41). People ‘figure’ who they are through activities, and in relation to others, through social relationships that are in constant flux. As Holland et al (1998) note:

‘by means of appropriation, objectification and communication, the world itself is reproduced, forming and reforming in the practices of its participants’ (p.53).

Holland et al.’s (1998) figured world helps us to understand the relationships within the bilingual classroom setting. The hegemonic values associated with language use that circulate, are taken up within the figured world, as pupils and teachers negotiate identities through activities and relationships with one another. Identity is therefore not stable, but constantly changing within the different communities of which we are a part. The language we speak, our clothes and how we act are used as markers of social division and positions of privilege relative to others (Holland et al, 2008).
Holland et al (2008) developed their earlier work, distinguishing between different interrelating aspects of what they call emergent identities. Emergent identities are formed from both positional and figurative identities. Positional identities, are to do with one’s position relative to others, as well as a sense of social place and entitlement, whereas figurative identities have to do with the stories, characters, activities, as well as symbolic resources, that make the world cultural. Together, figurative and positional identities make up what Holland et al (2008) call emergent identities.

The linguistic background of the teacher is part of the symbolic resource that makes up the cultural world of the bilingual pupils. The linguistic identity of the co-teachers mediate pupil identity as bilingual language learners. Some Chinese teachers are from China and only speak Putonghua, while others are from Hong Kong or southern districts of China and speak both Putonghua and Cantonese. Chik (2008) showed that the perception of others was valued when forming their learner identity. As bilingual or trilingual language learners themselves, staff may be perceived as empathetic towards pupils’ language learning within the bilingual classroom and within the context of a devalued mother tongue. These perceptions infiltrate the classroom and affect the learners’ behaviours as they are expected to censor their heritage knowledge and language to meet classroom requirements.

Pupils are extended positional identities associated with the dialect they speak (Cantonese or Putonghua) as well as their perceived language proficiency in the classroom languages (English and Chinese). Andrews (2013) and Flores et al, (2015) both note how emergent bilingual pupils are forced to construct identities that do not acknowledge their linguistic skills in order to excel within the classroom environment that does not acknowledge their linguistic backgrounds. Lee and Anderson (2009) use the term ‘oppositional’ identities, to describe this situation where pupils disassociate from school in order to maintain a sense of self that is not recognised within the classroom. The reverse is also possible, where a pupil forms an ‘oppositional identity’, disassociating from their home language background in what might reflect subtractive bilingualism (Section 2.2.3). As Collett (2019) argues, positional identities are informed by how pupils are granted and denied agency in social interactions. If pupils in the bilingual co-taught classroom can use their agency to determine when they use each of their languages, inclusive of Cantonese, this will inform how they are positioned within the classroom as part of their figured worlds.

Holland et al (2008) describe the way that narrative identities, as part of a language learners figured world, draws on cultural scripts. How pupils take up these narrative identities shapes the way they position themselves and how others position them. How teachers understand the value of pupil languages and how this is communicated as part of their practice, projects the identity of an ‘ideal’ pupil, which dissociates some pupils creating conflicts of belonging (Wenger, 1998). Pupils who experience themselves as not ‘belonging’ to the school community are marginalized and their participation in school activities undermined. Not being afforded legitimate peripheral participation (Lave and Wenger, 1990) can result in disengagement which impacts on the learning opportunities made available to these pupils. Learning is not the accumulation of skills and information it is a process of becoming (Wenger, 1998).

Norton (2000) discusses pupil participation within the mainstream language learning classroom context. She argues that pupils behave differently (engaged or
disengaged), through access to agency, according to the context in which they find themselves. She noted that participants could appear motivated and confident, while at other times could be silent depending on the context of the dominant or subdominant culture. She goes on to argue that learning opportunities may change as a function of pupils positioning at these times. Pupils are positioned differently in relation to one another, the lesson content and the teachers and this affects their ability to exercise agency. Within the bilingual classroom setting, these ideas about the complexity of identity negotiation highlight how bilingual pupil interactions with their co-teachers, and peers as well as how they assert their agency within the learning environment, will shape their identities and participation as language learners.

The importance of pupil agency can also be seen in Koshiba and Kurata (2012) in their study of heritage language learners, which found pupils developed their own distinct language identities rather than taking up pre-existing fixed identities, in what has been termed ‘cultures of hybridity.’ Further studies by Henry and Goddard (2015) and Cavanagh (2017) substantiate this claim, finding that the languages a pupil speaks influence their cultural identity and therefore how they are positioned as language learners. Gyogi (2020) draws on identity narratives over a four year period to conclude that pupil identities are both fluid and fixed, these features of identity co-exist as they accept and reject narratives as language learners. Pierce (1995) notes that the classroom can become a site of struggle. Negotiation of identities are characterized by power differentials that create the learners’ biliterate identities (Hancock, 2012).

Collett (2019), in her research of emergent bilinguals in U.S elementary schools, calls for more research to understand how to create learning environments that are equitable for emergent bilingual learners, advocating for teachers to use instructional methods that draw on pupils’ funds of knowledge (p.239), a view that is aligned with good translanguaging practices. She notes that there has been minimal research that coordinates classroom observation with interview, to capture how pupils are positioned in learning spaces and their perspectives on this.

2.6.3 Teacher Identity Within a Co-taught Classroom

Within the co-taught classroom, it is not just pupil identities which are important. Teacher professional identity and their agency is also negotiated within the setting, making it important to consider teacher perceptions and their enactments within the classroom. As Kayi-Aydar (2015) notes, ‘the teacher is not a neutral player within the classroom’ (p.94). The positional identity of the teacher in relation to both the pupils and the co-teacher will mediate the complex, multi-layered, identities within the setting. Within the co-taught language classroom a teachers beliefs about their role as a teacher can explain how they position themselves, for example, some teachers may position themselves as a language teacher, others as a subject or grade level teacher.

How teachers position themselves will mediate their teaching practice, what is made available to learn and what is given significance or priority. Yoon (2008) found that teachers’ differing approaches to teaching were connected to different levels of participatory behaviours within the classroom. In some classrooms pupils were positioned as powerful and strong while in others they were positioned as powerless
and weak (p.515). As Yoon (2008) claims: ‘whatever the positions teachers take, that positioning guides them in their interactive approaches with pupils in classroom settings’ (p.499) this in turn influences pupil participation.

Kayi-Aydar (2015) researched the positioning of three pre-service English language teachers in a university programme in the United States. As part of the analysis of pre-service teacher journals and interviews conducted as part of the research, Kayi-Aydar (2015) found that pre-service teacher identities were significantly shaped by their relationship with their teacher mentor and the teacher mentor’s teaching philosophy (p.98). Kasworm (2010) found similar findings in her research into adult learners negotiated identities as part of an undergraduate programme. The adults articulated relational identities predominantly based on university staffs tacit and explicit academic acceptance of them (p.143). As noted by Holland et al (1998), adult pupils’ positional identities are influenced by their actions and interactions in relation to the cultural context. Within the co-taught classroom, teacher relationships as well as teaching philosophies and pedagogical practices shape and reshape teacher identities and therefore their practice through the dialectical relation between cultural context and ongoing activity.

The relational identity between the two teachers and the pupils is mediated by the co-taught classroom practices, enabling and constraining teacher agency and professional practice within the classroom. Teacher agency is shaped by social interactions and mediated by the tools and structures of the co-taught setting. The approach to co-teaching taken by each set of co-teachers could position each teacher differently, for example, if one teacher dominates the teaching or if they take on different roles within the class such as disciplinarian. This positional identity could constrain their agency within the classroom, and change the way the pupils interact with each teacher, as these positional identities become part of the figured worlds of the pupils, creating an unintentional hierarchy which further mediates pupil language learning opportunities.

In a bilingual setting, such as the co-taught classroom, a perceived language dominance or language hierarchy could also create an unequal setting where power relations enable and constrain teacher agency in addition to pupil participation. Norton Peirce (2000) in her work with immigrant women in Canada, argues that while at the time most theories assumed motivation was a character trait of the individual learner that determined one’s ability to learn the target language, she instead drew attention to the role of unequal relations of power between language learners and target language speakers (Norton 2013). Mills (2004) suggests that language is a powerful means of inclusion and exclusion (p.177), how the co-taught model is understood and enacted by teachers within each primary classroom mediates pupil experience of inclusion and exclusion. The Hong Kong context of this study makes it unique. How co-teachers view heritage language learners, and how they communicate language valuations within their co-teaching practices, will be an important addition to the literature.

2.7 Research Questions

The research is concerned with the language policy in an international bilingual school, a policy, which seeks to support the bilingual development of all pupils in English and Chinese, but which does not necessarily draw on pupils’ linguistic capital depending on the home language background of each pupil. The changing
political landscape of Hong Kong and the cultural and economic capital associated with linguistic expertise in Mandarin, and the continuing global hegemony of English as a transcultural language shape pupil and teacher experiences. The school language policy is enacted primarily through co-teaching, which is seen as a socially just way of catering for the linguistic diversity of the pupils and as the means to equip them for the global employment market. Yet the initial study established that the school offered little guidance about how co-teaching was understood or practiced to be effective for all pupils.

The research questions for this thesis are structured to take account of Rogoff’s (1997) planes of analysis (see discussion chapter 3.2.2). Already outlined in Chapter 1 and 2 is the socio-political landscape of Hong Kong that provides a backdrop to the school setting. The nature of sociocultural research is that the personal and social are seen as a duality. This backdrop is therefore an important lens through which to understand school policy and practice. The research questions take Rogoff’s (1995) planes of analysis one at a time, foregrounding one plane while acknowledging the others are in the background. The first research question starts by illuminating the community plane and the subsequent research questions narrow down to foreground the interpersonal and finally person planes of analysis.

The refined research questions that emerged from the initial study and which fill gaps in the current literature are:

1. To what extent are the ideals of the school language policy a reality in the co-taught bilingual classroom?
2. How is bilingual co-teaching enacted and understood by teachers?
3. How do bilingual co-teaching practices support pupil identities as language learners?

### 2.8 Conclusion

This chapter has identified the sociocultural framework within which this study is located. Wenger’s social learning model has been discussed and drawn on in the subsequent discussions of bilingualism and learner identities. The use of co-teaching within a language context has been shared and finally the research questions for this thesis identified.
Chapter 3 Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to discuss the research methodology in this study. The study draws on both quantitative and qualitative methods to explore pupils’ and teachers’ experiences within a bilingual school context. This chapter discusses the methods of the research, justifying the case study approach taken. It outlines how participants were selected as well as the timeline for each of the research methods employed. Data collection as well as the framework for the data analysis are discussed, both of which are linked to the choices of methods employed. In the last part of the chapter, issues of validity are discussed, which includes issues of translation.

3.2 Paradigm Rationale

Each research methodology brings with it a particular set of assumptions. As Harrits (2011) states: ‘methodological differences are founded within paradigms constituted by ontological and epistemological assumptions’ (p.2). It is therefore important to adopt a research methodology that is congruent with the researcher’s ontological and epistemological beliefs about the world. In the following section, I argue why interpretivism, which seeks to understand social phenomena within a social context, fits with my sociocultural understanding of the world.

3.2.1 Positivism and Interpretivism

Paradigms of research methodologies are discussed in the literature, the two most prevalent being positivism and interpretivism. Positivist researchers believe in observing an objective reality, they believe that there are facts that can be proven, reality is the same for each person (Ryan, 2018). One of the key characteristics of positivism is deductive reasoning which generates hypotheses that can be tested for provable results. For this reason positivists tend to look for causal relationships in the data that links events and observations to general laws. The data gathered can therefore be used to make generalisations, since the observable reality can be applied to other contexts (Alharahshah et al, 2019).

The methods used by a positivist researcher are typically deductive and highly structured. While a range of methods can be used, the analysis tends to be quantitative, focusing on objectivity (Ryan, 2018). Positivist methodological approaches assume that the mind is a container that is filled with reflections from the external world (Kieran et al, 2001). This view of mind therefore allows research designs in which the individual is studied in isolation from the context of study. The positivist paradigm therefore fails to capture the complexities of human interactions. In arguing against these assumptions Bickhard (1992) notes:

‘How can we possibly know that our representations of the world are correct? The only possible answer seems to involve checking those representations against the world to see if they in fact match, but, by assumption, the only epistemic contact we have is with the world via those representations themselves - any such check, therefore, is circular…’ (Bickhard, 1992, p.63)
From my sociocultural perspective, the existence of an objective reality is rejected as it is understood that representations of the world are subjective reflections that are mediated by the cultural and historical experiences of the individual (Roth and Radford, 2011). Knowledge construction is therefore embedded culturally and historically, and meaning is negotiated by the agentive mind. Subjective experiences are therefore not repeated, which means as a sociocultural researcher, I would not expect to make generalisations as this ignores the complexity of social interactions. Sociocultural approaches require a methodology that recognizes that participants and activity are mutually constitutive and in constant flux. As Rogoff (1997) argues: ‘people change through transforming their participation in sociocultural activities in which both the individual and the rest of the world are active’ p.266. Isolating the individual from his or her cultural context leaves ‘the nature of the learner, of the world, and of their relations unexplored’ (Lave and Wenger, 1991, p.47). The individual and the social are not separately analysable, they are a duality. A positivist approach was therefore not deemed appropriate for this study.

On the other hand, interpretative researchers seek to uncover the complexities of human interactions. They are concerned with in-depth variables and factors related to context (Alharahshah et al, 2019). Interpretivists aim to uncover what people really think and are therefore concerned with their different social realities that arise from their individual experiences. Rich insights lead to a shared understanding from the research participant’s perspective. The methods used tend to be inductive, with small samples and qualitative data from a range of sources. Data do not just come from external observation as in the positivist paradigm, but instead from aspects that cannot be directly seen, such as values and beliefs (Cohen et al, 2008). In this paradigm the researcher is therefore not separate from what he or she is researching and so objectivity is not seen as achievable (Eisner, 1993).

As this study is concerned with understanding teacher and pupil experiences of co-teaching and language learning within a bilingual setting, the interpretive paradigm is more suited to the nature of this research. However, interpretivism has been criticised for being too impressionistic (Hussain et al, 2013) and lacking in objectivity (Grix, 2004). As sociocultural research, validity of findings is achieved through transparency in the research procedure. Reflexivity requires openness about the researcher’s assumptions, activities and how the participants change, since they are in constant flux. Reality is messy and challenging to understand. Interpretivism is further criticised for being unreliable, invalid and for lacking in transferability. However, my intention is not to transfer my findings to other contexts since I believe all subjective experiences are unique. As argued by Richards (2003), while the positivist paradigm has its uses, it is not designed to ‘explore the complexities and conundrums of the immensely complicated social world that we inhabit’ (p.6). For this reason, the interpretivist paradigm is useful to this research since it allows for flexibility in research methods drawing on both quantitative and qualitative data to create rich data and in-depth descriptions of practice and experiences.

3.2.2 Sociocultural Approaches and Methodologies

The nature of this research and its sociocultural approach has methodological implications. Viewing the personal and the social as a duality, requires an understanding of one to understand the other. Arguing from a sociocultural approach, Rogoff (1995) suggests three planes of analysis: institutional, interpersonal and personal, which are derived from her view of cognition as distributed. Rogoff argues, that these planes of analysis are inseparable and
mutually constituting. Usefully Rogoff explains how planes can be foregrounded one plane at a time, while acknowledging the other planes in the background, since all planes are interdependent. The planes offer lenses that bring in to focus different processes and allow an appreciation of the complex activities that are taking place. Rogoff (1995) uses the description of two girl scouts selling cookies to demonstrate how the three planes cannot stand alone in the analysis of activity. In doing this, Rogoff looks at community, for example traditions and structures such as the cookie order form. She notes the collective endeavours of the participants ‘constitute and transform cultural practices’ (p.8) recognizing the mutual constitution between planes. Rogoff’s (1995) three planes offer a useful framework from which to analyse pupil and teacher experiences of co-teaching within the bilingual setting since they allow for a multi-layered understanding of policy, practice and experience.

Rogoff’s (1995) community plane illuminates institutional structures such as school language and co-teaching policies that shape what teachers and pupils understand about what it is possible to say, do, and be. School structures, policies and practices and the relationships between the school and its members are not directly negotiable by individuals (Ivinson and Murphy, 2007). They represent enduring practices and structures that shape the classroom setting. The interpersonal plane foregrounds events that take place in the classroom and the personal plane the process of appropriation as a result of participation (Ivinson and Murphy, 2007). It is within both the interpersonal and personal planes that emergent subjective experiences are foregrounded. These shared experiences are what is appropriated by individuals as they negotiate meanings, this can be both tacit and explicit knowing. Penuel and Wertsch (1995) note: ‘a moment in action, may in fundamental ways change from activity to activity, depending on the way, in each activity, the purpose, form, cultural tools and contexts are coordinated’ (p.84). This captures the inherent difficulty of trying to separate people from the environment in which activity is taking place and is why a multi-level analysis of the kind offered by Rogoff is appropriate for this case study.

3.3 Research Design

Interpretive methodologies require social phenomena to be understood ‘through the eyes of the participants rather than the researcher’ (Cohen et al, 2008). The aim is to understand both the activity and the context in which it takes place. For this reason, interpretivists draw on qualitative data over extended periods of time, usually as case studies or as part of an ethnographic study (Rehman and Alharthi, 2016). This research draws on case study.

3.3.1 Case Study

This research design looks at the school as a case study. Case study design has the benefits of flexibility in terms of the types of research questions that can be researched and the data collection methods that can be used (Pearson et al, 2015). It is common for case studies to use multiple methods to allow for in-depth analysis of situation in its natural setting (Pearson et al, 2015).

Yin (2003) and Stake (1995) describe differences in case study types based on the purpose or outcome of their use. Yin (2003) categorizes case studies as explanatory, descriptive or exploratory. An explanatory case study seeks to interpret why a particular theory or phenomena exists. It is used to test theories and
explore cause and effect relationships. It is particularly useful in multiple case study design where patterns can be looked for across cases. Descriptive case studies are used to describe a particular phenomenon within its context. It can be used to expand on a particular theme or theory. Finally, an exploratory case study is used to define questions and hypotheses or to test a research procedure.

Since this study sought to understand pupil and teacher experiences of co-teaching within a bilingual classroom, this research aligned most closely with a descriptive case study research design. It is descriptive since I did not expect to find one single answer as each teacher and pupil has a different perspective. Here my use of a descriptive case study differs from that of Yin (2003) since he based his approach in the constructivist paradigm. Case studies offer constructivists a way of generating data from multiple methods and sources that allows them to understand and make sense of the objective reality that is the focus of the study. This research takes the view that all our experiences are mediated in some way by our own experiences and histories of participation that we bring to the research setting. Bearing this in mind, a descriptive case study is used to capture the views of the participants within the school. In this study, the case is the international school which is one of three bilingual, private Independent Schools in Hong Kong.

Case study has been criticized for being too specific to the circumstances of the individual practice being researched, making generalisations difficult (Harland, 2014). The in-depth and qualitative nature of case study data collection means that the scale of the research can also be an issue. Choices have to be made about the settings that can be examined and the number of participants who can be focused on. As already argued, socioculturally, generalisations would not be expected or desirable since all subjective experiences are unique and any attempt to generalise would ignore the complexity of individual experiences. For this same reason, the scale of this research does not pose any problems, since each case is individual. From my sociocultural perspective, the specificity that case study offers is an advantage as it allows an in-depth study of the institutional practice that uncovers the complexity of pupil experiences within the setting thus allowing for the study of individual and the environment as a duality. The assumption is that the richness of the case study will allow others to see similarities and differences that prompt further enquiry.

### 3.3.2 Multiple methods

Sociocultural methodology can be seen as rejecting the quantitative/qualitative dualism. Ercikan and Roth (2016) argue that the qualitative and quantitative classification of research is based on the nature of the data produced. They describe data as the representations of phenomena in nature, society, education, and culture and go on to argue that phenomena of all types exhibit both quantitative and qualitative characteristics. Freeman et al (2007), also argued this point when they noted that ‘there are no ‘pure’, ‘raw’ data, uncontaminated by human thought and action, and the significance of data depends on how the material fits into the corroborating data.’ (p.27). Qualitative subjective judgments come in at various stages in the research process when identifying data sources, in interpreting these and creating data be it quantitative or qualitative. It is important to make these judgments explicit and justified. Socioculturally, the use of multiple methods provides multiple lenses addressing different interrelated levels of context through which understanding can emerge. The lens through which the analysis is done, determines what is seen, for this reason it would not be a problem to have different
conflicting sources of data since they offer different perspectives. Miles (2015) notes that multiple methods of data collection allows for the triangulation of the data, adding to the trustworthiness of the data collected.

Another methodology that I draw upon is ethnography methods. Where a case study places emphasis on an in-depth understanding of a particular case, ethnographic practices start from a less-bounded starting point (Perkins, 2013). Ethnography emphasizes ‘thick descriptions’ aimed at understanding the lived experiences of the participants within the setting. These ‘thick descriptions’ have value within a case study, whilst acknowledging the time constraints placed on this research. Educational ethnography aims to develop the story as it is experienced by the participants (Bligh, 2014). It draws on a variety of methods that give access to participant voices and experiences. Pupil artifacts from lessons will be an important source of data that will help capture pupils’ classroom experiences.

3.4 Participants

The design focused on two co-teaching partnerships and their understanding and enactments of co-teaching. It also focused on pupils as cases within these classroom settings to understand their experiences as language learners in the bilingual setting.

It was part of the design intention to select classes and pupil cases with age, gender and language background in mind. Selecting co-taught classes in different year levels not only represents pupils of differing ages, it also represents pupils with more or less time spent within the school’s bilingual programme. As a sociocultural researcher, I see age, gender and linguistic background as aspects of learner identities, these identities are then shaped by the social and cultural contexts of language learning (Section 2.4). Each pupil experience within the co-taught classroom is mediated by their identities and so selecting cases with these characteristics in mind helped to uncover the complexity of pupil experience.

Initial classroom observations of different year levels across the primary school (Years 1 to 5) were used to identify participants for the case study. A parent information sheet (Appendix 1) was sent to all parents in Y1-Y5 prior to the start of these initial observations. These observations were unstructured in nature. Co-teaching pairs were selected as the focus for observation and interview. These teachers and their classes were selected pragmatically from those teachers willing to be involved in the research and those that would offer interesting insights into how co-teaching is understood and enacted. Through these initial observations, two classes were selected that represented two different enactments of co-teaching. These were a co-teaching pair in Year 3 (Y3) with a male English speaking teacher and a female Chinese bilingual teacher and a Year 5 (Y5) co-teaching pair where both teachers were female.

These co-teaching pairs were selected for the insights that they might offer from the different approaches they took to co-teaching. One co-teaching pair, (Y3) mainly utilised the ‘One teach, one float’ method (Section 2.5). This method was highly utilised by teachers across the primary school throughout the initial observations and was consistent with observations of co-teaching found in the literature (Hanover Research, 2012). One pair of co-teachers was therefore selected due to the
prominent use of this method as it represented the model that was used most often across classrooms within the school. The other co-teaching pair utilised all models regularly, switching between modes of co-teaching within the same lesson. This represented a very different approach to what was seen in most classrooms and offered a different enactment from which to answer my research question.

Data from the unstructured observations were used to inform participant selection based on emerging themes of language and identity. Three pupils were selected from each class. Socioculturally, every pupil is different and so pupils were selected based on gender (3 male and 3 female participants) and linguistic background to ensure the research captured the variety of linguistic backgrounds that were represented in the classrooms.

To support these unstructured observations, pupil demographic data were collated from admissions data submitted by parents on entry to the school. Data each academic year are collated by the admissions team in this way and added to year group profile data. These data are further collated by teachers throughout the year, along with academic achievement data, that follows the pupil from Primary Y1 to Secondary Y13. These data were sorted in Excel to show: age, date of birth, gender and home language of Y3 and Y5 pupils. Pupil data for those whom parent permission had not been obtained were removed and the other data were collated with participant numbers to anonymise and support participant selection. Participant information of the selected pupils is given in Table 3.1. A flow chart showing the process by which participants were recruited is given in Figure 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil pseudonym</th>
<th>Year level</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Language(s) spoken at home</th>
<th>Other languages spoken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winston</td>
<td>Y5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>Learning English and Putonghua at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffery</td>
<td>Y5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Putonghua &amp; English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Y5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9 years 9 months</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Learning Putonghua at school, Cantonese and Malaysian at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cantonese &amp; English</td>
<td>Learning Putonghua at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7 years 5 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
<td>English at school and when talking to friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6 years 5 months</td>
<td>Cantonese &amp; English</td>
<td>Learning Putonghua at school and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A flow chart showing the process of participant recruitment is given below.

![Flow chart](image)

**Figure 3.1 Flow chart showing process of participant recruitment**

### 3.5 Data Collection

Data were collected in several different ways. School-wide unstructured classroom observations took place throughout the entire project. Structured classroom observations were conducted over a five-month period. A questionnaire was sent to pupils, and semi-structured interviews were conducted with pupils and teachers. An overview of data collection with a timeline is given in Figure 3.2.
3.5.1 Observational Data

Field notes were the main observational data collection method within the setting, supplemented by video capture of the enactment and interactions between participants in the co-teaching practices. Initially, unstructured observations took place. These were observations carried out in line with my school role and did not target a specific year level or observe with any intention other than to be in the classroom and interacting with teachers and pupils. It was these observations over a 16-month period that helped me to determine which co-taught classes the study would focus on. These unstructured observations took place throughout the research across all year levels and have been recorded in the research journal.

In addition to these observations, structured observations were conducted. These took place purposefully on alternate weeks for a five month period. During these structured observations, field notes focused on the interactions between the pupils and teachers to see which language was chosen during each interaction and how this impacted on pupil engagement. Field notes were used to record conversations with pupils and teachers during the activities about their language choices both in their interactions and, in the case of the pupils, the work that they produced.

Classroom observations of the two classes took place alternate weeks (excluding school holidays) so that each class was observed eight times. As part of the research journal, I recorded my thoughts about the research within the context of institutional practices. Each journal entry was dated, acting as an aide memoire. For each class, one day of the week was selected to carry out the eight observations. The day was selected to be a day when the pupils were involved in Unit of Inquiry and Mathematics lessons, since these involved the usual classroom teachers. Other specialist lessons such as Drama, Art and PE were taken by specialists and were not co-taught. The schedule of observation with each class can be seen in Appendix 18.
Conversations with pupils about their learning would usually happen when I was observing classes and so this approach was natural to the pupils who were very used to members of the leadership team interacting with them in this way. I was often invited into the classroom by either the pupils or their teachers to participate in their investigations and answer pupil questions on a range of topics. In this role, there is a much clearer sense of horizontal expertise (Engestrom, Engestrom & Karkkainen, 1995) Engestrom et al (1995) conceptualise horizontal expertise as expertise that generates understanding through boundary crossing. In other words, the process of knowledge production that occurs between people in different positions, teachers and pupils for example. Boundary crossing represents a shift from a vertical notion of expertise in which knowledge is viewed as hierarchical, to one in which all participants bring and contribute skills and competence in different situations (Walker & Nocon, 2007). The pupils were used to my presence in the classroom and to me asking them questions, positioning them as knowledgeable. This meant that my presence in the classroom had minimal impact on the teacher’s practice and the pupils’ interactions.

Different pupils have different language resources and while some pupils were able to enact the school language policy, speaking and writing in both English and Chinese through the choices they make within the classroom, others were positioned differently. Through engaging with the pupils, I asked them about the choices that they made, seeking to understand their perceptions of themselves as language learners within the bilingual classroom setting. Responses were recorded using notes in my research journal.

In addition to the observational notes that were taken, video recording equipment was used to record the classroom observations to allow for further analysis of pupil and teacher interactions and language choice. Within the school there was already a culture of using video recordings in classrooms for lesson observations and feedback. Both teachers and pupils were therefore familiar with being videoed during lessons as an ongoing institutional practice.

Thirty-minute segments of each lesson were recorded. In each case, the start of the lesson was selected, where whole class teaching was used to introduce lesson content and activities and to review past learning. The whole class nature of these interactions meant video audio quality was likely to be significantly better than once class activities had started.

There are three lessons for Y3 where there is no video available. On one occasion the video failed to record and on two other occasions all video recording equipment was being utilised in other areas of the school. Information on dates and classes where video recordings are available can be seen in Appendix 19.

As part of the classroom observations, photos were taken of pupils’ work that recorded language choice. Photos of classroom displays were taken at the end of the research period as they represented the children’s work as part of an exhibition, known as a ‘learning journey’ in which parents are regularly invited into the classroom to see the work that the children had produced. Lesson resources used during activities were collected for further analysis to understand the teachers’ learning intentions through the use of language and how these resources may support pupil understanding and language development.
3.5.2 Translations

There is a responsibility as a researcher to ensure that interactions are understood and recorded in a way that reflects participant understanding of the interaction. Had this research taken a different epistemological position, then the objectivity of the research and the elimination of bias would have been a key concern. These concerns could have been eliminated by ensuring agreement of a ‘correct’ translation, either by an unbiased researcher or translator. In sociocultural research, however, language has meaning only in the context of activity and words. Rather than carrying meaning, they gain meaning when they are used in particular ways with particular intentions (Wertsch, 1993). As Simon (1996) asserts:

‘The solutions to many of the translator’s dilemmas are not found in dictionaries, but rather in an understanding of the way language is tied to local realities, to literary forms and to changing identities. Translators must constantly make decisions about the cultural meanings which language carries’ (pp.137-138).

Socioculturally, there is no neutral position from which to translate since all experiences are mediated in some way. As argued in chapter two, a view of the mind where language mirrors reality was not adopted. As such, enlisting the help of a translator after the interaction had taken place was not undertaken, since I wanted to understand the intentions of participants within the interaction. Instead, I checked for understanding during participation in interactions and afterwards by checking for shared meaning. During participation, I would simply ask the students if my understanding was correct, or ask them to tell me what they had written (translation) where I was unfamiliar with vocabulary. Where I was observing interactions that I did not fully understand, I sought clarification by noting down the interaction at the time in my research journal and where it was possible to check meaning during participation, I did so by asking pupils or the teacher if my understanding was correct. Where it was not possible to check understanding during participation, I wrote the interaction down in Pinyin and asked participants at the end of the lesson or activity to clarify and check my understanding, with the participants in each case. Where the interaction had been video recorded, this offered another opportunity to check my understanding and translations. In these instances, the bilingual co-teachers in each classroom were willing and helpful in checking translations. This acknowledges the inherent constraints of working in a multilingual setting, and only being fluent in one of the languages of that setting.

3.5.3 Co-teaching Model Analysis

As noted in Chapter 2 there are six recognized co-teaching models. These models will be used as a way of analysing the co-teaching enactment in each of the classrooms during observation. Since these recognised models were developed in Special Education, there was no need to specify which of the co-teaching roles the two teachers took on. For example, One Teach, One Float within the context of a bilingual classroom needs to be further understood. Subdividing the model into two different models that specify which of the teachers (and therefore instructional languages) is leading and which is floating or supporting is a helpful additional lens through which to look at co-teaching enactment. This is true of One Teach, One Observe as well as Alternate Teaching, since the two teachers take on different roles within these models. With this in mind, within the context of the bilingual, co-taught classroom, this research recognises nine co-teaching models, as listed
below. Please note the nuances between alternate teaching and parallel teaching as applicable to the bilingual classroom.

1. One Teach (Chinese), One Float (English) – instruction led by Chinese co-teacher with English co-teacher supporting

2. One Teach (English), One Float (Chinese) – instruction led by English co-teacher with Chinese co-teacher supporting

3. One Teach (Chinese), One Observe (English) – instruction led Chinese co-teacher while English co-teacher observes the children

4. One Teach (English), One Observe (Chinese) – instruction led English co-teacher while Chinese co-teacher observes the children

5. Alternate Teaching (Chinese) – the Chinese teacher takes a small number of children to work on a specific skill or task in a smaller, more intimate group while the rest of the class receive instruction (English) as a larger group. Both the content and language of instruction in each group are different.

6. Alternate Teaching (English) – the English teacher takes a small number of children to work on a specific skill or task in a smaller, more intimate group while the rest of the class receive instruction (Chinese) as a larger group. Both the content and language of instruction in each group are different.

7. Parallel teaching – both teachers teaching the same content at the same time to two smaller groups of children, but using different languages to do so.

8. Station teaching – two teachers teach using different languages at specified stations and children rotate between stations to receive instruction

9. Team Teaching – two teachers teach together at the same time to the whole class, taking it in turns to give instruction

During classroom observations, these models will be used to recognise co-teaching enactment to try to understand teacher decisions about their practice that support pupil language development within the classroom.

3.5.4 Questionnaire

A questionnaire was sent to all pupils in years 3, 5 and 7, towards the end the classroom observation period and prior to pupil interviews taking place. The purpose of the questionnaire was to understand pupils’ awareness of the school language policy. Given the age of the pupils, rather than specifically ask about their understanding of school language policy, the questions instead sought to understand pupil experiences of when they were allowed to use each of their languages and their perception of how each language was valued within the school. The questions used a Likert scale to understand these perceptions. The questionnaire answers were followed up on as part of the interview with the case pupils to try to further understand and clarify responses given. For the purpose of this study, only data collected from Y3 and Y5 are discussed. Data from Y3 and Y5 were used as these were the two year groups involved in the interviews and classroom observations. The questionnaire (Appendix 2) combined both quantitative and qualitative data. The language diversity of the pupils was captured in this questionnaire.
A letter was sent to all parents (Appendix 3) and these were returned via the classroom teacher. The questionnaire was then sent out electronically by email directly to pupils for whom parental consent had been granted. Pupils were told at the time the questionnaires were sent out, by the classroom teacher, that if they needed help completing the questionnaire that they could complete it at school. All pupils completed the questionnaire without help from the class teacher. I cannot be certain if pupils received help completing it at home with a parent or helper. This is because the questionnaire was sent to all pupils in both English and Chinese, yet 100% of returned questionnaires were returned in English, not the home language of the majority of pupils. It is possible that the return rate in English could be an indication that pupils received help completing the questionnaire by their domestic helper, many of whom can read English but not Chinese. In Y3 in particular there were also a lot of blank responses and questions that the pupils reported that they did not understand (table below), this is a possible indication that these pupils answered it themselves. A total of 198 questionnaires were sent out to Y3 pupils and 192 Y5 pupils, following parent permission. A return rate of 95.4% (189 responses) in Y3 and 98.4% (189 responses) in Y5 was recorded.

In Y3, 35 responses left one or more open questions blank, representing 18.5% of pupils. In addition, of those were answers were submitted, a further 33 indicated explicitly or implicitly through what they wrote (not relevant to the question asked) that they had not understood the question. Table 3.5 summarises these responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left blank</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m not sure</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t understand</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like every teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s not fair to the teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Y5 only 2 of the 189 responses (1%) were left blank and there were no responses that explicitly or implicitly indicated that the question had not been understood.

Table 3.6 shows a summary of participant information for pupils in Y3 and Table 3.7 shows the summary of participants in Y5. A full list of participants in the questionnaire along with their declared home languages at admission to the school can be found in Appendix 4 (Y3 participants) and Appendix 5 (Y5 participants).
Table 3. 3 Summary of participant information and declared home language(s) of Y3 questionnaire participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. participants</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Declared home language(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6 years 11 months – 7 years 5 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6 years 3 months – 7 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese/English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
<td>Cantonese/Hokkien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 years 5 months</td>
<td>Cantonese/Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6 years 4 months – 7 years 5 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 years 4 months – 7 years 0 months</td>
<td>English/Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6 years 4 months – 7 years 5 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 years 11 months – 7 years 1 month</td>
<td>Putonghua/English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
<td>Putonghua/Japanese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals

189  91  98  Youngest: 6 years 3 months  
Eldest: 7 years 5 months

Table 3. 4 Summary of participant information and declared home language(s) of Y5 questionnaire participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. participants</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Declared home language(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9 years 2 months – 10 years 7 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 years 3 months</td>
<td>Cantonese &amp; Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9 years 2 months – 10 years 6 months</td>
<td>Chinese (specifics not stated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9 years 2 months – 10 years 2 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9 years 6 months</td>
<td>English &amp; Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 years 6 months</td>
<td>English &amp; German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9 years 6 months – 9 years 8 months</td>
<td>English &amp; Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 years 5 months – 10 years 2 months</td>
<td>English &amp; Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 years 3 months</td>
<td>English &amp; Thai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Korean &amp; Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 years 3 months</td>
<td>Not declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 years 2 months – 10 years 4 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Putonghua &amp; Japanese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

- **189**
- **108**
- **81**

**Youngest: 9 years 2 months**

**Eldest: 10 years 7 months**

### 3.5.5 Interview Data

A letter was sent to parents of pupils that were interviewed (Appendix 6) requesting pupil and parent permission for involvement. Interviews with pupils provided insights into both the interpersonal and intrapersonal planes (Rogoff, 1997). Having observed the pupils over an extended period, interviews were used to understand their perceptions and actions within the classroom setting, and how they felt about the value placed on different languages within the school. Data from the questionnaires were used to develop the semi-structured interview schedule of focus questions. This was particularly important given the age of the pupils and the complexity of the questionnaire. Examples of questions included for pupils were: Do you think it is important to learn languages? What does language learning look like at school (when can you use each of your languages)? A full list of questions used in pupil interviews can be found in Appendix 8.
Interviews were conducted in English and audio recorded and transcribed. An example transcription for a Y3 pupil can be found in Appendix 9 and for a Y5 pupil Appendix 10. The interview schedule is given Appendix 20. Participating pupils were offered interview times over a two-week period during the second half of the school lunch hour or after school. An example of a full English teacher transcribed interview can be found in Appendix 11 and a full transcript of a Chinese teacher transcribed interview in Appendix 12.

The interviews with co-teachers were semi-structured to ensure that the key ideas were covered. Caudle (2013) argues that a semi-structured interview gives space for the researcher to cover these key ideas, while taking account of the many different realities and perceptions of the interviewees involved. Interviews with the co-teachers took place individually for this reason. I wanted each co-teacher to have the space to share their own experiences of working as a co-teacher. Examples of questions included for teachers were: What does being a co-teacher mean to you in practice? How has the school language policy influenced your approach to co-teaching? A full list of semi-structured interview questions for teachers can be found in Appendix 7.

The interview schedule for the teachers is given in Appendix 20. All interviews were conducted in English and audio recorded and transcribed with the participants’ permission. Total word count and size of interview datasets can be found in Appendix 21.

3.6 Ethical Issues

Ethical approval for the study was granted by the university’s Human Ethics Review Committee (Appendix 15). The principal of the school provided informed consent to participate. Parents and pupils also gave informed consent (BERA, 2011). All parents received an information sheet via email informing them about the research (Appendix 1). All participants were informed of their right to withdraw without negative consequences up until the point of data analysis. Paper copies of collected data were kept in a locked cabinet and all digital material was stored on a password protected computer. Assurance was given to all participants that data collected would only be used in this research.

3.6.1 Trustworthiness

While research informed by a positivist paradigm is generally concerned with validity and reliability, qualitative methodologists have increasingly preferred a different conceptualisation that offers a break from the positivist insistence on neutrality. From a sociocultural perspective, neutrality is unachievable since all experiences are mediated in some way. Lather, (1986) discusses the issue of validity, in which she states:

‘The attempt to produce value-neutral social science is increasingly being abandoned as at best unrealizable, and at worst self-deceptive’ (p.63).

McLeod (2011) has suggested that ‘the question of qualitative validity always comes back to a matter of whether the researcher is plausible and trustworthy’ (p.279). As such, Shenton’s (2004) influential framework, which proposes addressing four
criteria to assess trustworthiness, has been adopted and is discussed below (Section 3.6.2.1 through 3.6.2.4).

**3.6.1.1 Credibility**
Research is credible if a true picture of the phenomenon being investigated is presented. Several considerations were taken into account to address the study’s credibility.

The ‘development of an early familiarity with the culture of participating organisations before the first data collection’ (Shenton, 2004, p.65) is one aspect of the researcher’s credibility, and this was ensured by my own longstanding involvement and sustained presence in the school. It is also important that the researcher conducting the study is credible by virtue of their background, qualifications and experience. My qualifications and experience as a teacher addressed this requirement.

Triangulation of data was an essential component of the research design. Triangulation is offered by many researchers as a check for validity. Within the positivist paradigm the use of several methods to explore an issue, greatly increases the chances of accuracy (Hammersley et al, 2003). As Lather (1986) notes however, there is no criteria for including or excluding data and there is also the possibility of conflicting data that will be in need of interpretation. Socioculturally, the aim of research is to understand multiple perspectives. This ensures that ‘a rich picture of the attitudes, needs or behaviour of those under scrutiny may be constructed based on the contributions of a range of people’ (Yardley, 2008, p. 66). This means that conflicting data are not a problem for a sociocultural researcher, since all data offer a different perspective and a different lens through which to understand the research.

Finally, tactics were employed to encourage honest responses from participants. The case teachers chosen were those considered more likely to be candid, and all were told that they could withdraw from the study at any point without negative consequences. Repeated assurances of confidentiality, were also employed.

**3.6.1.2 Transferability**
Transferability can be demonstrated by the research design’s transparency. The inclusion of sufficient detail of the context in which the research is carried out (Chapter 1) is essential in enabling the reader to judge whether findings apply to other settings.

There should also be a strong coherence between the methods being used and the underlying philosophical assumptions of the study. The research procedure has to offer transparency in its ideology, choice of methods and findings (BERA, 2011). Thematic analysis is orthogonal to both the data and the philosophical orientation of the researcher, but the theoretical orientation and other methodological components must be clear and appropriate (Clarke & Braun, 2018).

**3.6.1.3 Dependability**
While dependability does not equate to replicability, the methods used should be presented in sufficient detail so that the research can be repeated. Shenton (2004) has suggested a report should include sections on the research design and its
implementation, the operational detail of data gathering, and a reflective appraisal of the project. This information is covered in the data collection and analysis sections.

3.6.1.4 Confirmability

Confirmability can be demonstrated when researchers show clearly how findings are derived from the data. The researcher cannot adopt a neutral and objective stance, nor would this be desirable. Indeed, subjectivity in qualitative studies has been described as a ‘resource,’ and not a ‘problem to be managed’ (Clarke & Braun, 2018, p.107). Instead, it is important to set out the researcher’s theoretical perspectives which guide data selection and interpretation. The adoption of a reflexive stance and a full awareness and acknowledgement of the researcher’s positionality in the research are an essential part of addressing confirmability.

Respondent validation was part of the project’s design. Participants were asked to what extent they found the study’s conclusions a true reflection of their experience. Participants were also involved in checking translations as I engaged with pupils and co-teachers to check understanding. This offered what Lather (1986) calls face validity, an opportunity for tentative results to be redefined in light of the participants’ reactions.

3.6.2 Insider Researcher

Several tensions existed as the research was conducted, for example, having two roles within the institution, one as a member of the senior leadership team responsible for implementing institutional practice, and the other as a researcher. These roles positioned me within the same settings in multiple roles. Power relations played a role: for example, as a member of the leadership team, I was responsible in part for teacher appraisal. Holland et al (2008) emphasize the importance of power relations and their role within the figured world of the participants. The unstructured observations that I carried out initially allowed me to judge who was more comfortable with my presence in the classroom. It was important to document these sites of conflict as they arose within my research journal that, since this allowed for analysis and reflection on the research process.

Traditionally, researcher distance, as a condition for objectivity, has been seen as an important feature of research design. For example, Bakhtin (1986) in exploring settings familiar to the researcher notes that: ‘in the realm of culture, outsidersness is a most powerful factor in understanding’ (p.7). More recently, however, Kieran et al (2001) argue that working in unfamiliar cultural settings is problematic. As Lave (1988) also argues, the value that is placed on direct and distanced observation is a matter of theoretical position. As a sociocultural researcher, objectivity cannot exist since all experiences are mediated in some way. Instead, my intention was to ‘abandon the role of the dispassionate observer in favour of the role of a passionate participant’ (Lincoln, 1990, p.86). I considered my understanding of school context to be an advantage since it gave me a point of reference in the negotiation of meaning with the participants and in understanding institutional practices and their enactment.

Second, a tension was created by my not being a fluent Mandarin speaker. Within the co-teaching bilingual classroom, at times I had to rely on the interpretation of what was said by checking my understanding with the pupils as part of the
interaction. This was be done as soon as possible without disruption to the activities taking place but could not always be achieved immediately.

Third, the use of video was challenging but the decision was made in recognition of this need for further analysis of interactions within this multilingual setting. The translated interactions were discussed with the participants to ensure that meaning was established from both the teacher’s and the pupils’ perspectives. Epistemologically, as a sociocultural researcher, this was essential to the research process.

3.7 Thematic Analysis

Thorne (2000) characterized data analysis as the most complex phase of qualitative research. Braun and Clarke (2006) describe thematic analysis as a common but ‘poorly demarcated and rarely-acknowledged’ (p.4) approach to qualitative data analysis. Clarke and Braun (2018) also noted that thematic analysis has sometimes been used without the development of a proper theoretical paradigm within which to conduct research. They argue that this should be made explicit where thematic analysis is used as a method. Ponterotto (2005) however, highlights ‘the complexity of locating a particular qualitative approach in one specific paradigm’ (p.133). Braun and Clarke (2006) go on to argue that thematic analysis is a widely used qualitative analytic method that offers a flexible approach to analysing qualitative data. It is therefore a method which can be draw upon across a range of theoretical and epistemological approaches. It is a method for noticing, organizing, describing and then reporting themes within research data (Braun and Clarke, 2006). As a sociocultural researcher, the ‘noticing’ is an important first stage in the analysis, as Rogoff (2003) notes: ‘the focus of analysis stems from what we as observers choose to examine’ (p.58). All experiences are mediated in some way. As Braun and Clarke (2006) note, ‘a good researcher will make this transparent’ (p.80). The thematic analysis in this research draws on this four-stage approach.

3.7.1 Data Analysis

Thematic analysis was chosen as the analytical tool through which to analyse the findings. Sociocultural theorizing was used to explain and account for the existence of patterns and understand the ‘why’ of the analytical process (Flick, 2007). As noted above, thematic analysis draws qualitative data together through a process of noticing, collecting and organizing, describing and finally reporting. The data analysis process is given below:

**Step one: Noticing**

After each of the interviews were completed, the audio recording was transcribed and the transcript was read over multiple times. The process of transcription and the reading and rereading of data allowed for the development of some initial codes. Notes were made at the time to capture any insights in the data but also as a source of reflexivity.

**Step two: Organising**

The transcripts were then open-coded. The goal was to generate as many codes as possible, without thinking too much about how they may be put together. The focus was on a close reading of the transcripts and to code the data line by line. Codes were assigned inductively, which allowed the codes to develop from the data rather than the theory. Each part of the transcript was treated equally, with no significance
assigned to what was said in what Cayne and Loewenthal, (2006) call horizontalization.

**Step three: Describing**
Co-occurring codes were then clustered together to form themes. A theme is something that ‘identifies a coherent aspect of the data and tells you something about it, relevant to the research question’ (Clarke et al, 2015, p.236). At this stage the themes were still provisional and so I sought to ensure I had enough data to support them. In some cases themes could be combined and in other cases data were too diverse to support the theme.

**Step Four: Reporting**
An analytical commentary was written as part of the findings of this thesis (chapter 4) in which themes and the relationships between the were further described and explained. Extracts from the transcribed interviews with pupils and teachers were used to illustrate the points made.

**3.8 Conclusion**
This chapter has both identified and justified the research methods used in this thesis. Ethical issues as well as those surrounding the validity of the research have been discussed. Data analysis and findings will form the next chapter.
Chapter 4 Data Analysis – Thematic Analysis

4.1 Introduction

The data analysis is separated into three sections, according to data collection method. Analysis of pupil interview data is first, followed by teacher interview data. Both of these sections identify the main themes that are prevalent in the data. An analysis of the questionnaire data follows this, drawing on many of the themes identified in the interview data. Chapter 5 is an analysis of classroom observation data and Chapter 6 brings the two analysis chapters together in research findings, where the research questions are answered.

4.2 Pupil Interview Data

The data from the six pupil interviews were open-coded. From this open-coding, emerging themes were identified and then grouped into key themes as described in Chapter 3. These coded data from the pupil interview transcripts were grouped together under the following two identified key themes:

1. Development of language and associated identities
2. Hegemony of English over Chinese

4.2.1 Development of Language and Associated Identities

The table below (Table 4.1) gives an example of initial codes for one identified key theme, amalgamating Y3 and Y5 data together in one table. The amalgamated table for the other key theme can be found in Appendix 13 as well as separate data tables for Y3 and Y5 data for each key theme. The data were amalgamated since the identified themes ran through both sets of pupil data. The small number of pupil interviews also meant that the data could be amalgamated easily, and this helped with analysis of themes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open coding</th>
<th>Emerging themes</th>
<th>Key theme</th>
<th>Examples from transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumed identities</td>
<td>Language and cultural identities</td>
<td><em>I would say I am Hong Kongese</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identities of belonging</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Y3 Angela</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positional identities</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>When I am around my grandparents, I normally speak</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data under this key theme are discussed as separate emerging themes. Y3 data will be discussed, followed by Y5 data in each case. The emerging themes identified were:

1. Language and cultural identities
2. School supporting bilingual identities of pupils
3. Marginalisation of Cantonese language and identities

### 4.2.1.1 Language and Cultural Identities

All Y3 participants spoke about their language uses in school and home contexts and what that meant for them in terms of which language(s) they considered to be their mother tongue. The language identities of the pupils were often complex in terms of their sense of belonging to the language and culture that they identified.
Kevin, a Y3 pupil, who identified his mother tongue languages as English and Cantonese, exemplified this point when he noted that he did not feel very Hong Kongese as a result of his perceived linguistic competence in Putonghua:

‘Because Chinese I’m not very good at. I know bits, so then sometimes I can say a few words, I’m fine with that, but then if you have to do a speech and stuff, you have to plan it out and stuff. For example, Ted Talks and stuff. I actually need someone to help me with that. I also think I’m not very Hong Kongese sort of thing because I speak English almost most of the time’ (Kevin Y3).

Chloe (Y3) identified her home languages as English and Cantonese. Her family moved to Hong Kong from Mainland China and so she was also learning Fujian Chinese so that she could communicate with family members that cannot speak Cantonese:

‘I’m learning my own type of Chinese, like from my old home. Because like everyone knows, and my grandmother doesn’t know normal Chinese, So, I have to learn it’ (Chloe Y3).

Chloe referred to Fujian as her ‘own type of Chinese,’ suggesting a connection and sense of belonging to the language, even though she did not consider it to be ‘normal Chinese.’ When talking about the different varieties of Chinese, Chloe stated that the only thing she would change about Chinese is the difficulty she has writing turtle (鱉 Biē) as it contains 18 separate strokes for one word.

Angela, another Y3 participant, who identified her mother tongue as Putonghua, noted that she mainly uses English at home as a result of the linguistic skills of family members:

‘Because a few of my older sisters they study in the US, so they like – they are more fluent in English than Putonghua as they’re used to English. So I only speak English to them. But my mum and younger sister I do Putonghua’. Angela, Y3 (Appendix 9 for full transcript).

Angela went on to say that she feels she is now more fluent in English than Putonghua as a result of the languages she speaks to her friends. She stated that when she does Maths or when she ‘thinks,’ her thoughts are in English. She also noted that:
‘Like when I speak English I can read it without my lips moving. But when I say Chinese I kind of have – need my lips to move like.’ Angela Y3 (Appendix 9 for full transcript).

She noted that she considers herself to be ‘in between’ Chinese and Hong Kongese due to the amount of English she uses. Her perceived linguistic resources positioned her in between two languages and cultures as she draws on English rather than her mother tongue to communicate with her friends. Her sense of belonging to her home language and culture has been affected since she does not consider herself to be fully Chinese or fully Hong Kongese. This could suggest there is some evidence of subtractive bilingualism, where one language and culture replaces the other. She goes on to say:

‘I have friends who I think have like kind of like their English is better than their Putonghua Chinese. So, I communicate with them with English but like sometimes they act like Cantonese inside’ Angela Y3 (Appendix 9 for full transcript).

Angela positioned her friends as Cantonese, as a result of how they act and their linguistic skills. She felt that culturally or ‘inside’ her friends act Cantonese. She positioned aspects of their behaviour as what she perceives to be Cantonese behaviour. There was an assumption that by speaking another language, such as English, that her friends should act differently, despite their first language backgrounds and the cultural context in which they live.

There is evidence too of teachers positioning pupils according to their perceived linguistic competence. Kevin for example noted that:

‘It’s sometimes hard. As sometimes you just don’t know the word that you need and you need a lot of, well it’s like being an English person and you need a Chinese word and it’s like, what does that mean? And sometimes the teacher just don’t know that you don’t know the Chinese’ (Kevin Y3).

Kevin went on to share his perception that he feels the older he gets the more pressure there is, as he feels teachers expectation of his Chinese ability increases with age and time in school. (Kevin Y3).

Kevin was aware of the school expectations around language learning and felt that he had been in the school long enough to have language skills in Chinese. He compared himself to an English person when he does not know the Chinese words, suggesting that he did not feel connected to the language at these times. He felt, as a consequence of the amount of time he has spent learning Putonghua, his teacher positioned him as more competent than he felt he was. These positional identities that the pupils were experiencing could shape their participation and non-participation within the classroom, shaping what is made available to them as learners. Kevin went on to talk about the anxiety that he felt at times when he did not know the Chinese:
‘It’s really very wrecking, because it’s like they expect you to know, so you try but then you fail it, but then it’s sort of ok because practise makes perfect so you know? And it’s actually a bit hard as it’s just really nervous’ (Kevin Y3)

He went on to note his internal dialogue as he asked himself questions like ‘what do I do? What do I say?’ (Kevin Y3).

The complex language backgrounds of the Y3 participants are echoed in Y5 data. In a Y5 interview with Ashley, she stated that her mother tongue is English, but goes on to reveal the layers of complexity in her language and cultural identities when she shares that her mother is Chinese and her father Malaysian therefore they communicate in English at home as the language that unites them. Ashley noted that she considered herself 50% Australian, despite the heritage of her parents. Ashley associates the English language with her mother’s time in Australia, rather than a language of Hong Kong where she had lived most of her life. She later continued talking about her language use, noting that she speaks English all the time because she can ‘talk faster’ and that when she speaks Chinese ‘it sounds weird’:

‘When I talk Chinese is like – you, it sounds weird. It sounds strange and I talk really slowly because I always need to think what word to use and what it means and all that stuff’ (Ashley Y5).

Ashley clearly has a connection and sense of belonging to her Chinese heritage considering herself to be 50% Chinese, but the connection to the language did not appear to be as strong since she thought she sounded ‘weird’ when speaking the language.

Winston, who identified his mother tongue as Cantonese, also noted the influence of English on his identity as a language learner:

‘In school I usually speak English and at home I speak just Cantonese. Well except sometimes if I don’t know the word for it in Chinese I replace it with the English word instead. Sometimes I speak English with my cousin because they are in university in America, and so they prefer to speak English to me. I am also better in English than Chinese’ Winston Y5 (Appendix 10 for full transcript).

Despite identifying his mother tongue as Cantonese, Winston recognised that his linguistic skills in English are stronger and that he sometimes has to replace words in Chinese with English words when he does not know the word he needs. Winston went on to note that he ‘feels 50% Chinese and 50% English’ even though both his parents are ‘fully Chinese’. However, he also stated that in the context of the international school he feels ‘Chinese,’ suggesting the school and its practices may be responsible for positioning him in this way.

This positionality could, in part, be a result of his perception that his teachers believed he was better at Chinese than he felt he was. Winston noted that he thought his teachers believe he understood more Chinese than he did, in other words his
perception was that he had been positioned as good at Chinese, which Winston felt put him under pressure:

‘I feel kind of stressed because I’m not actually at that level but I understand like most of them [characters].’ Y5 Winston (Appendix 10 for full transcript).

Jeffery (Y5) is a Putonghua first language speaker. He speaks Putonghua at home to both his parents, who are Chinese, but he also has two domestic helpers that he communicates with in English. When speaking about his language learning in Putonghua, Jeffery stated that:

‘There is too, a lot of words that I don’t understand, so I find it hard, just about medium.’ Jeffery Y5 (Jeffery Y5).

He compared it to learning English which he perceives as a great deal easier to learn as there is no memorisation of characters. When speaking about his fluency in each of his languages, he noted that his English is ‘pretty good,’ and his Chinese is ‘not that good or that bad.’ Jeffery was more confident in English than in Chinese. His perception is that it is more difficult to learn Chinese than it is English. Pupil language and cultural identities are complex and multiple. Pupils come from diverse linguistic home backgrounds, which are further complicated by their own and others perceptions of competence in each language.

4.2.1.2 School Practices Shape Pupil Bilingual Identities
In addition to pupil perceptions of linguistic competence, and how they position themselves and others as a result of this, school practices within the bilingual co-taught classroom shape pupil experiences and what is made available for them to learn. Angela (Y3), reflected on her understanding of the school language policy. She understood that she should use each of the classroom languages equally:

‘Like for our class we have to be bilingual so it’s like the first time for example, you use English, then the next time you have to use Chinese, English – Chinese, English – Chinese, like that’ Angela Y3 (Appendix 9 for transcript).

Angela knew that the school wants pupils to be bilingual and the work she produces should represent both languages equally. As a result of this, she made sure that the work she produced follows this guidance. Interestingly, however, when she was talking about the nature of instruction, she said that there is much more English than Putonghua. Angela shares that if the instruction was bilingual, with equal amounts of English and Chinese, she and others would not understand.

One piece of evidence that suggests Y3 pupils may not understand if there was more Chinese instruction comes from pupil use of Google translate, used to support written Chinese for words pupils do not know. For example, Angela stated:

‘For example, homework like a lot of people I know they just copy and paste what they want – their thoughts in English and then they Google Translate it
into Chinese. But I don’t think that’s like – because Google Translate is not always right. So, I like write down the words without Google Translate but with the words I actually really don’t know in Chinese, I Google Translate.’ Angela Y3 (Appendix 9 for transcript).

It was clear that Angela understands that Google Translate is not always accurate and she was trying her best to translate her work into Chinese to meet the school’s expectations, but she did not always have the linguistic resources to do this without support. Kevin (Y3) too, states that he uses Google Translate ‘as a guide.’ Chloe (Y3) however, had a different strategy, noting that Google Translate is ‘all wrong.’ Instead, Chloe noted that she ‘writes lightly so it’s easy to erase’ and then ‘no one can see your mistakes.’ She goes on to clarify that:

‘I write lightly in English so I know what to say, then I work out the Chinese and write over the top so you can’t see’ (Chloe Y3).

All three of the Y3 pupil participants used translation to fulfil the criteria of writing bilingually, regardless of their home language background. All three pupils were also using their agency to develop their linguistic skills within the classroom as they navigate the curriculum.

In a discussion about her understanding and experience of the school language policy, Angela noted that Unit of Inquiry (UOI) and Maths are bilingual subjects and Arts (Drama and Visual Art) and PE are EMI. Despite Maths being a bilingual subject, Angela noted some differences in pupil participation:

‘If you’re good at maths you do it in Chinese and if you’re not good at maths you do it in English’ Angela Y3 (Appendix 9 for transcript).

Angela positioned the pupils doing Maths in Chinese as better at Maths. Her understanding is that there is no choice in language use in this subject, it is about mathematical competence, rather than pupils using their agency to determine language use. Chloe in Y3 is also aware of the expectations for pupils to be bilingual when she noted that her work sometimes needs to be half in English and half in Chinese:

‘It must be bilingual when you write it, it must be bilingual because UOI [Unit of Inquiry] you can write English or Chinese but sometimes you need to write bilingual. So, half and half.’ (Chloe Y3).

Kevin (Y3) also noted that UOI is meant to be bilingual, although he stated that in reality it is ‘70% English.’ Kevin notes that Maths, PE, Music and Arts are all EMI. The Y3 pupils understood that since they are in a bilingual school, there are expectations for them to produce work that is bilingual. They all recognised that this is the expectation in their UOI lessons. Both Angela and Chloe have stated that they try to ensure that the work they produce is written bilingually, while Kevin notes his preference for English. There was disagreement among Y3 participants regarding
Maths instruction. As already noted, Angela believes that the language of instruction is determined by your ability in Maths. In contrast, Kevin believed Maths is studied in English, and Chloe understood that it is a bilingual subject. Three pupils in the same class had three different experiences of Maths instruction. It is likely that Kevin and Angela were drawing on their own experiences within the classroom, since Angela worked in the parallel Maths group and Kevin did not. Angela believed that her position in the Chinese Maths group is a result of being good at Maths, as opposed to being good at Chinese. Chloe was not in the parallel Maths group and completes her Maths in English. It appears, however, that she was aware of the additional group and the opportunity to complete the work bilingually. This point will be returned to in the next chapter.

In Y5, there was also evidence that pupil linguistic skills shaped their experiences within the classroom. Winston for example notes that the amount of questions pupils answer in each of their languages is determined by their competence in each language:

‘Some people like Chinese experts or stuff like that, they do four Chinese, two English. [pupil’s name] is good at Chinese. Like people who are like, “I love Chinese” those kinds of people.’ Winston Y5 (Appendix 10 for transcript).

Winston noted that he sometimes uses Google Translate to help him in class, even though he recognises it is not that accurate:

‘Yes, because Google Translate is all about the English, so then when you find all the fact about English and the teacher all of a sudden says, “you have to write bilingual” and you’re just like, “damn it, we don’t have any Chinese” and you’re like, “How do I do this? How?” Any, this is what happens you try to find the Chinese… You try to find the Chinese examples and research stuff on Google…’ Y5 Winston (Appendix 10 for transcript).

Like the Y3 participants, Winston expressed how he uses his agency to facilitate his language learning and meet the bilingual expectations. He was clearly conflicted about doing this as he believed that translating his work is a ‘bit like cheating’. Using Google Translate enables pupils to see characters as well as Pinyin (an alphabetised Chinese). The Pinyin helps pupils with pronunciation of characters (Lee and Kalyuga, 2011). Within Chinese, the stroke is the smallest unit of a Chinese character. The more stokes, the more complex the character is and the more difficult it becomes to memorise the character as a novice learner (Xiong et al, 2021).

The other two Y5 participants, felt differently about using Putonghua in class. Jeffery stated that he ‘uses English all the time’ since he found it easier and Ashley noted that she felt forced into using Chinese. Ashley used her agency within the classroom to use English rather than Chinese, she noted that this is because she ‘can talk faster’. She goes on to note that:

‘When I just think in Chinese, it take even longer because I need to think and use the right word. But when I use English, I just think and the ideas pop up very quickly. And then I just translate it and then it’s done.’ (Ashley Y5).
Both Ashley and Winston shared that they work in English and translated into Chinese, in the same way that Y3 participants do. This could be evidence of the dominance of English within the classroom and school practices. A theme that will be returned to in Section 4.2.2. It was also evident that this practice is shaping their learning as well as their identities as they navigate their learning and approach in multiple languages.

4.2.1.3 Marginalisation of Cantonese Language and Identities
All Y3 pupil participants believed that they were not allowed to speak Cantonese or that their teacher’s preference was for them not to speak it in class. For example, when asked what they understood about the school language policy and when they could use each language, both Kevin and Chloe stated that they were not allowed to speak Cantonese. As Chloe clarifies:

‘In class, only in class. In play time you can speak it [Cantonese]. In Chinese class, you cannot say Cantonese and English. In English class you cannot say Cantonese and Chinese.’ (Chloe Y3)

Angela (Y3) also noted that during class, they are not allowed to speak in Cantonese (Appendix 9). The restriction of Cantonese, as far as the Y3 participants understood, was during class time. Cantonese was understood to be allowed outside of class. Chloe specifically noted that it is allowed at play time. Kevin also stated that:

‘I speak Cantonese to my friends at lunch.’ (Kevin Y3)

Cantonese appeared to be marginalised through the Y3 pupils understanding of the school language policy. There are other examples from the interviews that might indicate that Cantonese within the school community is marginalized. For example, Kevin stated that:

‘I think that the workers in the school, maybe the cleaners, or the office managers also should be bilingual because they – sometimes we walk around and try to communicate with them, they usually speak Cantonese. I’ve once been in [at] the nurse, I heard they all speak Cantonese in the office. I think they should be bilingual to communicate with us.’ (Kevin Y3)

Kevin’s home language is Cantonese and yet he felt that office staff should be bilingual to communicate with pupils. This preference to avoid Cantonese is also seen in Angela’s interview:

‘Personally I think my Chinese is – I think it’s fine not too bad but not like really good. But my friends – friends can’t speak Chinese very well, only Cantonese so it’s better to use English.’ Angela Y3 (Appendix 9 for transcript).
Angela referred to Cantonese as ‘only Cantonese’ which could suggest that she did not perceive it as having a status within the school. As a result she felt it was better to communicate with her friends in English.

In Y5 there is also evidence of this marginalisation. All Y5 participants reported that they were not allowed to use Cantonese in class. Winston (Y5) for example stated:

‘Yeah it’s mostly English and Putonghua, but the teacher encourages not to use Cantonese in class, to say like, no Cantonese, just try.’ Winston Y5 (Appendix 10 for transcript)

Jeffery too noted his understanding of the school language policy stating that ‘the teacher doesn’t let us use Cantonese.’ Ashley’s interview reiterates this point, noting that the school is ‘bilingual’ and not ‘trilingual’ in respect of Cantonese:

‘In primary is like you’re in class you’re allowed to either speak English or Mandarin because it’s bilingual not trilingual’ (Ashley Y5).

Other evidence of marginalization can also be seen in the way pupils interpreted the language hegemony outside of the school, for example its perceived usefulness in taking the culminating IB exams in Y12 as they leave formal education and apply to university:

‘When you do IB it’s English and Chinese in your exams. The IB doesn’t do Cantonese. The school can teach it, but it doesn’t help, because it’s not the IB’ (Jeffery Y5).

It is interesting that a pupil in Y5 has already formed an opinion about the usefulness of Cantonese in terms of his future prospects for exams that he will not take until he is 18 years old. The status of Cantonese as a social language was confirmed through its use at social times in school. For example Jeffery noted that his teachers let him ‘speak Cantonese when it’s recess.’

This language hegemony can be seen in pupil perceptions of school practices. Ashley for example noted that Cantonese cannot be valued by teachers as they did not teach it:

‘Because there’s no whole lesson about Cantonese, teaching Cantonese it’s not part of the primary lessons for languages. So, I don’t think they value is as much as a lot of times when we speak Cantonese, the teacher will tell us to speak either English or Mandarin.’ (Ashley Y5).

Ashley went on to state that the school principals all speak English and did not know Chinese, her perception was that this was because ‘English is more popular’ as a result of all the pupils speaking ‘English over Chinese’. Ashley was aware of staff linguistic resources and perceives their preference for one language over another
as an indication of the value they ascribe to each language. Winston too, was aware of staff linguistic resources when he noted that:

‘I think other people like cleaners and stuff, usually they don’t have anyone to talk with, so they pretty – like a few of them, so they have no one to talk to, because they only speak Cantonese. I think they should be bilingual.’ Winston Y5 (Appendix 10 for transcript).

This is similar to Kevin in Y3’s comment about office workers. Pupils were aware of the language resources of support staff within the school and they both felt that they should be bilingual to work in the school for communication purposes, even though the language of Hong Kong is Cantonese and a significant majority of the pupils are first language Cantonese speakers.

4.2.2 Hegemony of English Over Chinese
The second identified key theme found within the pupil interview data is the hegemony of English over Chinese. A table of key themes emerging from data can be found in Appendix 13. Two emerging themes under this heading were identified:

1. Chinese perceived more negatively than English
2. English perceived as the dominant language of the school

In this section, these two emerging themes are discussed together since they are so closely related, for example Chinese being perceived more negatively than English (first emerging theme) resulting in a preference and dominance for English (second emerging theme).

There was evidence of hegemony of English over Chinese, firstly as a result of pupil preference for English due to the perceived difficulty in learning Chinese and secondly as a result of the dominance of English within school practices. In Y3 pupils noted their struggles with Putonghua, which they perceived as more difficult to learn than English, for example Angela noted:

‘For Putonghua it kind of was a bit of a challenge for me because – my Putonghua was never actually really good. And even at school when I read I have like kind of like a lot of words I don’t really know so…’ Angela Y3 (Appendix 9 for transcript).

When asked about her English language learning, Angela noted that it is important to her for two reasons, communication with friends who do not speak Putonghua (her mother tongue) as well as for economic benefit for her future. Both justifications give an insight into her investment in English as she navigates the bilingual classroom. Kevin (Y3) also noted his struggles with Putonghua:
‘I mean Putonghua, I don’t use much of that as I am not very good at it. It is really hard for me to remember the words, and some, are like, it’s really hard to read.’ (Kevin Y3)

Chloe (Y3) identified her struggle, in particular with reading, as a result of the combination of traditional characters and Pinyin that is taught by the school:

‘I can’t find Chinese books with Pinyin and they’re hard words. I guess some of the words I don’t know how to read and I don’t get the story.’ (Chloe Y3)

Chloe added that she speaks English at home to her domestic helper adding to the dominance of English usage and exposure. Kevin also notes what he considers to be the dominance of English in school practices, stating that:

‘Chinese is just not that big. People love English class.’ (Kevin Y3)

Perceptions of teacher linguistic competence shaping language choice can be seen in Chloe’s interview, where she noted that it was important that Chinese teachers can speak English, so they can communicate with the English teachers. There was no sense from her interview that she felt the reverse was also true. She went on to note that in classroom interactions:

‘Like the Chinese teacher do Chinese. But sometimes the Chinese teacher do English. But the English teacher only do English.’ (Chloe Y3)

Kevin too noted the bilingual nature of interactions with his Chinese teacher, where he stated that his process in journal work that he wrote in English was sometimes marked by the Chinese teacher.

In Y5, participants also recognised the difficulties of learning Chinese, compared to learning English. Ashley, for example, stated that:

‘I prefer English because English I can express more. And I think there’s more words. And then in Chinese, the characters are really hard to write. And when you write it it’s so many strokes. So, that you get really tired and a lot of time you forget how to write it.’ (Ashley Y5)

Jeffery attributed his difficulty to the logographic system of Chinese:

‘In Chinese you might not know how to say it and you might not know the meaning, but in English it’s a word and you know the alphabets, so it’s easier to speak it out and you might know it.’ (Jeffery Y5)

The ease of using English compared to Chinese means that pupil participants tend to use English as a preference where they can, noting that they spend a lot of time at school and at home talking English. Jeffery, noted that as a result of having ‘aunties’ he spoke a lot of English at home. Here Jeffery was talking about his
domestic helpers, which are common in Hong Kong and are often referred to as aunts or 姐姐 (Jiějiě) meaning older sister. For many pupils, as discussed in the literature review, domestic helpers add to the home language diversity of families. Winston (Y5) shared his view of English, showing an appreciation for language learning in Chinese, but noting his perception as to the importance of English:

‘Chinese is really important but then the English is just ruling it’ Winston Y5 (Appendix 10 for transcript).

Data has revealed that pupils in both Y3 and Y5 have a preference for using English over Chinese regardless of their linguistic background. This is due to the perception that it is easier and faster to use English. The participants were all aware of the school expectations for language learning and the absence of space given to Cantonese. Pupils exerted their agency in multiple ways, shaping their participation and belonging.

4.3 Teacher Interviews

Four teachers were interviewed, two from Y3 and two from Y5. One of the teachers in each co-teaching team was English-speaking, the other Chinese-speaking. In each case, teachers worked as co-teachers, but were interviewed separately. Data were open-coded for themes as described in Chapter 3. These coded data have been grouped together under the following key themes:

1. Language learning in a bilingual context
2. Teacher perceptions of co-teaching practice within the school
3. Teacher identities in the co-taught classroom

Table 4.2 below gives an example of initial codes for one key theme. The data for Y3 and Y5 teacher interviews have been combined in this table. Combined tables for other key themes, are found in Appendix 14.

Table 4.2 Coding example linked to theme: Language learning in a bilingual context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open coding</th>
<th>Emerging themes</th>
<th>Key theme</th>
<th>Examples from transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language hegemony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'most of them speak English and Cantonese at home, they seldom speak Mandarin [Putonghua]' T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language background supporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linguistic competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception as too difficult</td>
<td>Barriers to learning Putonghua</td>
<td>Language learning in a bilingual context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment of Chinese</td>
<td>English and 'Western' culture are hegemonic in the institution</td>
<td>‘We try to make the children balanced but they don’t really want to write in Chinese so much as it’s hard for them’ T2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not wanting to speak in Chinese</td>
<td>Perceptions of the use of Cantonese within the school/classroom</td>
<td>‘you have to teach the curriculum and try to differentiate for the children who don’t speak Chinese’ T1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in linguistic systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Putonghua is torture for them’ T4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in English</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘All pupils can speak English’ T3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment for English</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Children naturally choose more English’ T3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English dominance</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘In recess they mainly speak English’ T4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese as dialect/social language</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘The children don’t even know that I speak Cantonese’ T2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese as not valued</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘I pretend I don’t speak Cantonese’ T2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers can’t support children in Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘More teachers are from Mainland China, they don’t speak Cantonese’ T4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3.1 Language Learning in a Bilingual Context

Data under this key theme will be separated into three emerging themes:

1. Barriers to learning Putonghua
2. Dominance of the use of English
3. Perception of Cantonese
4.3.1.1 Barriers to Learning Putonghua

Y3 co-teacher participants spoke about the challenges of learning Putonghua in the context of the school. This was evidenced by teacher observations that the children find Putonghua more difficult to learn than English and that the children therefore have a preference for English. For example, Adrian, Y3 English co-teacher (Y3EC) stated that:

'I think it's harder for them in Chinese, they do make progress but it's more difficult for them to learn. They [the children] would rather write in English as it's easier than remembering all the characters, and much faster for them to write in English' Y3EC (transcript Appendix 11).

This point was further exemplified by the Chinese co-teacher (Y3CC) of the same class:

'If they want to express their ideas say for example, we should recycle plastic and that sentence will be like, I have to write down every word for them on the whiteboard, they just copy down. And then I don't think it's meaningful because in UOI [Unit of Inquiry] we want to know their ideas. I don't want to know how many characters they know. So, yeah, we let them choose what language but we did encourage those like who write Chinese and we say, 'oh you are so balanced,' (Y3CC)

There is a frustration evident in working with conflicting learning outcomes. Is the teaching priority language learning, or is the priority lesson content? For PYP teachers there is an emphasis on teaching key concepts, but in order to do this, pupils will need access to the language(s) of instruction. The Y3CC noted that she did not want to know how many characters the pupils know, but she did want to know how much of the lesson content they understood. This suggests her priority is lesson content. This point will be further explored in Section 4.3.2 in a discussion of teacher identity. In addition to the difficulty of learning Putonghua, the Y3CC also notes that the home language background, makes learning Putonghua particularly difficult:

'I also think that their home language is also – like I said before, they don’t speak Putonghua at home. And they only spend eight hours at school and the go home and it’s all Cantonese and English and I don’t think they value Putonghua’ (Y3CC).

She goes on to say that she believes it is a ‘Hong Kong thing’ noting that ‘people don’t respect Putonghua.’ The Y3CC is a first language Putonghua speaker from Mainland China. She does not feel that Hong Kong people respect Putonghua as a
language and therefore she feels the pupils are not motivated to learn it. This motivation to learn Putonghua is raised again, by the same teacher later:

‘Because they don’t speak Putonghua at home, they don’t feel the need to learn Putonghua. Why do I need to learn Putonghua just to do like - ? They don’t need to use Putonghua for them. It’s just to learn some boring Chinese lessons. So, and also their parents don’t speak – they don’t encourage them to speak, they only speak English with them.’ (Y3CC).

In Y5 similar views about the difficulty of learning Chinese were expressed. The Y5 English co-teacher (Y5EC) for example noted that:

‘I think when we ask them to use Chinese, if they have written all in English for example and they get really frustrated because they, it’s not that they won’t do it, they genuinely cannot do it. And you can differentiate a lot but some of the kids have only got to Kindy level.’ (Y5EC)

It is clear that the linguistic difficulty of learning Putonghua is recognised, but this also indicates identity positioning as the Y5EC positions the pupils as working at the level of a kindergarten pupil in their Chinese language learning. The Chinese co-teacher (Y5CC) of the same class also noted that:

‘For UOI [Unit of Inquiry] it should be 50:50 but not others. We try to make the children balanced but they don’t really want to write in Chinese so much as it’s harder for them. But get pressure from parents because they think Chinese is important. That’s why they choose [school name] I think, because it’s bilingual.’ Y5CC (Full transcript Appendix 12)

The tensions evident in the Y3 teacher interviews around teaching both content and languages was also evident in the interview with the Y5EC:

‘You have to teach the curriculum and try to differentiate for the children who don’t speak Chinese’ (Y5EC).

The challenges of teaching Chinese are evident in the Y5CC interview, for example, she refers to learning Chinese as ‘torture’ for the children who she believed found it challenging to learn. She went on to note that they also find Chinese boring, adding:

‘Yeah. Especially for the pupils who don’t speak Chinese at home because it’s quite difficult for them. When they don’t speak they really can’t read, can’t write and then during the Chinese lesson they really need one-on-one. But I’ve got other 26 so I can’t put so many times on them and then when you give them some individual work because they don’t got the foundation, even though I give them basic stuff they still can’t do it.’ Y5CC (Full transcript Appendix 12).
Similar to the views of the Y3 teachers, the Y5CC shared her opinion that children who are not exposed to Putonghua at home, find the learning in school particularly challenging. These same children, she believed find the learning boring. There is other evidence of this in the Y5EC interview when she acknowledged pupil disengagement in Chinese can often be seen overtly in behaviour changes, for example, she stated that during Chinese lessons:

‘I think their behaviour goes off the top, they literally walk in and they’re disengaged, they’re not interested’ (Y5EC).

### 4.3.1.2 Dominance of the Use of English

All teachers spoke about the hegemony of English, and this was evidenced by teachers’ observations that children naturally preferred to speak English (as noted above), were more comfortable and confident doing so, and that it was, in fact, the ‘default’ language of the classroom and the school. The Y3EC, noted the difficulty of learning Chinese in a Hong Kong environment and in the context of a perceived English dominance at school:

‘It must be hard as they [pupils] see English is important as everyone speaks it in school and they move to secondary and all their lessons are in English. But there’s nothing for Cantonese and Putonghua is difficult to learn and they can’t use it in Hong Kong so where’s the motivation?’ Y3EC (Full transcript Appendix 11).

The same teacher noted that:

‘I think the children naturally chose more English because they feel more confident to express themselves in that’ Y3EC (Full transcript Appendix 11).

This claim is substantiated by the Y3CC who acknowledged that the ‘children prefer to use English’ in the classroom interactions where they can.

English language dominance is also seen in the linguistic progress of one of the Y3 students. The Y3EC noted the remarkable progress that Angela had made since joining the school. Angela, (pupil case details, Table 3.1) is a heritage language Putonghua speaker from Mainland China. The Y3EC reflected that, upon arrival, Angela had very little English and did not speak, even to the Chinese teacher:

‘I mean the pupils can all speak English, well Angela [pseudonym] couldn’t speak any English when she arrived, she is such a success story, I can’t believe how well she is doing, it’s so great to hear her speak in English, she wouldn’t say anything at all when she arrived, not even to 老师 [Lao Shi /teacher]’ Y3EC (transcript Appendix 11).

The success is a result of English language dominance both within the classroom but also Hong Kong, where one of the official languages is English and where
English and Cantonese are used in preference to Putonghua. The Y3 teacher participants also noted that, although the school policy indicated that English and Chinese should be given equal priority within the classroom, English tended to be used more in subjects such as Mathematics, Science, and UOI, partly because teachers felt the focus should be on content, and so teaching language development at the same time would be cognitively too demanding:

‘They understand pretty much everything in English and Chinese if that unit is not too difficult, if they are familiar with that. For example, … if it’s about their family they found it easier to learn even in Chinese. But if the unit is about science … they find it a bit difficult. Even for some English terminologies they found it difficult, so I think Chinese is even more difficult’ (Y3CC).

The perceived difficulty that the Y3 pupils experience in learning and using Chinese was further substantiated when the Chinese co-teacher noted her struggle getting the pupils to speak and write in Chinese:

‘They find it easier and faster to write. I have encouraged them to use Chinese. Sometime when I ask them a question they respond in English’ (Y3CC).

She went on to say that when this happens, and pupils respond to her questions in English, she will ask them to ‘repeat in Chinese’ while she acknowledges that the pupils are ‘not confident.’

At the classroom level, Y5 teacher participants also observed that English was dominant. There was parity in the suggested reasons for this with those given in the Y3 teacher interviews. Y5 teachers stated that the children were more used to English, since they had had more exposure to it, and that they therefore find it easier to use. The observation of the Y5EC exemplifies this point:

‘When you look at like our children, what language do they often use? English. I would say 75% to 80% English and that’s even when [Chinese co-teacher] is in the room, right? And she never responds back to them in English, it’s always Chinese, but they will always try to speak to [Chinese co-teacher] in English’ (Y5EC).

The Y5CC also noted the same issue with pupils responses, noting that her approach is to continue to speak in Chinese and to ask them to do the same:

‘They prefer speak English. I always speak to them in Chinese. And then I tell them, “speak Chinese to me.’ Y5CC (Full transcript Appendix 12).

Children responding in English to a question given in Chinese has been noted in both the Y3 and Y5 teacher interviews and supports the teachers’ claims that the children are more confident and proficient in English. The hegemony of English was instantiated by both institutional practices and practices at classroom level. In these
examples, the pupils were choosing to engage and participate in English rather than Putonghua. Within a community of practice, participation and identity transform together as pupils move from legitimate peripheral participation towards community member. Pupils align their behaviour and forms of participation or non-participation, both of which shape their identities of belonging.

Within the school, Y5 teacher participants also noted, that assemblies were mostly delivered in English, that the school song was in English, and that the specialist teachers (Music, Art and PE) were primarily English-speaking:

‘Even with like dismissal, flag raising, everything. Any kind of whole-school, I mean like everything is presented to them in English really’ (Y5EC).

Pupils draw on community tools, resources and role models, in the formation of their identities, as they envision new possibilities for the future. If the tools, resources and role models are dominated by English, pupils actively engage with these as part of their identities of belonging, within the communities of practice, of which they are a part. As the Y5CC noted:

‘Like the school they say we want Chinese and English is 50-50 but most of the special is not all specialists they use English to teach. So, it’s quite difficult for children to use 50 and 50 English and Chinese in their school life too.’ Y5CC (Full transcript Appendix 12)

The Y5CC goes on to say that in assembly even the ‘principal speak in English’ and so why would the children think that they ‘need to speak Chinese.’

In sharing her understanding of this point, the Y5EC described the school environment as ‘kind of very westernized’ and ‘very much an English environment.’ In exploration of this idea, the same teacher noted that the Chinese teacher was usually in the position of accommodating the English teacher who could not speak Chinese. Hence, planning took place in English, and much of the interaction within classes was led by the English teacher. For example, she noted that:

‘It’s good that she [Y5 Chinese co-teacher] can speak good English. Because again, if you are planning in English, and you gotta have at a certain level, I think in English’ (Y5EC).

The same was true when discussing the nature of parent meetings. The Y5EC stated that:

‘So, whenever I speak my parts I speak in English and then the remaining seven minutes when Aki speaks in Chinese I’ve got no idea what’s being said, no idea. But I’m usually the one that speaks and starts because then, then Aki knows what I’ve kind of said’ (Y5EC).

The linguistic resources or language backgrounds that the two co-teachers could draw upon, shaped the everyday classroom practices of the school. These practices were observed by pupils, shaping their perceptions about language use.
4.3.1.3 Perceptions of Cantonese

As noted in Section 1.5.1 the school language policy on using Cantonese within the classroom is that it is allowed ‘where needed’ and ‘as necessary.’ This has led to uncertainty about its role for different teachers. For example, in Y3, when asked about the place of Cantonese, there seemed to be some confusion about what was allowed and what the school rules might be. The Y3EC for example noted that:

‘I think Cantonese is used – can be used for explanations, for conceptual explanations, in class. But I don’t think they [the pupils] use it, I’ve not heard them use it’ Y3 English co-teacher (Full transcript Appendix 11).

By contrast, the Y3CC notes that it can only be used individually and not as part of whole class teaching:

‘I think it can be used, but not to the whole class. Individually’ (Y3CC).

It is interesting to note that neither of the co-teachers in Y3 can speak Cantonese (which is not unusual since most Chinese teachers come from Mainland China as first language Putonghua speakers). This may give context to the Y3EC commented that:

‘Some [pupils] don’t speak Cantonese and they [pupils] don’t use it in class work, so you don’t really hear it at all’ Y3EC (Full transcript Appendix 11).

If the Y3 Chinese co-teacher believed pupils can use Cantonese either for conceptualisation or working individually, but neither class teacher spoke Cantonese, it is perhaps not surprising that Y3 pupils did not draw on this resource as part of the classroom environment. When asked if there was an opportunity for pupils to use Cantonese within the classroom, the Y3CC confirmed that there was not an opportunity as a consequence of the teachers not being able to speak the language. She went on to acknowledge that there is active discouragement to use Cantonese:

‘I guess – like when they are in primary and they – when we wanted to encourage them to speak Putonghua so sometimes we might say, “No Cantonese, no Cantonese.” And they were like not happy’ (Y3CC).

The Y3CC also noted the difficulty that she believed Chinese teachers who are first language Cantonese speakers face as teachers within the school:

‘If you speak Cantonese, the parents view, and this may just be a complete generalization, but the parents view the Chinese teachers as maybe not being as qualified as like a native Mandarin speaker’ (Y3CC).
It is unclear what the co-teacher means by less qualified. This could be as a consequence of not being a native Putonghua teacher or it could be an extension of the perceived marginalisation of Cantonese. Unfortunately, I did not follow up on this comment during the interview.

In the Y5 teacher interview data, there was also some confusion around how and when Cantonese is permitted. The Y5EC for example, stated that:

‘A lot of our children are Cantonese speakers, so when we’re teaching for example math, I teach English which is a second language to our children, if Aki is meant to teach the concepts of Maths in Mandarin, that’s in a second language. So, you’re teaching the concept of Maths and it’s not in their first language. And sometimes things need translating into their mother tongue, you should be able to use Cantonese. And when it’s ever bought up with leadership it’s still not clear, it’s not clear if they [pupils] are allowed to use it’ (Y5EC).

It is clear that the Y5EC is unsure of the language policy on using Cantonese to help pupils in the classroom. This was also reflected in the Y3 teacher interviews above. The Y5CC substantiated these views too, stating that:

‘They [school leadership] don’t want children speak Cantonese. We speak to them in Putonghua so they can learn that’s what they [school leadership] want’ Y5CC (full transcript Appendix 11).

The Y5CC went on to note her perception of parent views on using Cantonese in school:

‘Parents want bilingual so come to [school name] so they know it’s important. They can speak Cantonese at home.’ Y5CC (full transcript Appendix 12)

When asked if the school values each language, the Y5EC stated that Cantonese is not valued as a language:

‘I think Cantonese not – their mother tongue is not valued at all. I mean that’s right, that’s kind of the given and it’s like if it’s a necessity then you can wait, it’s not pushed in any way. It’s almost like if it’s really necessary. So, Cantonese is not, which is sad actually because that is their mother tongue’ (Y5EC).

She went on to say that:
They don't have any identity with Cantonese. That's, again, they didn't... Whether it's valued at home but I think in school it's almost for them they see it as like not valued it is just seen as a social language' (Y5EC).

This notion of Cantonese as a social language appeared in the pupils' interviews too, when Kevin reflected that Cantonese can only be spoken at recess. As pupils participate to fit in, they can use their agency to ensure their behaviours align with school expectations. This might mean only speaking Cantonese at recess. Through alignment (Section 2.6), an identity of belonging is formed. This type of participation is not problem free, learner identity as a Cantonese language speaker, with permission to only use the language at recess, is likely to be a site of struggle for the young bilingual children that are unable to fully access their linguistic resources. In a discussion about how excited the children in Y5 got, arriving to a assembly and hearing secondary pupils talking to each other in Cantonese, the Y5CC, also shared her understanding that Cantonese is just a social language:

‘Once they [the pupils] went to assembly with the secondary pupils and they got excited that they were all speaking Cantonese when they walked in. But in class they [the pupils] seldom use it, it’s only a social language.’ Y5CC (full transcript Appendix 12).

Within a nexus of multi-membership, pupils enact their identities differently. Pupils responding excitedly at hearing Cantonese outside of recess reinforces aspects of pupil identity in what might be termed reconciliation (Section 2.1.1). Within the Y5 co-teaching team, the Y5CC is a first language Cantonese speaker. In noting the linguistic resources of her teaching partner, the Y5EC reflected that her partner was not allowed to let the children know that Cantonese was her mother tongue, instead she had to pretend that she did not speak Cantonese:

‘It’s so the children don’t use it in class, then they need to use Mandarin’ (Y5EC).

The Chinese co-teacher confirmed that she was made to conceal her language identity, so the children did not know that she could speak Cantonese:

‘When I arrive at the school first time, I have to pretend I don’t speak Cantonese. So the children don’t speak to me like that’ Y5CC (full transcript Appendix 12).

The fear that speaking Cantonese can detract from learning Putonghua is evident in these practices. It is clear that Y5CC’s actions to hide her mother tongue came from her understanding of school language policy and her belief that she was helping to support pupils language learning in Putonghua.
4.3.2 Teacher Perceptions of Co-teaching Practices Within the School

Data under this key theme will be separated into the two emerging themes that were identified:

1. Benefits of teamwork within the co-taught classroom
2. Challenges of bilingual co-teaching

4.3.2.1 Benefits of Teamwork Within the Co-taught Classroom

The Y3 co-teaching team both reflected the importance of their relationship in having a successful co-taught classroom. The Y3CC noted that this year had been a better year for their relationship, having already worked together in the previous year:

‘In our first year we were not as good at it [co-teaching] and we might nearly talk over each other, but it’s better now. We understand each other more now’ (Y3CC).

She went on to state that:

‘We look at each other and I know when Adrian [pseudonym] is ready for me to take over. Sometimes there is something that needs to be clarified or I give the instructions again in Chinese so the pupils hear them’ (Y3CC).

This partnership that Janet described, is also reflected in Adrian’s (Y3EC) comments:

‘We know how each other work. I know when I need to stop and allow Janet [pseudonym] to translate for the pupils, and we can bounce off each other as we know each other. We take it in turns with the content as we know each other’s strengths.’ Y3EC (full transcript Appendix 11).

In discussions about their perceptions of co-teaching, the Y3EC also reported that he believed their role was to encourage the pupils to use both languages as part of a supportive environment. He felt that through this approach, they were able to see improvement in the children’s language skills. He stated that both he and his co-teacher make a point of encouraging the children with the classroom languages, to try to get them to increase the amount of Chinese they write each time. He stated that:

‘We made a real effort to model that there was no difference between us and there’s no difference between the languages. I find that by the end of the year the kids use both languages, they can come to either of us.’ Y3EC (full transcript Appendix 11)
This perception of the importance of a supportive environment for the children was also reflected in Y5 teacher interviews in which both teachers acknowledged the school’s bilingual programme and the necessity to therefore have two teachers to support language development. This language development was encouraged through the use of both languages, where each teacher ensured the content is translated and that pupils are exposed to concepts in both languages. As the Y5EC stated:

‘Why I’m delivering sort of within English, then if [Aki] needs to reiterate anything, any of the concepts then she’ll obviously deliver that in Mandarin. So it’s not standalone, even if one of us is taking the lead, we are both constantly involved and use both language with the children’ (Y5EC).

Interestingly, both the Y5 co-teachers reported that they intentionally plan with language learning in mind as part of their practice, and both reported that they see themselves as language teachers, in addition to being a subject teacher and therefore plan with this in mind.

The Y5 team also reflected that they try to play to their individual strengths in teaching, taking the lead in areas where they are most confident. For example, the Y5EC stated that:

‘I guess playing to our strengths, so, we kind of look at what like Aki’s strength obviously is math and mine is UOI [Unit of Inquiry] and we both agree that. So, quite often it’s just an agreement that Aki [pseudonym] will kind of lead certain things and I will lead’ (Y5EC).

The Y5CC substantiated this view, noting that:

‘We always help each other out. Sometimes like in math lesson maybe I can take bit more in charge and then Danny [pseudonym] sure that we help each other out. We work together, always a team’ Y5CC (full transcript Appendix 12).

The sentiment of being a team came across strongly in the Y5 teacher interviews, with the English co-teacher describing co-teaching as a marriage.

4.3.2.2 The Challenges of Bilingual Co-teaching

Section 4.3.2.1 above demonstrates that the Y5 team purposely plan with language in mind. Conversely, the Y3 team co-plan for subject content and not language, believing that language will be acquired through exposure alone:
'All you can do really is try to encourage them. There’s not much you can do really to plan for language in UOI class or Maths, it’s the same for English, we don’t teach this either it’s just about exposure at this age’ Y3EC (full transcript Appendix 11).

This difference in approach and belief about language development is a theme that will be revisited in Section 5.2.1. Teacher perspectives on language learning as part of their practice can also be seen when asked about their understanding of the school’s rationale for using co-teaching. The Y3 team believed that it was likely a ‘marketing ploy’ (Y3EC) or a way of reducing teacher-pupil ratios (Y3CC). Despite these views, both Y3 co-teachers acknowledged that the school’s expectation was that pupils used both languages within the classroom, for example, the Y3EC noted that:

‘I don’t think there is anything written about when to use languages, not even in the language policy, but everyone knows that we are expected to have the learning journey in both and they [the school] want 50/50 just so that when the parents come in they see the learning journey in both’ Y3EC (full transcript Appendix 11).

As noted by the Y3EC, there is nothing in the language policy about how and when pupils should use each language (Section 1.5.1). He goes on to note how challenging he believes this is for the pupils and the need to be ‘realistic’ about how much of the pupils work is bilingual, given their home language backgrounds. In exploring this point further, the Y3EC expressed his perception that strict adherence to the 50/50 policy and ‘forcing’ children to use both languages is counter to supporting bilingual language development:

‘I think when we are forcing them to – when our focus is percentage of language or when our focus don’t speak this or say this, then that’s holding them back’ Y3EC (full transcript Appendix 11).

Emphasizing some of the same difficulties with language learning, the Y3CC noted that in UOI, the pupils cannot express their ideas in Chinese and so she has to write full sentences down on the whiteboard for them to copy down. She expressed her frustration that it is ‘just not meaningful’ as she wanted to know their ideas about the concept and not how many characters they know in Chinese. For the Y3 teaching team, it appears there is a tension between teaching content, which they both feel is their responsibility and language development. The Y3CC also noted the additional struggle she faces encouraging pupils to use Chinese, when English is easier for them:

‘English and Chinese they’re two different linguistic system. English you just use phonetics you can spell out everything but for Chinese you have to memorise the characters. So, even for native speakers they sometimes they want to be lazy they just use English’ (Y3CC).
The challenges of teaching bilingually and getting the children to use both languages is acknowledged in Y5 too, as the Y5EC noted:

‘You’re meant to kind of have the children’s writing like an equal balance of English and Chinese. Which then that throws a spanner in the works with the co-teaching model because if you’re meant to have a balance of their writing but obviously these children, that do lean more towards English and then some lean more kind of towards Chinese then when you say, no you’ve got to write 50-50 with your explanation, it’s kind of a little bit overwhelming’ (Y5EC).

While all co-teachers noted the importance of a strong teaching relationship with their counterpart, the Y5EC noted just how difficult the first year can be for a teacher new to co-teaching:

‘Our staff coming in find the first year really, really tough because they find a lot of staff. It’s quite a unique model to us and they find it really hard the first year’ (Y5EC).

Only one of the teacher participants knew that that there were different models that could be used for co-teaching, having read an article about it previously. She reported that she could not recall anything about them only that she had read an article once.

4.3.3 Teacher Identities Within the Bilingual Co-taught Classroom

Data under this key theme will be separated into the two identified emerging themes:

1. Marginalised teacher identities relative to one another
2. Perception that teacher status is linked to mother tongue language

4.3.3.1 Marginalised Teacher Identities Relative to One Another

There was a perception that the Chinese teacher’s identity was marginalized relative to the English teacher. This perception manifested itself in different ways, for example, it was noted that the availability of resources in Chinese traditional script made it difficult to ensure that both languages were represented equally. As noted by the Y3EC:

‘It’s not a choice it’s all that’s available. I mean well, [Janet] used to say there’s a gap in the market in terms of IB appropriate type materials. I think the IB is a tad more a western ideal, isn’t it? So, I think – but there are – I mean there are gaps for things in Chinese [Putonghua]’ Y3EC (full transcript Appendix 11).
The gap in the market that he is referring to, reflects the unique traditional script and Pinyin combination used in Hong Kong for learning Putonghua. The combination is only found in Hong Kong and Taiwan. Teaching materials that originate from Mainland China, tend to be in simplified script with no Pinyin. The censorship of written materials is another source of tension for teachers accessing teaching material from Mainland China. He went on to note that translation by the teacher would be a ‘massive job.’

The lack of access to appropriate resources leads to a dominance of English while Chinese is underrepresented within the classroom. The Y3EC also notes that English can dominate due to what he perceives to be the personality of western teachers relative to their Chinese teaching partners, requiring the western teacher to be self-aware in the classroom.

Other evidence for the marginalization of the Chinese teachers’ identity relative to the English teachers also come from the perception that parents have a preference for talking to the English co-teacher, often contacting them via email in English rather than Chinese. What is particularly interesting about this is that different teachers interpreted the parents’ actions very differently, each taking their understanding from their unique sociocultural position in which their individual experiences and histories shaped their understandings and interpretation of parents’ actions. For example, the Y3CC noted that:

‘The perception is [of the parents], and I’m just a TA’ (Y3CC).

She went on to note that:

‘Sometimes I think we should teach parents about co-teaching. They don’t understand then they tend to go to western teachers’ (Y3CC).

It is interesting to note that the English co-teacher had the same perception that parents tended to contact him, but he attributed this to being male and therefore dominant rather than being western. He noted that:

‘Maybe we also need to educate parents. I think a lot of our parents are quite traditional and I think they would go to the male teacher because they see the male teacher as being lead.’ Y3EC (full transcript Appendix 11)

Both Y3 teachers noted that when parents send emails they only send them in English and to the English co-teacher. The Chinese co-teacher believed that she needed to assert her status as an experienced classroom teacher, to prevent her being seen as a ‘TA’ (teaching assistant):

‘Every year when I first met with the parents, I had to reinforce how many years I’ve been here. I need to let them know I’m experienced so that they are kind of more respect’ (Y3CC).
There is a clear sense from both Y3 co-teachers that there is not equal respect from parents, although they seem to attribute this to different things. Either way it gave the perception to both teachers that the Chinese teacher is marginalized relative to the English co-teacher.

In Y5 there were similar themes in the data. The Y5 teaching team cited the lack of availability of teaching resources in Putonghua leading to Chinese being underrepresented in the classroom:

‘Because it got a problem like our school use traditional Chinese. Even though you can find something in Chinese but like the Mainland China one use simplified Chinese. Sometime I need to translate a simplified to traditional to… or from English to traditional Chinese’ Y5CC (full transcript Appendix 12).

The linguistic skills of the co-teachers were also thought to play a role in the status of Chinese within the classroom, for example, in Y5EC noted that she starts each lesson in English. She says that it has to be this way since if her co-teacher started she would not know what had already been said since she does not speak Chinese. It is therefore easier for her to begin each lesson and her Chinese co-teacher to take over and add to her initial discussion or explanation. This could give the implicit impression that the English co-teacher is the lead teacher. The Y5EC also noted that all planning, as a result of her language skills, necessarily takes place in English.

As already noted in the Y3 interview data, there was a perception amongst the teachers that the western teacher tended to dominate in the classroom, giving the impression that they were the lead teacher. This sentiment was also acknowledged by the Y5EC who noted that:

‘I think there was a perception a couple of years ago on how the western teachers take more leads and they dominate the classroom. I still think that’s an opinion that’s kinda some have’ (Y5EC).

While the Y5 teacher noted that this is a perception that some teachers have, she attributes it to others rather than holding this view herself. There were other similarities too, for example parent communication. Both Y5 co-teachers noted that communication takes place in English but the understanding as to why this happens is different from the perspectives of the Y3 team. For example the Y5CC stated that:

‘I think Danny [pseudonym] usually reply emails and also like some parents they don’t write good Chinese, so might be easier for them in English.’ Y5CC (full transcript Appendix 12)

When talking about the parent-teacher conferences, she also stated that:

‘I think that when we had individual conferences and I think most of them prefer to speak English because they want both of us to understand.’ Y5CC (full transcript Appendix 12)
It is interesting that in the discussion of Y5CC attributed the use of English to the parents' linguistic competence, rather than an understanding of teacher status. The Y5CC did not mention any sense of inequality in treatment by parents. What is not known is whether this is a result of being first language Cantonese, rather than Putonghua, as in the case in the Y3 teaching team. The theme of teacher status based on first language is explored in the next section.

4.3.3.2 Perception That Teacher Status is Linked to Mother Tongue Language

As already noted in Section 4.3.3.1 above, there was evidence in teacher interviews of a perception, at least with some staff, that Chinese teachers were treated differently based on their first language dialect. An example of this can be seen in the Y3CC interview when she stated that:

‘We were joking me with some of my Mainland friends and we said the reason why we didn’t get promoted because we are not her friend. We are not – Cantonese. We are not that group’ (Y3CC).

This point is further exemplified by the Y3EC who stated that:

‘From my conversations with teachers who have left, some from the Mainland, some from Taiwan, they feel that native Putonghua speakers were not respected or Mainland speakers are not respected and almost looked down was the feedback that I got’ Y3EC (full transcript Appendix 11)

This appears to be the same perception that teachers believed parents hold in regards to the status of a teacher teaching Chinese. This was an unexpected theme within the data of which I was not aware prior to this research. The Y3EC went on to note that despite the large number of first language Putonghua speakers at the school, none of them are in leadership positions, instead the two Chinese deputies are ‘both Cantonese speakers’. He went on to note that he felt it did not send the right message to the children about the importance of learning Putonghua. It is interesting that he did not appear consider the advantages of school leaders coming from the same language backgrounds as the pupils.

When the school was initially set up, it drew heavily on local Cantonese staff to make up the Chinese teaching teams. As time has gone by, there are an increasing number of Putonghua first language teachers recruited. This perhaps represents the changing demographic of Hong Kong, following the changes to sovereignty.

The segregation of Chinese teachers by mother tongue is also noted in the Y5 interview data. For example, the Y5CC noted that:

‘I think for us we don’t feel like there are from the Mainland China they are a group and we’re Cantonese, we are a group…..I heard some people say that, like that we are the Cantonese group’ Y5CC (full transcript Appendix 12).
The language skills of staff and their positions within the school, was also raised in the Y5 co-teacher interviews. For example, when talking about teaching Putonghua, the Y5CC noted that:

‘The leadership actually they don’t really understand Chinese, in my point of view.’ ……..Because they haven’t learned Chinese so how can they know how to teach Chinese?’ (full transcript Appendix 12).

The Y5EC also stated that:

‘How can you say Mandarin is important and have a bilingual school if none of the leadership are native Mandarin speakers?’ (Y5EC).

It is clear that both teaching teams felt that Putonghua speakers are not represented in the school leadership and this is to the detriment of the school and the Chinese programme within it. It also feeds into the perception that Chinese teachers have a different status based on first language dialect and this runs counter to the school’s bilingual mission that prioritises Putonghua over Cantonese.

4.4 Questionnaire Data

A questionnaire was used to understand pupil experiences of the school language policy. The questions sought to understand their experiences of how and when they could use each of their languages and their opinions on whether each of their languages were valued. The broad understanding gained from pupils’ responses, allowed for follow up at interview with the selected case pupils.

The questionnaire was sent to 198 Y3 pupils with a return rate of 95%, in Y5 192 questionnaire were sent out with a return rate of 98%. The data that follows therefore represents the views of 189 Y3 pupils and 189 Y5 pupils. The data will be separated into two sections, each dealing with the data for one year level. Pupil profiles of those who answered the questionnaire can be found in Appendix 4 (Y3) and Appendix 5 (Y5).

4.4.1 Year 3 Questionnaire Data

There was evidence that the bilingual programme at the school was successful in terms of pupil enjoyment of language learning, in particular in English as well as their reported confidence in using the language.
Pupils report that they enjoy learning English a lot (72%). This preference for English as a language was seen in the findings of the pupil interview data discussed above and might be a result of the perceived ease of learning English compared to Chinese.

More than 60% of pupils report that they are very confident in using English. The percentage of pupils that reported that they were either confident or very confident in using each language was English 96%, Putonghua 81% and Cantonese 78%. This might be considered surprising given that the majority of pupils were first language Cantonese speakers and yet they were reporting that they were least confident in this language.

Pupils were also asked their perception on whether the school values languages equally. Graph 4.3 shows the findings.
The majority of pupils reported that they did not feel that the school values each language equally, with 57% of pupils saying no. Some pupils specifically identified that they felt the school only valued English and Putonghua, despite this being a closed question. This corresponds and supports pupil interview data on the value accorded to languages, from the pupils’ perspective (Section 4.2.1.3) Presumably the pupils were referencing the place of Cantonese, although there is nothing specific in their answers to verify this. The total percentage of pupils that believe the school does not value all languages (inclusive of those that believed they only value English and Putonghua) is 60%.

The language hegemony evident in the teacher and pupil interviews is also evident in the questionnaire data. Pupils were asked which language(s) they felt were most important to speak, write and for doing exams. Graph 4.4 shows the results for speaking.
The graph shows that English and Putonghua are perceived as most important, either individually or collectively. Cantonese was perceived as least important of the three languages despite it being the mother tongue of the majority. It is unclear if this perception is a result of attending a bilingual school in two languages that are not their mother tongue or if there is parental influence in these beliefs, or both. The perceived oral nature of Cantonese was reflected in the next question about the most important language to be able to write. Cantonese was perceived as important by 14% of pupils when it came to speaking but only 5% when it came to writing.

![Graph to show perceived importance writing in each language](image)

The graph also shows a higher percentage of pupils who place importance on written English. In this case, English is significantly higher than Putonghua which might be a reflection of pupil understanding that they will take exams in secondary school in English. Additional evidence for this could come from the next graph that shows which language is the most important for learning (preparation for exams).

![Graph to show pupil perception on the importance of learning each language for tests](image)
English is again shown to be hegemonic within the institution and beyond in terms of the value it holds for future engagement with exams. These language views about the value of English were also seen in pupil interviews where there was evidence of English language dominance and with it, a preference for its use within the school setting.

Pupils were asked about their language preference when talking to friends both inside and outside of school.

![Graph showing language preference in school](image1)

**Figure 4.7** Graph to show pupil preference for language use in school

In school English and Cantonese were rated highly, with English slightly ahead of Cantonese (English 35%, Cantonese 29%).

![Graph showing language preference outside school](image2)

**Figure 4.8** Graph to show pupil preference for language use outside of school
Outside of school the trend was reversed. Cantonese and English were still the highest rated languages, but this time Cantonese was rated more highly than English (Cantonese 38%, English 26%).

Putonghua, both inside and outside of school was 13%. With no change, it might represent first language Putonghua speakers within the data. There is evidence in this data that the school is mediating pupil language use while in school since they are making different language choices. Graph 4.9 below offers one possible explanation for this.

It is clear that there was an understanding among pupils that they were not allowed to use all their languages when in school, and this may help to explain pupils’ language choices when in school. In the pupil interviews, as noted above, pupils reported that their teacher did not like them using Cantonese and encouraged them to use Putonghua. It is likely that pupils perceived teacher preference, as well as pupil understanding about the rule around language use, mediate their language learning and language use.

**4.4.2 Year 5 Questionnaire Data**

Pupil enjoyment and confidence in using a language might be considered evidence of a successful bilingual programme. In the Y5 data there was evidence of pupil enjoyment in learning English as well as their confidence in using it. In Y5, 79% of pupils stated that they enjoy learning English a lot, this is up from 72% noted in the Y3 data (Figure 4.10). Enjoyment for learning Cantonese remained stable, but there was a drop in Putonghua from 44% in Y3 to 31% in Y5.
The preference for English is also reflected in the graph below in terms of pupil confidence. Pupils were most confident in English and therefore it makes sense that this was also the language they enjoy.

Pupil confidence in English (confident or very confident) remained high in the data for both Y3 (96%) and Y5 (97%) which is supported by pupil interview data. Cantonese remained stable too, but there was some movement in results for confidence in Putonghua, with ‘not very confident’ growing from 18% in Y3 to 29% in Y5. Pupils overall were reporting a reduction in enjoyment and feeling of confidence in Putonghua and conversely an increase (albeit small) in enjoyment and confidence in English.
Pupil attitudes towards each language possibly reflect their perspectives on how the school values each language and the importance it is ascribed in its everyday use.

The graph shows that the majority of pupils did not feel that the school values each language equally. In addition it also shows an increase in the number of pupils that felt the school does not value all languages equally from 56% in Y3 to 61% in Y5. As with the Y3 data, some pupils specifically identified that they felt the school only values English and Putonghua. The change in these values from Y3 to Y5 might reflect the length of time the pupils have been in the school and their increasing dissatisfaction at not being able to draw on their linguistic resources in their home language. It could also reflect a better understanding of the school language policy with age. Perhaps the pupils were happy to use the languages of instruction as directed in the first few years of schooling, but as they have become older and more confident in their language use, perhaps they feel differently about being directed towards just two of their languages.

As with Y3 data, there was evidence of language hegemony evident in the questionnaire data. The Y5 data contains an additional category ‘all languages’ which was noted by 14% of the children.
The graph shows that English and Putonghua are perceived as most important, either individually or collectively. Cantonese is perceived as least important of the three languages to speak.

Similar trends were found in the Y5 data regarding the importance of each language to write. English and Putonghua as might be expected are most often selected by pupils as the most important, with Cantonese shrinking to just 3% (6% in Y3). The graph shows an increase overall in the percentage of pupils that felt it was important to write in English.
Figure 4. 15 Graph to show pupil perception on the importance of learning each language

English was perceived to have significantly more value in learning for tests than other languages, with Putonghua following behind in second. Pupils understood that the school is bilingual only in primary and that when they move into secondary, all of their learning will be in English. They also understood the nature of the curriculum that is taught, requires them to be successful in English so as to be successful in their exams, and thus this result is perhaps not surprising.

Pupils were asked about their language preference when talking to friends.

Figure 4. 16 Graph to show pupil preference for language use inside school

The data show a preference in school for English, closely followed by Cantonese. The graph also shows a drop in the percentage of pupils that used Putonghua to communicate in school, when compared to the Y3 data (Y3 13%, Y5 3%). This could be the changing attitude to the language and therefore pupil agency in their language choices, but equally, as noted in the Y3 data, it might reflect the first language preferences of the cohort. As noted in the pupil interviews, pupils were very aware of the language requirements in the secondary school and of the culminating exams, it could therefore be likely that the ease of English, its hegemony
within the school and its requirement within the secondary school all shape pupils’ perceptions about languages, including their language preferences.

The data for communicating outside of school shows stable values for Putonghua but a growing percentage of pupils opting to communicate in Cantonese rather than English outside of school. This same pattern was seen in the Y3 and might also reflect pupil understanding of language policy.

The majority of pupils did not believe that they are allowed to use all languages at school. Some of the same confusion existed in teacher interviews too, with confusion over what and when languages were allowed to be spoken.
4.5 Conclusion

This chapter has presented the data analysis and findings of the pupil and teacher interviews, as well as questionnaire results for both Y3 and Y5. The data have revealed their language preferences as they navigate the bilingual classroom and their membership of the communities of practice that they inhabit. Identities of belonging were noted, as pupils used their agency to engage through participation and non-participation. Cantonese, determined by pupils and teachers as a social language, represented a site of identity struggle for the young bilingual children. The hegemony of English resulting from pupil language preferences through its perceived ease (relative to Chinese) as well as the availability of teaching resources has been shown as a frustration to co-teachers as they try to meet language policy expectations.

Teacher interviews outlined the benefits of teamwork, a finding that was expected based on evidence from the literature review. The different ways that co-teachers negotiated their identities as part of their beliefs about co-teaching practices, was an unexpected finding. Finally, pupil questionnaire data supported the key themes found in the interview data. These same themes are revisited in the next chapter, where observational data and artifacts are explored. A discussion of these themes and their links to the literature are presented in Chapter 6.
Chapter 5 Data Analysis – Classroom Observations

5.1 Introduction

The data analysis in this chapter is formed from observational data recorded in a research journal as well as an analysis of short video-recorded opening sections of these same observations. Data for this section are analysed using the themes identified to support the findings from the pupil and teacher interview and questionnaire data. Chapter 6 brings together the analysis of Chapter 4 and 5 in the research findings, where the research questions are answered and links to the literature are made.

5.2 Observational Data

Observational data and associated artifacts collected during these observations have been organized into three key themes that support the findings above. The themes are:

1. Language hegemony
2. Co-teaching enactment
3. Pupil agency and participation within the bilingual classroom

5.2.1 Language Hegemony

Teacher interviews, as discussed above, revealed teacher understanding of the language policy was that pupils should be bilingual and balanced in how they use both languages. Also noted was the difficulty in achieving this as the perception was that pupils do not necessarily have the linguistic competence in Chinese to access the curriculum and participate in each language 50% of the time. Classroom observations over the research period confirmed a dominance in the use of English by both pupils and teachers.

The 30 minute filmed lesson segments of classroom observations have been separated to show time spent conversing in each language. The data for Y3 can be seen in Table 5.1 below. In addition to the three languages, ‘other’ denotes classroom activities taking place, where individual language use is inaudible or denotes thinking time, where no one is speaking.
### Table 5. 1 Language use in filmed segments of Y3 classroom observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Video number</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Language use (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23rd February 2017</td>
<td>S3200001</td>
<td>00:29:56</td>
<td>English:18:03 Putonghua: 0:12 Cantonese: 0:0 Other: 11:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th March 2017</td>
<td>S3200002</td>
<td>00:25:16</td>
<td>English: 12:44 Putonghua: 0:21 Cantonese: 0:0 Other: 12:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd March 2017</td>
<td>S308001</td>
<td>00:29:56</td>
<td>English:10:27 Putonghua:1:04 Cantonese: 0:0 Other: 18:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th April 2017</td>
<td>S308002</td>
<td>00:29:25</td>
<td>English:11:49 Putonghua: 0:0 Cantonese: 0:0 Other: 17:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th May 2017</td>
<td>S3080003</td>
<td>00:29:56</td>
<td>English: 17:31 Putonghua: 0:0 Cantonese: 0:0 Other: 12:25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two of the five lessons recorded no Chinese speaking in the first 30 minutes of instruction. Across the three other lessons, a total of 1 minute 37 seconds was recorded in Putonghua. This compares to a total of 1 hour 10 minutes and 34 seconds in English across the five lessons. This finding supports the perspective of the Y3EC, who noted his perception that classroom practice was 90% English and 10% Putonghua. There were no instances of Cantonese recorded in the video transcripts. This is not surprising since this section of the lesson was teacher lead and neither teacher speaks Cantonese.

Another interesting finding in the analysis of the video recorded lesson observations, is that in all lessons that recorded Putonghua, it was initiated by the Y3EC and not the Chinese co-teacher. On 23rd February for example, the only Putonghua spoken, can be seen in this excerpt:

#### Table 5. 2 Lesson excerpt Y3 23rd February 2017

**Scene setting:**

Two teachers in the classroom, English co-teacher leading from the front, Chinese co-teacher circulating and supporting children.

Students sat in groups of four at desks.
On the 9th March, the Chinese co-teacher affirmed some of the initial instructions that had been given in English, and then there was a subsequent dialogue between the two teachers in their respective languages. This can be seen below:

**Table 5. 3 Lesson excerpt Y3 9th March 2017**

**Scene setting:**
Two teachers in the classroom, English co-teacher leading from the front of classroom, Chinese co-teacher at the front of classroom stood to the side.

Students sat in groups of four at desks.
It appears that the Y3EC is actively trying to involve his co-teacher in the classroom instruction, but despite these efforts, there is still a dominance of English. While one might assume this is as a consequence of the Y3 pupils’ linguistic competence in Putonghua, this final excerpt from the 23rd March seems to reveal that pupils have a good grasp of the language:

Table 5. 4 Lesson excerpt Y3 23rd March 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Audio</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:11</td>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>‘老師 [Lao Shi] (teacher) do you want to pick someone to give feedback?’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:20</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>‘Yep’</td>
<td>Moves to the front.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘What answer have you written?’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scene setting:
Two teachers in the classroom. Teachers stood either side of the whiteboard at the front of the class, English co-teacher is leading the dialogue with the students as a class.

Students sat in groups of four at desks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:31</td>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>‘I think that the water will evaporate from both bottles’.</td>
<td>Reading from book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>我覺得水會從兩個瓶子裏蒸發</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:49</td>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>‘Anyone else? Adora – ’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:08</td>
<td>Adora</td>
<td>‘I think water can’t escape with the lid on’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:21</td>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>‘Anyone else? Anyone else got anything? 老師 [Lao Shi] (teacher) do you want to pick?’</td>
<td>Looking around at the pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:43</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>‘Yes, Kevin?’</td>
<td>Motions to pupil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:56</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>‘I think the water will evaporate when it gets hot’</td>
<td>Reading from his book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>我認為水遇熱時會蒸發</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:21</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>‘Yes ok, thank you’</td>
<td>Returns to the side of the classroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this last interaction, pupils are able to use key vocabulary such as ‘evaporation’ and express scientific ideas about what will happen to the bottles of water if they were left in the sun. Despite their reported and observed reticence for using Putonghua, verbally, at least, they seem to have a good understanding of the language. In answering the questions posed, all pupils answering in Chinese read the answers from their books, whereas those that answered in English were able to speak without reference to what they had written. This could be evidence of a lack of confidence in Putonghua, which was also reported in the questionnaire data, or that they need to read the characters as they are unfamiliar with the vocabulary they are using. Either way, it is important to note the progress these young bilingual pupils are making with character recognition in Chinese. All pupils were able to answer the
questions posed, even if they did not feel confident in doing so without reference to their work.

In Y5 the first 30 minutes of all eight lesson observations were able to be video recorded. The table below shows the breakdown by language use. As with the Y3 data, ‘other’ denotes periods of group activities where language was not audible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Video number</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Language used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14th March 2017</td>
<td>S3140002</td>
<td>00:29:57</td>
<td>English: 2:34 Putonghua: 2:09 Cantonese: 0:0 Other: 25:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th March 2017</td>
<td>S3140003</td>
<td>00:29:57</td>
<td>English: 3:31 Putonghua: 2:04 Cantonese: 0:0 Other: 24:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th April 2017</td>
<td>S3140005</td>
<td>00:29:56</td>
<td>English: 7:11 Putonghua: 3:31 Cantonese: 0:0 Other: 19:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th May 2017</td>
<td>S3140006</td>
<td>00:29:57</td>
<td>English: 1:21 Putonghua: 0:48 Cantonese: 0:0 Other: 27:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd May 2017</td>
<td>S3140010</td>
<td>00:29:57</td>
<td>English: 5:12 Putonghua: 4:56 Cantonese: 0:0 Other: 19:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th June 2017</td>
<td>S3160001</td>
<td>00:16:12</td>
<td>English: 6:06 Putonghua: 4:03 Cantonese: 0:0 Other: 14:02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Y5 data there was no recorded evidence of Cantonese speaking, this is despite the first language of the Y5CC being Cantonese. In the interview data, it was noted that she felt a responsibility to the children to speak in Putonghua as she believed it was what the school and the parents wanted. She had also tried to conceal her first language to reduce the likelihood of the children using it in interactions with her within the classroom. The data in these videos therefore
support the findings of the interview, with respect to Cantonese use in the classroom.

All eight of the video recorded lessons were bilingual to some degree. There was still a dominance of English noted with a total of 49 minutes and 11 seconds spoken in English compared to a total of 24 minutes and 57 seconds in Putonghua. The time difference in each language comes mainly from two lessons: 28th February and 25th April. On both of these occasions the dominance of English stemmed from resourcing issues rather than co-teaching language preference. This finding is supported by exploratory case study of Tam (2011), who noted the tensions and conflicts that arise from teaching Putonghua within Hong Kong as a result of a shortage of appropriate resources to support curriculum programmes.

In interview data (Section 4.3.1.2), the Y5EC stated that lessons were always started by her. Both teachers were mindful that they did not want to be translating what had been said already. The video recorded segments of the eight lessons showed some evidence of this, with five of the eight lessons beginning in English (as part of a team teaching approach), followed by the addition of supplementary information in Chinese. The two segments below are both from the 14th March, and illustrate this point (full transcript Appendix 16):

Table 5.6 Lesson excerpt one Y5 14th March 2017

| Scene setting: |
| Co-taught classroom. Children sat on the carpet in front of the whiteboard, gathered at the feet of the two teachers (sat on chairs next to one another). English co-teacher starts the lesson as the last few pupils get seated. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Audio</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:23</td>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>‘Ok, that’s it. Please sit closer. Thank you. Children gathering on the carpet in front of the whiteboard. Two teachers sat side by side.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:34</td>
<td>Aki</td>
<td>‘Thomas, come and sit on the carpet as well please.’ Thomas, 請過來坐在地毯上。 Thomas, qǐng guò lái zuò zài dì tán shang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.7 Lesson excerpt two Y5 14th March 2017

Scene setting:
Children are still sat on the carpet, at the co-teachers feet. As instructions are given, some of the children start to move. The Chinese co-teacher stands as she begins to speak.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Audio</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:17</td>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>Another group will be using the ipads to start their inquiry into how Japanese children live, and the third group will be doing some Maths review looking at the fractions work we started on Monday.</td>
<td>Pause – looks to co-teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4:02 | Aki | ‘If you are working on the ipads as your first activity, you will need to take one of these worksheets.  
如果你選擇使用ipads作為你的第一個活動，你需要在這裡拿一張工作紙。  
Rú guǒ nǐ zuǎn zé shǐ yòng ipads zuò wéi nǐ de dì yī gè huó dòng nǐ xū yào zài zhè lǐ ná yì zhāng gōng zuò zhǐ. | Holds up the worksheet |

None of the information given was repeated, the information followed seamlessly from what had been stated already. Another example of this can be seen on the 15th May (Appendix 17). In this example, the English teacher began the lesson, as with the above examples, followed by the Chinese co-teachers instructions.

In all five recordings started in English, both teachers sat together in chairs next to each other with the pupils gathered at their feet. Starting the lesson with the Team Teaching model in this way, helped to ensure equity in language instruction as the tasks were introduced. There were three occasions when the teaching started in Chinese. In each case, the English co-teacher was not part of the teaching and instruction and so the instructions were given monolingually. On no occasion in these recordings did the lesson begin monolingually in English. Despite this, the balance of instruction is still weighted in favour of English.

As noted in Section 4.3.2.2, the Y5 co-teachers both said that they plan not only for lesson content but for language teaching as well, with both co-teachers seeing themselves as language teachers in addition to class teachers. This was not the case for the Y3 team, who felt that language learning happened naturally as a result of being exposed to both languages. The nature of the interactions in both the Y3 and Y5 classrooms supports these views.

5.2.2 Co-teaching Enactment
As noted in Section 3.7.2, this research recognises nine different co-teaching models, applicable to a bilingual classroom.
In Y3 there were eight full days of classroom observation. During this time, three of the nine co-teaching models were drawn upon. The models and their timing across the eight days can be seen in the figure below.
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In the classroom there was a dominance of the One Teach (English), One Float (Chinese) model. There was evidence of this too in the video recordings and in teacher interviews. The Y3 co-teaching team believed that learning two languages, in addition to the class content was too much for the children, noting their preference for speaking in and using English over Chinese. It is perhaps not therefore surprising that the co-teaching models drawn upon, supports this thinking.

During periods of classroom instruction where the Y3EC was leading and the Chinese co-teacher was supporting, children were still encouraged to use both languages. The Y3CC would circulate and talk to the pupils in Chinese and encourage them to write sentences in Chinese alongside their English. Where the children didn’t know how to write a word, the teacher would write it for them, either directly in their book or on the whiteboard for them to copy. For example, on the 23rd March I noted in my research journal:

‘[teacher name] was working with Kevin today on his prediction for the science experiment. He was encouraged to write his prediction in Chinese but wasn’t sure of the word for ‘evaporate’. [Teacher name] wrote the word in the margin of his book to help him form the sentence.’
In this interaction, Kevin and his teacher were speaking in Putonghua, but Kevin switched to English to explain that he didn’t know the word for evaporate in Chinese. The teacher repeated 蒸發 zhēng fā (evaporate) in both English and Chinese as she wrote it down for him in his book. This practice was not uncommon, with children responding well to language support. Pupils were actively engaged in the negotiation of meaning, as they transformed their participation in the negotiation of meaning, and their participation transforms their identities as language learners. As the Y3CC circulated she would also correct work that had been incorrectly written or translated from Google Translate. This meant that pupils could draw on this work in class discussion if requested to do so in Chinese (as seen above), enabling them to further participate as members of the bilingual classroom.

The three instances of Parallel Teaching were all related to work in Maths. The Y3EC continued to lead instruction, in this case in their Maths topic, while the Y3CC worked with a smaller group of pupils, also in Maths but completing work in Chinese. The co-teachers noted that pupils for the smaller group were selected as they were strong in Maths and would be able to work through the activities more quickly than the larger class group. Pupils referenced this difference in instruction at interview too (Interview with Angela Y3).

The content of the Maths work carried out in the Parallel Teaching group was the same as the main group taught in English, although the expectation was that they would get further with the activities. The resources for this lesson had been downloaded from a popular American Maths resource site (K-5 MathTeachingResources.com). Internet research was also conducted by both groups in English. On exploring this with the pupils from the Chinese Maths group, I noted in my research journal:

‘I spoke to the small Maths group today about their internet research which they all seemed to be doing in English rather than Chinese. They told me that it was easier to research in English as you don’t have to know the Pinyin’ (Research Journal 1st June 2017)

This highlights the hegemony of English within the classroom noted in the previous chapter, as well as the difficulties that co-teachers face as they try to ensure exposure to both languages. The children from both groups needed to think of creative ways to present their findings. This was done either in English or Chinese depending on the group they had been assigned to, despite the resources and research of both groups being in English. Presenting their ideas creatively in Chinese, when many of the tools (internet access) and resources (worksheets) are in English, might represent pupil investment in learning the target language, as they work to meet the expectations of the classroom despite the barriers that are in place.

Station Teaching was also utilised. This occurred after the content introduction in each case. Pupils were separated into table groups with each table taking part in a different activity, some self-directed, and some with each of the co-teachers. This model was utilised in both Maths and UOI and allowed both teachers to work with much smaller groups of pupils in the target language. While the teacher was present pupils worked in the target language of the co-teacher, but when the teacher moved
on or the activity changed, pupils were able to choose which language(s) they were using. In station teaching with the Chinese co-teacher there was more work completed in Chinese than at any other time.

The dominance of the One Teach (English), One Float (Chinese) model positions the English co-teacher as the lead teacher, rather than a shared responsibility for the class and their learning. This perpetuates the English language dominance within the classroom and wider school, constraining the language learning opportunities and language identities of some pupils. Figure 5.4 below illustrates the relationships between different aspects of classroom language dominance.

Student preference for English, availability of resources as well as co-teaching model utilisation, that forefronts the English co-teacher as the lead teacher, all perpetuate the dominance of English. Model utilisation that supports the Chinese teacher as lead, or that supports and understanding of equal language status, could seek to redress this balance towards English dominance.

In Y5 there were eight full days of classroom observation. During this time, the co-teachers drew on six of the nine co-teaching models. The models and their timing can be seen in the figure below.
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Within the Y5 team, Team Teaching was the most utilised model. As shown in the interactions above in Section 5.2.1 Language Hegemony, in each case the team teaching is started in English with the follow up in Chinese. The use of this model also supports their understanding that they were not only content teachers but language teachers and this is evident in their practice. When enacting Team Teaching, both teachers would bring a chair to the front of the classroom and they would sit side by side with the children gathered at their feet. This physical act of sitting next to one another contributed to their shared identity as a teaching team and also positioned the two classroom languages as equally important.

There were three instances in which the One Teach, One Float (English and Chinese) were utilised. In each case, regardless of which teacher was leading, the model was used to allow space for the other co-teacher to catch up with marking, set up resources for the activity that was to follow or put up display work. In each case the co-teacher was listening to the interactions and would chip in as necessary to help manage pupil behaviour. In each case where the co-teacher was engaged in one of these activities, once the classroom instruction had been given and the pupils started the activities, they would return to fully engage with the pupils as part of the activities.

The One Teach, One Float model was used in both languages to allow the co-teacher space and time to continue with everyday classroom tasks, but as the example above illustrates, while the floating teacher was not directly involved in leading the instruction, they were still part of the classroom activities, circulating to support the pupils and supporting their counterpart with behavioural expectations. In this way, they continue to form a united front as co-teachers with co-responsibility for learning, irrespective of the language of instruction.

Alternative Teaching was used in both languages for Maths and Literature Circles. Literature Circles happened in both languages at different times. Pupils were assigned a group in one of the languages of instruction, with their peers at the same reading level. The Alternate Teaching time was used to visit the library to select a book for the group to read and then the pupils would read it together as well as at home and return to the Literature Circle to discuss content and themes, under the supervision of the assisting teacher. At different times throughout the school year, pupils would get to be a part of a group in each language.
While the Chinese Literature Circle was taking place on this day, the rest of the class worked with the English co-teacher to learn about the atomic bomb. Pupils worked in English as they wrote a diary entry as if recounting the events as a child living in Hiroshima. The Y5EC shared during this lesson the intentionality of looking at ‘recount’ while the Chinese co-teacher took pupils for the Literature Circle. She noted that activities that practise tense changes, such as those used in English, when recounting past events, are not applicable in Chinese:

‘Danny explained to me that the reason she was leading the work on Hiroshima was because they were looking at ‘recounting’ which she said does not exist in Chinese. She said that there are no such thing as tenses so when teaching this to the children it can only be done in English, it can’t be done bilingually so they decided to use the time in another way.’ (Research Journal 9th May, 2017).

There are no verb conjugations in Chinese, all verbs have a single form whether past, present or future. In English pupils have to learn conjugations for grammatical accuracy. From this conversation with the Y5EC the level of careful language planning is evident but also demonstrates their understanding of the coteaching models available to them and how they can be enacted to support the children in their language learning.

Alternate Teaching was also utilised for Maths support. In both languages at different times, one of the Y5 co-teachers would take a small group of children to revisit the concepts that the class had been learning. On the 25th April for example, the Y5EC took a group of six pupils to look at converting fractions into percentages and back again. The children gathered on the carpet at the front of the classroom with a small easel in front of them and they worked together to solve problems, the teacher questioning them about the steps they would take and their understanding. In this interaction, all teaching and dialogue with the pupils took place in English. On 28th February, it was the Y5 Chinese co-teacher that took a small group of eight pupils to look at lines of symmetry. Again, the pupils gathered on the carpet working with the teacher as a small group. In this case, all instruction took place in Chinese, with pupils responding in Chinese when prompted to do so. In one instance, a female pupil answered in English rather than Chinese and the teacher directed her to try again to answer in Chinese, which she did with help. In both cases, the rest of the class worked on their UOI with the other teacher until the small group re-joined the main class. The pupils moved between groups as instructed without comment. It appeared from observation that the pupils were used to this way of working and were happy to move between activities, teachers and languages.

The final co-teaching model that was utilised is Station Teaching. This was used in two different capacities – either stations were set up, in the same way that they were in Y3. Pupils working with one of the co-teachers or independently and then rotating through the activities, or the stations were set up and the pupils rotated through but the two teachers visited all of the stations to offer support so that no station was working completely independently. In this case, pupils were expected to engage in the language of the teacher that was assisting them. Where pupils worked
independently they had a choice of language in spoken and written dialogue. Much of the written work from Station teaching was in English with small snippets of Chinese. This meant that pupils were using their agency in determining the language that they worked in, opting mainly for English. Despite the use of both languages in the written work, all of the spoken dialogue was in English, unless the Chinese co-teacher was present. After Team Teaching, this was the most popular model utilised by the Y5 team.

Figure 5.7 summarises the English language dominance in Y5. While many of the same pressures are evident, as with the Y3 team (dominance of English in classroom resources and student preference for English), the utilisation of Team Teaching as the preferred co-teaching model, positioned the classroom languages as having equal status. Teaching in this way also provided an opportunity for pupils to draw on both languages throughout all classroom interactions. While there was still a perceived dominance in English, the choice of model utilised, helped to redress this balance.

A comparison of co-teaching model utilisation across Y3 and Y5 classrooms can be seen in Figure 5.6. This visual representation shows the range of models draw upon by each team as discussed above.
5.2.3 Pupil Agency and Participation Within the Bilingual Classroom

In Y3 there was evidence of pupils using their agency to navigate the language expectations and their preferences in language use through their interactions. As noted in the Y3 teacher interviews pupils sometimes answer in English to questions posed in Chinese.

Instances such as this were recorded in lessons too. For example, on the 9th March 2017, it was noted that:

‘Janet was working with a group of pupils today on the characteristics of relationships. She spoke in Chinese to the group of four girls, only one of which [pupil name] responded in Chinese. She [Janet] tried to encourage them by asking them to repeat what they had said in Chinese.’ (Research Journal, 9th May 2017).

While acknowledging that pupils were meant to use Chinese and English 50% of the time, the Y3 co-teaching team noted at interview that pupil preference was for English. This is seen in many of the artifacts that were collected during the observation period. On the 18th May for example, pupils had been discussing the case of a frog called Kelso and trying to help the frog make decisions about conflict resolution. Pupils were asked to write on a strip of paper what they felt about Kelso’s choice wheel. The statements could be made in English or Chinese with some pupils opting for a combination. This was a UOI lesson and so all pupils, as evidenced in the interviews, knew that this is a bilingual class. The results of their choices can be seen in the image below:
Of the twenty six responses, sixteen were made in English, nine in Chinese and two in a combination. This represents pupils using their agency and language preferences within the classroom to make decisions about language choices. These findings are significant given that these choices have been made despite encouragement throughout the activity, for pupils to draw on both languages. It supports the findings of the pupil interviews and questionnaire of pupils preference for English.

Pupils worked in their note books during UOI lessons. Photos collected during these lessons show the dominance of English use within pupil work.
The work shows pupil preference for using English, in fact the final sentence in this book was added only after the Y3CC spoke with the pupil and encouraged him to add a sentence in Chinese. It is interesting that he chose not to add a new sentence but instead rewrote his final sentence again, but this time, translated into Chinese. This idea of working in Chinese as a translation of an idea in English was introduced during the pupil interviews. There was evidence that some pupils were using Google Translate to help them in class once they had the answer in English (Section 4.2.1.2). The dominance of English in this example is significant as it speaks to their confidence in using and working in Chinese, something that was also evident in the questionnaire data.

The balance of English and Chinese seen in the above example was not uncommon. There were also examples of pupils that responded in a more equitable way, for example:
In this example the two sentences in Chinese are, again, a repeat of what is written before in English. The use of English prior to Chinese each time, might possibly indicate that it is easier to write in Chinese as a translation.

As noted earlier in Section 2.5 Dillon and Gallagher (2019) argue that the practice of repeating work in two languages is not an effective practice for language development. There is evidence here, that the practice of translation adds additional pressure to the pupils and teachers in terms of time, as they try to repeat work in two languages rather than just one.

Within the Y3 observations, I did not hear or notice any pupils interactions in Cantonese. It might have been the case that despite the pupils being used to my presence within the classroom, that they refrained from using Cantonese in my presence, even in their informal interaction with each other.

In Y5 there was also evidence of pupils using their agency to determine the languages they used. As with Y3, there were instances of pupils answering the Chinese co-teacher in English rather than Chinese, and in their way, expressing something about their identities within the classroom. An example of this was seen in the video transcribed lesson interaction recorded on 14th March (Appendix 16). In this example, Ashley wanted to know if she would be able to eat the sushi rolls once they had been made. The classroom interaction with the Chinese teacher was in Chinese, with Ashley’s contribution in English. The teacher responded in Chinese and the lesson continued.

In other examples, teachers encouraged students to use both languages. Danny was working with the pupils to create Haiku poems. She was working with a small number of pupils to write a poem about a dog. She was talking to the pupils about dogs, trying to get ideas together for the poem. She asked one pupil, a first language Putonghua speaker, ‘what can you tell me about dogs?’ (Research journal 23rd March), the pupil used actions rather than words:

‘She [the pupil] was leaning up on the table on her forearms with her knees on the chair, she responded by moving her body from side to side as if wagging her tail. She said, in English – this, they do this! Danny responded by saying, ‘you mean they wag their tail? Is that what you mean? Let me write that down for you’.

This interaction was interesting as the pupil chose not to speak in Chinese as she knew the teacher would not understand, but she was unable to communicate the idea in English and needed to draw on translanguaging practices to act out the action she was trying to state. Williams (2022) notes that translanguaging practices include non-linguistic modes of meaning that allow for the expression of ideas. In this example, the pupil was able to communicate the idea about the dog through imitation and gesture, replacing unknown words with actions. This example also shows that pupils are aware of the language skills of their teachers and they modify their language and behaviour to participate within the classroom. It demonstrates that translanguaging can support language development even when only one monolingual teacher is present.

As with Y3, much of the work that was produced by pupils in Y5 was dominated by English. For example, on the 4th May 2017 the pupils were writing a newspaper
article about the Hiroshima bomb. The activity was bilingual but as can be seen in the example below, the pupil preference was for English:

Figure 5. 11 Y5 pupil work example from Unit of Inquiry lesson (example one)

The part in Chinese reads:

‘Hiroshima in Japan was destroyed by an Atomic bomb. Japan saw an atomic bomb for the first time, and after the city was destroyed, there was radiation which caused a lot of people to die.’

The text in Chinese is different to the text in English and so the work is not a translation from English but a continuation of the article using a change of language. This was not the only example found during the lesson. However, in all cases the amount of English dominates the examples. In both the interview and questionnaire data pupils referred to English as being easier to write and so these artifacts support these findings.

There is other evidence too that supports these findings. In the afternoon 5th June, the pupils started a new UOI titled ‘How we express ourselves.’ Pupils started by thinking about how they express themselves with the languages that they use. The task was to write about the languages they speak at home and school and about how they feel about expressing themselves in those languages. They were directed that they could use a colour or a symbol to represent how they feel. Although this activity was led by the English co-teacher and therefore all of the work produced for this lesson was in English, what the pupils wrote exemplifies some of the themes noted above.

Winston, a first language Cantonese pupil noted in the opening sentence of his essay:
‘My first language is Cantonese. I am fluent with speaking Cantonese but I am not really good at writing Chinese. At home I speak Cantonese with my mum and dad. I speak Cantonese in some of my classes outside of school. I have questioned some of my friends that study at local school and asked the language they speak, they say Cantonese. I think the colour that represents Cantonese is orange because I don’t like writing Cantonese but I like speaking it.’ (Excerpt Y5 essay, Winston).

Winston then went on to write about learning and speaking English, which he referred to as his ‘most common language’ He noted that he ‘finds is very easy because he can pronounce the words’. Finally, he wrote about Mandarin (Putonghua), which he cites as his ‘least favourite language’ as a consequence of it being ‘very hard because there are lots of words I have no idea how to write’ he closes his essay by stating that he wishes that ‘Mandarin had never been invented.’

In contrast to this, Jeffery, a first language Putonghua speaker, stated that he ‘hates’ Cantonese, but ‘kind of likes Mandarin:’

‘I hate Cantonese just the tone is so deep the accent and people in Hong Kong speak so loud that the language it’s like a man two feet away from his wife and needs to shout. Cantonese is red for complete madness.

I kind of like Mandarin because in my blood I’m Chinese but culture wise not so much. I know Chinese is language that can get quite far in life.’ (excerpt Y5 essay, Jeffery).

The notion of culture and pupils expectation about how they should feel or behave is a recurring theme in the data.

Jeffery wrote about his English, noting that he likes it because ‘it’s easy to understand and 26 letters, Chinese has 600,000 words itself and many phrases.’ This comparison of English to Chinese and the notion of it being easier and therefore more enjoyable is a recurring theme throughout the data.

Our final Y5 pupil, Ashley is a first language English speaker. In her essay, Ashley wrote:

‘I have a language which I prefer and use mostly, it is English. English is a language that stands for happiness to me. When I speak English to my friends and family we always laugh and giggle.’ (excerpt Y5 essay, Ashely).

Ashley went on to write about her association and experience of Chinese:

‘When grandma’s here she can’t speak fluent English, she can only speak fluent Cantonese so every time she is here we speak Cantonese……. I had lots of Chinese lessons and became really good at Chinese (Cantonese). When I think of Cantonese I think of anger, because Cantonese sounds really rough and when my mum scolds me she calls me my full Chinese name and scolds me in Cantonese.’ (excerpt from Y5 essay, Ashley).
Ashley associated her English and Cantonese languages (and names) with different uses, describing English as a language of laughter and Cantonese as the language which was used for discipline. This might represent her multi-membership to different communities of practice as she negotiated her different language identities.

In the Y5 classroom there were two recorded instances of Cantonese being spoken during classroom activities. On 4th May 2017, pupils had just started to think about writing their recount of the Hiroshima bomb. Winston leaned across the table to speak to one of his peers:

Winston: Do you know what you have got to do?

Winston’s peer looked at me and then back again at Winston and nodded. Winston replied:

Winston: Can I see?

In this interaction, it could be interpreted that the silence that met Winston’s request for support was a result of my presence in the classroom. The interview data suggested that pupils were not certain that they could use Cantonese in their interactions and this interaction seems to support this finding.

The second instance of Cantonese observed was between two pupils, neither of which were selected as participants in interview. On the 23rd February while pupils were working, a female student got up from her seat and walked over to the table close to where I was sitting. She picked up a pen from the pencil case of another female student and asked:

Can I borrow this? (holds up a pen)

Neither of the students seemed to notice my presence, or acknowledged me in anyway during the short interaction. Both of these examples might be classified as social interactions since they are peer interactions and did not specifically involve a discussion of the activity content. How students engaged in activities as part of the different communities of practice they are a part of, is mediated by their own personal histories which shapes their agency and identity as Cantonese language speakers. These four students were the only students I witnessed using Cantonese within the classroom, which supports the findings of the questionnaire and interview.
data, that pupils do not believe they were allowed to use Cantonese and that they saw the language as a social language.

5.3 Conclusion

The three key themes in the observational data, language hegemony, co-teaching enactment and pupil agency and participation within the bilingual classroom, have been explored through the use of supplementary artifacts collected during the observation period. These key themes support the themes evident in data from interviews and the questionnaire in Chapter 4, allowing for the triangulation of data to support these themes. The nine identified co-teaching models were used to analyse co-teaching enactment within the classroom. Data from enactments supported themes already identified. These themes are addressed in the following chapter, connecting the ideas to the literature and answering the research questions.
Chapter 6 Discussion

6.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the broad themes identified in the research findings and makes connections to the literature discussed in Chapter 2. The findings have been arranged under the research questions, namely:

1. To what extent are the ideals of the school language policy a reality in the co-taught bilingual classroom?
2. How is bilingual co-teaching enacted and understood by teachers?
3. How do bilingual co-teaching practices support pupil identities as language learners?

Following the discussion of each research question, a summary of the findings pertaining to each question is given. Chapter 7 where this thesis is concluded with its contribution to practice and opportunities for further research.

6.2 To What Extent are the Ideals of the School Language Policy a Reality in the Co-taught Bilingual Classroom?

The school language policy, as outlined in Section 1.5.1 aims to support bilingual and biliterate pupils through the use of co-teaching. There were three important aspects of the school language policy identified in Chapter 1.5.1 that are revisited here in relation to the discussion of findings:

1. Desire to support bilingualism (English and Putonghua) for all pupils
2. Assumed personal and cultural identities
3. Status and attitude to school languages

6.2.1 Desire to Support Bilingualism (English and Putonghua)

The language policy seeks to support bilingual development through the use of a co-taught, bilingual provision (see Chapter 1.5.1). Teachers are encouraged to ensure pupils are ‘balanced’ in their language use, drawing on English and Putonghua equally as part of the learning process. Pupil and teacher interviews, as well as observational data, evidence a dominance of English rather than language balance in classroom and wider school practices. This dominance reduces pupil exposure to Putonghua making it difficult for them to use both languages with the balance the policy seeks. The research findings therefore concur with the work of Pearson (2007) and MacLeod et al (2022) who both identified language input (exposure) as the most significant factor impacting language development (see discussion in Chapter 2.4.1). Pupil preference for English and the dominance of its use in resources, reduce language exposure, perpetuating a cycle of English dominance. Wang and Kirkpatrick (2013) in their study of trilingual learners in a
trilingual language environment in Hong Kong, also concluded that exposure, in this case, through additional tutoring classes in Putonghua outside of school, lead to higher proficiency in Putonghua than by pupil and teacher effort alone. For the majority of pupils in this study, additional Putonghua exposure would need to take place with tutors, as most of the pupils do not have exposure to Putonghua outside of the classroom setting. Language development without community support through language exposure, whether this is at home or within the wider community, is difficult to overcome.

As argued in Chapter 2.4.1, a focus only on language exposure would treat language learners as information processing machines and not as children with agency. It would ignore the sociocultural and historical context of each child as well as their motivations to learn each language. Pearson (2007) recognised four factors, other than input, that influence bilingualism: language status, access to literacy, family language use and community support (Chapter 2.4). The findings of this research suggest that it is impossible to isolate these facets: instead they can all be seen as part of language exposure since they are complex and overlapping.

The school language policy appears to support a view of language development as information processing (see Section 1.5.1) and this view was shown to be shared by some of the co-teachers within this research. On the one hand it states that ‘all teachers are language teachers’, but on the other, gives no guidance as to how teachers should support language learning to be effective for all pupils. Without any guidance on effective support for language learning, there was confusion noted in teacher interviews about the place of Cantonese, which ultimately led to the devaluing of this linguistic resource. Murray (1996) called for teachers to capitalize on the diversity of pupil experiences and backgrounds in language learning, encouraging a celebration of linguistic diversity. Since then, there have been many more calls like this (Chik, 2014; Kissman, 2020; Gaspard de Galbert and Woogen, 2021). The policy expects equal exposure to each language without taking account of the complex language backgrounds of the children or how these might be celebrated or used to support their linguistic development.

It was evidenced in teacher interviews that they had different opinions about their role as teachers and whether this included a role as a language teacher. The Y3 team believed that exposure alone was enough to support language development, and therefore their role was to teach lesson content and to encourage pupils to use increasing amounts of Putonghua in their communication. This view of language learning does not take into consideration the fact that language learning and language use is much more than information processing. As already argued in Chapter 2, it is the transformation of social relations and identities (Lin, 1997). Within Y3 these young bilingual pupils were mainly Cantonese first language speakers and were trying to learn Putonghua, a language that for most pupils, is not a community or home language. Kirkpatrick and Wang (2014) argue that pupils in learning environments where Putonghua is used, but where they do not have proficiency to discuss and present ideas effectively, will suffer in terms of their proficiency, potentially even losing interest in the subject. The differences in responses to the questionnaire between Y3 and Y5 pupils does provide some evidence that pupils were less interested in Putonghua as they got older. To attribute this fall in interest to pupil struggles with proficiency, however, would be an oversimplification of
individual pupil interest, investment, history and identities with the language and its use.

English is also a second language for most of the pupils. The difference is that English is a community language within Hong Kong and most pupils have some access to it in the home environment even if only with domestic helpers. Pupils therefore have more exposure to English and their relationship with the language is different, since Hong Kong has historical and cultural ties to it. In addition, as Besser and Chik (2014) note, English is also a desired form of linguistic capital (within Hong Kong) due to its perceived advantages for social and economic mobility. How each language is valued and used within the community impacts pupil motivation and investment.

In interviews it was noted that one of the great success stories in Y3 was Angela, who had very little English language skills on arrival to the classroom (Section 4.3.1.2). Given the views of the Y3 team about language development, it might be surprising that Angela has made so much progress in her English language learning. However, her interview gave some evidence of her motivation and investment in language learning. Angela noted the importance of English to communicate with friends, and her understanding that English has economic benefit for her future (Section 4.2.2). Angela’s acculturation into English is supported by the work of Schumann (2006). Angela become part of the dominant language group and this is seen in her changing participation within the classroom. As noted by the Y3EC, when she arrived at the school ‘she did not speak’ (Section 4.3.1.2).

Angela’s progress or learning trajectory is signified in her changing engagement noted by her teacher. Angela had moved from periphery to fuller participation as she grew in confidence and competence in her language use, and her developing identity as a bilingual. Angela’s investment in learning English as well as the dominance of English with the classroom and wider community, supported her linguistic development. Schumann (2006) identifies eight factors that determine the favourable and unfavourable conditions for language learning (Section 2.2.1). Social dominance is one such favourable condition and, as already argued, English is the dominant classroom language. Angela was motivated to learn English (Section 4.2.2), giving her a positive attitude towards the language, which provides favourable conditions for learning. The majority of pupils in this study were first language Cantonese speakers; this put Angela, as a first language Putonghua speaker, into the minority language group, decreasing her chances of being able to communicate in her mother tongue and again increasing her English exposure.

Conversely, the Y5 team identified they wanted to support language learning, seeing themselves as language teachers, while acknowledged the difficulty of doing this alongside content teaching, which they saw as a competing demand on them, as teachers, and for the pupils, as learners. They acknowledged the importance of pupil motivation, as a potential barrier to language development, as well as the difficulties of learning two languages that are not their mother tongue. Many of the complexities of language learning are therefore understood by the team. They understood the tensions that had been created by the language policy, as well as appreciating the important aspects of language learning, such as, exposure, home and community
support as well as pupil investment in the language. They lacked the tools, however, (classrooms resources, time and training) to be able to meet the diversity of pupil needs as well as confidence in their understanding of language development.

Chapter 2.3 noted the difficulty of finding resources that support language learning in a Hong Kong context. This difficulty was acknowledged by all teachers, but was also raised by Chloe (see Section 4.2.2) when discussing opportunities for reading in Putonghua. It is clear that the availability of literature impacts pupil exposure to Putonghua, both within the classroom and socially as part of their enjoyment of literature. All teacher participants cited a lack of adequate resources as one of the reasons for English dominance within the classroom. Artifacts collected during classroom observations show that resources are in English, even when Station Teaching is utilised in Chinese. Language exposure for Putonghua is therefore tied to access to resources and literacy and not separate from them. The unique nature of learning Putonghua within the context of Hong Kong exposes the complexities behind bilingual development for these young learners.

In both the questionnaire data and pupil interviews, pupils made reference to the difficulty of learning Chinese as opposed to English, therefore stating their preference for English use and accounting, in part for the English dominance within the classroom setting. Each of the pupils within this bilingual setting are part of different imagined communities (Norton, 1997). As previously argued (Chapter 2.6.1), these communities can be understood through learner investment: that is, learner investment in the target language and the conditions in which they are able to use the language. In the case of Putonghua, most of the pupils only had access to it as part of the classroom practices as it was not a community language.

One might therefore perceive these pupils as having a low investment in the target language. Pupil interviews however, illustrated that this was not always the case with pupils in both Y3 and Y5 noting the importance of language learning for future prospects in employment, travel and the importance of speaking Putonghua while living in China (Chapter 4.2.1.1). These attitudes to the importance of language learning are congruent with the findings in Kirkpatrick and Wang (2014) in their interviews with Hong Kong parents. They reported that English was the most important world language and that Putonghua was increasingly becoming important in particular for their children’s generation. Investment is socially and historically constructed. The political history of Hong Kong has no doubt shaped attitudes to English and Putonghua and it continues to do so as we move ever closer to 2047, shaping parent and pupil attitudes and investment in languages. As Bourdieu (2012) argues, if language learners are going to invest in learning another language, they do so with the understanding that they are also acquiring symbolic and material resources that carry value in the social world. This can be seen in the pupil interview responses about the importance of language learning noted above. An investment in language learning is therefore an investment in a pupils’ identities (discussed in Section 6.2.2).

Family language use situates pupils in different sociocultural worlds with differential access to classroom languages. They therefore arrive to the classroom setting from different sociocultural worlds which shape their access to language learning and language use, enabling and constraining their participation and modes of belonging as part of the classroom communities. The classroom rhetoric, noted in teacher
interview (Section 4.3.1.1), that purports the ideal of a balanced acquisition and use of both languages is therefore not realistic for all pupils.

The language policy seeks bilingual proficiency in two languages that for many pupils is not inclusive of their mother tongue. The classroom observations found very limited evidence of Cantonese language use, and it was restricted to social interactions between pupils. Despite the policy allowing for conceptualization in their mother tongue, there were little or no opportunities for pupils to do this due to teacher language backgrounds, teachers hiding their Cantonese language skills, or confusion amongst teachers about the place of Cantonese within the language policy. Questionnaire data, as well as pupil interviews noted a hierarchy of languages where English was perceived as the most important language and Cantonese reported as not being valued. This research shares the view of Lin (1997) who argues, ‘it is highly doubtful that a schooling policy that aims at the development of proficiency in language excluding the mother tongue of the child can be said to be conducive to the development of the child’s potential’ (p.433). See Section 6.2.3 below for a discussion about the place of Cantonese.

6.2.2 Assumed Personal and Cultural Identities
As noted in the previous section, the school language policy seeks to support pupils to become bilingual. The policy also refers to developing a pupil’s ‘personal and cultural identity’. This research has identified that many of the pupils at the school are learning more languages than this, and in some cases are multilingual (Appendix 4 and 5). This research therefore takes the view that the language policy does not represent the linguistic diversity and backgrounds of the pupils it seeks to support. In addition, the assumption that learning English and Putonghua will support their personal and cultural identities is problematic.

Pupil interviews with both Y3 and Y5 highlighted some of the inherent problems with making assumptions about someone’s personal and cultural identities (interview Angela Appendix 9 and Winston Appendix 10). Emerging from the thematic analysis was the fact that both pupils make the connection that your culture is dictated by the languages you speak. The pupils were therefore situated in two or more cultures, where they cultivate their bilingual or multilingual identities, in a process that is fundamental to language learning (Chik, 2014). As pupils negotiate their language and cultural identities, school language dominance shapes how these pupils position themselves culturally and linguistically.

The language policy assumes a Chinese cultural and personal identity, but it is unclear if this is inclusive of a Hong Kongese identity. Kevin referred to his Hong Kongese identity, whereas Winston referenced a Chinese identity. Angela spoke about her friends acting Cantonese despite speaking English (Section 4.2.1.1). This exemplifies the findings above that the pupils understood there to be a strong link between language and culture. Miller (2000) argues that ‘if pupils cannot be heard representing themselves and enacting social roles in ways that other pupils can recognise, a degree of exclusion from social interaction seems inevitable’ (p.73). In this case, Angela was in the minority as a non-Cantonese speaker. It would be interesting to know how Angela’s behaviour as a non-Cantonese speaker was interpreted by her English speaking Cantonese friends. Did she appear to act in a
way that is perceived as congruent to her linguistic background?. Pupils position themselves and others, as they negotiate their identities, each of which has consequences for their social interactions (Kayi-ayder, 2014).

Angela and her friends’ behaviours, as described by Angela in her interview, reveal one of the ways in which these young bilingual children can express their agency, culturally and linguistically, despite not being able to access their Cantonese language skills in the classroom (see discussion 6.2.3). Agency plays a critical role in language identity negotiation (Besser and Chik, 2014; Collett, 2018) (Section 2.1.2). As Holland et al (1998) note, behaviour is mediated by a person’s identity, defined as a sense of self. Identity is therefore dynamic (Section 2.1.1), it takes multiple forms and is embedded in social practice. Identities are shaped by social positioning, and where identities are imposed on a language learner, this could shape their opportunities for agency. In the example given above, Angela’s friends exert their agency in their Cantonese behaviour. They are happy to speak in English, a language that unites them, but refuse to match the perceived need for a change in behaviour. Angela appears to position this behaviour differently to what she would expect of individuals speaking in English. Wenger (1998) notes that we do not only produce identities through the practices we engage with, such as speaking in English, we also define ourselves through the practices we choose not engage in, for example changing our expected behaviour norms. Other evidence of this in the findings was noted in the change in pupil behaviour during Chinese lessons (Section 4.3.1.1).

Another example of pupil agency can be seen in the interview with Chloe (Y3) who is learning Fujian Chinese. She referred to Cantonese as ‘normal Chinese’ (Section 4.2.1.1), which suggests she was connected to the language and saw it as a valuable part of her identity, and a normal part of her linguistic repertoire. She talked about Fujian as her ‘own type of Chinese’. She meant that it’s the language that she connects with her family in Mainland China. Using words like ‘normal’ or ‘her own’ as opposed to dialect or social language, attributes value to the languages that she speaks and is likely to represent her investment in each of these languages. Her ownership of these languages also represented her agency in actively positioning herself as a multilingual pupil, as she took on the identities associated with each language.

Like the pupils in Miller’s (2007) study, which illustrated how positioning a pupil as a good or poor language learner shaped classroom participation and language learning experience, the findings of this research have found the same. Winston (Y5) reported that he feels stressed by the teachers perspective that he is good at Chinese (Section 4.2.1.1). His positioning as a competent language learner afforded him opportunities not available to other pupils perceived as less competent in Putonghua. These opportunities, supported his learning and opportunities for language development. In Y3, Angela, as a competent Putonghua speaker, received CMI (Section 4.2.1.2). Both of these opportunities enabled the pupils to be cognitively challenged in Putonghua and increased their individual exposure to the language in ways that pupils positioned as less competent did not. This means that while some pupils will be empowered by their linguistic skills in some or all classroom settings, others may develop a deficit understanding of themselves as language learners.
The assumed identity that Winston (Y5) is thought to have, and his positioning as a competent Putonghua speaker had not supported a positive identity for him as a language learner. Not only did he not feel Chinese inside, he felt stressed about how his teachers have positioned him (Section 5.2.3). His feelings are so strong that in his essay he wrote that he ‘wished Putonghua had never been invented’. Winston only felt Chinese within the context of an international school (See transcript Appendix 10). He recognised aspects of his identity that he associates with being Chinese, but his international education and perceived linguistic abilities also place him outside of how he expected to feel and act as an international school pupil. Jabal (2010) writes about a ‘forth culture’ to describe an international school setting, that captures a little of what Winston might be feeling.

6.2.3 Status and Use of Classroom Languages
Chapter 2.1.1 argued that hegemonic language ideologies arise as a result of power relations in society where the language resources of some social groups become elevated over others conferring social advantage. In Mainland China, the government has been encouraging the use of Putonghua as the lingua franca even for those that do not speak it as a first language (Wang and Kirkpatrick, 2014). Local dialects, such as Cantonese, are not allowed to be used in mass media and government offices or schools, a ruling of the national Language Law 2001. While Hong Kong has the autonomy to determine its own policy on language, it recognises the importance of Putonghua as the national language of China and therefore, its cultural, political and economic value. At the same time, within Hong Kong, Cantonese is viewed as a ‘home language’ (Wang and Kirkpatrick, 2014) and therefore has little status outside of social settings. As noted in Chapter 1.2, many parents of the children at the school enrol their children to gain access to Putonghua because of their beliefs that it will offer important opportunities for their children in the future. Evidence from pupil interviews (Section 6.2.1) recognises that the children were also aware of the linguistic and cultural capital they were building. These cultural language valuations that circulate as part of the community are reflected in institutional policies and taken up in classroom practices.

As already noted in Section 6.2.1, the language policy focuses on achieving bilingual and biliterate pupil identities. Cantonese as the mother tongue of the majority of the pupils is not given a formal place as part of the curriculum. Within the language policy it is referred to as a ‘dialect’ and as a ‘social language’. These are views that circulate as part of the wider community, as well as attitudes that are reported in the literature (Wang and Kirkpatrick, 2013; Cheung, 2014; Ng and Zhao, 2014). Parents at the school are keen to ban the use of Cantonese completely, believing that it spoils an individual’s ability to learn Putonghua with any accuracy. What they mean by this, is that teaching Chinese literacy (Standard Written Chinese) through the use of oral Putonghua has the advantage that the words match the speech directly, ‘*my hand writes [what] my mouth [speaks]*’ (我手寫我口). Cantonese on the other hand varies greatly and many of the words do not have a written form (Poon, 2010).
These language valuations are taken up within the school, influencing how and when pupils can access their mother tongue to support their understanding and language identities. Many of the children interviewed reported that they found writing in Chinese to be difficult when compared to English and this accounted, in part, for their language choices in the classroom.

There is evidence in the data, of this language hierarchy whereby English was the dominant language and most important, not least because it is the language of their final IB exams, and Putonghua being of next importance. The pupils’ perceived value of Cantonese is linked to the context of its use, with both English and Putonghua having status within the school due to their perceived usefulness for exams and future employability. The language policy that states that Cantonese can be used where ‘possible’ or where ‘necessary’ feeds pupil and teacher narratives about language use within the school. The use of ambiguous phrases such as ‘where necessary’ are the opposite of encouragement and so although Cantonese use is allowed within the classroom for conceptualisation, teacher and pupils perceive that this is not the case.

Given these findings it is perhaps not surprising that Cantonese has a low status within the school despite a reported preference for its use by pupils outside of school (Figure 4.17 and 4.18). As Lin (1997) argues, Cantonese is placed at the bottom of the language hierarchy, even though it is socially and culturally an important language for the majority of people in Hong Kong.

This research shares the views of Wang and Kirkpatrick (2014) who argue that it is unnatural and unnecessary to forbid the use of other languages within the classroom. The opportunity to switch between languages, to support the linguistic challenges of learning in a language other than your mother tongue, is an important part of the learning process. There was some evidence in teacher interviews of a contrary belief, that Cantonese use within the classroom would not support language learning. This belief resulted in the Y5CC trying to hide her Cantonese language identity to prevent them using Cantonese in class. The teacher believed she was following language policy and supporting pupil language learning, however, learning is not separate from culture, social relations, identity or situated social practice (Lin, 1997) and so it is important to embrace the diversity of pupil experiences that they bring to the classroom to support their learning and language identities. As argued in Wang and Kirkpatrick (2014), using Cantonese (as the pupils’ mother tongue) in the language classroom can facilitate language learning.

In Y5 language essays each pupil spoke about their languages and tied them to the context and experiences of their use (Section 5.2.3). Both Ashley and Jeffery bring to the classroom context these views about their home and community languages, and in particular a negative disposition towards Cantonese. This negative disposition shapes their investment in and motivation for Cantonese. In the school context where Cantonese has already been defined as a social language with no value or place within the formal classroom setting, there is a growing marginalisation of the language and with it the Cantonese identities of pupils and teachers.

There was evidence of perceived identity marginalisation as a result of language status in teacher interviews too. The Y3 teaching team reported that ‘Mainlanders are not respected’ (Y3EC Appendix 11) and that mother tongue language
determined whether you would be promoted within the school (Y5CC Appendix 12).
The feeling from both Y3 co-teachers was that Putonghua first language teachers are marginalized within the school. This perceived segregation between teaching staff as a consequence of first language was supported by the Y5CC interview when she noted that there are distinct language groups, although she did not go so far as to say one group was advantaged over the other. Gu (2010) argues that individuals who have the same ethnicity (Chinese), ‘still experience linguistic and cross cultural obstacles to their socialization’ (p.17). The existence of two perceived language groups within the Chinese teaching community could therefore represent evidence of these obstacles. Gu (2010) problematised the uncritical assumption that individuals within a multilingual setting have equal rights and opportunities in their language learning. This could be extended to include opportunities for language teachers as they draw on their languages as symbolic resources within the setting.

6.2.4 Summary of Research Question 1
The school language policy seeks to support bilingual language development. Its starting point is an understanding that pupils have a Chinese personal and linguistic identity which this research has found to be problematic. Pupil identities connected to language and their sociocultural histories are multiple and complex. A focus on bilingualism does not allow for the celebration of pupil linguistic diversity and for some pupils the assumed Chinese identity constrains their learning and participation within the classroom.

The language policy encourages pupils to produce their classwork in both English and Putonghua with the aim of being balanced in both languages. In this way, the school is expecting pupils to code switch in their oral contributions as well as their classroom writing, although this term is not specifically used or referred to. Pupils used their agency in their language choices, which was represented in a dominance of English language use. Despite the dominance of English, with the support and encouragement of their teachers all pupils were all able to produce work and acquire linguistic skills in both of the classroom languages. The findings suggest that this was not without consequence for the children. Positional identities as language learners within the classroom supported language learning for some and constrained it for others.

Pupils reported mixed feelings about their language learning as a result of school policy and a perceived language hierarchy. There was confusion reported in teacher interview about the use of Cantonese within the classroom and a clear understanding from pupils that it was not allowed. This rejection of their mother tongue in favour of classroom languages has created an explicit hierarchy in which some pupils and teachers do not feel their language and cultural identities are acknowledged.

6.3 How is Bilingual Co-teaching Enacted and Understood by Teachers?
In order to show how co-teaching perspectives shaped teacher enactment, this discussion is separated into key themes that represent separate findings about how
teacher perspectives of co-teaching directly shaped their practices. The three parts are as follows:

1. Dual role as content and language specialist
2. Pupil and teacher linguistic resources
3. The co-teaching relationship

### 6.3.1 Dual Role as a Content and Language Specialist

Teacher perspectives about co-teaching varied between the two teams. In Y3 there was the belief that co-teaching was used as a ‘marketing ploy’ (Y3EC) and that it was a way to reduce the pupil-teacher ratios (Y3CC). Conversely both of the teachers in Y5 recognised that the model was there to support children with their language learning. The perspectives these teachers held influenced their approach to co-teaching. The Y5 team, as noted in an earlier discussion (Section 6.2.1.), believed that they were not just classroom teachers of content, and planned their lessons accordingly. There was evidence of this in the range of co-taught models utilised in the video transcribed observations. The team drew on six of the nine possible models utilizing team teaching most often (Figure 5.6). Gurgur and Uzuner (2011) argue that Team Teaching (along with Station Teaching) are the most time intensive in terms of planning. The Y5 team noted that they spent a lot of time planning, in particular to meet their learning intensions for language learning.

Gurgur and Uzuner (2011) note that no co-teaching model is superior to any other. This research, however, does not agree with this finding. It should be noted that Gurgur and Uzuner’s (2011) research took place within the special educational needs setting and not a language classroom, which might account for the differences in findings. Currently, there has been no research into co-teaching model effectiveness within the bilingual dual immersion classroom setting. The findings of the current study has found that the intentional use of Team Teaching and within this, the mindful approach, with both teachers sat together at the front of the classroom bought a sense of equity to the teachers and the classroom languages. Team Teaching supports pupils in accessing their linguistic resources as there are natural opportunities for translanguaging, since both teachers and languages are present. The Y5 teachers made an effort to ensure they were not translating each other, instead, each used their language of instruction within the classroom space to build on what had been said, to clarify or elaborate. Pupils were therefore unable to wait for translation in their preferred language and instead engaged and listened, while making agentive choices about how and when they responded in each language.

The two One Teach, One Float models (English lead or Chinese lead) also allow for these natural translanguaging opportunities, but the languages are not positioned with equal status within these models. A dominance of One Teach, One Float in which one language dominates the ‘teach’ part, can send unintentional messages to language learners about the value of one language compared to another. There was evidence of this in pupil interview data, in which pupils reported a perceived
language hierarchy, where by English was perceived as the most important language within the school as a consequence of its dominance.

The Y3 team, who did not see the purpose of co-teaching to be about language development, did not intentionally plan for language learning, instead focusing on lesson content. They drew heavily on the One Teach (English), One Float (Chinese) model. Both teachers recognised that pupils were more confident and competent in English language skills and it therefore made sense for them to draw on a language and teaching model that supported their understanding of lesson content. The Y3 team also drew on two other models, Parallel Teaching and Station Teaching.

In both of these models, the Y3 team set them up to be monolingual with a small number of children working with a single teacher in a single language. In the Parallel Teaching example, only pupils perceived as competent in Putonghua were able to access the group to work on their Maths. In Station Teaching, all pupils circulated through the different stations and therefore received instruction in both languages at different times. However, working monolingually does not create the natural opportunities for translanguaging in the way that Team Teaching and to a lesser degree, One Teach, One Float would. In an analysis of co-teacher perspectives on language learning in a bilingual context, Dillon and Gallagher (2019) note that translanguaging is an important aspect of co-teaching. This research supports this position, taking the view that language separation in monolingual Station or Parallel Teaching does not give pupils a flexible approach to understanding the functional interrelationships between their languages, in the way that translanguaging would.

6.3.2 Pupil and Teacher Linguistic Resources
The findings from the data, evidence a pupil preference for English language use (Chapter 5). The video transcribed lesson observations also showed a significant difference in time spent in each language (Section 5.2.1). The Y3 team believe that Chinese is hard for the children to master, noting that when the children want to express an idea in their writing, the Chinese co-teacher has to write down every word for them to copy.

As noted in Section 6.3.1, the Y3 team drew heavily on the One Teach (English), One Float (Chinese) model of instruction. The perspective that children find access to Chinese more difficult than English, is likely one of the key drivers for this instructional choice. The findings (Section 5.2.1) showed that the Chinese interactions within the utilised model were facilitated by the English co-teacher. In each of the instances where Putonghua was used, it was the actions of the English co-teacher that initiated the Chinese teachers participation. In addition, the contributions were mainly used to restate instructions that had already been given in English. In her interview, the Y3CC noted that she did this so the children get to hear the instructions in Chinese as well. Gurgur and Uzuner (2011) argue that in successful co-teaching it is important that the teachers make decisions together and that they share responsibility for all aspects of the planning, teaching and marking. Dillon and Gallagher (2019) note that this shared responsibility is required to meet the diverse needs of the pupils within a co-taught language classroom. Teacher linguistic resources also shape the use of instructional models. The Y3 team did not draw on One Teach (Chinese), One Float (English) since the children did not yet have the linguistic skills to access the lesson content and the English co-teacher did
not have the linguistic skills in Chinese to understand what is being said and to offer the support needed, for the children to access the lesson content in this way.

In contrast to this, the Y5 team were able to utilise One Teach (Chinese), One Float (English), despite the English co-teacher also being monolingual. Their success is likely to be a combination of the children’s age and linguistic development in Chinese, as well as the co-teachers careful planning for language development as a result of their perceived identities as language teachers.

The Y5 team’s careful planning and wide ranging use of instructional models facilitated a more equitable balance between the two classroom languages. The teachers were aware of the dominance of English and pupil preferences for its use, leveraging this insight to support their planning. For example, the Y5EC noted that she always starts the lesson during Team Teaching. This practice, however, is balanced against the times when the co-teachers draw on One Teach (Chinese), One Float (English), giving the pupils exposure to Putonghua as well as giving the Chinese teacher and her language, equal status within the classroom. Teacher linguistic resources, in this example, do not constrain pupil access to language learning.

Classroom language dominance at times, is outside of the teachers control, despite careful planning. For example, the lack of availability of resources in Chinese to support classroom instruction and pupil preference for English as a result of the perceived difficulty in using Chinese. In interview, the Y5 Chinese teacher describes Chinese as ‘torture’ for the pupils who find Chinese ‘boring’ (Y5CC Appendix 12). Both examples exemplify the struggles that co-teachers are trying to mitigate against.

### 6.3.3 Co-teacher Relationship

The Y3 teaching team both recounted the development of their teaching partnership. The opportunity to learn from each other is well documented in the literature, encouraging the development of professional skills, and opportunities for mutual confidence-building as classroom practitioners (Bianchi and Murphy, 2014; Schwarz and Gorgatt, 2018; Dillon and Gallagher, 2019). Teacher relationships are fundamental to the enactment of successful co-teaching. Schwarz and Gorgatt (2018) note that teachers undergo three stages in their co-teaching relationship, that are perceived as fundamental to building understanding and communication. The first stage is noted as, initial relationship building, where the co-teachers learn about each other’s cultural background and share prior professional knowledge. The second phase is curriculum planning and decision making on the instructional content, and the final stage is ongoing problem solving. In this final phase, teachers are thought to undergo a process of reconsidering their language ideologies and language practices. This research contests these stages, instead arguing for a far more nuanced and non-linear progression and development of the co-teachers relationship and thus their identities.

One of the teachers explained that he and his partner had particular curriculum strengths that they drew on as part of their teaching. This could place the Y3 team in phase two or phase three according to Schwarz and Gorgatt (2018). It appears the team are planning the curriculum (phase two) but equally one might argue that delivery according to perceived strengths is a negotiation as part of the ongoing problem solving process. The Y3EC also noted that he and his teaching partner
have ‘made a real effort to model that there is no difference between us or the languages’. Would this be part of the problem solving phase? One could argue that they are trying to represent themselves as united and the same, to anchor both teachers equally within the setting, which would be phase three. Alternatively, it could be argued that this is the initial phase: cultural understanding has not yet been achieved since they are not able to understand difference and celebrate it to support pupil language learning and identities, instead trying to minimise differences, potentially marginalising aspects of pupil and teacher identity. This research argues that cultural understanding is an ongoing process since culture is not static. It therefore features in every stage of relationship development and co-teaching success.

The research findings are in agreement with Schwarz and Gorgatt (2018) that the first stage is characterised with the sharing of prior professional experience, a ‘getting to know each other’ which in this research included expectation setting for working together, although it is noted that no guidance was given to support this process. The research findings also argue that the second and third stage of Schwarz and Gorgatt (2018) model, are both part of the ongoing phase (phase three) which is seen as more nuanced and in constant flux as teachers negotiate and re-negotiate their identities as co-teachers. Figure 6.1 captures the co-teaching early phase relationship development as understood from the research findings.

![Figure 6.1 Early phase development of co-teaching identities](image)

In this early phase of co-teacher development, the two teachers are aware of the differences in culture, language ideologies and practices and their identities as subject teachers that they bring to the classroom. They negotiate and plan the curriculum from these different standpoints. At different times, they are likely to draw on the expertise of one another. Crucial to this phase is that the co-teachers are each negotiating curriculum planning and pedagogical practices from their own vantage point. They have not yet begun to influence each other’s practice or ideologies.

![Figure 6.2 Ongoing phase in the development of co-teaching identities](image)
In the ongoing phase (Figure 6.2 above) co-teachers begin to change their practices, embracing differences in support of one another. The two teachers develop co-teacher identities that encompass cultural understanding, approaches to curriculum planning and language ideologies and practices. Evidence of this phase can be seen in the Y5 teacher data (Section 4.3.2.1). They were able to recognise difference in their approaches and with it, the struggles that each partner faces. There was also recognition that teaching practices had changed as a result of co-teaching.

In interview the Y3EC noted parent preference for emailing in English. It is interesting to note that the interpretation of this practice was understood differently by each of the co-teaching teams. The Y5 team did not view this as a problem, instead understanding it as a linguistic norm of working in Hong Kong. The Y5CC was Hong Kongese and therefore understood the cultural and linguistic context of Hong Kong and the challenges that parents might face expressing themselves in written Chinese. This therefore might represent a deeper understanding of the cultural and linguistic identities of parents in Hong Kong, that shapes their own attitudes to their role as a language teacher within the international bilingual school.

6.3.4 Summary of Research Question 2

The findings of this research indicate that a teacher’s understanding of co-teaching shapes their enactment. Teachers that understood co-teaching as a support structure for bilingual language development, enacted co-teaching instructional models that facilitated translanguaging and equal access to the target languages. Teachers that understood co-teaching differently, for example, to reduce teacher–pupil ratios, paid less attention to enacting models that support bilingualism, instead focusing on models that supported pupil access to the broader school curriculum.

Team Teaching was found to be the most important model to facilitate translanguaging and therefore language development in the co-taught classroom. The two One Teach, One Float models (Section 3.7.2) were also found to facilitate translanguaging but their use positioned the two languages differently, which could inadvertently support the ongoing narratives about language status that were seen to circulate as part of the community and school practices.

All teachers noted the importance of the relationship they had with their teaching partner as being integral to their practice. This supports the findings of previous research into co-teaching practices. The model of relationship building within a co-taught language classroom found in Schwarz and Gorgatt (2018) is contested within the research findings. The three phases, as proposed by Schwarz and Gorgatt (2018), are instead seen as two phases, the second of which is ongoing and the result of developing co-teacher identities in which the co-teacher practices are shaped as a result of the partnership and their developing understanding and respect for one another. The international curricula and western pedagogical inquiry approach, meant that there was much flexibility on the part of the Chinese co-teacher in particular, to meet the expectations of practice within a co-taught classroom. All teachers noted the absence of training, that would help to facilitate understanding in new teaching partnerships.
6.4 How do Bilingual Co-teaching Practices Support Pupil Identities as Language Learners?

Bilingual co-teaching practices shape the pupil’s figured worlds. As argued in Section 2.1.2 learning is the transformation of identity. Pupil linguistic competence and belonging evolve together as they participate in their communities negotiating understanding (Wenger, 1998). As Holland (2000) asserts, identities are ‘possibilities for mediating agency’ (p.51). Identities construction are therefore processes of negotiation between these sites of agency and with it, possibilities for belonging.

The pupils in this study used their agency to determine their participation and non-participation within each of their communities, shaping their identities as language learners and their sense of belonging within the classroom setting.

1. Translanguaging as an identity of participation
2. Non-participation and subtractive bilingualism

6.4.1 Translanguaging as an Identity of Participation

In observational data, there was evidence of pupils using their agency in their language choices, supporting their identities as language learners. Co-teachers acknowledged that the children sometimes choose to respond in English as opposed to Chinese, despite the dialogue being led in Chinese. The children were using their agency to determine how they wanted to communicate. They were making decisions about their participation with their classroom communities. The school policy could be described as a monolingual ideology in which pupils are expected to use one language at a time, with each teacher, as part of the schools approach to bilingual development. In the case of Ashley, noted above, the Chinese teacher did not challenge her on her English language use, but she did respond to her question in Chinese. This research takes the view that this type of heteroglossic or multiple languages approach to pupil participation enables bilingual individuals to express themselves and create meaning and identities as a language learners. The ongoing dialogue within the classroom setting, led by the Chinese teacher, allowed pupils to engage and participate in the learning, while using their agency to determine their language of expression. Code-switching as a translanguaging practice (Goodman and Tastanbek, 2021; Sayer, 2013) gives pupils access to the learning community, through participation and language choice, supporting the development of positive language identities. As Garcia-Mateus and Palmer (2017) note, translanguaging serves to give a space for pupils to co-construct identities and negotiate meanings.

Garcia et al (2017) propose that bilingual pupils translanguage in their writing, not just their oral communication. They suggest that in a written composition, translanguaging includes writing in a single language, if the pupil has used their bilingualism to compose or evaluate their writing or if they have used transliteration by using phonology from one language to write characters in another (Lee and Garcia, 2021). All of the pupil work samples showed a dominance of English. Pupils
took different approaches to communicating their written ideas in the two classroom languages. Some pupils repeating their written work, for example, writing in one language (usually English), followed by a translation of the same information in the other language (usually Chinese). Other pupils switched languages, so that rather than repeating written work, they offered continuous prose and line of argument switching between languages, usually a paragraph at a time. In interview, Winston gave us insight into his written work, when he described his approaches to writing. He shared that he uses Google Translate to find the Pinyin (an alphabetised Chinese). The Pinyin helps him with the pronunciation of characters (Lee and Kalyuga, 2011). Using the Pinyin in this way, is a form of translanguaging or transliteration. He is using his knowledge of the alphabet to support character pronunciation. He is drawing on his knowledge of one language to support his communication in another. Chloe too draws on translanguaging practices when she notes that she needs to think about what she wants to write in English first. Once she knows what she wants to say, she is able to translate it, one word at a time into Chinese (which she does herself without assistance). She notes that she just can’t write directly in Chinese (Section 4.2.1.2). Here, Chloe is drawing on her linguistic skills in one language to support communication in another, but using a different technique to Winston.

Chloe’s perceived competence in Chinese shaped her identities of belonging as a language learner. Chloe appeared invested in her Putonghua learning, noting that languages are important for communication. She was learning two other types of Chinese and so her investment in Chinese language learning was supported by her home environment. Besser and Chik (2014) found that parents play a significant role in language identity development, through a socialisation into a belief about the importance of language learning. While Chloe appeared to be invested in her language learning, she did not appear to be confident. She reported that it ‘sounds weird’ when she hears herself speak in Chinese. Holland et al (2008) posit that behaviour is mediated by a person’s identities (Section 2.6.2). Chloe considered herself a first language English speaker, and she took on the identity of a pupil that is not confident in her Chinese language learning (translating her writing in secret from English). Chloe participated in class by exerting her agency through improvisations, as she created and moulded the activities through her use of translation and overwriting her work (Collett, 2018). Holland et al (2008) argue that this type of identity development happens in the figured worlds of the pupils that is specific and unique to the individual (Chapter 2.6.2).

6.4.2 Non-participation and Subtractive Bilingualism
As noted in Section 4.2.1.2 a number of the children drew heavily on Google Translate to help them with their writing. This practice represents pupils using their agency to facilitate and support their language learning identities. Winston however, perceived his agency differently, positioning himself as a cheat (Appendix 10). He considered translating his work a waste of paper as it is the same work, in a different language. His frustrations with himself and his language learning, shaped his identities as a language learner. As noted earlier (Section 6.2.2), Winston did not feel Chinese inside and reported that he wished Putonghua had never been
invented. Yihong et al (2005) in their study of identity changes among Chinese undergraduates found that changes to a pupil’s cultural identity was linked to their English language proficiency, where an increased proficiency resulted in greater cultural identity changes. Winston reported that English was his mother tongue as its the language that he used most often, despite his parents speaking to him in Cantonese. This could be a sign of subtractive bilingualism in which is native culture and identity are replaced by English (Section 2.2.2). His identity as a bilingual language learner is not fully supported by the classroom practices that see English dominate and this shapes his identities as a language learner and how he views his own linguistic identities.

Additional evidence of subtractive bilingualism can be seen in the case of Angela. Angela (Y3) considered Putonghua to be her mother tongue language as it is the language she speaks the most. In interview however, Angela reported that she considered herself more fluent in English than Putonghua. As a young bilingual, Angela was exposed to a dominance of English which resulted in language fluency in English that she perceived to have taken over her fluency in Chinese. In the case of both Angela and Winston (above), the data reveal the subtractive power of the school language policy and practices that unintentionally influence pupil identities as language learners. The language hierarchy found to be present in the school, that places Cantonese as a dialect or social language, restricts pupil use to their language resources that could support their learning and participation. In this way, pupil home language backgrounds and identities are denied legitimacy within the classroom, shaping how they claim and participate in their language identities.

Pupils in this research were shown to have a clear understanding of the linguistic skills of their peers. In other words, pupils were aware of the positionality of their peers as competent linguists in one or more languages. For example, Winston referred to ‘Chinese experts’ to describe the positionality of his peers that he believed were highly competent in Putonghua. In Y3, the pupils positioned in this way, were empowered by their linguistic skills, moving to a separate group to study Maths. The positioning of ‘Chinese experts’ in this way, creates a deficit understanding for the pupils not selected. Nasir and Hand (2008) build on the work of Holland et al (2008) through the concept of ‘practice-linked identities’. They argue that pupil identities are shaped by the ways in which they become participants in activities. Being selected to become part of a Chinese Maths group for example, would be an important part of identity development for these children. Participation after selection can be linked to a sense of value and investment in the group, shaping future participation and engagement. For those that were not selected, the deficit understanding of their linguistic skills, through their positioning within the classroom, also shapes their future participation and identity.

6.4.3 Summary of Research Question 3

Pupil participation in bilingual co-teaching activities shape their language learning identities. Pupil participation within the classroom was found to be shaped by their agency as they made decisions about how and when they were going to use each of the classroom languages. This agency was seen not only in their oral contributions, but also the ways in which they engaged with written tasks. Pupils drew on translangaging practices to facilitate their language learning and
expression. The data revealed that some pupils drew on Google Translate to facilitate their understanding of Chinese characters, drawing on the Pinyin for pronunciation cues.

The language hierarchy found to be present within school policy and practices shaped pupil participation and identities. Cantonese as the home language of the majority of the pupils was denied as a resource and identity within the classroom. There was evidence of early subtractive bilingualism, where some pupils no longer felt Chinese or Hong Kongese, instead taking on new cultural and language identities that aligned with the English language dominance of the classroom.

6.5 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a discussion of the findings connected to the literature organized around the research questions. A summary of the findings relating to each of the research questions has been given following each discussion. Chapter 7 is the final chapter of this thesis where the study process is summarised, including a review of methods used, the limitations and areas of focus for future research.
Chapter 7 Conclusions and Recommendations

7.1 Introduction
This final chapter of the thesis reflects on the study aims and main research questions. It offers a review the methods used as well as a consideration of the limitations of the study. Opportunities for future study are recommended, and in the final part of the chapter, its contribution to theory and practice is outlined as well as information on how this research has been disseminated. Finally, the chapter closes with my concluding reflections about the research.

7.2 Study Aims and Research Questions
This research was concerned with school language policy in an international bilingual school setting within Hong Kong. The school sought to provide language and cultural development of its pupils. The school’s approach to language learning was a bilingual programme that drew on co-teaching (English and Putonghua) to offer language support and instruction to the pupils. The pupils in this study were primarily first language Cantonese speakers and the languages of instruction could both be considered second languages to the multilingual children within the classroom settings.

The research questions that formed the basis of this research were:
1. To what extent are the ideals of the school language policy a reality in the co-taught bilingual classroom?
2. How is bilingual co-teaching enacted and understood by teachers?
3. How do bilingual co-teaching practices support pupil identities as language learners?

7.3 Review of Methods
This study sought to understand co-teaching and language development within a bilingual classroom. Within the unique context of Hong Kong there is a lack of research on co-teaching, specifically within a bilingual primary school context. Drawing on existing research on co-teaching models, there were six identified approaches to co-teaching. Within the Hong Kong context, this was extended to nine models to take account of the differences in language lead, to ensure attention was paid to how languages were positioned within the classroom and the ways in which this positioning might have shaped student identities and participation within the classroom. This extension to the current understanding of co-teaching is a useful addition for researchers studying co-teaching, specifically within a bilingual or multilingual context.
One of the difficulties that I experienced with my methods was time. I spent a lot of time in the classroom as part of my school role before determining the classes that I was going to select for the study. Once selected the eight full days with each class over a 5 month period went very quickly and while I was able to collect rich data during these days within the classrooms, the data collection was limited in terms understanding identity connected to language learning and language use. Given the dynamic nature of identities, which take multiple and varied forms, spending time in the classroom over the course of a year or more, would have enabled me to build on my understanding represented here, about the ways in which pupil identities are shaped through positioning and levels of agency exerted, as they participate in the classroom activities. The post interview with pupils gave me a lens through which to understand pupil identity, but it did not capture the dynamic nature of identities that are in constant flux. A pre and post interview, either side of an extended observational period, would have facilitated a better understanding and enabled me to answer my third research question more fully.

Another consideration in my methods is related to the number of participants in the research. The participants in this research comprised two co-teaching pairs, one in Y3 the other in Y5, as well as six pupils, three from each of the co-taught classes. This limitation gave a narrow field of pupil and teacher data to draw upon. While this study took the view that all pupil and teacher data are unique due to the mediation of their experiences as individuals, having a larger quantity of data might have allowed for broad patterns to have been established.

The questionnaire data included a very broad sample (almost all pupils participated) across the two year groups involved in the study. All pupil participants were therefore primary aged children. It was clear from the data that some of the younger children in Y3 struggled with the some of the questions, leaving them blank. As a result of this there are cases where pupil experience of school language was not recorded. However, it must be reiterated that the purpose of the questionnaire was to support pupil case selection. Much more emphasis was placed on interview data and classroom observations for interpretation and discussion of the findings. The questionnaire data served as an opportunity for triangulation of data, descriptive analysis and the generation of graphs for the illustration of the data.

### 7.4 Contribution to Theory and Practice

The research took place in Hong Kong during an interesting transitional period following the handover of sovereignty in 1997. The changing political climate in Hong Kong, that has included national educational policy changes, circulate hegemonic views of languages connected to the historical and economic context of Hong Kong. Lave (1988) argues that the constitutive order of social and cultural worlds is in a dialectical relation with the experienced and lived world. These dialectical relationships are ongoing, shaping the language identities of the pupils and their teachers. This research draws on this sociocultural framework as a lens through which to understand these relationships and teacher and pupil experiences of them.
Currently, there is little research on co-teaching, particularly as it is understood within a language setting (Im and Martin, 2015). Where research does exist, the focus has been on effective collaboration between co-teachers to support minority languages within a majority language classroom, rather than supporting language learners in bilingual development. These studies, that address language support within a co-taught setting, have focused on English as an Additional Language learners, where the co-teacher offers language support to minority language speakers within the classroom setting, to increase access to, and participation with, the target language. Analysing co-teaching practices, as they are understood and enacted by teachers and pupils and the differential impact that these practices have on pupil language learning and language identities, would be a welcome and essential contribution to the field. The unique socio-political context of Hong Kong and the school, and the use of co-teaching to support the bilingual development of all pupils, within a trilingual community represents a unique contribution.

In addition, there has not yet been research into the suitability and effectiveness of the different co-teaching models in the language classroom. This research offers initial insights into this, through the lens of an understanding of the importance of opportunities for translanguaging.

There are a number of implications of this research for institutions that draw on co-teaching to support language development. Staff professional development in co-teaching pedagogy and practice is essential. Guidance on different approaches to co-teaching and their implications for student language and identities development would support practitioners in meeting student language needs. Practitioners need time to reflect on the different models and the implications for teaching practice as well as the differential impact on student learning outcomes. Given the cultural, language and ideological differences likely to exist between two co-teachers, professional development that structures and supports them in understanding each other’s perspective, would support the development of positive working relationships and the formation of a co-teaching identity.

The second implication of this study is that practitioners need support in understanding the role of translanguaging within their classrooms. This is not restricted to the bilingual classroom as in this study, but all classrooms where students have multiple language identities. Practitioners need clear guidance as to what translanguaging is, why it is important to language and identity development and practical suggestions as to how they might support this practice within their pedagogy.

These implications require school policy and co-teaching guidance to be clear about the expectations of teachers to take on the role of language teacher, in addition to subject or year level teacher.

### 7.5 Limitations

Data were collected on co-teaching enactments and how these enactments supported pupil language learning and language use. The data revealed that Team Teaching provided good opportunities for language development and that the complexities of Team Teaching in terms of planning and the collaborative work needed to ensure its success, required the formation of a co-teaching identity, in which the two teachers take on an understanding and appreciation for the culture
and language practices of their co-teaching partner. Since this was not the focus of this thesis, but an unexpected finding, further research in this area would confirm if this is a finding pertinent only to this school context or if the findings are supported more widely. Further research in this area could support these early findings.

Despite the findings, this thesis has a number of methodological limitations (see Section 7.3). The thesis provides just a snap shot of attitudinal values towards the school and community languages. Given the transitional nature of this unique period of time in Hong Kong, longitudinal data, with measurements of attitudinal value changes over time, would be a welcome addition to the literature and our understanding of the impact that political and social changes are having on language hegemony within Hong Kong.

7.6 Recommendations for Future Research

In view of the findings and limitations of this study discussed above, it is important to make the following recommendations for future research:

1. Changing attitudinal values to languages within the context of HK, shaped by the changing sociocultural and political landscape as we move closer to 2047. Language loss and language attrition starts with a change in attitude towards the language. It affects the identity of the community, the roles that language has within society, therefore having far reaching implications for the speakers of the language. In the case of Cantonese in Hong Kong, there have been no recent attitudinal studies pertaining to the status of Cantonese as a community language. As the socio-political situation of Hong Kong changes, as it moves closer to 2047 and the reunification with China, a study of attitudinal values would be a welcome addition to the literature.

2. There is evidence in the research findings that co-teacher relationships change over time, which influenced pedagogy in support of language development. Changing co-teacher relationships influenced co-teaching model utilisation, as the co-teachers learned from each other and about each other’s practices. Different models support language development in different ways and also position each of the classroom languages differently. While this early research suggests that some models better support language development through the support of translanguaging practices, and the equal positioning of both languages within a bilingual classroom setting, a more comprehensive comparison of different enactments in support of languages would be a welcome addition.

3. The findings regarding the effectiveness of Team Teaching, argue that its effectiveness stems from the opportunities for translanguaging. Written translanguaging practices were evidenced in the findings of this thesis, as well as in oral contributions. It was outside the scope of this thesis to look at how translanguaging differed according to pupil age, learner identities (including language preference) and context of language use. Without an understanding of these facets of translanguaging our understanding of the effectiveness of co-teaching models that support it, is also limited. It is therefore recommended that a functional analysis of pupil translanguaging
practices (oral and written) takes place and in particular, how these vary according to pupil age, learner identities (including language preference) and context of language use.

4. Although not a focus of this thesis, there is evidence within the findings of a tension within the co-taught bilingual classroom between teacher dual roles as language teachers and content teachers. Findings from teacher interviews as well as evidence from observed classroom practice, suggests that teacher perception of the importance of each of these roles, determines how they enact co-teaching. The Y3 team in particular noted the additional pressure that they feel in meeting parent expectation for language development, in addition to curricular expectations. A study that specifically looks at these tensions and how to mitigate them for effective co-teaching and language development would be a welcome addition to the literature.

7.7 Dissemination of Research

Permission for this study was given by the school with the agreement that the results would be feedback to the leadership team to inform future practices of co-teaching. Despite no longer working in the same organisation, I was able to present the findings at a school-wide leadership meeting focusing on three key areas: school language policy (understanding and implementation), co-teaching practices that support language development (including mother tongue support) and teacher induction and training to support best practice. As a consequence of this feedback, I have worked with the school on updating the language policy and helped to write a teacher induction, outlining key aspects of both the language and co-teaching policy and how co-teaching practices can be used to support pupil language development.

In addition to this, I have presented a different aspect of this research at the Alliance of International Education Conferences in Mumbai and Bangkok. The first conference was focused on connecting cultures within international education where I presented on the unique language and cultural setting of Hong Kong and the ways in which this had influenced attitude to languages within the community and within the school, including policy and practice. I drew attention to the ways in which the sociocultural and historical context, can influence international schools. In the second conference which focused on engaging with difference, I presented my research on pupil identity connected to language learning, to argue the importance of the recognition of pupil cultural and linguistic diversity within our schools and how our practices can support and encourage this diversity.

7.8 Reflection

As part of my reflection over the last seven years since I initially engaged with this study, I can say that I have been challenged at every stage and have been on a continuous learning journey. I have found the engagement with literature and the
fieldwork to be most exciting. I have enjoyed relating the literature to my experiences in the classroom and thoroughly enjoyed my role as an insider researcher.

My interest in bilingual education stemmed from my professional practice. Working everyday with these amazing multilingual pupils and wanting to understand how to acknowledge and support them was my driving force. I have found the research to be rewarding, in particular getting to know the pupils in the two classes that formed part of the study. It was a privilege to learn from and with them and for them to open up their worlds to me, just a little!

There were a number of challenges, not least given my role as an insider researcher, since I was aware of the ethical and methodological dilemmas associated with this role. Pupils were used to my presence in the classroom but not for such long extended periods. There was no way to completely avoid these dilemmas, but it was important to be aware of them and to raise them as possible limitations within my methodological approach. In addition, another challenge that I faced was my own linguistic skills. This created a unique challenge for me as I had to rely on translation for Cantonese utterances, and needed support with Putonghua translations.
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Appendices

Appendix 1 – Parent Information Sheet

Dear Parents,

I am writing to inform you that I am currently studying for a professional doctorate in Education. Many of you will know this already having received prior information about my initial study and requests for permission for participation.

Following my initial study, the focus of my thesis has changed and I am now interested in looking more closely at language and its use with our schools bilingual model. This means that my focus has moved from looking at language in the Diploma Programme to language within the PYP. As part of this research I hope to observe students in class, looking at the language choices that they make when interacting with both their peers and teachers.

I am also interested in our unique co-teaching model and how this model is enacted in different classrooms and how this shapes students language learning. I will be working with a number of classes over the coming months and if this involves your son/daughter’s class, I will be writing to you separately to seek permission for your child’s participation. At a later date, I will also be requesting some student involvement in interviews and a language questionnaire - again, I will seek permission for involvement, which is of course voluntary.

Should you require further information regarding this research or if you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

Ms N Williams
Director of Curriculum
nwilliams@vsad.edu.hk
Appendix 2 – Questionnaire Sent to Pupils in Y3, 5 & 7

The school uses three languages (Putonghua, English and Cantonese) and teaches two (Putonghua and English). I am very interested in your views about learning the school languages and about using the school languages. In the table below please tick in the box that best describes how you feel about your language learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much do you enjoy:</th>
<th>I enjoy it a lot</th>
<th>I enjoy it a little</th>
<th>I’m not sure</th>
<th>I don’t really enjoy it</th>
<th>I don’t enjoy it at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Putonghua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking in Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking in Putonghua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How confident do you feel</td>
<td>Very confident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>I’m not sure</td>
<td>Not very confident</td>
<td>Not at all confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putonghua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putonghua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How good are you at:</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>I’m not sure</td>
<td>Not very good</td>
<td>Not good at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putonghua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putonghua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table put a tick in the box under the language you choose when you answer each question. If you want to tick more than one box please do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which language do you prefer to use when you:</th>
<th>Cantonese</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Putonghua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speak in school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write in school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to friends in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to friends outside school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communicate outside school in writing this could be on paper, on a computer/tablet /smart phone etc.

Which language is most important to learn:
To speak?
To write?
For doing exams and tests?

Think now about how you are expected to use languages? Tick the box which best shows how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I strongly agree</th>
<th>I agree</th>
<th>I’m not sure</th>
<th>I disagree</th>
<th>I strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We have enough teaching time in Putonghua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have enough teaching time in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish we had some teaching time in Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be more lessons where I can choose the language I use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do you believe about how the school and home value languages? Please answer each question in the space provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Write an explanation to your answer here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school values each of its three languages equally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think this because..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My class teacher(s) value each of my languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think this because..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family value each of my languages equally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think this because..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am allowed to use any of the languages I speak in school at anytime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think this because..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other comments you would like to make about languages at home or at school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Appendix 3 – Parent Permission Letter for Questionnaire

Dear Parents

As part of my professional doctorate in Education, I am interested in the bilingual language model of our school. Specifically, I am interested in observing when students use each of the target languages during their lessons and how they feel about learning English and Putonghua.

As part of this research, I will be conducting a questionnaire of Grade 3 to 7 students to find out what they think about language learning in our school. The questionnaire will be sent to each student via email and they have the option to return it if they want to participate. If you do not want your son or daughter to take part, please let me know via the email address at the bottom of this letter and I will ensure the questionnaire is not sent to them. All responses will be anonymous and individual responses kept confidential.

Should you require further information regarding this research or if you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

Ms N Williams
Director of Curriculum
nwilliams@vsa.edu.hk
## Appendix 4 – Questionnaire Data Y3 Pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class code</th>
<th>Participant number</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>Age (at time of answering)</th>
<th>Declared home language(s) on admission to school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3/5/2010</td>
<td>6 years 11 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8/7/2010</td>
<td>6 years 9 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28/5/2010</td>
<td>6 years 10 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13/8/2010</td>
<td>6 years 8 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21/8/2010</td>
<td>6 years 8 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13/5/2010</td>
<td>6 years 11 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21/1/2010</td>
<td>7 years 5 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28/12/2010</td>
<td>6 years 4 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15/1/2010</td>
<td>7 years 3 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9/4/2010</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24/10/2010</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cantonese/English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18/12/2010</td>
<td>6 years 4 months</td>
<td>English/Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27/1/2010</td>
<td>7 years 3 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26/10/2010</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>English/Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3/4/2010</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
<td>English/Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19/7/2010</td>
<td>6 years 9 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10/3/2010</td>
<td>7 years 1 months</td>
<td>Putonghua/English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9/5/2010</td>
<td>6 years 11 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9/8/2010</td>
<td>6 years 8 months</td>
<td>Cantonese/English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Date of Birth</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/12/2009</td>
<td>7 years 4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/4/2010</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>17/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>19/11/2010</td>
<td>6 years 5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/11/2010</td>
<td>6 years 5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/4/2010</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>28/9/2009</td>
<td>7 years 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>26/7/2010</td>
<td>6 years 9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/2/2010</td>
<td>7 years 2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>28/1/2010</td>
<td>7 years 3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>28/7/2010</td>
<td>6 years 9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>19/11/2010</td>
<td>6 years 5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>25/12/2010</td>
<td>6 years 4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>24/12/2009</td>
<td>7 years 4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>18/1/2010</td>
<td>7 years 3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>20/7/2010</td>
<td>6 years 9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>22/11/2010</td>
<td>6 years 5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/6/2010</td>
<td>6 years 10 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/8/2010</td>
<td>6 years 8 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/3/2010</td>
<td>7 years 1 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>20/2/2010</td>
<td>7 years 2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/5/2010</td>
<td>6 years 11 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>22/2/2010</td>
<td>7 years 2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/7/2010</td>
<td>6 years 9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/10/2010</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19/5/2010</td>
<td>6 years 11 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3/1/2010</td>
<td>7 years 3 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16/4/2010</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
<td>Putonghua/English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
<td>Cantonese /English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11/1/2010</td>
<td>7 years 3 months</td>
<td>Cantonese /English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18/6/2010</td>
<td>6 years 10 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12/7/2010</td>
<td>6 years 9 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19/6/2010</td>
<td>6 years 10 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9/6/2010</td>
<td>6 years 10 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20/11/2010</td>
<td>6 years 5 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14/6/2010</td>
<td>6 years 10 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
<td>Cantonese /Hokkien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21/11/2009</td>
<td>7 years 5 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9/2/2010</td>
<td>7 years 2 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25/3/2010</td>
<td>7 years 1 month</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9/11/2010</td>
<td>6 years 5 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21/12/2009</td>
<td>7 years 4 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30/6/2010</td>
<td>6 years 9 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18/3/2010</td>
<td>7 years 1 month</td>
<td>English/Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29/11/2010</td>
<td>6 years 4 months</td>
<td>English/Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13/10/2010</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8/3/2010</td>
<td>7 years 1 month</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25/5/2010</td>
<td>6 years 11 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21/10/2010</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18/5/2010</td>
<td>6 years 11 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23/1/2010</td>
<td>7 years 3 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22/11/2010</td>
<td>6 years 5 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30/12/2010</td>
<td>6 years 3 months</td>
<td>Cantonese /English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6/11/2009</td>
<td>7 years 5 months</td>
<td>Cantonese /Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4/10/2010</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2/7/2010</td>
<td>6 years 9 months</td>
<td>Cantonese /English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28/7/2010</td>
<td>6 years 9 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3/10/2010</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15/2/2010</td>
<td>7 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28/6/2010</td>
<td>6 years 10 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23/5/2010</td>
<td>6 years 11 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31/12/2009</td>
<td>7 years 4 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1/6/2010</td>
<td>6 years 10 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3/11/2009</td>
<td>7 years 5 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20/6/2010</td>
<td>6 years 10 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12/10/2010</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cantonese /English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2/6/2010</td>
<td>6 years 10 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17/6/2010</td>
<td>6 years 10 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15/5/2010</td>
<td>6 years 11 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14/4/2010</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
<td>English/Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6/10/2010</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29/7/2010</td>
<td>6 years 8 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18/6/2010</td>
<td>6 years 10 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27/2/2010</td>
<td>7 years 2 months</td>
<td>English/Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3/5/2010</td>
<td>6 years 11 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11/11/2010</td>
<td>6 years 5 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4/8/2010</td>
<td>6 years 8 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18/12/2010</td>
<td>6 years 4 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A4</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11/5/2010</td>
<td>6 years 11 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17/2/2010</td>
<td>7 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31/7/2010</td>
<td>6 years 8 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18/5/2010</td>
<td>6 years 11 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25/11/2009</td>
<td>7 years 5 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11/12/2010</td>
<td>6 years 4 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23/4/2010</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
<td>English/Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26/4/2010</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19/3/2010</td>
<td>7 years 1 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23/12/2010</td>
<td>6 years 4 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15/8/2010</td>
<td>6 years 8 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2/11/2009</td>
<td>7 years 5 months</td>
<td>Cantonese/English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5/11/2009</td>
<td>7 years 5 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30/3/2010</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25/3/2010</td>
<td>7 years 1 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5/10/2010</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21/7/2010</td>
<td>6 years 9 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23/1/2010</td>
<td>7 years 3 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29/5/2010</td>
<td>6 years 10 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11/10/2010</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15/7/2010</td>
<td>6 years 9 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20/11/2009</td>
<td>7 years 5 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12/2/2010</td>
<td>7 years 2 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29/12/2009</td>
<td>7 years 4 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26/6/2010</td>
<td>6 years 10 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A5</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5/7/2010</td>
<td>6 years 9 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9/8/2010</td>
<td>6 years 8 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1/4/2010</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31/3/2010</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14/5/2010</td>
<td>6 years 11 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25/1/2010</td>
<td>7 years 3 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5/10/2010</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12/8/2010</td>
<td>6 years 8 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7/1/2010</td>
<td>7 years 3 months</td>
<td>Cantonese /English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7/1/2010</td>
<td>7 years 3 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19/5/2010</td>
<td>6 years 11 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24/4/2010</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
<td>Putonghua/Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
<td>English/Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10/12/2009</td>
<td>7 years 4 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8/4/2010</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5/6/2010</td>
<td>6 years 10 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16/8/2010</td>
<td>6 years 8 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5/5/2010</td>
<td>6 years 11 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30/6/2010</td>
<td>6 years 9 months</td>
<td>English/Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14/10/2010</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29/8/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6/2/2010</td>
<td>7 years 2 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31/3/2010</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9/12/2010</td>
<td>6 years 4 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6/4/2010</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
<td>English/Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A6</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5/10/2010</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16/11/2010</td>
<td>6 years 5 months</td>
<td>English/Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3/3/2010</td>
<td>7 years 1 month</td>
<td>Cantonese/English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23/12/2009</td>
<td>7 years 4 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23/6/2010</td>
<td>6 years 10 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18/7/2010</td>
<td>6 years 9 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3/8/2010</td>
<td>6 years 8 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17/4/2010</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31/4/2010</td>
<td>6 years 11 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12/12/2010</td>
<td>6 years 4 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19/1/2010</td>
<td>7 years 3 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19/5/2010</td>
<td>6 years 11 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19/9/2010</td>
<td>6 years 7 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4/10/2010</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20/10/2010</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13/4/2010</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11/7/2010</td>
<td>6 years 9 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10/4/2010</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9/5/2010</td>
<td>6 years 11 months</td>
<td>Putonghua/English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9/8/2010</td>
<td>6 years 8 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3/12/2009</td>
<td>7 years 4 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13/8/2010</td>
<td>6 years 8 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27/2/2010</td>
<td>7 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7/1/2010</td>
<td>7 years 3 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6/4/2010</td>
<td>7 years 0 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3A7</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20/6/2010</td>
<td>6 years 10 months</td>
<td>English/Putonghua</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 5 – Questionnaire Data Y5 Pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class code</th>
<th>Participant number</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>Age (at time of answering)</th>
<th>Declared home language(s) on admission to school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23/10/2008</td>
<td>9 years 4 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18/8/2008</td>
<td>9 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2/3/2008</td>
<td>10 years 0 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15/2/2008</td>
<td>10 years 1 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8/3/2008</td>
<td>10 years 0 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22/6/2008</td>
<td>9 years 8 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29/9/2008</td>
<td>9 years 4 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29/9/2008</td>
<td>9 years 4 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3/3/2008</td>
<td>10 years 0 months</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15/3/2008</td>
<td>10 years 0 months</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1/10/2008</td>
<td>9 years 4 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4/8/2008</td>
<td>9 years 6 months</td>
<td>English/German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28/5/2008</td>
<td>9 years 9 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14/3/2008</td>
<td>10 years 0 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16/8/2008</td>
<td>9 years 6 months</td>
<td>English/Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25/2/2008</td>
<td>10 years 1 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8/10/2008</td>
<td>9 years 4 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26/11/2008</td>
<td>9 years 3 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11/8/2008</td>
<td>9 years 6 months</td>
<td>English/Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11/6/2008</td>
<td>9 years 8 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14/8/2008</td>
<td>9 years 6 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A1</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 1 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30/11/2008</td>
<td>9 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22/12/2008</td>
<td>9 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13/10/2008</td>
<td>9 years 4 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 11 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12/3/2008</td>
<td>10 years 0 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13/6/2008</td>
<td>9 years 8 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24/7/2008</td>
<td>9 years 7 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17/11/2008</td>
<td>9 years 3 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11/11/2007</td>
<td>10 years 4 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15/7/2008</td>
<td>9 years 7 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23/2/2008</td>
<td>10 years 1 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11/3/2008</td>
<td>10 years 0 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3/9/2008</td>
<td>9 years 5 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8/7/2008</td>
<td>9 years 7 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16/10/2008</td>
<td>9 years 4 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23/12/2007</td>
<td>10 years 3 months</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17/10/2007</td>
<td>10 years 5 months</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5/9/2008</td>
<td>9 years 5 months</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20/12/2008</td>
<td>9 years 2 months</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11/10/2008</td>
<td>9 years 4 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Date of Birth</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25/11/2008</td>
<td>9 years 3 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A2</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27/12/2008</td>
<td>9 years 2 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29/8/2007</td>
<td>10 years 7 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20/6/2008</td>
<td>9 years 8 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7/8/2008</td>
<td>9 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1/2/2008</td>
<td>10 years 1 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6/7/2008</td>
<td>9 years 7 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27/6/2008</td>
<td>9 years 8 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26/12/2008</td>
<td>9 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7/6/2008</td>
<td>9 years 8 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10/12/2007</td>
<td>10 years 3 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9/6/2008</td>
<td>9 years 8 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6/3/2008</td>
<td>10 years 0 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10/6/2008</td>
<td>9 years 8 months</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9/11/2008</td>
<td>9 years 3 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4/11/2008</td>
<td>9 years 3 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4/3/2008</td>
<td>10 years 0 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23/10/2008</td>
<td>9 years 4 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19/11/2007</td>
<td>10 years 4 months</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2/12/2008</td>
<td>9 years 2 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A3</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 9 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22/11/2008</td>
<td>9 years 3 months</td>
<td>Language not declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15/12/2007</td>
<td>10 years 3 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7/3/2008</td>
<td>10 years 0 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29/12/2007</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Putonghua/English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25/8/2008</td>
<td>9 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21/12/2007</td>
<td>10 years 3 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28/2/2008</td>
<td>10 years 1 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5/11/2007</td>
<td>10 years 4 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27/6/2008</td>
<td>9 years 8 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4/3/2008</td>
<td>10 years 0 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6/8/2008</td>
<td>9 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24/11/2008</td>
<td>9 years 3 months</td>
<td>Cantonese/Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4/2/2008</td>
<td>10 years 1 months</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31/10/2008</td>
<td>9 years 3 months</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5/10/2008</td>
<td>9 years 4 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25/2/2008</td>
<td>10 years 1 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28/10/2008</td>
<td>9 years 4 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11/6/2008</td>
<td>9 years 8 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29/12/2007</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Korean/Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A4</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19/5/2008</td>
<td>9 years 9 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20/2/2008</td>
<td>10 years 1 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20/8/2008</td>
<td>9 years 6 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16/12/2007</td>
<td>10 years 3 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28/7/2008</td>
<td>9 years 7 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28/6/2008</td>
<td>9 years 8 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4/6/2008</td>
<td>9 years 8 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30/3/2008</td>
<td>9 years 11 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4/6/2008</td>
<td>9 years 8 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3/3/2008</td>
<td>10 years 0 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 1 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3/7/2008</td>
<td>9 years 7 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9/3/2008</td>
<td>10 years 0 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7/12/2008</td>
<td>9 years 2 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22/8/2008</td>
<td>9 years 6 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18/8/2008</td>
<td>9 years 6 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23/9/2008</td>
<td>9 years 5 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14/6/2008</td>
<td>9 years 8 months</td>
<td>English/Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8/8/2008</td>
<td>9 years 6 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18/3/2008</td>
<td>10 years 0 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2/5/2008</td>
<td>9 years 9 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13/9/2008</td>
<td>9 years 5 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14/9/2008</td>
<td>9 years 5 months</td>
<td>English/Mandarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18/8/2008</td>
<td>9 years 6 months</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12/2/2008</td>
<td>10 years 1 months</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A5</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21/9/2008</td>
<td>9 years 5 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25/7/2008</td>
<td>9 years 7 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Putonghua / Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24/10/2008</td>
<td>9 years 4 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10/5/2008</td>
<td>9 years 9 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17/7/2008</td>
<td>9 years 7 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13/2/2008</td>
<td>10 years 1 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30/11/2007</td>
<td>10 years 3 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3/5/2008</td>
<td>9 years 9 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18/8/2008</td>
<td>9 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21/8/2008</td>
<td>9 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15/11/2008</td>
<td>9 years 3 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29/12/2007</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27/9/2007</td>
<td>10 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12/7/2008</td>
<td>9 years 7 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28/2/2008</td>
<td>10 years 1 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28/9/2008</td>
<td>9 years 5 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6 343</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15/11/2008</td>
<td>9 years 3 months</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6 344</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25/6/2008</td>
<td>9 years 8 months</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6 345</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6 346</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6 347</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6 348</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15/10/2008</td>
<td>9 years 4 months</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6 349</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22/5/2008</td>
<td>9 years 9 months</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6 350</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18/3/2008</td>
<td>10 years 0 months</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A6 351</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20/6/2008</td>
<td>9 years 8 months</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7 352</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7 353</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29/9/2008</td>
<td>9 years 4 months</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7 354</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7 355</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6/9/2008</td>
<td>9 years 5 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7 356</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7 357</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18/6/2008</td>
<td>9 years 8 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7 358</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18/8/2008</td>
<td>9 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7 359</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7 360</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28/11/2008</td>
<td>9 years 3 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7 361</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25/12/2008</td>
<td>9 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7 362</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7 363</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20/10/2008</td>
<td>9 years 4 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7 364</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7 365</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3/9/2008</td>
<td>9 years 5 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7 366</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20/12/2008</td>
<td>9 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7 367</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1/4/2008</td>
<td>9 years 11 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7 368</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17/10/2008</td>
<td>9 years 4 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14/11/2008</td>
<td>9 years 3 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9/6/2008</td>
<td>9 years 8 months</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11/3/2008</td>
<td>10 years 0 months</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5/1/2008</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11/10/2008</td>
<td>9 years 4 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11/11/2008</td>
<td>9 years 3 months</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4/11/2008</td>
<td>9 years 3 months</td>
<td>English/Thai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5A7</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5/3/2008</td>
<td>10 years 0 months</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6 – Interview Permission Letter

Dear Parents

As part of my professional doctorate in Education, I am interested the bilingual language model of our school. Specifically, I am interested in observing when students use each of the target languages during their lessons and how they feel about learning English and Putonghua.

As part of this research, I would like to interview your son/daughter about their language learning experiences in school. During the interview process I will be asking questions about your son/daughters school experiences, with particular focus on learning English and Putonghua. The interview will be audio recorded and transcribed for analysis. All interview data will be kept confidential, pseudonyms will be used to protect student identities.

If you are happy for your son/daughter to take part in these interviews, please sign and return the declaration below. If you would not like your son/daughter to take part no further action is necessary. Participation is voluntary. Should you agree to participate and change your mind, you can withdraw your permission up until October 2017, by which time the data analysis would already have taken place.

Should you require further information regarding this research or if you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

Ms N Williams
Director of Curriculum
nwilliams@vsa.edu.hk

I, ____________________________________________ parent/guardian of ____________________________________________ agree to my son/daughter being interviewed as part of this research into bilingual language learning. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that my responses will be kept confidential.

Signed: _____________________________ Date: ____________________________
Appendix 7 – Semi-structured Interview Questions for Co-teachers

1. What does being a co-teacher mean to you in practice?
2. What's your understanding of the school’s co-teaching policy?
3. Do you know anything about the different models of co-teaching that can be used?
4. What training or instruction have you had in regard to your co-teaching?
5. As part of the co-teaching policy you have to have an essential agreement in place. What do you think is the purpose of this and how has it been used as part of your co-teaching practice?
6. What do you think is the rationale for having a model of co-teaching within the school?
7. How do you think the pupils view the two of you as co-teachers?
8. How do you determine which of you will teach which part of the lesson and in what language?
9. Do you think the school/pupils value languages? Why?
10. Has the school language policy changed your approach to teaching?
11. What is the role of Cantonese within your classroom?
Appendix 8 - Semi-structured Interview Questions for Pupils

1. What languages do you speak? And where?
2. Do you think it’s important to learn languages? Why?
3. Can you tell me anything about the school language policy? Which languages you can use and at what times?
4. Do you think the school and your teachers value language learning?
5. Why do you think you have two teachers, what the rationale for that? What roles do they have?
6. Do you enjoy learning in more than one language at school?
Interview with Angela

[0:00:00]

**Interviewer:** Excellent. Okay. So, first thing I want to know is about your language background. So, what languages do you speak at home to your parents and family and friends?

**Angela:** I speak Putonghua and English.

**Interviewer:** Okay. Who do you speak those languages to?

**Angela:** Kind of like different members. Because a few my older sisters they study in the US so they like – they are more fluent in English than in Putonghua as they’re used to English. So, I only speak English to them. But to my mom and younger sister I do Putonghua.

**Interviewer:** So, your mum speaks English as well as Putonghua?

**Angela:** Yes.

**Interviewer:** And what about your dad?

**Angela:** My dad can speak English. Like both my parents can speak like Putonghua and English.

**Interviewer:** Okay. Okay. But you speak to both parents in Putonghua?

**Angela:** Yes.

**Interviewer:** Alright so if someone said to you, What’s your mother tongue language, would you know how to answer that?

**Angela:** I think I'll choose Putonghua.

**Interviewer:** Putonghua. Okay. Why do you say that?

**Angela:** Because I speak it the most at home.

**Interviewer:** Okay. So how do you feel about learning each of your languages and why?

**Angela:** Not quite sure for English. I mean when I first started learning English, I feel quite excited because like I'm learning new language and I'm very happy. For Putonghua it kind of was a bit of a challenge for me because – my Putonghua was never
actually really good. And even at school when I read I have like kind of like a lot of words I don't really know so.

*Interviewer:* Okay. So, and please tell me if I have not understood this correctly, you feel that your English is stronger than your Putonghua?

*Angela:* Yes.

*Interviewer:* Okay. That's interesting. Why do you think that is?

*Angela:* I think because it's easier to learn it and we speak it at school. My friends don't really know Chinese so I speak to them in English.

*Interviewer:* So do you enjoy learning languages?

*Angela:* Yeah.

*Interviewer:* Which is your favorite to learn?

*Angela:* English.

*Interviewer:* English. Why English?

*Angela:* Because I have more friends that speak English so I can like communicate with them in English.

*Interviewer:* Okay. So, at school we talk about being bilingual and dual culture. Is that an idea that you can connect to?

*Angela:* I would say I'm Hong Kongese.

*Interviewer:* Okay.

*Angela:* But then like – it's actually like Hong Kong is in like China so we're all kind of Chinese. Like it's going to be impossible for half English like only if your parents are actually half English then you get to be half English.

*Interviewer:* Okay.

*Angela:* But I can say myself like Chinese, Hong Kongese kind of like in between.

*Interviewer:* Okay. And can I ask if your parents are from Mainland China or from Hong Kong?

*Angela:* China.

*Interviewer:* Okay. So, do you go to China often?

*Angela:* I don't like – I go back to China when it's Chinese New Year.
Interviewer: Okay. All right. And do you think it's important to learn languages?

Angela: I think it's kind of important to learn Putonghua because you are born in China so you kind of have to learn it. Cantonese, well of course because you are born in Hong Kong. English, well like because some like few Westerners they come to Hong Kong. And some of them like – if for example if I want a job here, if I speak English, then I can actually communicate better with the people who are not born in Hong Kong.

Interviewer: Okay. So, it's got some economic benefit.

Angela: Yeah.

Interviewer: For future. Okay. And do you think any of the languages that you speak are more important than others?

Angela: I think English.

Interviewer: Is the most important, why is that?

Angela: Kind of because like I have friends who I think have like kind of like their English is better than their Putonghua, Chinese. So, I communicate with them with English but like sometimes they act like Cantonese inside.

Interviewer: Okay. So you just use English with your friends and they just use English with you?

Angela: Yeah. Well sometimes we just switch.

Interviewer: You switch languages?

Angela: Yeah, actually I use English and if I – I kind of like don’t really have a word I don’t know how to say. So, but sometimes I kind of like say for example, I say some things with my friend then all of a sudden I can’t say a Chinese word but then I’ll switch back to English [inaudible 0:07:49], yeah.

Interviewer: Okay. And so, do you think that's because you said that your English is better than your Chinese? Do you think you've just got a bigger vocabulary?

Angela: Personally I think my Chinese is – I think it's fine like not too bad but not like really good. But my friends - friends can't speak Chinese very well, only Cantonese so it's better to use English.

Interviewer: And what do you understand about the school language policy? What do you think our policy is about language use in the school?
Angela: In primary?

Interviewer: In primary, yeah.

Angela: In primary. Don't really know.

Interviewer: Don't really know? Do you know anything about like when you should use each language, what the rules are?

Angela: Oh yeah, well, all I kind of know is like we only learn Putonghua and English and for all the other subjects we say English except for Chinese class. And we're not allowed to say Cantonese in school when we are in class.

Interviewer: Okay. So, no Cantonese, English in all subjects apart from Chinese?

Angela: Yes.

Interviewer: Okay. Is that your understanding? Okay. So, what about the Unit of Inquiry?

Angela: The Unit of Inquiry?

Interviewer: Yes. So, your UOI lessons, they are English as well?

Angela: Yeah, no they are a kind of bilingual like both of the teacher like they teach at same time. Like for example, our English teacher [teacher’s name] he says something in English and then like [teachers name] our Chinese teacher she kind of adds on in Chinese. Like it’s kind of bilingual for UOI.

Interviewer: Okay. But it’s led – the lesson by [teacher’s name] is it? He starts?

Angela: No, it’s kind of like – no, it’s just kind of like 50/50.

Interviewer: Okay. All right. And so, Unit of Inquiry is in both languages. What about Maths?

Angela: Math is – because for like – it’s like [teachers name] group and [teachers name], we only have two groups.

Interviewer: Okay.

Angela: Like the group that have like they can do things more quickly and understand more like things and know more things about Math, they go to [teachers name] group. But the people who like don’t really catch like – don’t really understand a lot of things in Math, like that quickly they go to [teachers name] group.
Interviewer: Okay.

Angela: For [teachers name] group she like uses Chinese but in [teachers name] group he uses English.

Interviewer: So, it depends which group you are in as to which language you do Maths in?

Angela: Yes. If you’re good at Maths you do it in Chinese and if you’re not that good you do it in English.

Interviewer: Okay, that’s interesting. And when I was in your class, I noticed that some pupils in Math, they’d be doing Maths in the English group. And then if they were asked to do a sum or something like in their head, they would kind of count and be doing their multiplication in Chinese but then give their answer in English. Is that quite common?

Angela: I don’t know like – when I do Math just like when I think stuff, my thoughts are in English.

Interviewer: Okay.

Angela: Not sure why but like –.

Interviewer: Okay.

Angela: But like when I speak English I can read it without my lips moving. But when I say Chinese I kind of have – need my lips move like.

Interviewer: Okay.

Angela: It’s kind of really weird.

Interviewer: Okay.

Interviewer: Okay. So, when you’re in Unit of Inquiry lessons, how do you make a decision as to when you’re going to use English and when you’re going to use Chinese?

Angela: Not sure. Because like sometime we have to like write down, we have essential questions, so we have to write down our first answer for it. Like the first day we learn about it we are just like what we think is the answer to the question is.

Interviewer: Okay.

Angela: Like for our class we have to be bilingual so it’s like the first time for example, you use English then the next time you have to use Chinese English–Chinese, English–Chinese, like that.

Interviewer: Okay.
Angela: Yeah. But like for example, in class discussions it depends on which teacher's asking then like I answer in which language.

Interviewer: Okay. And do you find that at different times there's one teacher that takes more of a lead role than the other or is it about 50/50 or does it change?

Angela: I think 50/50.

Interviewer: 50/50?

Angela: Yes.

Interviewer: Yeah, okay. So when you are expected to write Chinese, then English to have both languages, do you find that easy to do?

Angela: Yes. We use Google translate.

Interviewer: You do?

Angela: Yeah, but like sometimes when I just kind of challenge myself like, "Okay, think in Chinese so," [inaudible 0:14:54] words I don't know so I use the English word to like [inaudible 0:14:59] Chinese word. But I don't really use Google Translate except for the words I really don't know.

Interviewer: Okay.

Angela: For example, homework like a lot of people I know they just copy and paste what they want – their thoughts in English and then they Google Translate it into Chinese. But I don't think that's like – because Google Translate is not always right. So, I like write down the words without Google Translate but with the words I actually really don't know in Chinese, I Google Translate.

Interviewer: Okay. Okay. Do you think that the school values languages equally?

Angela: No.

Interviewer: Okay. Why?

Angela: Not Cantonese.

Interviewer: Not Cantonese.

Angela: Definitely not Putonghua because all the other subjects are in English except for Chinese.

Interviewer: Okay.
Angela: I'm not saying I disagree because like if they actually say it in Chinese we won't really understand. But I think they could like maybe add a few more subjects in Putonghua to like make more bilingual. Because right now we have some pupils from China and their English is not that good yet. So, then when people say it in English, they kind of really have to [inaudible 0:17:29], I think they find it really difficult to understand what they're saying. So, if you kind of balance it up like a few more subjects in Putonghua like the people from China just like people whose English is not that great will understand better.

Interviewer: Okay. And you said you didn’t think the school valued Cantonese?

Angela: Because like I think like in school, you’re not allow to speak it.

Interviewer: Okay. And so you would like to see there be more Chinese?

Angela: Yeah.

Interviewer: Yeah? SO do you think that your learning at school is impacted in any way? By not having enough Chinese I mean?

Angela: No.

Interviewer: Not really? Okay, that’s good. And so who marks your books in Unit of Inquiry, your English teacher or your Chinese teacher?

Angela: Both.

Interviewer: Both.

Angela: You get both but like I think for some pupils it’s like more of the Chinese teacher or more of English teacher. Because it depends on like they write more English than Chinese then [teachers name] will have to check more. But if they write more Chinese than English then [teachers name] will have to check it more so.

Interviewer: Okay. And do you think that your teachers have the same role in the classroom or do they take on slightly different roles?

Angela: I think they are the same role.

Interviewer: Same role, okay. And when you're writing in Unit of Inquiry do you have free choice about when you write in English and when you write in Chinese? Or does your teacher tell you when you've got to use in English or Chinese?

Angela: Because sometimes I think for most of people in our class like we write in English more than Chinese. So, [teachers name] is often like, “Oh –,” sometimes she choose people to write
[inaudible 0:19:46], “Okay, so you, you, you, have to write in Chinese.” Or she’s like, “It has to be bilingual at least like maybe two answers to five of the questions have to be in Chinese,” so.

 entreviQeerer: Okay.

Angela: To make it bilingual.

Interviewer: Okay.

Angela: In exhibition, I didn’t write a Chinese reflection, so then [teachers name] tell me like, “You need to write Chinese reflection this week.”

Interviewer: Okay. And do you think it's important to have that balance in your writing?

Angela: Because this is a bilingual school I think it is important.

Interviewer: Okay. So, when you are learning a topic in Unit of Inquiry, say you're learning about ecosystems, how does having to learn that topic in both languages impact on your learning?

Angela: I don’t know.

Interviewer: You don’t know. Do you think it makes it more difficult or does it makes it easier, more interesting or?

Angela: No.

Interviewer: No?

Angela: I think it's kind of middle of easy and difficult.

Interviewer: Okay.

Angela: Yeah, like in between.

Interviewer: Okay. Why?

Angela: I’m not sure actually.

Interviewer: No?

Angela: Yeah, I do. I just kind of think it's like an in between.

Interviewer: Okay.

Angela: I guess when you have to – it kind of slows you down because you have to translate it back into Chinese. And because for example, for English, for example, say today I something,
something, something, but in Chinese kind of like the opposite, it's like the opposite of English kind of.

**Interviewer:** So, you're talking grammatically?

**Angela:** Yeah.

**Interviewer:** Okay. All right. If I asked your teachers about your language skills, what do you think they would say? Do you think they'd say –?

**Angela:** I think [teachers name] will say my English is fine, I guess.

**Interviewer:** Okay.

**Angela:** I think he will say like in the parent pupil meeting – and teacher meeting, he said my reading is really good, my writing feels okay but like my spelling is like not – it's kind of like my weakest strength so. For Chinese I think [teachers name] will say I improved a lot.

**Interviewer:** Okay.

**Angela:** Because start of year my writing I had to use like Pinyin in like Chinese so then I was writing Pinyin instead of the actual word. So, but now I kind of like I don't avoid doing that and I don't really do that.

**Interviewer:** Okay. So, you were – your teacher advised you to use the Pinyin rather than the traditional characters at the start?

**Angela:** Well, she said like we kind of have to use the traditional words because for some pupils like me, our Chinese is not as great as the others we have to kind of like use Pinyin but I don’t really do that now, like I don’t do it all.

**Interviewer:** That's good. Do you think your teachers value all language equally?

**Angela:** Yeah. I think they do.

**Interviewer:** You think that they do. Okay. Is there anything else you want to add about languages, anything else you want to say about the bilingual program, anything at all?

**Angela:** I think overall, I think our school can like kind of encourage us to speak more Putonghua, but overall, I think it's fine.

**Interviewer:** Yeah. Okay. Anything else?

**Angela:** No.

**Interviewer:** Okay. Fantastic. And –.
[End of Audio 0:21:47]
Appendix 10 – Full Transcript Example of Interview With Y5 Pupil

[00:00:00]

**Interviewer:** As I mentioned, I’d like to ask you some questions about your languages and how you use them at home and in school, if that’s ok?

**Winston:** Yes sure

**Interviewer:** Can you please start by telling me which languages you speak?

**Winston:** So, in school I usually speak English and Cantonese, and at home I speak just Cantonese. Well except sometimes if I don’t know the word for it in Chinese I replace it with the English word instead. Sometimes I also speak English with my cousin because they are in university in America, and so they prefer to speak English to me. I am also better at English than Chinese.

**Interviewer:** Why do you think that is?

**Winston:** I think like we mostly go to school and, actually my mum and dad are both Chinese and their English is not very good [laughs], so I think my English is better than my Chinese as I haven’t really been in any, well only in a bit in Chinese classes.

**Interviewer:** So both of you parents speak Cantonese Chinese?

**Winston:** Yes.

**Interviewer:** And what did you mean when you said that you have not really been in Chinese class?

**Winston:** I mean that in school I spend a lot more time speaking English than I do Chinese and this is why I think it is much better.

**Interviewer:** So if I was to ask you what language you felt was your mother tongue language, do you know what I mean by that?

**Winston:** Yes and I would definitely say that it’s English.

**Interviewer:** Can you explain why you feel this way?

**Winston:** Just because I am better at English and so it feels more natural for me. It’s easier
Interviewer: So how do you feel about learning languages?

Winston: So, like, I think, when you get used to speaking that language and it's easy and you like write about it. But if you like suddenly teach me Spanish, I'll like definitely not get it. So when you're used to a language and then it gets changed, it's like oh my god, what do I do, what do I say.

Interviewer: So do you feel that your teachers have a good understanding of your level of Chinese?

Winston: I think so because in Chinese I am like the highest in the class.

Interviewer: Wow! So how do you know you're the highest in Chinese?

Winston: Because when we are in Chinese class we have to read and its picture books, but mine are like chapter books with no pictures.

Interviewer: How do you feel about that?

Winston: I feel kind of stressed because I'm not actually at that level but I understand like most of them.

Interviewer: If you think you are not that level, why do you think you have been given that book?

Winston: I think that maybe they are trying to stretch me. I dunno?

Interviewer: So do you think that it's important for you to learn Chinese?

Winston: Yes because some jobs and like in order for your boss to like you and for you to know how to talk with customers, you need a good speech.

Interviewer: We talk a lot in school about culture. We say that at the school we are bilingual and dual culture. How do you feel about that? Is that your experience?

Winston: Well, I think I’m 50% English and 50% Chinese because at school it’s English and home it’s Cantonese. I feel more Chinese than English I think because my parents are fully Chinese, so yeah, but I feel Chinese in the context of the international schools.

Interviewer: Okay. And that’s different to Chinese in a non-international school?

Winston: Yeah. Even though my mum and dad are Chinese, I still and I'm very – I don't feel that Chinese inside me because I'm the low- not the lowest but low Chinese, so it's really weird because I'm a Chinese person. Usually Chinese people are
I thought you said your teachers put you at the top in Chinese? With the chapter books?

Top of my group, but there are other groups. I'm middle of low level, but I am Chinese.

What about with your English? You have excellent English, how do you feel about that?

Non. No, I need grammars.

Can you tell me anything about the school language policy?

Yeah it's mostly English and Putonghua, but the teacher encourages not to use Cantonese in class. To say like no Cantonese, just to try.

Okay. But otherwise its bilingual? Bilingual in all your subjects?

Not exactly.

Can you tell me a bit more about that? When is it bilingual and when it's not?

Yeah. Because sometimes in drama class, the drama teacher is English, he is not Chinese, so sometimes the specialist lessons they're not bilingual.

So specialist lessons, are not bilingual they are in English? Is that all of them, Art, Drama, PE and Music?

PE it depends because [teachers name] knows Cantonese and Chinese, so if he was also teaching then he could explain it but the people there are really afraid then he could explain it but then the people there are really afraid that they'll get mad. So, they don't dare ask a question.

Are you saying that pupils don’t dare ask questions in Cantonese?

No, because some people think [teachers name] is a strict person, but really it's because people are doing things wrong, they're doing mad things so he has to be strict, it's teachers policy.

Teachers policy about what language the teacher can use?
Winston: Yes but they think he is just being strict but it’s not him. But then really you have to teach – if you don’t know something you should just ask the teacher. You have to ask.

Interviewer: So when you have to ask a question and [teachers name] answers, what language does that usually happen in?

Winston: Technically English but then if the people ask Cantonese I think he would explain it.

Interviewer: Okay. So what about Maths? What language do you speak in Maths?

Winston: It’s English. Chinese teacher will just say Chinese. Sometimes because we have this thing called Start of the Week for Math, so then some of the answers the Chinese teacher ask us to say Chinese. Some people don’t know, some people know.

Interviewer: What about UOI? Do you use Chinese there?

Winston: It’s bilingual. You have to write Chinese too.

Interviewer: So are there any rules about how much Chinese and English you need to write?

Winston: Half Chinese and half English, but most people do English.

Interviewer: Is that what you do?

Winston: Sometimes, it’s odd, you can’t really separate evenly, so then I wouldn’t just do – for example, there are so many questions you have to answer in English and Chinese, I won’t just like four English and as two Chinese. But some people like Chinese experts or stuff like that they do four Chinese, two English.

Interviewer: Okay.

Winston: [Pupil name] is good at Chinese. Like people who are like, “I love Chinese” Those kind of people.

Interviewer: Those kinds of people do more Chinese than English?

Winston: Yeah.

Interviewer: So does your teacher ever ask you to write more in Chinese?

Winston: Yeah, yeah. You know in year 6 there is this thing where Wednesday’s you have extra class, so the teachers can’t suggest you to go to extra Chinese, extra English, or different languages so you can learn. But then people who are bad at Chinese, the Chinese teacher in three-way conferences would suggest you to go extra Chinese.
Interviewer: Okay. So are you worried you might have to do extra classes in one of your languages when you get to year 6? Is that what you are saying?

Winston: I don't know I think we will see later.

Interviewer: So in UOI, when its bilingual, who is it who is responsible for marking your books?

Winston: Both of them, they both do it.

Interviewer: So your English teachers marks the parts in English and your Chinese teacher marks you Chinese?

Winston: Yeah, but the Chinese teacher sometimes marks the English because she knows English but then the English doesn't know Chinese.

Interviewer: Does that ever cause any problems, that your English teacher can’t speak Chinese as well?

Winston: No, no I don’t think so.

Interviewer: So do you know why you have two teachers in the classroom?

Winston: Because it has to be bilingual. Because one English, one Chinese so then they're both actual part of situation, and then if it’s one teacher teaching English and Chinese that will also be tiring for the teacher and also won’t be really bilingual. Because maybe he has a favourite that’s English and he knows Chinese a lot, who is just speaking English the whole time.

Interviewer: So your teachers have equal roles in the classroom, just in different languages?

Winston: Yeah.

Interviewer: So you have talked to me a little bit about when you use each of your languages in school. But I’d like to know if you think the school values each of your languages equally?

Winston: No, most of the teachers are women and they’re usually English. So, there should be – I’m not saying everyone should be boys here, it's not being mean or anything, it’s just less boys. It’s okay you can add more men if you want for teachers, it's just men are not usually teaching, so then not much men would teach here. English a lot of people know, so they’ll choose English unless they know Chinese.
Interviewer: So you think that lots of teachers are female, but also that more people know English so there is more English? Have I understood that right?

Winston: Yes. Chinese is really important but then the English is just ruling it.

Interviewer: What do you mean by that?

Winston: The Chinese should be as higher level than English, but then English is just – because it’s really popular in school.

Interviewer: So school is mainly English but you don’t think it should be?

Winston: Yeah. But I think it’s okay. Because say I’m here, my mum also teaches me new things, I also have a Chinese tutor in Chinese class and stuff so yeah.

Interviewer: So when you are in UOI class and say you’re learning about ecosystems. You need to show what you have learned about ecosystems and you also have to write half in English and half in Chinese. How does that affect you in class? Do you think about it?

Winston: Well it affects me because usually you can’t translate them because it’s just like cheating.

Interviewer: Cheating? What do you mean by that?

Winston: It’s a bit cheating, as in because you can just do English or this and just translate it, and you just wasted a whole page just on the same reasons but in different languages.

Interviewer: So it’s cheating to write the same thing twice but in different languages?

Winston: Yeah. But I think sometimes is bad in UOI because they felt like – usually we use Google and stuff, and Google is not really that Chinese

Interviewer: Oh okay.

Winston: You can use Google translate but it’s not that accurate, yeah.

Interviewer: So how do you overcome that then, when you’re trying to write in Chinese?

Winston: I still use it, but then I ask the teacher if it’s right or not.

Interviewer: Okay. So does writing in English and Chinese affect your learning in any other ways in Ecosystems for example?
Winston: Yes, because Google is all about the English, so then when you find all the fact about English and the teacher all of a sudden says, “you have to write bilingual” and you’re just like, “damn it, we don’t know have any Chinese” and you’re like, “How do I do this? How?” Any this is what happens, you try to find the Chinese…. You try to find the Chinese examples, and research stuff on Google …- And then this is what happens, when they copy it down they’ll only copy down the wrong thing, so then they list all the time like trying to find the specific sentence and stuff and it’s just like got the wrong facts.

Interviewer: Is there anything that you find useful about the bilingual lessons?

Winston: I think you can get better at both languages

Interviewer: That’s good.

Winston: Yeah, like you make mistakes and then the teacher helps you correct them. Yeah, you can – this phrase is wrong and the you should swap like the –

Interviewer: And that helps you to complete the Chinese part of your work?

Winston: Yeah. If I don’t know the Chinese I just ask other people who know, and if they don’t know then I would ask the teacher. The teacher would say what it is, usually the [inaudible 00:24:52] and then I would go get the dictionary see where it is. Or if it’s really hard word, and really hard that you don’t know what the word how you write and stuff, then she would either write on the white board, or write under -- use your pen and write under the word that you collected.

Interviewer: What do you think your teachers think about your language skills in English and Chinese?

Winston: Maybe at English, [teacher name] will say my writing is pretty good, but maybe I need to work on my presenting skills and my speech. My Chinese teacher will say, “read more books.” [Laughs]

Interviewer: So do you feel you have the right balance of English and Chinese?

Winston: Yeah. Because I am talking with my parents at home.

Interviewer: Do you think your two teachers value both languages that you speak?

Winston: Of course.
Interviewer: Why do you say that?

Winston: Because they try to make us be balanced. They want us to learn both languages. Also I know because I hear them plan. They usually plan.

Interviewer: They plan? How do you know that?

Winston: Usually they plan. They do plan but then there is a change of plans they usually – because I’ve heard a bit of whispering in class for teachers. Usually if there is a change of plans, example, this year someone did something wrong, they change plans. They will usually whisper it secretly when someone – [whispers]. Yeah, like that, something like that and then while we’re doing something else or chatting or whatever, they give us a task, random task while they explain or think about it. And then they both agree then they’re like, “Okay, stop talking” or something like that, then they say the plan.

Interviewer: So you think they change the plan during the lesson to help you learn? And that’s because they value both languages?

Winston: Yeah.

Interviewer: I haven’t asked you yet about your Cantonese. Do you only speak it at home or at school too?

Winston: Mainly at home, you’re not really allowed in school, teachers policy. But also there’s some words I don’t know, so yeah. Also I think other people like cleaners and stuff, usually they don’t have anyone to talk with, so they pretty – like a few of them, so they have no one to talk to, because they only speak Cantonese. I think they should be more bilingual.

Interviewer: So you think the cleaner should be bilingual? So they have someone to talk to?

Winston: Yeah.

Interviewer: But you think it’s okay for your English teachers to not be bilingual?

Winston: Chinese it’s okay to – I think because English teachers – this is what I am afraid of. If they learn Chinese they might get used to Chinese and don’t learn English, so they won’t use English in school.

Interviewer: And this is important because you want to learn English at school?

Winston: Yeah.
Interviewer: Okay. We are running out of time unfortunately as I know you need to go. Is there anything else you want to add about your experiences at school and the languages that you're learning?

Winston: I think that's it.

Interviewer: Thank you very much –

[End of Audio – 00:26:02]
Appendix 11 – Full Transcript Example of Interview With Y3 English Co-teacher

[0:00:00]

Interviewer: I think that is on? Fingers crossed. I just want to say thank you for your time today and for allowing me to be in your classroom this year, I’ve really appreciated it. So I have some follow up questions if you don’t mind?

My first question is related to co-teaching. What does it mean to you to be a co-teacher? And how is it different being in a co-taught classroom rather than a solo practice?

Adrian: I think it takes some getting used to. I remember in the beginning it could be frustrating as you have in your mind what you will get done and you get to the end of the lesson and you have not got that far, but you get used to it. I think that now I have been working with [Janet] for a few years we are used to each other and how we work, so it’s a lot smoother.

Interviewer: How long have you been paired together?

Adrian: 2 years now.

Interviewer: So you said that it’s now a lot smoother. I wonder what you mean by that?

Adrian: Just that we know how each other work. I know when I need to stop to allow [Janet] to translate for the pupils, and we can bounce off each other as we know each other. We take it in turns with the content as we know each other’s strengths.

Interviewer: So do you plan in advance who will deliver each part of the lesson?

Adrian: Yes we try, but you also have to be a bit flexible as things come up in class that you might not expect. That’s when having a good relationship helps as you just chip in. We both know what the Statement of Inquiry is and where we want to go, so it’s just making sure we get there.

Interviewer: Okay. What about planning for languages? Sorry, what I mean is, when you plan who will deliver which part of the lesson content, is part of the consideration the language of instruction? So are you consciously thinking about language learning and exposure or is the planning about the content and Statement of Inquiry?
Adrian: We plan for content as we have to get through each unit in about 6 weeks. Of course, when [Janet] delivers her content it is in Chinese and we try to encourage the pupils to use both languages but it’s hard for them at this age. All you can do really is try to encourage them. There’s not much you can do really to plan for language in UOI class or Maths, it’s the same for English, we don’t teach this either it’s just about exposure at this age.

Interviewer: Okay. And through this exposure to each language, you see an increase in literacy throughout the year? In both languages I mean?

Adrian: For sure. I mean the pupils can all speak English, well [Angela] couldn’t speak any English when she arrived, she is such a success story, I can’t believe how well she is doing, it’s so great to hear her speak in English, she wouldn’t say anything at all when she arrived, not even to 老师 [Lao Shi].

I think it’s harder for them in Chinese, they do make progress but it’s more difficult for them to learn. They would rather write in English as its easier than remembering all the characters, and much faster for them to write in English. But they do all make progress yes.

Interviewer: Okay.

Adrian: I think as well it depends on what they do at home and the languages they speak. There is definitely a wide range of ability in Chinese.

Interviewer: Okay. So, coming back to co-teaching and you as a co-teacher for a moment. Do you identify yourself as a Y3 teacher, or as a teaching co-pair or as an English co-teacher?

Adrian: I think for me the strongest partnerships are the ones who identify themselves as Y3A7 or Y3A4 teachers.

Interviewer: Yeah.

Adrian: Because then you are a collective. I think they are the strongest team. If the teachers who divide up the time and say, “This is my English time, this is your Chinese time,” they are the ones I think they’re more traditional in their approach. Which is still effective, but I think the reason we have the success is, again, it’s the environment as well. I mean it’s that shared thing of for example, if the children are disrespectful to [Janet], they are disrespectful to me kind of thing that, no we are one basically. And I think having a flexibility in how we work makes for that shared atmosphere in the class.
Interviewer: So you see some practice as traditional, where teachers split up the English and Chinese teaching and, if I’m understanding correctly, those teachers don’t deviate from this. But you see your approach as more flexible and responsive to the class?

Adrian: I found with year three it’s different. I used to work with [teacher name] I had a Chinese in year six and [teacher name] very similar to [Janet] in her approach. With the year six it was very much – we’d look at the big understanding and from that we’d look at what knowledge is needed to access that understanding. From that, most of the time it became quite clear, “Well, hold on I’ll take – this seems to lend itself naturally to English and this seems to lend itself naturally to Chinese.” So, in – for an upper grade class you could have both teachers in the room one teaching Chinese, one teaching English at the same time, – but with the threes, because the children – credit for Mommy Janet, but the children's Putonghua level is more foundational. So, it tends to be more standalone for Chinese in the lower grades.

Interviewer: Okay. Okay. So, you would decide what you want to do and then [Janet] would teach that as standalone in Chinese?

Adrian: Yeah.

Interviewer: And then the rest is English, right?

Adrian: Yeah.

Interviewer: Okay. So I want to talk a little bit about the school language policy. What do you understand is school policy on language in the primary school?

Adrian: I honestly, I probably should know this given my last position, but it’s not clear. I think we’ve kind of made our own. I know there used to be things about process journal should have this split between them. I’ve never agreed with that. I think especially for the lower grades if we ask them to write in Chinese, it would take hours.

Interviewer: Okay.

Adrian: Okay. So I want to talk a little bit about the school language policy. What do you understand is school policy on language in the primary school?
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Adrian: Okay. So I want to talk a little bit about the school language policy. What do you understand is school policy on language in the primary school?
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Adrian: Yeah.
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Interviewer: Okay. So, I'm just kind of backtracking here, so I understand your practice and why you do that. You said that you understand there needs to be a split. So, are you saying that the school policy requires both languages?

Adrian: Yes. They have to use both languages.

Interviewer: And what about Cantonese? Is there any guidance on that?

Adrian: I think well, I mean it's – I think Cantonese is used – can be used for explanations, for conceptual explanations, in the class. But I don’t think they use it, I've not heard them use it.

Interviewer: Why do you think this is?

Adrian: I’m not sure. It’s never come up as an issue. I guess the focus is on English and Putonghua. I think over the years I’ve been here I’ve noticed less and less in the classrooms, playtime yes, recess times but in the classroom I found the discussions are English or Putonghua. Which shows the level of language has improved but there is a disparity between the English and Putonghua in the lower grades.

But I think we need to be realistic as a school. We are trying to do a full academic year of Putonghua and a full academic year of English with children whose mainly first language is Cantonese. So, again we need to be realistic in what we can achieve. And I think if you compared us to a first language Putonghua school, of course we're way behind. If you compared us to a bilingual school in Beijing, we're behind because again the environment we are in. So, again I think a bit of realistic thinking wouldn't go amiss from the school.

Interviewer: Okay.

Adrian: Yeah.

Interviewer: So what do you think is the rationale for our co-teaching model in the primary school?

Adrian: Why have two teachers?

Interviewer: Yeah. No? You are shaking your head.

Adrian: I would say it's probably a marketing ploy at a guess, it's – the rationale would be the ratio of teacher to pupil is 1:14, or should be 1:14.

Interviewer: Right.

Adrian: So, there is an extra person in the class you can do Maths in both languages so you can use the strongest language to teach Maths. But again, issues crop up there. Because I know
for example, fractions in English we would say, “A quarter,” but in Putonghua it’s the opposite way around.

We would say, “20% off,” they would, “Say 80% off.” I mean Putonghua speakers [inaudible 0:14:35] it sounds very rude but if they would, “Say 80% of the price.”

**Interviewer:** Right.

**Adrian:** We would say, “20% off the price.” So, again there can be some cultural confusion goes on there.

**Interviewer:** So, are you saying that you think then that if you are approaching a subject from dual language when they're learning a new concept for example, fractions or percentages, that it’s confusing for them? Am I understanding you correctly?

**Adrian:** I think you’re not confusing them, as long as, as a team you’ve discussed it before.

**Interviewer:** And so, how do you plan for that? Do you make a decision to teach that particular Maths class only in one language or how do you -?

**Adrian:** If it was something like that, then probably we divide the board and I would show the English way, [Janet] would show the Chinese way. Or [Janet] could teach them and they could try and teach me. So, try make it more inclusive. We’ve not had a problem with it. I think if you haven’t communicated with your partner, then you could have a problem with that. I think that needs to be thought about. But again that's all in your planning or your discussions as a team that you have. And again, the successful partnerships are the ones who talk.

**Interviewer:** Okay. And so did you receive training in co-teaching before you joined or when you joined the school? So you would know how important this planning is?

**Adrian:** [teachers name] and I did a workshop once. But it was more a presentation.

**Interviewer:** Do you mean you led a workshop? Or you attended one?

**Adrian:** Yeah, we did a presentation to teachers.

**Interviewer:** Presentation, okay.

**Adrian:** But that was very difficult because it was more you two work well as a team so you can present to the others. But again, so we had to try and pick apart why we work well as a team. So, it's us kind of analyzing ourselves. And it's still not –
sometimes it's just your personalities mesh. But no, there hasn't been any training – I would say there should be.

*Interviewer:* Okay. And are you aware that there are different types of co-teaching models?

*Adrian:* Yes. We have – I know there are different models of co-teaching

*Interviewer:* Yeah.

*Adrian:* And one time in the leadership team a guy came in talked about these but off top of my head I couldn't tell you what they are right now.

*Interviewer:* Okay. So, you have a working agreement in the primary for you to work together as a co-teacher with your teaching partner?

*Adrian:* Yeah.

*Interviewer:* What's the purpose of that working agreement? And how do you use it as part of your practice?

*Adrian:* You mean the essential agreement we write between us?


*Adrian:* I think it's supposed to be to make agreements about how we will work, so like if we have a disagreement we know how best to resolve it.

*Interviewer:* Do you refer to it very often?

*Andrew:* I don't think I ever read ours [inaudible 0:16:53] but –. Because I don't think – common sense says you don't need one, right? If problems come up you talk to each other.

We never needed it.

*Interviewer:* Okay.

*Adrian:* I never said, you know, [Janet] never said, “You promised in August that you would tidy up your desk and you haven’t.” It never came to that. It was never an issue [inaudible 0:18:15]. Just say, “Hell no.” I think it's meant to be in case of – it's better to build a shared ground but it’s also used as I guess mediation if things were to go wrong.

*Interviewer:* Right.

*Adrian:* I know it has for some people.
Interviewer: So the Essential Agreement doesn’t cover things like how much of each language you will use in instruction, or anything like that? It’s just about your relationship with each other?

Adrian: Yes it’s just about how we will work. I don’t think there is anything written about when to use languages, not even in the language policy, but everyone knows that we are expected to have the Learning Journey in both and they want 50/50 just so when the parents come in they can see the Learning Journey in both, but it just puts a lot of pressure on teachers especially with the lower grades.

Interviewer: Okay.

Adrian: I think the children would naturally chose more English because they feel more confident to express themselves in that. I think between us English and Math is fairly even in terms of what we do.

Because - I mean some things are good in Math. I mean I’m pretty strong in the concepts and the silly part, the jumping around and making them laugh. [Janet] is definitely a better Maths practitioner than I am. And I think that’s a very nice balance to have.

She is way smarter than me basically is what I’m saying.

Interviewer: I noticed in class that most of the resources that you use are in English. Can I ask if this is a conscious choice?

Adrian: It’s not a choice it’s all that’s available. I mean well, [teachers name] used to say that there’s a gap in the market in terms of appropriate IB type materials. I think the IB may be a tad more a Western ideal, isn’t it? So, I think - but there are – I mean there are gaps for things in Chinese, I think they’re being created. I think there’s a huge market for it. In English you find loads of materials as this is the language of most of the international schools, so it makes it easier.

Interviewer: Okay. So the use of English or Chinese resources is to do with what is available?

Adrian: It's too difficult for everything to be translated, that would be a massive job and who’s going to do it? We just try our best with what’s available.

Interviewer: Well, okay. That's interesting. So, how do you think the pupils view you two as a teaching pair?

Adrian: God. I don’t – I think there was – as I would say – I would hope, there was equal respect. I think they would – they saw both of us as teachers, that sounds a strange thing to say. But
what I mean is I've seen classes where if the kids have a problem, they'll go to one teacher because they see that one is the one who can fix stuff.

*Interviewer:* Okay.

*Adrian:* Whereas I found there was no, you know, three quarters of the class would go to [Janet] because she was nicer than me kind of thing. I think they saw us as equals. I think they like the atmosphere in the class. I mean, I think the telling thing is now I think most days I still see most of last year's class. And it's June and the class finished July of last year so there's-, you know. I've seen [pupil name], [pupil name] several others today just coming to see us. So, I think there are very strong bonds in class. I think they enjoyed being in there.

*Interviewer:* Do you think that they have an awareness of your language abilities? So they know that you only speak English? Has that had any impact on their choice of language use?

*Adrian:* I don't know. I think with this class, because we've modeled – we made a real effort to model that there was no difference between us and there's no difference between the languages. I find by the end of the year the kids use both languages, they can come to either of us. I think sometimes [pupil name] for instance, would naturally come to me because she could express herself because she's Australian and both parents speak English.

I mean, I think the default for most of them was English because it's spoken at home as well as Cantonese for most of them.

*Interviewer:* Okay. Well, that's good. So, they – you don't remember instances particularly where pupils come and they want to speak to Janet in English?

*Adrian:* Not really, it's only [pupil name] because she's Australian so she can't use Chinese.

*Interviewer:* Okay.

*Adrian:* And that was only really in Maths I would say because again the terms, right?

She finds it very difficult, bless her.

*Interviewer:* She finds the Maths terms particularly difficult in Chinese?

*Adrian:* So she is not strong in Maths and so to try to learn Maths in another language as well just is too much pressure.
Interviewer: Okay. So do you think, as a school, we value all languages equally?

Adrian: How confidential is this? [laughs].

Interviewer: It’s confidential in the sense that I will be using pseudonyms in my write up. Does that help?

Adrian: Definitely [inaudible 0:24:57]. Okay, no. I would say no.

Interviewer: Okay. Why?

Adrian: Because in primary our deputy head doesn't speak Putonghua and I think in my opinion that doesn't send a good message out. So, in assemblies the principal, the two deputies is English. And I think that's not a good message for the school.

Interviewer: [teacher name] speaks Chinese?

Adrian: She speaks Cantonese and English.

Interviewer: She doesn't speak Putonghua?

Adrian: She butchers Putonghua.

Interviewer: Oh.

Adrian: And I think we don’t have – [teachers name] was a native Putonghua speaker, right? But again, her first name was Cantonese. The two deputy heads that are Chinese, they are both Cantonese speakers. We have loads of – Janet’s Mainland born, we have loads of Mainland born teachers of Putonghua. But none of them are in any positions of authority and I think that doesn't send a good message out to the children, I think.

Interviewer: So, you think the children are aware of the language backgrounds of the staff and their position in the school?

Adrian: I think they can't help but pick up on that. I think English has always been the stronger.

Interviewer: Okay.

Adrian: And I think that Putonghua needs to be higher profile in terms of the encouragement. And when we do that there is confusion. We do other things but it’s a little bit tokenistic, you know, and I think it just needs to be more fun. In terms of how it’s respected around school. That’s it, I mean my opinion.

Interviewer: And do you think that impacts on pupils’ attitudes towards learning languages?
Adrian: Yes. It must be hard as they see English is important as everyone speaks it in school and they move to secondary and all their lessons are in English. But there’s nothing for Cantonese and Putonghua is difficult to learn and they can’t use it in Hong Kong so where’s the motivation?

Interviewer: So do you think that these attitudes to language influence the pupils in their ability to learn each of these languages?

Adrian: I’ve never noticed much stopping them learning. I think as long as you’ve set up your lessons and you’re understanding as well, I think that you’ve allowed the children time to make the connections, to make the understandings. Then they can all express themselves.

Interviewer: Okay.

Adrian: I think as well as being bilingual, I think also the fact that we’re an IB school and we are inquiry driven is an added dimension to language. Because I don’t find it holds children’s thinking back. I think they can still think and express, I think when we are forcing them to – when our focus is percentage of language or when our focus don’t speak this or say this, then that’s holding them back.

I know there have been times where teachers have been concerned about process journal. There must be a mix of languages, there must be – and if you’re focused on that you’ve got away – you’ve lost the point. So, I think it hasn’t – but I think that’s us being confident in what we’re doing almost belligerent in terms of we can defend our choices in the class. But I think if you’re not as stroppy as we are, you might just follow what you think is the rule. I think there has been a lot of confusion over this. In terms of impacting learning, I haven’t really noticed that. A few times I guess the children are struggling for the concept and to find the words. They understand the concept they just can’t really express it in terms of their writing. There’s ways around that where we can help them.

Interviewer: And do you find technology in the classrooms are helpful? – I know you’ve got iPads. Do you think that that supports language learning or not?

Adrian: Research is easy in English, I don’t think it’s helpful in Chinese, but you’ve also got the problem of resources that mentioned before.

Interviewer: Yes. So what do you do when there is the pressure you spoke about for the learning journey to be in both languages?
Adrian: You’re kind of left to kind of your own devices. And we said very early on that really the split in the lower primary is probably close to 70/30 65/35. You know, and in fact it varies from kid to kid so putting a number on it is irrelevant. It’s basically the rule for us was, whatever your stronger language is your challenge is to try and do a little bit in the other one. I mean it’s as simple as that. If you can write a sentence in Putonghua right now – Chinese right now, could you do a little bit more next time? If you can, we are happier. So, I think taking away that pressure, I think really had huge benefits. And let's face it the worst pupil in the class with Chinese is me, so whatever you do, you are better than me anyway, right? And the kids love that especially lower primary. 

Interviewer: That must make them feel more confident?

Adrian: They can show off say things to me I’ve got no idea what they are taking about.

Interviewer: So, just to clarify as I think this through. You are saying that when pupils use the ipads for research, its usually done in English?

Adrian: Yes. Even [pupil name], whose first language is Chinese, would try and use English more which is bizarre. I’ve often wondered about years one and two almost being streamed in terms of the input. And then the bilingual nature would come in like at year three when the children have got that foundation, they want to enable it. Because poor [Janet] is trying to do bilingual and foundation standalone at the same time. It’s very, very difficult.

Interviewer: Okay. I asked you about whether you think the school values languages equally? Now I’d like to know if you think the pupils value languages equally?

Adrian: I think that comes from the modeling from the teachers, right? I think if you get two teachers where it’s clear they respect each other, they like each other I think yes. I think if the children see one definitely stronger than the other, then I think no. But I think that's not just teaching – that’s parenting isn’t it?

If you know one is the strict one and one’s the weak one, you naturally know what to do. And I think not allowing the children to come – again it’s parenting between you to play off against each other. You know that question of, “Miss Janet said it was all right, did she?” “Oh no.” “So, why are you asking?” Do you
know what I mean? I think if you do those things the modeling will be very it'd be then yes and again that's common sense, I think.

And that’s not to say that I don't think they naturally gravitate towards English because of where we are, they do, but if you model that both languages are equal the pupils will pick up on that even if they use one language more.

**Interviewer:** So you think the pupils value English and Putonghua equally?

**Adrian:** Yes. But I think my question to the school would be if we are teaching English and Putonghua, does the school respect the languages? For example, if you looked in the primary staff room, you looked at the positions of responsibilities, how many native Mainland Putonghua speakers are in those positions? Zero. Why? So, again –.

**Interviewer:** Yes, you mentioned this before. I’m interested to know if this is something that you think other staff are aware of or is it just something that you've picked up on?

**Adrian:** From my conversations with teachers who have left, some from them Mainland, some from Taiwan, they feel that native Putonghua speakers were not respected or Mainland speakers are not respected and almost looked down was the feedback I got. Now, I’m not a native mainland Putonghua speaker or from the Mainland, so I don't know myself.

**Interviewer:** Okay.

**Adrian:** When a member of SLT makes a disparaging comment to another member of the SLT about Mainlanders and that member of the SLT is married to a Mainlander, then you kind of pick up on – do you know what I mean? If disparaging comments are made – I mean even the phrase Mainlanders is almost a negative term.

And if someone else's is making disparity comments about them, do you know what I mean? “Well, hold on that's my wife you are talking about.” And then there is this feeling, right?

**Interviewer:** Okay. So we have talked a lot about English and Putonghua. I’m interested in Cantonese. How is Cantonese used or is it not used in your classroom? I think you mentioned earlier that you had not heard it?

**Adrian:** We don’t use it.

**Interviewer:** No?
Adrian: Not for teaching and learning. In their discussions. I mean, sometimes you could pick up on, you know, if the boys are speaking Cantonese and you heard obviously because some words don't translate. So, if then you heard you know, Ronaldo or Messi, you know, right? Cantonese is fine but if you're talking about football then it's not because you are off task, right?

Interviewer: Okay.

Adrian: Right. So, back on track. So, again, it's like Cantonese is fine if you are discussing, but not if you're off task. Whatever language you're using we don't want you doing that.

Interviewer: Yeah. So -

Adrian: But didn't – I found out our class they didn't tend to use it too much because of the mixture of the kids in the class. Some don't speak Cantonese and they don't use it in class work, so you don't really hear it at all.

But actually, having said that they were teaching [pupil name] at recess once. She doesn't speak Cantonese. She was learning it with her friends.

Her friend – it was just – it was cute to see the kids – in lower grade they're very practical if there's a group limit. “So, right, you speak, you speak. Well, let's use this language. Or let's switch between them.” So, I think at that age it's absolutely fine, isn't it? But I didn't notice it too much in our class. And again, the longer I've been here, I've heard it less and less of it in the classroom.

Interviewer: Okay.

Adrian: But it's not been something we've discouraged.

Interviewer: All right. Anything else you'd like to tell me about languages or co-teaching I haven't covered?

Adrian: No, I just think it's a brilliant model. I just think the school could do a lot better with it in terms of the co-teaching models that we are using, I think the modeling for teaching we are using. I think how to get the best out of the coaching of the languages, I think it all comes down to your planning, right? So, more time for teachers to sit down and talk with each other.

Interviewer: Okay.

Adrian: That's my perception.

Interviewer: Okay.
Adrian: Maybe we also need to educate the parents. I think a lot of our parents are quite traditional and I think they would go to the male teacher because they see the male teacher as being the lead.

Interviewer: Oh really?

Adrian: Especially if you're a Western male teacher. And I think that is a traditional thing. I mean I know my wife's mum is 90 years old, and she would naturally go to defer to the male. And I'll give you an example, it was her 90th birthday and we asked if she was celebrating and she said, "No, because women celebrate the 81st because men celebrate the 90th, men get the zeros women get the ones." So, basically even then, you know, the men get a more important number. So, getting and I think our parents are still in that mindset. Once they meet us it's fine, I mean they know –.

Interviewer: Right. So you think gender plays a role in how you are perceived as a teacher?

Adrian: Yes because of the culture. But then the Western teachers have a responsibility because naturally we are louder and because of the way we've been raised I think it's important for us to shut up and allow our partners equal time. I mean, it's very important as well we let the parents know we are a team, we are equals, we are both teachers. And I think it's important to not give off the impression that I'm the lead, no, we are a team.

Again, hasn't happened for a long time but it did happen to one of my teaching partners where the parents were rude to her. And I did say, "Actually, no that's not acceptable and actually if you look at our teaching experience, she has more than me. And she's a superb teacher and I fully respect her so please." And they were fine after that and it was the dad who did it, and he backed right down.

Interviewer: When you meet the parents, do you meet them together or separately?

Adrian: Yeah, we have meet the parent night right where we present, and again we usually say something not as in, "We are both equal," but the way that we do we split it between us. And I think that's important for them to know at that point, right?

Interviewer: Okay.

Adrian: Yeah. Well, I always tell them I'm the weak link in this team.
Interviewer: So, when parents email, do they send those in English, even though their first language is Cantonese in most cases?

Adrian: Yeah.

Interviewer: Do they copy you both on those emails?

Adrian: Most of them are pretty good and CC both of us. Occasionally you'll get a parent who would just contact one of us.

Interviewer: And is that usually you, or do they do that to both of you?

Adrian: Yeah, I guess it’s mainly to me and then we make a point of replying by cc’ing the other one there.

Interviewer: Okay.

Adrian: But again this year I’ve got a couple who only email in Chinese to [Janet].

One he emails me in Chinese which is very odd because there's no point Google Translating it because it comes up some very strange stuff. So, I mean I think some of our parents – so I think because we're – the parents are quite wealthy. I think some of them haven’t got a clue who the teacher is. I mean I have parents say to me, “Oh, I thought the teacher was female, my son’s teacher was female.” And I’m like, “That was 12 months ago so.” He moved up a year.

Interviewer: And do you think the parents have any understanding about why we have a co-teaching model or do you think they just –?

Adrian: That’s a really good question. I would be very interested to know the answer to that. I think some of them have definitely signed up because they like the IB method. They like the co-teaching, they value Putonghua and they like – I think [pupils name] parents definitely are on board with all that.

Interviewer: Okay. That's really interesting. Thank you so much.

Adrian: You are welcome.

Interviewer: I am so pleased – let me turn this off.

[End of Audio 0:38:34]
[00:00:00]

Interviewer: Okay. So my first question is about your co-teaching practice. I’m interested to understand what being a co-teacher means to you?

Aki: We always help each other out. Sometimes like in math lesson maybe I can take more a bit in charge and then Danny sure that we help each other out. We work together, always a team.

Interviewer: Is that what’s important in a successful partnership?

Aki: I think so. Also if you have been together a while you like know the practice of the other one. Like Danny and me have done 3 years, this is our third year together so it works well. Because I teach local school before and then I compare is totally a big difference because like in local school, if you face some problems you just solve your problem by yourself. But right now in like the co-teaching and you can always talk to her and then also what is your suggestion like? I just almost go like another, how can I say? Another…

Interviewer: Team mate?

Aki: Exactly. Yes, always help and when I got something, “Ah, some idea we can share.” Before I just do my job and then that's done.

Interviewer: So, what's your understanding of the school’s co-teaching policy? What do you think they are hoping to achieve?

Aki: You use different language.

Interviewer: What do you mean by that?

Aki: They want you use different language with the children. This is a bilingualism school so that’s what they want.

Interviewer: Bilingualism in English and Putonghua?

Aki: Yes

Interviewer: What about Cantonese? Does the policy allow for that?

Aki: They don’t want children speak Cantonese. We speak to them in Putonghua so they can learn, that’s what they want.

Interviewer: Do you ever speak to the children in Cantonese?
Aki: I didn’t. The children didn’t know I can speak Cantonese but now some of them do. Because they don't want the children, “Oh, you can speak Cantonese and they kept speaking Cantonese to me.”

Interviewer: So, you tried to conceal that you spoke Cantonese? So they didn’t use Cantonese?

Aki: Yes. When I arrive at the school first time, I have to pretend I don’t speak Cantonese. So the children don’t speak to me like that.

And actually not every Chinese teacher can speak Cantonese now, right? Because some are from Mainland China they can’t speak Cantonese very well. But now they told us when you want explain the concept you can explain it in Cantonese if you needed. But not everyone can speak Cantonese, the teachers.

Interviewer: And so do you explain in Cantonese, the concepts I mean?

Aki: I can but they don’t as they use English. Some pupils don’t know Cantonese as well, now so I like think things changed a bit.

Interviewer: Okay. Is there anything you want to add about co-teaching?

Aki: I think it's quite similar to like just two of us go into the classroom and then you share the workload and then we plan together but not very clear to me just like one teacher is I use Mandarin and one English to teach.

Interviewer: So, do you think the expectation is- like that the lesson delivery will be 50-50? Is that the expectation?

Aki: It depends really on the lesson it is. For UOI is should be 50:50 but not others. We try to make the children balanced but they don’t really want to write in Chinese so much as it’s hard for them. But get pressure from parents because they think Chinese as important. That’s why they choose [school name] I think, because of the bilingual.

Interviewer: Okay. So have you had training in co-teaching? To know about the different models?

Aki: I didn’t have training but I did know about the models. I read about it once the different ways to do it. I don’t think the school has preference for any way. We need two teachers, one Chinese and English.
Interviewer: So I am aware that all teaching partners write up an Essential Agreement when they start working together. What do you think is the purpose of that document?

Aki: We discuss about the essential agreement at the starting at least we know each other expectation because if we don't tell the partner is quite difficult sometimes to know, “Oh, I like tidy up every day or you like tidy up for a week.” This will be, “I can't work.”

Interviewer: Does it include anything about how you structure the learning? Like when you will use each language or when each of you leads the teaching? Anything like that?

Aki: No. Nothing like that. It’s about the classroom. Like how you will behave and how you will respect the other teacher, like that sort of thing.

Interviewer: Why do you think that is?

Aki: Bilingual culture?

Interviewer: What do you mean by that?

Aki: For me the first thing will be a thing about the bilingual culture. If you have different culture and expectations you need to respect both of the bicultures. Also the pupils they it can explore to both…

Interviewer: So the essential agreement allows teachers to understand how each other work from a cultural standpoint?

Aki: The expectation yes.

Interviewer: You mentioned the pupils and them having respect for both cultures, Do you think this is the case? Does the co-teaching provide a space for that, do you think?

Aki: I think it’s okay yes. They prefer speak English. I always speak to them in Chinese. And then I tell them, “Speak Chinese to me.”

Interviewer: And why do you think that is? Why is it just…?

Aki: I think most of the time their family culture affect them. Because I did ask them, “So, when you're at home did you speak Mandarin or Cantonese or English?” So, most of them speak English and Cantonese at home, they seldom speak Mandarin. Just like [pupil name], if their mother tongue is Mandarin, she always speak Mandarin to me but the others mainly speak Cantonese and English at home.

Interviewer: So, they know now you speak Cantonese?
Aki: They know I can understand Cantonese.

Interviewer: Do you hear the pupils in your class speak Cantonese ever?

Aki: Yeah.

Interviewer: Is that to each other? In class?

Aki: Yeah sometime class, but mainly on recess they speak it or English.

Interviewer: Okay, right. How do you feel about them speaking Cantonese?

Aki: Yeah. I don’t mind. When they-, except the Chinese I want them to speak Mandarin to discuss. But recess is, okay la.

Interviewer: How do you decide what resources to put in what language when you plan and teach?

Aki: I have to translate it into Mandarin, lots of time if want Mandarin. Because a lot of the resources are only in English or sometimes Chinese but its simplified and we don’t use it

Interviewer: So how do you decide when you are going to translate something or not?

Aki: It depends on the lesson really and time as I need to translate a lot for standalone Chinese. Sometimes I can find resource and its traditional but content like might not be that suitable for our children.

Interviewer: So finding resources is a challenge that impacts your teaching?

Aki: Very much.

Interviewer: So would you say it’s fair to say that the majority of the resources you use in UOI and Maths are written in English?

Aki: Yes. We try to improve it. It takes long time. Because it got a problem like our school use traditional Chinese. Even though you can find something in Chinese but like the mainland China one use simplified Chinese. Sometimes I need to translate a simplified to tradition to…or from English to traditional Chinese…

Interviewer: So, you need to get resources from Taiwan usually?

Aki: But Taiwan only got a few IB schools so is not a lot of resources we can use.
Interviewer: So do you think your access to resources changes the way you teach? I mean as a partnership in a bilingual classroom and you can’t get resources in Putonghua, does that change how you approach your teaching?

Aki: Every time I change partner, I think my teaching style they change a bit. Because it quite depends on your communication with your partner, your partner's teaching style, because if your style is totally different with your partner is quite, I don’t know, it's quite difficult to teach in the same classroom. Because the children will think, “This a traditional teacher, this is like…” It's very different. Every time I do change, I think.

Interviewer: Do you see that change as progress in your teaching?

Aki: Yeah. We learn from each other.

Because before I teach in the local school is like just totally traditional and then I just chalk and talk, right? But right when I get into this school is like change to not only chalk and talk and try to do more activity and then different ways to teach.

Interviewer: So, do you consider that as a Chinese teacher that chalk and talk is a traditional Chinese pedagogical practice? Is that your understanding of…?

Aki: Not only Chinese all, and then the children just sit and listen, they don't think. Because before we just, “Right now you need to open your book to page 23,” and then we just teach the content but we don't let them to think or even try to find out the answer by themselves, we seldom do that.

Interviewer: So, do you prefer how you do it now or do you prefer that?

Aki: I think prefer now because in the local school I always rush, rush, rush because the curriculum is so full. I need to teach I think four textbooks in a year. So, it's just, so today, one chapter, tomorrow one chapter. You never stop and reflect yourself too.

Interviewer: And what about teaching now, you said you do activities rather than the textbook, but that must also be a challenge if you need to translate everything?

Aki: It is but the children like the activities and they get to think. It’s less pressure I think on the teacher to get through content. But like the translation is lots of time. I think easier in English as there are already lots of IB schools in English.

Interviewer: How do you think pupils view each of you? Do you think they view you as co-teachers or do you think they view you as the Chinese teacher and Danny as the English teacher?
Aki: I think they know we are co-teachers and then we always have the same point of way of two, especially Chinese pupils, right? We seldom go…

Interviewer: Do you think the pupils have a preference to go to one teacher over the other for anything?

Aki: No I think they come to us both. Some pupils try - they try speak to me English but I always speak Chinese, even I reply them Chinese.

Interviewer: What about the parents, do they have a preference? I mean, have you noticed that it depends on their language for example? Which of you they go to?

Aki: One or two they prefer go to Danny. But most no, they are like happy to approach both. Mainly in English though. The parents they mainly contact us in English

Interviewer: Why do you think that is?

Aki: I think Danny usually reply emails and also like some parents they don't write good Chinese, so might be easier for them in English.

Interviewer: Okay. So…. Sorry I can't see where I have got up to with my questions, hold on.. Okay. Do you think the school values all languages equally? And by that I mean the three school languages.

Aki: No.

Interviewer: Okay, why? Where's the emphasis for you, do you believe?

Aki: Like the school they say we want Chinese and English is 50-50 but most of the special is not all specialist they use English to teach. So, it's quite difficult for children use 50 and 50 English and Chinese in their school life too. And we always said we can do the same thing in English lesson or in Chinese lesson like writing. But Chinese and English is totally a different language. Even though how we learn like I learn English is totally different from what I learn English, the style is totally different. I don't know…

Interviewer: So you think its unequal value as it's not really 50:50 because of the specialist subjects?

Aki: Yeah. And also the leadership actually they don't really understand what is Chinese, in my point of way.

Interviewer: What do you mean by that?
Aki: Because they haven’t learned Chinese so how can they know how to teach Chinese?

Interviewer: Yeah.

Aki: I think they don’t understand some of the ways to learn. Chinese is different to learn that English as you need to learn the characters. This takes long time and need practise

Interviewer: So this misunderstanding about how to learn Chinese makes you feel that it is not as valued? Or is it the fact that there are no native speakers of Putonghua that makes you feel this way?

Aki: Both. But I think for us we don’t feel like they’re are from mainland China they are a group and we’re Cantonese we are a group, we don’t… but I heard some people say that, like that we are Cantonese group

Interviewer: Okay. But you don’t feel like that?

Aki: No

Interviewer: So, you say that in terms of status of languages within the school it appears that English is valued most then the Mandarin then the Cantonese? Have I understood that correctly?

Aki: Yes

Interviewer: Is there anything else that the school does or doesn’t do that contributes to you feeling this way? Do you have anything to add?

Aki: No. That’s alright, I don’t have to add anything.

Interviewer: Are there any ways that learning is enhanced or impacted as a result of working with two languages within the classroom?

Aki: Yeah. Especially for the pupils who don't speak Chinese at home because it's quite difficult for them. When they don't speak they really can't read, can’t write and then during the Chinese lesson they really need one on one. But I've got other 26 so I can't put so many times on them and then when you give them some individual work because they don't got the foundation, even though I give them basic stuff they still can't do it.

Interviewer: And how does that change the way they interact in class?

Aki: So, they just... sometimes, like when you give out your instruction, they just sit there and close their ears, they don’t listen to you.
Interviewer: But do those same pupils excel when the language is English?

Aki: Yes I think so. And then they always feel frustrated in Chinese lesson because they don't know what they are doing, right?

Interviewer: So, do you think that that influences on their attitude to learning because they see that they're behind?

Aki: Yes. They just Chinese equal boring.

Interviewer: You think the children view learning Chinese as boring?

Aki: Yes, because of the dictation and is in other tests too. They have to learn like this. In local school they do drills, so many drills but these children don’t like learning like this way and so get behind. They don't like it and find it hard. But expectations are the same, so much pressure on teacher. Sometimes parents say to me that their children not learn enough, but I can’t do anything else, they don’t want learn Chinese.

Interviewer: It sounds frustrating for you too!

Aki: Very much.

This is the difference between Chinese and English because I don't know, when you learn Chinese it really takes time to build up your foundation, when you build up your foundation it's easy to read and write to learn Chinese before English. I don't know in my point of way, it's quite easy to, how do you say, learn English. English you can use the sound to write but China is totally like, it's totally different.

Interviewer: So, we talked about kind of the value of languages from a staff and school perspective, and what about pupils? Do you think they value the three languages equally?

Aki: It's English, Mandarin.

Interviewer: You think the pupils value English most then Mandarin?

Aki: I don't know because like during the assembly, principal speak in English, how come they will like, “I need to speak Chinese.” They will get the message that everyone speak English.

Interviewer: So assemblies are always conducted in English?

Aki: Yeah, except that they did a bit Chinese, they did a bit English. But that was just once I think.
Interviewer: And what is the, and I know we've touched on this, but is there a place for Cantonese?

Aki: Yes. I just warn them because when they discuss this kind of like speaking practice was, that's why I always encourage them to speak Mandarin during Chinese lesson. But like UOI or math, when they're doing projects. When they go together they sometimes start to speak Cantonese, I seldom discourage them. But when I go into the group and ask question so they will reply me in Mandarin.

Interviewer: So do you think the pupils value Cantonese?

Aki: I think they like it as it's their mother tongue. Once they went to assembly with secondary pupils and they got excited that they were all speaking Cantonese when they walked in. But in class they seldom use it. It's only social language. It's like, when they get to year 7 they are taught in English and they know they have to learn this so it's most important.

Interviewer: You think the pupils are aware of how languages are used later in their schooling and that changes how they interact with languages now?

Aki: Yes as their parents know this. And parents want bilingual so come to [school name] so they know it's important. They can speak Cantonese at home.

Interviewer: Okay. Is there anything you'd like to add on languages?

Aki: No. I think that's it.

Interviewer: Okay. Actually, just one final thing from me. How do you get to choose who you work with? Is that your choice, your co-teacher?

Aki: You have to fill in form but the leadership decide who you work with. Because when I first come here because I'm from a local school to and IB school, is very important to get a good partner. Because at least he or she can guide you because when you are from local school, you don't got any experience about IB or bilingual. You really need to learn a lot. So, if your partner is not-, then you don't know that year.

Interviewer: So you rely on the experience of your co-teacher to guide you in terms of teaching in a bilingual setting and understanding the IB?

Aki: Yes as you are from local school. It is very different especially IB way. We don’t have that in local school.

Interviewer: Great, thank you. Is there anything else that I haven’t asked you that you would like to add?
Aki: No, I think that is ok for me.

Interviewer: Thank you very much. Let me just turn...

[End of Audio – 00:31:14]
### Appendix 13 – Coding Examples for Pupil Interview

#### Amalgamated data for Y3 and Y5: Key Theme - Hegemony of English over Chinese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open coding</th>
<th>Emerging themes</th>
<th>Key theme</th>
<th>Examples from transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty of learning Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese is perceived more negatively than English</td>
<td>Hegemony of English over Chinese</td>
<td>‘I think English is more important’ Y3 Angela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of characters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Chinese is just not that big. People love English class’ Y3 Kevin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher language background</td>
<td>English is perceived as the dominant language in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Definitely not Putonghua because all the other subjects are in English except for Chinese’ Y3 Angela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background mediates classroom practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff mainly English speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist subject teacher languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table for Y3 data only: Key theme – Development of language and associated identities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open coding</th>
<th>Emerging themes</th>
<th>Key theme</th>
<th>Examples from transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identities of belonging</td>
<td>Language and cultural identities</td>
<td>Development of language and associated identities</td>
<td>‘I would say I am Hong Kongese’ Y3 Angela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positional identities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘I communicate with them with English but like sometimes they act like Cantonese inside’ Angela Y3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Vs Hong Kong identities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘I’m not very Hong Kongese sort of thing because I speak English’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic competence</td>
<td>Encouragement in use of school languages</td>
<td>Bilingual practices</td>
<td>Seeking support for language development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School supports bilingual identities of pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learner agency enables &amp; constrains language learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>almost most of the time’ Kevin Y3</td>
<td>‘Because Chinese I’m not very good at’ Kevin Y3</td>
<td>‘For Chinese I think [teachers name] will say I improved a lot’ Y3 Angela</td>
<td>‘UOI is bilingual’ Y3 Kevin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open coding</td>
<td>Emerging themes</td>
<td>Key theme</td>
<td>Examples from transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identities of belonging</td>
<td>Language and cultural identities</td>
<td>Development of language and associated identities</td>
<td>'When I am around my grandparents, I normally speak Cantonese because they only know Cantonese’ Y5 Ashley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘I am also better in English than Chinese’ Winston Y5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Some people like Chinese experts or stuff like that’ Winston Y5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I love Chinese” those kinds if people’ Winston Y5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed identities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual practices</td>
<td>School supports bilingual identities of pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘They have equal amount in class’ Y5 Jeffery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Because I have aunties, so I also have to speak a lot of English too’ Jeffery Y5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingualism perceived as important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Chinese is really important but then the English is just ruling it’ Winston Y5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘They have equal amount of classes’ Winston Y5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching supports language learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking support for language development</td>
<td>Learner agency enables &amp; constrains language learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘It’s a bit cheating’ Winston Y5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘English it’s a word and you know the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Avoidance of Chinese use/learning

In Chinese, the characters are really hard to write. And when you write it it's so many strokes. So, that you get really tired and a lot of time you forget how to write it. Vanessa Y5

No place or value for Cantonese

Marginalisation of Cantonese language and identities

'We’re not allowed to speak Cantonese’ Y5 Ashley

Not allowed to use Cantonese

Table for Y3 data only: Key theme – Hegemony of English over Chinese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open coding</th>
<th>Emerging themes</th>
<th>Key theme</th>
<th>Examples from transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty of learning Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese is perceived more negatively than English</td>
<td>Hegemony of English over Chinese</td>
<td>'I think English is more important’ Y3 Angela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Chinese is just not that big. People love English class’ Y3 Kevin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘I can’t find like any Chinese books with Pinyin and they’re hard words. I guess some of the words I don’t know how to read and I don’t get the story’ Chloe Y3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Definitely not Putonghua because all the other subjects are in English except for Chinese’ Y3 Angela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff mainly English speaking</td>
<td>English is perceived as the dominant language in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Chinese teachers know English so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher language background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mediates classroom practice

Specialist subject teacher languages

they communicate with the English teachers in English’  
Y3 Chloe

‘The drama teacher is English, he is not Chinese, so sometimes specialist lessons they’re not bilingual’  
Kevin Y3

Table for Y5 data only: Key theme – Hegemony of English over Chinese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open coding</th>
<th>Emerging themes</th>
<th>Key theme</th>
<th>Examples from transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty of learning Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese is perceived more negatively than English</td>
<td>Hegemony of English over Chinese</td>
<td>‘Putonghua there is too a lot of words that I don’t understand, so I find it hard’ Jeffery Y5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of characters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘In Chinese, the characters are really had to write’ Vanessa Y5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher language background mediates classroom practice</td>
<td>English is perceived as the dominant language in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Definitely not Putonghua because all the other subjects are in English except for Chinese’ Y3 Angela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff mainly English speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Chinese teachers know English so they communicate with the English teachers in English’ Y3 Chloe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 14 – Coding Examples for Teacher Interview**

**Key theme: Teacher perceptions of co-teaching practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open coding</th>
<th>Emerging themes</th>
<th>Key theme</th>
<th>Examples from transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers have equal roles in classroom</td>
<td>Practice supports language learning</td>
<td>Teacher perceptions of co-teaching practice within the school</td>
<td>‘We try to encourage the pupils to use both languages’ T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to local school practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘it’s not standalone, even if one of us is taking the lead, we are both constantly involved and use both languages with the children’ T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children can speak Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘They can show off say things to me, I’ve got no idea what they are talking about’ T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages equal within the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in co-teaching</td>
<td>Practice hinders language learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘If we asked them to write in Chinese it would take hours’ T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of school expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘I didn’t have any training so I don’t know about the models’ T4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensions in meeting expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘I don’t think it’s very clear’ T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties of dual language instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘I think it’s probably a marketing ploy’ T3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key theme: Teacher identities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open coding</th>
<th>Emerging themes</th>
<th>Key theme</th>
<th>Examples from transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic background of school leadership</td>
<td>Mandarin teachers' identity is marginalised relative to English teacher</td>
<td>Teacher identities</td>
<td>‘There are gaps for things in Chinese’ T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourcing difficulties in Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“It’s too difficult for everything to be translated into Chinese” T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘My co-teacher is a sidekick’ T1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Unequal language use | ‘I’d say 80% is in English’ T2  
| Co-teacher relationship not equal | ‘The perception is I’m just a TA’ T4  
| Parent perceptions | |  
| Respectful partnership | ‘We know how each other work’ T3  
| Learning from each other | ‘You can always talk to her [co-teacher] and then also get suggestions’ T2  
| Collaboration and team work | ‘We know what our style is and where we’re going’ T4  
| Pupil perceptions of co-teachers | ‘I think they see us as both the same. They will go to us both for help’ T4  
| Perceptions of self as a co-teacher | ‘We are a team’ T1  
|  | ‘Pupils see us as both the same’ T3  
|  |  
| Teacher linguistic background in Cantonese | ‘They don’t know I speak Cantonese’ T2  
| Parent perception of Cantonese | ‘When I arrive at the school I try to pretend I don’t speak Cantonese’ T2  
| Identity as Cantonese speaker | ‘Parents view is that the Chinese teacher may not be as qualified as native Mandarin speaker’ T1  
| Cantonese as teacher identity |  
| Teachers’ perceptions of self and co-teacher supports identity as equals | |
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### Appendix 16 – Transcribed Y5 Video Recorded Lesson (March 2017)

**14th March 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Audio</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:34</td>
<td>Aki</td>
<td>‘Thomas, come and sit on the carpet as well please.’ Thomas, 請過來坐在地毯上。Thomas, qǐng guò lái zuò zài dì tán shang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:41</td>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>‘That's it. Ok thank you. So today we are going to start a new unit of inquiry. ‘A journey to Japan!’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:54</td>
<td>Jua</td>
<td>‘I'm from Japan’ Raises his hand as he calls out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:57</td>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>‘That's right Jua, you are! And that's why you are also going to be our class expert, - does that sound ok with you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:07</td>
<td>Jua</td>
<td>‘Yeah’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:09</td>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>You will be creating a book that will tell a story of your everyday life as a Japanese child – it’s going to be a book about you! You will be the Japanese character. As we work through the unit, you will gain experience of different aspects of Japanese life and culture that you can include in your book. You will tell us about your family, what you eat, the games you like to play. You can illustrate each page of your book with your own drawings. So today we have a number of different activities for you to do as you start your journey into Japan. Some of you will</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
work with me, some with [teacher name] and some of you will work independently. One group will be making sushi rolls –

Shhh please settle down -

Another group will be using the ipads to start their inquiry into how Japanese children live, and the third group will be doing some Maths review looking at the fractions work we started on Monday.

Cheer from the pupils

Pause – looks to co-teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4:02</th>
<th>Aki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'If you are working on the ipads as your first activity, you will need to take one of these worksheets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

如果你選擇使用 ipads 作為你的第一個活動，你需要在這裡拿一張工作紙。

Rú guǒ nǐ zuǎn zé shǐ yòng ipads zuò wéi nǐ de dì yī gè huò dòng nǐ xū yào zǎi zhè lǐ ná yī zhǎng gōng zuò zhǐ.

You will find a list of questions that you need to research and some excellent resources you can access on the back page. Remember you must present your research in your book bilingually.

你可以在背面找到一系列研究需要的問題和一些有用的資源。請注意，你必須在書中以雙語的形式發表研究。

Nǐ kě yǐ zài bèi zhǎo dào yī xì liè yán jiù xū yào de wèn tí hé yì xiē yòu yòng de zī yuán. qǐng zhù yì, nǐ bì xū zài shǐ zhōng yī shuang yǔ de xíng shì fā biǎo yán jiù.

I will leave these worksheets here for you to collect

我會把這些工作紙放在這裡等你來收

Wǒ huì bā zhè xiē gōng zuò zhǐ fàng zài zhè lǐ děng nǐ lái shōu

If you are making sushi rolls, you will be working with me.

Holds up the worksheet

Turns to show the back page

Puts worksheets on a table close to where she is sitting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:41</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>‘Have you got wasabi?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:41</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>你有芥末嗎？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:49</td>
<td>Aki</td>
<td>‘Yes we do have wasabi, but you will need to be careful as it’s hot! We will work over there on those tables. One person by each mat. I will show you what you need to do. 有，我們有芥末，但你要小心因為很熱！我們會在那些桌子上工作。一人一個墊子。我會告訴你需要做什麼。’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>‘Do we get to eat them afterwards?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:19</td>
<td>Aki</td>
<td>‘Yes, you can eat the rolls when we have finished making them. 有，我們有芥末，但你要小心因為很熱！我們會在那些桌子上工作。一人一個墊子。我會告訴你需要做什麼。’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shhhh - If you are doing Maths fractions, you will stay here on the carpet and work with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[teachers name]. Everyone will have a chance to do all of the activities.

Rú guǒ nǐ zài zuò fèn shù(shù xué), nǐ yào liú zài dì tán shang gēn [lǎo shī de míng zì] lǎo shī yī qǐ gōng zuò. měi ge rén dōu yǒu jī huì cān yǔ suǒ yǒu de huó dòng.

Any questions before we put you into groups?

Zài bāng nǐ men fēn zǔ zhī qián, yǒu méi yǒu qí tā de wèn tí?
Appendix 17 – Transcribed Y5 Video Recorded Lesson (May 2017)

15th May 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Audio</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:32</td>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>So today I like to welcome [teacher name]. Can we all say good morning please?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:41</td>
<td>Children in unison</td>
<td>Good morning [teachers name]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:50</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Good morning, I am really pleased to be working with you today!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:57</td>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>[teachers name] is joining us today to help us with our unit of inquiry. Today we are going got be making Japanese Kimono. Does anyone know what a Kimono is? Yes, Hedy -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:16</td>
<td>Hedy</td>
<td>It's like a dress that people wear. It has big sleeves and like a thing that goes around here</td>
<td>Motions around her waist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>You mean like a belt?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:50</td>
<td>Hedy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nods her head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:57</td>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>You’re right yes. Have a look up here at these pictures. These are all different Kimono’s. They are pretty aren’t they? Do you like the look of them? Has anyone seen these before?</td>
<td>Turns on projector to show pictures of Kimono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:49</td>
<td>Children in unison</td>
<td>Yes!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:01</td>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>So today, we are going to be designing our own Kimono and then we are going to make it. [teachers name] is joining us today as she will help us to make the kimono.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aki

The first thing you are going to do is to design the colours and patterns you would like on your kimono. You are going to do that on this template.

你要做的第一件事是在和服上設計你想要的顏色和圖案。你要把你的設計畫在這個樣板上。

Nǐ yào zuò de dì yī jiàn shì zài hé fú shàng shè jì nǐ xiǎng yào de yán sè hé tū àn. nǐ yào bā nǐ de shè jì huà zài zhè ge yàng bān shang.

I will distribute these once we get started.

當我們開始的時候，我就會把這些發給你們。

Dāng wǒ men kāi shǐ de shí hou, wǒ jiù huì fā gěi nǐ men.

When you are making your design you need to think about the research you have done. What patterns and pictures might be significant to a Japanese person. If you want to do some research to look at different Kimono’s you can do that too. The ipads are in the ipad trolley.

設計的時候，你需要考慮之前做過的研 究。對日本人來說，什麼樣的圖案和圖 片才是最重要的。 如果你想研究其他 不同的和服，你也可以這樣做。 ipads 就放在 ipad 手推車裡面。

Shè jì de shí hou, nǐ xū yào kǎo lǜ zhī qián zuò guò de yán jiū. duì rì běn rén lái shuō, shén me yàng de tú àng hé tū piàn cái shì zuì zhòng yào de. rú guǒ nǐ xiǎng yán jiū qí tā bù tóng de hé fú, nǐ yě kě yǐ zhè yàng zuò.

Once you have a design, you will work with [teacher name] to print your design and start making your kimono.
當你完成設計後，你要請 [老師的名字] 老師幫助你打印你的設計，並開始製作和服。

Dăng nǐ wán chéng shè jì hòu, nǐ yào qǐng [lǎo shī de míng zì] lǎo shī bāng zhù nǐ dǎ yǐn nǐ de shè jì, bìng kāi shǐ zhì zuò hé fú.

Does anyone have any questions so far?

到目前為止，大家有沒有任何問題？

Dào mù qián wéi zhǐ, dà jiā yǒu méi yǒu rèn hé wèn tí?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Question/Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:14</td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Do we work on our own or can we work with a partner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>我們是要自己完成工作，還是可以跟同學一起做？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wǒ men shì yào zì jǐ wán chéng gōng zuò, hái shì kě yǐ gēn tóng xué yī qǐ zuò?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:25</td>
<td>Aki</td>
<td>You will each do your own design. We are going to display your Kimono’s in the classroom and you will be able to show your parents when they come to visit your learning journey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>每個人都要有自己的設計。我們會在教室裏展示你設計的和服，等你們的父母來參觀、了解你的學習之旅時，你就可以給他們看。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Měi ge rén dōu yào yǒu zì jǐ de shè jì. Wǒ men huì zài jiào shì lǐ zhǎn shì nǐ shè jì de hé fú, děng nǐ men de fù mǔ lái cān guǎn、liáo jiē nǐ de xué xí zhī lǚ shí, nǐ jiù kě yǐ gěi tā men kàn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any other questions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>還有其他問題嗎？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hái yǒu qí tā wèn tí ma？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ok, please return to your seats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>好的，請大家回到自己的座位。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
好的，请大家回到自己的座位。
### Appendix 18 – Classroom Observation Schedule

#### Classroom observation schedule Y3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of observation</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23rd February 2017</td>
<td>Full day 9am – 3:25pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th March 2017</td>
<td>Full day 9am – 3:25pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd March 2017</td>
<td>Full day 9am – 3:25pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th April 2017</td>
<td>Full day 9am – 3:25pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th May 2017</td>
<td>Full day 9am – 3:25pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th May 2017</td>
<td>Full day 9am – 3:25pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st June 2017</td>
<td>Full day 9am – 3:25pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th June 2017</td>
<td>Full day 9am – 3:25pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Classroom observation schedule Y5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of observation</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28th February 2017</td>
<td>Full day 9am – 3:25pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th March 2017</td>
<td>Full day 9am – 3:25pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th March 2017</td>
<td>Full day 9am – 3:25pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th April 2017</td>
<td>Full day 9am – 3:25pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th May 2017</td>
<td>Full day 9am – 3:25pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th May 2017</td>
<td>Full day 9am – 3:25pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd May 2017</td>
<td>Full day 9am – 3:25pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th June 2017</td>
<td>Full day 9am – 3:25pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 19 – Video Recording as Part of the Classroom Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Video number</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23rd February 2017</td>
<td>S3200001</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>00:29:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th March 2017</td>
<td>S3200002</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>00:25:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd March 2017</td>
<td>S3080001</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>00:29:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th April 2017</td>
<td>S3080002</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>00:29:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th May 2017</td>
<td>S3080003</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>00:29:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th February 2017</td>
<td>S3140001</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>00:29:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th March 2017</td>
<td>S3140002</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>00:29:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th March 2017</td>
<td>S3140003</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>00:29:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th April 2017</td>
<td>S3140005</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>00:29:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th May 2017</td>
<td>S3140006</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>00:29:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th May 2017</td>
<td>S3140009</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>00:29:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd May 2017</td>
<td>S3140010</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>00:29:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th June 2017</td>
<td>S3160001, S3160002</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>00:16:12, 00:07:59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 20 – Interview Schedule With Pupils and Teachers

Student interview schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil pseudonym</th>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>Age (at time of interview)</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Length of audio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winston</td>
<td>26/04/2008</td>
<td>9 years 10 months</td>
<td>23rd June 2017 1pm</td>
<td>00:26:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffery</td>
<td>29/12/2007</td>
<td>10 years 2 months</td>
<td>29th June 2017 1pm</td>
<td>00:24:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>19/05/2008</td>
<td>9 years 9 months</td>
<td>21st June 2017 1pm</td>
<td>00:27:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>24/10/2010</td>
<td>6 years 6 months</td>
<td>28th June 2017 1pm</td>
<td>00:23:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>21/01/2009</td>
<td>7 years 5 months</td>
<td>22nd June 2017 1pm</td>
<td>00:21:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>9/11/2010</td>
<td>6 years 5 months</td>
<td>21st June 2017 3:30pm</td>
<td>00:21:36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher interview schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Year level taught</th>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Length of audio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danny (pair 1)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y5</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>27th June 2017 1pm</td>
<td>00:43:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aki (pair 1)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y5</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
<td>27th June 2017 3:30pm</td>
<td>00:31:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet (pair 2)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>Putonghua</td>
<td>23rd June 2017 3:30pm</td>
<td>00:24:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian (pair 2)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>29th June 2017 3:30pm</td>
<td>00:38:34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 21 – Participant Interview Data Wordcount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Length of audio</th>
<th>Transcribed word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>Y5 English Co-teacher</td>
<td>00:43:56</td>
<td>5124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aki</td>
<td>Y5 Chinese Co-teacher</td>
<td>00:31:14</td>
<td>3257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>Y3 English Co-teacher</td>
<td>00:38:34</td>
<td>5658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Y3 Chinese Co-teacher</td>
<td>00:24:08</td>
<td>3297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston</td>
<td>Y5 Student participant</td>
<td>00:31:14</td>
<td>2729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashely</td>
<td>Y5 Student participant</td>
<td>00:27:09</td>
<td>2134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffery</td>
<td>Y5 Student participant</td>
<td>00:24:17</td>
<td>2112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Y3 Student participant</td>
<td>00:21:47</td>
<td>2673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Y3 Student participant</td>
<td>00:23:20</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>Y3 Student participant</td>
<td>00:21:36</td>
<td>1772</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>