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Abstract

This research study investigates how three four-year-old Polish bilingual learners, use translanguaging whilst acquiring English during their first year of schooling. It is argued that if practitioners support translanguaging in the classroom then children’s bilingualism is seen to be valued (Cheatham, Jiminez-Siva and Park, 2015). There are, however, only a small number of research studies that have investigated how translanguaging is used in an Early Years setting to scaffold language learning (Kirsch, 2018; Kirsch and Seele, 2020; Lewis, Jones and Baker, 2012) and little research of this kind has been carried out in England to date. This thesis, therefore, seeks in part to address this gap and demonstrates how the children make use of translanguaging in different ways to communicate and how translanguaging scaffolds their language learning.

The research was conducted during one academic year in an Early Years setting within a primary school in England. Data were collected through audio-recordings, supplemented by field notes of the three children participating in a wide range of activities. Interviews were also carried out with their class teacher, Teaching Assistant, head teacher and their parents. A case study approach was adopted and thematic analysis used to categorise the data according to recurring themes that had arisen during the research.

Findings indicate that the children respond appropriately in either English or Polish to meet the contextual need and communicate through translanguaging, to mediate understandings, co-construct meanings, include and exclude others and demonstrate knowledge. Findings also show how the children’s translanguaging practices over the year act as a scaffold for both of their languages and thus for language learning, enabling the children to communicate confidently in both English and Polish with peers and adults.

Recommendations for Early Years teachers are presented to suggest ways in making use of first languages to scaffold the children’s language learning in the classroom. Finally, implications are discussed for Early Years policy and implementations.
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Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 General Introduction
This thesis offers unique insights into the translanguaging practices of three young Polish bilingual learners in their first year of schooling and seeks to address the gap in this under-researched community. The study was conducted in an Early Years setting in England. This first chapter discusses the context and purpose of the research study. The significance of the research is introduced in relation to the research questions and finally the structure of the thesis is outlined.

1.2 Context
Since after the Second World War there have been increasing numbers of bilingual children entering Early Years settings and many of these children are new to English. Twenty percent of school children in England have a first language other than English and it is now estimated that over a million school children in England are bilingual (DfE, 2019). This constitutes a very diverse population and includes new arrivals from the European Union (EU), as in this research study, refugee and asylum seeking children and also children from established minority ethnic communities. Certainly it would appear that any child in England who uses a language other than English is not in a minority population (Safford and Drury, 2013) and indeed bilingualism is now the norm in many schools (Whiteside and Gooch, 2016).

The school where the research was conducted uses English as the language of instruction as is the norm in English schools and is a small primary school in the Midlands, in a fast expanding town. The school has a total enrolment of 247 pupils (four to seven years). In addition, all the teachers, including myself (teacher-researcher), are monolingual English speakers, as in many Early Years settings in England (Drury, 2007, 2013; Bligh and Drury, 2015). The school serves a multi-ethnic community with children from a range of linguistic backgrounds and minority ethnic groups, representing over 100 languages spoken across the local authority. In the school there are currently 20 different languages spoken and these include Urdu, Punjabi, Gujerati, Shona, Yoruba, Polish, Romanian and others (Please see Chapter
3 for further details). The three Polish bilingual learners who participated in this research were four years old and in their first year of schooling.

The Framework for the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS, 2020) recommends that there should be greater use of first languages in classrooms (see Chapter 2, section 2.2.2). There is, however, still little guidance on how this might be translated into practice (Robertson, Drury and Cable, 2014) and English is still promoted foremost in UK schools. This presents a paradox for hard-working and conscientious teachers who are keen to view young bilingual learners positively as skilful learners and are aware of the cognitive benefits of bilingualism (Cummins, 1981, 2000; Gregory, Long and Volk, 2004 and Kenner and Ruby, 2013). Early Years teachers are, however, keenly aware that bilingual children’s communication and language skills must be assessed in English and that they should reach an expected level in the Early Learning Goals (see chapter 2, section 2.2.2) at the end of the Foundation Stage. As a teacher, I became aware that a great deal of communication and meaning-making was occurring which was not being captured by the assessment framework and not reflected in the achievement data. This research study aims to highlight this discrepancy in terms of bilingual children who may have well-developed communication and language development skills in their first language, but whose skills in their first language are still not recognised within the present system.

1.3 Purpose of the research

This study arises from my own experiences as an educational practitioner. Since it was my role as an Early Years practitioner which led me to focus on this research, it is my intention to keep the study firmly linked to practice, to use the research to consider implications for future practice for other practitioners in Early Years settings (please see Chapter 6 for more details). I embarked on this research study because in my early days of teaching I wanted to welcome and validate the linguistic resources which the young bilingual learners brought with them to my classroom and encourage the use of their mother tongue as a tool for their learning. Even after forty years spent in classrooms working with bilingual children and their families, I am still curious and still searching for the best ways to understand their knowledge, skills and understanding as learners.
While I was in my first year of teaching in 1974 in a large London Borough, I had several children in my class whose first languages were unknown to me. I attempted to include them and differentiate my teaching accordingly, but I felt especially uninformed of what they knew and how I needed to teach them within our classroom. My interest in young bilingual learners and my desire to gain a greater understanding of how the pupils come to understand and use English alongside their first languages stems from my professional experience. Hence, my post graduate studies focused on the areas of early bilingual development, teaching English as an Additional Language and an M.A. in Linguistics in Education.

I have taught bilingual children in schools around England both as a class teacher and specialist teacher employed through Section 11 (see section 2.2.2) and have taught in the participating school for over 13 years. My position as a class teacher provides me with a unique and privileged access to the learning experiences of young bilingual learners in an Early Years setting. The research study was created as I reflected on my own teaching experiences as a practitioner and this led me to this doctoral study of three young Polish bilingual learners (Anna, Maria and Peter) in their first year of schooling.

I began to question how and why the three children interacted with each other, their monolingual peers and other adults in school in both their first language (Polish) and English without overt planning or agreement between the children. I became very interested in how the children used their languages according to a range of contexts in everyday situations. By observing the children's growing understanding and control of their language learning I was captured by their enthusiasm, creativity and involvement and the energy and concentration they displayed in moving between languages with their peers and adults during their first year of schooling. This gave me the impetus to begin this study and to attempt to understand bilingual learning from the perspectives of the children themselves.

I wanted to find out their level of involvement in the classroom situation and if they were fully active members of the group or merely bystanders. For example: Are they supported to learn from both adults and peers? Do they use their first language in school? These questions have remained with me throughout my career and have now developed into a more focused research interest. I wondered how I could begin
to define their knowledge and understanding adequately, since this really requires an insider’s perspective and an interpretation of how they make sense of their new language. I have always wanted to explore how these learners begin to navigate their journey into this new environment in which they find themselves and how they manage this task in their new language - English. Within the present school, my daily encounters with the three young Polish bilingual learners inspired me to deepen my understanding of their language backgrounds and try to interpret how they approached the task ahead of them as they moved through their first year of schooling and tried to make sense of their learning. I needed to understand how the three young Polish bilingual learners (Anna, Maria and Peter) drew upon their first language to make meaning of their environment (Garrity, Aquino-Sterling, Van-Liew and Day, 2016) in a mainstream Early Years setting. Building upon children’s strengths and positioning them as language users instead of lacking language (Axelrod, 2014) is an underlying motive of this research.

1.4 The significance of the research

Schools in the United Kingdom (UK) have undergone a shift in their pupil demographic which in part reflects the changing pattern of trans-migration since the accession of new member states to the European Union (EU) from 2004 to 2007 (Department for Children, Schools and Families DCSF, 2008). There are now nearly a million Polish families living in the UK, making up the largest foreign-born community in this country, with Polish being the second most spoken language (Office for National Statistics, 2019; Flynn, 2018). This directly relates to the significance of my study of three young Polish bilingual learners in the Early Years as research with this community should be of interest to educators, policy makers and researchers.

The study also sheds light on the provision of support and creation of learning opportunities for the children by their teachers. The specific language needs of young bilingual learners are still not sufficiently recognised. Bilingual learners come into Early Years settings with considerable linguistic knowledge which has not always been well understood by the education system and has not hitherto been deeply explored by educational researchers (Safford and Drury, 2013). The study also seeks to contribute to Early Years policy and practice and articulates the
importance of maintaining and using first languages in the classroom to scaffold bilingual children’s learning in the mainstream classroom. This study also hopes to emphasise that if the richness and variety of bilingual children’s experience is understood and adopted at policy level, the possibilities of success in language learning will be significantly enhanced.

The present study reflects an enthusiasm on my part to conduct research which would do more than merely highlight existing issues. From the outset, I was committed to making a positive contribution to the learning experiences of young bilingual children and give something beneficial to the participating school. Viewing the children’s bilingualism through the lens of translanguaging revealed the linguistic resources they bring to the classroom, using both languages to communicate with their Polish and English peers and how their learning in school is scaffolded through the use of their first language. This also strengthened my conviction of the value of first languages and became the impetus to pursue doctoral research in this area, with a focus on the following research questions:

How do young Polish bilingual learners make use of translanguaging in different ways to communicate in an Early Years setting?

How do young Polish bilingual learners use translanguaging to scaffold their language learning?

1.5 Structure

Chapter one provides an introduction to the study and background information which informs the research. It describes the research journey, presents the context of the study and its research aims and questions, before concluding with the significance of the research and the structure of the thesis.

Chapter two presents an overview of key theoretical perspectives underpinning this research and provides a conceptual framework. It reviews existing literature on young bilingual learners in the Early Years of education and defines bilingualism, code switching and translanguaging. Scaffolding from a socioconstructivist
perspective is introduced, leading to a discussion of translanguaging and scaffolding research. This chapter also indicates how the study is linked to previous research as well as highlighting issues in current research which the study addresses.

Chapter three reviews early childhood research approaches including case studies, and describes the study’s research design and methodology and choices made in relation to the research design and data collection. The participants are discussed in detail. It also discusses the methods used to collect data through interviews, audio recordings and participant observation. This is followed by a discussion of ethical considerations, thematic analysis and reflection on the role of practitioner-researcher.

Chapter four looks at the translanguaging practices of Anna, Maria and Peter and analyses data according to seven themes which are drawn from the data and the literature. These include: - translanguaging to mediate understandings among each other, to co-construct meaning of what the other is saying, to construct meaning within themselves, to include and exclude others, to demonstrate knowledge and to scaffold language learning.

Chapter five brings together key findings with regard to the research questions and discusses these in reference to literature, justifying the originality of the study and clarifies its contribution to the body of existing knowledge in the field. There follows a discussion of how the findings provide insights into how the three children make use of translanguaging practices to scaffold their language learning throughout their first year of schooling.

Chapter six reflects back over the whole research process, summarises the main findings, and considers conclusions to be drawn from the analysis of the data in terms of the research questions. The chapter reflects on the study’s contributions to both the research field and Early Years policy and practice, including recommendations for teachers of young bilingual learners. Finally, some of the limitations of the study are discussed, and possible directions for future research are suggested emerging from this study.
Chapter 2  Literature review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter explores the literature in the field of bilingualism in the Early Years and translanguaging which is the focus of this research and forms its theoretical basis. This chapter presents research studies which look at the experiences of young bilingual learners and how they make use of their languages to communicate.

This literature review discusses the findings from other research studies with young bilinguals. These have provided the foundation for the research questions given in Chapter 1 and which has led to the chosen thematic analysis adopted in the methodology for this study.

Translanguaging theory has provided researchers and practitioners with a useful framework to understand the everyday communicative practices of bilingual children and to find ways to scaffold new learning in bilingual spaces (Hamman, 2018). Translanguaging provides a means of including children and their families for whom the language of the school is not the language of the home. Translanguaging is the chosen framework for this study as it provides ‘a lens to explore students’ use of language’ (Bauer, Presiado and Colomer, 2017, p.12). Studies by Garcia, 2009; Garcia and Kano, 2014 and other researchers’ work in the field of translanguaging (see below: 2.6) are pertinent to my study on how young children are using their first language whilst acquiring another language in an Early Years context.

The chapter begins by defining bilingualism in the Early Years and with a review of English Government and Education policies relating to young bilinguals. This is followed by a discussion of bilingual children in the Early Years and the linguistic resources that young bilinguals bring to the Early Years classroom; language of the home and code switching. Scaffolding from a socioconstructivist perspective is discussed in relation to young bilingual learners. This leads into the final section on translanguaging and scaffolding research from an applied linguistics point of view in an Early Years setting.
2.2 Bilingualism in the Early Years

2.2.1 Definitions

There is no agreed, common definition or understanding of the term ‘bilingual’ (Baker and Wright, 2017). It hides a very complex phenomenon and Baker and Wright ask:

‘does the term ‘bilingual’ cover those who are able to speak a language but don’t? Those who understand what others say in one of their languages but rarely or never use that language? Does the term ‘bilingual’ cover those who are proficient in one language but are only just beginning to learn a second language? Does the term ‘bilingual’ cover those who can speak a language without literacy, or only those who speak, read and write in both languages?’ (Baker and Wright, p. xv).

These questions highlight that there is not just one dimension and there are many variations and types of bilingual learner and different bilingual families.

The ‘balanced bilingual’ (Cummins, 2000) is one term which attempts to capture an individual who is approximately fluent in both languages across the various contexts. In an everyday setting, most bilingual learners will use their two languages for different purposes. Interestingly, Skutnabb-Kangas (2007) reflects that most bilinguals are only bilingual because they are forced to be in order to survive in the majority community. In addition, Baker (2014) points out that, ‘Given the great number of dimensions of skill in each language and the great range of different contexts where a language may or may not be used, it becomes apparent that a simple categorisation of who is or who is not bilingual is almost impossible.’ Baker (2014, p. 125).

Scheffler (2015) comments that if children are born in bilingual families and experience two languages from birth, they usually become active bilinguals. They both understand and speak two languages or alternatively they become passive bilinguals, often understanding two languages but only speaking one (De Houwer, 2009). Some children learn two languages simultaneously from birth or may begin to learn an additional language whilst still continuing to develop their first language (Wagner, 2018).
In response to the intensified movements of peoples across national borders and consequent language contact and change in the 21st century, Garcia, Sylvan and Witt (2011) proposed that bilingualism is not linear but dynamic. This conceptualisation of bilingualism goes beyond the notion of additive or subtractive bilingualism as defined by Lambert (1990). Additive bilingualism occurs when the learning of another language does not interfere with the learning of a first language. Consequently, both languages are well developed. In contrast, subtractive bilingualism occurs when a second language is learnt to the detriment of the first language which can result in the loss of the first language. Instead it is suggested that the language practices of all bilinguals are complex and interrelated and suggests that they do not emerge in a linear way. Garcia (2009) likens bilingualism to an all-terrain vehicle with individuals using it to adapt to both the ridges and craters of communication in uneven terrains. She also compares bilingualism to a banyan tree, because bilingualism is complex as it adapts to the soil in which it grows (Garcia, 2009).

Garcia and Kleifgen (2015) have taken the definition of bilingualism a little further and contributed to the large amount of literature on this subject. Dynamic bilingualism as defined by Garcia and Kleifgen (2015) refers to the development of different language practices to varying degrees in order to interact with increasingly multilingual communities. The difference is that within a dynamic bilingual perspective, languages are not just viewed as autonomous systems that people ‘have’ but rather as practices that people ‘use’.

In addition to the concept of dynamic bilingualism, researchers have long argued that bilinguals are not just two monolinguals in one (Grosjean, 1982; Gutierrez-Clellen, 2002). By proposing the concept of multicompetence, Cook (2002) maintains that bilingual speakers are different from monolingual speakers because they hold knowledge of two or more languages in the same mind. Herdina and Jessner (2002) also propose that speakers of more than one language have dynamically interdependent language systems whose interactions create new structures, such as the use of mixed utterances or creation of ‘new’ words from both languages (see Axelrod’s 2014 study: 2.4.2) that are not found in monolingual systems. Consequently, it is important to move towards a definition of bilingualism that truly
reflects its advantages and celebrates the strengths of bilingual children, rather than a ‘deficit’ model (see Cummins and Hornberger, 2010 in 2.4) which emphasises limitations or weaknesses. It would appear that according to Baker (2014) ‘a simple categorisation of who is or who is not bilingual is almost impossible’ (p.125).

2.2.2 English Government and Education policies relating to young bilinguals

It is important to emphasise that despite recent research (Garcia and Wei, 2014; Garcia and Kleifgen, 2015; Cummins and Hornberger, 2010; Baker, 2014; Baker and Wright, 2017; Wei, 2000; Kenner, 2004; Kenner and Ruby, 2013) highlighting the positive contribution of languages in a young child’s education, this has not always been reflected in the key policy documents on the teaching and learning of young bilingual children in mainstream classrooms in England. Garrity et al., (2016) maintain that despite the well-known benefits of bilingualism in young children (Kovacs and Mehler, 2009b, Tabors, 2008) there still appears to be a mismatch between research and current education policy. This may well be due to the subtractive and monoglossic language ideologies that value monolingualism over bilingualism (Garcia, 2009).

Historically, children’s English language proficiency became an important educational issue with the arrival of New Commonwealth citizens from Ghana, Nigeria, India, Pakistan, Jamaica and Trinidad from the late 1950s onwards, or even earlier with the arrival of refugees as workers after the end of the Second World War (1945). It was recognised that the children from these backgrounds should develop their English as a Second Language (ESL) knowledge and skills as quickly as possible in order to overcome the ‘language barrier’ (Department of Education and Science DES, 1974). In 1966, England established ‘Section 11’ of the Local Government Act in response to this period of migration. Section 11 funded the teachers and resources to help bilingual children to quickly assimilate, either by withdrawal classes in mainstream schools or through language centres (Safford and Drury, 2013). Eventually, the ESL provision developed in the 1950s and 1960s was scrutinised in the 1970s and various Government surveys reported that the reception
ESL provision did not adequately prepare children for their integration into mainstream classrooms (DES, 1971b, 1972). The changing political and cultural climate contributed to the publication in 1976 of the Bullock Report: ‘A Language for Life’ (DES, 1976) which recognised that English language development was a long term process involving all areas of the curriculum and that short term intensive English language teaching only served as a limited form of educational provision. This created a fundamental shift in the positioning of bilingual learners as ‘full participants’ in their education, and by 1985 the Swann Report (DES, 1985) stressed that ‘the language needs of an ethnic minority child should no longer be compartmentalised’ (Swann Report, 1985, p.385-386).

This influential Government report (DES, 1985) found these language centres to be an example of institutional racism and they were abandoned. The Commission for Racial Equality [CRE], 1986 ruled that bilingual children should learn in the mainstream classroom; it was recommended that ‘it is better to educate children whose first language is not English in mainstream classes rather than separately’ (p.6). This report also stated that bilingual children ‘suffered detriment’ (op.cit. p.13) as their learning processes were hindered by not taking place in an environment where they can learn alongside their monolingual (English) peers through the whole curriculum. It has been argued that these important documents created a new agenda for the education of bilingual learners and moved their education from ‘outsider to active participant’ (Leung, 2016, p.25). This move from segregation to inclusion of bilingual children represented an important shift in how bilingualism and bilingual children were viewed (Leung, 2016).

English language teaching in England was largely labelled as English as a Second Language (ESL) up to the late 1980s, and since the early 1990s, as English as an Additional Language or EAL. This move from ‘Second’ to ‘Additional’ reflects the view that the label itself should suggest that they already have more than one language and a linguistic repertoire before learning English (Leung, 2016). This terminological change mirrored the developments in ideological and educational perspectives regarding bilingual pupils. In England from the 1990s to the present time, bilingual learners have been included in mainstream classrooms and this integration of bilingual children into the mainstream curriculum has been a
Government policy priority and has been strongly motivated by principles of equality of access to educational provision (Leung, 2016).

During this time of change, from 1999 to 2009 the Department for Education (DfE) produced extensive guidance and training materials for schools with a focus on bilingual children (for example, ‘Excellence and Enjoyment: working with children learning English as an Additional Language and learning and teaching for bilingual children in the primary years’) Bilingual pupils in Primary Years and New Arrivals Excellence - Primary National Strategy, DfES, 2006 and DCSF, 2008). These documents recommend that there should be consistent opportunities for including first languages in the Primary curriculum. This comprehensive guidance stresses that learning opportunities should be planned to help bilingual children develop their English by providing bilingual assistants and opportunities for children to hear and use their first languages in the classroom, as well as English.

In 2008, the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) was introduced and particular attention was paid to ‘the children’s cultural and linguistic differences and the critical role of the practitioner in providing opportunities to develop and value differences’ (EYFS, 2008, p.6). The current Early Years education policy is reflected in the EYFS guidance DCSF(2020) and DfE (2020) ‘Development Matters’ which is ‘underpinned by an understanding that language is central to our sense of identity and recognises and values linguistic diversity’ (Section 3.4, p.18). The EYFS (2020) recommends that first languages should be encouraged in the Early Years classroom and that practitioners need to find out as much as they can about a child’s prior language experience. The EYFS (2020) recommends that bilingual children should be offered opportunities to participate in activities which are not reliant on English in order to succeed: ‘...they must be able to participate in ways that reveal what they know and can do in the security of their home language’ (EYFS section 3.4. p.18). Despite these positive recommendations, however, the early learning goals for communication and language, and for literacy, ‘must still be assessed in relation to the child’s competency in English’ (section 3.4. p.18).

Despite policy rhetoric (Cable, Eyres and Collins, 2006) ‘there still seems to be little guidance on how this might be translated into practice in a mainstream Early Years classroom’ (Robertson et al., 2014, p. 6), where all language skills are still assessed
in English and these assessments are also used with monolingual children who speak English already. Thus, bilingual learners are framed through a ‘monolingual planning and assessment framework’ which may affect their future potential (Safford and Drury, 2013, p.70). For bilingual children, the formal assessments available do not ‘adequately measure a child’s full knowledge, but rather the child’s knowledge of the test’ (Michael-Luna, 2013, p. 448). This testing system fails to take into account the bilingual children’s existing considerable cultural and linguistic knowledge which is viewed as a ‘problem’ (Safford and Drury 2013), despite the EYFS (2020) positive and encouraging recommendations (Section 3.4, p.18).

Findings from Robertson et al’s (2014) research challenge current Early Years policy and practice in relation to early bilingualism and argue that maintaining first languages and learning English are still wrongly interpreted as ‘two opposing forces’ (p.1) that do not seem to be reconciled in English schools and Early Years settings. Their research findings indicate that there was very limited evidence of children being encouraged to use their first languages for learning. Mottram and Hall (2009) argue that the ‘current language of schooling is sharply focused on deficit and on oversimplified, easily measurable notions of attainment’ (p.109). The importance of creating opportunities for bilingual learners to use their first languages in the classroom, is also supported by Grieve and Haining (2011) who stress that this helps to build their sense of identity and is a valued skill. Although the EYFS (2020) recommends that first languages should be encouraged in the classroom, (section 3.4, p.18) there is no specific educational policy regarding their use. Consequently, the extent to which teachers recognise and value children’s first languages is largely dependent on their interpretation of policy (Mehmedbegovic, 2017). It would appear, therefore, that there is a disparity between what EYFS policy documents recommend and the reality of the classroom for both children and practitioners.

Flynn and Curdt-Christiansen’s (2018) research explores this disparity and their findings contribute to a practical understanding of how ‘policy enactment in practice may be divorced from policy makers’ intentions’ (p. 410). Few studies have examined how teachers in England interpret policy in their classroom practice with bilingual children. Their study seeks to address this gap by investigating how policies for bilingual children have changed in England over the past twenty years and
explores how teachers make sense of past and current policies in relation to teaching bilingual children. The study reveals how policies are interpreted in reality in the classroom and to what extent policy is carried out in practice for bilingual children in England. Flynn and Curdt-Christiansen provide an analysis of bilingual policy documents before and after 2010, to reveal policy-makers’ intentions for the teaching and learning of bilingual children. It is interesting to note that assessment procedures outlined in the documents were inappropriate as they required teachers to use a measure of monolingual progress for children. This in turn reflects a problem which has been recognised in England whereby policy assumes a monolingual model for both teaching and assessment (Safford and Drury, 2013) and this problem still exists today, as detailed in the EYFS (2020).

Findings from Flynn and Curdt-Christiansen’s (2018) research indicated, for example, that in pre-2010 policy documents there were 133 mentions of ‘bilingual’ compared to post-2010 where there was only one mention. Additionally, there was a marked difference in the terminology used in the DfES (2006) Excellence and Enjoyment: Learning and teaching for bilingual children in the primary years document (p.25) and the DfE (2011) Developing Quality Tuition: Effective practice in schools: English as an additional language document (p. 1). Whereas in 2006 it was stated that bilingual children should reach their ‘potential’ and ensure access to the curriculum at a ‘cognitively appropriate level’ (p. 419), by 2011 there was a stark difference. This document stated that their learning ‘experience differs’ because they are learning through another language and their communities have ‘different understandings and expectations’ of education’ (Flynn and Curdt-Christiansen, 2018, p. 419).

Flynn and Curdt-Christiansen’s (2018) study examines how the policy for children learning English as an Additional Language has altered its intentions as governments have changed in the UK over the last twenty years. The post-2010 changes in policy suggest that the children are lacking something while they are learning language, rather than taking account of language learning for a child who already speaks other languages. These changes are particularly highlighted in post-2010 policy documents, which coincided with the change from a Labour (centre-left)
government to a coalition (liberal and centre-right) government, followed by a centre-right government after May 2015 (p.414).

Flynn and Curdt-Christiansen (2018) also compared the text of the two versions of The National Curriculum (DfE, 2013; DfES/QCA, 1999). They highlighted several differences including how much text was given to the teaching of children for whom English is an additional language and the use of terms related to such children and to inclusive practice. The pre-2010 document included eight pages of instruction for teachers in order to make their classes inclusive and oriented towards children for whom English is an additional language (DfES/QCA, 1999, p.37). In contrast, the post-2010 document devoted one page for all aspects of education for children with additional needs and only seven lines related to the teaching of children for whom English is an additional language (DfE, 2013, p.8).

Their comparison of policy documents from the pre- and post-2010 periods suggests that there has been a shift from a positive view of bilingualism as an advantage to one which views bilingualism as a disadvantage or barrier to learning which adversely affects young bilingual learners in mainstream Early Years classrooms today.

In addition, the study also involved a survey which was designed to encapsulate teachers’ understanding of these policy documents and their relevance to the classroom. Many teachers were unaware of national policy documents and were more likely to seek help from more experienced colleagues, rather than the local Ethnic Minority Achievement Service (EMAS) team in order to support their teaching of bilingual children. A lack of teacher training in this area was also highlighted. Findings also indicate that issues related to a disconnect between policy and practice, already identified by other researchers, still persist in England (Foley, Sangster and Anderson, 2013; Faulkner and Coates, 2013; Potter, 2007; Leung, 2016). A practical way in which practitioners could support the use of first languages as recommended above, is to encourage translanguaging practices which help children to become bilingual and continue to develop in their first language as well as in English – their new language and that of their school (Garcia, 2009).
This view is supported by Harju and Akerblom’s (2020) three year action-research project with four teachers of three to five year old children who do not speak Swedish in a pre-school with considerable linguistic diversity. Despite pre-schools in Sweden emphasising a multilingual approach, bilingual children still find themselves experiencing an educational system based on monolingual norms, whereby their language tends to be problematised (Akerblom and Harju, 2019). The focus was on facilitating knowledge and change through analysis and shared investigations, instead of the researchers telling the teachers what to do. One of the identified challenges at the outset of the research was the discussion around the children as ‘lacking in language’ (p.156) and being viewed from a deficit perspective regarding their language development; thus allowing the children little agency. In response to such challenges, researchers, in liaison with the teachers, restructured the daily activities according to a translanguaging approach.

In line with Garcia’s (2009) research, their findings indicate that by introducing translanguaging practices in the classroom with the children, there was more emphasis on language as a process for expression and meaning making rather than as a tool for naming. Furthermore, Harju and Akerblom’s (2020) research also demonstrated that this approach turned teachers away from deficit assumptions about the children and moved the focus towards more emphasis on the children’s skills and agency. Instead of viewing the children as ‘lacking in language’ (p.158), the teachers realised that they were in fact ‘competent agents and competent users of multiple languages’ (p.158), similar to the three Polish children in the present study. Harju and Akerblom’s (2020) research demonstrated that the theoretical concept of translanguaging became a ‘tool for perceiving what was going on in a new way’ (p.160).

2.2.3 Supporting bilingual children in Early Years settings

Early Years settings enable young children to be active and powerful constructors of their own learning (Conteh and Brock, 2011). Importantly, Chen (2009) stresses that the ways in which teachers mediate languages with their pupils will have powerful influences on their success and the most crucial component in their learning is what the children bring with them into the classroom. Research on the translanguaging of bilingual children at play has also shown that they accomplish various tasks and
goals through strategic use and application of their multilingual repertoires. Findings from Bengochea, Sembiante and Gort’s (2018) research with bilingual preschool children indicate that they translanguage all the time. They constantly move between the school language and their first language or formal and informal language. Bengochea, Sembiante and Gort (2018) investigated how emergent bilingual preschoolers in a Spanish/English dual language bilingual education programme in a city in the United States drew on their developing bilingual language and language repertoire in classroom-based sociodramatic play. These investigations revealed that the children were strategic in their combination of linguistic resources, which they integrated into their play with others. They drew on these resources to solve problems, extend storylines, choose roles, plan and initiate play and co-construct social roles. They also used translanguaging to mediate understandings with their peers and teachers whilst choosing which language features to select according to their audience (p.41). Their effortless movement between languages shows great intuition and confidence (Orellana and Garcia, 2014).

A multilingual Early Years classroom, such as the one featured in this study, provides an ideal opportunity for teachers and other educational practitioners to explore the linguistic resources that bilingual learners bring to the classroom (Cummins and Early, 2011). Supporting and encouraging bilingual learning in young children makes sense and is crucial to their long-term success, both academically and socially (Grosjean, 2010). Moreover, if Early Years teachers and practitioners support classroom interactions in which a child’s first language, English, or both are used through translanguaging, this can contribute to a supportive context in which children’s bilingualism is valued (Cheatham et al., 2015). Indeed, bilingual children are continually using their languages in a complex learning process (see section 2.4 for a detailed discussion) of which mainstream class teachers are largely unaware (Parke, Drury, Kenner and Robertson, 2002) and links directly with the difficulties that some practitioners may have in the classroom.

An understanding and validation of a child’s full linguistic repertoire is beneficial for young children’s emotional, social, and educational development, by finding a place for their first languages within the mainstream Early Years classroom (Dressler, 2014). Importantly, Early Years teachers need to be at the same time ‘positive
towards children’s language and cultural backgrounds, responding to children’s language and cultural needs, celebrating diversity and recognizing the linguistic and cultural gifts of such children’ (Baker, 2014, p.114). The early childhood years are a critical time in children’s bilingual development and in their development as bilingual members of the community (Palviainen, Protassova, Mard-Miettinen and Schwartz, 2016).

As well as the more structured classroom setting, an Early Years environment also encourages the use of other less structured spaces for all children - such as book corners, play houses and arts and crafts areas; for bilingual children. These spaces provide opportunities to use either the language of instruction or the informal use of their own first languages through play and social interaction (Garcia and Wei, 2014). This is supported by Conteh and Brock (2011) who highlight the need for these ‘safe spaces’ in which children are invited to co-construct their learning together. Similarly, Canagarajah’s (2011) research in the United States stresses that classrooms should be ‘safe spaces for students to adopt their multilingual repertoire for learning purposes’ (p.402). Teaching and learning spaces should be recognised as sites where learners construct experiences, bilingual peers mix and use translanguaging (Garcia, 2013) strategies to communicate their meanings. These sites or spaces are complex environments with children at their centre (Conteh and Brock, 2011). For young bilinguals safe spaces ‘empower them – with support of adults in a wide range of ways – to co-construct their learning’ (Conteh and Brock, 2011, p.358).

Additionally, Early Years settings encourage cooperative learning between both bilingual and monolingual peers and this creates social and linguistic interactions (see Chapter 5 for discussion of the data), providing assistance and direction (Garcia and Baker, 2007). Children’s simultaneous membership of different linguistic groups in school enables them to utilise their languages appropriate to each group according to the purposes needed (Gregory, 2008). These groupings provide opportunities to learn new skills in collaboration with others (Bodrova and Leong, 2012). Cooperative learning in groups through play and activities is a natural way to create a close community of learners where bilingual children can feel comfortable and connected to their peers and adults around them (Riojas-Cortez and Flores, 2009; Kirsch, 2018). Early Years settings offer opportunities for bilingual children to
integrate speaking and listening in a relaxed and enjoyable environment (Bredekamp, 2011; Mary and Young, 2017). If bilingual children play and interact in different groups either with their bilingual or monolingual peers or a combination of both, this reinforces their knowledge of their first language (Garcia, 2009; Garcia and Kleifgen, 2015) whilst meeting their diverse learning needs and interests (Melzig, Schick and Escobar, 2017).

2.2.4 **Language of the home**

Wei (2011) stresses that maintaining the first language is an important issue to minority communities, because there is a real need for everyday communication within the family. Communicating with elder family members could become difficult and young bilingual learners may feel less connected to their family traditions and heritage if they lose the language of their home. This could eventually affect their confidence (Espinosa, 2008; Magruder, Hayslip, Espinosa and Matera, 2013). This view is reflected in Kenner’s (2004) research which suggests that children who maintain their first language as well as learning English feel more connected to their families and communities. Through the use of their first language they can begin to develop flexible multilingual identities, linking different aspects of their lives and therefore enabling them to feel part of a wider multicultural society (Kenner, 2004).

With reference to the use of first languages, Baker (2005, p.147) states that, ‘When a person owns two or more languages, there is one integrated source of thought because both languages operate through the same ‘central system’ or the ‘home language’. Cummins (2000) also emphasises that continual development of first language competence is very much integral to the learning of other languages.

Through their research studies on first language proficiency, Yazici, Iltor and Glover, (2010) concluded that the first language plays a very important role in a child’s social and personal development and stressed the close relationship between first language development, children’s confidence, well-being, feelings of inclusion and educational attainment. Children acquire a diverse range of social, cultural and family values through their first language and it also plays an important role in the development of their comprehension and analytical skills (Aytemiz, 2000, p. 87). If a child develops knowledge of both languages, for example Polish and English, this
will have a beneficial effect on the way in which they can ‘... express their feelings, thoughts, interests and needs’ (Clark, 2002, p.182).

Annick de Houwer’s (2015) research explored the factors underlying young children and their families’ well-being in language contact situations. De Houwer (2015) argued that parents of children who are being raised with two languages may be advised to stop speaking one of the languages to their children (Kirsch, 2018). When children who are raised with two languages appear slow in developing language, grandparents, speech therapists and educators often blame the bilingual situation (Abdelilah-Bauer, 2008; De Houwer, 2009). Children who speak another language in addition to the school language can be ridiculed (Baker, 2014), and bilingualism may be considered the cause of unruliness in children who speak two languages.

De Houwer researched bilingual children speaking just a single language and the effect on their families. She carried out an in-depth case study of Kate, who stopped speaking Dutch at the age of four years old after she had moved from Belgium to the United States (US) with her family at the age of three years, eight months. In the US her father continued to speak Dutch to her, but Kate started to answer just in English. When at the age of four years, six months, Kate returned to Belgium again, she could no longer communicate with her monolingual Dutch-speaking grandparents, who understood no English (De Houwer, 2015). The research study suggested that children themselves may become embarrassed in interactions with relatives whose language they cannot speak and it may be impossible for children to communicate with members of their extended family and/or family friends.

Kate spoke Dutch with her paternal grandparents, her father, the researcher and anyone else who addressed her in Dutch. She spoke English with her mother, at school, with other children and English-speaking international visitors. There were no signs that the bilingual situation caused anyone any problems, or that the family’s well-being was negatively affected by the bilingual situation. Insights from her research revealed that speaking two languages in an Early Years setting appeared to be a major contributing factor for harmonious bilingual development. Informal observation also suggested that this development stood a good chance when children spoke each of their languages at more or less the same level (De Houwer, 2015).
The findings from this in-depth research study are of particular importance in relation to the present study with three young bilingual children. There are distinct similarities between Kate’s bilingual experiences and those of the three children in the present study. As with De Houwer’s (2015) research, the present study is also focusing on a deeper understanding of young children’s bilingualism through their interactions both in Polish and English. De Houwer (2015) has suggested that further research should be carried out into young children’s active and proficient language use and the communicative need for active use of each language. In this sense, the present study seeks in part to address this gap and inform future practice.

Gildersleeve-Neumann and Wright’s (2010) study in Portland U.S.A. examined English speech acquisition in three to five year olds whose first language was Russian and compared them to their monolingual (English) peers. The expanding body of research on simultaneous bilingual speech acquisition had primarily been conducted with groups of Spanish-English simultaneous bilinguals, the largest bilingual population in the United States. Although these studies had increased researchers’ understanding of bilingual speech acquisition, Gildersleeve-Neumann and Wright (2010) wanted to conduct further research to determine the extent to which they could generalise findings from these studies to other language groups. Findings from Gildersleeve Neumann and Wright’s (2010) case study demonstrated how the unique properties of the bilingual child’s two languages affected the way in which he or she developed the two language systems and shed light on why the languages affected each other. Many aspects of the Russian-English and English phonetic inventories did not differ significantly. Generally, children in both language groups had similar phonetic inventories, levels of phonetic complexity and types of error patterns. Gildersleeve-Neumann and Wright (2010) suggested that in the case of learning a second language, children relied on their first language skills. These findings are relevant to the present study, where the focus is on how the three young Polish bilingual learners make use of their first language skills in acquiring English.

Michael-Luna’s (2013) research presents a case study of an (Italian-English) dual language preschool community in a major United States (U.S.) city, working with parents to inform early childhood educators. The aim of the two year case study was to explore what information linguistically diverse families held about their bilingual
children’s language development and use. Parents were interviewed about the children’s use of Italian and English both at home and school. Michael-Luna (2013) has suggested that while the population of bilinguals and English learners continues to rise in our schools, teachers often feel frustrated with their lack of knowledge about the best practices to support their multilingual pupils’ language and cognitive development. The findings of the case study provided information which helped teachers to create linguistically appropriate support for young bilinguals and their families and which also gave them greater insight into understanding formal and informal assessment data. Additionally, this study also demonstrated how a rich knowledge of bilingual children’s use of language outside the classroom could strengthen teachers’ knowledge of bilingual development. Similarly, the research based around a classroom situation with the three young bilingual learners in the present study seeks to inform teachers’ understanding of bilingualism.

### 2.2.5 Code switching

The concept of code switching, as defined by Gumperz (1977), refers to the alternate use of two or more languages in the same utterance or conversation. Most of the early research on code switching has looked at adult–adult interaction (Clyne, 1967; Gumperz; 1977, Weinreich, 1953). However, the early 1980s witnessed increased interest in studying children’s code switching (Alvarez, 1979; Zentella, 1997). These studies have shed some light on how bilingual children use different languages according to addressee and context. However, these studies do not describe how children develop code switching over the years, and how code switching is used to extend communicative competence for achieving conversational goals during peer interaction. In the code switching study by Poplack (1980) with Puerto Rican American bilinguals, she analysed adults’ conversations in natural settings and speech during a sociolinguistic interview to learn about bilinguals’ linguistic competence and their use of code switching. Poplack’s findings pointed out that code switching was used by those individuals whose language skills in both languages were balanced. Code switching might be an indicator of bilingual ability in adults (Poplack, 1980) but also indicates development of bilingual communicative competence in children who are still learning an additional language (Reyes, 2012).
It would appear that code switching is an essential part of the communicative competence of proficient bilinguals (Gort, 2015). In contrast to misconceptions based on the deficit theory of bilingualism (MacSwan, 2000), research has shown that code switching is a sophisticated, rule-governed, and systematic communicative behaviour used by linguistically competent bilinguals to achieve a variety of communicative goals.

Research demonstrates that young bilingual learners can use their developing languages differentially and appropriately with different conversation partners from the earliest stages of productive language (Genesee, 2008; Meisel, 2004; Paradis, Nicoladis and Genesee, 2000). From as young as three years of age, young bilingual learners begin to switch systematically between languages as a function of the participants, the setting, the message, and to some extent, the topic of conversation (Genesee, 2008, 2015). Young children demonstrate communicative flexibility and adaptability by using code switching for their social play (Reyes, 2006). Consequently, code switching becomes an important aspect of bilingual development (Genesee, 2008; Gort, 2015; Kenner, 2004). In bilingual development, the two languages are integrated, and each language serves as a resource for the other. For bilingual children, linguistic experience is spread across two languages (Gort, 2015). Experience is encoded in either of two languages and can be expressed in one or both languages, whilst information also can be represented by switching between the languages (Malakoff, 1992). In this way, bilingual learners naturally explore the connections between their two developing languages and practice code switching in their interactions with other bilingual peers as a normal part of membership in their individual linguistic communities (Freeman, 2004; Gort, 2015; Hornberger, 2005; Martinez-Roldan, Carmen and Sayer, 2006 and Perez, 2004).

Research carried out by Scheffner, Hoff, Uchikoshi, Gillanders, Castro and Sandilos (2014) support these findings and have observed that the phenomenon of code switching is believed to be a result of the interaction of two independent linguistic systems (Bernardini and Schlyter, 2004; Cantone and Muller, 2008). Even though there are relatively few studies which have investigated young bilingual learners’ code switching, it would appear that the children use adult-like structural constraints,
which implies that they possess complex knowledge of how to fit the two languages together during an utterance and also possess language-specific syntactic knowledge from an early age (Paradis, Nicoladis and Genessee, 2000).

A similar research study carried out in the U.S. by Reyes (2006) examined the code switching patterns in the speech of Spanish-English speaking children. Seven and ten year-old boys and girls from bilingual classrooms were each paired with a mutually selected friend, and their speech was collected in two different contexts. The findings challenged the negative view that code switching by children who are learning two languages is due to lack of proficiency, and instead supported the view that it is used as a strategy to extend their communicative competence during peer interaction. Reyes (2006) concluded that during peer interaction the children used the language with which they both felt most comfortable and had greater competence. This also indicated that those speakers with the greatest degree of bilingual communicative competence were the ones who most frequently use code switching as a strategy to meet their conversational goals and to communicate with their peers (Reyes, 2006).

Code switching is interpreted as a sign of purposive language use through which the integration of multiple codes serves to support dual language and learning, achieving particular intended meanings in two languages. The availability of more than one language should, therefore, be viewed as part of a total communicative resource and can help bridge the gap during social interactions between bilingual children, their peers and adults (Moore, 2002).

Modern day research now refers to ‘translanguaging’ which includes code switching – the shift between two languages in context. Translanguaging does, however, differ from code switching in significant ways, as it includes other bilingual practices that go beyond a simple switch of code and focuses on the complex language strategies of young bilinguals in communicative settings. Both code switching and translanguaging are seen as positive bilingual developmental processes which in turn raise communicative ability. Code switching research searches for ‘language transfer’ while translanguaging research analyses how ‘bi/multilingual learners are involved in their linguistic practice’ (Hornberger and Link, 2012, p. 267). Importantly, according to Lewis, Jones and Baker (2012) code switching aligns with the idea of
separating languages in contrast to translanguaging which focuses on learning both languages at the same time without separation. Wei (2017) also argues that within translanguaging the focus is on how the language user draws upon different linguistic resources to make sense and meaning. Translanguaging is the framework employed for this research study and is discussed in greater depth in section 2.4 below.

2.3 Scaffolding from a socioconstructivist perspective

2.3.1 Scaffolding

Scaffolding is a construct attributed to the psychologist Bruner (Wood, Bruner and Ross, 1976; Bruner, 1978), and was developed in response to Vygotsky's research. Bruner (1978) and Wood et al., (1976) treat scaffolding somewhat differently. Wood et al., (1976) define scaffolding as 'helping somebody who is less adult or less expert' (Wood et al., 1976, p.89). They distinguished between scaffolding and simple assistance in completing a task. They suggest that scaffolding involves controlling the task so that the child could concentrate on those elements, which are within his/her capability. They argue that the process leads not only to achievement at a higher level but also at an increased pace.

In Bruner's (1983) later work he opens up the application of scaffolding from the support in a defined task to more informal teaching of language skills between a mother and child. He extended the scaffolding metaphor by applying it to an analysis of these interactions in an account of the pre-verbal foundations of language acquisition. The adult/parent takes on an informal teaching role to assist the early development of language through the use of familiar patterns of interaction or 'formats'. As the child becomes more capable of responding, the adult's leading role is reduced. A scaffold ensures that children are not left to their own devices to understand something. The support or scaffold is removed when the child is ready. The term scaffolding is intended to be an active one. The adult is responsive to the child and scaffolding is a reciprocal process with both parties involved. Bruner (1983,1986,1990) focused on how exactly this more knowledgeable other imparts their greater knowledge and competence to a learner and how the learner responds to this new knowledge, gradually developing more and more understanding with the help of the knowledgeable other (Wood, 1988). The scaffolding metaphor, as
Maybin, Mercer and Stierer (1992) point out is ‘elusive ... and problematic in practice’ (p.188). They pose the question that scaffolding is clearly a form of help; but what kind of help is it? ‘What are the specific features which distinguish scaffolding from other forms of assistance?’ (Maybin et al., 1992 p.188). They argue that it should be seen as an interactional process between the teacher and the student and not simply contained within the behaviour of the teacher. Furthermore, they argue that evidence is required to demonstrate that the teacher is enabling the learning, and evidence is needed of the learner being able to achieve something that can be attributed to the scaffolding.

Holton and Clarke (2006) define scaffolding as ‘an act of teaching that supports the immediate construction of knowledge by the learner; and provides the basis for future independent learning of an individual’ (p.131). In the above definition, Holton and Clarke (2006) suggest scaffolding involves the immediate use of supporting knowledge construction and the long term intent. Building on Vygotsky’s (1962, 1978, 1986) work, according to Gregory et al., (2004) the mediator is ‘the teacher, adult or more knowledgeable sibling or peer’ who initiates ‘children into new cultural practices or guiding them in the learning of new skills’ (p.7). Gregory, Arju, Jessel, Kenner and Ruby (2007) questioned the assumption inherent in current educational thinking that children’s learning necessarily involves scaffolding by an adult, arguing instead for a more reciprocal view of such learning. In addition, Haworth, Cullen, Simmons, Schimanski, McGarva and Woodhead (2006) explored the factors that enhance young children’s bilingual development. Findings from their data suggest that children appear to need the opportunity to lead as well as to follow if they are to learn and develop effective language for thinking skills. The term scaffolding is now used in many different fields of research, including the field of applied linguistics within which this study sits. In this sense, scaffolding is also used to support children’s development in two or more languages. The process of scaffolding through translinguaging is discussed in more detail in section 2.4.3 later in this chapter.
2.4 Translanguaging

2.4.1 Definitions

Current research (Garcia and Wei, 2014; Garcia and Kleyn, 2016; Lewis, Jones and Baker, 2012; Nikula and Moore, 2016; Safont and Portoles, 2016) has shown that the flexible use of two or more languages in the same context can serve a number of communicative purposes. This is what is known as translanguaging. In formal schooling, a monolingual approach in the classroom does not take into account the complexity and dynamism of several languages in multilingual settings. Copland and Yonetsugi (2016) stress that separating languages in the classroom is undesirable and does not represent the outside world in which the bilingual learners and their families are living. This is also expressed in the literature on bilingual education which focuses on the complex language practices which enable plurilingual children to develop their language and learning (Garcia and Wei, 2014). Therefore, new pedagogical approaches, such as translanguaging, have been proposed (Portoles and Marti, 2017).

The term 'translanguaging' originated in the Welsh language as 'trawsiethu' by Williams (1994), for educational practices where students were asked to alternate between English and Welsh. It was translated to 'translanguaging' by Baker (2011, p.288). In the Welsh situation, the advantages of translanguaging in educational settings became clear as ‘a promotion of a deeper understanding of the subject matter, an aid to the development of the weaker language, a facilitation of home-school links and cooperation and an integration of fluent speakers with early learners. It is the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages.’ (Baker, 2011, pp. 289-290). These advantages were obvious in the early research in Welsh classrooms and were subsequently easily transferred to other contexts. Translanguaging as a concept expanded to refer both to complex language practices and to educational approaches involving these practices (Blackledge and Creese, 2010; Canagarajah, 2011, 2013; Garcia, 2009; Lewis, Jones and Baker, 2012).

Williams (2003) suggests that translanguaging often uses the stronger language to develop the weaker language, thus contributing to a more balanced development of a child’s two languages. As Gorter and Cenoz (2015) maintain, the pedagogic
approach to translanguaging was simply adopting the language practices the students exhibit in their own everyday languaging to the language class. Researchers such as Garcia (2009) and Garcia and Wei (2014) have broadened the scope of the term beyond the classroom but also beyond the association of the term with two languages. In Garcia's (2009) view, translanguaging is a common practice in multilingual settings that goes beyond the pedagogical practice suggested by Williams (2003). Speakers choose and exclude features from their language repertoire in order to communicate both in spoken and written mode. The significance of this broadening of the term is evident in Wei's (2011) account of translanguaging as a transformative act, one that: ‘creates a social space for the multilingual language user by bringing together different dimensions of their personal history, experience and environment, their attitude, beliefs and ideology, their cognitive and physical capacity into one coordinated and meaningful performance, and make it into a lived experience’ (p.1233).

Translanguaging recognises that varieties of language(s) are not singular and static but engage in a constant interplay with each other and foster communication and meaning-making among members of multilingual communities (Garcia et al., 2011). As a theoretical orientation, translanguaging maintains that children draw fluidly from their multiple languages even in spaces marked as predominantly monolingual or where bilingual programmes enforce strict separation of languages.

Axelrod and Cole (2018) maintain that this counters the monolingual assumptions underlying terms like code switching that treat each language as a separate system rather than a single, integrated repertoire from which bilinguals draw strategically for meaning-making and communication. Moreover, it challenges pedagogies that insist on the formal separation of languages to favour the authentic fluidity with which multilingual speakers employ languages (Axelrod and Cole, 2018).

Translanguaging as a theoretical concept is now an important part of the ongoing ‘multilingual turn’ towards an understanding of language, focusing on how everyone uses and lives with and in languages rather than viewing language as separate structures (Conteh and Meier, 2014; Garcia, 2009; Garcia and Lin, 2016; Torpsten, 2018). The concept has continued to gain relevance in educational settings around the world. It illustrates the communicative practices and processes in which children
simultaneously draw on different language registers and codes, during their everyday lives at school and within their home and wider community. Essentially, translanguaging is ‘increasingly a mode of choice for bilinguals’ (Garcia, 2009, p.48). Translanguaging as a concept focuses on speakers rather than just codes or languages, by valuing and recognising fluid linguistic repertoires. It moves away from the monolingual norm and recognises multilingual practice and contributes to a significant change in linguistics (Jonsson, 2013).

Translanguaging allows us to imagine new ways of being in the world in general and in educational settings in particular. Adinolfi and Tagg (2019) have stressed that ‘translanguaging can be defined as the capacity of individuals to combine elements from across their multilingual repertoires to communicate meaning and to move fluidly between languages in ways not captured by the term code-switching (which presupposes a ‘switching’ between languages).’ (p.32, EAL Journal, Spring 2019). It is more than just a method for education in bilingual settings, translanguaging constitutes a new approach to language learning and identity by shaping our understanding of the fluidity of language practices in diverse settings (Paulsrud, Rosen and Straszer and Wedin, 2017).

My own position on translanguaging is more in line with findings from Garcia and Wei’s (2014) research which broaden the scope of the term beyond the classroom and also beyond the connection of the term with two languages. Their research suggests that translanguaging considers the language practices of bilinguals not as belonging to two autonomous language systems but as part of their unique linguistic repertoire (Garcia and Wei, 2014, p.2). My use of the term translanguaging is in its broadest sense with the three children using both their languages in whichever way helps them in the classroom, through their use of just Polish or a combination of both Polish and English to make themselves understood and make meaning, affording them the freedom to use whichever language they choose.
2.4.2 Translanguaging research

One field in which there has been a theoretical as well as an empirical shift in terms of the application of a translanguaging approach is that of language and education. Researchers such as Blackledge and Creese (2010); Gorter and Cenoz (2015); Flores and Garcia, (2017); Garcia (2009) and García and Wei (2014) have looked at how students or pupils make use of translanguaging practices both inside and outside of the classroom (Moriarty, 2017).

Research by Garcia, Makar, Starcevic and Terry (2011) analysed the language practices of 37 preschoolers aged five and six years at a school located in the city of New York. The school followed a two-way dual bilingual programme in which English and Spanish were taught. The research study was initiated in September 2007. Garcia et al., (2011) visited the classroom weekly from early September and drew from observations and taped transcripts gathered in the first three months as the children first constructed their language and cultural identities. Although classes were supposed to be only in Spanish or only in English, Garcia et al., (2011) described how the young multilingual learners used translanguaging for six functions. These were: To mediate understandings among each other; to co-construct meaning of what the other is saying; to construct meaning within themselves; to include others; to exclude others and to demonstrate knowledge. According to Garcia et al’s (2011) findings, the most common function of translanguaging is to construct meaning.

The first function – ‘to mediate understandings among each other’ reflects children’s translations and interpretations to mediate with others and themselves. ‘Pupils use their whole language repertoire in order to communicate effectively. Interpretations, explanations and direct translations are all examples’ (Portoles and Marti, 2017, p. 71). Similarly, Garcia et al., (2011) argue that ‘when talking to each other children often use both languages because they want to ensure that they’re understood’ (p.46).

Translations are a simple form of translanguaging and children rely on these in order to make sense of what is being taught. In this kindergarten class, one bilingual boy, Diego, has an important role to play. He often provides interpretations and
translations, both for the teachers and for the children. In this example, the teacher, Maia Starcevic (who was also a member of the research team) has called the group to the carpet in the English classroom. She calls the children to attention, which the bilingual interpreter (Diego) quickly translates for the class:

Starcevic: Sit up!
Diego: In Spanish, it’s *siéntate arriba* (says to the whole class).

Diego provides a quick translation that facilitates understanding.

The next function ‘to co-construct meaning of what the other is saying’ identifies ‘when children make use of the other language for understanding and use their previous knowledge from their linguistic repertoire to create new concepts and establish relationships between languages’ (Portoles and Marti, 2017, p.71).

The two participants in this example are having a snack during break time in the English classroom. A Spanish-speaking boy, Alfredo, whose bilingualism is at the very early stages, is eating his snack next to Beatriz, a Spanish-speaking girl whose bilingualism is more advanced:

Alfredo: (Looking out the window and talking to himself).
*Está lloviendo mucho.*
[It is raining a lot.]
Look (telling the others). It’s washing. There’s washing *afuera.*
[outside.]

Beatriz: ¿*Está lloviendo*? (She asks him).
[It is raining?]
(Turning to Garcia). He says raining. He speaks only Spanish.

Alfredo: Raining.

Although Alfredo had no word for ‘raining,’ and used ‘washing’ to communicate, the translanguaging that occurred allowed a meaningful interaction between Alfredo, Beatriz, and Garcia, and enabled Alfredo to acquire the vocabulary that he needed without any intervention from the teacher. In this example, translanguaging in the classroom enables language acquisition without having to wait for the teacher to assume her role.

The third function – ‘to construct meaning within themselves’ reflects how important translanguaging is to children to develop bilingualism, particularly when listening to
children talking to themselves, which is prevalent in the Early Years. ‘The translanguaging practices that are constructed always bring the other language to the forefront, even when that language is not being activated by the instruction’. Garcia et al., (2011, p.49).

In this next example, Maia Starcevic has taken the children outside and is showing them the trees and teaching them how to compare them. Angelica, a Spanish speaking emergent bilingual Latina tries it out under her breath:

    Starcevic:  This tree is bigger. That tree is smaller.
    Angelica:   (Tries out under her breath). This tree is grander.

The fourth function - ‘to include others’, reflects how children respond to the perceived language use of an interlocutor. In the two-way bilingual kindergarten, playtime or work choices become translanguaging negotiation events and the only way in which activities can continue across the different languages. Although the teacher of the English classroom is bilingual, her Teaching Assistant is not. In the next monologue by a bilingual Latino boy, Pablo, it is clear that translanguaging plays a role in order to include the English speaking teacher assistant, Garcia, and the child’s inner voice. This occurs in the English classroom. The bilingual boy (Pablo) is playing with an Etch-a-Sketch board and starts talking to Garcia in Spanish, addresses himself frequently in English, uses English to address the Teaching Assistant, and returns to Spanish when he tells Garcia that he has forgotten to write down his name on the worksheet:

    Pablo:    (He then turns to the English speaking Teaching Assistant).
               Can I do with this pencil?
               (He then turns to Garcia).
               \textit{Mira, ¿quieres ver?}
               [Look, do you want to see?]

In this exchange, Pablo translanguages in order to respond to his perceptions of the interlocutor’s dominant language, both the teacher’s assistant and Garcia’s, and to include them all. It is interesting that he also translanguages in talking to himself. Like the papers in the ‘Etch-a-Sketch,’ his language practices come in and out, as he erases and interlinks different language practices and linguistic identities.
The fifth function – ‘to exclude others’ identifies instances when translanguaging is used deliberately to exclude others from interaction. Just as translanguaging is used to include, it is also used to exclude others. Inclusion of others is a social practice that has to be learned in early learning. In the next interaction, two boys Francisco and Miguel are playing in Spanish, but when they disagree with each other over handling a play horse, the bilingual boy, Francisco, switches to English to exclude Miguel who speaks very little English:

Miguel: No, yo soy el caballo. [No, I’m the horse.]
Francisco: I quit. (Miguel starts to walk away).

The last function – ‘to demonstrate knowledge’, illustrates how young bilingual learners who are acquiring English, enjoy trying out the words they know. They are constantly trying out what they have learned. Garcia et al., (2011) discovered that translanguaging is especially prevalent among the Latino and non-Latino children who are acquiring Spanish, as they try out all the words they know. One day, there are children working on the computer in the Spanish classroom. Maritza, who has a Spanish speaking Mexican father, and an English monolingual mother and who is developing her bilingualism, tries out all the words she knows in Spanish with Garcia. The conversation consists of words that start with the letter ‘a,’ the letter that they had been studying that week:

Maritza: Mira, [look] I made un avión. [a plane.]
          Un arcoiris. [A rainbow.]

Additionally, Portoles and Marti’s (2017) study drew on four of these functions of translanguaging: mediating understandings, including and excluding others, demonstrating knowledge and co-constructing meanings. Qualitative data was collected in three sessions of English for 25 Valencian kindergarteners from the province of Castello (Spain). The participants were aged four to five years old and were in their second year at a Catalan-immersion school, where two other languages were taught as the media of instruction (Spanish and English). Their first and second languages were Catalan and Spanish and English was learnt as a third language.
(Portoles and Marti, 2017) stress that young children love to show off what they have learned about English either in class or outside it, as shown by the example below which corresponds to the ‘demonstrating knowledge’ function:

Teacher: Do you know what is black?
Child: Black. *Es un color en ingles.*
[Black is a colour in English.]

Their findings depict how very young language learners used their first, second and third languages strategically in order to serve different communicative functions which, in turn, did not compromise their learning of the language of instruction (English). Portoles and Marti (2017) concluded that a purely monolingual approach to teaching English to speakers of other languages was not a particularly realistic picture of learners’ linguistic development both inside and outside the classroom in multilingual settings. Portoles and Marti’s (2017) research on translanguaging as a teaching resource in early language learning of English as an additional language identified that the use of translanguaging in the classroom allowed bilingual children to ‘mediate understandings among each other, to co-construct meanings of what other children are saying and to construct meaning within themselves’ (p.66).

Garrity et al., (2015) have examined the translanguaging practices of young emergent bilinguals in programmes for infants. The purpose of their study was to document the first year (2012) of the implementation of a Spanish / English dual language programme in a young infant (age six to fifteen months) classroom within the researchers’ university campus centre. It was located in an urban area about twenty minutes from the United States / Mexico border. The centre served children from six months to five years of age, whose parents were either students or staff of the university. A total of 16 infants were enrolled in the young infant classroom (six to eleven months at the time of enrolment) and informed consent to participate in the research was obtained from 14 families. Infants attended the programme between two and five times a week. Eleven of the infants came from monolingual English backgrounds. The remaining children came from homes in which Mandarin and English, Spanish and English and English and Italian were spoken. A total of 314 observations of children’s language development were reviewed. When selecting child observations to explicate their findings, Garrity et al., (2015) drew from the language performances and interactions of four children (Kate, Samantha, David and
Clark aged four years old) as they attended the centre every day. The four children were observed on a regular basis and these examples demonstrate how they used translanguaging on an everyday basis: (Spanish is in italics. Monique, Lily and Sandra are infant teachers):

Sandra told Samantha, *en cinco minutos te vas a dormir*, okay?
She said, no.
Sandra walked towards her and she said, no, no, night, night.
Kate walked towards Monique and handed her the water can.
Monique said, do you want some more water?
Kate said, *agua* and grabbed Monique’s hand.
Lily asked David, *quieres limpiar*?
David said, yes!
She handed him a rag to clean the table.

Their research study of translanguaging in an infant classroom demonstrated how the children used multiple languages to make meaning of their environment, form connections with others and learn about the world. Garrity et al., (2015) emphasised that translanguaging emerged as a powerful construct that helped the researchers make sense of their specific context, gave meaning to the data and provided a cogent framework to help them explicate their findings. Their analysis of child observations helped them to identify classroom language practices that informed their emerging understanding of how the infants and teachers in their study used translanguaging to make sense of their environment and form connections and interact with one another. Importantly, their data also highlighted the reality of a multilingual classroom in which both children and teachers used language fluidly and seamlessly as they went about their everyday lives. Garrity et al’s (2015) findings concurred with Garcia’s (2014) research which revealed that, despite the language separation policies that governed the classroom, translanguaging was a common practice among kindergarten children, as it became a way ‘to mediate understandings, construct meaning, include, exclude and show knowledge’ (p.45).

In Luxembourg, Kirsch (2018) conducted longitudinal research (2013-2017) with young children capitalising on their entire language repertoire for language learning at school and her study has similarly used translanguaging as a framework. Kirsch (2018); Lewis, Jones and Baker (2012) have all maintained that while translanguaging has been well researched in bilingual settings with older pupils and has been found to contribute to cognitive and personal development, there has been
little research on translanguaging of young multilingual children, particularly in the field of child-directed translanguaging. Kirsch (2018) commented that in trilingual Luxembourg, at school, children learn Luxembourgish aged 4 years, German aged six years and French aged seven years, with the majority not speaking Luxembourgish on school entry. Consequently, the number of languages to be learned may have left teachers little time or space to capitalise on first languages and to encourage translanguaging. Her longitudinal research study contextualised and examined the practice and purposes of translanguaging of nursery and primary school children who speak a language other than Luxembourgish at home.

Over two academic years, data were collected about the 18 focus children in one of the nursery classes and 18 focus children in one of the primary school classes involved in the project. All 36 focus children grew up speaking a language other than Luxembourgish at home. Children were chosen who spoke French, Portuguese, English or other non-national languages at home. The research team used observations, video-recordings and interviews to collect data, spending one day every six weeks in the two classes to observe and make detailed field notes of the language use of the teachers and children. All interactions between the focus children and between the teachers and the children were examined.

This example from Kirsch’s (2018) data focuses on Benjamin and Diego who began to learn Luxembourgish aged three years at preschool. At home, Diego spoke French with his mother and French and some Italian with his father. Benjamin spoke English at home. He understood some French because his parents had enrolled him as an infant in a crèche with French-speaking staff. The example shows how Diego (D) and Benjamin (B) both aged five years moved between Luxembourgish and French while recording a story and two songs on the iPad. In the English translation below, Luxembourgish is presented in normal script and French is presented in italics:

D  Once upon a time.
B  A villain...But look. No, in French.
D  OK. (using a story telling voice) Once upon a time there was a very [bad boy.]
D  He was in a cavern as dark as black. He was bad. He was invisible And he took all the odours that smelt nice and then everything smelt like cow poop.
Kirsch (2018) suggested that in a safe and meaningful environment, translanguaging happened by invitation and choice. Benjamin invited Diego to speak French although he knew that he could not understand everything. Diego was aware of Benjamin’s competences and provided comprehension clues through his multimodal performance. Diego adopted a storytelling voice, gestured and mimed, drawing on Benjamin’s interest in French.

Kirsch’s (2018) findings indicated that the children made use of their entire multilingual repertoire in order to communicate, construct knowledge and develop their multilingual identity. Evidence from the data indicated that translanguging was a frequent and legitimate practice in both classes although the older children drew less on first languages other than Luxembourgish. The findings also indicated, in line with Garcia and Wei (2014) and Velasco and Garcia (2014), that young bilingual learners, in this case emergent multilingual learners, were able to translanguage strategically and drew on features of all four languages to mediate their understanding. The children learned when and where to select, but also to suppress, particular features of their repertoire and used languages appropriately in order to meet the demands at hand. Furthermore, Kirsch (2018) stressed that the multilingual learning environment, the curriculum and the language learning tasks directly influenced the children’s ability to translanguage and created opportunities for this to happen. Findings from Kirsch and Seele’s (2020) research with four Early Years practitioners in Luxembourg indicated that by encouraging the children to use their first languages in the classroom and by addressing the children in their first languages, translanguaging became a legitimate practice within the school. Perhaps not surprisingly, both the children’s and the practitioners’ language competence developed significantly through these translanguaging practices.

In their 2017 study, Mary and Young undertook a longitudinal study in a pre-primary classroom of three to four year old emergent bi/plurilingual children during their first year of formal schooling in France. Out of the observed in the classroom, eight spoke French at home, five Turkish, two Albanian, two Serbian, five Arabic and one spoke Creole and French. Mary and Young (2017) used translanguaging as part of their framework and focused on how the teachers’ intercultural competence
facilitated the emergent bilingual children’s transition from home to school and developed positive relationships with these parents and included them in the classroom. Their study demonstrated that well-being, learning and inclusion could be fostered by engaging with emergent bilinguals and their families in the pre-primary classroom.

Within the context of their study, they defined a preschool classroom as one in which the language of schooling was French, the pupils spoke a variety of different languages at home and the teacher was not bilingual in any of her pupils’ languages. Mary and Young (2017) use the concept of translanguaging defined by Garcia (2009) as the ‘flexible use of the learners’ first languages by the teacher in addition to the language of schooling’ (Garcia, 2009, p.140) in similar but distinct ways. Their use of the term is consequently closer to that of Baker (2011) who defines translanguaging as ‘the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages’ (Baker, 2011, p. 288).

The data were collected in a preschool in a catchment area known in France as ‘high priority’ (Reseau d’éducation prioritaire – REP) and received additional funding. Many of the children came from low socio-economic backgrounds and a large number spoke languages other than the language of schooling, whilst a significant number spoke Turkish because of the large Turkish community in the area. Their teacher did not speak languages other than French fluently, but had acquired some Turkish vocabulary and made a conscious effort to learn key words spoken by the children and their families. During the year’s study, the data collected consisted of video recordings of interactions and activities involving the teacher, Teaching Assistant, pupils and their families, as well as field notes and recorded interviews. The findings of the study contributed to the body of knowledge based on the valuing of children’s languages and cultures.

Mary and Young’s (2017) study has demonstrated how teachers can provide increasingly empowering and equitable learning environments for emergent bilingual pupils and in turn how this has implications for future practice in schools. Mary and Young (2017) suggested that when the teachers used certain items of vocabulary from the children’s languages and asked them how to name them, it encouraged the
children to build on their linguistic competence and knowledge they had already acquired in and through their first languages. This kind of flexible language policy allowed the teachers to publicly acknowledge and value the children’s linguistic knowledge and skills. However, Mary and Young (2017) also warned that not all the teachers found this release of power easy and preferred to enforce an English only policy, which in turn resulted in the silencing of the children who could not yet express themselves in the language of the school.

The study by Hornberger and Link (2012) contributed further to the growing body of research with young children using translanguaging in the classroom. They drew on ethnographic data from two different educational contexts to argue that the welcoming of translanguaging in classrooms is not only necessary, but desirable educational practice. Their research also highlighted that practices should also recognise, value and build on the communicative repertoires and translanguaging practices of children, their families and communities.

Their data were drawn from two different educational contexts. Scenario one was from a primary school and scenario two from a University context. Data drawn from scenario 1 featured Beatriz who used translanguaging at home and school. She was a Mexican first-grader (aged six to seven years - the equivalent to the UK Year Two) in Pennsylvania who moved fluidly backwards and forwards between English and Spanish over the course of her school day (Link, 2011). At age three years, Beatriz moved from Mexico to a suburb of Philadelphia with her mother and older siblings to join her father who had arrived several years earlier. Beatriz attended a school with a minimal number of Latino immigrants until recent years when growing numbers of Spanish-speaking, and mainly Mexican-heritage, children had arrived and made up 65% of the school’s population. The language of instruction was still English, though the classrooms gradually became multilingual spaces as children from both Spanish and non-Spanish speaking homes learnt Spanish for a variety of functions during their school day.

Through classroom observations, Hornberger and Link (2012) collected data about Beatriz’s language repertoire. During Literacy sessions, Beatriz listened to a story in English and then discussed it in both Spanish and English with a Spanish peer. She offered a sentence in English about the story’s setting and while she attended her
English as a second Language class, she participated in guided reading in English and discussed the meaning of English vocabulary both in Spanish and English and wrote a sentence in English. At lunchtime she interpreted for a newly arrived Mexican child and at playtime she played hand games with lyrics in English and some Spanish.

Hornberger and Link (2012) concluded from this data that Beatriz displayed a wide range of varieties of Spanish and English, used for different functions throughout various activities during her day. Her translanguaging practices where she moved backwards and forwards fluidly between the two languages allowed her to make meaning and communicate across numerous interactions, whilst she also engaged in language learning and teaching both at home and school.

A translanguaging framework also set the foundation for the study by Axelrod (2014) which explored the language development of two four year old emergent bilingual children (Soraya and Estrella) in a bilingual (Spanish / English) Head Start classroom with flexible language practices in New York City with a large immigrant population. The demographics of the 13 children in their class reflected those of the community, mostly Dominican and Mexican families. All of the Latina children spoke Spanish, although half of the children from Mexico were of Mixteco heritage and all their families spoke Mixtec at home. They spoke Spanish to each other in the classroom. Data were collected of their negotiations between and among their languages with their peers and teachers during the year long ethnographic case study. The data examples from classroom observations of one of the children, Soraya are now presented. Her family was from the Dominican Republic, but her parents grew up in New York. Her parents spoke English at home with the children but she also spent much time with her maternal grandparents who spoke to her only in Spanish. She appeared to be able to go backwards and forwards between Spanish and English with ease. Soraya appeared to be able to translate between the languages and helped mediate conversations between children who spoke different languages. Axelrod (2014) observed her engaging in translanguaging practices, for example:

(Spanish is in bold):

Soraya: I’m gonna play in the cocina [kitchen].
Axelrod (2014) also highlighted the playful language practices of Soraya by drawing on an example of an invented word: ‘rainbowi’. The word ‘rainbowi’ appeared in the classroom after a reading of The Very Hungry Caterpillar (Carle, 1969).

The teacher read the line. ‘Now he wasn’t hungry anymore – and he wasn’t a little caterpillar any more. He was a big, fat caterpillar’.
Soraya: He is so beautiful. He is so rainbowi.

Axelrod (2014) explained that the word ‘rainbowi’ (which should be spelt ‘rainbowly’ but the Spanish spelling was recorded in her field notes and was kept in) was Soraya’s way of creating an adjective out of the word ‘rainbow’. While she had not yet learned to explain grammar patterns in the English language, she knew that adding a ‘ly’ at the end of a word could indicate the quality of something. She also knew that words, in this case the noun ‘rainbow’ could be altered to create other words that still kept the properties of the initial word. ‘Rainbowi’ described the degree of colours and to ‘rainbow it up’ (in Soraya’s words) was the action of creating a rainbow when she was painting. Although neither uses were conventional, the meaning was understood and Soraya’s play with language demonstrated her knowledge and some of the rules and conventions of language. She felt comfortable exploring language and expressed her perception of herself in an interview later in the year, as a bilingual:

Soraya: I speak both and I am very good at both because when I speak, I think I’m good.

This study has offered another example into the ways in which translanguaging practices supported children’s language development when teachers allowed them to utilise their full linguistic repertoire in ways that were meaningful and realistic. By her recognition and acknowledgment of Soraya’s ‘invented’ word, the teacher created an environment where children’s languages were supported, which encouraged them to play with language and allowed them to bring into the classroom the translanguaging practices that they experienced in their homes. Soraya was positioned as a language user, instead of lacking language and her translanguaging practices were fostered and accepted.

Robertson (2015) has recommended that ‘home languages should be used in primary classrooms as a pedagogic tool to raise the academic achievement of pupils
whose home languages differ from the official language of schools’ (p.21). As translanguaging has gained recognition, projects such as Roma Translanguaging enquiry learning space (ROMtels) have been established. The project (University of Newcastle, 2017) was established as a response to the decline (or non-existence) of first language use in classrooms (age 5-11) as a pedagogic tool to raise the academic achievement of pupils whose first language(s) differed from the official language of their school. This project took place across four European countries: the UK, France, Finland and Romania. It lasted for two and a half years.

The project began in the UK with two technologies working together (digital table and large scale 360 degree projected displays) to create an immersive virtual reality-like space. The children entered the space as investigators of a particular enquiry. Characters appearing in the space spoke to the children in English and a translanguaged form of Roma and the children’s Eastern European language, to set problems and puzzles along the way. The children collaborated to solve problems thereby encouraging purposeful language use through translanguaging. Children were encouraged to talk in a natural mix of their first language(s) and English to support their learning. A translanguaging approach made sure children had access to cognitive academic language – which they needed to learn about school subjects – in both their first language(s) and English. The ROMtels project demonstrated exactly how this happened in translanguaging spaces created in schools.

The overall aim of the ROMtels project was to improve the education of Eastern European Traveller children and Roma children in particular, in primary school (age five-eleven years) classrooms across Europe, and one secondary school in France (with pupils up to the age of 15), to bring about more pupil engagement and motivation with the ultimate goal of improved attainment. The project was in response to data concerning persistent gaps in school attendance and the achievement of Gypsy, Roma and Traveller pupils in comparison to national averages across Europe and in the partner countries specifically.

In Romania, the practice of home language use for learning, which had arisen naturally as a result of the specific circumstances of the school, began to be more formalised in classes. Children were encouraged to write in Romanian and Korturare
Collaboration with parents, and the transformation of teachers’ attitudes towards Roma communities was an integral part of the project so that children’s cultural and linguistic backgrounds were made available to schools by parents who trusted that this information was respected and used by teachers to improve the educational and social inclusion of their children. At the same time families became more knowledgeable about institutionalised education.

ROMtels improved both how children learn and their sense of belonging. This benefitted children, families, and teachers as part of the whole school community, and the wider social community. ROMtels used technology to support multilingual enquiry-based learning for groups of children. The software helped teachers customise what children saw and heard, so children could access the same information in multiple languages. Children were encouraged to talk in a natural mix of their home language(s) and English to support their learning. This helped children talk about school work both in the classroom and at home with their parents and community.

### 2.4.3 Translanguaging and scaffolding research

A body of research by Hammond and Gibbons (2005) and Gibbons (2006) has applied a linguistic lens to scaffolding. Their work aimed ‘to investigate what scaffolding actually ‘looked like’ as it was played out in the day-to-day enacted curriculum, and to analyse its enactment more closely both in pedagogical and linguistic terms' (Hammond and Gibbons, 2005, p.7-8). Their resulting model has two tiers: macro and micro aspects of teacher-student interaction. Macro-scaffolding is consciously planned by the teachers including ‘the ways in which classroom goals are identified: how classrooms are organised; and in the selection and sequencing of tasks' (Hammond and Gibbons, 2005, p.12). Micro-scaffolding describes more spontaneous teaching. However, Hammond and Gibbons’ model focuses on teaching in the learning process and therefore their focus is on the teacher behaviours. They do not address the potential role of the students in their own learning, and how the children may scaffold each other unintentionally (although this
involves an extension of the original concept). This point is relevant to the present research as the translinguaging practices are peer-led interactions with no teacher present.

Translinguaging is a tool to break with what Cummins (2008) calls the ‘language solitude’ premise within mainstream education describing the fact that languages are often compartmentalised and separated in education, ‘as if they belonged to different nation-states or different speech communities’ (Garcia and Wei, 2014, p. 227). With reference to Cummins’ (2008) research, the term translinguaging relates to the use of the child’s language alongside the language of the school which effectively facilitates communication between the teacher and the child. This in turn, aids cognitive processing for the child who is learning through an additional language and also helps to develop language production in the new language. Cummins (2008) indicates that translinguaging can be used to scaffold learning both of and through the language of schooling.

The term translinguaging is now very often used in the context of a scaffolding (supportive learning) technique used in schools (Garcia and Kleyn, 2016, p.18). As already discussed earlier, originally, translinguaging consisted of the planned systematic use of the two languages of schooling (English and Welsh) with the pedagogical goal of scaffolding learning. This helps to support children’s literacy development in both languages as children use their stronger language as scaffolding to understand a text in their weaker language (Creese and Blackledge, 2015). Translinguaging is concerned not just with what language repertoires are in use but how children creatively draw on their language repertoires to scaffold learning (Swanwick, 2015). Consequently, children’s learning can be challenged and supported through the purposeful use of both languages in the classroom (Cummins, 2008). Since its origins, the term translinguaging has since evolved to encompass a variety of linguistic practices which permit the dynamic and integrated use of two languages in the mediation and organisation of mental processes involved in understanding, speaking, literacy and learning (Lewis, Jones and Baker, 2012).
2.4.3.1 Child-led scaffolding

Donato (1994, 2004), Lantolf (2000) and Smith (2006) refer to ‘collective scaffolding’ in collaborative writing, where children mutually guide each other through problems such as child-led writing tasks. Pupil-pupil collective scaffolding is possible through ‘natural translanguaging’ (Williams, 2002) whereby translanguaging activities are undertaken independently by more competent bilinguals or pupil-directed translanguaging (Lewis et al., 2012) when pupils work independently and choose how to complete a translanguaging activity, for example, gathering information from the internet in English and discussing the content in their first language.

Findings from Esquinca, Araujo and De la Piedra’s (2014) research indicate that learners have been shown to draw on a full range of meaning-making abilities in learning activity. In studies of bilingual children in literature discussions, children are shown to use Spanish to interpret materials in English (Reyes and Azuara, 2008), to use both languages to retell narratives written in one of the languages (Martínez-Roldán and Sayer, 2006), and to use Spanish to make sense of English narratives (Moll, 2014). As Moll (2014) notes, such studies demonstrate a Vygotstskian principle ‘that what is possible to achieve in the end is already available in some form in the beginning, in the immediate environment’ (p. 79).

Esquinca et al's (2014) studied translanguaging practices in science lessons. They reported that the emergent bilinguals in Year 4 clarified, hypothesised, explained, used multimodality, paraphrased and translated while moving between the languages. Consequently, these strategies scaffolded the learning of their peers. Language mediation among bilingual children includes processes and strategies such as what Olmedo (2003) terms ‘the bilingual echo,’ which is when ‘a child spontaneously tries to mediate the language comprehension or concept learning of a peer through a variety of linguistic and paralinguistic strategies’ (p. 150). In Olmedo’s study, students used diverse strategies such as translation, scaffolding, and modelling.

Kirsch’s (2018) study of storytelling tasks in combination with the benefits of the app iTEO with young bilingual learners in a nursery class in Luxembourg, provided opportunities for the children to create dialogue, repeat, imitate, analyse, transform
and speak about language use. They listened carefully, asked for help and helped each other through peer support. Their actions and strategies scaffolded their learning, as demonstrated in Kirsch’s study and also in studies by Velasco and Garcia (2014); Angelova, Gunawardena and Volk (2006) and Flynn, Hoy, Lea and Garcia (2019). In Kirsch’s study, the nursery teacher encouraged the 18 pupils to use their first languages through translanguaging practices. She explained that the children felt much freer when they realised that the use of a language other than Luxembourgish was accepted (interview, 4.6.15). The teacher ensured that she, the parents and the Luxembourgish-speaking children scaffolded the understanding of the other children through pictures, gestures, actions and gestures.

2.4.3.2 Teacher- supported scaffolding

Teachers involved in Duarte’s (2016) research specifically mentioned using translanguaging as a scaffold to link knowledge in the three languages of instruction to knowledge in the first languages Polish and Arabic, by including them systematically in the daily routines of the group. This is carried out without further explanations by the teacher, suggesting that it is a routine to greet, recite the days of the week and count in several languages. Both researchers and teachers see translanguaging here thus as fulfilling a scaffolding function offering temporary bridges between languages which allow pupils to build links between official instruction languages and between home and school languages. These scaffolding moments acknowledge all different languages by giving them the same role and relevance in daily classroom routines. In addition, and from the perspective of the Polish and Arabic speaking pupils, translanguaging as a scaffold renders their family languages as an exceptional resource. A scaffolding function is achieved when temporary but systematic bridges towards other languages are incorporated in everyday teaching, thus attributing equal value to all languages. Teachers require no knowledge of other languages to do this, as long as pupils are perceived as the experts for their own family languages (Duarte, 2016).

Garcia and Wei’s (2014) research builds on these studies and indicates that translanguaging as a scaffold is particularly relevant when teaching students who cannot make meaning through the language of instruction. For instance, a teacher who uses translanguaging as scaffolding for these students provides them with, for
example, readers in a language they understand, creates listening centres where they can hear the school text in a language they understand, or uses more visuals and gestures. Often teachers and students use electronic translations and other technology as a scaffold. Many teachers allow students to write with the features that they have until a later time when students have added and appropriated relevant features of the new language. Some teachers also allow students to perform or draw their meanings. The purpose of translanguaging pedagogy as scaffolding is simply to help students during a transition phase while they are adding and appropriating the necessary features that are required to complete the academic task in one or more named languages (Garcia and Wei, 2014).

2.4.3.3 Teacher and child scaffolding

Hamman’s (2018) research in two-way dual language classrooms demonstrates how translanguaging is used as a useful pedagogic technique for scaffolding language and learning. During whole class interactions, translanguaging provides an opportunity for the teacher to scaffold students’ language and content learning simultaneously. This example shows how a student’s translanguaging helps him to make a meaningful contribution to the class conversation. In this interaction, the teacher was in the middle of a whole class read-aloud (in Spanish) a non-fiction text about pumpkins. She pauses to ask students about factors that might negatively impact on how pumpkins grow. Derrick, an English-dominant student, raised his hand and shares his thoughts with the class:

Derrick: If you have too much sol, they will burn. If you have too much sun, they will burn.
Teacher: ¿Me lo dices en españa? [Can you tell me that in Spanish?]
Derrick: Si tu tienes too much sol, the calabaza...[they will burn. If you have too much sun, the pumpkin...they will burn].
Teacher: Demasiado sol se quema la planta, ¿no? [Too much sun burns the plant, right?]

This example illustrates how a positive view of translanguaging facilitates Derrick’s participation in the class conversation and builds upon his existing Spanish knowledge. The teacher continues to speak in Spanish throughout this interaction and guides Derrick towards translating his response but does not restrict him from
sharing his thoughts across both languages. At the same time, she pushes Derrick to try to express his idea in Spanish, thus emphasizing the importance of working towards Spanish proficiency (Hamman, 2018).

Mary and Young’s (2017) study with three to four year old emergent bi/plurilingual children during their first year of formal schooling in France indicated that instances of translanguaging observed in the classroom were cleverly designed to scaffold the children’s learning and build on their prior knowledge in their first language (Turkish). Mary and Young’s interpretation of the construct of scaffolding is the support given by the teacher to enable the child to do something s/he would not be able to do without assistance. Through the teacher’s use of both languages, the teacher in the study provided support to the children which enabled them to understand the activities they were engaging in and modelled language use which they could try out within a secure context. The teacher’s use of Turkish words when interacting with the Turkish speaking children was a practised policy in which the teacher frequently engaged to scaffold children’s learning by building bridges between their first languages and the language of the school. Through this practised language policy, translanguaging opens up a safe space in which the knowledge and skills encoded in the children’s first languages may be transferred from one language to another. This in turn may be used to scaffold learning both of and through the language of schooling, in accordance with the language interdependence proposed by Cummins (2008).

Findings from Duarte’s (2016, 2018) research refer to translanguaging as a bridge between the instruction language of the day (Frisian) and the other two languages of instruction within trilingual instruction (Dutch and English). As such, it allows for less language compartmentalisation than in the traditional triple immersion programme the school used to follow, in which instruction languages were kept strictly apart. Furthermore, Duarte (2016) applied sociocultural discourse analysis to peer-peer interaction and therefore considered how young learners scaffold one another as they participate in collaborative talk and in the construction of knowledge. Results showed how translanguaging was used to scaffold meaning through interaction and contribute to jointly solving school tasks. It was evident that the examples of translanguaging showed an overwhelming amount of speech acts typical of exploratory talk (Mercer and Littleton, 2007) in which knowledge is shared and
interlocutors critically build on another’s ideas. In this sense, translanguaging plays a role in ‘making sense’ of the task in hand and making meaning. Duarte’s (2016) research represents an important link between sociocultural theory and translanguaging.

In relation to talk as a social action, Duarte’s (2016) research explains how translanguaging is used to create joint knowledge and understanding and highlights the ways in which pupils scaffold each other to learn through several languages. As Conteh, Kumar and Beddow (2008) argue ‘pupils not only scaffold each other but also take opportunities offered to consolidate their own knowledge through talk’ (p. 162).

2.5 Summary

This chapter has presented literature from the field of bilingualism and translanguaging in the Early Years. Findings from research studies which look at the experiences of young bilingual children have been discussed. All of the research studies discussed in this chapter have used a translanguaging framework to study young bilingual children’s language development in mainstream Early Years settings. The present study is therefore supported by this body of work and aligns, for example, with Kirsch’s (2018) study which focused on child-led translanguaging occurring during children’s everyday activities. The researchers cited above have stressed that there should be more classroom research with young learners in order to inform practice. Little research has been conducted into how the translanguaging approach can be used to scaffold language learning (Duarte, 2016, 2018) and the present study contributes essential Polish-English bilingual data to this body of research.
Chapter 3 Methodology

3.1 Introduction
This chapter considers the ethical considerations relevant to this study within early childhood bilingualism research and presents the rationale for the chosen methodology. An argument is presented for considering the use of a case study approach as defined by Bassey, (2000); Blaxter, Hughes and Tight, (2010) and its trustworthiness and generalisability are discussed. An overview of the data collection methods is provided and the research tools are discussed, followed by details about the setting, the participants, the children’s families and their teachers. An account is given of the data collection and data analysis following Braun and Clarke’s (2013) thematic analysis with reference to the relevant literature. Finally, questions about insider-outsider issues are raised in relation to this study.

3.2 Ethics and research with young bilingual children
Scott and Usher (2011) state that, in all research ‘issues of power…are always already present…regardless of intent or locating paradigm’ (p. 18). In research with young bilingual children, issues of power between the monolingual researcher and participating children are especially evident and gaining their informed consent was a particularly important aspect of the research. Dealing with problematic situations when unexpected dilemmas arise in the field reinforces both the need to follow formalised ethical guidance (British Education Research Association - BERA, 2018) and the crucial position that ethics holds throughout the research process.

As suggested by Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2017), researchers should gain permission from the adults responsible for the children, before that of the children. Once the intentions of the research were clearly explained, informed consent letters were sent to the participating adults and parents, the head teacher who provided consent for the study (see Appendix A (i)) the class teacher and Teaching Assistant of the three children, clearly indicating that contributing to this research would be entirely voluntary. The important ethical consideration for this research was the protection and respect for the three bilingual children, aged four years of age. For this reason, an interpreter from the Polish community was sought and she liaised with the other Polish parents and offered valuable support to the children and their
families. She also played a pivotal role as an interpreter when necessary and as a translator for the transcriptions of the audio-recordings for this research. The informed consent letters (see Appendix A) were translated into Polish in conjunction with the interpreter, who discussed the content with the other parents on the researcher’s behalf. The participants were given adequate time to consider the contents of the letter and consent (or not) to participate in the study. The children themselves were given every opportunity to decide whether they wanted to participate in the research or not. This was discussed with their parents and also by the parents with the children. No assumptions were made that initial consent equated to ongoing consent.

Continuation of researcher access to data collection was continually (verbally and non-verbally) renegotiated with the participants prior to each stage of data collection. Each participant was offered free access to a copy of any abstract and (if requested) to view the observational records (field notes) and transcripts of interviews during the period of research. Once an outline of the research had been presented to the participants, the offer of further discussions was made available at any time during the period of research. Child and adult participants were made aware that they could withdraw from participating in the research at any time within the specified time frame. It was also explained that if they did not participate or decided to withdraw consent, there would be no negative consequences and their data would be immediately destroyed (see Appendix A for further details).

Ethical approval for this study was sought from The Open University Human Participants and Materials Ethics Committee (HPMEC) – and the approval incorporated observations of the three children, including audio recordings, and interviews as part of this research process. In addition, the study was registered with the data protection agency. An enhanced Criminal Records Bureau clearance had already been obtained for the researcher prior to the research commencing. Both participant, parental and practitioner informed consent was required for this study, along with an assurance of anonymity and confidentiality at all stages of the research.

The procedures that were followed during this study for gaining access and informed consent addressed the need for privacy, confidentiality, anonymity and secure data
storage. To protect the participants' identities, the names of the participants, the setting and any other identifiable information, were either omitted or replaced with chosen pseudonyms. When participants gave their consent for interviews, they were recorded using a digital voice recorder and the data were then transferred to hard disk prior to transcribing into print and shared with the participants. Data generated from observation (field notes) were transcribed and also shared with the participants. Any original audio-recordings, handwritten data and transcribed data were stored securely with access only by the researcher for the duration of the research and will be retained for a period of 5 years.

3.3 Early Childhood Bilingualism Research

3.3.1 Research Paradigms

As in many different fields, early childhood bilingualism research has been looked at through two different paradigms (Parker-Rees, Leeson, Willan and Savage, 2010). Two recognised approaches have developed and these perspectives have largely determined the choice of methodology (Cohen et al., 2017). The first approach is the quantitative paradigm which is concerned with discovering natural and universal laws regulating and determining human behaviour (MacNaughton, Rolfe and Siraj-Blatchford, 2010; Cresswell, 2003). Within the field of education such methods are mainly used for large scale longitudinal studies that allow for national and international comparison (Cohen et al., 2017).

The second approach is the qualitative paradigm which emphasises how people differ from natural phenomena and also from each other (Guba and Lincoln, 2005). Qualitative research is ‘subjective, insider, holistic, naturalistic, valid, inductive, exploratory and discovery-oriented’ (Grieg, Taylor and Mackay, 2013, p. 47) and involves ‘interpreting the specific’ and ‘investigating the taken for granted’ (Cohen et al., 2017, p. 35) which can be achieved more effectively through a qualitative approach.

The focus of qualitative research, therefore, is to gain detailed information about a small population, in comparison with quantitative research which is designed to make generalisations about large numbers of people or phenomena (Mukherji and Albon, 2010). Qualitative research has been adopted by researchers with young
bilingual children because a small number of children can be studied in detail, for example, Flynn et al’s (2019) research which focused on the story telling skills of one emerging bilingual pre-schooler: Diego. Similarly, Bengochea and Gort’s (2020) research on translanguaging through play focused on only three children: Adam, Mari and Anthony. The present study was carried out in a naturalistic setting where the three young bilingual learners, their teachers and parents felt comfortable and secure when being observed or interviewed. This meets the characteristics of qualitative studies which are usually carried out in a natural setting or environment (Cresswell, 2003; Safford, Stacey and Hancock, 2011). The nature of the data (audio-recordings, interviews and observations) and analysis from a very small number of cases suggest that it is a qualitative study.

### 3.3.2 A case study approach

The exploratory nature of this study leads towards a case study approach as this requires the researcher to study and analyse in depth only a small number of cases and ‘gives an opportunity for one aspect... to be studied in depth in a limited timescale’ (Bell, 2018, p.10). The case study approach is appropriate to this research study, as it investigates data drawn from a small number of specific situations. Case studies can be used to study an individual child or group of children in an Early Years setting (Blaxter et al., 2010) and are a useful tool for small scale early childhood bilingualism researchers with limited resources (Mukherji and Albon, 2010). This type of methodological approach is suitable for real life settings in which most child practitioners work and appropriate for carrying out research (Greig et al., 2013) with young bilingual children as in the present study. They are usually undertaken in a naturalistic setting, such as the Early Years mainstream setting as in this research study (Denscombe, 2017).

Dyson and Geneshi (2005) comment that a case study approach is a way of gaining access to others’ worlds and researching how teaching and learning happen through social participation. It is important to note that a case study approach is not just a method of collecting information but allows the researcher to choose a variety of data collecting tools, such as interviews and observation which have been used in the present study of young bilingual learners. Since case studies are highly qualitative they involve researchers spending extended time in the field as a participant in a real
life setting, such as the mainstream Early Years setting in this research study. This approach hopefully answers the question, ‘What’s going on here?’ (Edwards, Dattilio and Fishman, 2010) and gathers very detailed information with a narrow focus.

Here it is useful to focus on the case study approaches that have been used effectively by researchers of young bilingual learners in the Early Years as in the present study. For example, Annick de Houwer’s (2015) case study of Kate informed the choice of methodology for this study as it also offers a detailed insight into the experiences of a young bilingual learner through the use of transcripts from parent interviews and audio-recordings of the child’s use of languages over a period of time.

Gildersleeve-Neumann and Wright’s (2010) case study shows marked similarities with the present study as they are both concerned with young children whose families speak the first language at home (Russian/Polish) whilst learning English at school. Gildersleeve-Neumann and Wright’s (2010) methodological approach is also based around a classroom situation using observation and audio-recordings of the children’s interactions and parent interviews, with the focus on the use of first languages, including the use of an interpreter or bilingual informant where necessary as in the present study.

Michael-Luna’s (2013) case study informed the present study and methodological approach because it is also based around a classroom situation with young children who were observed weekly, using field notes to document activities and interactions, including parent interviews, which is very similar to the present research study. Michael-Luna’s (2013) case study and the present study both explore the role of first languages in learning English at school.

As outlined above, these three case studies in Early Years settings (Annick de Houwer, 2015; Gildersleeve-Neumann and Wright, 2010 and Michael-Luna, 2013) have been used to discover something that was not known before and communicate that finding to others. They provide good examples of a case study approach being used as a successful and appropriate research tool, forming a series of observations with a bilingual child together with details about the child with the parents and teachers. The findings observed from case studies ‘reflect what happens in ‘real life’
as opposed to laboratory studies, where participants may not behave in the same way as they would in their natural setting’ (Mukherji and Albon, 2010 p. 87).

Mikkelsen (2005) maintains that ‘to serve as a foundation for generalisations, case studies should be related to a theoretical framework, which in turn may be adjusted as case study results provide new evidence’ (p.92). Vasconcelos (2010) stresses that according to the nature of the issue we need to investigate, it is important to choose adequate methods and procedures. Stake (2017) recommends that a case study approach is a good way of investigating an aspect of the development of a child, such as their language, as is the case in this present research study.

There are limitations to be considered as with any approach and because case studies are an in-depth study of one or very few cases, the findings may not be applied to the whole population or be generalised. This is because case studies look at particularisation and generalisation is not the aim, as the emphasis is more on uniqueness and understanding (MacNaughton et al., 2010). Another limitation to be considered is that the findings may not be easily replicable by others. In other words, the researcher may bring bias to the situation by being selective in the case they decide to study, as well as in what and how they record and how they analyse the data (Mukherji and Albon, 2010). It is very important to be aware of researcher bias throughout this study, particularly being a teacher-researcher within her own work place. The importance of considering researcher bias is discussed in detail in section 3.9.

3.3.3 Trustworthiness and generalisability

Bassey (2000) identifies that the underlying ethic of the case study researcher should be a respect for the truth. He replaces the concepts of reliability and validity with ‘trustworthiness’ and ‘generalisability’ (p.75) and provides a check list for researchers to ensure that the methods employed can be measured against this criterion. In striving for trustworthiness it is perhaps less important to aim for generalisation and more important that this study should be ‘a study of singularity, conducted in depth in natural settings’ (Bassey, 2000, p.47). In terms of generalisability, a case study should be ‘an invitation to see if it works for you’ (Bassey, 2000, p.52). It is hoped that the present study fulfils these expectations.
Cohen et al., (2017) argue that the purpose of a case study is to provide a basis for
generalisability. If case study researchers wish to make generalisations on the basis
of their findings they need to ensure that their case study context is representative of
a wider population to which findings might be generalised. This is more difficult in a
small in-depth case study such as the present one. However, identifying
generalisable findings is not the only reason for undertaking a case study because
one of its strengths is providing ‘unique examples of people in real situations’
(Burgess, Sieminski and Arthur, 2006, p.59). The present study is able to provide
insight into unique examples of bilingual children using translanguaging in real
contexts which aligns with other studies in this field, for example, Garcia et al.,
(2011) and Portoles and Marti (2017). It should be stressed that in case study
research with young bilingual children as in the present study, it is unlikely that the
researcher can identify a single case which can be considered as a representative
sample of a population (Scott and Usher, 2010). It is perhaps more important for this
research study to aim for consistency and trustworthiness. Although the cases are
limited and not chosen as representative of a wider population, the data gathered
about the young children’s use of translanguaging in a mainstream classroom, will
be of interest to others involved in this field of research.

3.4 Data Collection Methods

3.4.1 Observation

Observation is used as a way of collecting data as part of both qualitative and
quantitative methodologies (Mukherji and Albon, 2010, p.103). It is important to know
what to observe, how to observe and when to observe (Burgess et al., 2006). There
are also issues of trustworthiness (see 3.3.3) to consider as well as the danger of
bias from the viewpoint of the observer (see 3.9). Context is also very important
when using observation as a research method with young children. It is the
responsibility of researchers to be aware of ‘situational features’, including our own
presence, appearance and language, which might cause the children to behave in
one way rather than another (Parker-Rees et al., 2010, p.64).
According to Genzuk (2003), observation lies on a continuum which ranges from complete immersion in, to complete separation from the life and experiences of the people being observed. In order to fully understand how the three young Polish bilingual learners interacted in both Polish and English, it would be advantageous to fully immerse oneself in their lives at one end of Genzuk’s continuum. This, however, would pose difficulties in terms of practicality and opportunity. Consequently, as a teacher-researcher (see 3.9 for further discussion), it was important to take up a position at some point in the middle of this continuum, mindful of both complementary and sometimes conflicting roles.

Studies with young bilingual children have favoured observation as an appropriate research method to ensure that the children feel secure and relaxed, with no pressure on the children. For example, Portoles and Marti’s (2017) qualitative research with four to five year olds used classroom observation most effectively to observe the children’s translanguaging practices during the course of their school day (see 2.4.2). Observation was also used in Garrity et al’s (2015) study with four young emergent bilinguals, demonstrating through 314 observations how they used translanguaging every day in their nursery (see 2.4.2). For the purposes of the present study, observation was used to focus on the way in which the children used their translanguaging skills to develop their learning in the context of what Dunn (2005) would have called their ‘everyday setting’ (p.87) at school. The observed sessions in this study provided a rich source of data and created insights into the bilingual children’s use of both languages through translanguaging in an Early Years setting.

3.4.2 Interviews

Interviews can be designed to produce quantitative or qualitative data and can range from highly structured, semi-structured to unstructured, depending on the type of data to be collected. Semi-structured interviews contain a mixture of closed and open questions and are often used in qualitative research, providing more flexibility to seek further detail in relation to a particular response (Mukherji and Albon, 2010). In this study, a semi-structured design was therefore chosen to interview the headteacher, the children’s class teacher, Teaching Assistant and the children’s parents. When choosing interviews as a suitable research method for collecting data
it is also important to consider their limitations. On the one hand, interviews are a flexible and adaptable way of exploring ideas, but on the other hand, concerns about trustworthiness can reduce their perceived potential (Robson, 2004).

This is particularly relevant to this study as the interviewer/researcher could be seen to be in a position of power by the parents. This was mitigated in part, at least, by the presence of the bilingual informant during the interviews who interpreted and helped reassure the parents if necessary - please see section 3.9 below for further details.

Research studies of young bilingual learners often use interviews as part of their data collection to gain background information from the children’s teachers and to ascertain their views and attitudes towards bilingualism. Flynn and Curdt-Christiansen’s (2018) study, for example, sought teachers’ views on policy and practice for the teaching of bilingual children (see 2.2.2).

3.4.3 Audio-recordings

Audio-recordings form an important part of qualitative research (Silverman, 2015) and remain the most widely used way of collecting data. They provide accurate records of observations in the classroom and are a useful source for backing up any field notes (Hopkins, 2014). In this present study it was vital to capture the voices of the children in their everyday school setting so that their language use could be recorded and then played, replayed and transcribed. Audio-recordings form an important part of early childhood bilingualism research as the focus on the children’s language use is represented clearly and accurately. Mary and Young’s (2017) study analysed audio-recordings of 3-4 year old Turkish speakers using translanguaging during their interactions and activities with their teachers and families. Similarly, the audio-recordings from the present study were closely examined to reveal translanguaging practices of the children within the classroom, providing an excellent record of ‘naturally occurring’ interaction (Silverman, 2015, p. 20). The audio-recordings and their transcripts together with the field notes offered a very reliable record to which the researcher could return repeatedly as new themes emerged (Silverman, 2015).

In the present study it was also important to record the interviews with the parents and teachers, as the record acted as ‘the best index of the interviewer’s effect on the
respondent’s testimony’ (Fielding and Thomas, 2008, p.256), whilst allowing the researcher the space and time to focus upon the discussion with the participants (Denscombe, 2017). The researcher was, of course, mindful of issues of permission, confidentiality and storage associated with electronic data recording (see section 3.2 for details) and all transcripts were made available to the participants. It should be noted that the three interviews with the children’s Teaching Assistant were not recorded at her request and this was, of course, respected. Transcribing the audio-recordings took a long time but this process of listening, re-listening and transcribing gave a level of understanding and analysis that would have been difficult to achieve through field notes alone (Roberts-Holmes, 2018). Furthermore, as data were not dependent on the researcher’s recall or selective attention, audio-recordings improved the trustworthiness of the data collection (Bloor and Wood, 2011).

The use of the digital recorder was unobtrusive and after initial interest was ignored for the rest of the sessions by the children who did not find it inhibiting. Background noise in a busy Foundation Stage classroom and outside areas caused some technical problems but the majority of the recordings could be transcribed without difficulty and analysed in detail. Unlike video-recordings, it was not possible to document facial expressions or gestures, but these were recorded as necessary in field notes. Although the majority of observations were audio-recorded not all were: for example, if the session observed had too many other children present or was held outside in the playground.

Although video-recording was not used in this study as the focus was on the children’s use of language and not non-verbal-communication, it can be argued that the video is a powerful research tool which can be ‘instrumental in giving voice to children’s perspectives’ (Haggerty, 2020). In this research study, video-recording would possibly have provided more data about the three children’s body language and other forms of non-verbal-communication (gestures, gaze, posture, facial expressions, movement and actions) during their child-led interactions. It is an effective means of showing the realities of the context – the Foundation Stage classroom and learning areas, particularly for those readers who are unfamiliar with the English Education system. In the present study, (in line with the school’s safeguarding and data protection policy), the use of video-recording was discussed
with the parents of the three children; supported by the bilingual informant. However, despite the assurance of confidentiality and anonymity by sounding over all names and blurring out faces, the parents did not wish to sign a consent form to grant permission for the use of video recordings or photographs of their children during the research and their wishes were, of course, respected by the researcher.

3.4.4 Field notes

Field notes were used throughout this study to supplement interviews and observations of the children in order to build up a broad picture, taking into account the context, setting and other contributory factors. Several researchers suggest that field notes should include a record of the date, time and location of the situation and description of the participants in order to increase trustworthiness whilst providing essential context to inform the data analysis (Phillippi and Lauderdale, 2017; Schwandt, 2015). Pachego-Vega (2019) and Eriksson, Henttomen and Merilainen (2016) consider that writing field notes is an important part of ‘the strategies and techniques available to qualitative researchers’ (p.1). Contextual information for example, from Hornberger and Link’s (2012) study of Beatriz showed how she moved backwards and forwards between both Spanish and English at home and school through different interactions (see 2.4.2).

Within this study it was very important to keep detailed field notes whilst observing the three children, as the notes acted as an important source of verification of what happened (Fielding, 2008), the children’s use of their languages and were also useful when reflecting on classroom practices (Thompson, 2014). The field notes also helped the researcher to explore emerging patterns within the data (Hopkins, 2014, p.103), for example, the various themes relating to the use of translanguaging.

3.5 The setting

The school site for the primary age range four to eleven years, containing a First School and a Middle School, is situated within a fast-growing and diverse city in the Midlands. It has a high growth rate of 20.2% compared to the average growth rate of 8.9% for the rest of the UK. Communities represented include: Bangladeshi, Chinese, Ghanaian, Indian, Italian, Lithuanian, Kenyan, Nigerian, Pakistani, Polish,
Somalian, Sri Lankan, Tanzanian and Zimbabwean. The latest annual pupil data records over 156 languages being spoken by children in the schools, and 20.3% of minority ethnic children are learning English as an Additional Language. At least 10.6% of households have one person whose main language is not English. Out of the 266,800 population, over 1.5% of people speak Polish. (Office for National Statistics ONS, 2019). The Polish community in the city holds regular meetings, including language classes and seasonal traditions and celebrations, particularly for the children and their families. There is also a Saturday Polish school nearby. The three Polish bilingual learners do not attend this one but Peter goes to a Saturday Polish nursery in London with his father.

The First School is mixed with 246 children on roll, aged four to seven years. Data were gathered from the Foundation Stage which is the first year of schooling for children aged four to five years. The school serves a catchment area which is socio-economically diverse and multi-ethnic. The school policy aims to ‘promote mutual respect and tolerance for those with different faiths and beliefs and promotes and celebrates the diverse backgrounds and beliefs of its children and families. All members of the school community are encouraged to know and understand that it is expected and it is important that respect is shown to everyone. In addition, the children and staff uphold the school’s values which include friendship, success, honesty, challenge, kindness and community. Social, moral, spiritual and cultural aspects of learning are well promoted throughout the school. This aspect of the school’s work is very effective because the different strands link together through the school’s values which indicates the immense importance the school places on being tolerant of the religions and cultures of others’ (see Appendix B for further details of the school policy).

3.5.1 Early Years Provision in the school

In the first year of schooling (The Foundation Stage), the Statutory Framework for the Early Years Foundation Stage (2020) is followed, which is a carefully integrated programme of learning which covers seven key areas of learning (see Appendix C for further details of the EYFS Framework). Children are assessed each term in the Foundation Stage through day-to-day observation of their progress in the key areas of development (Early Learning Goals). At the end of the year an individual profile is
prepared by the class teacher of each child. This is shared with the children, their parents and their Year 1 teacher. In conjunction with the local Ethnic Minority Achievement Service (EMAS), the school also has a policy offering guidance for the teaching of bilingual learners (See Appendix D for further details) which reflects the EYFS (2020) recommendations that bilingual learners should have opportunities to ‘engage in activities that do not depend solely on English for success’ (EYFS, 2020, section 3.4).

In England most children start school full-time in the September after their fourth birthday and will turn five during their first school year. If parents do not think their child is ready to start school at the usual time, they can start later - as long as they are in full-time education by the time they reach ‘compulsory school age’. Children must start full-time education once they reach compulsory school age. This is on 31st December, 31st March or 31st August following their fifth birthday - whichever comes first. All three to four year olds in England are entitled to free early education before they start school full time (https://www.gov.uk).

The ‘everyday setting’ (Dunn, 2005) at my school took place within the Foundation Stage (aged four to five years) which has three parallel classrooms. Every morning there are structured literacy and mathematics sessions for the whole class. After the teacher-led input, the children work in small ability groups, supported by the teacher or Teaching Assistant and after completion of their individual tasks are free to choose another activity in the inside shared area (see section 3.5.1). In the afternoon, the range of activities are related to the theme of the week (example, ‘Moving Around’) followed by free choice from any of the areas described above.

The three children were also observed during music lessons, library sessions, physical education and whole school assemblies in the main hall. The researcher also observed the three children during their free playtimes or ‘downtime’ in the Foundation Stage outside area and in the large school playground with older children from Years One and Two, as well as during their lunch and snack times with the rest of the school.

Throughout this study I combined my roles of a researcher and a class teacher. (Please see section 3.9 for more details). During two days a week I collected data
with the children as they were involved in their everyday activities within the Foundation Stage, both inside and outside the classroom, including role play and playground times. Observations of the three children were audio-recorded and/or accompanied by field notes and discussed with their class teacher and the parents. In addition, their class teacher, Teaching Assistant, headteacher and the children’s parents were interviewed at regular intervals throughout the year, to discuss the three children’s use of Polish and English both at school and at home.

As a class teacher I taught for two days a week in a parallel class and in the three children’s class as part of a job-share arrangement. I taught Literacy (including Phonics lessons and Guided Reading sessions) Mathematics and Topic lessons as a whole class and planned activities in small groups. In conjunction with my class teacher’s role I also fulfilled my role as the Ethnic Minority Achievement Coordinator (EMACO) throughout the whole school (from Foundation Stage to Year Two). This involved monitoring the progress of all the bilingual children; liaising with their class teachers and the local EMAS team, whilst providing training for newly qualified teachers and in service training sessions for the staff. The two roles of teacher and researcher complemented each other as I was in an excellent position to discuss the data with the class teacher and the parents on a regular and informal basis. The class teacher did not feel threatened by my presence as a researcher as she respected both my roles and fully endorsed and welcomed the research with her children. The role of teacher-researcher also presented some challenges, as the children took time to adjust to the situation and the change in dynamics, but soon became accustomed to the regime and reacted accordingly.

The Foundation Stage, from which the participants for this study were drawn, has three classrooms. The classes are of mixed ability with a maximum of 30 children in each. Each class has a teacher and full-time Teaching Assistant. There is also an inside shared area outside the classrooms, where children can choose from a wide range of activities, including a role play area, book corner, craft tables or mathematics or literacy activities related to the topic of the week. The covered garden area is for quiet learning using construction toys, dolls houses, writing and reading zones. There is also an outdoor area for active learning, including sand and water play, play house, a maths themed activity, music corner, writing wall, and a
large climbing frame. The area also includes a variety of small apparatus and a range of bikes and scooters which can be ridden round a circular track on the floor. In one corner, themed child-led activities are set up, which are related to the week’s topic. All these areas are carefully supervised by three Teaching Assistants and the children have free access to them during the school day, in addition to their own classrooms, where they can work with their class teacher or choose to access the interactive white board, laptops or tablets. The children come from a variety of pre-schools, nurseries and other day care providers. The experiences that children have before joining Foundation Stage are all very different, but the school welcomes this diversity and views it as a positive strength.

3.6 Participants

3.6.1 Anna

On entry to the Foundation Stage in September 2013 Anna was four years, eight months old and the oldest of the three young Polish bilingual learners involved in the research study. She has an older brother, four years older who attended the local middle school at the time. He was born in Poland and came to England with his parents when he was eighteen months old. Anna’s father previously came to England on his own and lived and worked in the local area for two years before he sent for his family to join him. Both parents are full-time shift workers in a local factory. Her father usually brings Anna to school and picks her up, before and after his shift. Very occasionally, her mother picks her up, if her shifts change. Anna was born in the local hospital in England and attended a nursery with Maria (her best friend and one of the other Polish children in this study) attached to a nearby first school for one year before she joined the Foundation Stage. Her father was keen to tell me during our interview that the nursery staff were very pleased with her progress and did not want to lose her. Her father explained that she was moved from the nursery to be on the same site as her brother which would be more convenient for the family, although she had been making good progress and enjoyed the setting. Anna and her best friend Maria both joined the Foundation Stage together and they maintained a close friendship during their first year of schooling.
3.6.2 Maria

Maria joined the Foundation Stage in September 2013. On entry, she was four years, three months old and the youngest of the three young Polish bilingual learners involved in the research study. In 2000, her parents came to England, looking for work. They both worked in the local area for two years, before Maria was born. Her father works full-time in a local business and her mother is at home looking after Maria’s young brother who was eighteen months old when Maria joined the school. Her mother always brings Maria to school with her younger brother in the buggy and picks her up every day. Maria was born in the local hospital in England and she and Anna attended a nursery attached to a nearby first school for one year before she joined Foundation Stage.

3.6.3 Peter

On entry to the Foundation Stage Peter was four years, four months old. He has an older sister aged eighteen at the time of data collection who attended the local secondary school. She was born in Poland and came to England with her parents, when she was ten years old. Peter’s parents came to England in 1995, for his father’s work with the Football Association. His mother is at home. She brings Peter to school and picks him up every day, usually with another Polish mother. Very occasionally, his father picks him up, if he is at home. Peter was born in the local hospital in England and attended a local private nursery for one year before he joined the Foundation Stage. During one of our interviews, Peter’s mother told the researcher that he also attended a Polish nursery in London.

3.6.4 Adult participants

The headteacher, the children’s class teacher, Teaching Assistant and the children’s parents were interviewed by the researcher during the year (see Appendices I and J for sample transcripts). The headteacher had been in post for two years at the start of the study and was keen to support the bilingual children in the school and worked in close liaison with the local EMAS team to ensure that provision was in place for the children. The researcher worked closely with her to help prepare assemblies to mark celebrations for the bilingual children in the school and she showed an interest
in the use of their first languages in the classroom. Towards the end of the school year she was interviewed to discuss the progress of the three children and the researcher provided an update of the research study during the year. The end of year reports for Anna, Maria and Peter were also discussed.

The children’s class teacher, who was a newly qualified teacher and bilingual herself in Afrikaans and English, was very interested in the use of children’s first languages and often asked the researcher for advice on how the children could be encouraged to use Polish in the classroom. She displayed a keen interest in their language use during the year and was supportive of the research study. She was interviewed each term to discuss Anna, Maria and Peter’s language learning and to provide information about their progress.

Similarly, the Teaching Assistant was also interviewed each term to seek her views about the children’s participation in a range of activities led by herself. She had worked in the school for over fifteen years and was very experienced in working with Early Years children. She supported the research study and was very interested to find out how the children used their first language through play and other activities. She often worked with the children in small groups and enjoyed a close relationship with them and was always willing to listen to their experiences and share their stories.

The parents of the children were very supportive of the research study and keen for their children to take part. The mothers of Peter and Maria were chosen as they brought the children to school and collected them and therefore had time to come in for an interview. The fathers of Peter and Maria had work commitments and could not attend during the school day. Anna’s mother worked early shifts and was unable to come in during the day but Anna’s father worked at nights so was willing to come in as he dropped Anna off every morning. He was very interested in the research study and keen to share his experiences with the researcher about his family and their use of Polish at home.
3.7 Data Collection for this study

Data collection took place two days a week over a one year period from September 2013 to July 2014, excluding during seasonal school closures, within the school’s Foundation Stage setting and library. Data from the three young Polish bilingual learners, their parents and their teachers were collected through observations and interviews, using both audio-recordings and field notes.

The children’s use of language was observed in different contexts: for example, when talking to one another in Polish or English; or talking in small groups with Polish and English peers or talking in English to adults – their class teacher, Teaching Assistant or the researcher. Observations were carried out during the school day while the children were involved in their everyday activities which included role play, constructing models, sharing stories and dual language books with an adult, craft work and follow up sessions to classroom input (see Chapter 4 for examples). These observations were audio-recorded and transcribed by the researcher; Polish speech was translated where necessary by the bilingual informant.

The interviews with the children’s parents and their teachers took place within the school library, Information Technology (IT) suite, the headteacher’s office and classrooms which were familiar to all the participants. They were audio-recorded and transcribed and the transcriptions were made accessible to the participants. All the interviewees were assured that permission would be gained before using the material for any other purpose than the submission of this research (see 3.2).

The following tables (3.1 and 3.2) summarise essential information about the participants and list the number of observations and interviews undertaken with each one.
### Table 3.1 Data Collection Chart Summary - Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Family Position</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>First Language</th>
<th>Age on starting school in September 2013</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>12.01.2009</td>
<td>Youngest of 2</td>
<td>Father – Polish Mother - Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>4 years 8 months</td>
<td>51 sessions 14 hours total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>22.06.2009</td>
<td>Eldest of 2</td>
<td>Father – Polish Mother - Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>4 years 2 months</td>
<td>42 sessions 11 hours total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>31.05.2009</td>
<td>Youngest of 2</td>
<td>Father – Polish Mother - Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>4 years 3 months</td>
<td>37 sessions 11 hours total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.2 Data Collection Chart Summary - Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>First Language</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna’s Father</td>
<td>Bilingual: Polish / English</td>
<td>30.58 minutes 1 interview - Audio recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria’s Mother</td>
<td>Bilingual: Polish / English</td>
<td>35.22 minute 1 interview - Audio recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter’s Mother</td>
<td>Bilingual: Polish / English</td>
<td>35.22 minutes 1 interview - Audio recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Teacher of children in research study</td>
<td>Bilingual: Afrikaans / English</td>
<td>1 hour 22 minutes 3 interviews - Audio recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistant of children in research study</td>
<td>Monolingual: English</td>
<td>39.09 minutes 3 interviews - Field notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Teacher of School</td>
<td>Monolingual: English</td>
<td>20.22 minutes 1 interview - Audio recorded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See also Appendices E and F which contain further details about all the observations and interviews undertaken during the research study, including information about the participants involved, the location and timing of all recordings, which languages were used and also contextual information regarding activities carried out.

### 3.8 Data Analysis

Thematic analysis as a named approach was first developed by Gerald Holton in the 1970s (Merton, 1975) and is recognised as a distinctive method with a clearly outlined set of procedures (Howitt and Cramer, 2008; Whittaker, 2009; Howitt, 2010; Joffe, 2012; Stainton Rogers, 2011; Braun and Clarke, 2013).
Thematic analysis aims to unravel the accounts that are given in order to find out what is going on and how to make sense of the data (Braun and Clarke, 2013). It is an adaptable method that can be applied across a wide range of theoretical approaches. Braun and Clarke (2013) suggest that ‘through its theoretical freedom, thematic analysis provides a flexible and useful research tool, which can potentially provide a rich and detailed, yet complex, account of data’ (p.78). Within this study the thematic analysis is channelled through a translanguaging framework which provides a focused structure for the analysis and thus guards against the criticism made by Braun and Clarke (2013) that thematic analysis may be at times criticised for being too broad, generalised and descriptive.

Using thematic analysis for this study allowed the categorisation of the data according to recurring themes that had arisen during the research. The data are analysed in detail in Chapter 4, according to the themes which arose from the data and the literature. The first six themes are based around the translanguaging functions portrayed in studies by Portoles and Marti (2017) and Garcia et al., (2011), as discussed in Chapter 2. The six functions form the first six themes through which the data are analysed (see Chapter 4) and the seventh theme - translanguaging to scaffold language learning - emerged from the data.

3.9 Insider-outsider issues

Hammersley (2003) considers that there are advantages and disadvantages to both the positions of outsider and insider in research and argues for a combination of both ‘involvement and estrangement’ (p. 219). It would appear that in every study the researcher can be both insider and outsider. The researcher can never just be an outsider in the research process, but will take on different roles along a continuum between insider and outsider, depending on which aspect of the research context is being considered (Hellawell, 2006). In this study the researcher fulfils dual roles: she is both an insider as a teacher initiating activities with the children, but also an outsider as a researcher observing the children’s language use. It is, however, difficult to carry out research with young bilingual children without becoming involved in the situation that one wants to study. Many of those interested in researching with young children have tried to find ways of reducing the distance between themselves as adults and the children in the study (Clark, Flewitt, Hammersley and Robb, 2014).
Several researchers have written about this dilemma, including Corsaro (2003) who has worked extensively with bilingual pre-school children in Italy and the United States. Although he agrees that he will never be seen as part of their ‘peer culture’ (p. 37) he was assigned a special role by the children – in his case as ‘Big Bill’ – a non-adult-like adult or a ‘big kid’ (p.14).

At the same time, a researcher must always be conscious of her own roles and influence on what is observed. Haviland, Johnson, Orr and Lienert (2005) also comment that an outsider has no in-depth understanding of the setting being explored, whereas an insider knows the participants well. The position of insider/outside is quite complex and it is possible to be both in a setting ‘because we occupy multiple positions simultaneously’ (Haviland et al., 2005, p.13). There is of course a danger that through familiarity it is possible to ‘come to any situation with many preconceptions’ (Haviland et al., 2005, p.14). In the researcher’s situation in this study it was necessary to stand back and reflect on the role and be keenly aware of the processes involved.

In fact, Hellawell (2006) argues that the researcher can actually benefit from the different perspectives of insider and outsider. In this sense, the analysis of the data became a cyclical process of maintaining a distance from the data and from the insider position to reflect objectively as a researcher and then moving back from the outsider position to become immersed in the data again. As the research progressed during the year it was important to analyse and stand back from the context, but also try to present a transparent and accurate portrayal of the participants.

MacNaughton et al., (2010) stress the importance of remaining objective and to be aware of one’s own prejudices, likes and dislikes, before embarking on a research project. Bryman (2015) comments that we constantly adjust and modify our behaviour as we present ourselves to others and researchers need to be sensitive to these changes in others as they are observed in different situations. It was also important to be aware of the potential for bias caused by the power imbalance between the researcher and the three bilingual children whom they may regard as an authority figure (Oates, 2006). Importantly, as a teacher-researcher it becomes almost impossible to completely eliminate researcher influence and achieve total objectivity (Cohen et al., 2017). To try and counteract the risk of bias and increase
objectivity it is important to avoid evaluations and judgements when recording observations (Rolfe, 2001).

It was important when conducting this research to reflect carefully upon both the roles of a practitioner and researcher in the workplace. Powney and Watts (2018) assert that the roles of the teacher researching in her own school may impinge on each other. At various times, she is a colleague, teacher, researcher, and /or interviewer. This mixture of roles could easily lead to bias in the research and Powney and Watts (2018) warn that the teacher should be wary of the 'self-fulfilling prophecy'. In this study, for example, the researcher developed a strong bias in favour of recognising and promoting the benefits of bilingualism and this may well have influenced the data collection and analysis.

As a monolingual teacher-researcher it was very important to reflect upon this role and the support from the Polish bilingual informant, ensured that the bilingual children did not feel uncomfortable in any way. She formed a vital link between the researcher, the school and their families. She not only translated the children's utterances when necessary but also offered insights into their use of languages in the classroom and at home. Her empathy with the Polish community within the school and outside was most valuable and enabled the researcher to form better relationships with not only the three bilingual children but also their parents.

3.10 Summary
In this chapter early childhood bilingualism research approaches have been discussed and ethical issues related to this research study considered. A qualitative case study approach has been chosen as appropriate to this research study, as it investigates data drawn from a small number of specific situations in a naturalistic setting. The importance of trustworthiness and generalisability has been emphasised; however, despite the small number of participants this study about the young bilingual children’s use of translanguaging contributes important data and addresses gaps in this field of research.
The methods of data collection employed in this research have been presented as have essential details about the school, the setting and the participants and their families. Thematic analysis has been discussed as the approach to adopt to analyse the data, carefully structured via a translinguaging framework. Finally, the challenges of combining the roles of teacher and researcher have been presented and the issues of remaining objective whilst being an insider-outsider have been carefully considered and kept in mind throughout this research.
Chapter 4  Data Analysis

4.1  Introduction

In this chapter I present the data according to themes which have arisen from both the data collected and from the literature. The first six themes draw on the translanguaging functions discussed in Garcia, et al’s (2011) study and the research study by Portoles and Marti (2017). Their studies also focus on the important role that the children’s translanguaging practices have in negotiating and building their more dynamic bilingual identities. Portoles and Marti’s (2017) research identifies that translanguaging is very dynamic and unpredictable. Young bilingual learners use their entire linguistic repertoire in order to successfully communicate, make meaning and reinforce their multiple identities (Portoles and Marti, 2017). Garcia et al., (2011) conclude that ‘the children do not simply acquire a separate additional language but instead they integrate bits and pieces of these new linguistic practices into their complex and growing repertoire’ (p.45).

Garcia et al., (2011) identify six functions of translanguaging:

- to mediate understandings among each other;
- to co-construct meaning of what the other is saying;
- to construct meaning within themselves;
- to include others;
- to exclude others;
- to demonstrate knowledge.

These six functions form the first six themes through which the data are analysed. The following theme has emerged from the data and is discussed below:

Theme 7 – ‘Translanguaging to scaffold language learning’ shows how the ‘process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages’ Baker and Wright (2017, p.289-290) helps support the development of bilingual learners’ second language, in this case, English. Thus, translanguaging offers the three children in this study the opportunities to use their entire linguistic repertoire on which they draw strategically for meaning-making and communication (Axelrod and Cole, 2018) as they develop their English - the language of instruction.
Theme 7 – ‘Translanguaging to scaffold language learning’ is discussed in more detail in Chapter 2, also drawing on research by Duarte (2018) and Cummins (2008).

The seven themes are presented in the table below:

**Table 4.1 Translanguaging Themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Related to key literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Translanguaging to mediate understandings among each other</td>
<td>Children’s translations and interpretations to mediate with others and themselves.</td>
<td>Garcia et al., (2011) Portoles and Marti (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Translanguaging to co-construct meaning of what the other is saying</td>
<td>Children make use of their first language for understanding and to create new concepts and establish relationships between languages.</td>
<td>Garcia et al., (2011) Portoles and Marti (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Translanguaging to construct meaning within themselves</td>
<td>Children talk to themselves, often using their first language, to make meanings and assist their learning.</td>
<td>Garcia et al., (2011) Portoles and Marti (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Translanguaging to include others</td>
<td>Children responding to the perceived language use of interlocutors.</td>
<td>Garcia et al., (2011) Portoles and Marti (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Translanguaging to exclude others</td>
<td>Children using translanguaging to exclude others from an interaction.</td>
<td>Garcia et al., (2011) Portoles and Marti (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Translanguaging to demonstrate knowledge</td>
<td>Children trying out the words they have learnt in their new language.</td>
<td>Garcia et al., (2011) Portoles and Marti (2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following key is applied to all data examples in this chapter

R = Researcher  
A = Anna   Polish bilingual learner  
M = Maria   Polish bilingual learner  
P = Peter   Polish bilingual learner  
O = Oliver  Peter’s Polish friend  
K = Kate    Anna’s Polish friend  
E = Ellis   Peter’s English friend  
C = Child

Polish text is italicized and translated in […] underneath. Essential contextual material is added in (...).

4.2 Anna

4.2.1 Theme 1 – Translanguaging to mediate understandings among each other

As discussed in Chapter 2 (section 2.4.2) this theme reflects children’s translations and interpretations to mediate with others and themselves (Portoles and Marti, 2017, p.71; Garcia et al., 2011, p.46).

Example 1 (Term 1, 3rd October)

In Example 1 below Anna is sharing a dual language book ‘First 100 Word in Polish’ (Amery and Cartwright, 2008) with the other Polish children in their classroom. They are naming objects from the picture of children getting dressed in the morning. Above the main picture in the book are a series of pictures labelled in Polish and English which relate to the main picture. (See Appendix G for a copy of the relevant page in the picture book and Appendix H for a sample transcript):

R  And what are these?
A  (Pausing before answering) Trousers. Spodnie.  

Example 1 shows that Anna provides a translation for ‘trousers’ and uses her first language to facilitate understanding between herself, the researcher and the rest of the Polish children in the group. Garcia et al., (2011) comment that this is a social practice that children learn well. Translations are a simple form of translanguaging and children rely on these in order to make sense of what is being taught (p.46). Anna’s translation for the group provides evidence of her ability to translanguage
comfortably, but she is also aware that she has an advantage by being bilingual and she displays confidence in her translanguaging ability. In addition, Garcia et al., (2011) stress that translanguaging sometimes ‘consists of a discourse in different languages to mediate one’s own understanding’ (p.47). In this sense, Anna is perhaps confirming her own understanding of both languages as she answers the researcher by saying: ‘Trousers. Spodnie [trousers]’ She is using English and Polish to expand upon something the researcher has said, thus mediating her own understanding of what is happening.

Example 2 (Term 1, 3rd October)

In Example 2 below, Anna, Maria and Peter are talking to the researcher in their classroom about their use of first languages with their Polish peers and family members, before sharing a dual language book together:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Good. <em>Dobra</em>.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Good.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>(Laughing). <em>Dobra</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Good.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, M, P</td>
<td>(Laughing). You taught me that yesterday didn’t you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Good.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td><em>(Laughing).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, M, P</td>
<td>(Laughing).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This example shows that Anna, Maria and Peter are confirming the researcher’s understanding of the Polish word for ‘good’ and ensuring that she understands its use and translation. It is also an example of Theme 4: ‘Translanguaging to include others’ as they are using translanguaging to establish a relationship with the researcher and encourage her to participate in their discussion whilst responding to her dominant language use (English). The multiple themes shown here also underline the many different functions for which the children use language and translanguaging.
Example 3 (Term 1, 4\textsuperscript{th} December)

In Example 3 below, Anna is talking to the researcher in an empty classroom with Christmas artefacts on display:

\begin{itemize}
  \item R (Points to a Christmas card with a picture of Father Christmas on it). Who’s that?
  \item A I don’t know.
  \item R You’re not sure? It’s Father Christmas. Is that what you call him? (Pause) In Poland?
  \item A Erm. \textit{Mikolaj}. [Nicholas.]
  \item R Ah! \textit{Mikolaj} is he coming to your house? [Nicholas.]
  \item A. (Anna shrugs her shoulders).
\end{itemize}

Example 3 shows that Anna is mediating understanding between herself and the researcher by using translanguaging. Her use of English and Polish is evidence of using ‘both languages because they want to ensure that they’re understood’ (Garcia et al., 2011, p.46). Anna is making sense of what the researcher is saying and translates Father Christmas into \textit{Mikolaj}.

Example 4 (Term 2, 3\textsuperscript{rd} March)

Example 4 below shows Anna and Maria in the covered outdoor area attached to the three Foundation Stage classrooms. They are playing with a doll’s house and using the dolls and animals to create their own role play situations:

\begin{itemize}
  \item A \textit{Ona sika na poduszke...sika Maria se... Tutaj jestem ja. A swinia sika na wszystko}. [It makes a wee wee on the pillow...Maria makes a wee wee... Here I am. And the pig wees on everything.]
  \item M \textit{A gdzie to? Ona bedzie plywac}. [Where should it be? She is going to swim.]
\end{itemize}

Example 4 shows that Anna is using her first language to involve Maria in their role play. Her confidence in her translanguaging ability is demonstrated through her fluency and sentence construction whilst maintaining a conversation with Maria.
Example 5 (Term 3, 21st May)

In Example 5 below the researcher is talking to the three Polish children in their classroom about their learning experiences and their use of Polish at home and school:

M  (Whispers). Yes.
R  Why is it hard? Can you tell us? Can you tell Anna, maybe in Polish? Anna. I want her to tell me if she finds things hard in the classroom. (Anna and Maria whisper quietly to each other in Polish).
A  When we were playing a game she forgotten the sounds.
R  The sounds?
A  (Nods). When was reading them, Maria forgotten.
R  In phonics?
A  (Shouting). No!
R  No?
A  When we play cards, we was reading, but Maria forgotten the sounds.

Example 5 shows Anna’s use of both English and Polish. Even though the Polish conversation between the girls was in whispers, Anna interprets for the researcher what Maria has said to her in Polish. She is also ‘including others’ (Theme 4) by including Maria in the discussion, whilst also ‘demonstrating knowledge’ (Theme 6) as she explains to the researcher in English, why Maria is finding it difficult in the classroom.

Example 6 (Term 3, 22nd May)

In Example 6, below, Anna and her friend Kate are building with Lego in the classroom, whilst making up their own stories based around the Playmobil objects:

A  Is broken (holding up a piece of Lego and showing Kate).
K  Tutaj macie jablka.
    [Here you have an apple.]
A  Oh. Tutaj jest jabłoń.
    [Oh. Here is an apple tree.]

Example 6 shows that Anna’s use of translanguaging allows her to respond to Kate’s comment and create an understanding between them as they develop their role play together. Her use of both English and Polish is evidence of using ‘both languages because they want to ensure that they’re understood’ (Garcia et al., 2011, p.46).
Interview Example 1 (Term 3, 3rd March)

Anna’s class teacher also commented in her interview with the researcher that Anna:
‘... spends a lot of time with Maria and she’s very protective of her. She often translates for her in class if she doesn’t understand instructions.’ (Interview 03.03.14)

This provides further evidence of how she is mediating understandings among each other through her use of translanguaging.

4.2.2 Theme 2 – Translanguaging to co-construct meaning of what the other is saying

Findings from Portoles and Marti’s (2017) research indicate that children make use of their first languages for understanding, whilst also using their previous knowledge from their developing linguistic repertoire to create new concepts.

Example 7 (Term 1, 3rd October)

In Example 7 below, Anna is sharing a dual language book with the other Polish children. They are naming different fruits from the picture of a family having breakfast together. Above the main picture in the book are a series of pictures labelled in Polish and English which relate to the main picture. (See Appendix G for a copy of the relevant page in the picture book and Appendix H for a sample transcript).

R And what’s this one?
A (Sounding out the initial letter) O - o - o - orange.
R Orange. Ooooh!
A Pomarańcza.
[Orange.]
R Pomarańcza?
[Orange?] Shall we look at another picture? Peter? Would you like to see another picture?

Example 7 shows that Anna is providing a translation, as in the other examples above, but is also co-constructing meaning as she confirms her understanding of the vocabulary. She is becoming aware of her own learning by using her skills and capacities as language learners and demonstrating her bilingualism to the researcher.
Example 8 (Term 3, 22\textsuperscript{nd} May)

In Example 8 below, Anna and her friend Kate are building with Lego in the classroom, whilst making up their own stories based around the Playmobil objects:

A  Oh! Fridges! Kate spójrz! Jed, dwa, trzy, cztery, pięć. To jest pięć fridges!

K  Tutaj wy macie jabłka!

[Kate look! One, two, three, four, five. It’s five fridges!]

Example 8 shows that Anna is confirming Kate’s understanding of the vocabulary both in Polish and English, as she moves seamlessly between the two languages in order to co-construct new meanings.

Interview Example 2 (Term 3, 20\textsuperscript{th} May)

In an interview with the researcher Anna’s father remarked that when English and Polish friends came to the house:

‘She speaks to one in English and the other one in Polish’ (Interview 20.05.14)

This shows that Anna is using her first language for understanding and co-constructing new meanings whilst also including others - an example of Theme 4.

4.2.3  Theme 3 – Translanguaging to construct meaning within themselves

According to Garcia et al., (2011) young children often talk to themselves and this practice is particularly evident in Early Years settings. In this way translanguaging helps children to develop their bilingualism.

Example 9 (Term 2, 12\textsuperscript{th} March)

In Example 9 below, Anna and Maria are in the outdoor covered area attached to the classrooms. They are playing with a doll’s house and using the animals to create their own stories:
Anna is talking to herself as she uses her first language to create her story independently from Maria when she says, ‘Tu nie ma nic. Mamy swinie w domu’. [Here is no anything. We’ve got the pig at home]. Anna’s conversation is completely in Polish which concurs with Garcia et al’s (2011) view that her first language is foregrounded as she makes meanings for herself.

**Example 10 (Term 3, 22nd May)**

As shown in Example 10 below, Anna and her friend Kate are building with Lego in the classroom, whilst making up their own stories with Playmobil objects and houses made from Lego:

Anna is again talking to herself as she uses her first language to create her story posing her own questions and answering them herself when she asks, ‘Co jest co? To jest dom!’ [What’s that? It’s a house!]

**4.2.4 Theme 4 – Translanguaging to include others**

This theme reflects how children respond to the perceived language use of an interlocutor. In Example11, Anna is responding to perceptions of the researcher’s dominant language (English) to include her into the activity and inviting her to participate.
Example 11 (Term 1, 3rd October)

Anna is sharing a dual language book with the other Polish children in their classroom. They are naming food from the picture of children having their breakfast in the kitchen. Above the main picture in the book are a series of pictures labelled in Polish and English which relate to the main picture:

A Mleko
[Milk.]
R Mleko?
[Milk?]
A Milk.
R Milk?
A Mleko
[Milk.]
[Milk?]  

Anna provides a translation for ‘milk’ in response to the researcher pointing to the corresponding picture in the book. Anna is using translanguaging to include the researcher in the discussion and also to make herself understood by responding to the researcher’s language use. (See Appendix G for a copy of the relevant page in the picture book and Appendix H for a sample transcript).

Example 12 (Term 2, 12th March)

In Example 12 below, Anna and Maria are in the covered outdoor area attached to the three Foundation Stage classrooms. They are playing with a doll’s house and using the toy animals to make up their own story. Anna attempts to include Maria and encourages her to participate in the role play:

A Ona sika na poduszke...sika Maria se... Tutaj jestem ja. A swinia sika na wszystko...
[It makes a wee wee on the pillow...Maria makes a wee wee... Here I am. And the pig wees on everything.]
M A gdzie to? Ona bedzie pływac.
[Where should it be? She is going to swim.]
A Ide do samochodu z Tobą, jedziemy do domu.
[I go to the car with you, we go home.]
In this example, Anna is responding to Maria’s language use and helps her to participate by including her in the story. She is using her first language to include her in their role play.

**Example 13 (Term 3, 22nd May)**

In Example 13 below, Anna and her friend Kate are building with Lego in the classroom, whilst making up their own stories based around the houses they make with objects and animals. Peter is also present and is playing with Ellis, his English friend alongside the girls:

P  He’s going in the car (putting a Playmobil figure in a Lego car and showing the researcher).
R  Yes.
A  Is broken (holding up a piece of Lego and showing Kate).
E  Oooh. Peter. What’s this?
A  Peter *spójrz. Mam tu lozco tutaj, podobne do prawdziwego.*
  [look. I’ve got the bed here; it’s like a real one.]
K  Anna. *Spójrz! Sheep.*
  [Look! Sheep.]

In Example 13, Anna is using her first language to include Peter in her role play with Kate. In her attempt to include Peter by talking to him in Polish, her translinguaging also corresponds to Theme 5 - ‘to exclude others’. She is fully aware that Ellis is a monolingual English speaker and will, therefore, not be able to participate in this conversation.

**Example 14 (Term 3, 22nd May)**

In the next Example 14 below, Anna and her friend Kate are building houses with Lego in the classroom, whilst making up their own stories. Peter is also present and is playing with his Ellis, alongside the girls.

P  Are we making a house? (addressing Anna and Kate).
A,K  Yes.
P  We can make a house.

Anna now tries to include Peter again and Ellis by responding to him in English.
Example 15 (Term 3, 22nd May)

Similarly, in Example 15 - Anna and Kate are building Lego houses in the classroom, and playing with toy animals. Peter is also present and is playing with Ellis, alongside the girls:

K: *Dlatego ze budujemy pokój... prawda? Sheep's pokój?*  
[Because we build ... room, is that true? ...room?]

A: Pig, pig, pig (holding up a plastic pig to show the other children).

P: This houses. This is my sheepy (holding up Lego).

(Aubout and background noise as they select Lego to build their models).

A: Aha! I scared you! (Pointing a toy animal at the researcher).

R: Ah. Yes you did!

K: *My nie zamierzamy jest z chłopcami, my po prostu udajemy się budować.*  
[We are not going to be with boys, we just going to build.]

A: *Co jest co? To jest dom!*  
[What's that? It's a house!]

A, K: Silly Billy, silly Billy (playing with playmobil figures).

Anna uses English to include both the researcher and the other children in her role play. She moves effortlessly between the two languages as she appropriates the use of language in order to include others.

Interview Example 3 (Term 2, 3rd March: Term 3, 17th July)

Anna’s class teacher also commented that:

‘Anna is beginning to make friends with the other children and gaining confidence’  
(Interview 03.03.14).

Later in the year, her teacher told the researcher that:

‘Anna has made lots of friends among the English children as well and invites them to join her outside in the games and our activities’ (Interview 17.07.14).

Anna’s class teacher was pleased that Anna was responding well to English speakers by including them and widening her circle of friends and thus including others.
4.2.5 Theme 5 – Translanguaging to exclude others

This theme identifies occasions when translanguaging excludes others from interaction (Garcia et al., 2011, p.52).

The themes chosen for the data analysis of the children’s translanguaging practices draw upon findings from Garcia et al’s (2011) and Portoles and Marti’s (2017) research (please see section 2.4.2 for more details). In order to analyse my data I took into account their research studies on translanguaging functions in a preschool classroom. I recognised parallels between their research and the three children’s interactions observed during this study. In particular, Theme 5 draws upon findings from Garcia et al’s (2011) research which identified that the bilingual children used their translanguaging practices to exclude other children from interaction. Garcia and Kleifgen’s (2015) research indicates that bilingual children like Anna, Maria and Peter use translanguaging to develop their ‘sense of ‘confianza’ (confidence) and exhibit their agentive roles’ (p.1). Their exclusion of others through translanguaging indicates that they are learning ‘when to select or suppress certain features of their repertoire’ (Garcia, Lin and May, 2016, p.120). By conversing in Polish which effectively excludes English speaking children is perhaps their way of establishing their own linguistic identity and ‘to take control of their own learning … depending on the context in which they’re being asked to perform’ (Garcia and Wei, 2014, p. 80).

Garcia et al’s (2011) definition of translanguaging to exclude others is demonstrated in her example of interaction (see section 2.4.2) between two bilingual children who are using Spanish in their play until they have an argument over a toy horse. Francisco uses English, for example, ‘I quit’ to exclude Miguel, whose English is limited and he walks away (Garcia et al., 2011, p.52). Similarly, Portoles and Marti (2017) also drew on Garcia et al’s (2011) study and findings from their research identified that bilingual children used translanguaging to exclude others from interaction, as demonstrated in the following example (p.73):

Teacher: Alba which colour do you want? Green, yellow, pink , orange?
S4: Orange.
S5: Alba tu tenies un rosa.
(Alba, you had pink.)
The teacher asks Alba which colour she prefers. She replies ‘orange’, but then another student, S5, claims in Catalan that Alba had already chosen pink. Portoles and Marti (2017) use this as an instance of exclusion.

Building upon the research studies by Garcia et al., (2011) and Portoles and Marti (2017), as outlined above, the findings from the present study’s data suggest that Anna, Maria and Peter enjoyed taking part in activities and including themselves and others as part of a group, but could also use translanguaging to exclude others from interaction, as defined by Garcia et al., (2011) and shown in the following examples:

Example 16 (Term 1, 11th November)

In their classroom, Anna and Maria with the other children have been listening to their teacher telling them the story of Rama and Sita and watched a short film about celebrating Diwali. The input was entirely in English and Anna and Maria remain silent throughout the session. In Example 16, Anna and Maria are involved in a craft session making clay divas (clay lamps). They are seated at a craft table in the outside shared area with the Teaching Assistant and three other monolingual English speaking children. Anna and Maria and the other children watch the Teaching Assistant (TA) and listen to her instructions. None of the group speak during the input:

TA (Giving each child a ball of clay). You roll the clay with this little rolling pin and make it flat. See? Then you push your thumb in here (demonstrating) and then you start to make a hole and keep on making it bigger till you get a little lamp like this. See? (She holds up her clay diva to show the children at the craft table). OK?

A OK.

(Turning to Maria) Jest miękki. Spójrż! [It’s soft! Look!]

M (Moulding the clay) Jak to?

[Like this?]

A Robię lampę. [I make a lamp.]

TA That’s lovely Anna. What’s it for? (Anna shakes her head and laughs).

TA At Diwali, children put a candle in the lamps or divas and light them. It’s pretty. We’re going to decorate them next week.

A (Showing her clay lamp to Maria) Podoba ci się? [Do you like it?]
This example shows that Anna uses Polish, ‘Jest miękki. Spójrz!’ [It’s soft! Look!] whilst talking to Maria about making the lamps, which excludes the monolingual children engaged in the same activity at the same table. Anna and Maria are sitting together and talking quietly in Polish, whilst the other children talk in English to each other and the TA about their lamps. Anna does not use English to include them in her conversation with Maria or invite them to join in. Similarly, she does not respond to the TA’s comments, (Anna shakes her head and laughs), but turns to Maria and continues her conversation in Polish – ‘Podoba ci się?’ [Do you like it?] which at this point, excludes the TA. On the other hand, Anna chooses to use English in her reply to include the TA when she says ‘OK’ in her first utterance (see Theme 4).

Example 17 (Term 1, 4th December)

Another example of this theme is evident in Example 17. Anna and Maria are in the outdoor play area attached to the Foundation Stage. It is a cold afternoon and no other children are outside at this time. The girls are standing together at a craft table. The two girls are laughing together, whilst making models out of playdough. The researcher asks them about their models and they begin to talk to her in English.

R OK. (Looking at the cat that Maria has made). Oh. That’s lovely. What sort of sound does a cat make?
M (Sounding out the initial letter) c- c- c- c- cat.
R (Sounding out the initial letter) c- c- c- c- cat. Good girl. (Looking at what Anna is making). Ooooh. What’s this?
A A tree.
R Yes. It’s a tree like a Christmas tree isn’t it?
A (Shouting) Yes.
R OK.
A I make. (Showing her playdough tree to the researcher). I wanna go on bike. (Pointing towards the bikes and shouts to Maria). Maria! Chodz tutaj! [Come here!]
M (Running after Anna and shouting loudly)
Anna! Anna! Zaczekaj na mnie! [Wait for me!]
A (Riding her bike and waving to the researcher).
Hej! Spójrz na mnie! [Hey! Look at me!]
Anna responds to the researcher’s question in her first utterance in English, ‘Yes’. She then makes sure that the researcher knows what she intends to do by using English - ‘I wanna go on bike’, which includes the researcher in the conversation to a certain extent. However, when shouting to Maria, she uses Polish – ‘Chodz tutaj’ [Come here!] and again when waving to the researcher – ‘Hej! Spójr z na mnie!’ [Hey! Look at me!] which is directly aimed at her, even though Anna knows that the researcher’s dominant language is English. This use of Anna’s translanguaging effectively excludes the monolingual researcher, at least with regard to language from their interaction at this point, but also attempts to include her by ‘waving to the researcher’ through her use of non-verbal-communication (See Theme 4).

Example 18 (Term 2, 12th March)

Similarly, in Example 18, Anna and Maria are playing outside in the covered area attached to the three Foundation Stage classrooms. The researcher is observing the two children. Other monolingual children from the three classes are present; involved in various activities – constructive play, puppet shows, drawing and talking to the TA in small groups. The two girls are playing with a doll’s house and using the toy animals and playmobil figures to create their own story. Anna and Maria do not interact with any of the other monolingual children around them. (At one point, Anna pushes one child away who attempts to join them at the beginning of this interaction): 

A Maria *daj to pani. No Maria, zapomniales!* [give it to lady.] [you forgot!]
M *Gdzie ja jestem?* [Where I am?]
A Maria *chodz ze mna ukladac!* [Maria come to me to set everything!]
   *Tutaj jestem Ty i ja...tu jest nasze...*
   [Here I am and you are... there is our...]
M *A tu? A tu?* [And here? And here?]
A *Tu nie ma nic. Mamy swinie w domu.* [Here is no anything. We've got the pig at home].
M *(Laughing) Swinie w domu??* [A pig in our house??]
The entire role play is conducted in Polish between Anna and Maria without any interaction with the researcher or the other monolingual children who have not been encouraged to join in and in fact, ‘Anna pushes one child away who attempts to join them at the beginning of this interaction.’ It would appear that Anna is not involving or including them by her exclusive use of Polish and this example shows that her use of translanguaging is excluding others.

4.2.6 Theme 6 – Translanguaging to demonstrate knowledge

This theme illustrates how young bilingual learners who are acquiring English, enjoy trying out the words they know.

Example 19 (Term 1, 4th December)

In Example 19 below, Anna is talking to the researcher in an empty classroom with Christmas artefacts on display:

R  (Points to a Christmas card with a picture of Father Christmas on it). Who’s that?
A  I don’t know.
R  You’re not sure? It’s Father Christmas. Is that what you call him? In Poland?
A  Erm. Mikolaj.  
    [Nicholas.]
R  Ah! Mikolaj. Is he coming to your house?  
    [Nicholas.]
A  (Anna shrugs her shoulders).

Anna is making sense of what the researcher is saying and translates Father Christmas into Mikolaj as she is aware of the two names for Father Christmas / St. Nicholas both in England and Poland and is keen to share this knowledge with the researcher, as she answers her question.
Example 20 (Term 3, 22nd May)

In Example 20 below, Anna and Kate are building with Lego and Playmobil objects in their classroom:

A  Oh! Fridges! Kate spójrz! Jeden...dwa...trzy...cztery...pięć. To jest pięć fridges!
[Oh! Fridges! Kate look! One...two...three...four...five...It’s five fridges!]

K  Tutaj wy macie jabłka!
[Here you have an apple!]

Example 20 shows that Anna is keen to demonstrate her knowledge of English [fridges]. She has specifically chosen to use the English word instead of the Polish word ‘lodowki’ [fridges].

Interview Example 4 (Term 3, 17th July)

Anna’s class teacher told the researcher that she was very pleased with Anna’s progress:

‘She can respond to me in English and shows really good understanding and often tries out new words in English when reading to me’ (Interview 17.07.14).

This serves as another example of how Anna is keen to demonstrate her knowledge of English.

4.2.7 Theme 7 - Translanguaging to scaffold language learning

The following examples from the data show how translanguaging is acting and has acted as a scaffold affording Anna the opportunity to move one step further and enabling her to communicate freely and confidently in English. These findings are also supported by Cummins’ (2008) research which indicate that translanguaging can be used to scaffold learning both of and through the language of schooling. The scaffold allows her to demonstrate that she can operate competently in an English context, using just English to communicate effectively with her monolingual English peers and adults.
Example 21 (Term 3, 19th May)

In Example 21, Anna is taking part in a Literacy lesson in her classroom about ‘The Very Hungry Caterpillar’ by Eric Carle (1969). The children have watched a video and have read the story online with their teacher. They are sitting on the carpet next to their talk partners. The teacher asks the class to talk to their partner and tell each other what the caterpillar ate. Anna turns to Lottie her English talk partner and starts to talk first:

**A**

He eat cake, sausage, apple, orange.
(The teacher uses the ‘Wave’ technique to elicit answers from the children).

**A**

(Anna laughs and shouts out) cake!
(Anna’s group sit down at a table and wait for instructions).

**A**

(Turning to Peter) *Lubisz pomarańcza?*

[Do you like orange?]

**P**

Yeah *ciasto*.

[Yeah and cake.]

**TA**

Now you need to try and write down three things that the caterpillar ate.
(Anna writes quickly and shows the TA her work).

**A**

(Pointing to each word and smiling).Cake, apple, lolly.

**TA**

Well done Anna! Now you can draw a picture of the caterpillar.

**A**

(Colouring her picture and pointing) my caterpillar, Peter.

**A**

(Showing her picture to an English child) look!

**TA**

Lovely! What’s on your list for your party?

**A**

Sweeties and erm cake.

This example shows that Anna’s vocabulary is developing as she can recall items from the story, ‘He eat cake, sausage, apple, orange’ and is gaining confidence when talking to English speakers, as she turns to Lottie (her English talk partner) and starts to talk first. She still uses Polish to talk to Peter, ‘*Lubisz pomarańcza?*’ [Do you like orange?] but is also equally at ease using English with the Teaching Assistant when she answers,’ Sweeties and erm cakes’ and with the English child on her table by using the word, ‘Look.’ When showing her picture to Peter, she reverts back again to English, when Anna says, ‘My caterpillar, Peter.’ It would appear that she is using her entire linguistic repertoire (Axelrod and Cole, 2018) in this learning context to make herself understood; increase her vocabulary and scaffold her language learning.
Example 22 (Term 3, 26th May)

In Example 22 Anna is in the covered outside area attached to the three Foundation Stage classrooms at the topic table, playing with Maria. Other children are involved with different activities. Plastic dinosaurs are arranged on the ‘tuff spot’ with twigs, leaves, soil and plastic rocks for the children to build homes for the dinosaurs. Anna and Maria have chosen this area. They play with the toy dinosaurs and make nests from the twigs and leaves. They talk in Polish to each other. Another child (C) joins them. She is an English speaker. Anna involves her in their play and gives her a dinosaur:

A  Hej! Dinozaury.
[Hey! Dinosaurs.]
M  Tutaj?
[Here?]  
A  Here you are. Have this one.
C  Ooh!
A  (Holding up a toy brachiosaurus) what this one?
C  That’s a brachiosaurus. See?
A  Brachsus? Look, my nest over here. I make it for this one.  
(Anna points to the brachiosaurus. The other child moves away. Anna and Maria resume their conversation in Polish and carry on playing).
A  Tutaj jest moje gniazdo.
[Here’s my nest.]
M  Spójrz!
[Look!] (Points to her nest).

In this example Anna talks to Maria in Polish, ‘Hej! Dinozaury.’ [Hey! Dinosaurs.] but also uses trans languaging to involve the English child in her play and begins to interact with her, as she says, ‘Here you are. Have this one.’ Her utterance ‘Have this one,’ welcomes the other child, as she hands her a toy dinosaur as well. She is expressing herself clearly and using English to form friendships and play cooperatively. Anna is keen to learn new vocabulary which she demonstrates by attempting to say the word ‘Brachsus?’ As she tries to involve the child further, Anna’s utterances are longer and contain more detail, as she says, ‘Look my nest over here. I make it for this one,’ and therefore inviting the other child to take an active part in her role play. Her trans languaging has helped her develop her use of English for communicative purposes and scaffold her language learning. She also shows that she is still aware of including Maria and supporting her Polish peer, by
resuming her conversation in Polish with her, ‘Tutaj jest moje gniazdo.’ [Here’s my nest.] after the English child has left.

**Interview Example 5 (Term 3, 21st May)**

Data from an interview with Anna’s father provides further evidence of how translanguaging has scaffolded her language learning. For example, when asked how Anna would have coped if she had been the only Polish child in the class, her father was keen to stress that:

‘She would struggle. I think she would. Maria help her a lot and Kate’ (a young Polish bilingual learner from the parallel class in Foundation Stage) ... I think it’s everything depending on the school, if they like the school like Anna, they’ve got good friends, Polish friends who they chat to or spend time together, that’ll help them relax a lot and they start picking up language’ (Interview 21.05.14).

Cummins’ (2005) research stresses the importance of the use of the first language in school with peers and teachers, as this can aid cognitive processing for the child (Anna) who is learning through an additional language and helps to develop her language production in the new language.

**Interview Example 6 (Term 1, 20th September: Term 3, 17th July)**

At the beginning of the year Anna’s class teacher remarked that:

‘Anna is more confident than the other two children but she doesn’t say much in the classroom though. I think she’ll be OK but she looks a little upset sometimes when the other children don’t talk to her. You know? She does try but they’re all in their own little groups now’ (Interview 20.09.13).

Later in the year, however, Anna’s teacher remarked during her interview with the researcher that Anna:

‘has reached all the Early Learning Goals and is very keen and enthusiastic to learn. [Anna] is always ready for a challenge and makes the most of every learning opportunity and she has made significant progress this year’ (Interview 17.07.14).

The importance of peer support is stressed by Carter and Nutbrown (2016) whose research showed that children learn through meaningful interactions with their
peers; creating opportunities to hear language models and to practise their languages (for example, English and Polish) in various contexts with different speakers. Data from these interviews with her father and with her class teacher suggest that Anna’s confidence and support for her peers are evident through her use of translanguaging to scaffold her language learning as she has thrived during her first year of schooling.

4.3 Maria

4.3.1 Theme 1 – Translanguaging to mediate understandings among each other

Example 23 (Term 1, 3rd October)

Maria is sharing a dual language book with the other two Polish children (Anna and Maria) in their classroom. They are naming items of clothing from the picture of children getting dressed in the morning. Above the main picture in the book are a series of pictures labelled in Polish and English which relate to the main picture. (See Appendix G for a copy of the relevant page in the picture book and Appendix H for a sample transcript):

R: And what are these?
A: (Pausing). Trousers. Spodnie. [Trousers.]
R: Oh. I see. And these?
A,M: Pants. Majtki, majtki, majtki! [Pants, pants, pants!]

Example 23 shows that Maria and Anna provide a translation for [pants] ‘Majtki’ and Maria uses her first language to create understanding between herself, the researcher and the rest of the Polish children in the group. The researcher is also translanguaging when she replies, ‘Majtki?’ [Pants?] It also serves as an example of Theme 2: To co-construct meaning of what the other is saying as Maria is confirming her understanding of the vocabulary in both languages.
Example 24 (Term 2, 6th January)

In Example 24, Maria and Anna are involved in an activity related to the topic of ‘Travelling Around’. They are in the outside playground attached to the three Foundation Stage classrooms. Other children from the three classes are also outside engaged in a range of activities. There is a variety of equipment laid out for the children to experiment with and show how they can travel from one place to another:

TA  Show me how you can move around the playground. You can move in lots of different ways. (Demonstrating) you can jump, crawl, skip or bounce. Look! You can use the waffle blocks, bouncers or the tunnel. Maybe you could make a den. Off you go! (Maria squeals and runs off to play with the waffle blocks with Anna and they start to rearrange them).

M  (Shouting) tutaj umieścić to tutaj. [here put this one here].

A,M  (Shouting) zrobić łóżko. [let’s make bed.]

M  (Calling out to the researcher) Look Mrs. P we make bed! (Both girls are lying down on the blocks, acting out going to bed and using the role play clothes. They are laughing and screaming. After a while, four other monolingual children join in their game and they welcome them in English).

M  (Laughing) come in our bed! We in bed now. (The session outside ends. Maria and Anna tidy up and lead back into class for their snack time whilst whispering together in Polish).

In Example 24, Maria uses her first language with Anna to create their role play together but can also mediate understanding of the situation by using English to the researcher and the other children.

Interview Example 7 (Term 3, 12th May)

Data from an interview with Maria’s mother provide further evidence of Maria’s use of translanguaging to mediate understandings. Maria’s mother confirmed that Maria was also using both languages at home. She told the researcher that Maria and Anna were good friends and speak together in Polish:

‘... but sometimes when they play I think that now they also use English. They try a little bit. Maria plays the teacher. They play ‘schools’” (Interview 12.05.14).
4.3.2 Theme 2 – Translanguaging to co-construct meaning of what the other is saying

Example 25 (Term 2, 12th March)

Maria and Anna are in the covered outdoor area attached to the three Foundation Stage classrooms. They are playing with a doll’s house:

M (Laughing) *Hej Anna, dawaj! Ja jadę!*

[Marry, let’s go! I go!]

A *Ide do szpitala.*

[I go to the hospital.]

M *Ja idę do szpitala. Idę spać.*

[Me go to the hospital! And I go to sleep.]

A *Ja ide cos zjesc...Ej! idz tam usiasc, to jest dla duzych! La la la, ja ide cos zjesc...mniam...mniam...mniam Oni tez ida spac.*

[I'm going to eat something...Hey! sit there! This is for the grown! La la la..I'm going to eat...yummy...yummy...yummy. They go to sleep as well.]

M *Nie, tylko ja ide spac.*

[No, only me sleep.]

In Example 25, Maria uses her first language to construct meaning of what the other is saying as she responds to Anna’s utterance, by replying ‘*Ja idę do szpitala. Idę spać*’ [Me go to the hospital! And I go to sleep]. Maria’s translanguaging ability is demonstrated through her developing sentence construction whilst maintaining a conversation with Anna through their role play.

Example 26 (Term 3, 9th June)

In Example 26, Maria is playing outside in the covered outdoor area attached to the three Foundation Stage classrooms. She is with Anna and three other monolingual children at the sand tray. There are toy dinosaurs and hidden dinosaur ‘bones’ and ‘teeth’ in the sand with paintbrushes and sieves:

M (Calling to Anna) *Anna! Spójrz! Znajduję kość.*

[Look! I find a bone.]

A *(Shouting and holding up a tooth).* *Tu jest ząb.*

[Here is a tooth.]

M *(Squealing and jiggling whilst calling to another English speaker)* come, come look!
(Maria and Anna sieve sand and uncover more ‘remains’ whilst making roaring noises. Maria tries to catch Anna who pretends to run away).

A (Screaming at Maria) *mój dinozaur będzie cię jeść.*
   [my dinosaur will eat you.]

M (Running round with a toy dinosaur) *jestem dinozaurem.*
   [I am dinosaur.]

TA (Holding up a toy dinosaur). What kind of dinosaur is this do you think?
(One English speaker finds a dinosaur book in the book box and points to a stegosaurus. Maria and Anna look as well, but do not say the name. The session ends and the children tidy up).

Maria is enjoying sharing her ideas with Anna and also her English peers in the above example. She is responding to what Anna and the other children are saying and co-constructing meaning. She is using English to act out her stories using the ‘dinosaurs’ and ‘bones’ as props. Her utterance ‘come, come, look’ involves and includes the English children, but she is also co-constructing meaning in Polish *Spójrz! Znajduję kość* [Look! I find a bone] with Anna.

### 4.3.3 Theme 3 – Translanguaging to construct meaning within themselves

#### Example 27 (Term 2, 12th March)

As in example 25, Maria is engaged in the role play based around the doll’s house:

A *Ona sika na poduszke...sika Maria se... Tutaj jestem ja. A swinia sika na wszystko... Tutaj nie ma nic.*
   [It makes a wee wee on the pillow...Maria makes a wee wee... Here I am. And the pig wees on everything. There is no anything.]

M *A gdzie to? Ona bedzie pływac.*
   [Where should it be? She is going to swim.]

A *Idę do samochodu Tobą, jedziemy do domu.*
   [I go to the car with you, we go home.]

M *Ona bedzie pływac gdzieś.*
   [She is going to swim somewhere.]

Maria is talking to herself whilst constructing meaning within herself as she uses her first language to create her own story independently from Anna when she says, ‘*Ona bedzie pływac.*’ [She is going to swim.] and later on she continues to make up a story on her own – ‘*Ona bedzie pływac gdzieś.*’ [She is going to swim somewhere.] which is not in response to Anna’s speech.
Example 28 (Term 3, 28th April)

In Example 28, Maria and Anna are in a small group in the shared area outside their Foundation Stage classroom. They are looking at the egg incubator which has been in the shared area for a few weeks. The children have been watching the eggs at different times during their school day. This week some of the eggs have hatched. The Teaching Assistant (TA) is standing by the incubator. A small group gather round:

M (Points and screams). Pisklę, pisklę... spójrz, Anna, spójrz! [Chick, chick...look, Anna, look!]

TA What do you think of the chicks?

M Yellow – erm - soft.

(The TA moves to another area and Maria stays to look at the chicks. She then sits at the writing table and starts to colour in a picture of a Chick. As she is colouring she is talking to herself).

M Żółty, żółty, miękki. [Yellow, yellow, soft.]

TA That’s lovely colouring Maria. Can you think of a word to go with your picture?

M (Pause) yellow.

TA Good. Shall we try and write your word now?

(Maria writes ‘yellow’ under her picture with the TA’s support whilst smiling at her).

Maria is using translanguaging in order to develop her understanding and begin to make meaning for herself. She co-constructs meaning with Anna in Polish – ‘Pisklę, pisklę... spójrz, Anna, spójrz!’ [Chick, chick...look Anna, look!], but translanguages as she answers the Teaching Assistant in English – ‘Yellow - erm...soft’ and ‘Yellow’. Whilst she is colouring she repeats these words to herself in Polish, ‘żółty, żółty, miękki.’ [yellow, yellow, soft.] and constructs meaning within herself, whilst drawing on her first language.

4.3.4 Theme 4 – Translanguaging to include others

Example 29 (Term 1, 3rd October)

In Example 29, Maria is responding to the researcher’s dominant language (English) to include her into the activity and inviting her to participate. Maria is sharing a dual language book with the other two Polish children. They are naming food from the picture of children having their breakfast in the kitchen. Above the main picture in the
book are a series of pictures labelled in Polish and English which relate to the main picture. Maria has provided a translation for ‘eggs’ in response to the researcher pointing to the corresponding picture in the book. (See Appendix G for a copy of the relevant page in the picture book and Appendix H for a sample transcript):

R  *Mleko?* Aaah. Milk. Um. And this one?
   *Milk.*
M  (Pointing to the picture in the book) *jajka.*
   *[eggs.]*
R  *J-j-jajka?*  
   *[Eggs?]*
A,M  (Laughing) *Jajka.*
   *[eggs.]*
R  *Jajka?* Eggs?
   *[Eggs?]*
M  (Laughing) Eggs.
   (Both Anna and Maria nod together and laugh).
R  (Pointing to the fruit in the picture) what’s this?
M  (Sounding out the initial letter) a-a-a-pple.
R  Good girl.

In Example 29, Maria is using translanguaging to include the researcher in the discussion and also to make herself understood by responding to the researcher’s language use when she replies in Polish – ‘*Jajka?*’ [Eggs?] It is also another example of Theme 1: to mediate understandings as she provides a translation for ‘*jajka*’ [eggs].

**Example 30 (Term 2, 12th March)**

In Example 30, Maria and Anna are in the covered outdoor area attached to the three Foundation Stage classrooms. They are playing with a doll’s house:

A  *Ide do samochodu z Tobą, jedziemy do domu.*  
   [I go to the car with you, we go home].
M  *Ona bedzie plywac gdzies.*
   [She is going to swim somewhere.]  
A  *To nie jest mama, tam jest mama. Chodz do wiezienia! Hej, ja kieruje!*
   [She isn't mum, there is mum. Come to the prison! ]
   *Jedziemy... brum...brum...brumm.*
   [Hey! I'm driving! We drive...bruuum...]
M  (Laughing) *Hej Anna, dawaj! Jajadę!*  
   [Hey Anna, let's go! I go!]
A  *Ide do szpitala.*  
   [I go to the hospital.]
In Example 30, Maria is responding to Anna’s invitation ‘Hej, ja kieruje!’ [Come to the prison!] and responds to Anna’s use of Polish. This helps Maria to include Anna in the role play when she says, ‘Hej Anna, dawaj! Ja jadę!’ [Hey Anna, let’s go! I go!]. She is laughing whilst enjoying the role play and using Polish to include others.

**Interview Example 8 (Term 3, 17th July)**

Data from an interview with Maria’s class teacher suggest that Maria is beginning to use translanguaging to include others in her class: both her Polish peers and her monolingual peers. Her teacher remarks that as Maria becomes less dependent on Anna, she:

‘... gains confidence and starts to make friends with some of the English children in the class and includes them in her games and activities, which is lovely to see’ (Interview 17.07.14).

### 4.3.5 Theme 5 – Translanguaging to exclude others

**Example 31 (Term 1, 16th October)**

This theme identifies occasions when translanguaging excludes others from interaction (Garcia et al., 2011, p.52).

Maria and Anna are playing together outside in the Foundation Stage playground. The researcher is observing the two girls. Other children from the three Foundation Stage classes are also present; engaged in various activities such as playing on the climbing frame and slide, making music, role play, sand and water trays and other craft activities led by the TA in small groups. By the wall is a play house which is equipped with kitchen utensils, plastic food items, a toy cooker, a small barbecue and several dolls, buggies, and soft toys. There is also a circular track painted on the floor where the children can ride bikes and scooters:

(Maria runs with Anna to the bike store. They each choose a bike and begin to ride round the track).
**Example 32 (Term 1, 22\textsuperscript{nd} November)**

In Example 32, Maria and Anna are participating in a Numeracy activity linked to the classroom input. This activity is taking place outside in the Foundation Stage playground. They are within in a group of four other children who are monolingual and supervised by their Teaching Assistant.

No other children from the Foundation Stage are present during this time. The researcher is observing the two girls. In the outdoor play area there is a number hunt.
laid out. On the back fence is a domino representation of a number. Hidden in the outdoor play area is a corresponding set of numbers one to ten. The children have to find the numbers and put them in the corresponding domino representation on the fence. Maria and Anna and the other children gather round the TA and listen to her instructions:

**TA** See if you can find the numbers to match the dominoes over there (pointing to the fence). We’ve hidden the numbers in lots of places. Off you go!
(Maria and Anna start to hunt for the numbers in all the different parts of the area. Maria pulls Anna round with her).

**M** (Shouting). *Przyjdź do Anna. Tutaj.*
[Come on Anna. Over here.]

**A** *Widzę jeden.*
[I can see one.]

**M** *Widzę numer pięć. Znajduje się pod zjeżdżalnią.*
[I see number five. It’s under the slide.]
(The other children in the group are running around looking for numbers but Maria does not call to them or show them her number cards, but stays with Anna for the whole session).

Example 32 shows that Maria is only interacting with Anna as they participate in this planned activity with the other monolingual children in her group. She is excited and eager to find the numbers with Anna – ‘*Widzę numer pięć. Znajduje się pod zjeżdżalnią.*’ [I see number five. It’s under the slide.] but does not involve or include any other children by her sole use of Polish. In this example, Maria is using her translanguaging to exclude others from interaction. Interestingly, although she is excluding others through her use of Polish, she is in turn, also excluding herself from interaction with her monolingual peers.

### 4.3.6 Theme 6 – Translanguaging to demonstrate knowledge

**Example 33** (Term 1, 3rd October)

Maria is in their classroom, sharing a dual language book with the other two Polish children. They are naming objects from the picture of children playing in the park. Above the main picture in the book are a series of pictures labelled in Polish and English which relate to the main picture. (See Appendix G for a copy of the relevant page in the picture book and Appendix H for a sample transcript):
R  Do you like going on the slide?
A  Yeah.
M  I too like.
R  I too like. What do you like?
M  Zjeżdżalnią.
[Slide.]
R  Zjeżdżalnią.
[Slide.] OK. (Pointing to the picture of the boots) What are these?
M  Kalosze.
[Wellington boots.]
R  Aah! Kalosze. They’re boots. When do you wear boots Maria?
M  (Points to the boots in the picture) there!

In Example 33, Maria is participating in the naming of the objects in Polish from the dual language picture book. By naming the ‘slide’ in Polish, she is showing the researcher that she is keen to demonstrate her knowledge of vocabulary in her first language – ‘Zjeżdżalnią.’ [slide.] She appears to feel comfortable using her first language in this context as she is supported by her Polish peers and also the researcher who also translanguages as she replies in Polish, ‘Zjeżdżalnią’ [slide] and again, ‘Aah. Kalosze. They’re boots,’ confirming her answers and thus valuing and recognising Maria’s full linguistic repertoire (Velasco and Garcia, 2014). At the end of the transcript, Maria attempts to draw the researcher’s attention to the boots in the picture by using English ‘there!’ (points to the boots in the picture). Even though she is not yet able to answer all the researcher’s questions, she wants to show that she has understood the concept. Her use of translangauging has given her the confidence to demonstrate her knowledge of Polish and English in this context.

Example 34 (Term 1, 4th October)

Similarly, in Example 34, Maria and the researcher are reading the story of ‘The Three Little Pigs’ (2011) together. They are sitting on the floor in the cloakroom of the Foundation Stage classrooms near the door overlooking the outside play area. No other children or adults are present. They share the book together and use wolf and pig puppets to help retell the story. It is a windy day during the afternoon:
M  (Waving to the researcher). Bye Bye.
R  Bye Bye. (Moving the puppets) Hey! I wonder what’s going to happen?
M  Now. Uh – oh!
R  Who did they meet?
M  Wilk. Wilk.
[Wolf. Wolf.]
R  A wilk?
[wolf?]
(Maria howls and holds up her hands to make claws).
R  Oh! A wolf!
(Maria nods and smiles, whilst pointing to the picture of the wolf in the book and makes a growling noise).

Maria is keen to communicate with the researcher and wants to demonstrate her knowledge of the Polish word for wolf when she says’ Wilk. Wilk’. [Wolf. Wolf.] She also uses actions to clarify her meaning by growling and pointing to the wolf in the book. In a sense, she is also including the researcher in making meaning (Theme 4) as she confirms her understanding as she nods and smiles.

**Interview Example 9 (term 3, 12th May)**

Maria’s mother told the researcher that at times Maria was using both Polish and English at home because she was keen to demonstrate her knowledge of English as well:

‘She start to speak at home and in English. Yes. She coming to me and she speak in English and I think it’s much better now.’ Maria’s mother also commented that:

‘We find English hard. It’s difficult for us. She pronounce much better. Her accent is much different than ours.’ (Interview 12.05.14).

**4.3.7 Theme 7 - Translanguaging to scaffold language learning**

**Example 35 (Term 3, 9th May)**

Maria and Anna are taking part in a craft activity led by their Teaching Assistant (TA). They are finishing a ‘Goldilocks and Three Bears’ display to put up in the corridor. There are no other children at the craft table which is in the shared area outside their classroom. Anna and Maria talk to each other in Polish as they put on their aprons and sit down at the table. They then listen carefully to the Teaching Assistant.
[I’m going to paint Goldilock.]
M  *Czy dziś malujemy?*
[Are we painting today?]
A  I need yellow. It’s Goldilock. Look at the balloon.
TA  That’s going to look really good for her hair.
A  Two balloons for my party. Some purple.
(Anna points to the balloons on the display).
M  Balloon – pink.
TA  Maria? What are you going to paint?
A  I going to paint mum.
M  I going to paint baby bear.
TA  We’re going to make faces for the bears and a dress.
M  Dress is yellow.
A  I make daddy bear.
M  Daddy.
TA  You do that one. (Helping her to glue it) his nose. Look.
A  I put eye on. I stick.
M  What this?
TA  Nose.
M  Nose. Nose on. Nose on.

In Example 35, Maria only uses English when working with the TA, although Anna is with her. She translanguages in this context whilst using Polish with Anna when she asks, *’Czy dziś malujemy?’* [Are we painting today?] before the activity. Through this use of translanguageing, Maria’s confidence in her use of English in a small group situation is growing and is evidenced with the support of the Teaching Assistant and from Anna whom she uses as a role model when she copies her sentence structure, ‘I going to paint...’ She also repeats the word ‘daddy’ after Anna. She has added her own contribution, however, when she says, ‘Dress is yellow’ which shows that she is gaining confidence in her use of her English. She also attempts to use the interrogative form by saying, ‘What this?’ which indicates that she feels able to communicate in this context, without always seeking reassurance or translation from Anna. It is also encouraging to note that she is beginning to play with language as shown by her sentence – ‘Nose. Nose on. Nose on?’ and she is a little more relaxed in her use of English. It would appear that her use of translanguageing with Anna earlier in the year has acted as a scaffold which in turn has afforded Maria not only the opportunity to use both of her languages in the class but also to begin to communicate in English, albeit in a small group with support.
Interview Example 10, (Term 1, 20th September)

Maria’s class teacher also commented that:

‘Without Anna she’d be lost completely I think. I know Anna and Maria talk in Polish when they can. They’re often whispering to each other specially if Maria’s getting upset because she can’t understand what’s going on.’ (Interview 20.09.13).

Example 36 (Term 1, 3rd October)

In this next Example 36, which takes place in the classroom, the researcher is asking the three children about their bedrooms. Earlier in this session, Maria shares a dual language book with the other two Polish children (Anna and Peter). They are naming objects from the picture of children getting dressed in the morning. To continue the discussion, each child describes their bedroom and their colour scheme to the researcher:

R  What is your bedroom like?
A  I have a princess one.
R  Wow!
M  I have ... baby, baby.
A  My colour is pink and green and it’s white.
R  Sounds lovely. What colour is your bedroom Maria?
M  Ah. Zielony. (Pausing) Green.
R  Green?
M  (Shouting) and I have doggy dog.

In Example 36, Maria follows the conversation in English and is able to describe her duvet cover quite accurately – ‘I have baby, baby’. Maria is involved and engaged in the discussion, contributing information and displaying her knowledge of colours – ‘Ah. Zielony. Green.’ in both languages which shows how her use of translanguaging is beginning to scaffold her language learning. In response to the researcher’s questions and by modelling Anna’s replies, she tries to extend her utterance - ‘and I have doggy dog’. It is interesting to note that she is not afraid to speak loudly and enjoys joining in.

In addition to the examples above, further evidence of how translanguaging has scaffolded Maria’s language learning is provided by data from interviews with her mother and with her class teacher.
Interview Example 11 (Term 3, 12th May)

Maria’s mother explained how Maria had felt at the beginning of the year and she was worried that Maria was not speaking any English, but she felt that Maria was now more confident:

‘Here she has Anna, Peter and Oliver. I know Maria only she talks in Polish and when I speak to Mrs. Z (class teacher) she says that after a while she start speaking English’ (Interview 12.05.14).

Interview Example 12 (Term 1, 20th September: Term 3, 17th July)

At the start of the academic year, Maria’s class teacher also commented that:

‘Without Anna she’d be lost completely I think. I know Anna and Maria talk in Polish when they can. They’re often whispering to each other specially if Maria’s getting upset because she can’t understand what’s going on’ (Interview 20.09.13).

Towards the end of the year, however, Maria’s class teacher remarked that although:

‘she [Maria] finds literacy hard she has improved during the year and we’re all so proud of her achievements. She hasn’t quite achieved the Early Learning Goals but she’s still made progress. I think she’ll continue to thrive in Year 1’ (Interview 17.07.14).

It is clear from this interview data that Maria’s own use of translanguaging and support from her peers has scaffolded her language learning and enabled her to participate more actively and confidently during the year. Her use of translanguaging has helped her to construct meanings in collaboration with her peers and communicate by accommodating both languages (Garcia, 2009).

4.4 Peter

4.4.1 Theme 1 – Translanguaging to mediate understandings among each other

Example 37 (Term 1, 3rd October)

In the classroom, Peter is sharing a dual language book with the other two Polish children (Anna and Maria). They are naming fruit from the picture of children getting dressed in the morning. Above the main picture in the book are a series of pictures
labelled in Polish and English which relate to the main picture. (See Appendix G for a copy of the relevant page in the picture book and Appendix H for a sample transcript):

(All the children are looking at a picture of a family having breakfast in the kitchen).

R Shall we look at another picture Peter?
P Yey.
R What can you see Anna?
P I see banan. It’s there! Banan [Banana] is there! [banana.]
Banan - banana was there.
R Good boy! What can you see Anna?
A I can see...
P (Squealing and pointing). Banan. [Banana.]

This example shows that Peter provides a translation for ‘Banan’ [Banana] and uses his first language to develop understanding between himself, the researcher and the rest of the Polish children in the group. Peter’s translation for the group provides evidence of his translanguaging ability. Peter is perhaps confirming his own understanding of both languages as he answers the researcher by saying, ‘Banan’ [Banana]. He is using English and Polish to expand upon something the researcher has said, thus mediating his own understanding of what is happening when for example, he uses both languages in the same sentence when he says, ‘Banan - banana was there’ which is an example of his translanguaging practices which in turn supports his understanding.

**Example 38 (Term 3, 23rd April)**

In Example 38, Peter and Oliver are playing in the covered outside area attached to the three Foundation Stage classrooms. They are playing with the construction blocks and making houses together:

O Peter Spójrz co zrobiłem! [Look here what I’ve done!]
P Kolorowy spójrz to tęcza. Ale to jest tęczowy dom ... dom i zrobi więcej, aby dodać. [Colourful, look it's rainbow. But this is rainbow-house...house...and will do more to add.]
In this example, Peter and his friend Oliver are mediating understandings between each other as they discuss their models together as Peter replies, ‘Spójrz! To drzwi i mogę je zamknąć. Spójrz.’ [Look! Here the door is, and I can shut it. Look.] Peter is using his first language with his friend to ensure he understands what he is trying to say and he responds appropriately. This is in sharp contrast to his use of Polish and English in the previous Example 37.

**Interview Example 13 (Term 2, 3\textsuperscript{rd} March)**

During an interview with Peter’s class teacher she commented that she was also pleased with the way in which he was using his English in class to mediate understandings among each other. She remarked that:

‘Peter’s coming out of his shell now a bit more since Oliver arrived next door (a Polish child in the parallel class) though he’s still very shy but does have a go at answering when we’re on the carpet. They play together and have joined the Gymnastics club after school. Been great for his confidence’ (Interview 03.03.14).

**4.4.2 Theme 2 – Translanguaging to co-construct meaning of what the other is saying**

**Example 39 (Term 1, 22nd November)**

Peter and Oliver are taking part in a Numeracy activity linked to the Numeracy input in the classroom. The children in their group are outside in the Foundation Stage playground with the Teaching Assistant. On the back fence is a domino representation of a number. Hidden in the outdoor area is a corresponding set of numbers one to ten. The children have to find the numbers and put them in the corresponding domino representation on the fence:
When they have finished their first activity they move on to play basketball together and are joined by Ellis (a monolingual English child and friend of Peter in his class):

TA  See if you can find the numbers to match the dominoes over there (pointing to the fence). We’ve hidden the numbers in lots of places. Off you go!
(Peter and Oliver start to hunt for the numbers in all the different parts of the area).

P  (Shouting) Dawaj Oliver!  Pomożmi znaleźć numer.
    [Let’s go]  [Help me find a number.]
(They run off together and find number eight and match it with the same domino on the fence)

O  Mam to! Mamy osiem.
    [I’ve got it! Here’s eight.]

P  Znajdźmy inny.
    [Let’s find another.]
(Calling to his friend Ellis) Look! I’ve found it. Number five!

E  Quick! Let’s run!
(Once the activity is finished Peter, Oliver and Ellis go and play basketball together).

P  Hej! Moja kolej!
    [Hey! It’s my turn!]

O  (Shooting a goal) Strzelitem gola! Tak.
    [I scored a goal! Yes.]

E  Come on Peter. Oliver’s winning.

P  Yeah. My go. I’m going to win!

In this example, Peter is quite comfortable translanguaging in this situation, according to who he is talking to. He is aware that not all the children will understand Polish and adapts accordingly. His translanguaging helps him to co-construct meaning with both Oliver and Ellis. For example, Peter calls to Oliver, ‘Dawaj Oliver! Pomożmi znaleźć numer.’ [Help me find a number., but also involves Ellis in the search when he shouts, ‘Look! I’ve found it. Number five!’ Consequently this excerpt also serves as an example of Theme 4 – ‘Translanguaging to include others’.

Example 40 (Term 3, 23rd April)

Peter and Oliver (another Polish child in the parallel class) are playing in the covered outside area attached to the three Foundation Stage classrooms. They are playing with the puppet show and act out a story using different puppets:
In Example 40, Peter engages in a conversation with Oliver as they become involved in their role play with the puppets in a shop setting. Peter takes on the role of a shopkeeper – ‘Dzień dobry. Chciałbym małą małpke.’ [Good morning. I would like the little monkey.] He uses his first language to construct meaning of what the other is saying as he responds to Oliver’s utterance, by replying – ‘Teraz? Niecee.’ [Right now? Nooo]. Peter’s translanguaging enables him to co-construct meaning of what the other is saying and also involves the researcher in his role play through his use of English – ‘Mrs. P. (Laughing) come and buy something in our shop’.

4.4.3 Theme 3 – Translanguaging to construct meaning within themselves

Example 41 (Term 3, 23rd April)

As in the above example, Oliver and Peter are playing in the covered outside area attached to the three Foundation Stage classrooms. They are playing with the construction blocks and making houses:

O Peter. Spójrz co zrobiłem!
[Look here what I've done! ]

P Kolorowy. Spójrz, to tęcza. Ale to jest tęczowy dom ... dom i zrobi więcej, aby dodać.
[Colourful, look it’s rainbow. But this is rainbow-house...house...and will do more to add,]

O Spójrz! Spójrz! Peter, spójrz, co zrobiłem!
[Look! Look! Peter, look what I've made!]

P Spójrz! Oto drzwi i mogę je zamknąć. Spójrz.
[Look! Here the door is, and I can shut it. Look.]
Peter is engaged in role play with Oliver but he is also reflecting on the house that he has made and is commenting to himself and how he could improve it whilst constructing meaning within himself in Polish – ‘Kolorowy. Spójrz, to tęcza. Ale to jest tęczowy dom ... dom i zrobi więcej, aby dodać’. [Colourful, look it’s rainbow. But this is rainbow-house...house...and will do more to add.]

**Example 42 (Term 3, 21st May)**

In Example 42, Peter is playing with Ellis, with Anna and Kate. They are building with Lego in the classroom, whilst making up their own stories using Playmobil people, animals and toy cars alongside the girls:

```
P  (Laughing) are you go make ho-use? Are we building a to-wer?
A,K  (Laughing) No, no.
P  (Putting a Playmobil figure in a Lego car and showing the researcher).
      He’s going in the car.
R    Yes.
P  (Turning to Ellis) we build a tree.
A    Tutaj mamy mate lozko.
      [Here we have a little bed]. Pig, pig, pig (Holding up plastic pig to show the other children).
P    This houses. (Holding up Lego) this is my sheepy.
```

Peter constructs his own meaning within himself as he builds his story around the Playmobil figure – ‘He’s going in the car.’ (putting a Playmobil figure in a Lego car and showing the researcher) and when he says, ‘This houses. This is my sheepy’. Although Peter is listening to Anna speaking in Polish he does not respond but continues his speech in English which also includes Ellis (see Theme 4).

**4.4.4 Theme 4 – Translanguaging to include others**

**Example 43 (Term 1, 22nd November)**

In Example 43 below, Peter and Oliver are taking part in a Numeracy activity linked to the Numeracy input in the classroom. The children in their group are outside in the Foundation Stage playground with the Teaching Assistant. On the back fence is a domino representation of a number. Hidden in the outdoor area is a corresponding set of numbers one to ten. The children have to find the numbers and put them in the
corresponding domino representation on the fence. When they have finished their first activity they move on to play basketball together and are joined by Ellis:

TA  See if you can find the numbers to match the dominoes over there (pointing to the fence). We’ve hidden the numbers in lots of places. Off you go!
(Peter and Oliver start to hunt for the numbers in all the different parts of the area).

P  (Shouting) *Dawaj Oliver!*  *Pomoż mi znaleźć numer.*
[Let's go]  [Help me find a number.]
(They run off together and find number eight and match it with the same domino on the fence).

O  *Mam to! Mamy osiem.*
[I've got it! Here's eight.]

P  *Znajdźmy inny.*
[Let's find another.]
(Calling to his friend Ellis). Look! I’ve found it. Number five!

E  Quick! Let's run!
(Once the activity is finished Peter, Oliver and Ellis go and play basketball together).

P  *Hej Oliver, zagramy w koszykówkę.*
[Hey ... let's play basketball.]

P  Hej! *Moja kolej!*  
[Hey! It's my turn!]

O  (Shooting a goal) *Strzelilem gola!*Tak.
[I scored a goal! Yes.]

E  Come on Peter. Oliver’s winning.

P  Yeah. My go. I'm going to win!

Example 43 shows that Peter is keen to include other children as he talks to Ellis in English - ‘Look! I’ve found it. Number five!’ He also wants to include Oliver by using Polish – ‘*Hej Oliver, zagramy w koszykówkę.*’ [Hey Oliver, let’s play basketball.] He continues to talk to Oliver in Polish during their basketball game but is still keen to include Ellis when he says, ‘Yeah. My go. I’m going to win!’ He is translanguaging to include others in this context.

**Example 44 (Term 3, 21st May)**

Similarly, in Example 44, Peter is playing with his English friend Ellis, with Anna and her friend Kate. They are constructing objects from Lego and playing with toy animals and cars, alongside the girls:

P  (Laughing) are you go make ho-use? Are we building a to-wer?
A,K  (Laughing) No, no.
(Putting a Playmobil figure in a Lego car and showing the researcher). He’s going in the car.

Yes.

(Holding up a piece of Lego and showing Kate) is broken.

(Turning to Ellis) we build a tree.

Tutaj mamy maly lozko.

[Here we have a little bed]. Pig, pig, pig (Holding up plastic pig to show the other children).

This houses. (Holding up Lego) this is my sheepy.

Oooh. Peter. What’s this? (Holds up a piece of Lego to show him).

Anna. Spójrz, sheep.

[Look! Sheep.]

Peter. Spójrz. Mam tu lozco tutaj, to jest podobne do prawdziwego.

[Look. I've got the bed here, it's like a real one.]

Are you go make ho-use? (addressing Anna and Kate).

Yes.

We can make a house.

We can make a rocket.

In Example 44, Peter asks Anna and Kate questions such as, ‘Are we building a tower?’ and ‘Are you go make ho-use?’ in English, to which they reply in English. They are all aware of Peter’s friend Ellis who is English and perhaps do not want to exclude him. The girls take their cue from Peter as he has spoken in English, although they speak in Polish together and to Peter at various stages. He appears to be moving from one conversation to another quite seamlessly and is mindful of the different audiences. Even though Anna addresses him in Polish, ‘Peter .Spójrz. Mam tu lozco tutaj, to jest podobne do prawdziwego’. [Peter look. I've got the bed here, it's like a real one.] he does not reply either in English or Polish, perhaps because he is too involved with his construction and does not want to exclude Ellis.

**Interview Example 14 (Term 3, 17th July)**

In an interview with the researcher towards the end of the school year, Peter’s class teacher noted that Peter was keen to join in with activities which was a marked difference to the beginning of the year. She mentioned that:

‘Peter is very friendly with Ellis (an English child in his class) and they play together outside school which is good’ (Interview 17.07.14).
Interview Example 15 (Term 3, 12th May)

Peter’s mother also noticed that Peter was keen to include other children and had formed a close friendship with Ellis which she encouraged; she told the researcher that she had asked his mother if Ellis could come over to play. She remarked that: ‘they are really good friends’ (Interview 12.05.14).

4.4.5 Theme 5 – Translanguaging to exclude others

Example 45 (Term 3, 23rd April)

This theme identifies occasions when translanguaging excludes others from interaction (Garcia et al. 2011, p.52).

In the following example, Peter and Oliver (another Polish child who is not included in the present study and is in the parallel class) are playing in the covered outside area attached to the three Foundation Stage classrooms. The researcher is observing the two boys. Other monolingual children from the Foundation Stage are also present and engaged in a range of activities, including – constructive play, model-making, role play, drawing and talking to the TA in small groups. Peter and Oliver have chosen to perform a puppet show and are using the puppets to make up a story about a shop, acting out the roles of shopkeeper and customer:

Peter and Oliver perform their puppet show entirely in Polish and have great fun acting out their roles. Peter’s use of his first language is fluent and imaginative – ‘Dzień dobry. Chciałbym małą małpke. [Good morning. I would like the little monkey.]

Other monolingual children are playing nearby, but are not encouraged to join in as
the boys are keen to continue their role play in Polish, which effectively excludes others from interaction in this example.

**Example 46 (Term 1, 3rd December)**

In Example 46, Anna, Maria and Peter with their friends, Oliver and Kate (Polish children in a parallel class and not included in the present study) are eating their packed lunches in the main hall and later go to play together outside in the main school playground. In this school, the Foundation Stage and Year One children eat their lunch together and there are often over 100 children in the hall. It is a busy and noisy environment, supervised by the caretaker and lunchtime helpers who are all monolingual. The researcher observes the children at their table in the main hall and outside during playtime.

(The class is led down to the main hall by their teacher who settles the children as they sit at their allocated tables. All the Polish children choose sit together on one table and shout loudly in Polish to each other. They do not involve any of the monolingual children on their table):

P (Leaning over to Oliver) *co masz w swojej kanapce?*  
[wat have you got in your sandwich?]

O (Shouting loudly) *szynka i pomidora.*  
[ham and tomato.]

A (Squealing) *mam ser na lunch.*  
[I got cheese for lunch.]

M (Waving her sandwich) *ja też ser ser.*  
[me too, cheese, cheese.]

P (Raising his hand to gain permission to leave the hall). *Skorczytem.*  
[Finished.]

P *Hej zagramy w koszykówkę.*  
[Hey let's play basketball.]

O OK. *Dawaj.*  
[Let's go.]

P (Screaming) *bramka, bramka.*  
[goal, goal.]

(When the whistle is blown all the children from the three classes line up).

O (Waving to Peter) *na razie.*  
[bye for now.]

P (Shouting) *na razie.*  
[bye for now.]
Example 46 shows how Peter uses Polish outside the classroom with his peers. He enjoys chatting to Oliver about his sandwiches and playing games together – ‘Hej zagrajmy w koszykówkę.’ [Hey let’s play basketball.] The lunch and playtime sessions give him the opportunity to use his first language freely and confidently and even though his use of translanguaging excludes others from interaction, it also indicates that he feels relaxed and secure enough to use Polish in an English monolingual context without fear of chastisement or ridicule.

4.4.6 Theme 6 – Translanguaging to demonstrate knowledge

Example 47 (Term 1, 3rd October)

In Example 47, Peter is sharing a dual language book in the classroom with the two other Polish children Anna and Maria. They are naming objects from the picture of children playing with their toys in the living room. Above the main picture in the book are a series of pictures labelled in Polish and English which relate to the main picture. (See Appendix G for a copy of the relevant page in the picture book and see Appendix H for a sample transcript):

R (Turns page forward again). Good girls. Another picture? One more
P Kolejka. Kolejka.
[Train. Train.]
R Where’s the pig? What noise does a pig make?
M Clap.
R (Pointing to the picture) what are these?
A, M Cows. (Laughing) Mooooot.
P Is it a cow?

This example shows that Peter is using the Polish word – ‘Kolejka’ for ‘Train’ and is keen to demonstrate his knowledge of Polish vocabulary to the researcher and to Anna and Maria. He also demonstrates his knowledge of English vocabulary when he asks – ‘Is it a cow?’
Example 48 (Term 2, 6th February)

In Example 48 Anna, Maria, Oliver and Peter are sitting at a table in the shared area outside their classroom with the Teaching Assistant. They are sharing ‘The Little Red Train: The Runaway Train’ (1997) book together:

P (Squealing) Oooh! – train. Look!
TA Tell me what you can see in the picture.
A Lots and lots of trains.
TA Can you see any people – passengers?
P I see boy and a mummy. Oliver. Spójrz na kolejkę.
[Look at the train.]
O (Pointing to the funnel) dym.
[smoke.]
P W ogniu!
[On fire!]
TA (Points to boxes falling off a trolley in the picture) what are these?
(The children do not know and shake their heads).
P (Pointing to a teddy bear on the platform) a bear – he lost.
TA What else can you see? Look carefully.
ALL (Shouting) a mouse!
TA Where is the train going?
A Poland!
ALL (Laughing) Polska!
[Poland!]

Example 48 shows how Peter is keen to demonstrate his knowledge of English vocabulary when he says, - ‘Oooh! – train. Look!’ and again, ‘I see boy and a mummy.’ He is also demonstrating his knowledge in his first language use with Oliver when discussing the trains, ‘Oliver. Spójrz na kolejkę.’ [Look at the train.] He is enjoying sharing this English book with his Polish peers and participates with confidence in both languages.

Interview Example16 (Term 3 12th May)

During an interview with Peter’s mother she commented that Peter liked to demonstrate his knowledge of English at home as well:

‘Peter speaks English to his big sister to show mummy how they can speak now’.
(Interview 12.05.14). She also noted that:
‘If he speaks about school he always speaks in English because it’s easier for him not to translate what the teacher say. So that’s why he speaks English when he talk about school’.

She also told the researcher that Peter could understand her English with a Polish accent but:

‘when he is repeating he pronounces it different. It’s probably because they learn English by listening to English people not from Polish people. That is really interesting’ (Interview 12.05.14).

4.4.7 Theme 7 - Translanguaging to scaffold language learning

Example 49 (Term 3, 9th May)

In Example 49, Peter, Oliver, Anna, Maria and 2 other English speaking children are engaged in a Teaching Assistant (TA) led activity which takes place in the Foundation Stage playground. The children choose to make paper aeroplanes from different types of paper, as demonstrated by the Teaching Assistant:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>When you've made your aeroplanes see if you can fly them. Watch! See how high it goes (demonstrating).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>(Jumping up and down and clapping his hands). <strong>Budujemy samoloty.</strong> [We make aeroplanes.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>(Shouting loudly) <strong>chodźmy.</strong> [let's have a go.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>(Asking an English child at their table) how you make it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Like this. See. Fold it over. OK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Thanks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td><strong>Mój samolot leci wysoko.</strong> [My plane goes high.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td><strong>Leci w gore, w gore, w, gore.</strong> [It goes up, up, up.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>How high did they fly boys?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>(Jumping and laughing) up, up, up!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Well done. Super aeroplanes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through interaction with his English and Polish peers, Peter is beginning to make the practices his own, through shared ownership and contribution. He moves between Polish and English as can be seen in this example with ease and is using his English appropriately with English peers - ‘how you make it?’ and responds well to the TA who asks, ‘How high did they fly boys? P (Jumping and laughing) up, up, up! This
example also corresponds to Theme 4 – ‘Translanguaging to include others’.

Although still quiet in the classroom situation, Peter reacts very well within this small group and uses both languages confidently and effectively with both his Polish and monolingual peers. The translanguaging that Peter has made use of during the year has helped him accelerate the process of developing abilities for understanding and achieve this growing confidence in his English use.

Example 50 (Term 3, 19th May)

In the following example 50, Peter is taking part in a Literacy lesson in the classroom about ‘The Very Hungry Caterpillar’ by Eric Carle (1969). The children have watched a video and have read the story online with their teacher. They are sitting on the carpet next to their talk partners. The teacher asks the class to talk to their partner and tell each other what the caterpillar ate. Peter turns to Ellis (his English talk partner) and listens to him carefully:

E Apple and orange.
P He eat cake, sausage. (The teacher uses the ‘Wave’ technique to elicit answers from the children).
P,E (They laugh and shout out together) sausage! (Peter’s’ group sit down at a table and wait for instructions).
A (Turning to Peter) Lubisz pomarańcza? [Do you like orange?]
P Yeah i ciasto. [Yeah and cake.]
TA Now you need to try and write down three things that the caterpillar ate. (Peter writes slowly and shows the TA his work).
P (Pointing slowly to each word).Cake, apple.
TA Can you think of one more thing?
P (Writing down ‘lolly’) lolly.
TA Well done Peter! Now you can draw a picture of the caterpillar.
A (Colouring her picture and pointing) My caterpillar, Peter.
P (Nods and shows his picture to Ellis) Look my caterpillar.
E That’s good.
TA Well done! Now. What’s on your list for your party?
P (Smiling) erm cake.

This example shows that Peter’s vocabulary is developing as he can recall items from the story, ‘He eat cake, sausage.’) and is beginning to gain confidence when talking to English peers. Peter turns to Ellis (his English talk partner) and after
listening to him, starts to talk ‘He eat cake, sausage’. He chooses to use Polish to talk to Anna ‘Yeah i ciasto.’ [Yeah and cake.] but is now becoming more confident using English with the Teaching Assistant, ‘erm… cake.’ and when showing his picture to Ellis, ‘Look! My caterpillar.’ he moves back again to English. It is evident that he is beginning to use his ‘full linguistic repertoire’ (Axelrod and Cole, 2018, p.135) in this learning context to make himself understood, increase his vocabulary and build on his sentence structure in English.

The examples above show how Peter’s use of translanguaging has scaffolded his language learning. The following extracts from interviews with his class teacher and with his mother provide further data that support this argument.

**Interview Example 17 (Term 3, 12th May)**

Peter’s mother expressed concern that Peter had not engaged with English when he attended a local nursery:

‘At the beginning I tried to speak English at home to push him to start speaking, but now he’s fine. We carry on in Polish. We don’t speak English at home’ (Interview: 12.05.14).

The importance of maintaining Peter’s first language at home with his family is supported by research (Yazici et al., 2010; Aytemiz, 2000 and Clark, 2002) which maintains that the first language plays an important role in developing children’s problem solving, whilst providing opportunities to express their feelings and interests. After her initial concerns, Peter’s mother was pleased he had settled so well and made new friends, both Polish and English.

**Interview Example 18 (Term 1, 20th September)**

Peter’s class teacher remarked at the start of the school year that Peter was:

‘So shy, but tries hard to understand and does talk to me a little bit now and with Helen (Teaching Assistant) in a small group but not in class much. Sometimes he tries to join in with what Anna’s saying in Polish. He’s very polite and well behaved. Mum’s very supportive. That all helps doesn’t it?’ (Interview 20.09.13).

Peter’s peer interaction provides motivation, feedback and a sense of his own contribution to the interaction (Chen and Gregory, 2004; Chen, 2009).
Interview Example 19 (Term 3, 17th July)

Towards the end of the year Peter’s class teacher was very pleased with his progress:

‘Peter’s made really good progress when you think of what he was like at the beginning. He’s talking a lot more now and made new friends, not just Polish ones but the English children as well, which is good because as you know, Peter really missed Oliver when he went back to Poland. Now, he joins in with all our activities, instead of being on the outside as he was back in September. He’s achieved all the Early Learning Goals and reached the expected levels. So that’s great!’ (Interview: 17.07.14).

Data from these interviews show further how translanguaging has scaffolded Peter’s language learning and has increased his confidence and motivation in the classroom.

4.5 Summary

This chapter explores the translanguaging practices of Anna, Maria and Peter and analyses data presented according to themes which are drawn from the data and the literature in response to the research questions. This study has adapted and extended the existing work by Garcia et al., (2011) and Portoles and Marti (2017) on translanguaging functions to include one new theme: Translanguaging to scaffold language learning. In line with Garcia et al’s (2017) research this chapter also shows how the three children ‘appropriate their use of language as they use their entire linguistic repertoires flexibly’ (p.54). The data also reflects how Anna, Maria and Peter all use translanguaging strategically in order to communicate effectively, form connections with others and ‘make sense of their worlds’ (Portoles and Marti, 2017, p.74). The data presented in this chapter shows that Anna, in particular, is now confident in her use of both languages and she feels increasingly empowered by her use of English because of the positive experiences that translanguaging has given her. The importance of the empowerment that translanguaging provides is discussed in detail in Chapter 5.
Chapter 5  Discussion

5.1 Introduction

The intention of this chapter is to bring together key findings with regard to the research questions and discuss these in reference to the literature, justifying the originality of the study and clarifying its contribution to the body of existing knowledge in the field. Firstly, insights into the children’s experiences in an Early Years setting are discussed as they shift between two languages in a variety of contexts and ‘perform bilingually in the myriad ways of classrooms’ (Garcia, 2011, p.147). Secondly research question 1 is addressed: ‘How do young Polish bilingual learners make use of translanguaging in different ways to communicate in an Early Years setting?’ The themes outlined in Chapter 4 are revisited to draw together how the children make use of translanguaging in different ways to communicate. Thirdly, research question 2 is addressed: ‘How do young Polish bilingual learners use translanguaging practices to scaffold their language learning?’ This is followed by a discussion of how the findings provide insights into how the children make use of translanguaging practices to scaffold their language learning throughout their first year of schooling. Finally, the contributions of the present study to this field of research are outlined.

5.2 Understanding the children’s experiences

The data suggest that as the children move from one context to another they respond appropriately in either language in order to meet the contextual need. This contributes to Sanchez, Garcia and Solorza’s (2017) research who discovered that this process reflects how each child negotiates and uses their linguistic resources in different language spaces. At any given moment, the children in this study are either on their own or part of a group; be it their Polish peer group, monolingual English peer group, mixed multilingual peer group or with adults. Regardless of which group they are in, the children’s translanguaging practices enable them to practise selecting appropriate features to make meaning for themselves, communicate with others by accommodating both languages and benefit understandings across language groups in a dynamic and flexible way (Garcia and Wei, 2014). These communication practices and their strengths can be seen reflected in the themes that arise from the young Polish bilingual learners’ data in this study (see Chapter 4).
This constant movement between groupings inside and outside their classroom in turn facilitates communication and contributes to the children's language learning and multilingual competence.

Findings from Kirsch’s (2018) research indicate that ‘children learn when and where to select, but also to suppress, particular features of their repertoire, and how to use languages appropriately in order to meet the demands at hand’ (p.51). For instance the children in the primary school class in her study began to understand that using French was valued and legitimate in Year 2 when French was a curricular language. In this sense, according to Garcia and Wei (2014), translanguaging refers to the flexibility of bilingual learners such as Anna, Maria and Peter to take control of their own learning, to self-regulate when and how to use their languages, depending on the context and indeed audience. Importantly, instead of learning a new additional language (English) these learners appropriate new language practices that make up their own unique repertoire of meaning-making resources. According to Garcia and Wei (2014) ‘the language practices then don’t belong to the school or the home; the languaging is that of the learner, (i.e. Anna, Maria and Peter) his or her own being, knowing and doing, as it emerges through social interaction’ (p.80). Additionally, the Early Years setting combines space/times where/when the named language (English) is privileged and spaces/times where/when the children are given freedom to express themselves using their own entire language repertoire (either Polish or English).

The findings indicate that through translanguaging in this particular context, both languages are kept visible – the language of instruction (English) and the first language (Polish) which reflects Garcia and Wei’s (2014) research. Other studies (Sembiante and Gort, 2018 and Bengochea, Sembiante and Gort, 2020) in preschool classrooms show that children are responsive to context and aware of the requirements of communicative partners when playing inside and outside the classroom. This concurs with findings from the data which show that Anna, Maria and Peter move from one language to another according to the contextual need. Cenoz (2017) refers to these fluid practices as spontaneous translanguaging.
5.3 Making use of translanguaging in different ways to communicate

5.3.1 Mediating understandings

Anna is the only child who interprets, using English and Polish as appropriate, for both the researcher and her Polish peers. For example, when Maria cannot answer the researcher’s question about what she finds hard at school, Anna offers to help and answers: ‘When we play cards, we was reading and Maria forgotten the sounds’ (Interview: 21.05.14). She displays more confidence than the other two Polish children in her translanguaging skills and often supports Maria in situations where she struggles to understand what is happening in the classroom (see Example 5). Anna is 6 months older than Maria and this may well be a contributory factor in her demonstration of greater confidence and more mature language use and support for others. Anna interprets willingly for monolingual adults and Polish peers in this Early Years context and this is supported by her class teacher who commented that ‘she’s [Anna’s] now writing independently and loves to talk about her work, but always happy to help others which is nice’ (Interview: 17.07.14).

All three children use translation in order to confirm that others understand them and in order to mediate understandings among each other, including the researcher (see Examples 1, 23 and 37). This is also demonstrated through role play (see Examples 4, 24 and 38). Maria uses English to mediate understanding between herself and the researcher and other monolingual children in her group (see Example 24). Peter’s fluent and creative use of Polish during role play with his Polish friend Oliver (see Example 38 - April 2014) is in sharp contrast to his use of Polish in an earlier context where he only used his first language for translation (see Example 37 - October 2013).

The three children use translanguaging to confirm their own understanding. This contributes to Garcia et al’s (2011) research which indicates that translanguaging sometimes ‘consists of a discourse in different languages to mediate one’s own understanding’ (p.47). Garrity et al’s (2015) research identified that children in their study used translanguaging to make sense of their environment, form connections and interact with each other, which is similar to the experiences of the three children in the present study.
5.3.2 Co-constructing meanings (of what the other is saying and within themselves)

As in 5.3.1 all the children co-construct meaning of what the other is saying through role play (see Examples 8, 25 and 40). Both Maria and Peter co-construct meanings through interaction with other monolingual children in their group. Whilst sharing ideas with their Polish peers they also use translanguaging to involve other peers through their use of English (see Examples 26 and 39). In addition, all the children use Polish to construct meaning within themselves (see Examples 10, 28 and 41) and Peter also uses English as he talks to himself whilst playing with his English friend (see Example 42), in order to involve his friend in their activity. Maria uses both languages to construct meaning within herself. She co-constructs meaning with Anna but uses English with the Teaching Assistant to confirm her own understanding, but reverts to Polish as she talks to herself during an activity (see Example 28).

The children ‘establish relationships between languages’ (Portoles and Marti, 2017, p.71) when they use English to act out their role play whilst involving monolingual peers but also use Polish to co-construct meaning with their Polish peers. Garcia et al., (2011) stress that young children often talk to themselves. This practice is particularly evident in Early Years settings such as the one in this study. The findings indicate that in this way translanguaging helps young bilingual learners such as Anna, Maria and Peter to develop their bilingualism and construct meaning within themselves.

Current research (Garcia and Wei, 2014; Garcia and Baker, 2007; Lewis, Jones and Baker, 2012; Nikula and Moore, 2016 and Safont and Portoles, 2016) has also shown that the flexible use of two languages in the same context serves a number of communicative purposes as seen in the translanguaging practices of the three children in this study. Williams (2003), for example, suggests that translanguaging often uses the stronger language (i.e. Polish) to develop the weaker language (i.e. English) – thus contributing to a more balanced development of a child’s languages. Garcia et al., (2011) highlight that translanguaging recognises that varieties of languages are not singular and static. As can be seen in the data in this research, the children’s languages are in a constant interplay with each other and foster
communication and meaning making. The findings also contribute to research by Conteh and Meier, 2014; Garcia, 2009; Garcia et al. 2016 and Torpsten, 2018 which indicates that children such as Anna, Maria and Peter, simultaneously draw on different languages during their everyday lives at school.

5.3.3 Including and excluding others

All the children respond to their perceptions of the researcher’s dominant language, (Garcia et al., 2011) and through their use of English attempt to involve her in their activities. Anna, in particular, uses English specifically to involve the researcher during her role play with a Polish peer (see Example 13). Peter uses Polish and English to include his Polish peer (Oliver) and his English peer (Ellis). He wants to involve both of them and is responding appropriately to their dominant languages (see Example 43). His translanguaging practices enable him to foster both friendships. All the children want to use Polish to exclude their monolingual peers sometimes (see Examples 18, 32 and 46) but other times they feel secure and relaxed enough to use Polish without fear of ridicule or retribution. These findings support research by Axelrod (2014) who suggests that teachers can create an environment where children’s languages are supported which in turn encourages them to engage in translanguaging practices.

The children’s playtime choices become translanguaging negotiation events and reveal how both languages are involved in the activities that they engage in during the day. Again they are using their ‘entire multilingual repertoire’ (Axelrod, 2014) in order to communicate and include or exclude others. Kirsch (2018) suggests that translanguaging in this sense happens by invitation and choice. Within this study the children often try to involve or include the researcher in their role play. All the children interlink different language practices, moving backwards and forwards between the two languages. This allows them to make meaning and communicate across numerous interactions, both including and excluding others (Hornberger and Link, 2012).
5.3.4 Demonstrating knowledge

All the children use Polish and English to demonstrate their knowledge of both languages to the researcher (see Examples 19, 33 and 47). Anna deliberately chooses to use English vocabulary during her Polish conversation with her Polish peer during role play in order to demonstrate her knowledge of English vocabulary (see Example 20). Maria also contributes Polish vocabulary during a discussion with the researcher to demonstrate her knowledge, confirm the researcher’s understanding and to include her (see Example 34). Anna is the only child to use just English to demonstrate her knowledge during a conversation with the researcher. She enjoys trying out the words she knows as she makes sense of the situation (see Example 19).

Findings from the data indicate that on several occasions the children are supported by the researcher and their Polish peers to use translanguaging to demonstrate knowledge. The data reveal that the researcher confirms their answers and this shows that she values their linguistic repertoire (Valesco and Garcia, 2014). In this sense, they are positioned as language users, instead of lacking language and their translanguaging practices are fostered and accepted which supports the findings from Axelrod’s (2014) research.

5.4 Making use of translanguaging practices to scaffold their language learning

All of the three children move seamlessly between Polish and English which serves to scaffold their language learning within a variety of contexts in their school setting. For example, when Anna was asked by the researcher what she likes doing at school, she answered – ‘Dressing up with Kate like princess and we like riding the cars’ (miming steering a wheel). Her sentence structure is quite complex and her answer is descriptive and informative (21.05.14). There is more evidence of interaction with monolingual children as the year progresses and in the classroom situation there is occasional use of English between Polish peers (see Example 21). During role play both Anna and Maria use English to welcome monolingual children, form friendships and play cooperatively together. They are both keen to learn new
English vocabulary from their peers and enjoy trying out their new knowledge. Findings indicate that their use of translanguaging has scaffolded their use of English for communicative purposes (see Example 22).

Maria’s confidence has increased through her use of translanguaging practices and later during the year she becomes less reliant on Anna’s support and begins to add her own contributions to discussions with other adults, as shown in (Section 4.3 in Chapter 4) above. She still, however, also benefits from the reassurance of using her first language with Anna and this in turn has scaffolded her learning (see Example 35). Similarly, Peter's translanguaging practices have helped to accelerate the process of developing his abilities for understanding. Findings also indicate that he interacts easily with both Polish and English peers simultaneously and uses both languages appropriately (see Example 49).

The findings show how translanguaging is acting and has acted as a scaffold, affording the children opportunities to move on and enabling them to communicate freely and confidently in English. The scaffolding allows them to demonstrate that they can operate competently in an English context, using just English to communicate effectively with monolingual peers and adults.

The findings thus support the literature: for example as discussed in Chapter 2, Cummins (2008) maintains that translanguaging can be used to scaffold learning both of and through the language of schooling. The children’s use of their ‘entire linguistic repertoire’ (Axelrod and Cole, 2018) to make themselves understood, increase their vocabulary and build on their sentence structures in English, is also in parallel with Kirsch’s (2018) research, where translanguaging offers spaces for children to mobilise their linguistic repertoire and support each others’ language learning. This helps them listen carefully, ask for help, help each other and provides opportunities to repeat, imitate and talk. Kirsch (2018) recommends that all these strategies scaffold the children’s learning. The three children’s creative use of their languages is also in line with Swanwick’s (2015) research which examines how translanguaging can scaffold learning in the classroom by mediating content and language that children do not yet know through the language that they do know.
The use of translanguaging to scaffold language learning gives the three children in this study the opportunity to build on what they already know and to actively participate in the learning process, as also reflected in the research by Conteh and Brock (2011). Findings from the data also support Garcia, Johnson and Seltzer’s (2017) research which refers to how translanguaging is often now used in the context of a scaffolding (supportive learning) technique in schools. Similarly, Mary and Young (2017) recommend that the knowledge skills encoded in the children’s first languages may be transferred from one language to another and may be used to scaffold children’s learning. In this sense, bridges can be built between the languages to scaffold children’s language learning, with teachers also scaffolding the children’s learning in a meaningful and accessible manner. This then helps the children make links between the languages and transfer their knowledge from one language to another. Translanguaging in this way also reassures the children and shows them that teachers value their languages (Vogel and Garcia, 2017). Where translanguaging is also used by teachers in mainstream classrooms, this provides the additional scaffolding from which young bilingual learners, such as the children in this study, are able to benefit (Garcia et al., 2017). ‘Language scaffolding is often needed to support bilingual pupils in the early stages of using the additional language (English) in a mainstream classroom’ (Garcia, 2009, p.329). Importantly, the children in this study are directing their own translanguaging practices in order to scaffold their language learning in the absence of any structured ‘language scaffolding’ from their teachers. In this way, they can and do self-regulate and advance their learning (Velasco and Garcia, 2014).

Findings from data on child-led scaffolding in the present study reflect Williams’ (2002) research which indicate that pupil-pupil collective scaffolding is possible through ‘natural translanguaging’. The three children in this research study are able to work independently and discuss the task or activity in their first language (Lewis et al., 2012). Their child-led translanguaging occurs naturally during their everyday activities as supported by Kirsch’s (2018) study. The peer-peer interaction between the three children supports research by Conteh, Kumar and Beddow (2008) who maintain that ‘pupils not only scaffold each other but also take opportunities offered to consolidate their own knowledge through talk’ (p.162). The children’s
translanguaging practices and strategies also scaffold the learning of peers as described by Esquinca et al., (2014) in their research with Year 4 bilingual learners.

Anna has developed her language to such an extent that the bridge or scaffolding provided by translanguaging practices is not always needed. Garcia (2009) uses a metaphor to liken bilingualism to an all-terrain vehicle with individuals using it to adapt to both the ridges and craters of communication in uneven terrains. In the context of the present study another metaphor may be applicable: the use of translanguaging has developed Anna’s use of English to such an extent, that she no longer relies on the ‘stabilisers’ on her bicycle, but can ride on her own with newfound independence and confidence. Findings from Mary and Young’s (2017) research identify that more ‘knowledge about bilingualism can actively contribute to challenging current discriminatory practices and provide increasingly empowering and equitable learning environments for emergent bilingual pupils’ (p.470). Hornberger and Link (2012) also stress the importance of ‘valuing bilingual learners’ first language and tapping into it as a resource in order to allow them to be successful in learning new content’ (p.9). Anna is now confident in her use of both languages and she feels increasingly empowered by her use of English because of the positive experiences that translanguaging has given her.

Findings from Anna’s data towards the end of the school year in July 2014 display a marked contrast to her language use in September 2013 (see Section 4.2 in Chapter 4). Her abilities in both languages have become more sophisticated and adaptable. She has moved on from simply offering translations to constructing quite complex sentences and questions and can create her own stories through role play, utilising both languages as demonstrated later in the year. She is taking advantage of her bilingualism and using translanguaging to successfully communicate and make meaning.

5.4.1 Anna
Throughout the school year Anna has been able to use her first language as an important cognitive tool (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2009) in order to socialise and interact in Polish and English with her monolingual and Polish peers. Findings show that across the year Anna is gradually adapting to the routines and expectations of an Early
Years mainstream setting and contributing to the school community. As she gains confidence and competence there is more evidence of her initiating interactions in different contexts which is confirmed by her class teacher (see 4.2.7 – Interview 17.07.14) who also remarked that she was always ready for a challenge. The findings show that Anna takes control of her own learning and meaning making, whilst using all her linguistic resources to achieve understanding (Velasco and Garcia, 2014).

5.4.2 Maria

Maria’s fluency in both languages improves as she grows in confidence throughout her first year of schooling (see Section 4.3 in Chapter 4). Indeed Maria’s mother commented that she had been worried that Maria had spoken little English early on in the year (see 4.3.7 - Interview: 12.05.14), but was keen to point out that with the support of Anna and Peter she had begun to use both languages with ease. As the school year progresses Maria’s data show that she has moved on from only offering translations and monosyllabic responses as can be seen in Example 33 from early in the year, to constructing longer sentences, formulating questions, creating her own stories through role play and utilising both languages later in the year as seen in Example 28 in Term 3.

In July 2014 her class teacher remarked that although she had not quite achieved the Early Learning Goals by the end of the year, she had still made good progress and she should continue to thrive in Year 1 (see 4.3.7 - Interview: 17.07.14). The findings provide evidence of how Maria uses translanguaging to scaffold her growing competence in English. Translanguaging has helped Maria make meaning and has enhanced and accelerated her learning (Mary and Young, 2017).

5.4.3 Peter

At the start of the year, Peter’s mother expressed concern that Peter had not engaged with spoken English when he attended nursery (see 4.4.7 – Interview: 12.05.14). Towards the end of the school year Peter had shown considerable signs of improvement in his use of English which is supported by his class teacher who was very pleased with his progress and made new friends, both Polish and English which was in marked contrast to the beginning of the year (see 4.4.7 – Interview:
12.05.14). Peter’s translanguaging practices (see Section 4.4 in Chapter 4) helped him overcome his initial shyness and reluctance to speak as seen in Example 37 in Term 1 and consequently scaffolded his language development as shown in Example 45 in Term 3. Translanguaging has enabled him to appropriate his use of language as he uses his entire linguistic repertoire flexibly (Garcia et al., 2011, p.54).

### 5.5 Contributions to the research field

The originality and distinctiveness of the present study have been demonstrated through the chosen topic and the three Polish children in an Early Years setting within a primary school in England. Findings from this study have highlighted how the children have become aware of potential meaning connections across their two languages (Polish and English) through their translanguaging practices. Findings from the data (see Chapter 4) about the translanguaging practices of these three children contribute to this growing body of research and increase our understanding of bilingual language use that is more in line with everyday interactions and experiences as they use language appropriately to make sense of their many worlds (Garcia, 2009). This is in line with Creese and Blackledge’s (2010) research which states that bilingual children can learn unfamiliar words and expressions in their other language with the help of a stronger or more familiar language. Anderson (2018); Kirsch (2018) and Moriarty (2017) have all emphasised that research on translanguaging in the early childhood educational sphere is rare. Findings from the data from the present study build on other research studies (Creese and Blackledge, 2011; Garcia, 2009; Canagarajah, 2013) with older children and since there are relatively few studies which research translanguaging among young children in Early Years settings in English schools, these findings contribute to this field of research. Additionally, the present study also highlights two overlapping fields of research: applied linguistics (in which my study is set) and socioconstructivism. (For more discussion see Chapter 6, section 6.5).
5.6 Summary

This chapter highlights that the findings of the study support the literature and demonstrate in practical terms the benefits of children making use of translanguaging within an Early Years setting. The findings indicate that the three children (Anna, Maria and Peter) are seen to be translanguaging effectively to scaffold and facilitate learning through a range of practices and strategies as they move between languages and within their peer groups. All three children have built on their knowledge of English and Polish through their continuous use of translanguaging which has also contributed to their developing competencies. The findings are in parallel with Duarte’s (2018) research which refers to ‘translanguaging as a scaffold which renders their first language as an exceptional resource’ (Duarte, 2018, p.12). In this chapter it has been demonstrated that the present study addresses the gap in the literature relating to research studies of translanguaging with very young children in an English primary school, whilst also building on existing studies in this field. The contributions of this study to research and practice will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.
Chapter 6  Conclusion and Recommendations

6.1 Introduction
This closing chapter reflects on the whole research process and considers the conclusions to be drawn from analysis of the data in terms of the two research questions. This study of Anna, Maria and Peter offers insights into how young Polish bilingual learners use all their linguistic resources through their translanguaging practices in an Early Years setting. The chapter reflects on the study’s contributions to Early Years policy and practice in relation to young bilingual children and clarifies the contribution of this study to the body of existing knowledge in the field. Important conclusions are drawn from the research study, including general principles which have implications for Early Years teachers and how these principles could be carried out in practice. Finally, some of the limitations of this research are discussed and possible directions for future research are suggested emerging from this study which might further contribute to our understanding of the use of translanguaging by young bilingual learners in an Early Years setting.

6.2  Contributions to policy
This study recognises bilingual children’s linguistic repertoires as a valuable resource which acts as a scaffold for their learning, whilst allowing them to create and participate in spaces where their first languages are valued. Findings from the data indicate that Anna, Maria and Peter make use of Polish and English through translanguaging to mediate understandings among each other, co-construct meanings of what others are saying and within themselves, include or exclude others and demonstrate their knowledge (see Chapter 4). Their unique linguistic resources facilitate meaning-making, whilst building their own bilingual competence. It is the recognition of these communication practices and strengths that is of prime importance to all those concerned with the education of young bilingual children, including policy makers, Local Education Authority (LEA) officers, Ofsted inspectors, educational advisers, Early Years teachers, practitioners, parents and teacher trainers.
There is potential for findings from this research to contribute to the EYFS (2020) which is ‘underpinned by an understanding that language is central to our sense of identity and recognises and values linguistic diversity’ (Section 3.4, p.18). This policy statement is encouraging in the sense that there is recognition of linguistic diversity in the classroom, but there is little reference to specific guidance that would help educational practitioners to understand how young bilinguals’ learning could be helped by recognition of their first languages. Practical recommendations for teachers have arisen from the findings of this research study, but in order for recommendations such as these to be implemented in the classroom; policy should ideally be informed by research: yet there appears to be a dissonance between researchers and policy makers. The language of researchers differs from that used by policy makers who are looking for concrete answers to the complex questions they are facing (Peeters and Vandekerckhove, 2015). Policy makers sometimes lack a long-term perspective, as their concerns lie with quick impact and their next election prospects (Staggs, 2012). Therefore, the research field needs mediators who can convert the research data into accessible and usable material and ensure its applicability for policy makers (Ulkuer and Sherrod, 2012). Hence the contribution of this study which contributes to links between the research fields of translanguaging and applied linguistics to the field of Early Years education (see 6.4 for Recommendations to teachers in Early Years classrooms). Linking policy to practice can be challenging and governments should work closely with both researchers and practitioners to enable high-quality and effective teaching and learning for young bilingual children (Grover, 2012). Researchers should ensure that research, such as the present study, is translated into practical use in the classroom and incorporated into initial teacher training, including newly qualified teachers’ in-service professional development.

Research suggests that policy enactment in practice may not reflect policy makers’ intentions (Flynn and Curdt-Christiansen, 2018). Their research study examined the tensions between policy and practice for the teaching of bilingual children. This disconnect has also been identified by other researcher such as Costley (2014) who comments that ‘what is stated at the level of policy is not always what happens at the
“coal-face” (p.277). Research by Strand, Malmberg and Hall (2015) also revealed that despite the growing numbers of bilingual children in schools and the challenges faced by teachers; the policy references to bilingual children have been reduced year by year since 2010.

Research indicates that in fact learning two or more languages simultaneously is as natural as learning only one and children can acquire competence in two languages that compares favourably with that of monolingual children in a supportive learning environment (Genesee, 2015). Bilingual children are constantly engaging with both or all of their languages in a complex learning process of which mainstream educators are largely unaware (Souto-Manning, 2016). It is a process that will continue regardless of whether or not the policy makers recognise it (Parke et al., 2002).

Findings from the data in this research study can contribute to policy because they demonstrate how the bilingual children (Anna, Maria and Peter) 'perform bilingually in the myriad ways of classrooms' (Garcia et al., 2011, p.147). The data provide evidence of how these children make use of translanguaging in different ways to communicate and how their use of translanguaging practices scaffolds their language learning. If policy makers wish to improve the quality of provision and outcomes for all children it would be advantageous to incorporate first languages into classroom learning, which research (see Chapter 2) has proved to be beneficial and supports learning, as also demonstrated through this research study.

Drury’s (2013) research revealed that not many contributors to official documents have expertise in teaching bilingual children and there are not many studies which seek to inform policy-makers about the strategies which would support bilingual children in Early Years settings. Hence the importance of the present study which goes some way towards linking research to policy and practice. Clear guidelines from policy makers are needed for practitioners to incorporate children's first languages into the classroom, whilst also supporting their learning of English. Home-school links can be fostered by welcoming families into the Early Years setting and involving them in the classroom, by incorporating their first languages through story telling or recordings of favourite rhymes and songs in both languages for the children to share with them and each other. The setting’s resources should reflect the
children’s first languages and experiences, whilst displays and posters relating to themes include reference to all the first languages shared by the children.

It should be stressed that teachers do not need to speak all the languages represented in the setting, but even a few words in the children’s first language can reassure and welcome them and can support their learning. To involve bilingual children it is important to include their first languages in all activities through day-to-day teaching, either as a class or in small group work to give them confidence and demonstrate to others that they are viewed as competent language users. Bilingual children should be encouraged to use their first languages in a variety of ways to scaffold their own learning and that of their bilingual peers (see Chapter 2, sections 2.4.3.1 – 2.4.3.3). Further recommendations for Early Years teachers can be found in section 6.4.

If children from different linguistic backgrounds, such as Anna, Maria and Peter, are to experience the optimum learning environment, it is vital that policy makers are made aware of research with bilingual children and their effective use of first languages for learning. This argument is supported by Bailey and Marsden’s (2017) research about teachers’ views on using first languages in the classroom, who recommend that the first vital step to increasing teachers’ confidence to use first languages is to make policy-level changes that recognise the potential advantages that bilingual children bring to the classroom. Until the voices of the researchers, who represent the children, are heard by the policy makers, practice and perceptions will not change and the possibilities of success in bilingual children’s language learning will be severely limited.

6.3 Contributions to practice

There are a number of practical applications stemming from the findings in this study and it is hoped that these outcomes can be useful for educators in schools. Clearly, Early Years teachers are inevitably bound by Government policy and practice through the EYFS (2020). However, practitioners often do take notice of research which applies to their area of work and can effect some change in their particular
field. All Early Years teachers are involved in the assessments of the Early Learning Goals based on observing a child’s daily activities, noting the learning that a child demonstrates consistently in a range of contexts. Furthermore, communication, language and literacy skills must be assessed in English and if a child does not have a strong grasp of English language, the child’s skills should be explored in the first language with parents to determine ‘whether there is cause for concern’ (see section 1.13) about possible language delay.

Findings from the data of the present study indicate that the three Polish bilingual learners do have considerable linguistic repertoires, but in Maria’s case she was assessed as ‘emerging’ and consequently did not reach her Early Learning Goals because her communication and language skills were assessed solely in English, with no regard for her fluency and competency in her first language (Polish) as reflected in the data collected (see Chapter 4). Robertson (2012) found that Early Years teachers feel trapped by the assessment requirements and particularly concerned that forcing bilingual children to speak English too soon is counterproductive. Her data suggest that teachers find it impossible to fulfil these aims; feeling that they are failing their children whilst ‘caught in the crossfire’ (p.8). Consequently, they are left in a situation where they feel torn between the external demands on them to perform in certain measurable ways and their own personal beliefs and professional knowledge about how to respond to the bilingual children in their classes (Duhn, 2011; Osgood, 2011; Fleer, 2006).

This study’s contribution to practice includes a call for change in the Early Years field and the assessment of the language and communication skills of bilingual children such as Anna, Maria and Peter who are agentive and active learners and using their first language in a variety of ways (see section 6.2) to support their learning both in Polish and English. The present study seeks to provide practical recommendations and strategies for Early Years teachers to enable translanguaging on an everyday basis, as well as contribute to research in the field and the strengths that bilingual children bring with them into the classroom. Findings from the data demonstrate what the children can bring to the Early Learning Goals whilst not only developing a strong first language but also using translanguaging as a tool for learning.
In line with research by Conteh and Brock (2011) and Baker (2011), the present study demonstrates that young bilingual learners are ‘empowered’ by safe spaces with support from adults in a wide range of ways to co-construct their learning, which includes the use of translanguaging. In a sense, as advocated by Vogel and Garcia (2017) their translanguaging practices give them freedom to express themselves and free them from the constraints of having to use language only according to certain conventions. Translanguaging develops communication, increases their creativity and enthusiasm for learning which in turn enables greater participation in lessons and maximises understanding (Garcia, 2009). These translanguaging practices (Garcia, 2009) can be applied to the classroom by encouraging bilingual children to participate using their first languages through role play which can be linked to familiar experiences from home (including labelled resources such as artefacts or food in both languages) in shared areas such as the home corner for example. A range of experiences and varied activities within the EYFS Framework can be offered to support their bilingualism, promoting their first language through play; embedding language in real and everyday situations. Collaborative games with the children in multilingual groups provide role models from the monolingual children in a relaxed setting which encourage children to use both languages according to the context, whilst forming friendships with both English and Polish peers.

This research study may encourage teachers to recognise the role of first languages in the classroom as a useful tool for learning and create a shift in teachers’ perceptions to appreciate the benefits of the use of first languages within mainstream classrooms. In reality, teachers need more than an awareness of linguistic diversity, but also need support to translate this awareness into practical and informed decisions of learning and teaching, content and the selection of resources. Contributions to practice from the study indicate that working in small groups with other multilingual learners develops their use of both English and first language to make meaning and ensures that they are understood. This will also give them a sense of empowerment as they will see that their bilingualism is valued and that they have something to contribute to the group. Frequent opportunities to interact with the teacher or Teaching Assistant during the day will allow them to demonstrate their knowledge of their first language and developing English, through action rhymes or storytelling using visual images, props or puppets to aid communication in both
languages. This provides support to the children which in turn enables them to understand the activities and also model language use which they can try out in a secure context. The teacher can make use of translanguaging to scaffold the children’s understanding of the story or rhymes, whilst maintaining their attention and engagement in the activity. (Please see section 6.4 below for more practical recommendations to Early Years teachers in classrooms). A comfortable learning environment characterised by teachers’ positive attitudes towards the children’s first language will certainly result in their success, high self-esteem and overall well-being. Interestingly, Cope and Kalantzis (2008) point out that it can be challenging to appreciate the use of first languages in an Early Years classroom which is specifically designed for monolingual children, but this study has shown how translanguaging can scaffold learning with young bilingual learners and provides evidence to support the importance of drawing on the children’s linguistic knowledge in the curriculum. In addition, findings from Creese and Blackledge’s (2017) research indicate that in a translanguaging classroom, learners and teachers constantly draw on all their linguistic resources, whereby all languages are valued and are seen as making different but equal contributions to language learning and meaning making.

6.4 Recommendations to teachers in Early Years classrooms

As a practitioner-researcher I am fully aware of the time pressures upon Early Years teachers and it is important that any recommendations offer strategies which are both accessible and practical within an everyday classroom situation. During this research it was possible to observe and record verbatim many child-led interactions that would perhaps have otherwise been mainly 'unheard' within a busy Early Years learning environment, in addition to several interviews with staff, parents and the children themselves and all these interactions have been analysed in detail. The implications of the research reported in this thesis have the potential to focus on what the child brings to the classroom and what the teachers can do to help utilise this through the use of their first languages wherever possible. As previously discussed in Chapter 2 (2.2.3), Early Years teachers are in a unique position to support bilingual children in their classrooms and encourage the use of their first
languages to scaffold and develop their learning. It is important to focus on a positive model and not take the deficit view of the children lacking language because they do not speak English. Classroom teachers who are keen to utilise the children’s first languages should be reassured to learn that they do not need to be bilingual themselves to make use of the children’s linguistic repertoire (Mary and Young, 2017). If teachers can make flexible use of the learners’ first languages in conjunction with the language of schooling, this will reassure and include both the children and their families and thus foster home-school links (Garcia, 2009). The importance of fostering home-school links through bilingualism is also supported by Baker, (2005, 2011, 2014); Garcia and Wei, (2014) and Lewis et al., (2012).

Paulsrud et al., (2017), however, comment that some teachers may feel uncomfortable about this ‘release of power’ (p.111) as they are used to only using English in their classrooms and need to feel confident in managing the children in their own classrooms. It is important to note that this policy may well result in the silencing of young children who cannot yet express themselves in the language of schooling (Paulsrud et al., 2017).

The use of first languages in the classroom can be supported by teachers through following strategies suggested by Mary and Young’s (2017) research to support their pupils, which include welcoming bilingual children during their first days at school by using a few words and phrases in their first language to reassure them and thereby attend to their physical and emotional needs. Translation could be provided by an older peer within the school to further support the younger sibling if he/she becomes distressed and help him/her to settle into the new setting. Findings from their data also reveal that Early Years teachers in their study use the children’s first language as part of their teaching to make connections between home and school and thus creating opportunities for them to bring their prior knowledge from home into the classroom. By building on this knowledge encoded in their first language, teachers can ‘scaffold the children’s learning’ (Mary and Young, 2017, p.120). Similarly, Kirsch and Seele’s (2020) research which focused on the translanguaging practices of four Early Years practitioners indicated how their own use of first languages with the children contributed to the children’s inclusion and participation. Chen (2009) also suggests that a supportive classroom should enable children to feel that their first
language makes a valuable contribution to the classroom and also provide planned opportunities to interact meaningfully with both the teacher and their peers through the use of their first languages.

The following recommendations for Early Years practitioners are aligned with the findings from the present study with the three young Polish bilingual learners. Findings from the data emphasise the importance of welcoming and nurturing bilingualism in the classroom and recognising children’s first languages as a valuable resource and positive asset to support their language learning and meaning making. The recommendations demonstrate the practical application of this study and will help Early Years teachers create a positive view of bilingualism and the children’s communication skills which they bring with them.

This underlying approach could be shared with the parents who can encourage their children to use their first language in school as well as at home to develop their communication skills in both languages. This policy should be embedded in the philosophy and ethos of the setting and class teachers should try to communicate with parents perhaps via ‘Welcome’ dual language leaflets, so expectations are made clear to everyone before their child starts their first year of schooling. Sharing dual-language books between the setting and home is a good way to reinforce similarities in patterns of languages and develop relationships. In the school where the research for this study was carried out, parents are welcomed through the ‘open door’ policy at the start and end of the school day, when parents are encouraged to spend time with their children in the early days of settling in. If possible, older siblings or peers could be linked so that children in the Early Years setting can still have access to their first language within the school and thus support their well-being as they become accustomed to their new environment.
6.4.1 Making use of first languages in different ways to communicate in the classroom

- Provide spaces where children can feel confident and communicate freely with their peers using their first language to confirm understandings and meanings through translation.

- Use a few words in the children’s first language to reassure them and meet their needs during their first days of schooling. This will help to reinforce the value of their languages which they bring to the classroom and to build relationships with them.

- Display everyday expressions with visual clues in both languages to help the children feel welcomed and included.

- Provide opportunities for imaginative role play using familiar objects, puppets, construction toys and small play figures to encourage story telling in their first language with their peers. This will help to make meaning with others through play.

- Give children time to talk to themselves using their first language whilst involved in activities with others to provide reassurance whilst developing their bilingualism.

- Encourage children to form friendships using the language they feel most comfortable with according to the context.

- Whilst reading dual-language books together encourage children to become involved with the story and language used by the characters.

6.4.2 Making use of first languages to scaffold their language learning in the classroom

- Plan for children to be included in smaller groups with their bilingual peers to provide support and construct meaning through interaction.

- Listen carefully to their contributions and encourage and attempt to interpret what they have said, using their first language wherever possible.
• Encourage the use of ‘talk partners’ and use interactive computer games to encourage working in pairs with their bilingual peers.

• Ensure children have plenty of opportunities to socially interact with other adults and their bilingual peers.

• Involve the children in storytelling or ‘Show and Tell’ by providing visuals and prompts (giving them key words and phrases to take part, such as, please, thanks, my turn). Encourage the children to use their first language to share with the class and build their confidence.

• Play board and number games with the children in multilingual groups, with plenty of opportunities to work with good role-models whilst welcoming their input in their first language as well.

• Encourage the use of their first language in a range of functions (for example, news telling, feely bags, ‘My Special Day’, ‘Circle Time’ and other collaborative games) and ensure that these are revisited every day to enable the children to join in using their language of choice and feel included.

• Provide opportunities for children to demonstrate their knowledge of both languages to show the rest of the class that they are competent language users and not lacking language. Emphasise that using more than one language should be lauded and praised.

• Build the children’s confidence by responding to their first language input positively and welcome interpretations and translations.

• Invite bilingual children to support their peers through interpretation to confirm understanding to encourage pupil-pupil scaffolding of language.

• Encourage discussion and expression of ideas through a range of activities such as acting out stories or making models using different materials and props.
6.5 Contributions of the research study

For teachers of young bilingual learners, language development is important. However, currently there exist a relatively limited number of studies that have examined the bilinguals' classroom experiences, particularly with reference to their use of translanguaging practices (Jung-In-Kim and Viesca, 2016). More research is therefore needed to better understand how teachers can support young bilingual children in order to motivate and engage them in mainstream classrooms.

Additionally, as there are relatively few studies on translanguaging practices of young children at school in England, the current study opens a small but significant window on to this area of research about the translanguaging practices of young Polish bilingual learners in an Early Years setting in England.

Recent research on young bilinguals’ translanguaging practices in Early Years settings (Gort and Sembiante, 2015; Pontier and Gort, 2016 and Schwartz and Asli, 2014) suggest that young children deploy all their language resources in rich linguistic repertoires producing speech and writing that contain elements of multiple language systems. The detailed data analysis in this study makes an original contribution to translanguaging theory by exemplifying the children’s emergent translanguaging practices, thus extending and complementing the scope of previous research from Garcia et al., (2011) and Portoles and Marti (2017). The current study also contributes to a new line of thinking by clarifying the importance of the use of translanguaging in an English Foundation Stage classroom to scaffold the children’s learning and reveals the importance of providing opportunities for children to utilise all their linguistic resources.

This study is unique in comparison to many previous investigations in this research field in England, because it also bridges the overlapping approaches of applied linguistics and socioconstructivism. Both fields have a great deal to offer research with regard to how translanguaging scaffolds language learning and how young bilingual learners’ language develops in an Early Years setting and are discussed in detail in Chapter 2 (sections 2.3 and 2.4.3). This study not only highlights these fields of research but also contributes to both of them by drawing on the term scaffolding from a socioconstructivist perspective and linking it to its use within applied linguistics.
Findings from the data indicate that Anna, Maria and Peter ‘provide scaffolds for each other’ (Esquinca et al., 2014, p.166) by utilising their first language in order to make sense of their learning and developing more understanding through the support of their peers. Haworth et al’s (2006) research with young bilingual learners argues that they need opportunities to lead as well as to follow if they are to learn and develop effective language for thinking skills.

Examples from the data (see Chapter 4, examples: 2, 5, 7 and 11) provide evidence of Anna, in particular, undertaking an interpreting role for both her peers and teachers whilst Baker (2005) suggests that translating and interpreting ‘give children a position of privilege and power’ (p.67). This study has contributed to both fields of research by demonstrating how the three children used their translanguaging practices to draw on earlier knowledge and experiences, using their full language repertoires in order to ‘scaffold new learning in bilingual spaces’ (Hamman, 2018, p.39). In this sense, it could be argued that this study combines the two fields to create one as both areas of research are pertinent to this study of young bilingual learners who are scaffolding their language and learning through translanguaging in the Early Years.

6.6 Limitations of the research study

This research was conducted with a very small number of young bilingual learners in a naturalistic setting, with one teacher-researcher. Questions necessarily remain to what extent outcomes from this research can be generalised to draw conclusions and implications about the use of translanguaging. Thus the need to be cautious when making claims. Placing the three children at the centre of this research is very important and an in-depth case study such as this, is one of the greatest strengths of this study. It is important to be conscious of the pitfalls of making sweeping generalisations based on the small number of bilingual children in this study and its limited context. This study focuses on the translanguaging practices of three young Polish bilingual learners aged four years in only one Early Years setting located in central England. Their experiences are not necessarily representative of all bilingual children who attend Early Years settings in England, but tentative links are established between the findings from this small sample of young Polish bilingual learners and those experienced within the wider population.
Although the findings of this research study have identified several implications in relation to current and future Early Years practice, there still remain some areas which could have been researched. This research study took place over only one academic year and if the children had been followed up at later stages in their school career this would have complemented the data collected during their first year of schooling. In addition, a research project over a longer time frame would allow more observations to be made and it is possible that more would be captured by the researcher and greater data created. In hindsight, some revealing data could have been collected within the home, for example, the research project ‘Reseaching Literacy Lives’ (Cremin, Mottram, Collins, Powell and Drury, 2015) which developed a greater understanding of the cultural, linguistic and social assets that children bring with them from home, to augment the classroom research and shed light on first language practices within the family. The perspective of the home from parents and carers was not included as it lay outside the remit of this thesis, but the interviews with the parents produced interesting and valuable data about the children’s use of language at home. Literature (see section 2.4.1 - Baker, 2011) has also highlighted the importance of schools developing and maintaining good links with parents.

6.7 Future research

This study highlights potential avenues for future research within the fields of applied linguistics, and early educational and childhood studies. In order to counteract the deficit model of education, whereby young bilingual learners are viewed as a ‘problem’ with negative connotations (Letts and Sinka, 2013), it is important to conduct more research in the field, to ensure that the rich, sophisticated language practices that the children have when they enter the classroom are not ignored (Souto-Manning, 2016). So often, their overall language capabilities are underestimated as there is little knowledge of their first language (Parke et al., 2002). Additional research in this area could focus on parental perceptions of first language use and translanguaging within schools and include specific home-school projects to help develop and use first language resources. Direct comparisons with other schools in different locations would also have been valuable in order to compare learning environments and the use of translanguaging practices with other
young bilingual learners. More research into continuing professional development for teachers is also needed as this could be a potential catalyst for change.

6.8 Final reflections
The most important part of this research is the participants – the three children, Anna, Maria and Peter. They demonstrated their lively participation and obvious enjoyment of learning. The willingness of the teachers, Teaching Assistants and parents to give up their valuable time for the study indicates that they were keen to make a difference to the lives and language learning of the three Polish children in their school. This was both reassuring and motivating. I have reached the end of this research study and my discussion of the participants. The teachers continue to teach. The parents are still encouraging their children to reach their potential and they remain very supportive of their children’s learning in school and at home. Peter’s family have returned to Poland but we still keep in touch and I shall always be grateful for their enthusiastic support. The children themselves are older and continuing to thrive on their journey as second generation Polish bilingual learners in their school careers.

In a study, which relies for its data on interviews, observation and audio-recording of spontaneous and natural language, the relationship between the researcher and the participants, Anna, Maria and Peter is of utmost importance. Their resourcefulness in ‘getting through’ and ultimately succeeding (Conteh, 2003) in a mainstream environment is truly remarkable. The three children in this study prove that they are capable of taking ownership of their learning both in and out of the classroom. The aim of this study is to challenge teacher beliefs and practices, inform policy and potentially, inspire future research. I am very aware that this small scale study only provides a snapshot of what is a complex and fascinating area of educational and applied linguistics research. There is still a great deal to learn about early childhood bilingualism (Genesee, 2015). This is only the beginning.
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Appendix A  Ethical approval

A (i)  Headteacher permission letter

A (ii)  Parents permission letter

A (iii)  HREC Approval
Dear Headteacher,

My name is Madeleine Pilcher and I am a researcher affiliated with The Open University carrying out research about the experiences of three four year-old Polish bilingual learners as they develop early literacy skills within a mainstream classroom in an Early Years setting. The research will also explore teachers’ responses to the challenges of supporting young children for whom English is an Additional Language. The project is being supervised by Dr. Rose Drury of The Open University. From this research a deeper understanding will be gained of the children’s language use of Polish and English, whilst accessing the Foundation Stage and how they can be assisted to achieve their full potential, with the aim of providing valuable insight and knowledge that may be enlightening to educators and other researchers interested in Early Years bilingual education. If you are happy for your school to participate in the study I hope to carry out audio-recorded observations of the children and interviews with yourself, teaching staff and the children’s parents. The observations with the children would last for approximately 10 minutes, on a weekly basis for the duration of my research project.

After seeking your permission I will also be seeking the appropriate parental permission.

Information collected from all participants will be kept anonymous and stored securely. Only myself and the project supervisor will have access to the data and, in accordance with the requirements of some scientific journals and organisations, the coded data may be shared with other competent researchers. If there is a withdrawal of consent before the point of data collation, the data will be destroyed. No information leading to the identification of your school or the individual pupils will be included in any publication or distribution of the results. Your school’s involvement is voluntary and you may withdraw permission at any time during the project.

If you have any questions or require further clarification about my study, I will be glad to answer them.

Please contact myself or Dr. Indra Sinka or Dr. Rose Drury (Doctoral Supervisor) Open University, Faculty of Education: Language and Literacy, Walton Hall. Tel. 01908 653212. Email: r.a.drury@open.ac.uk

Yours sincerely,

Madeleine Pilcher

If you agree to allow me to conduct this study, please sign the statement below and date it.

Thank you for your willingness to allow participation in the study.

This project has been fully explained to me and I am willing to allow Madeleine Pilcher to conduct this study.

Signature.................................. Headteacher

Date..................................
Appendix A (ii) Parents permission letter

Dear Parent/Guardian,

My name is Madeleine Pilcher and I am a researcher affiliated with The Open University carrying out research about the experiences of three four year-old Polish bilingual learners as they develop early literacy skills within a mainstream classroom in an Early Years setting. The research will also explore teachers’ responses to the challenges of supporting young children for whom English is an Additional Language. The project is being supervised by Dr. Rose Drury of The Open University. From this research a deeper understanding will be gained of the children’s language use of Polish and English, whilst accessing the Foundation Stage and how they can be assisted to achieve their full potential, with the aim of providing valuable insight and knowledge that may be enlightening to educators and other researchers interested in Early Years bilingual education. If you are happy for yourself and your child to participate in the study I hope to carry out audio-recorded observations of the children and interviews with the headteacher, teaching staff and with your permission, the children’s parents. The observations with the children would last for approximately 10 minutes, on a weekly basis for the duration of my research project.

Information collected from all participants will be kept anonymous and stored securely. Only myself and the project supervisor will have access to the data and, in accordance with the requirements of some scientific journals and organisations, the coded data may be shared with other competent researchers. If there is a withdrawal of consent before the point of data collation, the data will be destroyed. No information leading to the identification of your child or their school will be included in any publication or distribution of the results. Your involvement is voluntary and you may withdraw permission at any time during the project.

If you have any questions or require further clarification about my study, I will be glad to answer them.

Please contact myself or Dr. Rose Drury (Doctoral Supervisor) Open University, Faculty of Education: Language and Literacy, Walton Hall. Tel. 01908 653212.

Email: r.a.drury@open.ac.uk

Yours sincerely,
Madeleine Pilcher

If you agree to allow me to conduct this study, please sign the statement below and date it.

Thank you for your willingness to allow your child to participate in the study.

This project has been fully explained to me and I am willing to allow Madeleine Pilcher to conduct this study.

Signature.................................. Parent/Guardian

Date..................................

---
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From
Dr Duncan Banks
Chair, The Open University Human Research Ethics Committee

Email
duncan.banks@open.ac.uk

Extension
59198

To
Madeleine Pilcher, Language and Literacy

Subject
“A small scale study of the early literacy learning and teaching of young bilingual learners in a mainstream early years setting.”

Ref
HREC/2013/1403/Pilcher/1

Red form
Submitted
29 May 2013

Date
29 May 2013

Memorandum

This memorandum is to confirm that the research protocol for the above-named research project, as submitted for ethics review, has been given a favourable opinion by the Open University Human Research Ethics Committee.

Please make sure that any question(s) relating to your application and approval are sent to Research-REC-Review@open.ac.uk quoting the HREC reference number above. We will endeavour to respond as quickly as possible so that your research is not delayed in any way.

At the conclusion of your project, by the date that you stated in your application, the Committee would like to receive a summary report on the progress of this project, any ethical issues that have arisen and how they have been dealt with.

Regards,

Dr Duncan Banks
Chair OU HREC
Appendix B  The School Policy

The aims of the school for the children are:

- To be caring, thoughtful and considerate.
- To acquire a wide range of skills that will enable them to develop as individuals.
- To foster a joy for learning.
- To be responsible and caring members of our multi cultural society.
- To have the confidence to make informed choices and be independent learners.
- To rise to the challenge of individual goals and to fulfill their potential.
- To encourage and celebrate achievement in themselves and others.
- These aims are achieved by providing:
  - A caring and co-operative environment enabling children to feel happy, safe and secure.
  - A broad and challenging curriculum for all children.
  - A stimulating learning environment.
  - Varied, high quality and up-to-date learning resources.
  - Innovative teaching and an investigative approach to learning.

The school policy aims to promote mutual respect and tolerance for those with different faiths and beliefs. The school promotes and celebrates the diverse backgrounds and beliefs. All members of the school community are encouraged to know and understand that it is expected and imperative that respect is shown to everyone. In addition, the children and staff uphold the school's values which include: friendship, success, honesty, challenge, kindness and community. Social, moral, spiritual and cultural aspects of learning are well promoted throughout the school. This aspect of the school's work is very effective because the different strands link together through the school's values which indicates the immense importance the school places on being tolerant of the religions and cultures of others.

To develop children's sense of self awareness and reinforce the school's values, at the end of every break and at the end of the school day, all staff interact with the children in small “circles”. The aim of these is to foster self-confidence and self worth. This daily act of sharing, listening and reflecting makes a strong contribution to the school’s positive attitude.
Appendix C  Early years foundation stage profile (EYFSP)

For reference:- This extract has been reprinted from the 2020 handbook (page 18)

3.4 Children for whom English is not their home language
The EYFS profile assessment is underpinned by an understanding that language is central to our sense of identity and belonging to a community. The profile recognises and values linguistic diversity.
The communication skills of children for whom English is not their home language will vary. However, learning English as an additional language (EAL) is not a special educational need.
Children will be at different stages of learning English and one or more other languages. Practitioners need to find out as much as they can about a child’s prior language experience and any education they have received elsewhere. Parents as the first educators are an important source of information.
Practitioners may need to help parents understand that a child’s home language development will help them learn English. Parents also need to know that it is perfectly acceptable, even desirable, for the child’s home language to be used in the setting.
Practitioners will need to observe the child over time and raise questions with the parents, and/or bilingual support assistants, to be confident about what the child knows and understands.
The 3 aspects specific to the assessment of children for whom English is not their home language are:
• development in their home language
• development across areas of learning, assessed through their home language
• development of English
Within the EYFS profile, the ELGs for communication and language, and for literacy, must be assessed in relation to the child’s competency in English. The remaining ELGs may be assessed in the context of any language – including their home language and English.
This has implications for provision. The principles of good practice for children learning English are the principles of good practice for all children. Children must
have opportunities to engage in activities and first-hand experiences that do not depend solely on English for success. They must be able to participate in ways that reveal what they know and can do in the security of their home language. For children to grow in confidence, and hence demonstrate their embedded learning:
• their environment must reflect their cultural and linguistic heritage
• their learning must be supported by a wide range of stimuli and experiences

3.5 Children from minority groups
The ethnicities of children within a setting can be diverse, particularly in urban settings. They may be refugees or asylum seekers, their families may have histories of persecution and trauma. Children may come from settled communities or travel frequently. They may have had a positive experience but their cultural conventions, for example governing behaviours or gender roles, may be different. Cultural background may also determine how early education is perceived. It may affect how much experience a child has had of school or other Early Years settings before their EYFS profile assessment.
Practitioners must take particular care to make sure the learning environment echoes children’s positive experiences. They will be able to demonstrate their attainment best when opportunities such as role play, cookery, celebrations, visits to special places or events are linked to their cultural experience. This will also be captured in the narrative relating to the ‘Playing and exploring: using what they know in their play’ characteristic of effective learning. This is where the child’s ability to begin their play and exploration with things that are familiar to them is expressly considered. The narrative also considers how well the child builds new knowledge and learning from this starting point.
A practitioner’s relationship with parents is crucial to developing knowledge of the child and the practitioner’s ability to make an accurate assessment. Parents can help practitioners understand the values that explain their child’s responses to the environment and social situations. A child will find it easier to express their feelings and feel confident in their learning if practitioners listen and respond in ways that show understanding.
Appendix D  The school policy for Multicultural Education and English as an Additional Language.

At -------------- School we strive to ensure that the culture and ethos of our school are such that, whatever the heritage and origins of members of this school community, everyone is equally valued and treated with respect. Our pupils should be provided with the opportunity to experience and understand diversity. Some of the languages spoken by our pupils have included Gujarati, Arabic, Polish, Urdu, French, Punjabi, German, Japanese, Portuguese, Swahili, Yoruba, Italian, Thai, Cantonese, Spanish, Russian and Korean. These pupils have brought a great deal of experience and richness to our school and we are keen to celebrate the great mixture of cultures and wealth of languages we now have at our school.

This school provides an education for all, which acknowledges and is enriched by the diversity of ethnicity, culture and faith of its pupils. Our policy ensures that minority ethnic pupils are well supported and cherished within our school, so they can reach their full potential and bring benefits in many areas to -------------- school.

We recognise that it is challenging for pupils to come to a new school, when their first language is not English, and we endeavour to make this transition and integration a positive experience and enhance their self esteem. We aim to build on these pupils' knowledge of other languages and cultures and to ensure that they develop as competent and confident speakers, readers and writers of English.

Equality of access to the curriculum for all pupils, including those for whom English is an Additional Language, is ensured not only by direct language support from the EAL Co-ordinator, but also by a whole school approach. This comprises a learning environment that encompasses a varied range of teaching and learning strategies, multicultural and multilingual resources and displays, and whole school celebrations that embrace a wide range of world cultural events.

Aims

Children should have full and equal access to the National Curriculum, whatever their religion, ethnicity, first language, special educational needs, gender, (see Equal Opportunities Policy).
The aim of this policy is to set out how that access is achieved with regard to pupils for whom English is an Additional Language and for those pupils who belong to an ethnic minority. The school will provide effective learning opportunities for all pupils in accordance with the statutory inclusion statement of the National Curriculum, by setting suitable learning challenges, responding to diverse learning needs, and overcoming potential barriers to learning.

**Good practice in working with bilingual and multilingual pupils**

The school recognises the following factors as being central to progress for EAL pupils:

- Recognition of the importance of home language.
- Treating racism and racist incidents seriously.
- Strong home/school and wider community links.
- A learning environment that is sympathetic to a variety of cultures.
- Resources, which include bilingual materials.
- Curriculum, which portrays positive images and role models.

**Implementation of EAL Policy**

The school receives language support from the Ethnic Minority Co-ordinator (EMACO) and consultancy from the local Minority Achievement Support Service (EMASS). The EMACO works in close partnership with EMASS support staff to seek advice and borrow multicultural resources, to reflect the diverse cultures in our school. The involvement of the EMACO in school planning is recommended, as appropriate, to meet the needs of the current intake of EAL pupils.

The role of the Co-ordinator includes:

- Initial assessment of language stage of EAL pupils in Foundation, using Foundation Stage EAL guidelines, as advised by EMASS.
- Assessment of language stage of EAL pupils in Years 1 and 2, using English Language Acquisition Steps (based on NASSEA EAL Assessment System) and closely linked to Key Stage 1 National Curriculum levels.
- Monitoring of EAL pupils’ progress.
• In consultation with class teachers, collaborative planning and target setting for EAL pupils to incorporate both curriculum and EAL specific objectives.
• Direct support of pupils’ language development both in class and withdrawal (1:1 or small group) as appropriate, for language development and enrichment.
• Advice on differentiation of work for EAL pupils.
• Advice on inclusive curriculum materials.
• Advice on classroom strategies to support and include EAL pupils.

Curriculum Principles

The curriculum should reflect the ethnic and cultural diversity of modern Britain. Quality learning begins from sharing the experience that children bring to school from a variety of ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

The school’s goal is to enable pupils from minority ethnic backgrounds to gain full access to the National Curriculum. The school aims to develop strategies for recognising and overcoming any obstacles that prevent pupils from developing their full potential in mainstream classrooms.

Curriculum Planning and Classroom Practice

The needs of EAL pupils in accessing the curriculum need to be carefully planned, as does the provision of a balanced and positive multicultural education.

Teachers should ensure that:

• The language and learning needs of pupils are clearly identified and provided for.
• The language and learning demands of the curriculum are analysed and support provided.
• Visual support is provided for key concepts.
• Planning includes opportunities for first language activities in the classroom, where possible.
• The support requirements of pupils are identified.
• Teachers should have high expectations of all pupils regardless of ethnicity, gender, or social background.
• Activities are matched to pupils’ needs and abilities and have a clear sense of progression.

• There is evidence of development in oracy and literacy through:
  – the awareness and utilisation of the children’s first language expertise.
  – provision of scaffolding/writing frames.
  – using story props.

• Practice and development in all four language skills (listening and understanding, speaking, reading and writing) will be encouraged through:
  – collaborative activities that involve talk.
  – opportunities for feedback to others.
  – models produced by peers to show what can be achieved.

• Classroom organisation and groupings will encourage and support active participation by:
  – grouping and regrouping pupils for connected activities in order to develop language skills.
  – ‘supportive experts’ in each group ie. Good readers and writers.
  – using a range of grouping strategies (mixed/like ability, language, interest, random, gender, age).

• Displays in the classroom and around the school should reflect linguistic and cultural diversity.

• Assessment methods allow pupils to show what they can do in all curriculum areas.

• Access to meaning should be provided by presenting and introducing lessons or topics with visual support:
  – videos
  – maps
  – posters
  – pictures
  – objects
  – use of Information Communication Technology (ICT)
EAL pupils and Special Educational Needs

A child has special educational needs if she/he has a learning difficulty. A child should not be regarded as having a learning difficulty (see Code of Practice and school Special Educational Needs (SEN) policy) solely because the home language is different from the language in which she/he will be taught at school.

While regarding bilingualism in a child as an advantage, the school recognises that the spectrum of children with special educational needs will include a proportion of EAL pupils, and other pupils from minority ethnic backgrounds. The school recognises both the importance of, and the difficulties involved in, the early recognition of SEN in EAL pupils.

Assessment of SEN in EAL pupils will involve the EAL Co-ordinator, EMASS Consultant, and the Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator (SENCO).

If appropriate, the school will try and arrange an assessment in the child’s first language, through EMASS.

The nature of support for EAL pupils with SEN will be decided on an individual basis through consultation between the SENCO and EAL Co-ordinator. Provision of support will be jointly reviewed regularly. This support will take account of the child’s needs as an EAL pupil.

Information on the Code of Practice in the first language could be made available to parents at an early stage in the process, if at all possible.

The EAL Co-ordinator will be responsible for ensuring that the home language does not prevent the parents /guardians either from accessing information on their child’s special educational needs, or from putting forward their point of view.

Liaison with Parents

As with all children, it is acknowledged that liaison with parents is a vital element in the creation of a home/school partnership to support learning in school. Effective communication is the key. For parents of EAL learners this is taken into consideration by:

- Providing a welcoming environment, actively seeking to put parents at their ease in what may be an unfamiliar setting.
Monitoring letters, newsletters, sent home to check that language used is clear and straightforward.

Reading through letters (where appropriate) with children before they are taken home.

Provision of translations of school documents in community languages, where appropriate.

Encouraging parental attendance at parents’ evenings and participation in other school functions e.g. school assemblies, PTA activities, fêtes, sports days.

Informal contact with parents, before and after school, to reinforce communication.

Inviting parents into school to help with class activities e.g. reading, cooking, class outings.

Encouraging parental involvement with shared reading scheme and homework, which may be specifically language based.

Encouraging parental involvement on the Governing body.

Assessment and Target Setting

Monitoring EAL learners’ progress and development is shared between mainstream teachers and the EAL Co-ordinator.

Individual pupil profiles will be kept updated with relevant information and regular assessment tasks will indicate children’s progress. This assessment should also inform curriculum planning.

Pupils should be encouraged to take responsibility for their own learning by sharing their own targets for achievement with their class teacher.

The school also carries out a structured programme of ethnic monitoring to observe the performance of different groups in relation to academic achievement and uses the results to assess whether its provision is ensuring equal educational achievement by all groups.
Appendix E  Observations – Data collection

E (i)  Observations – Data Collection Chart (audio recordings)
E (ii) Observations – Data Collection Chart (field notes)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Language used</th>
<th>Context / environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, Anna’s father, class teacher, Teaching Assistant and rest of the class.</td>
<td>Audio recording</td>
<td>Outside the classroom</td>
<td>18 Sep 2013</td>
<td>10.23 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>Anna’s father drops her off and they talk together in Polish before he leaves. The Teaching Assistant takes the Polish children and settles them on the carpet and talks to them quietly while other children are arriving. She plays an interactive game with the class on the white board. Anna talks to Maria in Polish. Peter joins in for a few minutes and then returns to the game. The children sit in rows facing the board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher and Maria</td>
<td>Audio recording</td>
<td>Foundation Stage cloakroom</td>
<td>03 Oct 2013</td>
<td>12.59 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>Maria and the researcher are reading the story of “The Three Little Pigs” together. They are sitting on the floor in the cloakroom of Foundation area, near the door overlooking the outside playground. No other children or adults are present. They share the book together and used wolf and pig puppets to help retell the story. It is a windy day during the afternoon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria and Peter</td>
<td>Audio recording</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>03 Oct 2013</td>
<td>8.49 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>Anna, Maria and Peter are reading a Polish / English book- Part 1. The researcher share a dual language book with the children. The session takes place in an empty classroom with no interruptions. No one leaves the room. They sit at a table with the researcher and look at the book together and discuss the pictures and vocabulary in Polish and English. The recording is made in the morning after break time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria and Peter</td>
<td>Audio recording</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>03 Oct 2013</td>
<td>12.49 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>Anna, Maria and Peter are reading a Polish / English book- Part 2. The researcher and the children share another dual language book. They are in an empty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Language used</td>
<td>Context / environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria and Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Foundation Stage outside playground</td>
<td>16 Oct 2013</td>
<td>15.18 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>classroom, sitting on the floor and again discuss the pictures and vocabulary in Polish and English with the researcher. The recording takes place during the afternoon with no interruptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, class teacher, Teaching Assistant and rest of the class.</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>05 Nov 2013</td>
<td>30.43 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>The class listen to the input about fireworks. Peter and Anna join in with the firework sounds in the firework film. They look animated. Maria goes outside to work with the Teaching Assistant. Anna waves to her through the open curtain. Peter and Anna draw firework pictures at the art table. The Teaching Assistant talks to them. Peter describes his picture – “red, yellow”. Anna points to her drawing – “fire”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, class teacher, Teaching Assistant and rest of the class.</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Classroom and activity area outside classroom</td>
<td>11 Nov 2013</td>
<td>25.12 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>The class listen to the story of Rama and Sita and are shown how to make divas (clay lamps). Anna, Maria and Peter go outside to the craft table where the Teaching Assistant explains to the small group how to model the clay and decorate the lamps with sequins. She encourages the children in the group to express their ideas. Anna whispers to Maria in Polish during process. Peter shows his friend what he has made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Language used</td>
<td>Context / environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, Teaching Assistant and small group of children from their class</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Foundation Stage outside playground</td>
<td>22 Nov 2013</td>
<td>15.23 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>Anna, Maria and Peter join a small group outside and help to find domino cards hidden around the area and match them up with their partner. Peter shouts in English to his English friend. Anna and Maria run round together, shouting in Polish. After the number game Peter plays basketball with his friend whilst Anna and Maria ride the bikes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, class teacher, Teaching Assistant, caretaker and small group of children from their class</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>27 Nov 2013</td>
<td>25.16 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>The literacy lesson is about “People who help us” in the school environment. Anna, Maria and Peter are sitting on the carpet next to the Teaching Assistant who helps them identify different people who help them at school (secretary, caretaker etc). The children tell her the people they know and call out. The caretaker comes into the class to tell them about her role. The Polish children listen carefully but do not ask questions. They draw pictures of the caretaker. Peter points to his picture and says “Mrs K cleaning”. Anna talks to Maria about her picture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria and Peter and rest of Foundation Stage classes and Year 1 classes and caretaker with midday supervisors</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Hall/dining room and main playground</td>
<td>02 Dec 2013</td>
<td>25.34 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>Anna, Maria and Peter are in the hall eating their packed lunches. They sit with other Polish children from parallel Foundation Stage classes. They converse in Polish. It is very noisy and they are shouting to each other to make themselves heard until Mrs K asks everyone to talk quietly. They listen and continue their conversations. They do not interact with any English speaking children on their table. Once they have finished they go outside to the main playground. Anna and Maria play with other Polish girls and Peter finds some other children to play with. The whistle is blown and all the 3 classes line up to go inside. Anna waves to the Polish girl in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Language used</td>
<td>Context / environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher and Anna</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Class teacher’s classroom</td>
<td>04 Dec 2013</td>
<td>11.24 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Anna is talking to researcher in an empty classroom. They were standing together looking at the Christmas displays and describing what she can see. They later sit down at a table to talk about her learning experiences. The discussion is in English and takes place in the morning session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna and Maria</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Foundation Stage outside playground</td>
<td>04 Dec 2013</td>
<td>3.35 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Anna and Maria are in the outdoor play area attached to the Foundation Stage, during the afternoon. The discussion is in English with the researcher. The girls are standing at a table, both making models out of playdough and talking about them. The recording ends when the rest of the class come out to play and the girls choose a different activity together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, 20 other children and Teaching Assistant.</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Foundation Stage outside playground</td>
<td>06 Jan 2014</td>
<td>15.22 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>Anna, Maria and Peter join another group of children outside. They make tunnels and models out of waffle blocks and boxes. The Teaching Assistant encourages them to use vocabulary associated with moving around. They speak Polish to each other but also welcome other children into their games and converse in English as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria and other young English speaking learner and classroom assistant</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>School library</td>
<td>14 Jan 2014</td>
<td>15.14 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>“Rosie’s Walk” – Anna, Maria &amp; one other young English speaking learner. The researcher observes the children sharing this book with a Teaching Assistant and discussing the pictures and content. The children are sitting at a table with the Teaching Assistant. Part of the story is acted out with props by the children and supported by the Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Language used</td>
<td>Context / environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Oliver Peter and one other young English speaking learner and classroom assistant.</td>
<td>Audio recording  transcribed</td>
<td>School library</td>
<td>21 Jan 2014</td>
<td>15.43 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>“Gingerbread Man” – Oliver, Peter &amp; one other young English speaking learner. The researcher observes the children sharing this book with a Teaching Assistant and discussing the pictures and content. The children are sitting at a table with the Teaching Assistant. Part of the story is acted out with props by the children and supported by the Teaching Assistant. A barrier game is played. The session takes place in the afternoon in the library. No other children or adults are present. All discussions are in English. The researcher does not participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter and Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>Audio recording  transcribed</td>
<td>Foundation Stage outside playground</td>
<td>24 Jan 2014</td>
<td>20.34 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>Anna, Maria, Peter and 4 other children are outside, making junk models in the construction area. They are making cars and trucks. The Teaching Assistant asks them how they will make wheels. The English speaking children in the group offer suggestions. Peter shouts, “I make train from these,” pointing to the sticklebricks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Oliver, Peter and Teaching Assistant.</td>
<td>Audio recording  transcribed</td>
<td>School library</td>
<td>28 Jan 2014</td>
<td>15.32 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>“Little Red Hen” – Anna, Peter &amp; Oliver. The researcher observes the children sharing this book with a Teaching Assistant and discussing the pictures and content. The children are sitting at a table with the Teaching Assistant. Part of the story is acted out with props by the children and supported by the Teaching Assistant. A barrier game is played.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Language used</td>
<td>Context / environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Oliver, Peter, and classroom assistant.</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Activity area outside classrooms</td>
<td>06 Feb 2014</td>
<td>15.24 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>The session takes place in the afternoon in the library. No other children or adults are present. All discussions are in English. The researcher does not participate. The class listen to the story “The Train Ride” in the classroom. Anna, Maria, Oliver, and Peter go outside with the Teaching Assistant to share a “Thomas the Tank Engine” book together. They all look at the pictures and shout together about the trains. The Teaching Assistant draws their attention to what is happening in the story and they point to the pictures and shout out what they can see. She asks them where the train is going. They all shout, “Poland!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, classroom assistant and small group of English speaking children from their class.</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Foundation Stage outside playground</td>
<td>10 Feb 2014</td>
<td>15.45 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>Outside, the Teaching Assistant is explaining how to make an aeroplane from different sizes of paper. She demonstrates and shows the children how to fly it, asking them how far it will travel. Anna shouts, “Now I try!” Peter shouts, “Over there, there”, as he flies his plane. Maria points to the sky. She is smiling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, classroom assistant and 4 other children from their class.</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Activity area outside classrooms</td>
<td>03 March 2014</td>
<td>22.12 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>Anna, Maria and 4 other children from their class (2 bilingual – Romanian and Twi and 2 English speakers) choose to go to the role play area which is set out as “The Three Bears” house. The Teaching Assistant shows them pictures from the story and encourages them to act out the story together, using the props. The children start to interact. Anna tells Maria to be the baby bear. She speaks in English to her, but later gives her instructions in Polish. She tells the Romanian child to “Sit here!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Language used</td>
<td>Context / environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna and Maria</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Foundation Stage outside playground</td>
<td>12 March 2014</td>
<td>4.20 minutes</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Anna and Maria are in the outside playground attached to the Foundation Stage. Other children are present but are involved in other activities some distance away from the 2 girls. They are standing together playing with the doll's house and using the dolls and furniture to make up their own role play situations. The researcher is present but does not participate in their play, which is conducted solely in Polish. The recording takes place in the afternoon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Oliver Peter and 2 other young English speakers.</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>The children’s classroom</td>
<td>13 March 2014</td>
<td>7.10 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Anna, Maria, Oliver, Peter+ rest of phonics group (2 other young English speaking learners from Foundation Stage). This recording session is led by the researcher in her role as a class teacher. The children are seated on the carpet with the rest of their selected phonics group. The researcher is standing in front of the group and using the interactive white board to demonstrate the sounds and pictures referred to in the transcript. The young Polish bilingual learners are asked in turn to participate and respond by the researcher. No other adults or children are present. The recording takes place during the morning before break time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna and 3 other young English speaking learners and one other bilingual learner.</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>The children’s classroom</td>
<td>13 March 2014</td>
<td>10.02 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Anna and rest of guided reading group (comprising 3 other young English speaking learners and one other bilingual learner – Cantonese speaker). A selected book is chosen from the reading scheme suitable for the reading level of this group of children (Foundation Stage). The researcher leads this session in her role as a class teacher. The children are seated at a table with the researcher and each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Language used</td>
<td>Context / environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Kate and classroom assistant</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Activity area outside classrooms</td>
<td>21 March 2014</td>
<td>19.23 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>The class listen to the story “The Gingerbread Man” in the classroom. After the story, Anna chooses to go to an activity outside. She is joined by her Polish friend Kate from the parallel class. Maria is away today. They sequence the pictures from the story and talk in Polish. They run round the table with the gingerbread puppets shouting, “Here gingerbread man. He running!” Anna then joins the craft table and paints a gingerbread man with the help of the Teaching Assistant. She talks in English to her talk partner (Lottie) about the story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Oliver, Peter and 2 other young bilingual learners</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Activity area outside classrooms</td>
<td>28 March 2014</td>
<td>20.23 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Anna, Oliver, Peter and 2 other young bilingual learners (Cantonese and Twi) are playing a Bingo number game outside their own classroom in the activity area attached to the Foundation Stage, on their own. They are seated at a table. The researcher sets up the game and recording equipment at the beginning but does not participate in the game. The children return to their own classroom together. The recording takes place in the afternoon. No other adults are present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, small group of children from</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Activity area outside classrooms</td>
<td>28 April 2014</td>
<td>17.45 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>There has been a chick incubator in the activity area for the last few weeks. All the Foundation Stage children have been watching the eggs. This week...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Language used</td>
<td>Context / environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their class and Teaching Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>some of the eggs have hatched. Anna points to the chicks and shouts in English to Maria and Peter who are gathered round the incubator with other children. The Teaching Assistant asks them what they think of the chicks. Maria says, “Yellow, soft.” Anna and Peter move to the writing table where they are encouraged to write a word to describe the chicks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria and Teaching Assistant.</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Activity area outside classrooms</td>
<td>09 May 2014</td>
<td>11.23 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>The Teaching Assistant is finishing a “Goldilocks and the Three Bears” display to put up in the corridor. Anna and Maria are helping her. She talks to them about the bears and their characteristics. Anna says, “I need yellow. It is Goldilock. Look at the balloon.” She talks in English to Maria. The Teaching Assistant asks Maria what she will paint. She replies, “Nose, Nosey, nose.” When the session is over, Anna and Maria line up at the outside door to go out to play. They talk together in Polish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, rest of their class, class teacher and Teaching Assistant.</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>19 May 2014</td>
<td>24.44 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>The class listen to the story “The Very Hungry Caterpillar” and watch the video on line. The children are asked to talk about what the caterpillar ate with their talk partner. Anna says, “cake, sausage.” Maria tells the Teaching Assistant that the caterpillar likes apple. Peter tells his talk partner that the caterpillar likes cake, apple and lolly. Anna, and Peter sit at the writing table together and talk in Polish while they are waiting for instructions. They talk about their pictures they have drawn. The Teaching Assistant asks Maria what would be on her list if it was her birthday party. She replies “sweeties.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Language used</td>
<td>Context / environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Ellis, Peter and Kate (young Polish bilingual learner in parallel class)</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>22 May 2014</td>
<td>20.31 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>Researcher is with Anna, Ellis (young English speaking learner, who is Peter's friend), Peter and Kate (a young Polish bilingual learner and friend of Anna). The children are in an empty classroom whilst the rest of the class are elsewhere. Peter and Ellis are building cars and planes from lego and converse solely in English. Anna and Kate are also building with lego but make up their own stories based around the houses they make and playmobil people. They converse in Polish but occasionally ask the boys a few questions in English. Sometimes they reply. No other adults are present. The researcher does not participate in the play situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria and small group from their class and Teaching Assistant.</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Foundation Stage outside playground</td>
<td>09 June 2014</td>
<td>19.56 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>Anna and Maria are outside with a small group from their class. They are searching for dinosaur &quot;bones&quot; and &quot;teeth&quot; in the sand tray. Anna calls Maria over to look. They talk in Polish. Maria looks at a dinosaur book with a friend but does not speak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna and Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Activity area outside the classroom – book corner</td>
<td>20 June 2014</td>
<td>12 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Anna is looking at a reference book about dinosaurs with the Teaching Assistant. They are sitting together on bean bags on the floor in the book corner. The Teaching Assistant asks Anna how dinosaurs move. She says, “Like this,” and moves slowly on all fours and crawls back on to the bean bag. The Teaching Assistant points to a picture of a Tyrannosaurus Rex. Anna makes roaring noises and holds up her hands like claws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Language used</td>
<td>Context / environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, a small group of children and Teaching Assistant.</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Activity area outside the classroom – dinosaur table</td>
<td>26 June 2014</td>
<td>16 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>Outside, Anna, Maria, Peter and a small group of children are playing with the plastic dinosaurs and making homes for them out of twigs, leaves and rocks. They talk in Polish together but when an English speaking child joins them they welcome her and involve her in their role play. Anna holds up a dinosaur and makes an attempt at the word – “brachsus?” Once the other child moves away Anna and Maria resume their conversation in Polish. Peter moves away to another activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Peter and Ellis (young English speaking learner) and Teaching Assistant.</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Foundation Stage outside playground.</td>
<td>03 July 2014</td>
<td>15.12 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Peter and his friend Ellis (a young English speaking learner, who is his friend) are engaged in play activities in the outside playground attached to the Foundation Stage during the afternoon. They are playing basketball and move on to the hoops and jumping activities. They converse in English. A Teaching Assistant is present, supervising other children at play. Other children are present but engaged in different activities outside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, children from the 3 Foundation classes and Teaching Assistant.</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Foundation Stage outside playground.</td>
<td>06 July 2014</td>
<td>18.34 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>Anna and Maria choose to play in the water tray outside. They are part of a larger group. They pour water in and out using buckets, sieves and plastic fish. Anna says to Maria and the other children at the water tray – “Watch me pouring. Look out!” Anna and Maria move to a different area and start to build a house from blocks and knock it down. They are laughing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Peter and Ellis (young English speaking)</td>
<td>Audio recording transcribed</td>
<td>Foundation Stage outside</td>
<td>16 July 2014</td>
<td>12.08 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Peter and Ellis (a young English speaking learner, who is his friend) are constructing a castle and towers from mobilo and lego in the activity area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Language used</td>
<td>Context / environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learner and Teaching Assistant.</td>
<td></td>
<td>playground.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>attached to the Foundation Stage during the morning session. Peter converses in English with Ellis. Other children are present but engaged in different activities in the shared area, supervised by a Teaching Assistant. The researcher does not participate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E (ii) Observations - Data Collection Chart (field notes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Language used</th>
<th>Context / environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, class teacher, Teaching Assistant and rest of class.</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>18 Sep 2013</td>
<td>22.13 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>The class teacher enters the classroom after she has finished talking to the last few parents. She takes the register. All 3 children answer her and say “Good morning Mrs. Z”. The Teaching Assistant sits with them on the carpet. Anna whispers to Maria in Polish. Peter sits silently. The “Special Day” person is chosen. The 3 children do not participate in this activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, class teacher, Teaching Assistant and rest of class.</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Classroom and library</td>
<td>24 Sep 2013</td>
<td>25.13 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>The children are having their photographs taken today by a visiting photographer. The class listen to instructions whilst seated on the carpet. Anna talks to Maria in Polish. The class line up. Peter stands behind Anna and Maria. The girls are excited and jump up and down. They are led down the corridor to the library where they each have their photograph taken. The Teaching Assistant and class teacher accompany them. They reassure Anna, Maria and Peter. The children return to the classroom for a story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, class teacher, Teaching Assistant and rest of class.</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Classroom and activity area outside classroom</td>
<td>01 Oct 2013</td>
<td>30.10 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>The children watch a film about a birthday party. Anna and Maria talk in Polish during the film. Peter concentrates and listens carefully. During discussion the 3 children do not raise their hands. They look at the class teacher. They do not participate. After the input the children choose the next activity. Anna and Maria go to the role play area outside the classroom. The Teaching Assistant joins in their role play in the “kitchen”. Peter joins some other children in the outside playground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Language used</td>
<td>Context / environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, class teacher and half of class.</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Classroom and ICT suite</td>
<td>08 Oct 2013</td>
<td>20.16 min</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>The ICT suite is next door to the classroom. Anna, Maria and Peter are taken with half the class by their class teacher. Anna and Maria are partners on a computer. Peter works with Ellis (His English speaking friend). The class teacher demonstrates the lesson on the interactive white board and the children listen and carry out the activity, taking it in turns to work the “mouse” and use the keyboard. The polish children enjoy the session and participate fully. They “log off” and return to their classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, class teacher, Teaching Assistant and rest of</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>24 Oct 2013</td>
<td>25.19 min</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>The class listen to the class teacher who is using the interactive white board and identifying signs and familiar images (ToysRUs, school logo etc). Anna nods and laughs. Maria and Peter smile. They do not raise their hands to answer questions. The 3 Polish children are called out by the Teaching Assistant who takes them along the corridor to look for signs. At the staffroom, Peter and Anna say “teacher”. Maria smiles. They meet the secretary in her office and greet her. They return to the classroom and sit on the carpet. The class teacher asks the class about the signs. Anna and Maria whisper together. Peter is listening but does not answer any questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, class teacher, Teaching Assistant and rest of</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>22 Nov 2013</td>
<td>20.24 min</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>The class are learning how to identify how many objects are in a set and use words like “more” and “fewer” to describe 2 sets of objects. The Teaching Assistant sits on the carpet to support Anna, Maria and Peter. She whispers the instructions for the matching numbers game and tries to encourage them to take part. Anna is involved and joins in. The Teaching Assistant reinforces the mathematical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Language used</td>
<td>Context / environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, class teachers and Teaching Assistants from the 3 Foundation Stage classes and rest of children from Foundation Stage.</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Activity area outside classrooms</td>
<td>09 Dec 2013</td>
<td>30.32 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>The Foundation Stage children from the 3 classes are having their Christmas Party. After watching a film about the Nativity in their classroom, Anna, Maria and Peter put on their home made Christmas hats and go and sit in the activity area outside their classroom. The tables and chairs have been cleared away ready for party games. They sit in a circle with the rest of their class and play “Pass the Parcel”. No instructions are given, but the Polish children shout excitedly as they unwrap the parcels in turn. They then play “Musical Statues”. Peter has to sit out and looks disappointed but obeys the rules. Anna, Maria and Peter eat their party food in the classroom and talk in Polish to each other. The Teaching Assistant asks them about the party. Maria says, “good, is good”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Anna’s father, Maria, Maria’s mother, Peter, Peter’s mother and rest of class, class teacher and Teaching Assistant.</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Outside in activity area and in classroom</td>
<td>06 Jan 2014</td>
<td>10. 23 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>Anna’s father drops her off and they chat in Polish. Maria and Peter talk to their parents in Polish. They all go into the classroom and watch the game on the interactive board. Peter joins in. Anna is told by the Teaching Assistant to put her toy away in her tray which she does and sits down next to Maria. They talk together in Polish.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, class teacher and Teaching Assistant | Field notes | Classroom | 06 Jan 2014 | 20.40 minutes | English | The new topic “Travelling around” is introduced to the class. The class teacher asks how we move around. Anna is chosen and says “jumping” and demonstrates. The Polish children are taken out of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Language used</th>
<th>Context / environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Oliver, Peter, and Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Foundation Stage outside playground</td>
<td>16 Jan 2014</td>
<td>10.21 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>the classroom and work with the Teaching Assistant. She shows them pictures of moving around. Peter points to the picture of a car and calls out its name as do the other Polish children. They tell the Teaching Assistant about their bikes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Oliver, Peter, and class teacher, Teaching Assistant and rest of class.</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>27 Jan 2014</td>
<td>25.54 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>The class are celebrating Chinese New Year and waiting in their classroom for a visitor to arrive. Anna, Maria, Oliver and Peter are excited. The visitor shows them artefacts and some children try on the costumes. Maria puts up her hand and tries on a costume. They watch a film about the race of the animals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, small group of children and Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Foundation Stage outside playground</td>
<td>27 Jan 2014</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>Anna, Peter and Maria join a group outside. They all participate in wearing animal masks and chasing each other. Peter wears a dragon mask and chases other children, screaming. At the craft table, Anna uses black paint to make some Chinese writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Oliver, Peter, and classroom assistant and small group of English speaking children from their class.</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Foundation Stage outside playground</td>
<td>28 Feb 2014</td>
<td>18.34 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>The class have been reading the story “The Three Little Pigs”. Outside, Anna, Maria, Oliver and Peter are taking part in building houses form lego and duplo. Anna points to the roof and shouts, “Roof, roof, windows here!” The other children in the group help her. She gives instructions to Maria and Peter in Polish but asks the other children for extra pieces in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Language used</td>
<td>Context / environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, one English speaking child (her talk partner), rest of class and Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>24 March 2014</td>
<td>8.23 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>The class watch a powerpoint presentation about Mother’s Day in the classroom. The children are asked to talk to their talk partner. Anna stares at Lottie while she talks about her mother. Anna offers her contribution – “My mum cooking.” Anna puts up her hand and is chosen and says her mum is kind. She is praised by the class teacher. Anna looks round the class and smiles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna and small group of children from her class and Teaching Assistant.</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Activity area outside classrooms</td>
<td>24 March 2014</td>
<td>12.24 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Anna moves outside to the writing table with a small group of children from her class. She is asked to write a letter to her mother and think of what they could say to thank her. The Teaching Assistant encourages Anna to join in. She draws a picture of her mother and writes underneath – “my mum is kind.” The children talk about their favourite day out with their mothers. Anna tells the Teaching Assistant that she likes to go to Macdonald’s. All the children laugh together and Anna finishes her picture. She smiles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, rest of their class, class teacher and Teaching Assistant.</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>24 April 2014</td>
<td>14.34 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>The class are sitting in a circle on the carpet. It is “Circle Time”. This happens once a day. The children are encouraged to speak to the rest of the class. The theme is “Going for Gold” and doing your best. When a child is holding the toy lion s/he can speak. The children say what they are best at. Peter says football. Anna says dancing. Maria does not speak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Language used</td>
<td>Context / environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Peter, small group from their class and Teaching Assistant.</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Foundation Stage outside playground</td>
<td>05 June 2014</td>
<td>18.23 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>The class are working on a Maths challenge about dinosaurs. They have to work out what size clothes the dinosaurs need. The class teacher explains what estimate means. Anna and Peter work together with a small group outside with the Teaching Assistant. They are asked to estimate how many pencils long the dinosaur is which is chalked on the playground. They both shout, &quot;Five.&quot; They then measure different sized plastic dinosaurs using cubes. Anna shouts &quot;ten cubes&quot; and Peter writes it down. They share their results with the rest of the group. They are laughing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna and Keira (young English speaking learner)</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Role play area in activity area outside their classroom</td>
<td>11 June 2014</td>
<td>10.13 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Anna is playing with her friend Keira (young English speaking learner) in the role play area and conversing in English whilst acting out different roles in the &quot;shop&quot;. The researcher does not participate. Other children are present but engaged in different activities in the activity area attached to the Foundation Stage and supervised by a Teaching Assistant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Maria and classroom assistant.</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Activity area outside the classroom – craft table.</td>
<td>25 June 2014</td>
<td>12.34 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Maria is drawing pictures at a table in the activity area during the afternoon and describing them in English to the Teaching Assistant. She moves to the craft table and is also involved in making a face from a paper plate. She does not interact with any other children. The researcher does not participate in the activities. Other children are present but engaged in different activities in the activity area attached to the Foundation Stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Language used</td>
<td>Context / environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher, Anna, Maria, Peter, rest of their class, class teacher and Teaching Assistant.</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>10 July 2014</td>
<td>13.34 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>The class is sitting in a circle in their classroom. It is “Circle Time”. The class teacher explains that it is the end of their year in Foundation Stage and asks them what they have enjoyed. Maria says, drawing. Anna says bikes and Peter enjoys football.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Appendix F (i) Interviews - Data Collection Chart (audio recordings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Data Format</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Language used</th>
<th>Context / environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher and class teacher</td>
<td>Audio Recording</td>
<td>Class teacher’s classroom</td>
<td>20 Sep 2013</td>
<td>22.15 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>The researcher and the young Polish bilingual learners’ class teacher are in her classroom at the end of the school day. They sit together at a table. Examples of the children’s’ work are on display. No other adults or children are present. Discussion is based around her perceptions and observations of the children and their individual experiences as young bilingual learners in a mainstream environment. Questions are taken from those prepared by the researcher who outlines her research study and what it will entail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher and class teacher of the 3 Polish bilingual learners</td>
<td>Transcribed</td>
<td>Class teacher’s classroom</td>
<td>03 March 2014</td>
<td>15.24 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>The researcher and the young Polish bilingual learners’ class teacher are in her classroom at the end of the school day. They sit together at a table. Examples of the children’s’ work are on display. No other adults or children are present. Discussion was based around her perceptions and observations of the children and their individual experiences as young bilingual learners in a mainstream environment. Questions are taken from those prepared by the researcher. Particular reference is made to Maria’s progress and intervention programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher and mothers of Maria and Peter</td>
<td>Audio Recording</td>
<td>School library</td>
<td>12 May 2014</td>
<td>35.22 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Researcher and 2 parents – (mothers of Peter and Maria). The parents are invited by the researcher to stay after they had dropped off their children to their classroom in Foundation Stage. The recording takes place in the library in the morning. Martha brought her one year old son with her in his buggy and attends to his needs when necessary throughout the interview. The interview is conducted seated at a table and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Data Format</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Language used</td>
<td>Context / environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher and father of Anna</td>
<td>Audio Recording</td>
<td>School library</td>
<td>20 May 2014</td>
<td>30.58 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Researcher and 1 parent – (father of Anna) The parent is invited by the researcher to stay after he had dropped off his child to her classroom in Foundation Stage. The recording takes place in the library in the morning. The interview is conducted seated at a table and questions are taken from those prepared by the researcher. Concerns and views are discussed in relation to his child’s experiences in the first year of schooling. No other adults or children are present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher and Anna, Maria and Peter</td>
<td>Audio Recording</td>
<td>Anna, Maria and Peter’s classroom</td>
<td>21 May 2014</td>
<td>10.51 minutes</td>
<td>English and Polish</td>
<td>The researcher is with Anna, Maria and Peter in an empty classroom. Seated at a table talking to the researcher about their learning experiences. The recording takes place in the morning and no other children or adults are present. No interruptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher and Headteacher</td>
<td>Audio Recording</td>
<td>Head-teacher’s office</td>
<td>14 July 2014</td>
<td>20.22 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>The researcher interviews the Headteacher in her office. They discuss the progress of the three Polish bilingual learners and the researcher provides an update of the research study during the year. Questions are taken from those prepared by the researcher. They also discuss the end of year reports for Anna, Maria and Peter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher and class teacher</td>
<td>Audio Recording</td>
<td>Class teacher’s classroom</td>
<td>17 July 2014</td>
<td>20.43 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>The researcher and the young Polish bilingual learners’ class teacher are in her classroom at the end of the school day. They sit together at a table. Examples of the children’s’ work are on display. No other adults or children are present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
children are present. Discussion is based around her perceptions and observations of the children and their individual experiences as young bilingual learners in a mainstream environment. Questions are taken from those prepared by the researcher. Their end of year reports are also discussed.
Appendix F (ii) Interviews - Data Collection Chart (field notes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Data Format</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Language used</th>
<th>Context / environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher and Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Class teacher’s classroom</td>
<td>26 Sep 2013</td>
<td>15.13 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>The researcher and the Teaching Assistant of Anna, Maria and Peter are in the class teacher’s classroom during the lunch hour. The classroom is empty and no other adults or children were present. Discussion is based around her perceptions and observations of the children and their individual experiences as young bilingual learners in a mainstream environment. Questions are used from the schedule prepared by the researcher who outlines her research study and what it will entail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher and Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>ICT Suite</td>
<td>11 March 2014</td>
<td>12.32 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>The researcher and the Teaching Assistant of Anna, Maria and Peter are in the ICT suite during the morning break. The suite is empty and no other adults or children are present. Discussion is based around her perceptions and observations of the children and their individual experiences as young bilingual learners in a mainstream environment. Questions are used from the schedule prepared by the researcher. The Teaching Assistant is specifically asked about her intervention work with Maria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher and Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>School library</td>
<td>18 July 2014</td>
<td>11.24 minutes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>The researcher and the Teaching Assistant of Anna, Maria and Peter are in the school library during the afternoon break. The library is empty and no other adults or children are present. Discussion is based around her perceptions and observations of the children and their individual experiences as young bilingual learners in a mainstream environment. Questions are used from the schedule prepared by the researcher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Data Format</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Language used</th>
<th>Context / environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Teaching Assistant is asked her views on how the children have developed during the year and what strategies she has used to support them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F (iii) Sample of Interview Questions

Introduction

As you know I am a teacher at this school and I teach in the Foundation Stage and the rest of the time I am studying for a Doctorate in Education and I am very interested in children who speak English as an Additional Language. Part of my role here as well as being a class teacher is to find out how the bilingual children are progressing in the whole school not just in your class, so that is part of my job as well.

I know about your children in school and how they are progressing and how they behave but I haven’t got very much information on their home life and about the Polish and the English and how it all fits together. I would like to ask you some questions about your children. We will not be talking about the individual progress of your child because that is between you and Mrs. Z (class teacher) and that is private.

The information from this interview will be used towards my doctoral research and other publications in the future. Have you got any questions first about what I have just told you?

Family background

Can you tell me a little bit about your family in England. Brothers and sisters, grandparents etc.

How do you keep in touch with family in Poland?

Does your child talk to family in Poland? How do they communicate?

How often do you visit Poland? Do other family members visit you in England?

Are you in touch with other Polish families in the community in England?

Do you think it is important for your child to understand his/her culture and maintain his/her Polish whilst learning English at school?

Has it been difficult to achieve this?

Are you, your child or any other family members learning English elsewhere?
Child’s background
Can you tell me a little bit about your child and his/her schooling?
What activities did your child enjoy before s/he attended pre-school?
How did your child progress at pre-school? Did s/he enjoy the experience do you think?
Did s/he make any friends? What did s/he like playing?
How did your child feel about coming to our school in September?
Can you see any changes from September to now?
Is s/he happy at school?
What does your child like to do when s/he is not at school?
Does your child always speak Polish at home with you, family and friends?
Have you heard your child speak any English at home?
Does your child like listening to stories and songs in Polish at home?
Do you share Polish books with your child and his/her siblings?
Does your child enjoy learning English at school? Does s/he talk about his/her day when s/he gets home?
Has your child made friends in his/her class?
What does your child like doing best at school?
How fluent is your child’s Polish?
Does your child attend any language school to develop his/her Polish? If so, does s/he enjoy it?
Are you pleased with your child’s learning at school?
What do you think might support your child as s/he is learning English at school?
Does your child find anything difficult?

Closing remarks
Is there anything you want to ask me or want to add?
Thank you so much for agreeing to take part in this interview. Your views are really important to me and to my research.
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Appendix H  Sample Transcript No. 1

Transcript date 03.10.2013 10.45 am (8.49 minutes)
Recording identifier REC003


Context / environment
Empty classroom after break time. Anna, Peter and Maria sit at a table with the researcher and look at a dual language (Polish/English) book.

Transcription conventions
These transcription conventions will apply to all the extracts. Conventional punctuation has been used. Line numbers have been inserted.

KEY
R: Researcher
A: Anna Polish bilingual learner
P: Peter Polish bilingual learner
M: Maria Polish bilingual learner

Plain font: English
Italics: Polish
[ ] Translation into English
( ) Contextual information

START
1. R. Peter. We’re going to look at a book together today children and I want you to look at the book and see if you can talk to me about some of the things that you can see. O.K. Do you want to come round this side Peter? Can you tell me what you can see in the picture girls? What can you see? (Picture of the family in the living room)

5. M. I can see. I can see.
A. This one. Car.
M. Meeow. Meeow (pointing to cat in picture).
P. Was this dog. (laughing and pointing to dog).
A. Doggy. Look at the doggy. (laughing).
(More laughter and talking about the pictures to each other).
(Picture of the family getting dressed in different clothes).

10. R. Can you say the words to me?
M. Socks.
R. What is the man, what is the man doing? What’s he doing?
A. He’s putting on ... (inaudible) on baby.
M. OOOOh! Baby.
(All 3 children laughing and pointing at the baby).

15. R. And what are these?
(Long silence)
A. Trousers. (Pause) Spodnie [trousers].
R. Oh. I see. And these?
A, M. Majtki, majtki, majtki! [Pants, pants, pants].
(More laughing and pointing).

20. R. What can you see Peter?
A. (Pointing to her tights).
R. Tights? Tights Peter? Do you have tights Peter?
P. No!
R. No.
A, M. Noooo!! (laughter).

25 R. Do boys have tights? No. Shall we look at another picture Peter?
P. Yey.
(Picture of the family having breakfast in the kitchen).
(All children looking at picture).
R. What can you see Anna?
P. I see banan [banana]. It's there. Banan [banana] is there. Banan – banana was there.
R.  Good boy! What can you see Anna?

30.  A.  I can see.........

P.  *Banan* [banana] (squealing).

R.  Where are the children? Peter, Peter? Where are they?

M.  Girl, girl, girl, boy. Mmmmm.....

(All children looking at picture).

R.  What room is it?

35.  M.  Girl, girl, girl, boy.

R.  Are they in the kitchen?

A, M.  Yeah.

R.  Kitchen. O.K. Bread? (pointing to picture at top of page with Polish word alongside).

A.  *Chleb* [bread].........  *Mleko* [milk].

40.  R.  *Mleko*?

A.  Milk

R.  Milk?

A.  *Mleko* [milk].

R.  *Mleko*? [Milk]. Aaah. Milk. Um. And this one?

45.  M.  *Jajka* [eggs].

R.  *J-j-jajka*? [Eggs?].

A, M.  (Laughing) *Jajka* [eggs].

R.  *Jajka*? Eggs?

(A and M nodded).

R.  What's this? (pointing to fruit).


R.  Good girl! You know your sounds for apple don't you?

P.  *Banan*! [banana].

R.  You like bananas Peter?
P. Yeah (loudly).

R. And what's this one?
A. O – O - orange.
R. Orange. Ooooh!
A. Pomarancza [orange].

60. R. Pomarancza? [Orange?] O.K. Shall we look at another picture? Peter? Would you like to see another picture?
P. Yeah.
R. Yes? (He nods). O.K.
(Picture of the family washing up together).
A and M point to pictures at top of page and say the Polish words for table, chair and plate).
A, M. Stot [table], kresto [chair], talerz [plate].

65. R. What are they doing?
(Squealing and laughing as the 3 children notice a baby in the picture).
P. There's a cat!
A. Who's under the table?
A, M, P. Baby! (loudly with laughter).
R. He's falling down.

70. R. Oh no! Why's he under the table?
P. He's falling down.
R. Oh. O.K. He's fallen down under the table.
(More laughter).
R. Anna. What's this hiding behind the plate?
A. It's a d....... 

75. R. Quack, quack, quack!
(Picture of children playing with their toys in the living room).
(All 3 children point to the different toys and name them in Polish).

A, M, P *Kolejka* [train], *swinia* [pig], *owca* [sheep].

(R turns back to previous picture and Anna points)

A. . It’s a duuuck! There’s a *talerz* [plate].

R. Plate? *Talerz*? *Talerz*? [Plate? Plate?]


P. *Kolejka. Kolejka*. [Pig.Pig].

R. Where’s the pig?

(Laughter from all of them).

R. What noise does a pig make?

M. Clap.

85. R. What are these?


P. Is it a cow?

R. Anna. Is this *owca*? [sheep?]

A. (Nods).

A. Cat’s hiding.

90. R. Yes. The cat’s hiding behind..... the.....

A. The sofa.

R. Good girl! Where’s the horse Peter? Where’s the horse? Where’s the toy horse?

P. Errrr. There! (Points to horse in picture).

R. Oh yes. What colour is it Peter?

95. M. White and brown.

R. Good girl! Peter?

P. Brown.

R. And? (No reply from Peter). Can you find the duck? Can you find the duck?
(Shouts). Dog!

100. R. Not dog – duck. Can you find the duck?

(All 3 children point to the toy hen in the picture and shout).

R. That’s a hen.

A. Duck! (Shouts out). You’s hiding.

R. Can you see the duck Anna?

A. Yeah!

105. R. Where’s the duck Anna?

A. Hiding - toys.

R. And books?

A. Naughty!

R. Naughty duck.
Appendix I Sample Transcript No. 2

15 – REC 1012– INTERVIEW WITH CLASS TEACHER

Transcript date 17.07.2014  4.15 pm (10.10 minutes)

Recording identifier REC 1012

Context / environment

The researcher and the young Polish bilingual learners’ class teacher are in her classroom at the end of the school day. They sit together at a table. Examples of the children’s work are on display. No other adults or children are present. Discussion is based around her perceptions and observations of the children and their individual experiences in a mainstream environment. Questions were used from the schedule prepared by the researcher.

Transcription conventions

These transcription conventions will apply to all the extracts. Conventional punctuation has been used. Line numbers have been inserted.

KEY

R:             Researcher

Z:           (Newly qualified class teacher of the 3 Polish bilingual learners)

Plain font:     English

Italics:           Polish

[ ] Translation into English

( ) Contextual information

START

1.  R.       Thanks, again for talking to me after school. How have things gone this term with Anna, Maria and Peter do you think?

5.  Z.       Well. I’m really pleased with all of them. They have done well in their assessments as you know and they’ve made good progress when you think of what they were like at the beginning. They’re all talking a lot more and made new friends, not just Polish ones but the English children as well. Really nice to see. Peter is very friendly with Ellis and they play together outside school which is good cos Peter missed Oliver when he went back to Poland you know.

10. R.       Yes. I know. He’s doing so well and mum is very pleased with his English. She was telling me that he uses Polish and English at home now.

Z.       That’s interesting cos I don’t really hear him speaking Polish much in class. Maybe outside. Don’t know. Anyway he’s doing well with his sounds and
reading and can now form a few sentences, so he’s doing well. He tries so hard all of the time and is now trying to work independently and I know he practises at home. He’s now beginning to recognise letters of the alphabet and numbers up to 10. There are still areas for Peter to develop but he’s highly motivated to learn English.

He’s so polite to his friends and adults around the school. He’s always keen to cooperate and now joins in our activities and not staying on the outside as he was back in September. He likes working in a group and now he enjoys school. He’s achieved all the Early Learning Goals and reached the expected levels. He’s caught up a bit.

R. That’s great. I’m really pleased. How about Maria? Last time we spoke you were a bit concerned about her progress weren’t you?

Z. Yeah. I was. We all were. Now she’s got her new glasses, things have improved a great deal. We spoke to mum and she was very supportive and told us that Maria couldn’t recognise her sounds in Polish at home either which was interesting. She’s been having extra help from Helen and that’s helped a lot. She’s gaining confidence now and trying to make her own friends a bit more. Not so dependent on Anna. They fell out some time ago, as Anna no longer wanted to play with her as she thought she was a baby which upset Maria, as you can imagine. She just couldn’t keep up with Anna. The gap widened so much. They’re in different groups for everything and Anna’s friends with Kate next door now (another Polish child in the parallel class). I had a word with Anna and she agreed to include Maria at playtimes. I think she has, as Maria is not so tearful now, but it’s a shame. She finds literacy hard but she has improved during the year. She’s beginning to hear the initial sounds when writing unfamiliar words and understands that her sentences need to have a capital letter at the beginning and a full stop at the end. We’re all so proud of her achievements. She’s tried so hard and, she’s managed to make progress. She hasn’t quite achieved the Early Learning Goals, but she’s still made progress. I think she’ll continue to thrive in Year 1.

R. That’s great news. She seems much more confident now, doesn’t she?

Z. Yes. It’s lovely to see.

R. Shall we talk about Anna now?

Z. Of course. Anna’s done very well indeed and has achieved all the Early Learning Goals and is very keen and enthusiastic to learn. She can talk to me fluently and seems to understand most of what I’m saying. As I said, I’ve not really heard her talk in Polish in class but I know she does with Maria and her friend Kate next door at playtime. She’s always enthusiastic and still happy to translate for Maria, though they’re not so close now as I mentioned. She’s made lots of friends among the English children as well and invites them to join her outside in her games and our activities. Anna’s always been the most confident out of the three. She’s always busy and enthusiastic. It’s been lovely to see her growing in confidence over the year. You know, she’s always up for a challenge and makes the most of everything that’s on offer.
She's happy to share her ideas with the class. She's been a real support to the other Polish children. Her sounds knowledge is very good and she's reading lots of different books and enjoys sharing them with me. She's now writing her sentences independently and loves to talk about her work, but always happy to help others which is nice.

R. That's wonderful isn't it? Thanks so much for letting me know how they're all getting on. Great.

STOP – end of transcript
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Recording identifier REC 005

Context / environment

Researcher and 2 parents (Agnes, mother of Peter and Martha, mother of Maria). The parents are invited by the researcher to stay after they had dropped off their children to their classroom in Foundation Stage. The recording takes place in the library in the morning. The interview is conducted seated at a table and questions are raised from the schedule prepared by the researcher. Their concerns and views are discussed in relation to their children’s experiences in their first year of schooling. No other adults or children are present.
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These transcription conventions will apply to all the extracts. Conventional punctuation has been used. Line numbers have been inserted.

KEY
R: Researcher
A: Peter’s mother
M: Maria’s mother

Plain font: English
Italics: Polish
[ ] Translation into English
( ) Contextual information

START

1. R. OK. Thank you very much for coming in. It’s really kind of you
   M. That’s fine.

5. R. O.K. As you know I’m a teacher at this school and I teach in the Foundation Stage, three days a week and the rest of the time I’m studying for a Doctorate in Education and one of my great interests is children who speak English as an Additional Language. So, I’ve been teaching for forty years. Long time.
   A. Long time!

10. R. I taught in two major cities and now in (names the local town) and always
had children in my classes who had English as an Additional Language from countries all over the world and it's something I'm really interested in, and part of my job here as well as being a class teacher is to assess or find out how the children are progressing in the whole school not just in your class, so that's part of my job as well. So I know about the children in school and how they're progressing and how they behave but I haven't got very much information on their home life and about the Polish and the English and how it all fits together, so I was wondering if you could... We won't be talking about the individual progress of the children because that's between you and Mrs. Z and that's private. But I really wanted to know... Well, have you got any questions first about what I've just told you. Any questions?

A. No. That's O.K.

R. And you're happy for me to ask you?

A/M. Yes.

R. Part of the research is to listen to the way they're talking to each other to other Polish children and also to English children and it's very important and probably you agree as well that they keep their Polish as well as their English and keep them going together because they're going to be bilingual.

A. Aha.

R. I wondered how you felt about how you balance the English and the Polish, how that works at home. Is it very different at home as to how they are at school?

M. I'm thinking that maybe it is different because she didn't speak before in English. She spoke a little bit in nursery but in the home we are only speaking Polish.

R. Of course. Yes.

M. And in the beginning when she start here she had a little trouble. She couldn't understand. We speak no English at home. But for now she is a more confident. She understands more. She start to spoke at home and in English.

R. At home?

M. Yes. She coming to me and she speak in English, and I think it's much better now than in the beginning.

R. She went to nursery?

M. Yes.

R. Right and she was born in England wasn't she?

M. Yes.

R. And then she went to (names local nursery).
M. Yes.

50. R. With Anna?
M. Yes. With Anna.
R. They’re good friends?
M. Yes. They are (laughing). They love each other. Yes.
R. So do they see each other?

55. M. After school? Yes.
R. And when they’re together do they speak Polish?
M. Yes only in Polish, but sometimes when they play I think that now they also use English. They try a little bit. Maria and Anna will be Mrs. Z. For example, Maria is a teacher and...

60. R. (Laughing). They play “schools!”
M. (Laughing). Yes. They play “schools”.
R. O.K. Is it the same with Peter?
A. It was very hard at the beginning with his English, because he finished the nursery after one year and they speak English to him.

65. R. Which nursery?
A. Just around the corner.
R. He didn’t speak English or Polish?
A. No. He didn’t speak English after one year. I was a bit afraid. What’s going on? But now he’s fine. We don’t speak English at home.

70. R. No.
A. At all, because at the beginning I tried to speak English at home to push him to start speaking, but now not. We carry on in Polish, but Peter’s got a sister (she is 18 and studying A levels at the local secondary school) a bigger one and sometimes they... I see them speaking English between them. It’s like for them to show mummy how they can speak now (laughing).

75. R. You must be very proud of them.
A. Yes. Yes. And I’m very proud of them.
R. We all are. Lovely, lovely children and we’re very happy to have them in our school. We’re very proud to have them. So, in the nursery you were a little bit worried because he was silent for a year? Would you say?
A. Yeah.
And the teachers there?

(inaudible). But he understood but he didn't speak so....

It's quite normal.

Yeah, but for one year?

It can be longer.

Yeah, so I was a bit afraid and he behave like if someone talk to me in English it mean.... it looked like. He looked like it's not to me because it's in English. (Laughing). So I was a bit afraid.

Would it have helped in the nursery if someone could speak Polish? A Teaching Assistant? How would you feel?

Nooo.

Some schools round here who have a lot of Polish children have Polish speaking Teaching Assistants. But we don't unfortunately.

But I think they become lazy with the Polish speaking teacher.

To help them translate? But you think they've got to try on their own?

I think it's better like now.

OK. So school is English and home is Polish.

Yes.

And the two seem to be mixing a bit now?

Maybe in the beginning. (Referring back to bilingual help in the class). Maybe. But after a while it better, but in the beginning...

In the beginning we are mum so it is better to be speaking Polish around them because we are mum but now I think it is fine.

And with Maria? She had Anna didn't she so they could talk to each other, whereas Peter was on his own by the sound of it, with no other Polish child (in the nursery).

No other Polish child.

Do you think that helps? More confident?

She feel more confident because of Anna. More Polish children. She feel more confident but after a while she play only and talk with Polish kids because she can talk with them. She can play with them.

She can relax?
Yes. She can relax. There are some Polish children here.

There are four in Maria’s class and one in the class next door.

Here she has Anna, Peter and Oliver and I know Maria only she talks in Polish and after a while I speak to Mrs. Z and she says that maybe after a while she start speaking English.

It must be very hard. Part of my study is how they do this how they manage to speak and listen in English and learn even though it’s in another language. It must be very hard. Do they get tired? Do they find it difficult?

With Peter. It was like when he started this school at the beginning he was crying. When he saw me, when he saw me waiting he was like very quiet really, because in the nursery it was just three hours.

Aah. Just the morning.

Yes. Playing all the time.

Didn’t have to really listen and focus like we do?

Yes. After long day he looked very tired. With all the English people and English all the time.

Too much?

Yes. It was too much. It was for one week in the beginning. I have to carry him and hug him. He was crying after school.

I think the English children as well become very tired. They’re only four.

Yeah. They are so small.

In the nursery there are only three hours. And after school, Maria she was tired as well.

And he couldn’t understand people. He couldn’t understand why he was here. He was worried like you know...

Frightening?

Yeah.

If I went to Poland now I would be very tired after a long day.

After a long day.

Sometimes you feel very left out don’t you and isolated and thinking people are laughing at you because you can’t communicate with people.

Sometimes the kids they are worried because they don’t know how to speak in English the other kids they laugh, something like that. Like with Maria I remember in the nursery she could understand but she didn’t talk like Peter.
R. She was taking it all in but it takes a long time.

M. She listened but after a while she got better.

150. R. So, with David (Maria's baby brother) how will you manage with him? Will he go to nursery like Maria? Will you speak both languages to him or just Polish?

M. Sometimes when we talk to Maria we talk to him but I know that when he finish three years like Maria I take him to nursery.

155. R. Both of you were born in Poland?

A,M. Yes.

R. Do you mind telling me how long?

A. About eight years, but we had a break in between, so we went to Poland and we came back here.

160. R. And you?

M. About ten years.

R. And what about family back in Poland how do you keep in touch?

M. On line and internet.

A. Skype.

165. R. And is it regularly?

A. We try.

R. Do you visit?

M. It's difficult and expensive. They can go on holidays and one time or two times a year.

170. R. So you are the only people in your family here?

M. Yes.

R. You don’t have sisters, brothers, aunts here? Grandparents are in Poland?

M. Yes.

A. Maybe not so many but many Polish people are here with all families, brothers, sisters know each other. I think it's easy. It's better.

175. R. Is there a large Polish community in this town that you belong to?

A. Maybe. I don’t know.

R. Do you go to clubs or social...?
A,M. No.

180. R. OK.
A. Sometimes maybe once a year we have done something because my husband he works for Polish F.A.
R. F.A?
A. Football Association. Sometimes they are in Manchester or somewhere so we attend them but it's only once a year.
R. There'll be other Polish people there?
A. Yes.
R. And I know you mentioned to me that Peter goes to Polish class in London every Saturday?
A. Yes. Every Saturday. Yes, but you know in Poland it's different education. They should go to school when they are seven not four.
R. Much later.
A. Yeah, but all nurseries in Poland they provide education.
R. For free?
A. Yes. They provide education but our nursery is like a preschool but stay in nursery till they're six, seven.
R. Is that how you were educated?
A,M. Yes.
A. So the Polish school in London is the same system so Peter goes there to play, to learn some Polish poems?
R. Rhymes?
A. Yes. Rhymes, songs and to play with other Polish kids and there is a rule they can only speak Polish in Polish school. No English but there is a problem sometimes because they used to use English language between them so in Polish school they are trying to speak Polish and it's easier for them especially when their families meet. I mean father and brother and parents. Peter only learns rhymes and songs. That's it.
R. And Maria does she go to Polish school? I know there is one in our town.
A. At (names local secondary school).
R. Yes. That's right.
M. No.
A. It’s really expensive. At the beginning they had real good prices but now it’s very expensive.

R. How important do you think it is for them to keep their culture and their language?

215. M. It’s very important. We are here but...

A. We don’t know...

R. About the future?

A. Yes.

M. Exactly. Yeah.

220. R. So you might go back?

M. Now we are here but maybe after one year after two years we may go back.

R. And then they’ll have to slot back into the Polish system won’t they? So you like to keep things going at home in the way of culture.

A. Especially because sometimes people know they stay here but for example in my situation we just don’t know because my husband is changing his places so we don’t know so we must keep the Polish language.

225. R. It’s important for them as well isn’t it? It’s part of their identity.

M. When they speak to their grandparents they have to speak to them in Polish.

R. Of course. They expect that don’t they? Do you have books in Polish at home? Picture books and bedtime stories that they join in with?

M. All our books are in Polish. We have a couple in English but that’s all.

R. We have quite a few books in school that are in Polish and English in both languages that they quite enjoy reading. Their vocabulary is very good isn’t it? It’s really encouraging. Do you go to English classes?

A. Yes. I do. Because with me I don’t know what will be in the future so I want to improve my English as well as I can.

R. Is there anything you want to ask me? Anything you want to tell me?

A. No not really. We came here for you.

240. R. Thank you. You’re very kind. Have you seen any changes since September? Any changes in the way they’re acting or...they’re growing up...how their language is developing?

M. Before they speak. Now much better in English. In school they seem more confident as we said.

245. R. And are they happy in school?
M. Yes. They always want to stay in school. Maria says Mummy, mummy can I go to school when it is holiday! She ask me many times, can I go to school? She loves her teacher at school.

R. That’s good. Do they talk about things they’ve done in Polish to you? They can relate it back to what they did in school? They don’t tell you in English what they did in school?

M. In Polish.

R. Yes. Then you can ask them back what they did.

A. Peter. If he speaks about school he always speaks in English.

R. Ah. OK.

A. Because it’s easier for him. I think it’s easier for him to not translate what that teacher say. So that’s why he speaks English when he talk about school.

R. Maria? Does she do a bit of both?

M. She only speak in Polish.

R. And what about friends? I know the girls are very friendly aren’t they? So they play together at each other’s houses?

M. Yes. They play together at our houses.

R. And I know Peter is very friendly with Oliver isn’t he?

A. Yes. We are in touch after school as well.

R. And you went on holiday together!

A. Yes (laughing).

R. And what about English friends do they come round at all?

A. Ah.

M. At our house? No.

A. I ask one of the mums. Peter loves Ellis as well. I want to ask Liam’s mum because I see her not very often because she has a nanny. I ask Ellis’ mum actually. I don’t know I was a bit disappointed because they really love each other so they could be really good friends. I will ask Liam’s mum.

R. Maybe in the holidays because people are working and it’s not always easy. You’re pleased with the way they’re progressing. The children are happy at school. All that’s wonderful. We were thinking about bilingual teachers or Teaching Assistants. You think it’s better if it’s just in English and that helps them?

A. Er.
280. R. You’re happy with that. OK. Do you think there’s anything we could do as a school that might help more with your children?

A. Just one thing. I think at the beginning when the child is starting school, it doesn’t matter if it’s very young or a bit older when he start to speak English, the child I mean when he’s starting school, it will be easier and maybe they will feel more confident with bilingual teachers because just at the start, maybe one month, to settle them in at the beginning because children are very, very I can’t find proper word. They are like closed inside, they are very afraid inside at the beginning so it could be...

R. Helpful?

285. A. Yeah. Because there are more hours than nursery and if something happens to them, even with my older girl it was like someone hit her and she couldn’t say it to teacher and kids always put on her the blame and she couldn’t.

R. Can’t defend herself.

290. A. Yes. And it was very stressful for her. Kids are just kids. It’s normal someone hits someone.

R. They can be very unkind as well.

A. Yes. It would be very helpful if they can have support with one teacher at the beginning.

R. So they can be the go between.

295. A. Just for one month. Not longer, just to settle them.

R. September was quite difficult then?

A. Mmmmm.

M. (Laughing). Yes it was!

R. I understand. Thank you. And do you think there are things we’re doing right? It’s very helpful what you’ve told me. Obviously you are pleased with how things are going but if there is something we can do and put something like that in place. It’s difficult. In some schools there are a lot of Polish children and they employ a Polish assistant but we have many different languages so it’s not quite so easy but I understand the point that you’ve made. That’s very interesting. And you’re happy for them to speak Polish at school? You don’t worry about that?

A. Yes. Of course. I think they will start to talk English between them but it takes a while.

R. Not when I’m listening when they see this (pointing to recorder).

300. A. (Laughing).

R. Because I know at the beginning you asked me why do you want to record
their Polish and I said it shows us that they're developing in both languages so it gives us a really good idea.

M. (Laughing).

R. Is there anything they find difficult? Anything they find hard? Anything in school that they come home and say I couldn’t do that or that was hard or difficult to understand or any part of the school day is not so easy?

325. A. I didn’t notice.

R. Do they worry about anything?

M. No. I don’t think so. Sometimes they have better days or bad days. They don’t want to play.

330. R. Not friends any more?

M. Yes.

R. Nothing you can think of? OK. Anything they really enjoy at school?

A. Golden Time of course! (Laughing). What does it mean loony jobs?

R. Oh! Learning jobs!

335. A, M. Ah! Learning jobs!

M. And Maria says yennis jobs. I say what do you mean?

A. Loony means for me cartoon.

R. Or mad. Learning jobs...

M. Learning jobs!

340. R. Every morning when you see them and we start either literacy or maths every day and they sit on the carpet and they often watch something on the IWB and you talk to them about a story and they do a little bit of writing and THEN when they’ve done that they can then go either if it’s fine they can go outside or into the outside classroom or the shared area and then they can choose. So they can go in the home corner, cooking or building blocks, playing on the bikes.

A. Ah!

R. Anything they like for half an hour and then phonics. You know about phonics? Every day they learn their sounds of the letters and words. Then they have their snack and MORE learning jobs and then it’s lunchtime.

350. A. You know a funny thing I noticed that even my English is not with real English accent, it is with my Polish accent. Yeah, but even if I tell something to him with wrong accent he doesn’t say to me mummy you told me wrong but when he repeating me he always keeps his good accent not mine even if he repeating me he knows, he changes it. That is really interesting.
R. He is repeating it in English with an English accent.

M. We’ve got a hard English, the Polish. It’s difficult. Yes. She pronounce much better. Her accent is much different than ours.

A. They understand ours with our bad accent but when they are repeating they pronounce it different. Sometimes I try to repeat them but for me with my voice it sounds different. It’s probably because they learn English by listening and they learn English from English people, not from Polish people.

R. Thank you. It’s been really helpful.

A,M. You’re welcome.
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