Copyright Notices

Notice 1

Under the Copyright Act 1968, this thesis must be used only under the normal conditions of scholarly fair dealing. In particular no results or conclusions should be extracted from it, nor should it be copied or closely paraphrased in whole or in part without the written consent of the author. Proper written acknowledgement should be made for any assistance obtained from this thesis.

Notice 2

I certify that I have made all reasonable efforts to secure copyright permissions for third-party content included in this thesis and have not knowingly added copyright content to my work without the owner's permission.

PRACTICES IN YOUNG CHILDREN'S FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS: A COLOMBIAN-AUSTRALIAN COMPARISON

ANA CRISTINA MANTILLA

BBA (Honours) (Universidad de Los Andes), MEd (Monash University)

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for

the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Education

Monash University

December 2011

ABSTRACT

This thesis describes instructional practices in foreign language classrooms for young children in one private school in Australia and one private school in Colombia, between October and December 2008. The aim of the study was to describe everyday lessons and investigate patterns of similarities and variations in classroom practices across the two contexts. Observations (with and without a video camera) were conducted of four teachers as they taught French (in Australia) and in English (in Colombia) across a total of seven classrooms for children aged between three and six years. Each teacher was also interviewed, and documents (including teachers' notes and planning material, and guidelines for foreign language programmes and school curricula) were examined.

A transformation of participation perspective (Rogoff, 1995, 1998, 2003) was employed as an important and new theoretical informant to the field of Second Language Acquisition, allowing investigation of practices in relation to the contributions of the classroom participants and the ongoing – and changing – influences of the wider institutions of which they are a part. This perspective was applied throughout the study, which also relied on a case study research strategy for the design of the research fieldwork and methods.

The thesis argues that classroom activities are an appropriate unit of analysis for the study of foreign language classroom practices and provides a rich description of these activities. This study shows that there were multiple patterns of similarities – and only one variation - across contexts, with teachers employing common aims for activities (to teach, balance lessons and celebrate), a limited use of space and resources, and a transmission model of instruction, but a

difference in the consistency of the teachers' use of their first and second languages. Because of the lack of contrast between two (intentionally chosen) alternative linguistic scenarios, the thesis turns to an investigation of the cultural and pedagogical practices of schooling, including the Accelerative Integrated Method, immersion and the Primary Years Programme used variously in the two settings, and shows how reflection on these institutions provides an explanation for the regularities in classroom practices found in the study.

The thesis argues that young children have been given no voice, both in the literature on second language acquisition and in actual practices within lessons. Children (especially those in the pre-school years) have been mostly omitted from the literature or considered as not having sufficient language knowledge to significantly contribute to lessons. Similarly in everyday classrooms, the pervasiveness of traditional modes of schooling, as well as the beliefs and lack of support given by programmes and curriculums to foreign language teachers, strengthens their positioning as passive learners. The thesis concludes by suggesting possibilities for further research, arguing that without more rigorous research on classroom practices with a sociocultural framework, there will be no significant development in our understanding of young children's foreign language learning in classroom settings.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is with great excitement that I thank those who made this thesis possible. I especially want to thank my principal supervisor, Associate Professor Joce Nuttall for making my research life exciting and rewarding with her continuous intellectual challenging, rigorous research and frankness. I was delighted to have Dr Margaret Gearon as my associate supervisor and thank her for providing invaluable direction on second language research. I wish to thank her and Dr Anne-Marie de Mejía for facilitating my access to schools. I am indebted to the teachers, children and schools that were part of my research. I also wish to thank Dr Suzy Edwards, Gloria Quiñones, Dr M. Patricia Rivalland, Dr Hilary Monk, and Dr Avis Ridgway for their comments and advice. Also, I am heartily grateful with Dr Holli Tonyan, who encouraged me to embark on this research journey and who strategically guided me through my first year of studies.

I would like to acknowledge that this research was supported by an Australian Postgraduate Award (2006 – 2009) and by funding from the Faculty of Education Research Degrees and Induction Committee.

A huge ‘gracias’ to my parents Bernardo and Inelda whose example and teachings led me to doctoral studies overseas in my second language; and a very special thank you also to José Gabriel, Carolina, Tatiana, Juan Jaime and Esperanza as their help made the completion of this thesis possible. I dedicate this thesis to my boys Matías and Nicolás who were born while this thesis was written and kept me joyful and grounded. And to my husband Juan Pablo whose unconditional love, patience and sense of humour kept me motivated, strong and focused.

DECLARATIONS

This thesis contains no material that has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any educational institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference is made in the text of the thesis.

Signed: …………………………………………..

The research for this thesis received the approval of the Monash University Standing Committee for Ethical Research on Humans (Reference number: CF07/2195 – 2007001522)

Notice 1

Under the Copyright Act 1968, this thesis must be used only under the normal conditions of scholarly fair dealing. In particular no results or conclusions should be extracted from it, nor should it be copied or closely paraphrased in whole or in part without the written consent of the author. Proper written acknowledgement should be made for any assistance obtained from this thesis.

Notice 2

I certify that I have made all reasonable efforts to secure copyright permissions for third-party content included in this thesis and have not knowingly added copyright content to my work without the owner's permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iv

DECLARATIONS iv

TABLE OF CONTENTS vi

LIST OF APPENDICES xii

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

Chapter Overview *1*

Identification of the Research Aim *2*

The Beginning: Personal Narrative as Foundation of Research Interest 2

The Importance of Foreign Language Pedagogy in Early Childhood 6

Current Status of Literature on FL Learning and Teaching 10

The Aim of the Study *12*

The Research Questions 13

The Study's Contribution 14

The Context for this Research *15*

Languages Other Than English in Australia 17

FL Education in Colombia Today 22

The Two Private Schools in My Study 26

Thesis Overview *27*

Chapter Summary *29*

CHAPTER 2: ROGOFF'S TRANSFORMATION OF PARTICIPATION PERSPECTIVE: A RESEARCH APPROACH WITHIN SOCIOCULTURAL THEORY 30

Chapter Overview *30*

Barbara Rogoff and Sociocultural Theory: The Origins of her Transformation of Participation Perspective *31*

Lev S. Vygotsky: The Originator of Cultural-Historical Theory 33

Vygotsky's Cultural-Historical Theory: A Dialectical-Materialist Theory of Cognitive Development 35

Vygotsky's Perspective on the Relation between Learning and Development 41

Post -Vygotskyan Research Approaches 44

Barbara Rogoff's Research Approach 48

Barbara Rogoff: A Leading Psychologist with Anthropological, Sociological and Educational Sensibilities 48

Rogoff's Transformation of Participation Perspective 53

Participatory Appropriation 56

Guided Participation 58

Apprenticeship 59

Rogoff's Transformation of Participation Perspective in This Study 65

Chapter Summary *69*

CHAPTER 3: ROGOFF'S TRANSFORMATION OF PARTICIPATION PERSPECTIVE: A NEW PERSPECTIVE FOR STUDYING SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION 71

Chapter Overview 71

Second Language Acquisition: Main Theories and Sociocultural Theory 72

Behaviourism and Innatism 73

Information Processing and Connectionism 74

Interactionism 75

Socioculturalism 76

Rogoff's Transformation of Participation Perspective in SLA 79

Chapter Summary 80

CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH DESIGN 82

Chapter Overview 82

A Case Study of Classroom Practices across Contexts 82

Selection of one Private School in Each Country 83

Consent from Teachers, Families and Schools 85

Data Generation 87

Classroom Observations 88

Interviews 92

Documentation 93

Data Analysis 94

Unit of Analysis 95

Data Interpretation 97

Thematic Categories 107

Reliability and Validity of the Research Design *108*

Chapter Summary *110*

CHAPTER 5: CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING IN EARLY CHILDHOOD 111

Chapter Overview *111*

French at High Mount Girls Grammar School *112*

The Teaching of French in the Early Learning Centre, Prep and Year 1 113

An Everyday French Lesson in the Early Learning Centre 116

An Everyday French Lesson in Prep and Year 1 118

Classroom Activities in French Lessons 120

Classroom Activities across the Four Classrooms: Music, Routine, Book Reading, Movement Game and Counting 120

Classroom Activities only in the Early Learning Centre: Prop-labelling and Naming 125

Classroom Activities only in Prep and Year 1: Scripted Play, Pure Instruction and Drawing/Colouring 127

English and Primary Years Programme at The Canterbury School *131*

Teaching in English in Pre-School 133

Letterland 135

PYP Lesson 136

Mathematics 138

Language Arts 139

Classroom Activities in Lessons in English 142

Classroom Activities across the Three Classrooms: Routine and Music 142

Guiding and Complementary Classroom Activities in Pre-Jardín and Jardín: Letterland, Pure Instruction and Book reading with Prop-labelling, Experimenting, Drawing/Colouring and Presenting.................................. 145

Guiding Classroom Activities in Transición: Writing and Presenting........ 152

Chapter Summary.. *153*

CHAPTER 6: REGULARITIES IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM PRACTICES ACROSS SITES..155

Chapter Overview.. *155*

Aims of Classroom Activities.. *156*

Teaching Language and/or Concepts 156

Balance 158

Celebration... 159

Models of Instruction.. *160*

Transmission 171

Pedagogical Principles of FL Education in Early Childhood *172*

Environment and Resources 172

Experiential Learning.. 175

Verbal and Non-Verbal Language Use 176

Chapter Summary.. *179*

CHAPTER 7: ACCOUNTING FOR MAIN REGULARITIES ACROSS SITES...181

Chapter Overview.. *181*

The Transmission Model as an Impact of the Traditional Formats of Western Formal Schooling *182*
Teacher as Initial Sole Foreign Language Provider in AIM 183
Teacher-Centeredness and Transmission in Immersion 185
The Transmission Model and Teachers' Language Use at The Canterbury School *186*
PYP: An Emerging Philosophy at The Canterbury School 187
PYP and Early Immersion: A Uniquely Complex Curriculum 188
Chapter Summary *192*
CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSION 194
Chapter Overview *194*
Summary of Main Claims *194*
The Big Surprise: Where is the Contrast? 198
Benefits of a Transformation of Participation Perspective for This Thesis *199*
Suggestions for Further Research *200*
REFERENCES 202
APPENDICES 233

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A – Explanatory Statement for the Foreign Language Teachers …233

Appendix B – Informed Consent Form for the Foreign Language Teachers ..238

Appendix C – Explanatory Statement for the School Principal / Junior School Head ……………………………………………………………………………………241

Appendix D – Draft Letter for the School Principal / Junior School Head to Grant Institutional Consent ……………………………………………………………….246

Appendix E – Explanatory Statement for Parents / Guardians of Students in the Foreign Language Classroom (Australia) ……………………………………….248

Appendix F – Informed Consent Form for Parents / Guardians of Students in the Foreign Language Classroom (Australia)………………………………………. 253

Appendix G – Explanatory Statement for Parents / Guardians of Students in the Foreign Language Classroom (Colombia)……………………………………….257

Appendix H – Informed Consent Form for Parents / Guardians of Students in the Foreign Language Classroom (Colombia)…………………………………. 262

Appendix I – Guiding Questions for Foreign Language Teachers' Interview...266

Appendix J –Summary of a Transcript from a Teacher's Interview………….. 268

Appendix K – Thematic Categories for Analysing FL Classroom Activities in FL Lessons………………………………………………………………………………. 271

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

> Children born into the world on any given day arrive already equipped with a universal potential for acquiring language, any language(s) to which they are exposed and with which they interact. In the case of these same children, within 2–3 years, this potential will have transformed itself into over 5000 different languages being spoken. This suggests that a life lived monolingually misses out on something that is essentially human. (Richard Johnstone in Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009, p. iii)

Chapter Overview

This research is about instructional practices in young children's foreign language classrooms. It is also about cross-cultural research as it focuses on the practices undertaken in two private schools in cultural communities (one in Melbourne, Australia and one in Bogotá, Colombia) with contrasting linguistic goals. It is also about sociocultural theory as it draws on Rogoff's work as a novel perspective to discuss foreign language education. In this chapter I describe the identification of the research aim (showing why foreign language education in early childhood is important and the current status of the literature in the field); explain the aims, research questions and significance of the study; contextualise the participating schools within the characteristics of each nation's foreign language education systems; and finish with an overview of the thesis.

Identification of the Research Aim

My decision to commence doctoral studies was motivated by my history and worldview, along with a clear understanding of the current and complex challenges present in the field of second language pedagogy in early childhood. Consequently, to be able to explain the purpose and rationale for this study, I begin with a brief narrative about myself and the research paradigm I adhere to, and then focus on explaining the relevance of a) studying second language teaching and learning and b) doing so in early childhood.

The Beginning: Personal Narrative as Foundation of Research Interest

I arrived to Australia in 2003 to commence a Master of Education (Early Childhood) at Monash University, nearly two years after completing an honours degree in Business Management at the Universidad de Los Andes in Bogotá, Colombia (South America). I had no academic background in education and my experience working with children was limited to volunteer undergraduate work leading projects aimed at improving the nutrition, hygiene and after school education programmes of three low-income communities in Bogotá. Nevertheless, I have always been passionate about children and for many years had been keen on founding an innovative early childhood institution. This desire motivated my interest to combine my managerial skills and knowledge with postgraduate studies in early childhood education and I chose the Faculty of Education at Monash to be the place to fulfil this dream.

As a postgraduate student at Monash, I was excited with the theoretical and empirical educational research to which I was exposed. I was constantly curious and enthusiastic about describing and understanding the – normally contrasting – characteristics of early childhood education services, settings and classrooms, qualification systems and pedagogical practices, between Australia and Colombia. Simultaneously, I began working as a Spanish teacher for a private language institute that runs 50-minute to two-hour sessions using a play-based programme for young children (1-7 years). Firstly and importantly, teaching my first language in Australia was a fascinating experience that awakened my life-long love for languages and cultures. It reminded me of my own long journey learning English at school from the age of three, and of my – less successful but still exciting – experience learning French as an adolescent. It also made vivid the multiple adventures (personal, academic and professional) I have been able to have, the wonderful people I have met, the great books I have read in the authors' own words, and the worlds I now know thanks to having these three languages in my pocket. Secondly, I became aware of the need to explain the importance of learning a language other than English in Australia as I was – and continue to be – constantly questioned about my work as if there was something wrong with English-speaking families who want to expose their children to another language. This proved to be a challenging and complex question for me as my experience, and the fact that Colombia is a country where learning a second language is promoted and of high prestige (de Mejía, 2004, p. 3), make the benefits of bilingualism obvious to me. In brief, it was surprising for me that in Australia – a developed country with a multicultural population and innovative

philosophies of teaching (which I had learned about in my Masters and was continuing to understand through the research projects I was now involved in at the Faculty of Education) – learning a language other than English is not seen as important and is not being actively fostered throughout early childhood services and primary schools. Lastly, as my interest and knowledge increased (via study of research literature, experiences and conversations with families and colleagues) I started to identify that there were still many misunderstandings surrounding the area of bilingualism (for example, fears about confusion and language delays), and a general lack of information available for the wider community about the benefits of learning a second language, so I also started to question the appropriateness of the programme I was using for teaching in truly supporting and fostering the learners' second language.

Through both my postgraduate studies and research work experience, I had identified sociocultural theory as the paradigm that most strongly corresponds with my worldview, research interests and understandings of teaching and learning. I disagree with the traditional constructivist view which is still prevalent in many early childhood education settings around the world (Fleer, Hedegaard, & Tudge, 2009) and the stage-based developmental framework it entails (Edwards & Fleer, 2003; Fleer, Tonyan, Mantilla, & Rivalland, 2008). To me, development and learning cannot be understood unless integrated in "social, cultural, and historical context" (Rogoff, 2003, p. 50): a proposition which is the common ground for sociocultural theorists and originated with Lev Vygotsky and his cultural-historical theory (Chapter 2). Specifically, amongst the various post-Vygotskyan research approaches, I am

fascinated by the work of the North American sociocultural psychologist Barbara Rogoff, who states that "humans develop through their *changing participation* in the sociocultural activities of their communities, which also change" (Rogoff, 2003, p. 11; my emphasis). Her 'transformation of participation' perspective (Chapter 2) highlights the use of individual, interpersonal and cultural-institutional lenses of analysis to study "how children actually participate in sociocultural activities to characterize how they contribute to those activities. The emphasis changes from trying to infer what children *can* think to interpreting what and how they *do* think" (Rogoff, 1997, p. 273; emphasis in original). In addition, her work emphasizes studying patterns of variations and similarities within and across cultural communities; which, along with her – more practical – work on communities of learners (e.g. Rogoff, Goodman Turkanis, & Bartlett, 2001), shows a commitment (which I share) to explore cultural processes that explain learning and can therefore help transform pedagogy.

To sum up, my personal, academic and professional experience as a second language learner and teacher in Colombia and abroad, an immigrant in Australia, a post-graduate student, and researcher in the field of early childhood education and sociocultural theory, framed my own thinking and heightened my interest in researching second language pedagogy in early childhood across cultures.

In reviewing the existing conceptual and empirical research on second language learning and teaching, the impressions I had gained through my practical and personal experiences concerning the relevance of learning a second language and the misconceptions surrounding this cognitive activity were reinforced. Thus the literature review (which included reading renowned theorists (e.g. Chomsky, 1957; Chomsky, 1967; Krashen, 1982, 2004; Lantolf, 2000, 2003; Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Lantolf & Pavlenko, 1995; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Lantolf & Thorne, 2007; Thorne, 2005) books from Baker (1993, 2006), Ellis (1985, 1997), Lightbown and Spada (1999) and McLaughlin (1978), as well as refereed journal papers and videos from a variety of prominent researchers) highlighted a) the differentiation of learning a 'second' language from learning a 'foreign' language and the focus of this study on the latter; b) the relevance of learning a second or foreign language as it brings various invaluable benefits for learners, and c) the significance of starting this learning process early.

In the literature on Second Language Acquisition (see trajectory of this body of research in Chapter 3), the term 'second' is not "intended to contrast with 'foreign'" because it applies to both learners who "are learning a language naturally as a result of living in a country" and those who are "learning it in a classroom" (Ellis, 1985, p. 3). However, I found that most research (both conceptual and empirical) in young children's second language (hereafter L2) acquisition focuses on English as a second language (ESL) and particularly on ESL learning / teaching within English speaking communities (e.g. Beligan, Clyne, & Lotherington, 1999; Clark, November 5-7, 2000; Collier, 1995; Döpke,

McNamara, & Quinn, 1991; Francis, Fall 1999; Lee, 1996; A. Liddicoat, 1991; Makin, Campbell, & Jones Diaz, 1995; McLaughlin, 1992, 1995; Saunders, 1991; Saville-Troike, 1982; Siraj-Blatchford & Clarke, 2000). This means that the children who have been studied more extensively are those who speak a minority language at home with parents coming from a non-English speaking background (NESB). This is markedly different from the type of bilingual learner that this thesis is about - language majority children who come from a home where the dominant language in the society is spoken and are learning a 'foreign' language (hereafter FL). Hence, in this thesis, I explicitly make the distinction between the terms 'second' and 'foreign' by using 'second' to refer to all individuals who are learning an additional language (in a natural milieu and in a more formal environment) and using 'foreign' to refer to the learners who are of interest to this study: those who are formally learning an additional language that is not dominant in their society and where they have limited opportunities (outside the school setting) to use this language once they start learning it.

The literature also allowed me to locate my interest in languages into an area of research that has proven the multiple benefits associated with learning two or more languages: in "the past 40 years more than 150 studies have confirmed some of the mutually reinforcing relationships between non-linguistic and linguistic intellectual functioning and bilingualism" (Cummins, 2003, p. 61, as cited in Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009, p. 36). To date, research on bi/multilingualism "keeps getting better" (Hajek, November 29 2009) at explaining the benefits to learners (see for example Baker, 2006; Clyne, Pauwels, & Sussex 2007; Döpke, et al., 1991; Fernandez, 2008; Lee, 1996; Lo

Bianco & Slaughter, 2009; Makin, et al., 1995; Rado, 1991; Saunders, 1991) as individuals who are competent in more than one language – in comparison to monolinguals – have superior a) concept formation (general reasoning, divergent and creative thinking and problem-solving abilities, analytic orientation to language, superior semantic development, linguistic awareness, categorization skills, etc.), b) cognitive flexibility, and c) symbolic and visual-spatial skills. Interestingly, even learners with limited contact with a L2, show more positive attitudes to other languages and the people and culture of those who speak them; and d) metalinguistic awareness that gives L2 learners "greater flexibility in adapting to new linguistic systems" (Moore, 2006, p. 135) when "encouraged to rely on their different languages and language knowledge as positive resources" (ibid, p. 136) at school. The latter, importantly, can help explain why Yelland, Pollard and Mercuri (1993) found that young students who received Italian classes for one hour per week for six months had a "significantly higher level of word awareness than their monolingual counterparts" (p. 423); which was likely to advance their age of reading readiness in English (the L1 for this particular group of students).

Given that learning a L2 has been proved to bring invaluable benefits to learners (as well as being "critical to [societies'] economic success, national security, and international relations" (Rhodes & Pufahl, 2009)), the question of the best age to begin learning a L2 has been widely debated. Research generally shows that L2 learners of different ages "have both strengths and weaknesses" (Lotherington, 2000, p. 20) in the learning process. "Adults have more social finesse than teenagers which helps in the inevitable situations of embarrassment that second language routinely provides" (ibid), but they do not

have as much time to think and practice the L2. Older children and adolescents have better cognitive skills and learning strategies that help them to learn a L2 (especially grammar and vocabulary) faster. Finally, young children “are better at hearing and producing new sounds” (ibid) as the starting age for learning a L2 seems to determine levels of accuracy in pronunciation (Ellis, 1985). In addition, young children generally have more time to spend practicing a L2 and are better at taking risks (an important characteristic of L2 learning) (Lotherington, 2000; The British Broadcasting Corporation, 1983). Importantly, they will also have more years of exposure to the L2 that will a) allow them to build an academic proficiency in the second language after four to seven years of second language learning (Collier, 1995), and b) develop their overall communicative fluency (Ellis, 1985). As a result, “in the long-term, early starters do better in all aspects of language use” (Rado, 1991, p. 146).

Finally, I argue that the invaluable and irrefutable benefits that the activity of learning a L2 brings to learners, and the fact that these are better achieved when starting early, highlight the significance of studying L2 in early childhood. More specifically, given that this thesis is about *FL learning* and this occurs *through changing participation in non-static lessons* – commonly and most frequently – within a classroom, it is imperative to explore this context-bound cultural form (i.e. young children’s FL classrooms) by focusing on the practices that maintain and transform this cultural form.

Current Status of Literature on FL Learning and Teaching

I have previously highlighted the significance of uncovering what happens inside young children's FL classrooms. Consequently, this section briefly summarizes my review of the existing literature to show that there has been very little research done that portrays this. Chapter 3 provides a detailed discussion on the theoretical contributions of various research paradigms to the field of SLA. It highlights that most research to date has "been concerned with the nature of language learning" (Cross, 2006, p. xiv), leaving aside "what language teachers themselves bring to the process of language teaching" (ibid, p. 31) thus forgetting to "describe what exists presently in the [FL] classroom" (Tardiff, 1994, p. 467). I have shown, that even sociocultural theorists (who use a framework that foregrounds L2 learning within specific social and cultural contexts, and have promoted research to be undertaken within real everyday classrooms) have remained close to the learner and the process of learning, and thus, have not yet provided rich information on the process of participation along with the arrangements used for teaching within classrooms.

The purely empirical literature (e.g. reports, textbooks and evaluations) mostly focuses on topics like the "amount of foreign language instruction in schools, languages and types of programs offered, foreign language curriculum, teacher certification and professional development" (Rhodes & Pufahl, 2009, p. 1) in primary and secondary schools, with very little presence of studies of pre-school aged children. Specifically in regard to programmes (which is the topic above that is more closely related to my study), I found that the literature provided a clear explanation of the rationale and purpose of the

different types of programmes including their guidelines (e.g. teaching strategies such as language (s) use, focus on language or content, etc.) and “analyses of their success educating children” (Angelonova, Gunawardena, & Volk, 2006). However, a clear picture of what happened inside classrooms, how the teaching activities were actually planned and organized, and importantly, and of who participated and how, is missing in this literature. The only evidence is provided by a handful of studies or textbooks, which will be mentioned in Chapters 4 - 6 of this thesis, which exemplify some of the ‘fun activities’ and pedagogical principles used by teachers in FL school classrooms.

To summarise, examination of the literature reveals an under-researched area of study: real, everyday FL teaching activities and arrangements have rarely been described or analysed. I argue – drawing upon Rogoff’s research approach – that it is not possible to meaningfully analyse FL education, as the actual participants’ contributions and teaching practices have been ignored. In addition, young pre-school aged children have received very little attention in the current literature. Consequently, there is a need to undertake empirical research that helps to uncover the reality and complexities of everyday FL classrooms, removing the focus on the learners’ L2/FL learning process, and acknowledging the importance of all the participants involved. This study is therefore an initial step into this type of research as it is about uncovering classroom practices in young children’s FL classrooms.

The Aim of the Study

This study draws on Rogoff's sociocultural approach (Chapter 2) to identify, describe and explain young children's FL classroom practices. FL classroom practices are taken here to be culturally organised activities through which learners are taught a FL in relation to the contributions of the classrooms' participants and the ongoing – and changing – influences of the wider institutions of which they are a part. Identifying and describing the classroom's everyday activities, as well as the resources and cultural tools used to mediate the student's FL learning, is an essential part of understanding the practices. Furthermore, these cannot be understood without acknowledging their interdependence with the teachers and students' organization of participation, along with their embeddedness in broader institutional features and practices such as the history and culture of the FL programme in place, the school curricula, and national policies around FL teaching.

The FL practices are the phenomenon under study. Lessons within young children's classrooms within schools are the real-life context where the phenomenon is defined, enacted, transformed and perpetuated. For this study, FL lessons for pre-school and early primary aged children at two schools were chosen: at one private school in Melbourne (Australia) and at one in Bogotá (Colombia). The process of selecting this combination of educational contexts is described in more detail later in this Chapter. This is an important feature of this study as it is also about cross-cultural research, discerning patterns of variation and similarities (hereafter 'regularities' (Rogoff, 2003, p. 84)) of practices across the two cultural communities with contrasting linguistic goals,

where I have had the unique opportunity to participate (as a FL/L2 learner and FL teacher) and which had not been previously studied simultaneously.

The Research Questions

The main motivating research questions (Angelillo, Rogoff, & Chavajay, 2007) of this thesis are:

- What are the classroom practices in young children's (3 – 5 year olds) foreign language classrooms in one Australian and one Colombian school?
- What are the regularities of classroom practices across these contexts?

The secondary questions derived from the main motivating research questions and the study's embeddedness in Rogoff's sociocultural approach are:

- What are the classroom activities used by FL teachers to teach the FL to the children?
- How do the participants contribute to the teaching / learning process?
- How do the practices from each classroom relate to those present in the other classrooms observed within the same school? And across schools?
- How do the practices relate to the philosophies and beliefs of the FL programme in place at each school and also to the school ethos and curriculum?
- How are the practices transformed over time across the lessons observed?

- And how do these practices differ (or not) across schools? Why so?

Additional "specific empirical questions" that arose through the "ethnographic accounts" (Angelillo, et al., 2007) of the data and the interpretation process, can also be found in Chapter 4 where I explain how the thematic coding scheme was developed for this thesis.

To summarize, this study has three main aims: 1) a descriptive aim which is to describe the classroom everyday activities used to teach FLs to young children specifically in one Australian and one Colombian private school; 2) an exploratory aim which is to identify the main characteristics of classroom practices and the regularities of these practices across the two contexts; and 3) an explanatory aim which is accounting for the regularities found across sites.

The Study's Contribution

I argue that this study provides an original contribution to discussions on empirical and theoretical research on FL education. First, the study addresses a gap in the existing L2/FL literature as it a) goes beyond the current analysis of individual learners to explain L2 acquisition, and b) focuses on an age group that has not yet received attention in the literature. This study provides context-rich depictions and explanations of the culturally organised classroom activities through which young learners are taught a FL, in relation to the contributions of the classrooms' participants and the ongoing – and changing – influences of the wider institutions of which they are a part. Second, this thesis identifies the

regularities of these practices across schools in two cultural communities with contrasting linguistic goals that have not been studied simultaneously. Third, using Rogoff's work is a relevant and novel theoretical contribution to SLA (an argument explained in detail in Chapter 3), as the current focus of sociocultural theory in SLA mostly orients its enquiry towards the theoretical understanding and discussion of Vygotsky's core concepts and their implications in SLA, and does not yet incorporate central concepts from Rogoff's work such as participation, practices, culturally organised activity, cultural tools, arrangements, etc. Thus, using Rogoff's transformation of participation perspective also permits and supports this research from a new standpoint, which deepens the understanding of FL classroom practices across contexts so is of "utmost importance from a theoretical as well as from a practical perspective" for "elaborating a well-grounded theory of [FL] learning from instruction"(De Corte & Verschaffel, 2007, p. 248).

The Context for this Research

I have explained that this study is also about cross-cultural research as it investigates the instructional practices in young children's FL classrooms across two schools within two cultural communities. Rogoff's work has demonstrated that cross-cultural enquiries are valuable (when patterns and not specific behaviours or characteristics are studied (Angelillo, et al., 2007)) because they allow the comparison of processes that might reveal distinctive and yet culturally and historically meaningful ways of doing things (Rogoff, 2003). In a similar line, researchers in the emerging field of comparative education justify their studies by arguing that learning about a variety of

educational systems is "essential to educational progress" (Alexander, 2000, p. 27).

The cross-cultural nature of this study was firstly driven by my passion for cultures and my ongoing mental comparison between my home country and Australia. Given that there were no studies portraying and explaining young children's FL classrooms, I could have just studied one school or a few schools in Australia alone. However, such an enquiry would have been incomplete and ethnocentric for me. I recognize that the potential permutations for comparison are endless; however, the combination of educational contexts that was selected was the result of a deliberate and rigorous decision-making process. More specifically, this decision was discussed extensively with my supervisors and informed by comments from the Doctoral confirmation panel who reviewed my research proposal during my confirmation of candidature in January 2007. The decision was made to focus on only one type of educational context (either public or private) in Australia and Colombia considering my background as a Colombian, which provided me with a unique opportunity to meaningfully compare two educational contexts, as well as constraints of time, access and realistic scope of a doctoral thesis, while still allowing for an original contribution to the field. Classrooms for young learners within two *private* schools (one in each country) were chosen as settings because this took into consideration the Colombian and Australian compulsory schooling systems (described in more detail below) in which public schools do not generally include pre-school aged children.

I argue that these communities also provide an interesting comparison in terms of FL education as they have contrasting linguistic goals[1]: whereas Australia (along with most English native speaking nations) aims to "promote foreign language learning for educational enrichment", Colombia "promotes proficiency" in English as an "important world language" (Genesee, 2005, p. 4). This next section situates the reader in the two countries by highlighting the status of FL education in each setting and briefly explaining the most common language programmes present in them.

Languages Other Than English in Australia

Lo Bianco and Slaughter (2009), in their report on *Second Languages and Australian Schooling*, contextualize L2 education historically and politically in Australia, referring firstly to a very positive period during the middle to late 19th century, when there "were vibrant community language schools in both rural and urban Australia, flourishing non-English media and vibrant community institutions creating domains of natural use of a large number of languages" (p. 15). This period was followed by one of "closure and opposition" which began in 1918 with "several Australian states ban[ning] instruction in and through languages other than English [Ozolins, 1993], encountering little overt opposition because the affected minorities were small, dispersed and relatively powerless" (ibid). "It was not until the mid-1970s that languages returned to the primary school" (p. 28) and since then, a large number of "policy-related reports, investigations or substantial enquiries" (at least 67 until 2009) have

[1] There are also many distinctive geographical, economic, historical, political, social and cultural characteristics that I do not address explicitly in this study.

been conducted to inform L2 education provision. Lo Bianco and Slaughter argue that this number of recommendations has represented too much "chopping and changing and has served to weaken the place of languages due to continual shifting of priorities and ineffective interventions" (p. 6). Thus, this seemingly…

> … positive appreciation of the importance of language learning translates to low school completion rates in second languages, high rates of attrition from university language programs and a decline in the number of languages taught, their duration, spread and level of seriousness. A deep and persistent malaise afflicts language education in Australia, regrettably shared with other English-speaking nations, and the expressions of concern, even frustration, at the fragility of languages suggests a public refusal to accept this state of affairs (p. 1).

Nowadays in Australia, the Languages Other than English (LOTE) learning area has been identified in the *National Goals for Schooling* in 1989 and 1999 (Ministerial Council of Education Employment Training and Youth Affairs, 2005, p. 2) "as one of the eight key learning areas, and one in which all learners are expected to attain high standards of knowledge, skills and understanding". However, Clyne, Pauwels and Sussex (2007, p. 1) have stated that…

> … half the children in compulsory education in Australia are not being taught a language other than English (LOTE) in a mainstream school. The majority of those taking a LOTE are in programs with inadequate time allocation, and taught by teachers who have not received sufficient

> training or are not sufficiently proficient in the language they are teaching. […] Most schools do not require students to take a second language throughout the compulsory years of education.

The reality is that “Australian children spend less time on learning languages than students in any other Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) country” (Terry Aulich, Executive Director for the Australian Council of State School claims quoted in Ryan, 2007 p. 4). According to Clyne (2007, para. 1) this ”dominance of monolingualism underlies several language fallacies popular in Australia”. First, there is a *crowded curriculum fallacy* which suggests that the curriculum is too crowded to teach a language in addition to English. This in turn means that - in practice - any of the other key learning areas are – without objection - prioritised. Second, believing that *global English is enough* is another fallacy originated with English monolinguals and shared by English-speaking countries “in which only one language is used for official purposes” (A. J. Liddicoat, et al., 2007, p. 29). As a result, these countries are the ones where “compulsory language learning is least well established” and where “concern for participation in language learning is most commonly expressed” (ibid). However, it should be argued that given that “for most people in the world today, English is a second language […] monolingualism is not an advantageous basis for intercultural understanding and communication” (Clyne, 2007, para. 7). In fact, these two fallacies are strongly contrasted with the priority that has been given to languages in the European Union where “in 2007, 60% of students in upper secondary education studied two or more foreign languages” (Eurostat Press Office, 2009). Third, Clyne (2007, para. 5) states that “there is a *monoliteracy*

fallacy [suggesting] that literacy must be acquired through English only [which] underlies the argument that learning a second language takes away time from literacy acquisition." This is an argument that has been challenged by researchers who have shown that even very limited language programmes are useful for enhancing the learners' metalinguistic awareness and advancing the age of reading readiness in the learners' L1 (Yelland, Pollard, & Mercuri, 1993), and thus, learning a L2 "actually enhances and enriches children's language experience, and offers them unique insights and opportunities for the development of cognitive skills which are unavailable to the monolingual learner" (Fernandez, 2008, p. 8).

Specifically in Victoria (the Australian state where Melbourne is located), the situation is no different from the one described above. Slaughter and Hajek (2007) provide a comprehensive study "that looks at the provision of LOTE in 2003 in Victorian primary schools" (p. 7.1) which helps to contextualize LOTE policy and teaching for the school studied in Melbourne. They explain that LOTE programmes were first introduced as part of the mainstream primary school curriculum in the early 1980s with "government support of primary level community language programs" (ibid). A decade later, LOTE provision was expanded…

> …throughout the state primary system […] when the government adopted a policy titled *The LOTE Strategy* (Victoria. Directorate of School Education. Ministerial Advisory Council on Languages Other Than English 1993), under which all primary schools were expected to develop a LOTE program. (p. 7.2)

The time of instruction recommended by the Victorian government was "a minimum of 150 minutes per week at the primary level", however in 2003, only "4.1% of government primary schools ran LOTE programs for 150 minutes or more, and these were largely schools running bilingual programs" (p. 7.13). The reality was that most schools offered LOTE programmes which ran for an average of 65 minutes per week (ibid). The most common programme in place to date has been mainstream education with FL teaching (Japanese, Italian, Indonesian, French, German and Chinese being the main languages offered and studied) (Ministerial Council of Education Employment Training and Youth Affairs, 2005, p. 4), which is a type of programme that offers a structured language learning context based on the idea of teaching *a* language instead of teaching *in* a language. Through these programmes, majority language children receive lessons in a FL as an additional subject in their curriculum without the "aim, content, or structure [to] have bilingualism as a defined outcome" (Baker, 1993, p. 158). Importantly, Slaughter and Hajek (2007) have documented that these type of programmes have been in steady decline since 1999 when they "peaked" at 73% and in 2003 had dropped to 51.7% (p. 7.18), as they are being replaced by an even weaker type of programme, Language and Cultural Awareness Programmes, which "introduce limited vocabulary and focus on aspects of society, language and culture – mainly through the medium of English" (ibid). This presents a concern and indicates that…

> … rather than providing all students with the opportunity to acquire a second language directly, the data [they] have indicates that at least some community language speakers are being provided with the

> opportunity to maintain and develop their languages, but second language speakers are, broadly speaking, mainly exposed to language awareness classes. (p. 7.18)

Interestingly, the new Minister of Education (elected in late 2010) is very keen for languages to become a strong component of compulsory education in Victoria for all students. The new National Curriculum Statement for Languages was supposed to be released in September 2011 but has now been delayed and can therefore not be included in the writing of this thesis. To summarize, Australia – to date – offers weak LOTE provision which is behind that of most OECD countries, and is cultivated by multiple fallacies. Advocates for L2/FL education argue that a stronger language provision programme is relevant for Australia because it is a highly multicultural nation, because languages are important in an increasingly globalized world, and because L2/FL instruction brings along multiple benefits to learners. "A collaborative strategy on the part of many institutions, including governments, schools, universities, families and ethnic communities" (Clyne, 2007, p. 22) is therefore needed in order to support and promote L2/FL pedagogy appropriately.

FL Education in Colombia Today

Colombia's first decree on FL teaching was established in 1979 making English and French compulsory in secondary education (at different levels) with an intensity of two to three hours per week (de Mejía, 2004, p. 382). Since then, the *General Education Law* of 1994 has also introduced FLs in primary

education "generally from Third Grade onwards" (ibid, p. 383). More recently, in 2006, the Ministry of Education established a program titled 'Programa Nacional del Bilinguismo' (known as the 'Bilingual Colombian Programme' in English) in which bilingualism is promoted as a mean to educate "citizens who are capable of communicating in English in order to place the country in processes of universal communication, global economy, and cultural integration, with comparable international standards" (Ministerio de Educación Nacional, 2009; my translation from original text in Spanish). Today, strategies have been put in place with the goal of having competent English speaking high school graduates by 2019 (Ministerio de Educación Nacional, 2006a). This is not to say that FL provision is nowadays available to all, or that the conditions needed for this policy to become a reality are in place. In fact, Cardenas (2006) argues that the Bilingual Colombian Programme (BCP) has…

> … generated expectations and concerns. English is taught from elementary levels in private schools, but the situation is not the same for the public sector or for private schools who serve the needs of a good number of people. With a limited number of hours for English language teaching, not many resources, large classes, a shortage of qualified teachers, and scarce use of the English language in authentic communication, we can ask: "Are we ready for a bilingual Colombia? What is needed?" (p. 1)

Cárdenas (2006, p.1) also talks about joint efforts being needed "to raise the standards of teacher and student preparation to be able to

communicate in English as well as in the mother tongue (Patiño, Ardila, Roselli, Celis, Pineda, Torres, and Cárdenas, 2004)". Thus, the BCP will face complex challenges in the years ahead.

Importantly, it should be recognized that English language learning has been prioritised nationally and – as in most other non-English speaking countries – English continues to become treated less like a "foreign language and more like an international 'basic skill'" (Graddol, 2006 as cited in Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009, p. 9). English language has the "highest status in the country, particularly in the domains of education, business and tourism" (Zuluaga, 1996 as cited in de Mejia & Tejada, 2003, p. 38). In fact, "career advancement is dependent to a large degree on English language proficiency, and bilingual education is seen as the key to foreign language development" (de Mejía, 2004, p. 392). Generally, the main type of bilingual education programme present in schools is also mainstream education with FL (English) teaching, but research suggests that it "may be more fruitful" than in Australia with students learning more of the L2 as a result of high motivation along with "economic circumstances that encourage the acquisition of a trading language" (Baker, 1993, p. 157). For example, in private schools for middle and upper-middle classes, parents "demand and support [strong] bilingual programs" (de Mejía, 2004, p. 392). In such schools, three different types of FL programmes are found: a) mainstream education with FL teaching through Spanish plus English content-based teaching and learning, b) intensive English instruction that ranges between eight and twenty hours per week (ibid, p. 392), and c) immersion using both "Spanish and a foreign language as media of instruction in their programmes" (ibid). Although, the first programme type continues being

the most frequently used, schools with immersion programmes have experienced greatly increased demand over the last decade with "social pressures push[ing] for access to early 50-50 Spanish-English medium instruction from the age of five" onwards (Ordonez, 2004, p. 449). There are currently around 40 – 50 immersion schools in the country, mainly found in the cities of "[…] Bogotá, Medellin, Cali, Cartagena and Barranquilla. Most of them provide English-Spanish bilingualism" (de Mejía, 2004, pp. 387 – 388) while a few provide French, German, Italian and Hebrew bilingual education with English instruction. Historically, these immersion programmes were established in private institutions with strong foreign connections (de Mejia & Tejada, 2003, p. 39) that catered for the children of expatriate workers and their communities (de Mejía, 2004, p. 388). Nowadays however, "most of the students in bilingual schools come from monolingual Colombian families" who wish to give their children access to better job opportunities and/or postgraduate education abroad (ibid).

Overall, Colombia has historically given importance to FL Education in schools. Awareness of the multiple political, social and economical benefits of English-Spanish bilingualism has made English education a national priority. Nowadays, community support and pressure continue to drive this interest, pushing schools to go beyond mainstream education with FL teaching to implement stronger FL education programmes (especially in private schools for children from the middle and upper classes).

The Two Private Schools in My Study

The selection of the private schools selected for the study of instructional practices in young children's FL classrooms in Melbourne (Australia) and Bogotá (Colombia) is explained in Chapter 4. The focus on private schools (and not government schools) is intrinsically related with my interest in analysing classrooms where pre-school aged and young school aged children were taught a FL, as well as with the characteristics of compulsory schooling in the communities studied. In both Melbourne and Bogotá, there is one year of pre-primary education known as Prep in the State of Victoria (Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, 2011b, p. para. 2) and Transición in Colombia (Ministerio de Educación Nacional, 2006b) for children who turn five years of age during or before this first school year (in Colombia) or before April 30 specifically in Victoria (Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, 2011a; Ministerio de Educación Nacional, 2006b). Pre-school (i.e. pre-Prep or pre-Transición) programmes do not operate in government schools and can only be found in private (and some Catholic) schools. Consequently, L2 / FL teaching for young children (including children under five years of age) can be best investigated within private schools where compulsory FL provision is extended to the pre-school curriculum on offer.

The two participating schools (which I have named High Mount Girls Grammar School and The Canterbury School) were suggested by local experts (see Chapter 4), and whose independent recommendations were nevertheless consistent with the description of the FL programmes in place in each country. High Mount Girls Grammar School (in Melbourne) uses mainstream education with French teaching; and The Canterbury School uses

partial immersion to enhance a strong content and linguistically-based programme for the instruction of English and Spanish. Interestingly, High Mount Girl's Grammar School uses an innovative method called Accelerated Integrative Method (AIM); and The Canterbury School's partial immersion programme is taught in liaison with the pedagogical model of Primary Years Programme (PYP), which is promoted by the International Baccalaureate (explained in detail in Chapter 5). To conclude, the school contexts studied in this thesis seem to embrace the contrasting linguistic goals of the countries where they are situated. Additionally, the AIM method and the partial immersion within a PYP model in place also have – in theory – different pedagogical and philosophical implications for instruction in classrooms. I thus argue that these two settings have the potential of being…

> … alternative scenarios [that] can serve to identify new possibilities and produce 'new perspectives on those issues which can be of enormous benefit to our understanding of them' thus helping to refine our understanding of educational phenomena. (Bartram, 2006, p. 58 with quote from Phillips (1999, p. 18))

Thesis Overview

After this Introduction, Chapter 2 and 3 explain the theoretical basis and contribution of this thesis. Chapter 2 explains Rogoff's transformation of participation perspective situating it and differentiating from Vygotsky's cultural-historical theory and the various research traditions his theory has originated. An in-depth explanation of Rogoff's transformation of participation perspective is

given highlighting the core concepts of this theory and showing how this perspective provides a solid theoretical framework with clear FL classroom practices, and a powerful tool that supported data generation and analysis in my study. Chapter 3 then focuses on the trajectory of the major theories of SLA, highlighting the key concepts and contribution of sociocultural theorists, and making explicit how different their focus and interest is from Rogoff's research to clarify the novelty of using such perspective in this thesis. Chapter 4 explains in detail how Rogoff's transformation of participation perspective was applied throughout the study, relying also on a case study research strategy for the design of the research fieldwork and methods. An important discussion on the identification of the unit of analysis is reported and a description of the interpretation of the data, along with the development of a thematic coding scheme, is discussed. In Chapter 5, I draw on the descriptive nature of this study to provide contextually rich, in-depth qualitative descriptions of the classroom activities at both sites. Chapter 6 then goes beyond the description of the previous chapter in an attempt to theorize the classroom practices through thematic categories (drawn from the coding scheme) and identify the regularities across schools producing both definite and speculative cultural-historical institutional, interpersonal and personal conclusions. Chapter 7 turns into an investigation of broader institutions that help explain the findings on regularities. I conclude the thesis with a brief summary in Chapter 8 of the main claims of the thesis, underlining the limitations of my study as well as the implications of this thesis for FL education in early childhood, and proposing avenues for further research.

Chapter Summary

This chapter began with a personal narrative and a short review of some relevant background literature that guided the process of identifying the research questions for this study. In doing so, I have shown how my research aim is both informed by and located within current literature on SLA in early childhood and Rogoff's sociocultural approach. I have claimed that there is very little literature on FL classrooms and more specifically in young children's classrooms and have identified the need to address this knowledge gap by undertaking this exploratory study. In addition, I have started to argue that new theoretical frameworks are needed to explore this field, highlighting the everyday practices that occur between and across teachers, students and institutions, and removing the focus from the learners and their process of FL learning (an issue I expand upon in Chapters 2 and 3). Finally, I have explained the alternative linguistic scenarios I have chosen for this study in order to familiarise the reader with the main features of FL education in both countries and begin the ongoing process of cross-cultural analysis this thesis will describe. My aim is to contribute to research on FL education and on early childhood with an in-depth study of FL classroom practices across contexts, which describes and explains the culturally organised activities present in young children's everyday FL classrooms.

CHAPTER 2: ROGOFF'S TRANSFORMATION OF PARTICIPATION PERSPECTIVE: A RESEARCH APPROACH WITHIN SOCIOCULTURAL THEORY

Chapter Overview

I have stated in my Introduction that I approached my doctoral studies with a background in socioculturalism as an informant to my understanding of the education of young children and had established as one of my personal and academic goals, in becoming a doctoral student, to become knowledgeable in Barbara Rogoff's *transformation of participation* perspective (Rogoff, 1995, 1997, 1998, 2003). This chapter therefore focuses on the theoretical and analytical framework that Rogoff's perspective on sociocultural theory brings to this thesis. It begins by briefly situating the reader in the field of Sociocultural Theory and then explores important aspects of the life of Lev S. Vygotsky (as the originator of cultural-historical theory), along with some of the key concepts and principles of his dialectical-materialist theory of cognitive development. The chapter continues by explaining some of the differing articulations initiated by post-Vygotskyan thinkers and then situates Rogoff's work as a distinctive approach. Rogoff's work is explained using the conceptual links with Vygotsky's work, explaining her transformation of participation perspective in detail. The chapter concludes by stressing the importance of Rogoff's concepts and principles in informing and framing my research.

In this chapter I am writing in a way that I perceive to be harmonious with the theoretical principles of sociocultural theory, by acknowledging the complex dynamics between theories across time and culture. It therefore brings to the fore some of the key components and the interconnectedness of Marx and Engels *in* Vygotsky and his collaborators' research; and then their cultural-historical theory *in* Rogoff and her colleagues' research showing how their thinking – located within their particular time and society – influenced the next thinkers (and sometimes contributed to the former theory) which in turn was *transformed* into a new theory in itself. I recognize that a) there are many tensions and contradictions between and across theorists on the evolving interpretations of Vygotsky's work; and b) that the writing of this chapter portrays my developing understanding of this complex field.

Barbara Rogoff and Sociocultural Theory: The Origins of her Transformation of Participation Perspective

Rogoff's theoretical contribution lies in the explanation that "humans develop through their *changing participation* in the sociocultural activities of their communities, which also change" (Rogoff, 2003, p. 11; my emphasis). This contribution is based on sociocultural theory (Rogoff, 1997) and hence, it is important to understand what this theory means before exploring her work in detail.

In brief, sociocultural theory is one of the numerous articulations (others are for example cultural-historical theory, activity theory, CHAT (cultural historical activity theory) and sociocultural-historical) of a "theoretical,

research and practice perspective" (Holzman, 2006, p. 5) which recognizes Lev S. Vygotsky as its founder and expands his stance that individual learning and development are social, cultural and historical activities (Holzman, 2006; Rogoff, 2003). This theoretical field does not intend to be a unified theory or have one single consolidated view (Daniels, 2005a; Holzman, 2006; Rogoff, 1998); it rather involves a variety of distinctive approaches/traditions/schools which originate in Vygotsky's work "in the 1920s and 1930s among psychologists seeking to transcend the dualism that framed the 'crisis in psychology' in the early years of the 20th century" (Holzman, 2006, p. 6). These approaches are inspired by Vygotsky and his colleagues/contributors (who include "Luria, Leont'ev, and other Soviet scholars such as Bakhtin and Ilyenkov" (Rogoff, 2003, p. 50)) and developed by post-Vygotskyan thinkers seeking to expand his work in "diverse areas, most notably developmental, educational and organizational psychology; cognitive science; curriculum and teaching; literacy, writing and rhetoric; information technology and design; and geography" (Holzman, 2006, p. 6). In brief, sociocultural theory – and all the other articulations listed here – is a "healthy scholarly tradition" that has developed around Vygotsky's "crucial idea [...] that cognitive development depends greatly on social engagement" (Correa-Chávez & Rogoff, 2005, p. 8). Thus, the central role Vygotsky plays in this theory requires an understanding of both his life and works in order to be able to focus on Rogoff's work in my thesis.

Lev S. Vygotsky: The Originator of Cultural-Historical Theory

Lev Semyonovitch Vygotsky was born into a Jewish family in Orsha (in what is now Belarus) in 1896. He was first a lawyer and philologist and then began his career as a psychologist in 1917 (Cole & Scribner, 1978, p. 1). His work as a developmental psychologist was framed by the condition of psychology at his time, which was fragmented and with competing explanations of human behaviour given by traditional psychology, reflexology, psychoanalysis and behaviourist psychology (Vygotsky, 1997)); and also by Marxist society in postrevolutionary Russia during the interwar period.

> In his initial speech and a series of subsequent publications, he made it clear that in his view none of the existing schools of psychology provided a firm foundation for establishing a unified theory of human psychological processes. Borrowing a phrase from his German contemporaries, he often referred to the "crisis in psychology" and set himself the task of achieving a synthesis of contending views on a completely new theoretical basis. (Cole & Scribner, 1978, p. 5)

Vygotsky wished to create "a stable theoretical framework that had as its goal the scientific exploration and explanation of the development and function of the human mind" (Lantolf & Appel, 1994, p. 2). Vygotsky's research involved "theoretical work in an applied context" with a special interest in its applications in the fields of education and medicine (Cole & Scribner, 1978, p. 9). During his short life (he died of tuberculosis in 1934) he is said to have

produced more than 190 works (Vygotsky, 1999, pp. 283 - 300). Alongside his students and collaborators, he…

> … conducted a wide range of psychological studies on verbal thinking and practical intellect in children, the development of memory and attention, concept formation, educational psychology, the psychology of art, human developmental pathology, neuropsychology, and the ethno-cultural study of minorities. (Yasnitsky & Ferrari, 2008, p. 119)

Vygotsky and his collaborators also established a small psychology laboratory in Kharkov which was headed by Leontiev and became known as the Kharkov School (ibid). Vygotsky's work however is said to have been "suppressed in the Soviet Union […] – because he refused to censor Western (bourgeois) thinkers" – such as Spinoza, Piaget, Freud, Watson, and many others - from his writings (Newman & Holzman, 2002, p. 10). Moreover, "a period of intellectual ferment and experimentation" in the former Soviet Union was ended in 1938 with the Central Committee of the Communist Party issuing a decree that halted all psychological testing and all "leading psychological journals ceas[ing] publication for almost twenty years" (Cole & Scribner, 1978, p. 10). Vygotsky's work therefore only became available to the West with the publication of his monograph *Thought and Language* in 1962 (Vygotsky, 1962) and slowly followed by the publication of – mostly edited – translations, constructions and interpretations of his writings, many of which include elaboration of his initial ideas by some of his notable students and

collaborators such as Alexander Luria, Alexei Leontiev, Daniel Elkonin, and Alexander Zaprorzhets.

Vygotsky's biography (see for example Blanck, 1990; Daniels, 2005b; Newman & Holzman, 2002), methodology (see for example Mahn, 1999) and his conceptualization of a theory of mind (based on his eclectic knowledge and Marxist beliefs) have persisted and have received increased attention. Vygotsky has transformed traditional ideas of cognitive development (Correa-Chávez & Rogoff, 2005) and has thus continued "to influence research in a wide variety of basic and applied areas related to cognitive processes, their development and dissolution" (Cole & Scribner, 1978, p. 10).

Vygotsky's Cultural-Historical Theory: A Dialectical-Materialist Theory of Cognitive Development

Vygotsky's work cannot be understood without recognizing his commitment to a psychology based on Marxist premises. Thus, this section begins by briefly explaining Marxism *in* Vygotsky with the aim of locating Vygotsky's understanding of reality (ontology) and knowledge (epistemology) as well as his ethical and moral stand (axiological principles) and new methodological propositions. Vygotsky was a "Marxist [… and] was devoted to the intellectual freshening of Marxist doctrine" (Bruner, 1984, p. 93). He is therefore considered a Marxist "pioneer" (ibid) because he was "the first to attempt to relate [Marxism] to concrete psychological questions" (Cole & Scribner, 1978, p. 7) both theoretically and methodologically (Newman & Holzman, 2002). Marxist *materialist interpretation of history* and application of *dialectical logic* to

social and historical processes “played a fundamental role in Vygotsky’s thinking” (Cole & Scribner, 1978, pp. 6- 7).

Firstly, the Marxist materialist (i.e. “the idea that everything that really exists is material in nature” (Bullock & Trombley, 2000, p. 508)) conception of history is explained by Marx himself…

> … most concisely in his preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1859): ‘The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political, and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but on the contrary, it is their social existence which determines their consciousness… […]’ (Bullock & Trombley, 2000, p. 395)

Vygotsky, like Marx and Engels, considered that human consciousness was “[…] an indisputable fact, a primary reality, a fact of the greatest significance, and not a secondary or accidental one” (Vygotsky, 1994, p. 41). Psychologically speaking, Vygotsky viewed consciousness as something that developed out of material life, through social interactions and the historical transformation of the culture within which these interactions occur (Raven, 2003, p. 21). He therefore suggested that it was critical to examine consciousness as the bridge between the fragmented views of psychology at his time, and as a result he was able to highlight three revolutionary interrelated themes:

> 1) reliance on a genetic or developmental method, 2) the claim that higher mental processes in the individual have their origin in social processes; and 3) the claim that mental processes can be understood only if we understand the tools and signs that mediate them. (Wertsch, 1985, pp. 14- 15).

Secondly, Engels, in the *Dialectics of Nature* (1883, p. 172, as cited in Vygotsky, 1978, p. 60) explains the basis of a dialectical approach to history (as conceived by Hegel) to history by "admitting the influences of nature on man, [but asserting] that man, in turn, affects nature and creates through his changes in nature new natural conditions for his existence". As a result, the…

> … world is not to be viewed as a complex of fully fashioned objects, but as a complex of processes, in which apparently stable objects, no less that the images of them inside our heads (our concepts), are undergoing incessant changes…
>
> In the eyes of dialectical philosophy, nothing is established for all time, nothing is absolute or sacred. On everything and in everything it sees the stamp of inevitable decline; nothing can resist it save the unceasing process of formation and destruction, the unending ascent from lower to the higher - a process of which that philosophy itself is only a simple reflection within the thinking brain. Friedrich Engels, Ludwig Feuerbach. (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 120).

Vygotsky's work shows a truly dialectical notion of culture and history (Vianna & Stetsenko, 2006) in which culture is not seen as a "collection of inert (dead) artifacts but as a living continuous flow of practices that stretch throughout history and are enacted by each generation of people" abandoning "the notions not only of the child as a 'solitary actor' who develops essentially individually […] but also of each generation being separate from the rest of humanity and from history" and in which history and time are seen as a "continuous flow, in which the past, the present and the future are blended and always contained in each other" (ibid, p. 89).

Vygotsky also clearly explains that this dialectical approach is the "keystone of [his colleagues and his own] approach to the study and interpretation of man's higher psychological functions and serves as the basis for the new methods of experimentation and analysis that [they] advocate" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 61); and are based on three principles:

> (1) process analysis as opposed to object analysis; (2) analysis that reveals real, causal or dynamic relations as opposed to enumeration of a process's outer features, that is, explanatory, not descriptive, analysis; and (3) developmental analysis that returns to the sources and reconstructs all the points in the development of a given structure. The result of development will be neither a purely psychological structure such as descriptive psychology considers the result to be, nor a simple sum of elementary processes such as associationistic psychology saw it, but a qualitatively new form that appears in the process of development. (p. 65)

In addition to these direct methodological implications of the application of dialectical logic to social and historical processes in Vygotsky, “[p]erhaps the most important meaning of what is Marxist in Vygotskian theory is its emphasis on the centrality of transformative collaborative practices in human development” (Vianna & Stetsenko, 2006, p. 86). Bruner (1984, p. 96; emphasis in original) explains and then shows the relevance of this proposition by saying that the…

> … realization of one's individual powers through the utilization of knowledge and shared consciousness depended not on the individual child but on society's capacity to provide the child with the symbolic tools that the child needed in order to grow: on providing opportunity for the child to enter into relationship with somebody wiser **or** abler than himself who would provide the necessary concepts and consciousness that would enable him to make the epistemic leap forward what Vygotsky saw as the promise of the Revolution. The ZPD [the ‘zone of proximal development which will be explained in more detail below] was its instrument. ***So,*** while the major developmental thinker of capitalist Western Europe, Jean Piaget, set forth an image of human development **as** a lone venture for the child, in which others could not help unless the child had already figured things out **on** his own and in which not even language could provide useful hints about the conceptual matters to be mastered, [… Vygotsky] set forth a view in which growth **was** a collective responsibility and language one of the major tools of that collectivity.

With this proposition, it is said that Vygotsky and his collaborators also contributed to Marxism by “bringing this idea to the fore in research on ontogenetic development and teaching-learning, which had not been done consistently by Marx” (Vianna & Stetsenko, 2006, p. 86). This idea also clearly shows Vygotsky’s application of Marxist thought in his own views of ‘reality’ (ontology) as material, contextualized, relational, dynamic and transformative, with ‘knowledge’ (epistemology) being bounded within this ‘reality’ and seen as a process – not an object – that is held in the culture and not in the mind thus collectively and continuously constructed. “The mind then directly reflects the social and historical context within which it is formed” (Raven, 2003, p. 26). Additionally, Vygotsky’s ethical and moral stands (axiology) can be seen to be based on a collectivist commitment to transformation and change.

Vygotsky’s embededness in Marxist thought determined his placement of culture and history in the centre-stage of his approach, which lead to Vygotsky referring to his theory as ‘cultural-historical theory’ (Vygotsky, 1978). I have touched on a number of key concepts (e.g. mind, social interaction, zone of proximal development and tools) from this theory which I now endeavour to succinctly unpack using mostly Chapter 6 of *Mind in Society* (1978), in which Vygotsky explains the “interaction between learning and development”. I argue that exploring this theme helps me appreciate his “two famous propositions: the so-called ‘zone of proximal development’ and the ‘general genetic law of cultural development’” (Daniels, 2005a, p. 4) which in turn will allow me to elaborate on Rogoff’s utilization (and differentiation) of Vygotsky’s conceptualization of the terms ‘Internalization’, and the ‘Zone of Proximal Development’.

Vygotsky's Perspective on the Relation between Learning and Development

In Chapter 6 of *Mind in Society* (1978), Vygotsky "describes one type of social interaction that he felt was the most likely to promote cognitive development – namely interactions that occur within the child's zone of proximal (or potential) development. [… and] also discusses his views on the relation between learning and development" (Gauvain & Cole (eds.) in Vygotsky, 2005, p. 34). Vygotsky begins his discussion specifying that - in the early 1900s - the relation between learning and development remained unclear and could be "reduced to three major theoretical positions" (1978, p. 79) where learning was either "considered a purely external process that is not actively involved in development" (p. 79); considered to occur simultaneously with development and to coincide at all points (p. 81); or not considered to coincide as "development is always a larger set than learning" (p. 83). In Vygotsky's view, in order to arrive at a solution to this problem, a new approach was required and two separate issues needed to be discussed: "first, the general relation between learning and development; and second, the specific features of this relationship when children reach school age" (p. 84). Vygotsky's standpoint in dialectical materialism allowed him to see that children's learning at school always had a previous history as "learning and development are interrelated from the child's very first day of life" (p. 84). However, he clarified that school learning was different to any previous type of learning for the child where "instruction […] is designed to support the development of psychological functions as they are transformed and reconfigured through particular age periods" (Chaklin, 2003, as cited in Daniels, 2005a, p. 7). There was thus a need to focus on two developmental levels: the actual developmental level and the 'zone of proximal development'

defined as "*the distance between the actual development as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers*" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86; emphasis in original).

This proposition implied that "what is in the zone of proximal development today will be the actual development tomorrow – that is, what a child can do with assistance today she will be able to do by herself tomorrow" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 87). Consequently, he argued that the only good learning is that which is in advance of development (p. 89). As such, his proposition was distinctive from the three major theoretical positions of the time hypothesizing that *learning precedes development*. In other words, the proposition was that…

> … an essential feature of learning is that it creates the zone of proximal development; that is, learning awakens a variety of internal developmental processes that are able to operate only when the child is interacting with people in his environment and in cooperation with his peers. Once these processes are *internalized*, they become part of he child's independent developmental achievement. (p. 90; my emphasis)

Vygotsky proposed "that the transference of activity from inter-to-intrapsychological, from the social and historical environment to the internal mind, is defined by a process termed internalization, or interiorization, and is facilitated via mediators" (Raven, 2003, p. 25). These mediators are tools and signs; and they only have a mediational function within the zone of proximal development (Daniels, 2005a, p. 8). An important difference is highlighted

between the concepts following Marxist thought on the mode of production: signs "are internally oriented" and thus "a means of psychological influence aimed at mastering oneself" whereas "tools […] are externally oriented, aimed at mastering and triumphing over nature" (John-Steiner & Souberman, 1978, p. 127). On one hand, (technical / mechanical) tools (e.g. axes and plows) are created and invented by people "under specific cultural and historical conditions" which are used to manipulate the environment (Lantolf & Appel, 1994, p. 7). They are directed at objects and hence influence and change objects but in doing so, they "exert an influence in the individual in that they give rise to previously unknown activities and previously unknown ways of conceptualizing phenomena in the world" (ibid). On the other hand, signs are used as…

> …a mediating device basically [functioning] as a heuristic element with respect to the goal to be achieved. This is what happens when we tie a string around our finger in order to remember something, use paper and pencil to write down a phone number we wish to remember, or sketch an outline for a text to assist comprehension. (ibid, p. 8)

Importantly, Vygotsky identified a variety of sign-based tools which are known as psychological tools that are also internally oriented and therefore mediate mental activity: "various systems for counting, mnemonic techniques, works of art signs", etc., "but the one that he undoubtedly considered to be of greatest significance – "the tool of tools" – was language" (Wells, 1999, p. 7) "For language not only functions as a mediator for social activity" […]; but also

as “a medium in which those activities are symbolically represented”; and lastly, “provides the tool that mediates the associated mental activities in the internal discourse of inner speech” (Vygotsky, 1987, as cited in Wells, 1999, p. 7).

To conclude, learning takes place through the collaboration and guidance of the child with/by more knowledgeable peers or adults (who are members of the culture) using signs and tools that allow the child to become competent in an activity. The child then learns to “coordinate [its] own activity using the [signs and tools] and then gradually internalize[s] the activity so that the use of [these] may no longer be necessary” (Blunden, 2007, p. 261) and develops higher mental functions (complex mental processes such as attention, memorising and verbal thinking). Thus, at the core of Vygotsky’s theory is the idea that “humans *master themselves from the ‘outside’* through symbolic, cultural systems” (Knox and Stevens (1993, p. 15) in Daniels, 2005a, p. 8; my emphasis).

Post -Vygotskyan Research Approaches

I have so far focused on situating and explaining critical parts of Vygotsky’s cultural-historical theory. I have also made reference to the fact that his work continues to inspire researchers from the different fields and parts of the world who investigate within or across distinctive approaches / traditions / schools / articulations of cultural-historical theory aiming to expand his work; which I differentiate these below by drawing on Stetsenko (1999), who provides an interesting attempt to synthesize post-Vygotskyan research traditions. Stensenko argues that each tradition follows unique lines of enquiry based on

three interrelated concepts of Vygotsky's theory: *social interaction*, *cultural tools* and the *zone of proximal development*. In her view, within the Vygotskyan framework, these three concepts have been explained in relative isolation to each other without sufficiently explaining the internal links between them, and have served and continue to serve "perhaps not accidentally, [...] as the foundations for several distinct research traditions within the sociocultural approach that has developed after Vygotsky" (p. 237). Firstly, amongst those focused on social interaction, Stetsenko locates "the sociocultural research tradition in the United States, concentrated on socio-cultural models of teaching and learning with an emphasis on shared activity and social interaction" (p. 238). Within this group she identifies Michael Cole's Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition, Jean Lave and Barbara Rogoff as the main theorists. Secondly, amongst those focused on "the concept of cultural tools and their functional role in a child's development" (p. 239), Stetsenko identifies Peter Y. Galperin, Vasyly V. Davydov and Daniel Elkonin as the theorists who most clearly articulate this research tradition. She highlights that "Galperin was the first to single out and describe in detail the core distinctive features of the cultural tools and respective instructional procedures that defined the leading role of learning in a child's development [...]" (p. 241); and she also explains the concept of 'efficient cultural tools' to then show the implications of this work in "innovative programs of developmental teaching and instructional procedures (e.g. Dadydov, 1988), based on elaborated cultural tools" (p. 242). Finally, she talks about a third research tradition focused on the 'zone of proximal development' and its implications in teaching and learning. She refers specifically to Wood, Bruner and Ross (1976) and their description of assisted

performance as scaffolding; as well as to researchers exploring "strategies characteristic of an adult's assistance and the resulting qualities of a child's cognitive operations" (p. 243). I note here that Lave and Wenger (2005) have claimed that there are many differing interpretations of the conceptualization of the zone of proximal development which include the tradition Stetsenko (1999) has highlighted: a "scaffolding" interpretation based on Vygotsky's definition of the concept; but that also include critiques of this position which have led to a 'cultural' interpretation of the zone of proximal development based also on Vygotsky's "distinction between scientific and everyday concepts" and in addition a more contemporary interpretation "in the tradition of Soviet psychology" which provides a "collectivist"/"societal" interpretation of the zone of proximal development (Lave & Wenger, 2005, p. 150)[2]. .

A fourth research approach that I can identify is reflected in Stetsenko's interest in developing an "activity principle" which clarifies the relationship among the three concepts (i.e. social interaction, cultural tools and the zone of proximal development). To me, her work seems to be located alongside various publications of Seth Chaiklin where he explores Vygotskyan concepts in depth but explains their application in practice mostly in scenarios of learning and instruction (see for example Chaiklin, 2001; Chaiklin, 2003, 2011) This is in line with his joint work with Mariane Hedegaard (see for example Chaiklin, Hedegaard, & Jensen, 1999; Hedegaard & Chaiklin, 2005) which also focuses on "formulating a cultural-historical methodology for studying children's development in everyday settings drawing on the cultural-historical

[2] Contributors of both "cultural" and "collectivist" interpretations include Davydov, Hedeegard and Engeström which have been located in a different research tradition in this section, showing that this - useful – differentiation of research traditions proposed by Stetsenko (1999) is obviously not meant to be always unambiguous.

approach of L.S. Vygotsky and the phenomenology approach of Alfred Schutz, where both institutional practice and children's motives and engagement is incorporated" (Department of Education University of Oxford, 2011). A recent book *'Studying Children'* co-authored with Marilyn Fleer (2008) has a strong focus on conceptualizing a methodology (based, like Vygotsky, on a dialectic approach) which in turn encompasses important concepts from Hedegaard's "model of children's leaning and development through participation in institutional practice, where different perspectives are depicted: A societal, and institutional, and an individual perspective (Hedegaard, 2004)" (Hedegaard, 2008a, p. 10) . Yet another important research approach that has not been mentioned so far is known as CHAT (cultural historical activity theory) which shares roots in Vygotsky's work but also follows more closely the works of Alexei Leont'ev' and Alexander Luria who distinguished activity, action and operation, and focused more on institutional learning and change. Yrjo Engeström has become one of its most prominent contributors, as he developed what are now known as second and third generations of the Activity System which reveal the close connection between the acting subject and its context, acknowledging the role of "subject", "mediating artefacts" (signs and tools), "object" (referred to as "goal" in the modified versions), "rules", "community" and "division of labour" (Engeström, 1999).

At this point, it is important to locate this thesis within the sociocultural research tradition in the United States – of which Rogoff is one of the main thinkers – expanding Vygotsky's work mostly on social interaction and more specifically in culturally organized practices and arrangements of various cultural communities. The distinctiveness of Rogoff's contribution will be

discussed in detail later in this chapter showing how my research goals are better understood and explained through Rogoff's transformation of participation perspective.

Barbara Rogoff's Research Approach

Using a sociocultural stand point requires understanding Rogoff's post-Vygotskyan research tradition as one from a North American psychologist deeply involved with a Mayan town in Guatemala since the 1970s. Thus, just as I aimed to explain Vygotsky's work giving reference to his revolutionary nature as a Marxist pioneer in psychology in Russia in the 1930s, in the next section my goal is to explain Rogoff's work in light of her role as a leading psychologist with anthropological and educational expertise and with a special interest in development and learning. After this, I will explain in detail her theoretical contribution, as well as the principles and methodological preferences of such perspective.

Barbara Rogoff: A Leading Psychologist with Anthropological, Sociological and Educational Sensibilities

Barbara Rogoff is a developmental psychologist from the United States of America born in 1950 and who is currently the University of California Santa Cruz Foundation Distinguished Professor of Psychology. Her work is said to bridge psychology, anthropology and education (Rogoff & Angelillo, 2002) and draws on Vygotsky's work with a specific interest on his concept of social

interaction (Stetsenko, 1999). Rogoff's work has been described as cutting-edge research in explaining human development and she is therefore recognized for advancing the field of psychology. She has published extensively in the fields of human, child, behavioural and social development, as well as in general psychology, culture and education.

Rogoff conducted doctoral work in the 1970s at Harvard University doing an "interdisciplinary program in Psychology and Social Relations [...] where she focused on developmental psychology, with special interest in cultural aspects of development with anthropologists and psychologists interested in culture" (Rogoff & Angelillo, 2002, p. 211). Her graduate training included giving "cognitive tests to children in the Mayan town of San Pedro la Laguna, Guatemala" (University of California Santa Cruz, 2010). Her first visit to Guatemala was in 1974 and since then, she has frequently revisited the town and still remains close to the community. Since then, her research has focused on two themes: "the cultural variability of child development and the developmental processes in these culturally diverse paths" (Gauvain & The Gale Group Inc., 2003 - 2009). During the 1980s, Rogoff endeavoured to describe the way formal schooling is related to cognitive development (Rogoff, 1981) and concluded that the understanding of "cognitive development is deeply entwined with children's experiences with formal schooling and, thus, limited in its ability to account for the range of human intellectual development" (Gauvain & The Gale Group Inc., 2003 - 2009). With this in mind, her work has contributed empirical research on cognitive activity such as attention, communication, planning and problem solving (e.g. Chavajay & Rogoff, 2002; Radziszewska & Rogoff, 1988, 1991; Rogoff, Baker-Senett, & Matusov, 1994;

Rogoff, Mistry, Göncü, & Mosier, 1993), as well as on educational philosophies with a focus on models of teaching such as a communities of learners (e.g. Matusov & Rogoff, 2002; Rogoff, 1994; Rogoff, et al., 2001) within and across various cultural communities, searching to develop a theory that could explain the 'cultural nature of human development'. In sum, decades of experience as a *participant* (Rogoff & Angelillo, 2002) in a cultural community which was at first hand very different from her own, and her deep conceptualization of anthropological, sociological, educational (incorporating authors such as Dewey, Gibson, Pepper, Lave and Wenger) and Vygotskyan and post-Vygotskyan thought have been central in her research and have allowed her to develop a sociocultural approach where the "overarching orienting concept" is that "*humans develop through their changing participation in the sociocultural activities of their communities, which also change*" (Rogoff, 2003, p. 11; my emphasis).

Rogoff's work until 2003 mostly focused on developing this theory alongside the necessary proposition that this is a transformation of participation perspective (Rogoff, 1990, 1994, 1995, 1997, 1998, 2002, 2003) which "involves observation of development in three planes of analysis corresponding to personal, interpersonal, and community processes" (Rogoff, 1995, p. 139). In doing so, she has redefined "development in a fundamental way with her view that the proper level of developmental analysis is not the solitary child but rather the child's changing participation in socially and culturally organized activity" (Gauvain & The Gale Group Inc., 2003 - 2009). Since 2003, her work – now undertaken with her research group – has continued to use this perspective as the foreground but has focused more

specifically on the study of “cultural aspects of collaboration, learning through observation, children's interest and keen attention to ongoing events, roles of adults as guides or as instructors, and children's opportunities to participate in cultural activities or in age-specific child-focused settings” (University of California Santa Cruz, 2011a). And within these aspects, her research group has centred on “examining the idea that in Indigenous-heritage communities of Central America and North America, children are supported in learning through keenly observing ongoing community events and contributing in collaborative group engagement” (University of California Santa Cruz, 2011b). Her research group thus investigates ‘Learning through Intent Community Participation’ (ICP) (Paradise & Rogoff, 2009; Rogoff, Paradise, Mejía Arauz, Correa-Chávez, & Angelillo, 2003): a “theoretical framework that focuses on how children learn by observing and pitching in with initiative” (Intent Community Participation, 2011).

The distinction of the phases/themes of Rogoff’s work described above is important for this thesis, because my focus – given that this study is about classroom practices – is on appropriating central concepts from her Transformation of Participation Perspective (i.e. practices, culturally organised activity, cultural tools, etc.) to examine FL pedagogy in young children’s classrooms across two private schools in two different countries. My research interests are more closely related to her earlier work which defines and utilizes a transformation of participation (hereafter TOP) perspective in empirical research, it is important to clarify that her latest interest specifically in Intent Community Participation (ICP), although fascinating, conceptualizes a learning tradition, Intent Community Participation (ICP), which is…

> … specially prevalent in some communities in which children are routinely included in the range of mature endeavors of daily communicative life. In other communities, being excluded from many mature setting makes it difficult for children to observe and participate in the full range of economic and social activities (Morelli, Rogoff & Angelillo, 2003; Rogoff, Mistry, et al., 1993; Whiting & Whiting, 1975). (Rogoff, et al., 2007, p. 497)

Consequently, given that the children and adults who are part of the classrooms I studied, meet two aspects that Rogoff and Angelillo (2002) distinguish as characteristic of "middle-class life: extensive schooling and separation from the workplaces" (p. 218), it can be expected that the learning tradition of ICP will not be likely to be present in the classrooms I studied (see for example Chavajay & Rogoff, 2002; Göncu, Mistry, & Mosier, 2000; Matusov & Rogoff, 2002; Rogoff, et al., 2001; Rogoff, Matusov, & White, 1996; Rogoff, Mistry, et al., 1993).

This next section will focus on explaining Rogoff's work in the light of her three lenses of analysis, both to point the reader to key concepts in Rogoff's TOP perspective which have informed my research. My aim here is not to give a straightforward reiteration of all of Rogoff's work but rather to a) develop a clear understanding of the key concepts and connect and/or differentiate them from Vygotsky's work on learning and development (where relevant), b) portray the TOP perspective as a separate research tradition from others within sociocultural theory; c) highlight the key concepts that inform my

research and the methodological implications of using Rogoff's perspective; and d) to provide a clear understanding that will in turn allow me to later explain later how these differ from what is currently used to explain Second Language Acquisition (Chapter 3).

Rogoff's Transformation of Participation Perspective

I have explained previously that Rogoff has redefined development in a fundamental way by centring on the stance that "*people develop as participants in cultural communities* [and their] *development can be understood only in light of the cultural practices and circumstances of their communities – which also change*" (Rogoff, 2003, pp. 3 - 4; emphasis in original). Rogoff (1997) locates this contribution thus as a) based on sociocultural theory, b) built on a specific family of emergent sociocultural theories, and c) in line with the approaches that focus on participation. This means that she acknowledges her interest in expanding Vygotsky's work integrating individual development in a social, cultural, and historical context (Rogoff, 2003, p. 50), and sees her own work as part of an "emerging sociocultural perspective", in which "individual and cultural processes are *mutually constituting* rather than defined separately from each other" (ibid, p. 51; emphasis in original). Rogoff however goes further in recognizing that her perspective "is built on a family of sociocultural theories that are emerging from discourse across disciplines and cultural and historical communities using the concept of activity and emphasis on integrating levels of analysis" (Rogoff, 1997, p. 266), and within them

characterizes her work as distinctive because of her conception of development explained by *participation* in non-static sociocultural activities.

Rogoff's work gives preference to the concept of *participation*; a stance which creates a distinctive approach where the boundaries between environment and individual disappear. In other words she challenges "the way that researchers and practitioners have traditionally gone about understanding children's development using "individual", "social influence" and "cultural influence" models (Rogoff, 2003) which assume "a boundary between children's learning and the sociocultural world" (Rogoff, 1997, p. 267). Firstly, Rogoff clarifies that the "*solitary individual*" has been the traditional "object of study […] in developmental psychology" with "information about relations with other people and the purpose and the setting of the activity removed" (2003, p. 53; emphasis in original). Secondly, she states that studies of social relations investigate the ""child" apart from other people, [and are] studied separately even when they are engaging in the same event" (ibid, p. 54). And lastly, in models where the ""*cultural influences*" are added […], the child remains separate from them, "subject" to the effects of cultural characteristics" (ibid, p. 55; emphasis in original). In other words, these models "focus on the behaviours of individuals, defined separately from each other [and] arbitrarily separate the partners' [and / or institutional] contributions to whole dynamic events" (Rogoff, Mosier, Mistry, & Göncü, 1993, p. 231). These models are all very different from Rogoff's approach which opposes "individual development being influenced by (and influencing) culture" and proposes that…

> … people develop as they participate in and contribute to cultural activities that themselves develop with the involvement of people in successive generations. People of each generation, as they engage in sociocultural endeavors with other people, make use of and extend cultural tools and practices inherited from previous generations. As people develop through their shared use of cultural tools and practices, they simultaneously contribute to the transformation of cultural tools, practices and institutions. (Rogoff, 2003, p. 52)

Rogoff's approach goes beyond the "one-sided limitation of the transmission [of information and ideas to the brain from the outside world] and acquisition [of information and ideas by the brain] conceptions" (Rogoff, 1997, p. 266; emphasis in original) which are in line with the traditional models' view of development (Rogoff, 1998). She defines her TOP perspective as one in which "personal, interpersonal, and cultural aspects of human activity are conceived as different analytic views of ongoing, mutually constituted processes" (Rogoff, 2003, p. 52). Rogoff has thus developed a series of images and detailed explanations (see for example Rogoff, 1995, p. 158; Rogoff, 1997, p. 268, 2003, pp. 53 - 61) involving the observation of development and learning through these three separate but mutually constitutive lenses of analysis, and refers to developmental processes corresponding with these three planes as participatory appropriation, guided participation and apprenticeship (Rogoff, 1995, p. 139).

Participatory Appropriation

The personal (also known as individual) lens of analysis foregrounds *individuals* (e.g. children, carers, guardians, teachers, etc.) as they participate in sociocultural activity. Rogoff (1997, p. 267 emphasis in original) argues that the "process of children's participation and changing responsibility in an activity is how development occurs [… and thus, this lens] provides researchers with evidence they can use to understand development". Rogoff (1995, p. 150) uses the term…

> … "participatory appropriation" (or simply "appropriation") to refer to the process which individuals transform their understanding of and responsibility for activities through their own participation. […] The basic idea of appropriation is that, through participation, people change and in the process become prepared to engage in subsequent similar activities.

Rogoff uses the terms "appropriation" and "participatory appropriation" interchangeably, as the word "participatory" is only used to emphasize that in her perspective – differently from how other theorists may use the term appropriation – "participation is itself the process of appropriation" (1995, p. 150). This term is used to contrast "the internalization perspective views of development in terms of a static, bounded "acquisition" or "transmission" of pieces of knowledge (Rogoff, 1998, p. 682). It can be said that this theoretical distinction is necessary for two reasons: 1) "to express the difference between [Rogoff's] views and the version of internalization involving importing objects

across boundaries from external to internal" (1995, p. 152), and 2) to acknowledge that although Vygotsky's use of the concept 'internalization' is closer to her view "in emphasizing the inherent transformation involved in the process" (p. 152) it is also "at odds" with her view as his characterization proceeds from the interpersonal to the intrapersonal (as explained in page 13) and consequently "involves a separation in time of social and individual aspects of the activity" (p. 161). Rogoff continues clarifying this distinction explaining that in many views of internalization, time is fragmented into past, present and future; there is a boundary between internal and external; events are separated; individuals are used as the primary unit of analysis; and categories are used to explain human behaviour. Differently, in Rogoff's view, "change and development in the process of participation are assumed to be inherent, with prior and upcoming events involved in (not independent of) the ongoing present event" (1998, p. 690); events are "dynamically changing, with people participating with others in coherent events […]" (1995, p. 156); and there is a "mutual constitution of personal, interpersonal and cultural processes, with development involving all planes of focus in sociocultural activity" (p. 157). As a result, viewing "cognitive development as participatory appropriation through guided participation in a system of apprenticeship" (p. 157) means viewing development as "a dynamic, active, mutual process involved in people's participation in cultural activities" (p. 153; my emphasis).

Guided Participation

The interpersonal lens focuses on all *interpersonal relations* and *arrangements* (Rogoff, 1995, 1997, 2003; Rogoff, et al., 2003) and is represented by the concept of guided participation in cultural activity which is…

> …made up of the events of everyday life as individuals engage with others and with materials and arrangements collaboratively managed by themselves and others. It includes direct interaction with others as well as engaging in or avoiding activities assigned, made possible, or constrained by others, whether or not they are in each other's presence or even know of each other's existence. (Rogoff, 1995, p. 147)

The ""guidance" referred to in guided participation involves the direction offered by cultural and social values, as well as social partners; the "participation" in guided participation refers to observation, as well as hands-on involvement in an activity" (Rogoff, 1995, p. 142). In this sense, guided participation provides a perspective that allows researchers to reflect on the "varied ways that children learn as they participate in and are guided by the values and practices of their cultural communities" (Rogoff, 2003, p. 284). It thus encompasses interactions and arrangements in both school-like scenarios of explicit instruction as well as everyday cognitive activities at children's homes, neighbourhoods and other cultural communities. This is an important clarification of this concept as Rogoff recognizes that it is built on Vygotsky's notion of the zone of proximal development, but taking a broader cultural view which goes beyond Vygotsky's specific "instructional frame of

reference" (Daniels, 2005a, p. 7) which she has clearly demonstrated – through cross-cultural empirical research – overlooks "other forms of engagement that are also important to children's learning" (Rogoff, 2003, p.p. 282 – 283) both within schools and most evidently in families with little exposure to Western schooling (e.g. Intent Community Participation). In line with this distinction, new terms beside 'participation' come to the fore: 'cultural and social values', 'arrangements' and 'practices'.

Apprenticeship

The cultural-institutional lens focuses on "people participating with others in culturally organized activity, with institutional practices and development extending from historical events into the present, guided by cultural values and goals" (Rogoff, 1997, p. 269). The concept of apprenticeship is used as a model in this lens which…

> … has the value of including more people than a single expert and a single novice; the apprenticeship system often involves a group of novices (peers) who serve as resources for one another in exploring the new domain and aiding and challenging one another. Among themselves, the novices are likely to differ usefully in expertise as well. The 'master' or expert is relatively more skilled than the novices, with a broader vision of the important features of the culturally valued activity. However, the expert too is still developing breadth and depth of skill and understanding in the process of carrying out the activity and guiding others in it. Hence the model provided by apprenticeship is one of

> active learners in a community of people who support, challenge, and guide novices as they increasingly participate in skilled, valued sociocultural activity. (Rogoff, 1990, p. 39)

In this system of “interpersonal involvements and arrangements” (Rogoff, 1995, p. 143), the apprentices (novices) are actually involved in the process of taking new roles and responsibilities, becoming more responsible participants (Rogoff, 1995, 2003). In addition and differently from Vygotsky’s work, this system is explicit about the transformation of the ‘expert’ as well as the ‘novice’, giving the ‘novice’ an agentic role in which his/her transformation always and also entails transformation of the individuals, values and practices of the community. Research focusing on the cultural-institutional lens using the metaphor of apprenticeship therefore backgrounds the details of the individuals who participate and the relations between them and the arrangements, to focus on the “nature of the activity involved, as well as on its relation to practices and institutions of the community in which it occurs - economic, political, spiritual, and material” (Rogoff, 1995, p. 142); and recognizes…

> …that endeavours involve *purposes* (defined in community or institutional terms), *cultural constraints*, *resources*, *values* relating to what means are appropriate for reaching goals (such as improvisation versus planning all moves before beginning to act), and *cultural tools* such as maps, pencils, and linguistic and mathematical systems. (Rogoff, 1995, pp. 143 - 144; my emphasis)

I have so far shown that Rogoff found inspiration in Vygotsky's cultural-historical theory, "which posited that individual cognitive skills derived from people's engagement in sociocultural activity" (Rogoff, 2003, p. 237), as well as in her own experience as a cross-cultural researcher and a participant in an Indigenous community in Guatemala. In expanding Vygotsky's work, I have firstly shown that Rogoff's approach belongs to a specific family of post-Vygotskyan thinkers, out of which the distinctiveness and originality of work lies on the prevalence given to the concept of participation in her explanation of human development and on the corresponding TOP perspective she has delineated. In doing so, she has extended and transformed Vygotsky's use of the concepts 'internalization' and 'zone of proximal development' drawing on a broader cultural view – along with anthropological, sociological and educational knowledge – which have created her new use of the concepts 'participatory appropriation' and 'guided participation' along with the introduction / distinction of new terms which include social and cultural values, practices, arrangements and culturally-organized activity. I should highlight here that Rogoff uses "cultural tools" in a way that encompasses both the psychological tools and concrete artefacts that I have talked about in Vygotsky's discussion in the relationship between learning and development. They carry cultural and historical meaning for participants of specific communities at particular times but are – for Rogoff – appropriated and transformed through participation in sociocultural activity. One important differentiation relevant to this concept is that Rogoff does not highlight language as the "tool of tools" as her research shows that many cultural communities place less emphasis on verbal interaction and the written world (Rogoff, 1998).

An interesting differentiation from Vygotsky's work that should be noted is that Rogoff's perspective uses the terms "*development* and *learning* interchangeably" (1997, p. 265; emphasis in original). In her own words her perspective…

> …demystifies the processes of learning and development. To see development, we look directly at children's efforts and those of their companions and the institutions which they constitute and upon which they build, rather than searching for the mechanisms of acquisition or the nature of internalization as a conduit from external bits of knowledge or skill to an internal repository. What individuals do and how they think is the focus, rather than efforts to determine what they "can" do or think; variation and similarities in their participation in varying activities become central rather than nuisances in the attempt to observe "pure" competence. (Rogoff, 1997, p. 280)

This is an important distinction that implies differing research interests. Vygotsky's core question for the concept of internalization is "'How does the social become the individual?'" (Matusov, 1998, p. 331): an inquiry that implies "dualism of social and psychological in the internalization model" (ibid). Instead, Rogoff and colleagues' work is characterized as non-dualistic as they do not make a distinction between social and individual and examine mainly "how children actually participate in sociocultural activities to characterize how they contribute to those activities. The emphasis changes from trying to infer what children *can* think to interpreting what and how they *do* think" (Rogoff,

1997, p. 273). Also, research resulting from Rogoff's approach "emphasizes observing both similarities and differences across varying sociocultural activities, as well as tracking the relations among aspects of events viewed in different planes of analysis" (Rogoff, 1995, p. 161). Thus, studying regularities within and across cultural communities is an important feature of Rogoff's work.

Lastly, Vygotsky's research brought to the fore some important methodological implications that are relevant for most of the post-Vygotskyan approaches introduced in this chapter. Cole and Scribner (1978) explain that for Vygotsky a) "detailed descriptions, based on careful observation [...] carried out objectively and with scientific rigour [...] have the status of validated fact" (p. 14); b) observations "may often be as well or better executed in play, school and clinical settings than in the psychologist's laboratory" (ibid); and c) "anthropological and sociological studies" are "partners with observation and experiment in the grand enterprise of accounting for the progress of human consciousness and intellect" (ibid). In addition, it is understood that learning has to be observed and studied in its developmental process. Similarly, in Rogoff's work (which I have already shown draws from psychology, anthropology, sociology and education), "theory is built on observations of the sociocultural phenomena of the real world" (Rogoff, 1997, p. 265). More specifically, even though what I call her TOP perspective "does not prescribe the use of specific methodological tools" she "does emphasize the relation of particular tools to the theoretical purposes to which they are put" (Rogoff, 1995, p. 160). Most of her studies use "close analysis of events through ethnographic methods, abstraction of generalities based on this analysis,

extensive use of graphing of information and application of quantitative methods to check and communicate the patterns discerned through the ethnographic and graphic analyses […]" (ibid). Furthermore, Rogoff and Angelilo (2002) insist that description of cultural communities may require the use of "variables as analytic tools in holistic analysis", which must not be used as "a list of separate, freestanding variables crossed with each other" but rather must be interpreted "in the light of other aspects of cultural processes" (pp. 221 - 222).

To conclude, Rogoff shares Vygotsky's (ontological) dialectical notion of history but "shifts 'culture' to *ways of thinking and doing* [; …] as dynamic practices of communities, rather than as fixed categorical properties of individuals (or groups)" (Rogoff & Angelillo, 2002, p. 222; my emphasis). Hence, Rogoff regards "'real life' as multifaceted, dynamic configurations of cultural processes" (p. 221), and holds realist assumptions of knowledge production (epistemology) as an active and mutual process that requires interdependence of "individual mind, interpersonal relations and social [historical and cultural] situations" (Heath & Mc Laughlin, 1994, p. 473). Ethically speaking, Rogoff's work seems committed to exploring development within a broad cultural view that uncovers and values diverse cultural processes (with a special interest in indigenous communities in the Americas) that can help transform traditional views of development as well as traditional teaching and learning.

The principles described above are harmonious with my understandings about reality, my worldview and research interests. My own educational

passion encompasses transforming the traditional constructivist view which is still prevalent in early childhood education (Edwards & Fleer, 2003; Fleer, et al., 2008), as well as ‘transfer’ and / or ‘acquisition’ models of teaching (see Chapter 6) so that transformation of philosophies of teaching can lead to collaborative and non-ethnocentric practices. Rogoff’s perspective provides a strong theoretical and analytical framework for my investigation of FL education in early childhood. Consequently, the following section concludes this chapter by linking the perspective taken in my study to some of the conceptual and methodological principles of Rogoff’s work with my research.

Rogoff’s Transformation of Participation Perspective in This Study

Rogoff’s conceptual framework has been purposively chosen for the study of FL classroom practices in early childhood settings in this thesis, alongside empirical studies that support the descriptive (describing the classroom activities used to teach FLs to young children in an Australian and a Colombian school context), exploratory (identifying the main characteristics of classroom practices and the regularities of these practices across the two participating schools) and explanatory (accounting for the regularities found across sites) aims of my research. In addition, Rogoff’s work directly informs my methodology and thus the choice of my research design (see Chapter 4). To conclude this chapter, I focus specifically on three important aspects of a TOP perspective that I have appropriated within my study.

Firstly, I have argued that Rogoff’s purpose for using “the term lenses of analysis […] contrasts with prevailing notions of levels of analysis that treat

personal, interpersonal, and community processes as separate entities rather than simply analytic distinctions" (1998, p. 688). This is a very important characteristic of Rogoff's work as the lenses are non-independent "aspects of the event [which] constitute the activity" (Rogoff, 2003, p. 58). Thus, one can focus on one of the lenses depending on the type of study, with the other lenses necessarily remaining in the background of the analysis (Rogoff, 1995, 1997, 1998, 2003). In other words, "the distinctions between what is in the foreground and what is in the background lie in our analysis and are not assumed to be separate entities in reality" (Rogoff, 2003, p. 58). In my study, the cultural-institutional lens is the main focus of the research, as my interest is specifically on the nature of the activities through which young children are being taught a FL in relation to the contributions of the classrooms' participants and the ongoing – and changing – influences of the wider institutions of which they are a part. I am specifically interested in identifying and describing these practices (a central concept of this lens) by highlighting the resources and cultural tools utilised, showing how the practices are culturally organised and constrained and are interdependent with broader institutional features and practices such as the history and culture of the FL models, school curricula, national policies around FL teaching in each country and the broad concept of 'schooling'. In doing so, I have explicitly chosen to background the details of the particular teachers and children (individual lens), and the relations with each other (interpersonal lens) and to highlight the practices within and across naturalistic, everyday contexts in lessons within FL classrooms for young children in the Australian and Colombian school contexts. As a result, my study is entirely about cultural aspects (a key feature of Rogoff's work), given

that FL classrooms are a context-bound cultural form, and my focus is on practices that maintain and transform that cultural form. Furthermore, following Rogoff's line of work, I address the question of patterns of variation and similarity within and across the classrooms and schools studied.

Secondly, I have shown that there are various research approaches that have originated from Vygotsky's cultural-historical theory developing differing conceptual tools and methodologies. Amongst these approaches, it is important to emphasize that there is still controversy about the notion of the 'appropriate' unit of analysis, with the only real agreement being that it should reflect "the smallest part preserving the whole of the phenomenon" (Matusov, 2007, p. 316) and that individuals are an inappropriate unit. From a TOP perspective, Rogoff (1995, 1997, 1998) maintains that an 'activity' is an appropriate unit. The notion of activity in Rogoff's work seems to mostly refer to cognitive activities which include attention, communication, planning and problem solving (e.g. Chavajay & Rogoff, 2002; Radziszewska & Rogoff, 1988, 1991; Rogoff, et al., 1994; Rogoff, Mistry, et al., 1993). Other activities she has studied also include cookie sales and delivery (Rogoff, Baker-Senett, Lacasa, & Goldsmith, 1995) and learning to read (Rogoff, 1997). For this last activity (learning to read), she explains that…

> … from a participation view, the process of understanding learning to read involves investigating children's reading in sessions in which they are assisted in reading as well as in test situations; both activities involve their own particular constraints and resources. […] The test itself is an activity, rather than some kind of a window on hard-to-see

> competence that the individual “has”. We would examine learning to take tests in terms of how an individual’s participation in that kind of activity transforms. (Rogoff, 1997, p. 274)

Hence, a TOP perspective removes the focus on skills and individual learning, and instead focuses on participation within the everyday activities of assisted sessions and tests (in this example), and utilizes these as the units of analysis for her inquiry. In the same line, other everyday activities used in Rogoff’s work as the unit of analysis are paper folding activities (demonstration or actual folding) for studying attention (Correa-Chávez, Rogoff, & Mejía Arauz, 2005) and learning through observation and explanation (Mejía Arauz, Rogoff, & Paradise, 2005); and operating novel objects (Rogoff, Mistry, et al., 1993) for studying guided participation. Similarly, for my thesis, in understanding young children’s learning of a FL, my interest is not on how children learn but on their changing participation in the ‘classroom activities’ within FL lessons (including their interactions with teacher). The process of selecting ‘classroom activities’ as an appropriate unit of analysis is explained in detail in Chapter 4, drawing on Rogoff’s work, Matusov (2007), and literature on classroom cultures (De Corte & Verschaffel, 2007; Gallego, Cole, & Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition, 2001; Valli & Chambliss, 2007). At this point however, it is important to emphasize that ‘activity’ in this thesis is used - as in the examples of Rogoff and colleagues’ work above - in its everyday sense of participatory action, which is different from its theoretical formation within activity theory.

Lastly, the case study design, as well as the procedures for data generation and data analysis used in this study (Chapter 4) are in line with Rogoff's methodological principles as my research studies "phenomena of the real world" (Rogoff, 1997, p. 265): classroom practices within and across FL lessons / classrooms / schools, focusing on the cultural-institutional lens without separating it from the personal and interpersonal lenses. The selection of methods (i.e. classroom observations, semi-structured open ended interviews and documentation) were purposefully chosen for the research aims of this study and are also in line with the ethnographic methods which Rogoff's work encompasses. Finally, in developing thematic categories as an analytical tool (Chapter 4), I was able to draw on a variety of readings which utilize a TOP perspective (Chavajay & Rogoff, 2002; Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003; Matusov, Bell, & Rogoff, 2002; Rogoff, et al., 2001; Rogoff, et al., 1996; Rogoff, et al., 2005; Rogoff & Toma, 1997), permitting a rich, fluid, historical and holistic definition, description and interpretation.

Chapter Summary

This chapter has focused on situating, differentiating and explaining Rogoff's transformation of participation perspective. To do so, I have explained important aspects of the work of Lev S. Vygotsky, and have shown the multiple and distinctive traditions that have developed – and continue to develop – from Vygotsky's cultural-historical theory. I have then located and given an in-depth explanation of Rogoff's transformation of participation perspective, highlighting the core concepts of this theory and showing how this perspective provides a

solid theoretical framework for FL classroom practices, and a powerful tool that supported the data generation and analysis in my study. The next chapter will explain the main theoretical informants of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) firstly because exploring this body of knowledge is extremely important body for the purpose of this thesis, and secondly to highlight the uniqueness and appropriateness of using Rogoff's sociocultural account in the study of FL classroom practices.

CHAPTER 3: ROGOFF'S TRANSFORMATION OF PARTICIPATION PERSPECTIVE: A NEW PERSPECTIVE FOR STUDYING SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Chapter Overview

This chapter shows the trajectory of the major theories in Second Language Acquisition (SLA), paying particular attention to the emergent sociocultural theorists who are grounded in Vygotsky's cultural-historical theory. In this chapter I strive for a balance between the two main bodies of knowledge that inform my research: SLA research and Rogoff's sociocultural account (as explained in detail in Chapter 2). In doing so, I highlight the important contribution that sociocultural theorists in SLA have made to explain the 'acquisition' of a L2, and also demonstrate the way they have focused specifically on selected core statements (Lantolf, 2000) which include (amongst others) genetic method, mediated mind, internalization, inner speech, gestures and the zone of proximal development. It is important to emphasize that I am summarising the way socioculturalism has been taken up, rather than giving a direct recount of these concepts and principles in SLA. Thus, the chapter explicitly states the difference between sociocultural research in SLA and Rogoff's research approach, clarifying why using Rogoff's transformation of participation perspective is a relevant and novel theoretical contribution to SLA in general and more specifically to FL education and the aim of this thesis.

Second Language Acquisition: Main Theories and Sociocultural Theory

Acquiring a L2 "can be defined as the way in which people learn a language other than their mother tongue, inside or outside of a classroom; and 'Second Language Acquisition' (SLA) as the study of this" (Ellis, 1997, p. 3). This field emerged during the 1970s and "has grown to become a vast international discipline, relevant to the huge expansion of second language learning across the world in the decades since" (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009, p. 29). In this field, 'second' can refer to any additional language that is learnt after the mother tongue, and, therefore, it can be a third or fourth (or more) language for a particular individual. The way in which a L2 is learned can be explained differently depending on the theoretical framework that an author and/or researcher adopts. A short review of the main theoretical approaches that have informed SLA, showing their most important arguments and critiques, is given in this section. I have chosen the categories described by Lightbown and Spada (1999) to organize theoretical approaches but specific references of prominent researchers are incorporated to extend on explanations of some relevant concepts or principles of each approach. The approaches are organized into explanations that emphasise: (1) learners' innate characteristics (behaviourism and innatism), (2) the environment's role in language learning (information processing and connectionism), and (3) the integration of learner characteristics and environmental factors (*interactionism*). In addition, sociocultural theory is treated as a separate section and is explained in more depth using research from its main contributors to date.

Behaviourism and Innatism

Behaviourism views language development as the formation of habits explained in terms of *imitation*, *practice* and *reinforcement* (Lightbown & Spada, 1999, p. 35; my emphasis). In L2, this means that the learners' habits in their first language (hereafter L1) interfere with those needed for the L2. This view is linked with the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) (ibid), which predicts that when the L1 and L2 are similar, the learner will acquire the L2 structures easily but with more difficulty when they are different. Behaviourism has been criticised for providing an "incomplete explanation for language learning" (ibid, p. 36), given its reliance on studies "based on experiments at laboratories with animals learning responses from different stimuli" that "are not applicable for understanding the humans' natural language learning" (ibid, p. 45).

Innatism is first explained in Chomsky's work in the 1950 and 1960s (1957, 1967). He aggressively challenged behaviourist views arguing "[i]t is simply not true that children can learn language only through "meticulous care" on the part of adults who shape their verbal repertoire through careful differential reinforcement […]" (Chomsky, 1967; emphasis in original). Chomsky invented the notion of "generative grammar" (first outlined in Chomsky, 1957) which turned into the "Universal Grammar (UG) Hypothesis". In brief, the UG hypothesis refers to languages sharing a set of syntactic rules and principles which are innately known by humans. As such, children's innate knowledge of these principles guides their "effortless" and "quick" (Myles, 1995, p. 236) language acquisition. Although Chomsky did not make any claims regarding SLA, many linguists (such as Stephen Krashen and Lydia

White) have used his UG hypothesis to do so (Lightbown & Spada, 1999, p. 37). In their view, the UG hypothesis explains why some learners know more about the L2 than they could know from simple exposure to the input in the language.

Krashen, a highly influential American innatist, explains L2 learning and acquisition through five hypotheses (Krashen, 1982). In brief, Krashen distinguishes between subconscious *acquisition* and conscious *learning*, and argues that acquisition is more important. He then explains that the acquired system facilitates fluency and correct intuitive use of the L2, whilst the learned system only acts as a *monitor* that is used when learners want to focus on being 'correct'. He also proposes that learners go through clear *stages* and *sequences* of language development and, in addition, maintains that language acquisition only happens when learners clearly understand messages. Hence, *comprehensible input* (messages that are slightly above the learners L2 level) is essential. Finally, Krashen refers to 'affects' stating that "a strong affective filter (e.g. high anxiety) will prevent input from reaching those parts of the brain that do language acquisition" (Krashen, 2004; emphasis in original).

Information Processing and Connectionism

Innatism has been criticized by many researchers for different reasons. Ellis (1985) recaps some important criticisms saying firstly that the UG hypothesis "operates on the assumption that linguistic knowledge is homogeneous, and, therefore, ignores variability" (p. 271) and secondly that Krashen's hypotheses' weakness "is a methodological one" as they "cannot be tested in empirical

investigation" (p. 264). Yet other important critics of innatism are those who have developed differing theories to explain SLA such as researchers working in an *information processing* model (originated by Barry McLaughlin in the 1980s) and with *connectionism* (see Jasdzewski, 1998 for a chronological examination of connectionist researchers).The first state that L2 learners need *experience*, *practice* (involving effort from the learner), *motivation* and *noticing* (conscious awareness) for acquiring a L2. The latter (connectionists) attribute greater importance to the role of the environment than to any innate knowledge on the part of the learner, arguing that *linguistic input* is the foundation of linguistic knowledge. However, both information processing and connectionism have been critiqued by linguists for generalizing "the complexities of normal human language learning" as they usually use computer simulations to investigate how people learn "a set of linguistic features, often in an invented language" (Lightbown & Spada, 1999, p. 45) within a very controlled and unnatural setting.

Interactionism

Researchers using any of these – still mainstream – theories understand and explain SLA within a "decontextualised, generalisable, and analytical" frame that "requires "input", "interaction", and "output" independent of social context" (Cross, 2006, p. 26). Therefore, although interactionism concurs with innatist theorists arguing that "innate features of the human brain play an important role in the acquisition of language" (Cole, Cole, & Lightfoot, 2005, p. 299), interactionists also credit the role the environment plays in L2 learning. Among

interactionists there are a variety of theorists using different concepts to explain SLA. One of the main theorists is Michael Long whose work is "concerned with the question of how input is made comprehensible" and views the native-speakers' modified speech when holding conversations with non-native speakers (modified interaction) "as the necessary mechanism for this to take place" (Lightbown & Spada, 1999, p. 43; emphasis in original). Consequently, Long's interaction hypothesis critiques Krashen's theory by clarifying that interactions "should not be seen simply as a one-directional source of target language input, feeding into the learner's presumed internal acquisition device"(Mitchell & Myles, 2004, p. 160). Another environmentally oriented theory is proposed by Schumann's acculturation model (1978, 1986) in which he argues that "two group of variables – social and affective factors – cluster into a single variable [acculturation] which is a major causal variable in SLA" (Schumann, 1986, p. 379). Acculturation is thus defined as "the social and psychological integration of the learner with the target language (TL) group" (Schumann, 1978, p. 29), which implies that the learners' success is determined by their social and psychological closeness to the speakers of the L2. It was intended to be a model to explain SLA in immigrants, however his model has been used to explain instruction and learning in other settings.

Socioculturalism

Other interactionists are known as *sociocultural theorists* and "emphasize the way the sociocultural environment enters into partnership with the child" and "focus on the ways that children participate in a broad range of cultural practices that allow them to achieve language, culture and individual

development simultaneously" (Cole, et al., 2005, p. 300). Specifically in SLA, Lantolf and Thorne (2006; 2007) recognise two different theoretical strands using the term sociocultural theory in SLA. The first strand refer to scholars who "use the term sociocultural to refer to the general social and cultural circumstances in which individuals conduct the business of living" (Lantolf & Thorne, 2007, p. 197). The second strand has a "specific association with the work of Vygotsky and the tradition of Russian cultural-historical psychology, especially within applied linguistics research" (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 3). This line of research in SLA was initiated by Lantolf and his students and colleagues, and has grown rapidly during the past 15 years (Swain, Kinnear, & Steinman, 2011). These sociocultural theorists in SLA aim to investigate primary concepts that I have explained in Chapter 2 such as the *genetic* or developmental *method*, *mediation*, *internalization* and the *zone of proximal development*; and also expand on other relevant concepts which include *regulation*, *imitation*, *inner speech* (see detailed explanations of each of these concepts as taken in SLA in Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Lantolf & Thorne, 2007); *collaborative dialogue*, *everyday and scientific concepts*, and *interrelatedness of cognition and emotion* (see Swain, et al., 2011 for examples of these concepts).

I have shown in Chapter 2 that sociocultural theorists disagree with traditional psychological frameworks, believing that any "attempts to ground explanations of mental development in the isolated individual are inadequate" (Lantolf, 2000, p. 14) . In SLA, Lantolf, Thorne and colleagues use Leontiev's work to show that behaviourism "is a speech theory about the behaviour of the individual, isolated not only from society but also from any real process of

communication" in which "communication is reduced to the most elementary model of information transfer from speaker to listener" (1981, p. 92, as cited in Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 8). They also argue that innatism "continued to maintain the individualism" of behaviourism "with the social environment serving only to trigger innately specified linguistics principles" (ibid). Furthermore, Dunn and Lantolf (1998, p. 428) showed that Krashen's theory is incommensurable with sociocultural theory, arguing that his theory "belongs to the classic, hard science approach to scientific investigation and its aims of reducing complex phenomena to basic elements and constructing abstract schema to explain its object of study". On the contrary, sociocultural theory…

> … compels us to look at SLA from a perspective that differs from most current mainstream approaches to the phenomenon. It erases the boundary between language learning and using; it also moves individuals out of the Chomskian world of the speaker-hearer and the experimental laboratory, and redeploys them in the world of their everyday existence, including real classrooms (Lave and Wegner 1991). (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 1995, p. 116)

In sum, the work of sociocultural theorists (drawing from Vygotsky's cultural-historical theory) in SLA has brought to the fore important theoretical discussions and empirically-based studies which focus on "language learning and teaching in classrooms" but also on the investigation of "processes and consequences of learning other languages in domains beyond the classroom" (Lantolf, 2000, p. 19). Thus, socioculturalism in SLA has so far examined "important and relevant psychological, affective, linguistic, social, and

individual conditions" (Donato, 2000, p. 44) of SLA, as well as the "impact of culturally organised and socially enacted meaning on the formation and functioning of mental activity" (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 3).

Rogoff's Transformation of Participation Perspective in SLA

I argue that sociocultural theory in SLA has provided a broader and richer framework that foregrounds the embeddedness of L2 learning within specific social and cultural contexts, and has promoted research to be undertaken within real everyday classrooms. Nevertheless, I find that this research still mostly orients enquiry towards the theoretical understanding and discussion of Vygotsky's core concepts and their implications in SLA, staying very close to the learner and the process of learning, and not yet providing rich information on the process of participation or the contexts or arrangements of learning themselves. It seems to me then that sociocultural theory in SLA has not – to date – incorporated the core ideas of Rogoff's take on sociocultural theory and thus, it mostly aims to explain the 'acquisition' / 'internalization' of a L2 through mediation within the learners' 'zone of proximal development' (and other allied concepts which are "historically related to his theorizing" and include identity, scaffolding and dynamic assessment" (Swain, et al., 2011, p. xiv)), rather than uncovering L2/FL learning as "participatory appropriation through guided participation in a system of apprenticeship" (Rogoff, 1995, p. 157). Thus, using Rogoff's TOP perspective provides *a* new, important and different theoretical informant to SLA which, on one hand, contributes to strengthening sociocultural theory in SLA and, on the other, permits and

supports the study of classroom practices across cultural contexts. By appropriating central concepts from Rogoff's TOP perspective such as participation, practices, culturally organised activity, cultural tools, arrangements, etc., and focusing on the cultural-institutional lens, without separating it from the personal and interpersonal lenses (as explained in detail in Chapter 2), I am equipped to explain FL pedagogy in young children's classrooms across two private schools in two different nations.

Chapter Summary

This chapter has talked about some of the main theoretical informants of SLA with a particular interest in understanding sociocultural theorists in SLA. In doing so, I have identified the following concepts:

- imitation, practice and reinforcement in behaviourism;
- a critical period in children's development; acquisition/learning, monitoring, stages, comprehensible input and affects in innatism;
- experience, practice (involving effort from the learner), motivation and noticing in the information processing model;
- linguistic input in connectionism;
- linguistic input, modified interaction, acculturation, socialisation and identities in Interactionism;

- genetic method, mediation, inner speech, regulation, internalization, the zone of proximal development in Lantolf, Thorne and colleagues' work embedded in sociocultural theory.

I have then highlighted the main focus and contribution of sociocultural theorists in SLA, and made explicit how different their focus and interest is from Rogoff's research. I have thus shown that research in SLA has not incorporated the core ideas of Rogoff's TOP perspective and argued that my study provides a unique and appropriate theoretical informant to SLA, which broadens the possibilities of research by removing the focus on the examination of how, if, and/or when a child 'acquires' a L2 or FL, and stressing the importance of studying teachers' and learners' participation in sociocultural activities to "understand and support learning" (Rogoff, 1997, p. 283) in FL classrooms across contexts. Specifically for this study, I have made explicit (in this and the previous chapter) that Rogoff's TOP perspective provides a solid theoretical framework with clear conceptual understandings that facilitate the investigation of FL classroom practices, and also a powerful tool that supported the case study design, data generation and analysis, which I explain in detail in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH DESIGN

Chapter Overview

The case study design, procedures for data generation, and approach to data analysis used in this study are described in detail in this chapter, highlighting how Rogoff's Transformation of Participation perspective directly informed my methodology, and thus the choice of my research design, in the investigation of classroom practices within and across FL lessons within young learner classrooms in two private schools. I explain my fieldwork at High Mount Girls Grammar School and The Canterbury School, starting with how – and why – these two schools were identified and accessed in order to study FL classroom practices across contexts. I then explain the methods of the study and how they were used to generate data during fieldwork and then were subjected to the process of interpretation. In addition, I highlight ethical considerations and issues of reliability, validity and methodology throughout the writing of the chapter.

A Case Study of Classroom Practices across Contexts

I have explained in detail that the focus of this study is on the classroom practices in young children's FL classrooms in one Australian and one Colombian private school. The research design therefore had to allow me to describe, understand and explain these classroom practices (the phenomenon

of interest) within and across FL lessons within young learner classrooms in the two schools. Consequently, using a case study approach as my research strategy allowed me to "investigate [this] contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, specially [given that] the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (Yin, 2003, p. 13). In other words, this type of empirical enquiry supported my focus on the practices (phenomenon) and not the contexts (lessons, classrooms, schools or wider institutions) themselves as cases, even though these contexts – along with their past and present participants – define, enact, transform and perpetuate the practices.

The next step was then to confine the phenomenon to the sites. Consequently, the following sections describe the process of selecting and gaining access to schools in Australia and Colombia, and the recruitment of participants.

Selection of one Private School in Each Country

In my introductory chapter, I explained the process of selecting the combination of educational contexts for this thesis: FL classrooms for young children in one Australian and one Colombian private school. In brief, the number of sites for the fieldwork was chosen taking into consideration constraints of time, resources (specifically since this study involved fieldwork overseas), and scope of the study. I made the decision that, because of the focus of this research, involving just one school in each country provided sufficient insights on the classroom practices in FL classrooms. In addition, studying schools in Australia and Colombia was in line with Rogoff's interest in

cross-cultural work and, importantly, took into consideration my personal motivation and my background as a Colombian; this provided me with a unique opportunity to meaningfully compare two educational contexts that I have participated in and which have not been previously studied simultaneously. Lastly, choosing private schools instead of public schools was a critical choice given that public schools in both countries do not generally cater for pre-school aged children (i.e. children younger than 5 in Melbourne and Santafé de Bogotá) and are less likely to offer FL classes on a regular basis to young children.

To select the private schools in each country, the shared decision with my supervisors was to involve local experts (i.e. academics on bilingualism from each country) to help me to both identify and to be introduced to the schools. The selection of the private school was entirely up to the experts but they were asked to identify sites that would permit the in-depth study of information-rich (Patton, 1990) FL classroom practices. An additional consideration was that the FL taught had to be French, Spanish or English to facilitate my observation and analysis without the need for an interpreter. Fortunately, Dr Margaret Gearon from Monash University in Australia and Dr Anne-Marie de Mejía from La Universidad de Los Andes in Colombia were both extremely generous with their time and contacts and I was able to do my fieldwork in the schools they recommended. As expected, the private schools suggested by a local expert in each country, reflect the national status of FL education in each country with mainstream education with FL teaching being the most common FL programme in place in Australia; and with English as a key part of the curriculum in Colombia with a particular interest in immersion

programmes in private schools (Chapter 1). Later in Chapter 5 I describe the schools in detail.

Consent from Teachers, Families and Schools

In line with my ethics approval, in Australia Dr Margaret Gearon first contacted Pasqua (pseudonym), the Language Coordinator at a private school in Melbourne that I have chosen to call High Mount Girls Grammar School. A meeting was set up with Pasqua and the Head of Junior School so I could meet them in person. They were given a full explanation of the research, and received a copy of the project's explanatory statement (Appendix A) and informed consent form (Appendix B) to be passed on as my invitation to the FL teachers teaching children in pre-school and Year 1. (Including this year level was a suggestion from the language coordinator to better understand the FL programme in place at the school.) Both Pasqua and the Head of Junior School were excited about the project and agreed that Pasqua would be the one giving the forms to the teachers, as she worked collaboratively with her peers and was not in a position of power over them (an important ethical consideration). After a few months of unfortunate events (changes in staff and long holiday breaks), I received an informed consent form back from the specialist teacher for pre-school and Year 1. Lastly, an explanatory statement (Appendix C) was given to the school and I requested a letter of institutional consent (Appendix D) from the school.

In Colombia, Dr Anne-Marie de Mejía contacted Amalia (pseudonym), the Head of Middle School – who had recently been the Head of Pre-School –

of a bilingual private school in Santafé de Bogotá that I have called The Canterbury School and put me in contact with her via email. The documentation (Appendices A and B) was given to Amalia who then passed it on to three peers from pre-school: one teacher from each of the year levels. The three teachers quickly expressed their interest and agreed to participate. Lastly, once Amalia and I received the teachers' informed consent forms, Amalia presented the project at a School Board meeting using an explanatory statement for the school (Appendix C) and received full support – and a letter of institutional consent (Appendix D) – from the Board and the Head of Pre-School.

Additional consent was required from both schools as the students' language and activities needed to be included in my field notes and videotaped observations (explained in detail later in this chapter). The children in the participating teachers' classrooms were observed and videotaped as they interacted with the teacher and / or peers in an activity. Parental / guardian permission was requested to include children's language and activities during these incidental observations in the data analysis for the project. The schools were given an explanatory statement and electronic copies of informed consent forms (Appendices E and F for Australia and G and H for Colombia) for the children's guardians. Schools then made changes to the informed consent forms according to their own policies, and chose to be responsible for communicating with guardians and receiving their authorization.

In summary, the two participating schools were High Mount Girls Grammar School in Melbourne, Australia and The Canterbury School in

Santafé de Bogotá, Colombia. The first school is a private school (for girls only) that uses mainstream education with French teaching but with an innovative method called Accelerated Integrative Method (AIM). The second is a bilingual school offering an early partial immersion Spanish-English programme and with strong foreign connections. Within them, my participants were Sylvie (pseudonym), the specialized French teacher at High Mount Girls Grammar School and the children in the Early Learning Centre (3 and 4 year olds in two separate classrooms), Prep (first year of schooling in Australia) and Year 1. And at The Canterbury School, my participants were Virginia, Marta and Sandra (pseudonyms) and the children in Pre-Jardín (4 year olds), Jardín (5 year olds) and Transición (first compulsory year of schooling in Colombia) respectively.

Data Generation

The selection of methods in this study was purposefully chosen for the research aims of this study and is in line with the ethnographic methods Rogoff's work adopts (Chapter 2). In addition, this selection is derived from my use of case study as a research strategy which entails using multiple sources of evidence (Yin, 2003) that allow data triangulation (Patton, 1990, p. 187). Thus, data was generated between October and December 2008 using:

- *Classroom observations (with and without videotapes)* of lessons to identify and describe classroom activities, classroom organization and instruction;

- FL teacher *semi-structured open ended interviews* to support and/or corroborate the description of classroom activities and individual teachers' instructional practices;
- and *documentation* (specifically teachers' notes and planning material, and formal studies from the FL programmes and curriculums) to better understand and explain – historically and institutionally – practices and regularities across contexts.

Classroom Observations

Observations (with and without a video camera) of classrooms were the main source for data generation in this study as these sources allowed me to undertake a naturalistic enquiry that would lead me to the qualitative description and analysis of classroom practices. The participating teachers were observed two times in each classroom before videotaping took place. The observations aimed to familiarize the children and teachers with the researcher and the camera. These early observations were also used to make detailed ethnographic field notes through which the researcher described the situation in the classroom and recorded language and interactions, as well as the sequence of activities within each lesson (Delamont, 2002; Denzin, 1989). Once these two observations were concluded, one additional observation (without a camera) took place in Transición and two or three lessons were videotaped in all the other classrooms across the two schools. Considering I wanted to research natural and everyday lessons to analyse the classroom practices, my participation in the classrooms while undertaking observations

was largely that of a passive participant observer remaining in a corner of the rooms and only intervening (i.e. answering questions) when the participants involved me.

In line with my research aims and ethics approval, the camera was pointed towards the FL teachers (the creators of “the environmental context, [… the] opportunities for social mediation, and […the] challenging encounters [that] guide the learning” (Perez & Torrez-Guzman, 1992, p. 62) without losing sight of what was happening around them. In other words, the focus stayed close to the FL teachers whilst keeping the widest view possible, to include children’s language and activities as they interacted with the teacher and peers in each activity, as well as clarity about the resources and the classroom layout. This contextual richness is in fact one of the main reasons why videotapes have been used by sociocultural and classroom culture researchers alike (see for example Gallego, et al., 2001; Haworth, et al., 2006; Rogoff, Mistry, et al., 1993; Tobin, Wu, & Davidson, 1989). In addition, videotaping allows a slowed down viewing (Goldman & McDermott, 2007), the revisiting of data many times (Fleer, 2008a, 2008b), and interpretation by multiple viewers (Fleer, 2008b; Rosenstein, 2002), which were all analytic techniques benefiting this study. Videotaping was also a tool I had used for data generation and analysis in a previous study (Fleer, et al., 2008; Fleer, Tonyan, Mantilla, & Rivalland, 2009) which made its use familiar and helpful for me.

There are also various weaknesses associated with observations: they are time-consuming and expensive, and can cause events to unfold differently

because of the observers' presence (Yin, 2003, p. 86). Another weakness has to do with individuals not wishing to be filmed. These weaknesses were all pertinent for my research. The first issue was that observation time was limited to six visits to each school to generate data from six lessons (a decision made in agreement with my supervisor Dr Joce Nuttall). This still proved to be a time-consuming process for data generation with an incredible amount of rich data to analyse: 40 pages of field notes and over four hours of videotaped lessons: three 20-minute lessons in Early Learning Centre (hereafter ELC) 3, one 40-minute lesson in ELC4, and three 30-minute lessons in both Prep and Year 1. At The Canterbury School, 225 minutes were videotaped: two 45-minute lessons in Pre-Jardín and three 45-minute lessons in Jardín.

The second issue had to do with participants' behaviours towards the video camera. The children for example reacted in a range of ways from taking a quick look and then ignoring the camera and focusing on the teacher, to playing out / performing in front of the camera without ever losing awareness of my presence. Moreover, teaching in front of the camera seemed comfortable for Sylvie, but not for Virginia and Marta. Sylvie made no mention of feeling different when being filmed, and there is little evidence in the videos of eye contact with the camera. In contrast, Virginia and Marta told me they were not used to being videotaped while teaching, and they can be seen making quick and frequent eye contact, or smiling at me when children answered their questions correctly and/or when the children said or did something that made the teachers giggle. Because this study focuses on classroom practices (the cultural-institutional lens) – and not on individuals – resulting from the analysis of patterns and not of isolated variables (Rogoff &

Angelillo, 2002), these behaviours (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982) might have changed slightly the sequence of events but do not risk altering the findings of this study.

The third issue was that guardians did not always give permission for the children to be videotaped at The Canterbury School. Although I had been given ethical approval to observe but not use the segments of field notes and videotapes when these children were present for data analysis, in reality the teachers asked me to make changes in the use of the video camera. While in Pre-Jardín everyone could be videotaped, in Jardín, Marta first asked me to delete the parts of the video where the child (only one in this classroom) could be seen, and then decided to move the child to a different classroom for the remaining videotaped lessons so that I could videotape without editing. These changes seemed reasonable but may have temporarily impacted the child as he had to be removed from his everyday classroom for two lessons. I do not see this as having any impact on the data generation or analysis of this study. In Transición however, Sandra was concerned about having a videotape within the classroom as at least three guardians had not agreed their child could be part of the study and she had not received all the guardians' responses. Consequently, the only option she felt comfortable with was for me to observe and take field notes but without a video camera. To compensate, I made more rigorous notes of the contextual information I knew I could miss by not having a video camera but there is still a significant difference worth recognizing in not having videos of the lessons available during data analysis.

Interviews

Rogoff (1997, p. 273) asserts that…

> …neither the view of observers nor of people themselves is a “true” window on cognitive processes. Researchers should take advantage of whatever evidence is available from their own observations as well as from the reports of other observers and the people involved to create a plausible account that advances understanding among a community of investigators about the phenomenon under study.

Interviewing was therefore used as the second main method of data generation in order to understand the observations in the light of information from the participants responsible for setting up the FL teaching activities for the children. I used interviews to a) learn about the teachers’ personal experience learning and teaching a FL, b) understand their views on the FL programme in place at the school, and c) “enhance observation” (Rosenstein, 2002, p. 21) by asking them to describe what had happened during the lessons I had observed. I specifically used open-ended interviews as these are commonly used in sociocultural research (e.g. Rogoff and colleagues use this tool in extent), because they are a source of evidence that works nicely with observations (Denzin, 1989; Yin, 2003) and are targeted and insightful when developing case studies (Yin, 2003). This type of interview “require[s] working from […] a set of questions for which the researcher wishes answers” and “assume that meanings, understandings, and interpretations cannot be standardized” (Denzin, 1989, pp. 42-43). Prior to the fieldwork, I was aware that “informants may lie, omit relevant data, or misrepresent their claims”

(Dean & Whyte, 1958, as cited in LeCompte & Goetz, 1982, p. 46). In my study however, data triangulation suggested there were few examples of misrepresentation of claims on the part of the participants. Because the main aim of the interviews was to triangulate the description of classroom activities that I had observed, I found the teachers' input invaluable in allowing me to describe and clarify classroom activities and instructional practices.

For this study, I developed a set of questions that allowed me to conduct semi-structured interviews while keeping up an informal conversation (sometimes walking between classrooms and other times in the classrooms or staff rooms) with teachers. These guiding questions were in line with the main motivating research questions (Chapter 1) of my study and are shown in Appendix I along with a summary (in English) of one transcript (in Spanish) from a teacher's interview in Appendix J.

Documentation

Documentation was used as the third source of evidence for this study because accessing documents from the teachers (e.g. notes and planning material), the schools (e.g. newsletters and reports on websites), and the FL programmes and school curriculums in place (e.g. formal studies on immersion) supported the study by better understanding and explaining – historically and institutionally – the findings on classroom practices and regularities across contexts. There were two unexpected aspects about access to documentation that I wish to address. On one hand, before beginning the fieldwork I was unsure about how easy it would be to access documents from

the schools as I thought some documents could “be deliberately blocked” (Yin, 2003, p. 86). To the study’s benefit, all the participating teachers were willing to share documents with me and I was even allowed to review (and in various cases photograph or photocopy) very thick folders with timetables, notes and past and present planning material. One teacher also gave me a document which provided an evaluation of the teaching from a third-party institution. This was a helpful document that corroborated one of my findings but which I decided not to include as a source because it presented an ethical dilemma: using a document that the school – as an institution – might have preferred not to give me access to. On the other hand, another unanticipated result was that the FL programmes and the curriculum in place at the sites have been documented in various reports and studies (e.g. International Baccalaureate Organization, 2000, 2005 - 2009; Maxwell, 2004; McKinney, 2009) that I could easily access which proved to be extremely helpful in enhancing contextual descriptions and also investigating or explaining classroom practices.

Data Analysis

In this section I describe the process of identifying the most appropriate unit of analysis for this research, incorporating literature from data analysis, Rogoff’s TOP perspective and classroom cultures. Second, I describe the approach to data interpretation I employed in order to describe and identify cultural regularities across lessons, classrooms and schools, by giving details of the process from transcription of data, to the definition of categories, to finally re-examining the data using the resulting inductive thematic categories.

Unit of Analysis

I have explained in Chapter 2 that, in sociocultural theory, there is still controversy about the notion of the 'appropriate' unit of analysis. I have clarified that Rogoff (1995, 1997, 1998) maintains that an 'activity' is an appropriate unit and gave examples of everyday activities used in Rogoff's work as the unit of analysis (e.g. paper folding activities, operating novel objects, and cookie sales) to explain cognitive activities such as planning, problem solving and guided participation. In doing this, I have explicitly emphasised the use of the construct of 'activity' in this thesis in its everyday sense of participatory action. To describe, understand and explain the phenomenon of FL classroom practices, my first thought was to use the FL 'lesson' as the 'everyday activity' that enables the 'cognitive activity' of FL learning. Thus, each lesson (20 to 45-minute French lessons at High Mount Girls Grammar School, and 45-minute subject lessons in English at The Canterbury School) would be used as the 'activity' to be analysed. Yet, as I studied the data using the lesson as the analytical unit, it was evident that the complexity and 'messiness' of each lesson was not allowing me to analyse the data as closely as I needed to in order to address my research questions. Patterns of similar episodes within and across lessons and classrooms led me to look for a smaller analytical unit within each lesson. This idea is in line with Matusov's (2007) claim that "the unit of analysis cannot be fully known before the research is started" (p. 328) as it should be shaped by "the purpose of the researcher and the material of the study" (ibid, p. 308). Moreover, Matusov

argues that it should be defined in part by the audience and the research participants.

Using these ideas of an incomplete unit of analysis, I searched for a more appropriate unit of analysis for my research study. Literature from authors investigating classroom cultures became relevant; for example Clarke, Mesiti, O'Keefe, Xu, Jablonka and Mok (2007) and Valli and Chambliss (2007) found that smaller units of analysis within the lessons were more useful for researching mathematics classroom cultures. Clarke et al. identified lesson events "as an alternative unit consisting of a sub-unit of a lesson having a form (visual features and social participants) and function (intention, action, inferred meaning, and outcome)" (cited in De Corte & Verschaffel, 2007, p. 249). According to these authors, these events "have a certain familiarity and are used with sufficient frequency, and therefore, seem relevant and useful for cross-cultural comparison" (ibid). Valli and Chambliss (2007, p. 58) focused on classroom activities stating that "because teachers conceptualize and organize their lessons according to activities, they serve as a natural analytic unit, enabling the researcher to stay close to participants' frames of reference". To support their argument, they use Gallego, Cole and the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition's work (2001, p. 957 as cited in Valli & Chambliss, 2007, p. 58) on classroom activities revealing "the relevance of culture to learning, the different roles that participants play within those activities, and the varying types of cultures that are produced".

In my case, I was finding similar lesson episodes that were repeated – or slightly modified – both within one lesson and across lessons, but without

always or necessarily appearing with sufficient frequency or having a very clear function like the lesson events defined by Clarke et al. (2007). Furthermore, because my interest was in cross-cultural classroom practices using a TOP perspective, it seemed clear that my research goals were more related to Valli and Chambliss' definition of the term classroom activities (within FL lessons in my study). This then provided a unit of analysis that was methodologically and empirically suitable for my study. The classroom activities that were identified through data interpretation of observations, interviews and documentation are explained in detail in the following section.

Data Interpretation

Interpretation of the data for this study began with numerous reviews of the multiple sources of evidence (field notes, videos, interviews' transcripts and documents) selected for this study in order to become very familiar with them (Delamont, 2002). Each lesson was then described with 'thick description[s]' (Denzin, 1989)…

> … in a way that [was] faithful to the situation and at the same time comprehensible to someone from another background. The descriptions […] give sufficient interpretation and contextualization of the observation to enable an unfamiliar reader to visualize the scenario or to act out the sense and feeling of the event. (Rogoff, Mistry, et al., 1993, p. 38)

Considering that the main contribution and purpose of this study was to identify and describe the under-researched phenomenon of FL classroom practices in young children's classrooms across communities, I could not and did not wish to start my analysis with a series of prior categories to interpret the lessons. I began by viewing the videotapes – as they were – and dividing them into video segments based on a matrix where the transcript was divided every time a new episode seemed to begin or when I was unsure about the continuity of an episode (R. Mejía-Arauz, personal communication, July 19, 2006). The example below shows this process, illustrating how one part of the transcript of a videotaped observation was divided into three segments:

School: The Canterbury School Year Level: Jardín Teacher: Marta

Date: November 13 2008

Classroom size: 23 learners (12 boys and 11 girls).

Classroom Layout: The classroom is a spacious rectangle with big windows looking to a small playground. There are 5 circle-shaped tables (4 – 6 children) around the room as well as a bookshelf with books (from Oxford Reading Tree, Sunshine Books and GINN Big Book Phonics) and other materials.

There is a long white board on one side with the teacher's desk (not used during class) and a long carpet. The board displays a question: "How does it feel?" and some pictures with names and drawings of different subjects and activities.

Below the windows, there are ABC books and craft resources. Children have named holes to put their bags and clothes. On the opposite side, there is a shelf with a variety of teaching resources (e.g. flash cards, wooden shapes of different sizes, print outs, etc.) on it and a name that says: Maths / Language Centers. On the remaining wall, there is a display on children's work answering the question "how does it feel?"

Transcript Code: TCS – J D4

Line	Transcript	Description
463	M is standing near the whiteboard and some children are standing near her. Chidren are putting old shirts, t-shirts or smocks on.	Marta (the lead teacher) and the children are moving freely around the classroom. The children are putting on protective clothing (without being told why). Marta helps children find their clothing and makes sure sure everyone gets ready to begin class, while also bringing out resources (a big hand-made book titled "Brown bear, brown bear, what do you see?" (Martin Jr & Carle, 1967) and hand-made coloured paper puppets) that she will begin using next.
464	M: Look there's a t-shirt there.	
465	Children continue walking around.	
466	M is setting up an activity with a big hand-made book and hand made puppets.	
467	M (to one child): Let me see. (Grabs t-shirt, turns it around and gives it back)	
468	M: 1, 2, 3 everyone sitting on the carpet.	
469	M: This one belongs to María José.	
470	M talks to someone on the door about a child who is absent.	
471	Children continue putting their protective clothing on and some sit on the mat waiting for M.	
472	M: Ok, sitting on the carpet.	
473	M talks to the assistant for a second.	
474	M: Ok, Sara, Josesito, Ok…	
475	M: What do you see here? (points to the book)	Once the children are sitting down on the mat, Marta begins showing them the book pointing out to the big brown bear that is on the cover. Marta reads the title and then begins asking the children which animal they are seeing on each page. Children answer (in chorus). Marta uses a paper-made hand puppet of each animal to say "good morning" and children reply "good morning". Once the story ends, Marta goes back to the cover and begins the story again, but instead of reading and using puppets, this time she points to each animal, asks the children to say which animal it is and which colour it is. Children are asked if the colour matches the one of the real-life animal
476	C: Bear	
477	M: what do you see?	
478	C: Big bear	
479	M: A big, brown bear. Look, here is the brown bear.	
480	M grabs the bear puppet and talks to the children: Good morning children.	
481	C: Good morning.	
482	M (as bear): my name is Big Brown Bear.	
483	C1: El?	
484	M: Yes.	
485	C1: Es una historia?	
486	M: Yes, it is a story about Big Brown Bear. And BBB is looking at some things. Let's see what he finds out when he goes out.	
487	M: So here is BBB and he is asking us, what do you see? Gabriel…	
488	M reads: "Brown Bear, BB, what do you see?"	
489	M turns page: let's see what BB is	

	looking at… "I see a red bird looking at me". Look at the red bird and he is looking at BB.	and to say which colour the real-life animal is (if there is no match). With some animals (i.e. the cat and the dog), children are asked if they have one as a pet. Those who do raise their hands, and Marta asks them (in turns) to share the name of their pet with the group.
490	M grabs the bird puppet.	
491	M: Here is… a red bird looking at me. Look he's looking at you.	
492 – 630	[…]	
631	M: What animal do you see?	
632	C: Fish	
633	M: It's a goldfish. What colour is the goldfish?	
634	C: Orange and yellow.	
635	M: And, are these animals?	
636	C: No.	
637	M: These are…	
638	C: People	
639	M: children. Children looking at me.	The sequence of the animals in the story is now used to talk about the initial sound / letter of each animal (e.g. B for Bear). Marta uses coloured markers to write down the name of each animal, emphasizing the first letter and using the colour that was used in the book. Once the children identify the initial sound (with her help) she connects this sound with the character from Letterland and sings the song that goes along with it (e.g. Bouncy B…). Most children join her singing.
640	M: Ok, turn around and look to the board.	
641	M grabs a set of colored markers and places them on the small shelf below the board. She also grabs the book and puts it closer to her.	
642	M: V, S, looking to the board please. J?	
643	M (starts writing): Bear (uses the colour brown)	
644	M: What's the initial sound of bear?	
645	C: BBBB	
646	M begins singing the letterland song and using the action for bouncing.	
647	M and C: Bouncy B says B B * 4	
648	M: the initial sound of bear is BBB. And the colour is brown (writes the word brown). And it also starts with B.	
649 – 714	[…]	
715	M writes fish: What's the initial sound of fish?	
716	C2: and yellow.	
717	C: FFF	
718	M: Ok.	
719	C3: Que chévere, cierto?	

Once all the segments of rich-descriptions had been divided, I annotated an additional column where I wrote a "commonsense interpretation" that,

according to Hedegaard (2008c, p. 49), is “the first explicit statement made by the researcher in relation to what seems meaningful”. An example of this interpretation is now added to the information given above as follows:

Line	Description	Common-sense interpretation
463 – 481	Marta (the lead teacher) and the children are moving freely around the classroom. The children are putting on protective clothing (without being told why). Marta helps children find their clothing and makes sure everyone gets ready to begin class, while also bringing out resources (a big hand-made book titled “Brown bear, brown bear, what do you see?” (Martin Jr & Carle, 1967) and hand-made coloured paper puppets) that she will begin using next.	This seems to be an activity that is about “getting ready” for the next activity. Interestingly, the children are not told (and do not ask) why they need to wear protective clothing. Given that the resources Marta is taking out are not “messy”, I am also unaware of the purpose of wearing these clothes. This reminds me of Rogoff’s work where she explains that in communities where children are segregated and do not pitch-in, the steps to the overall process are rarely known by the novices themselves (Rogoff, et al., 2007). The children demonstrate understanding on the expectation of getting ready and sitting down on the mat.
482 – 638	Once the children are sitting down on the mat, Marta begins showing them the book pointing out to the big brown bear that is on the cover. Marta reads the title and then begins asking the children which animal they are seeing on each page. Children answer (in chorus). Marta uses a paper-made hand puppet of each animal to say “good morning” and children reply “good morning”. Once the story ends, Marta goes back to the cover and begins the story again, but instead of reading and using puppets, this time she points to each animal, asks the children to say which animal it is and	Marta sits down in front of the class in a small chair while the children sit on a mat on the floor. Marta leads the pace, the questions, etc. Children listen silently and respond when asked to do so. Marta uses praise. Marta uses English only. The children respond in both English and Spanish. And, only in Spanish when talking about their pets. The pre-planned activity seems to be about “doing story time” with the aim of reinforcing vocabulary names of animals and colours. However, the activity could also be divided as two separate segments as one part is

	which colour it is. Children are asked if the colour matches the one of the real-life animal and to say which colour the real-life animal is (if there is no match). With some animals (i.e. the cat and the dog), children are asked if they have one as a pet. Those who do raise their hands, and Marta asks them (in turns) to share the name of their pet with the group.	about "reading the book" and another about "testing" the children's vocabulary via quiz questions with one correct answer that all children answer with ease.
639 – 719	The sequence of the animals in the story is now used to talk about the initial sound / letter of each animal (e.g. B for Bear). Marta uses coloured markers to write down the name of each animal, emphasizing the first letter and using the colour that was used in the book. Once the children identify the initial sound (with her help) she connects this sound with the character from Letterland and sings the song that goes along with it (e.g. Bouncy B…). Most children join her singing.	Marta sits now stands in front of the class and the children remain sitting on the floor. Marta continues leading the pace, the questions, etc. The pre-planned activity seems to be about recognizing sounds of specific letters, learning to write animal names. This letters are linked to the Letterland song that the children already know. Marta also continues reinforcing vocabulary names of colours using different markers.
	Additional Note on Classroom Layout	When I first walked inside this classroom, I found a similar layout to the one found in the Australian schools I have visited during the last 6 years. This layout is very different to the one I experienced while studying at home when individual desks faced the teacher on the board and resources were hidden from learners so that the teacher was the only one who could access them. This feeling of changed setup alerted me to the possibility of seeing different types of teacher-learner interactions and collaboration. However, during this lesson, children never used the 'centres' and did not have access or time to explore the resources. Learners mainly sat on a

		mat on the floor (instead of the chairs) and faced the teacher. The following quote might help explain this (if I continue finding this throughout lessons in this year level): "A big part of the difficulty in attempts to 'implement' collaborative learning in U.S. classrooms may stem from the assumption that putting a bunch of children in a group will do the job". (Rogoff & Toma, 1997, p. 492)

In the next phase of analysis, both the transcripts and commonsense interpretations allowed me to use the qualitative strategies of tagging, labelling, defining and refining proposed by Baptiste (2001). Similar or slightly modified lesson episodes were tagged and given descriptive titles which – as the interpretation continued and was integrated with the interviews and documents – were then labelled as a coherent group and then categorized as different classroom activities. Some of the titles given to the classroom activities were informed by the literature and others were determined inductively from the data. Firstly, categories of activities that originated from the literature (usually L2 teaching materials) were: *music*, *book reading* and *games* (see for example Gilzow & Branaman, 2000; Haworth, et al., 2006; Huy Lê, 1999; Martin, 1995; Martin & Cheater, 1998; Munoz, 1969; Shtakser, 2001; Tierney & Dobson, 1995). Secondly, activities that originated from the FL programmes and curriculums in place (explained in detail in Chapter 5) were: *scripted play* (Histoires en Action In AIM Language Learning, 2007), *experiments*, *brainstorming* and *Letterland*. Lastly, activities originating from common teaching practices were: *routine*, *pure instruction*, *counting*, *drawing/colouring*, *writing*,

presenting, *prop labelling* and *naming*. For example, the three segments that I have illustrated above were now tagged along similar ones and categorized like this: Segment 1 – *Routine*; Segment 2 – *Book Reading and Prop Labelling*, Segment 3 – *Letterland and Music*. By this stage, this process was already starting to answer one of my secondary research questions, which aimed to identify the classroom activities used by FL teachers to teach the FL to the children. The identification and description of these activities in the classrooms of schools studied in this thesis is discussed in detail in Chapter 5.

Once these classroom activities had been identified and named, I needed to develop a "coding scheme" (Angelillo, et al., 2007) that would allow me to analyse this 'unit of analysis' using the key concepts from my theoretical positioning explained in Chapter 2 (i.e. practices, culturally organised activity, cultural tools, etc). To do this, it was imperative to use…

> … the study's working question to guide decisions about what categories should be coded, and how. Without continual reference to and honing of the central research questions, coding schemes run into a number of dangers – especially the risk of trying to capture everything that happens (rather than to focus) and the risk of examining arbitrary variables that do not address the purpose of the research. (Angelillo, et al., 2007, p. 191)

Hence, and given that my main motivating question (Chapter 1) was "What are the classroom practices in young children's (3 – 5 year olds) FL classrooms in one Australian and one Colombian school?", I focused on

finding thematic categories (Hedegaard & Fleer, 2008) that allowed me to foreground the cultural-institutional lens keeping a focus on the classroom practices which I had previously defined – drawing on Rogoff's research approach – as *the nature of the activities through which young children are being taught a FL in relation to the contributions of the classrooms' participants and the ongoing – and changing – influences of the wider institutions of which they are a part*. Classroom activities (and the corresponding video clips attached to each category) were therefore grouped; then, as I continued interpreting both the "ethnographic accounts" and the common-sense interpretations of video segments from the same category, "more focused empirical questions were crafted" (Angelillo, et al., 2007, p. 192) as part of addressing the research questions of the study. For example, in developing an understanding of music as a meaningful, shared, ongoing activity within the classrooms, some of the questions (based on similar examples by Rogoff (1997)) I asked while interpreting observations, interview transcripts and documents were:

- Why are teachers' using songs / action songs?
- Who sings?
- Which songs are used and why?
- What tools are being used? (e.g. language (L1 and FL), music, recordings, books, pictures, etc.)
- How do the teachers help the children make sense of the language that is being used in the songs? (e.g. use of tools such as L1)

- Is there transformation (added complexity) across songs and/or time?

- What are the links between the songs used?

- What are the links between the songs and other activities seen in the classroom?

- What are the links between the songs and the FL philosophy/curriculum in place? And with the school (in general) philosophy/curriculum?

This type of more focused empirical questioning, along with an effort to find "coding categories that retain[ed the] meanings" (Angelillo, et al., 2007, p. 192) of practices across lessons, classrooms, and schools, resulted in drafts of analytical categories that continued to be refined (Angelillo, et al., 2007; Baptiste, 2001). For example, the empirical question I have mentioned before on the tools used in classroom activities – driven by the use of sociocultural theory in this thesis – helped me pay attention to the concrete resources (e.g. books, pencils, puppets, CDs, objects of various shapes, etc.) and psychological tools (e.g. numerical system, alphabet, music and verbal and non-verbal interaction, etc.) used by participants in the process of FL teaching and learning. As a result, I noticed the use of the children's L1 as an important tool teachers used to mediate FL learning at The Canterbury School. Thus, many of my initial drafts for creating the coding scheme included the following uses of L1: L1 switch in conversation; to introduce or clarify a concept; to translate or request a translation; for classroom management; etc. Simultaneously, the fact that the teacher at High Mount Girls Grammar School,

used very little of the learners' L1 in class and instead relied mostly in gestures from the programme in place (see also Chapter 5), allowed me to focus on a "distinction [that] eventually became a coding category with a precise definition for the final coding scheme" (Angelillo, et al., 2007, p. 192): 'Verbal and non-verbal language in lessons' became one of the sub-categories of Pedagogical Principles of FL teaching in classrooms through which I could easily code and analyse, if, how, and by whom the L1 was used in the classroom, as well as whether movement, gestures and/or non-verbal representations were used by teachers and learners. The thematic categories I summarize in the following section were developed in the same way.

Thematic Categories

The description above shows the development of a coding scheme that allows the study of *patterns* – and not isolated episodes or activities – of classroom practices within and across lessons, classrooms and schools. Following Angelillo, Rogoff and Chavajay's (2007, pp. 190 - 191) advice, I have attempted to do this…

> … through recursively cycling through various phases of abstraction:
> developing and honing research questions based on the initial focus of the research,
> abstracting ethnographic descriptions of participants' engagements in the activities seen in single cases, and

> creating and fine tuning coding schemes to apply across multiple cases by abstracting coding categories that retain meanings fitting individual cases.

As a result, I have inductively generated thematic categories “as a dialectic between the aim of the research […], the theoretical preconditions and the concrete material [and] [t]hrough this process new theoretical conceptual relations develop[ed]” (Hedegaard, 2008c, p. 61). I should also highlight that the thematic categories developed in collaboration with my supervisors who played a critical role in the review of the data: discussion, clarification and abstraction needed to create the coding scheme (see Reliability and Validity of the Research Design). The coding scheme developed for this study can be seen in Appendix K, and the definition of the thematic categories along with the findings resulting from the coding are explained in detail in Chapter 6.

Reliability and Validity of the Research Design

Kirk and Miller (1986) define reliability as “the extent to which a measure procedure yields the same answer however and whenever it is carried out” (p. 19) and validity as defined as the “extent to which it gives the correct answer” (p. 20). This study followed various principles to address these during data generation and analysis. First, data triangulation was used via multiple sources of evidence which “provide multiple measures of the same phenomenon” (Yin, 2003, p. 99). Second, a chain of evidence was maintained to increase reliability (ibid, p. 105) by allowing the reader to understand every step of the

research design process from identification of cases and selection of settings and participants, to selection of sources, identification of the unit of analysis and detailed description of the category system used to interpret data. Specifically, theoretical premises were outlined and the constructs “that inform and shape the research" were defined facilitating replication (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982, p. 39). Third, I used analytic memos to allow “interobserver reliability” (ibid, p. 41) by writing at least four different memos through which I had to test concepts and claims of data in the context of the literature (J. Nuttall, personal communication, March 26, 2010) that were then shared and discussed with Dr Joce Nuttall. Similarly, and with the same result, a random sample of videotapes was given to Dr Margaret Gearon, who carefully viewed the videos, took notes and then discussed them in light of the usefulness of the selected thematic categories and the emerging patterns from analysing the videotapes of lessons across classrooms and schools. Fourth, this thesis also presents rich-transcript material and thorough descriptions providing checks on their interpretation that permit peer-examination (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982) by allowing the reader to check my interpretations (Rogoff, Mistry, et al., 1993) of classroom activities and the patterns across contexts. Fifth, an important aspect of the research design is that identical procedures for data generation were followed in the two sites, not because this ensured comparability, but because it was possible in, and pertinent, for both contexts. Comparison was done in “terms of what people [were] trying to accomplish rather than in terms of specific behaviours” or isolated variables (Rogoff, 2003, p. 33). Last, the validity of this study is also connected to clear explanations of “the historical

traditions of the practice and the preconditions that are anchored in the values that integrate and specify different perspectives" (Hedegaard, 2008b, p. 43).

Chapter Summary

This chapter has provided a detailed description and explanation of my case study and how the sites for fieldwork were selected, invited to participate, and accessed. The sources of evidence for the study were described in reference to data triangulation, their selection to achieve research goals, and the ethical considerations, strengths, and limitations raised by their use. The processes of data generation and data analysis were described and explained, with the aim of maintaining a chain of evidence and outlining theoretical premises and constructs. I argued that an important decision was the selection of the unit of analysis for this study. I described how the unit is in line with Rogoff's notion of meaningful, everyday sociocultural activity, and showed how the concept of 'classroom activities' was developed as an appropriate unit of analysis. In addition, I have illustrated the development of a coding scheme to provide thematic categories that I hope will be of use to researchers interested in studying classroom practices drawing on sociocultural theory. In brief, this chapter has addressed 'how' the research was done. The following chapter describes 'what' activities were observed across lessons, classrooms and schools.

CHAPTER 5: CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING IN EARLY CHILDHOOD

Chapter Overview

This chapter describes the activities during young children's lessons, classrooms and schools. The aim is to attend to the gap in the current literature by providing rich examples of what happens inside these real, everyday classrooms with respect to the organization of teaching activities and how children and teachers participate in these. In Chapter 4, I explained how the classroom activities were identified and how these categories were originated either in the literature, FL programmes and curriculums in place, or common teaching practices in place. To locate these classroom activities, this chapter is divided into two sections: one referring to High Mount Girls Grammar School and one to The Canterbury School. Each section begins with a short description of the school and an account of a) the FL programmes and school curriculum, b) the FL teacher and c) the participating FL classrooms. This information is then followed by a portrayal of everyday lessons and a detailed description of the classroom activities used to teach FLs. I first separate the classroom activities into a) those that are common across classrooms and those that are specific to one or two classrooms but not to all; and b) according to how frequently (measured by a simple count of number of episodes corresponding to each within each classroom. The description is therefore more extensive for activities that were observed more frequently and,

as similarities across activities start arising, less description is given for subsequent activities. The chapter ends with a brief summary showing some regularities of the selection of classroom activities across schools, giving way to further analysis on regularities in the following chapter.

French at High Mount Girls Grammar School

High Mount Girls Grammar School is located approximately 15 kilometres from central Melbourne in an upper-middle class suburb. It caters for over 1000 girls from the Early Learning Centre to Year 12. Its philosophy and curriculum are underpinned by Christian values and it is proud to provide a high quality education for girls by meeting their individual learning styles at different stages of their development (High Mount Girls Grammar School, 2007). The school offers French from ELC to Year 8 and Chinese from Year 7. All students are required to take both languages in Years 7 and 8, and at least one of them in Year 9. Both languages are a very common selection of LOTEs in Australian Schools (Ministerial Council of Education Employment Training and Youth Affairs, 2005).

The focus of French teaching at High Mount Girls Grammar School is on teaching the language via specialized lessons, not on using French as a medium of instruction. Consequently, the school can be considered typical in terms of providing a mainstream education program with FL teaching which – as explained in the Introduction to this thesis – is the most common L2/FL instruction approach used in Australia. However, at this school, the French program is taught with the Accelerative Integrated Method (AIM): a “holistic,

integrated and systematic approach" (AIM Language Learning, 2007, p. 2) that uses only the FL with a balance "among all four language skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking)". In this method, vocabulary and techniques are "systematically designed to ensure rapid fluency building" (ibid) and are taught through play units (usually traditional stories like "The three little pigs"). In other words, students are taught content-specific vocabulary that is presented through story/music/drama (AIM Language Learning, n.d., p. 8) and learned by practicing/repeating the words as well as gestured associations (for more details please read AIM Language Learning, 2007).

The Teaching of French in the Early Learning Centre, Prep and Year 1

Sylvie was the specialist French teacher who participated in the study in 2008. She is an Australian and has no French background in her family. Although she is a non-native French speaker, she is extremely competent and confident in her use of French. She started learning French as a student at High Mount Girls Grammar School when she was in Year 7 at the school. Her FL learning journey continued with one year living in Paris and four years of French studies at University where she completed a double degree in Arts and Science. In 2008, she had taught French at one other school and had been teaching French at High Mount Girls Grammar School for two years. She was most experienced in secondary school but was also familiar with teaching in elementary school. Sylvie received training to teach with AIM when entering the school. She was excited about using the AIM program and noticed the differences in children's fluency and motivation between using traditional

teaching methods (e.g. text books) and AIM. She was confident that children were becoming more fluent but recognized that the students were very unlikely to become competent bilinguals because of the limited time the FL was taught and used by the learners.

In 2008, Sylvie went to the school two times a week and moved between classrooms teaching French to a total of five classrooms on Mondays and four on Wednesdays. During my research, Sylvie taught three year old children in the ELC (ELC3) with one lesson each on Monday and Wednesday that lasted 20 minutes. Four year olds (ELC4) only had one French lesson a week, which lasted 40 minutes. Children in Prep had two lessons a week lasting 25 – 30 minutes depending on the day, and children in Year 1 had two 30 minute lessons each week. The ELC was located in a separate building purpose-built for this age group. ELC3 and ELC4 shared a common area for meals, bathrooms and an outdoor area. The classrooms however were separate, and each of them was designed to allow children (usually between 9 and 15 students) to explore different areas of the room (e.g. a small table with a computer and two chairs, shelves with toys and books, etc.). The walls were decorated with chalk drawings, pictures and artwork and a few notices for parents. The French lessons were held in a small side room that was used for circle-time by the lead teacher when I arrived to the classrooms. Sylvie sat on the only adult-sized chair in the room and the children gathered around her sitting on the floor. Children were not allowed to touch equipment/resources or move to other areas while the “Madame” was in the room.

The Prep and Year 1 classrooms were located in a different building in the Junior School area. Classrooms were larger, catering for 20 – 25 students. Similar to the classroom setup in the Early Learning Centre, children were able to reach different equipment and resources by themselves. There were four joint tables with assigned seats for children. In general, the walls were decorated with posters, photographs and children's artwork. Notices for parents were placed in the corridor outside the classrooms. Examples of this decoration included: children's photographs with their names, posters and photographs of 'healthy foods' from different parts of the world (though nothing from France or in French), and artwork by children answering the question "I am thankful for…". As in ELC, a side of the room was used for French lessons, with Sylvie sitting on an adult chair (this time with a white paper board behind her) and the children on the floor.

Within these year levels, I found no evidence of French being present in the children's school lives outside French lessons. The classrooms and hall rooms had no decoration or words in French, and teachers only knew how to say "bonjour" and "au revoir" to greet and to say good-bye to Sylvie. Most times teachers asked the children to behave "nicely while Madame taught French" and one offered stickers to those who were concentrating and listening during the French lesson. When the lessons were over, sometimes Sylvie asked the teachers if the children could continue the activity a bit longer and most agreed to let them finish and gave them a deadline of 15 minutes. Interestingly, one time a teacher 'greeted' Sylvie saying "I had completely forgotten we had French today" (HMGGS P D3, 806), which I understood to mean that French is seen as an activity only occasionally had by the children.

An Everyday French Lesson in the Early Learning Centre

A summary of the transcript from the third observation in ELC3 is used as an example of an everyday lesson in both ELC3 and ELC4 because Sylvie planned for these two year levels together, with her goal for this age group being to introduce "*AIM but very basic, just a couple of gestures, but […] mainly just play and […] introduc[e] French as a language*" (Sylvie, October 15, 2008: 15).

Sylvie began the lesson by greeting the children with a "bonjour" (good day) song. She then greeted children individually, waiting for them to reply with the sentences "bonjour Madame". Once the greeting was over, the lesson continued with Sylvie taking out various props from a basket full of animals and plastic food. She asked children to say what the prop was and praised correct answers by saying "Bravo". She then asked all children to repeat the word with her and moved to the next prop. Sylvie used songs that related to the props being shown. She also taught a new song using the props in the following way (HMGGS ELC3 D3 671 - 684):

Sylvie (S): Ok, sh sh sh… (She starts picking the same objects she has just shown the children.) Pomme, pomme	S (Sylvie): Ok, sh sh sh… (She starts picking the same objects she has just shown the children.) Apple, apple
Learners (in chorus) (L): Pomme	Learners (in chorus) (L): Apple
S: Poire	S: Pear

L: Poire	L: Pear
S: Fraise… Kate, fraise.	S: Strawberry… Kate, strawberry.
L: Fraise	L: Strawberry
S: Orange	S: Orange
L: Orange	L: Orange
S: Moi, j'aime les pommes. Moi, j'aime [rubs her tummy] les poires.	S: I love apples. I love [rubs her tummy] pears.
Sylvie [begins singing]: Moi, j'aime les pommes, moi j'aime les poires.	Sylvie [begins singing]: I love apples. I love pears.
[Children try to join her song.]	[Children try to join her song.]
S: Moi, j'aime.. hmmm.	S: I love.. hmmm.
S [begins singing again[: Moi, j'aime les pommes, moi j'aime les poires. J'aime les fraises, les oranges et les bananes.	S [begins singing again]: I love apples, I love pears. I love strawberries, oranges and bananas.
S: Encore une fois! Anne, tu te rappelles de cette chanson ? Moi, j'aime les pommes, oui ?	S: One more time! Anne, do you remember the song ? I love apples, yes?
S: Un, deux, trois… […]	S: One, two, three… […]

Once the song was over, Sylvie got some more objects from her basket and continued asking the children to say the names of each prop. She talked about the things she liked (e.g. chocolate) and used gestures to say "yum". Sylvie then got a book and started showing the pages to the children. It was a book about colours. She used the book to talk about the colours and also selected some objects (fruits and others) that matched the colour. Sylvie continued talking about colours, making references to children's clothing and props. Sylvie praised children who said the words for the colours or the props. Sylvie asked the children to repeat some words with her. As she began taking the props away, she said "au revoir" to each thing. Children repeated these sentences. Sylvie then continued the lesson reading a short story about a horse looking for someone to play with. Once the story was read, Sylvie sang a song about a horse walking, trotting, galloping, etc. Actions were copied by the children. She then played a CD and scrolled through the songs slowly while the children said "no Madame" until they heard a song they liked and said "oui Madame". Sylvie and the children sang together. Sylvie finished the lesson saying "au revoir", the children replied "au revoir" and we both left the room.

An Everyday French Lesson in Prep and Year 1

A summary of a transcript from the second observation in Year 1 is used as a descriptive example for both Prep and Year 1 because Sylvie also planned for these two year levels together and started introducing AIM more formally with the use of a Cinderella scripted play. Across lessons, activities might have

been slightly modified in response to children's behaviour and interest but the sequence and use of activities remained extremely similar.

Sylvie began the lesson greeting the children with a good day song. Sylvie said "bon jour" (good day) and gestured if she was well, unwell, happy, etc. (e.g. thumbs up with a smile). The children said the words "je suis" (I am) followed by the word that corresponded to the action. Sylvie emphasized the gestures for "je suis". Sylvie let four children (one at a time) sit on her chair and make the actions. All the children appeared interested in this activity, enjoyed it and knew it well. Sylvie then took out a hand-made book and asked "Qui est-ce?" (Who is this?) and the children answered "Cendrillon" (Cinderella). The book had big pictures with a short script written under each picture. Sylvie and the children read the story together using gestures when needed. Sylvie then arrived at a page that was new for the children. She introduced new vocabulary (e.g. gentleman, dance ball, evening) using posters, antonyms and closed-ended questions and checked that the children could say the words when she pointed to the pictures or the book. She then read the whole page slowly and using gestures. She asked the children to take out the hand-made puppets and practiced the script (including the new page) with them. After this, a child told Sylvie about someone's birthday so Sylvie called the birthday girl to the front and they all sang "Joyeux Anniversaire!" (Happy Birthday!) in French and clapped, counting from one to seven at the end of the song. Sylvie then told everyone the class was over and said "au revoir".

Classroom Activities in French Lessons

Classroom Activities across the Four Classrooms: Music, Routine, Book Reading, Movement Game and Counting

Music – in the form of tune, rhyme, lyrics and/or melody – was the most frequent classroom activity observed across ELC, Prep and Year 1. It was used however recurrently in all of the lessons observed in ELC3 and ELC4, and with less frequency in Prep and Year 1. Sylvie had identified that children in the ELC "*love songs, love them… we can do them… really, over and over again*" (Sylvie, October 13, 2008: 43) and used them accordingly. I found it intriguing however to note that Sylvie said she used songs to "*help to balance the lesson*" (Sylvie, October 15, 2008: 37) because the data revealed that she used them with pedagogical intent and not just as a break or for fun. In fact, the data showed that music – along with labelling props – was the main language input and teaching activity identified in these two classrooms, and was used throughout the lessons to make the transitions between episodes very smooth (e.g. labelling an animal then reinforcing the animals' actions with a song; singing a song about an animal that will then appear as the main character of a book that is going to be read; showing a cake and singing Happy Birthday before blowing the candles, etc.). By contrast, in Prep and Year 1 music stopped being used as frequently and – in line with Sylvie's description of music as a 'different', 'back-up', 'balancing' activity – songs were either used in the background of other activities or as a tool to gather the children, celebrate relevant events (i.e. birthdays and Christmas) or to help learners concentrate.

In general, *Greeting and Good-Bye Songs* were consistently used throughout year levels as an embedded part of the French lessons' routine to *open* and/or to *close* a lesson. Two different songs were used to begin lessons. One was a short repetitive song with a familiar tune. The other was a longer song in which children used simple gestures from AIM and were encouraged to say a full sentence in French (e.g. Je suis triste (I am sad)). For this second song, a few children (different students each lesson) were allowed to come to the front and use the gestures while singing so that the rest of the class completed the sentence out loud. One song was used to close lessons with the same tune and lyrics (only changing "bonjour" for "au revoir") as the shorter greeting song mentioned above. Another song that was part of all the year levels' repertoires was the *Happy Birthday Song* in French. This song was already known by the children and when Sylvie was not aware of someone's birthday, children reminded her to sing this song to whomever had or was going to have their birthday. The song was also used as part of a prop labelling activity in the ELC to practice vocabulary around birthdays (e.g. souffler (blow), bougies (candle) and gâteau (cake)). The only other songs that were observed in all the classrooms were a rock and roll version of the "Frère Jacques" song that Sylvie occasionally used as a "*treat*" (Sylvie, September 8, 2008: 13) and traditional Christmas Songs from France that were part of the December lessons. Most songs were used as a background for the guiding classroom activity but I also observed one 'angel song' that was taught to the children using a CD, gestures and repetition. All the other music activities were only seen in the ELC where music was used both as a guiding activity and

throughout other classroom activities. The use of these songs can be divided into the following groups:

Animal songs. The focus of the lessons was on animals. Hence, Sylvie was using a basket full of animal props and books about animals that were accompanied with songs about various animals and their actions.

Naming Song. One specific song was taught and used to label the animals (as above) but also to get each student to say her name with the full sentence "Je m'appelle …" (my name is….).

Fruit song. Sylvie taught this song to the children in one class and then practiced it in another. It was a simple, repetitive song with a catchy tune. Props were used to show the children the fruit that they needed to say. Props and repetition were used as tools to help children memorize the new vocabulary and words. The song was introduced by showing various food props and then focusing on the fruits before beginning to sing.

Another classroom activity that was used across the four classrooms was routine. The activities that were categorized as routine were those that had become a ritual within the classroom. The other teachers repeated these activities throughout lessons so the children were familiar with them and acted accordingly. At ELC, Prep and Year 1, these activities were simple and mostly short as they were only connected with beginning and finishing lessons via songs (as above) or sentences (e.g. "Ok, tout le monde. Maintenant la classe de français a fini!" (Ok everyone. The French class is over now!)). Routine

activities linked with the “Bonjour” and “Au Revoir” songs described earlier helped Sylvie to gather everyone on the mat and set the atmosphere for beginning more formal teaching. When no songs were drawn in, children repeated sentences like “Bonjour/ Au revoir Madame” (Good morning / Good-bye Mrs) in chorus. There was only one instance when Sylvie made explicit that the class would finish in a different way as seen in the following summary of a transcript (HGMMS P D5: 1282):

Sylvie turns the music off and tells the children (in French) that the class is finished and that it is a bit different because they are going to say "au revoir", "bonne année" and "bonnes vacances" (good-bye, happy new year and happy holidays).

In addition, two lessons had a slight variation to the routine as Sylvie greeted children individually and asked each of them to reply. In ELC3, this involved getting each child to repeat “Bonjour Madame” (Good morning Mrs) after she greeted them with their name. In ELC4, Sylvie asked each child “Ca va?” (How are you?), to which they had to reply how they were feeling on the day using the vocabulary learnt through the regular “Bon Jour song”.

Sylvie brought along children’s books to most lessons and read them out loud; thus, *book reading* was a classroom activity shared across classrooms. In ELC3 and ELC4, some of the books were selected based on the themes she was teaching: animals and food. One of the books was a short one about a horse looking for another animal to play with, and the other book

showed vivid pictures of animals eating food and was read using some of the props from the *prop-labelling* activities to reinforce that vocabulary. One additional book was used to practice colours which – along with numbers – seemed to be a topic that was integrated to the lessons in a recurrent manner. For all year levels, one book was read towards the end of one lesson "*to finish in a nice way*" because "*they all love stories*" (Sylvie, October 15, 2008: 72). Two more books were used to illustrate Christmas vocabulary and to read a fun story to commemorate this time of the year. Finally, and specifically for Prep and Year 1, Sylvie used one book of 'opposites' to talk about different adjectives and explicitly instruct the word "sale" (dirty) which was going to be used later in the teaching of a new page of the scripted play.

In addition to these classroom activities, there was also a short *movement game* that Sylvie used spontaneously towards the end of one lesson with ELC3, ELC4 and also with Year 1. The game involved different commands (including clapping, touching, whirling, etc.) which children copied in a sequence and stopped doing each time Sylvie said "stop". It seemed to be used in the ELC4 lesson because there was some free time before the lesson finished (Sylvie looked at her watch then started doing it) and then replicated with ELC3 and Year 1. Finally, *counting* was the last activity seen across classrooms. In ELC3 and ELC4, Sylvie used counting within the prop-labelling activity to count the number of candles on a plastic cake to practice counting from one to six. In addition, in all classrooms counting was used when finalizing the "Happy Birthday" song to count how old children were by clapping hands.

Classroom Activities only in the Early Learning Centre: Prop-labelling and Naming

Prop-labelling was – along with music – the most important classroom activity in ELC3 and ELC4. This activity was aimed at teaching vocabulary on the curriculum theme (i.e. animals and food), by taking out various props from a basket and asking children to say what the prop was. Praise was given to children who responded correctly and repetition from the rest of the class was required. These episodes were long and sometimes incorporated other activities such as music, book reading or *naming* (getting the children to say their own names within a complete sentence in French). An example of how prop-labelling, naming and music were used simultaneously to teach and reinforce the 'animals' vocabulary as well as teaching children how to say the sentence "Je m'appelle… " (My name is…) seen in the following transcript (HMGGS ELC3 D4, 529 – 547):

[Sylvie (S) grabs a piglet puppet from a blue basket she has brought with her.]	[Sylvie (S) grabs a piglet puppet from a blue basket she has brought with her.]
S: Qui est-ce?	S: Who is this?
Learners (in chorus) (L): Pig	Learners (in chorus) (L): Pig
S: Porcelet	S: Piglet
Sylvie [begins singing]: Je m'appelle porcelet (x3). Comment tu t'appelles?	Sylvie [begins singing]: My name is piglet (x3). What is your name?

[Sylvie points herself and says quietly: Je m'appelle Sylvie]	[Sylvie points herself and says quietly: My name is Sylvie]
S: ou Je m'appelle Harriet (looks at Harriet), ou je m'appelle Anna…	S: or my name is Harriet (looks at Harriet), or my name is Anna…
S: Anna, comment tu t'appelles? Je m'appelle…	S: Anna, what is your name? My name is…
Anna: Anna	Anna: Anna
S: Bravo.	S: Bravo.
[Sylvie takes a bunny]	[Sylvie takes a bunny]
S: Qui est? Il a des longues oreilles. Une petite queue et des grosses pattes … Il saute… sh sh sh… J	S: Who is this? He has long ears. A small tail and two fat legs… He hops… sh sh sh… My…
S sings: Je m'appelle le lapin (x3) (Children join her singing) …	S sings: My name is rabbit (x3)(Children join her singing) …
S continues: Comment tu t'appelles?	S continues: what is your name?
Sylvie looks at a girl: Je m'appelle (uses a very quiet voice) Tu dis? Je m'appelle…	Sylvie looks at a girl: My name (uses a very quiet voice) You say it? My name is…
Bonnie: Je m'appelle…	Bonnie: My name is…

S: Bonnie	S: Bonnie
Bonnie: Bonnie	Bonnie: Bonnie
S: Oui!	S: Yes!

Classroom Activities only in Prep and Year 1: Scripted Play, Pure Instruction and Drawing/Colouring

The *scripted play* is a central component of the AIM method and was the dominant classroom activity in Prep and Year 1. The AIM method begins with the script of “Les trois petits cochons” (The three little pigs) in grade 3 and suggests a few easy plays for younger children to begin understanding the idea of learning a play (AIM Language Learning, n.d.). At the time of data generation at High Mount Girls Grammar School, “Les trois petits cochons” was being taught in Year 2 and “Cendrillon” (Cinderella) was being used in Prep and Year 1. “Cendrillon” is not part of the suggested plays by AIM and was designed entirely by a previous French teacher who left a big hand-made book that had a drawing on the upper part of each page followed with short text with the script of the story. Sylvie explained that she had judged some of the structures to be too complicated for young learners so she “*planned beforehand to leave some parts out*” (Sylvie, December 10, 2008: 87). Sylvie used this book – along with hand-made puppets of the characters that the children had cut and coloured – to teach this play. She taught the children one page at a time and then repeated the whole play various times until the children – as a group – could say it together with little help. The following part

of the transcript shows how the scripted play took place (HMGGS P D3: 992 – 1009):

Sylvie (S) and Learners (in chorus) (L): "Voici l'histoire de Cendrillon. Cendrillon habite dans une grande maison avec ses deux sœurs"… (everyone gets the sisters' puppets)	Sylvie (S) and Learners (in chorus) (L): "And now the story of Cinderella. Cinderella lived in a big mansion with her two sisters"… (everyone gets the sisters' puppets)
L: "méchantes"	L: "wicked"
S: Bravo. Méchantes. Voilà!	S: Bravo. Wicked. That's it!
S and L: "Cendrillon travaille beaucoup"	S and L: "Cinderella works a lot"
S: beaucoup. Sœur un (Sylvie waits for the girls to be holding sister number 1) … un, deux, trois.	S: a lot. Sister one (Sylvie waits for the girls to be holding sister number 1) … one, two, three.
S and L: "Cendrillon, lave ma robe".	S and L: "Cinderella, wash my dress".
L: "Oui, ma sœur".	L: "Yes, my sister".
S: Sœur deux.	S : Sister two.
L: Cendrillon.	L: Cinderella.

S: Attends, attends. Un, deux, trois.	S: Wait, wait. One, two, three.
S and L: “Cendrillon, range ma chambre”.	S and L: “Cinderella, clean my bedroom”.
S : Très bien.	S : Very good.
L: “Oui ma sœur”.	L: “Yes my sister”.
S and L: “Cendrillon, trouve mes souliers.”	S and L: “Cinderella, find my shoes.”
L: “Oui ma sœur”.	L: “Yes my sister”.
S: Pauvre Cendrillon.	S: Poor Cinderella.
S and L: “Oh, je suis fatiguée”.	S and L: “Oh, I’m tired”.

The part of the script that the children had already learned was repeated every French lesson, adding new vocabulary to then be used on the next page (without always referring to the content of that page) using gestures and repetition and also a) pictures for nouns (e.g. showing a poster or a page on a book and asking the children to say what it is), b) the use of antonyms for adjectives (e.g. asking children if they live in a big house or a small house) or c) explanations and demonstrations which are defined by Matusov, Bell and Rogoff (2002, p. 141) as *pure instruction.* The example of pure instruction was observed when Sylvie tried to teach the sentence “est-ce-que je peux aller au bal?” (may I go to the (dance) ball?) by extrapolating a previously known idea:

that of asking for permission to go to the toilet (“est-ce-que je peux aller aux toilettes?”) while in class, to the sentence in the story. In other words, she used a linguistically complex explanation (M. Gearon, personal communication, February 16, 2010) to get the children to understand the verbal concept of asking for permission in French.

Finally, there were two different episodes of *drawing/colouring* activities within these two year levels. One took place only in Year 1 with Sylvie asking the children to colour a drawing of an animal that specified which colour to use where. Sylvie read the instructions aloud and clarified one-on-one when approached by individual children. The second one was to commemorate Christmas by *writing* “Joyeux Noel and Bonne Année" (Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year) and colouring in a picture of a Santa Claus on a Christmas card to take home. Sylvie wrote the text on the board so that each child could copy it on their own and the children then coloured in and decorated their cards while listening to Christmas songs in the background.

This chapter has so far located French language teaching within the school and provided a detailed description of everyday lessons and classroom activities observed during the second semester of 2008 at High Mount Girls Grammar School. Importantly, this description already provides a glimpse of what occurs within young children’s FL classrooms and thus, contributes to the state of current literature on FL education in early childhood. The following section will continue with the description of everyday lessons and classroom activities at the second site of this study: The Canterbury School in Colombia.

English and Primary Years Programme at The Canterbury School

The Canterbury School is located on the northern outskirts of Bogotá. It has been open since the early 1960s and was founded by an English woman to educate the children of Anglo-Saxon expatriate workers. It is an independent co-ed bilingual and international institution (The Canterbury School, n.d.) that caters for more than 2000 students (most of them from Colombian families nowadays) from Nursery (three year old students) to Year 11 (equivalent to Year 12 in Australia). The School is one of the 21 International Baccalaureate (IB) World Schools in Colombia (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2005 - 2009) and uses the pedagogical model promoted by the IBO through its three programmes: Primary Years Programme (PYP), Middle Years Programme (MYP), and Diploma Programme (DP). Hence, the School aims to form fully bilingual (in English and Spanish), knowledgeable, principled, inquiring, thinking and caring individuals (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2002, as cited in Kauffman, 2005, p. 247) who can be successful anywhere in the world. Consequently, all of the students take the bilingual (Spanish-English) version of the IB to graduate with an international diploma that is "recognized in the admissions processes for universities around the world" (Carber & Reis, 2004, p. 340).

Specifically, the IB Primary Years Programme is a

> … thematic, inquiry-based curriculum that spirals around six yearly organization themes. These organizing themes seek to focus learning on notions relevant to all humans, such as what Boyer (1995: 81) called 'Core Commonalities'. Units begin with teacher-generated questions

> that drive inquiry and that support exploration into the unit's central idea. Inquiries generally include an invitation for students to ask their own questions about the topics at hand, followed by teacher facilitation of research and production of projects to present discoveries. (Carber & Reis, 2004, p. 341)

Accreditation for PYP was granted to The Canterbury School on June 2007. Before this accreditation, the curriculum for the preschool and primary school was content-based. Hence, the teachers have received intense training and continue attending occasional workshops emphasizing PYP's "learning through guided inquiry and student involvement" (Kauffman, 2005, p. 248). The school also offers a semi immersion (The Canterbury School, n.d.) bilingual (Spanish and English) education programme. Immersion programmes "attempt to replicate" (Baker, 2006, p. 307) the subconscious process through which a child learns his/her L1 at home, to teach a L2. Hence, the "focus is on content and not the form of the language [and] it is the task at hand that is central, not conscious language learning" (ibid). Immersion education encourages real and authentic communicative competence. Thus, children learn a language by being "given the opportunity to function in it, concentrating on getting the meaning across rather than focusing on learning the formal characteristics of the language" (Lotherington, 2000, p. 52). Specifically at The Canterbury School, immersion is considered 'early' because FL teaching begins at the Nursery level, and it is also "semi" because they offer a partial immersion programme where learners are taught in the FL for 50 – 80% of the time (Lotherington, 2000, p. 51).

Virginia from Pre-Jardín, Marta from Jardín, and Sandra from Transición were the lead bilingual teachers who participated in my study in 2008. They are all Spanish native speakers with Colombian nationality. Virginia and Marta have learned English as a FL, while Sandra has learned it as L2 as she had ample opportunities to experience the language inside her home with her father (a German who only spoke in English with Sandra). English instruction was undertaken by all three at school (Virginia is actually an alumnus of The Canterbury School) and reinforced through studies overseas or during travels. In addition, when this research took place they were all undertaking English training and preparing for certification exams, as these were required by The Canterbury School. Each of them held teaching qualifications (early childhood and elementary pedagogy) from Colombian universities but not a specific qualification in L2 / FL teaching. Their experience teaching English or *in* English varied between 10 and 24 years, with all of them having at least 6 years teaching at The Canterbury School.

The three classrooms each catered for 20 – 25 students. They were spacious with big windows looking out on green outdoor areas. There were a few circular tables each for 3 – 6 children, placed around the room. There was also a bookshelf with books in English in different sizes and other resources that were easily reachable by children including blocks, paper and crayons/markers/pencils. Each room had a long whiteboard on one side with the teacher's desk. The boards usually displayed one of the PYP unit's guiding question (e.g. "How does it feel?" for the trans-disciplinary theme "How the world works" in Jardín) and pictures of the subjects/activities organized in the

correct sequence for the day. The boards sometimes displayed the date or other relevant content for the lesson they were undertaking. The walls were usually decorated with children's artwork (usually related to the PYP unit), Letterland letters and pictures, teachers' instruction material, and/or a display of PYP values. Everything displayed was written in English: there was no Spanish present in the classrooms besides the oral use of the language itself by the children and teachers.

In 2008, the pre-school children's curriculum subjects determined the children's days. As a result, each classroom had a timetable with five to seven 45 minute lessons. Most subjects were taught by the bilingual lead teacher (my research participant) and included Language Arts, Maths, Science, PYP, Values, ICT and Letterland (the latter is not a subject in Transición). Other subjects (drama, physical education, music, Spanish and learning support) were taught by Spanish-speaking specialist teachers. Even though PYP has a separate time in the timetable as with other curriculum subjects, the PYP "organizing themes" (International Baccalaureate Organisation, 2000, p. 23) were explored throughout subjects. I should therefore clarify that in the months of October and November 2008 in pre-school, Virginia and the children in Pre-Jardín were working on the organizing theme of "Sharing the planet" ("PYP Planner - Pre-Jardin," 2008) with the "unit title" (International Baccalaureate Organisation, 2000, p. 45) being "Let's cheer for water!" which was "an inquiry into: the properties of water; the uses of water; why water is necessary for survival; [and] ways of conserving water in our planet"("PYP Planner - Pre-Jardin," 2008). Marta and the children in Jardín were working on the organizing theme "How the world works", in the unit of inquiry titled "How does it feel?",

which was an inquiry into: “describing materials and their properties; what materials are used for and why; [and] how materials change” ("PYP Planner - Jardin ", 2008). Finally, Sandra and the children in Transición were working on the theme “How we organize ourselves” within the unit “Come and meet my hero”, “an inquiry into: non-fiction and fiction heroes from around the world; the attributes of heroes; [and being] heroes in our own way” ("PYP Planner - Transicion ", 2008).

Details of specific teaching episodes will be given when explaining the most common classroom activities identified in this study. For this section however, one lesson for each curriculum subject is described to familiarise the reader with the everyday experiences of the classrooms. Later in the chapter, whole – or parts of – lessons will be returned to with an analytical focus on the classroom activities observed in them.

Letterland

The *Letterland* programme is a “systematic and explicit phonic literacy resource” that helps children “learn to read and write” (EdSource, 2010). In this programme, each letter has its own character and multiple resources including “teacher's guides, story books, readers, software, posters, games and CDs” (ibid). Letterland was used in the school from Nursery to Jardín to teach pre/early reading and pre/early writing skills. Teachers were trained with a workshop run by an expert visiting the school and teachers followed the programme using materials the school provided.

Summary of the transcript from the first observation in Pre-Jardín (TCS PJ D1): The lesson began with Virginia and the children sitting on the mat and singing an action song. Virginia then took out some Letterland picture/text cards and asked the children (in English) to name the pictures. She played a CD saying "listen carefully". She played the song about Harry Hatman. Once the song was over Virginia asked the children to make the "h" sound. She took out the Letterland book and read the story using a very clear voice, making 'h' sounds, and mimicking actions. She showed them some pictures of things starting with the letter 'h' and the children repeated the words in English. Virginia asked the children to walk quietly (like Harry Hatman) to their tables. One child was chosen to get the crayons for each table. The children sat down and coloured a Harry Hatman picture with the Letterland music playing in the background. Virginia reminded them to write their names on their sheets. She checked which children were having trouble writing their names, walked to the board to write their names slowly, and asked them to copy what she was doing. Virginia continued walking around the room checking the students' work and reinforcing the pronunciation of the letter 'h'. Children were asked to hand in their work and get their snacks to go out for a break.

PYP Lesson

Summary of the transcript from the third observation in Transición (TCS T D3): On November 13 2008, the children in the participating Transición classroom were working on creating their own heroes (an activity in line with the PYP unit on which they were working). Sandra began the lesson by telling the students

they were going to continue with the activity of the story of their heroes. She switched to Spanish to tell them that they were creating their character ("Estamos creando nuestro personaje") so they needed to answer the questions about who the heroes are, what they do, where, and how. Sandra explained:

Tienen que usar su imaginación. Usen todo lo que tienen en su cabecita de la televisión, de viajes, de cosas que han leído, visto… Usen todo para crear/inventar su personaje/héroe. Primero cabeza, después hoja y lápiz, y finalmente póster.	You need to use your imagination. Use everything you have in your little head from TV, trips, things you have read, seen… Use everything to create/invent your character/hero. First thinking, then paper and pencil, and finally a poster.

The children picked up their books from a pile on Sandra's desk and sat at their places. They chatted about their stories (in Spanish) with the peers at their table. Various children stood up and approached Sandra to ask her questions. They used English to ask: "How do you write ____?" Sandra said the word and wrote it on the board. Sandra then walked around the room chatting with students and answering questions. Some students were focused on writing by themselves. Others seemed to write and chat simultaneously, while others chatted and observed. The lesson finished with Sandra asking the children (in English) to put their books in their bags.

Mathematics

Summary of the transcript from the second observation in Pre-Jardín (TCS PJ D2): This Maths lesson in Pre-Jardín was the first lesson for the day, so Virginia began the lesson with circle time. The first activity was a movement game (i.e. hands up, hands down, touch your head, etc.) followed by a "good morning" song. She asked the children what day it was in the following way:

Virginia (V): what day is today?

Learners (in chorus) (L): …

V: Yesterday was Monday. Today is …

L: Tuesday

She wrote the word "Tuesday" on the whiteboard and continued asking questions about the day. Virginia held some cards with pictures that listed the lessons the children were having on the day. She asked the children what they were and wrote the subjects/activities on the board. The list of subjects and activities was the following: 1. Maths, 2. English, 3. Snack, 4. Physical Education, 5. Music, 6. Lunch, 7. Drama, 8. Brush your teeth, 9. Spanish, 10. Fine motor skills, 11. Go home.

Virginia then continued the lesson with a variety of songs: "Today is a sunny day", "How many colours in the rainbow?" and "Five little ducks". For the last song, she drew ducks on the board and erased them one at a time as the song progressed. After that, Virginia asked the children to sit in a circle. She

brought out coloured wooden sticks and each child was given five. She then said: “If you have orange, show it to me!” She said a few other commands and most children showed her the matching stick. She asked them in Spanish to leave the sticks on the mat. She asked them to pick one up and then say how many they had left on the mat. She switched to Spanish if children seemed confused. One student was allowed to act as the teacher. Children listened, looked at each others' work, followed instructions and some answered correctly. Virginia let the children play with the sticks for a couple of minutes. Children made shapes; some counted or shared their sticks. They all spoke in Spanish. Virginia moved around asking questions in English like “What shape is that?”, “Show me the yellow one”, etc. Virginia then asked everyone to pick up the sticks and give them to her. The children were told to make a line to go outside and they all went to the nursery playground to collect five acorns each. While outside, the children looked for acorns and put them in their hands. Some collected the right number, others more, others less. Virginia asked each child to count with her in English. Once each child had five acorns, they walked back to the room, placed them in a tray and got ready to go out for a break.

Language Arts

Summary of the transcript from the fourth observation in Jardín (TCS J D4): Marta began this Language Arts lesson setting up an activity with a big hand-made version of the book *Big Brown Bear, What do you see? By* Bill Martin Jr (author) and Eric Carle (illustrator) (1967), and hand-made puppets matching

the animals in the book. She asked the children to sit on the carpet facing her. She began reading like this:

Marta (M) [points to the book]: What do you see here?

Learners (in chorus) (L): Bear

M: What do you see?

L: Big bear

M: A big, brown bear. Look, here is the brown bear.

M [grasps the bear puppet and talks to the children]: Good morning children.

L: Good morning.

M [acting as the bear]: My name is Big Brown Bear.

Antonio: El? (Him?)

M: Yes.

Antonio: ¿Es una historia? (Is this a story?)

M: Yes, it is a story about Big Brown Bear. And Big Brown Bear is looking at some things. Let's see what he finds when he goes out.

Marta continued reading the story using the puppets and asking the children to name the animal on each page and say good morning to it.

Because the book had animals of different bright colours that were not necessarily the real colours of the animals (i.e. a blue horse), Marta and the children had a discussion (mostly in English) about the animals' 'true' colours, and also about the animals each child had either as a pet or at some of the children's farms. Once the story was over, Marta opened each page of the book asking the children "What animal is this?", "What colour is it?", and the children answered in chorus. She then took a set of coloured markers and asked the children to face the whiteboard. Marta began this new activity by writing the word 'bear' with a brown marker. She asked the children to say the initial sound of 'bear' and began singing the Letterland song for B. Children joined the singing. She continued this activity going over each animal, colour, initial sound and Letterland song. After that, Marta asked the children to go to their tables and sit down. As children moved to their tables, Marta selected paints in primary colours. Half of the children from one table got some yellow paint to rub their hands with and the other half got red paint. Marta made reference to the animals in the story that were also yellow and red. Once the children from the table were ready, Marta asked them to stand up in pairs with different coloured hands and rub them together. She asked the children what colour would come out. The children said various colours. Marta got the children to show their hands and then asked the question again. She finished by saying "Red and yellow disappeared and we have a new colour that is … what colour?" Children replied "orange". The children with painted hands were asked to go to the bathroom to wash their hands. The rest of the children waited for their turn chatting, walking around the room, and asking Marta when they were getting some paint too. The same sequence of events occurred for

the remaining two tables, mixing red and blue, and then yellow and blue respectively. At the end, Marta finished the lesson with action games and the "Head, shoulders, knees and toes" song in both slow and fast motion. Children were then asked to get their snacks and leave the room.

Classroom Activities in Lessons in English

Classroom Activities across the Three Classrooms: Routine and Music

There were only two classroom activities that were identified as common across classrooms in the participating pre-elementary classrooms of The Canterbury School: routine and music. As explained before, the activities that were categorized as *routine* were those that had become a ritual within the classroom. These activities were mainly connected with beginning and finishing days/lessons and also with facilitating the transition between activities. The ritual for beginning days included various *music* activities in a "Good morning" song to say hello (across all classrooms), and more songs like "Today is a sunny day", "Mr Golden Sun" and "Rain, rain go away" to describe the weather, and a *counting* song ("There are seven days in a week") to write down the date on the whiteboard in Pre-Jardín and Jardín. In addition, the teachers went over the sequence of curriculum subjects and events of the day with the children by a) showing cards with pictures that the children recognized and said out loud in Pre-Jardín and Jardín or b) Sandra telling the children a few of the things they needed to do and then allowing them to choose in which order to do them. There was also a slight variation in one of the lessons in Jardín with Marta greeting children individually and asking each of them to

reply with the sentence “Good morning” and then say how they were feeling that day. The ritual for finalizing the lessons varied but – in general – teachers told the children to pack up and get ready (e.g. change their clothes for Physical Education, getting their lunchboxes for snack time, making a line for lunch, etc.) for the following subject or for a break. Marta also used a short *movement game* towards the end of most lessons when children were becoming restless after focused study. The game involved different action commands like standing, sitting, crawling and laughing, which children continued doing until a new command was given. Finally, examples of routines within lessons that helped in the transition between activities included short sentences to ask children to move from one part of the room to another, or getting the children to go to the toilet all at the same time so there would be no interruptions in the following activity.

Music activities were also observed across classrooms in most lessons. Similar to what was observed in High Mount Girls Grammar School, their use also decreased between year levels. Music was most frequently used in Pre-Jardín by Virginia who had previously worked as the Nursery Coordinator for two years, and who believed that English in preschool was meant to “*reinforce commands, following instructions, rhymes, songs and story telling*” (Virginia, November 19, 2008: 96 – 97; my translation). Virginia liked using songs and used simple, repetitive lyrics at diverse points, with different aims and in various subjects. By contrast, Marta in Jardín used music mainly in connection with Letterland or Language Arts lessons, where songs were used to learn or practice letters and words, and otherwise as part of singing “Happy Birthday” to children, or occasionally as a fun activity in other lessons. Finally,

in the next year level (Year 1), Sandra only used music once, to say good morning to the students. In general, the songs present in these classrooms can be can be grouped in the following way:

Action body songs. These songs used actions and the body as symbolic tools for learning. Children were encouraged to do a variety of actions (e.g. clapping, rolling, jumping, etc.) and/or to touch different parts of their bodies. These short repetitive songs or adapted songs using a familiar tune included ubiquitous songs like “Open, shut them”, “Hokey Pokey” and “Head, shoulders, knees and toes”.

Routine repetitive songs. These were short repetitive songs aimed at describing different everyday happenings that had been embedded in classroom routines.

Counting songs. These world-wide known songs were used either during routines, such as during maths lessons to support children’s number learning (e.g. “How many colours in the rainbow?”, “Five little ducks”) or to extend ‘Happy Birthday’ songs by clapping from one up to the birthday child’s age.

Letterland songs. Songs that were specific to the Letterland program used in Pre-Jardín and Jardín.

Guiding and Complementary Classroom Activities in Pre-Jardín and Jardín: Letterland, Pure Instruction and Book reading with Prop-labelling, Experimenting, Drawing/Colouring and Presenting

Letterland was used in Pre-Jardín and Jardín in 2008 as a subject, and reinforced throughout Language Arts lessons and any other lesson that had some literacy content in it. Participants in the classroom were very familiar with this programme and would rapidly follow instructions and answer questions. Children were observed singing the *songs* of the letters/characters they had previously learned and learning new ones (e.g. 'Harry Hatman' in Pre-Jardín and 'Kicking King' in Jardín). The song was usually reinforced with repetition and with the use of a CD. The letter itself was practiced using a) *prop-labelling* objects starting with the same letter from the Letterland reading books and cards, b) *colouring in* pictures of the letter that was being learnt, or c) creating 'costumes' related to the character (e.g. children in Pre-Jardín were observed wearing 'Harry Hatman' hats although they were not directly observed while undertaking this activity as part of the research fieldwork).

Pure instruction was also one of the guiding activities in Pre-Jardín and Jardín. A common theme across the two classrooms was teaching number concepts. In Pre-Jardín, this was done through the hands-on experiences described in the maths lesson above (i.e. counting wooden sticks and collecting acorns outdoors). In Jardín, the numerical concept that was being explained was *counting* forwards and backwards using the concepts "plus" and "minus". Marta wrote numbers on the board – first from one to ten and then from ten to twenty - one by one and then erasing the numbers one by one, asking children to say which number would be erased next.

Two additional themes taught via pure instruction were "Water" in Pre-Jardín and "3D Shapes and Floating/Sinking" in Jardín (themes in line with the PYP units on which they were working). The latter evolved in a similar way to how Virginia taught the numerical concept in Pre-Jardín, starting with prop-labelling and then continued with hands-on experiences. Marta began with *prop-labelling* by asking the children to say the shapes of different objects they had brought from home and to list the materials of which the objects were comprised (another important theme in the classroom). She first talked about 2D shapes (which the children could already identify) and then moved to 3D shapes to make connections – frequently switching from English to Spanish – between shapes (e.g. explaining how the pyramid was related to the triangle). This explanation was complemented with an outdoor experience walking around the playground identifying shapes and showing them to their peers. Children walked around the playground listing the shapes they could see and making sure Marta acknowledged their findings. The explanation then continued with an *experiment* that involved identifying the 3D shapes from a set of objects then predicting if they would sink or float when put in a plastic container filled with water. Marta did not explain why this new activity was initiated but demonstration via placing each object on the container did lead to discussions – mostly in Spanish – about materials, shapes and why some objects floated and some did not.

In the pure instruction activity about water in Pre-Jardín, the children had previously participated in a *brainstorming* activity about this concept, answering the following questions: 1. What does water look like?, 2. Where do you find it?, 3. What is water? and 4. How can we conserve water?. The

answers had been left on the whiteboard and, during my observation, the children were asked to sit down at their desks and divide a sheet of paper in four parts to *draw* their own understanding of each of those questions (one question on each of the four parts). Virginia repeated each question out loud and gave the children some time to draw. While they were drawing, she walked around the room checking children's progress and asking them what they were drawing (switching to Spanish if children seemed confused when she was asking questions). As children finished their drawings, they were asked to raise their hand, say "I'm finished", then sit on the carpet holding their drawings. One of the children was asked to explain to the research camera what he had drawn: the exact same flower in each section using different colours. However, when he was asked to show what he had drawn he made no reference to the flower and answered the questions in Spanish in the following way *(TCS PJ D4 406 – 433)*:

Virginia (V) [kneels down showing the picture to the camera and facing Juan].	Virginia (V) [kneels down showing the picture to the camera and facing Juan].
V: OK. Look at this. What does it [water] look like? ¿Cómo te parece que se ve el agua?	V: OK. Look at this. What does it [water] look like? How do you think it looks like?
[Juan has drawn an orange and yellow flower.]	[Juan has drawn an orange and yellow flower.]

Juan: Transparente y azul.	Juan: Transparent and blue.
V: Ok, transparent and blue.	V: Ok, transparent and blue.
[V looks at the camera.]	[V looks at the camera.]
V [points to the next section]: Where do you find water?	V [points to the next section]: Where do you find water?
[Juan has drawn the same flower using purple and black.]	[Juan has drawn the same flower using purple and black.]
[Juan looks at his picture.]	[Juan looks at his picture.]
V: Where do you find water? ¿Dónde encuentras el agua?	V: Where do you find water? Where do you find water?
Juan: En el hielo	Juan: In the ice
V: ice… yes… sale del hielo.	V: Ice… yes… it comes out from ice.
V: what is water for you? (twice)	V: What is water for you? (twice)
The child has drawn the same flower with various colours.	[The child has drawn the same flower with various colours.]
Juan: eh… eh…	Juan: eh… eh…
V: what is water for you?	V: What is water for you?
Juan: Para los peces también	Juan: For the fish too

V: ¿Eso crees que es el agua? ¿Qué mas crees qué es el agua?	V: That is what you think water is? What else do you think is water?
Juan [inaudible]	Juan [inaudible]
V: Ok and how can we conserve water? Here… How can we conserve water?	V: Ok and how can we conserve water? Here… How can we conserve water?
[Juan has drawn the same flower with various colours.]	[Juan has drawn the same flower with various colours
Juan [looking to the ceiling]: Para las plantas	Juan [looking to the ceiling]: For the plants
V: ¿Y cómo la cuidas?	V: And how do you take care of it?
Juan [looking away]: el agua	Juan [looking away]: the water
V: ¿Pero cómo cuidas el agua para que no se nos vaya? ¿No se acabe?	V: But how do you conserve it so that it does not run out? Not gone?
Juan: Cerrando el grifo.	Juan: Closing the tap.
V: Cerrando el grifo… ¿Y cómo mas?	V: Closing the tap and how else?
Juan: Hmmm… no gastando el agua.	Juan: Hmmm… not wasting water.
V: Excellent, very very good! (Gives	V: Excellent, very very good! [Gives him a cuddle]. Go to your place and

him a cuddle). Go to your place and sit down.

sit down.

By the time this episode finished, more children had gathered on the mat and were waiting for instructions. Virginia asked some of the children to stand up and answer the four questions by explaining their drawing. Similar episodes to the one described above were observed as children made little reference to the drawing itself but answered either according to the responses that had come up in the brainstorming activity, or made reference only to the drawing without a clear link to the question Virginia was asking them to answer. So, although Virginia used drawing to complement her explanation about water by asking the children to reflect through drawing, it is not clear if or how drawing helped the children in their understanding of the concepts.

Book reading was another activity used by Virginia and Marta in one lesson in each classroom. In Pre-Jardín, the story was about a girl out and about on a rainy day, and it was read to the children in a lesson about water. The story was read slowly with the use of gestures and pointing to the pictures. The word 'rainbow' was also reinforced with the use of the routine-song about a rainbow. Virginia then asked simple close-ended questions to check that the children had understood what was read. The story was appropriate for the age group but certainly too difficult in terms of the language structures and vocabulary involved for young children still beginning to learn English as a FL (M. Gearon, personal communication, February 16, 2010). There were several examples in the videotaped data (both during the reading and the short

comprehension-check) which showed children were paying particular attention to the pictures and not necessarily to what was being read. A short example is the following (TCS PJ D3: 184 – 192):

V: “as the rain stops the rainbow gently fades away”

C1: uy…

V: no more rain

C1: uy… se le salió la bota [Trans: oops… her boot fell off]

V: yes [V hand on her head as if saying “oh no”] [pause]

V: “and the clouds float away in the sky”. Bye bye clouds [waves]

C1: y se le salió … [Trans:her boot fell…]

V: sh, sh… we are going to take turns, ok?

V: “so, a thousand of tiny rain drops sparkle in the grass. The sunshine dries up all the rain.” Where’s the sunshine? Here, here! [points to the sun]… “suddenly the puddles get smaller” and smaller, and smaller [uses hands]… Look at the puddles. No more big puddles. Only small puddles, ok?

The story was then extended with an individual reflection through *drawing* as Virginia asked the children to draw their favourite part of the story on a white sheet of paper. All the children drew clouds, raindrops, a rainbow or a girl. They were then asked to share their drawings by standing up, holding

their picture and *presenting*. Children explained what they had drawn. And, although they used their L1 Spanish, all they said was that they had drawn clouds, drops of rain, etc. with no discussion of the various ideas in the book such as what clouds are made of, where rain comes from, why plants grow and so forth.

In Jardín reading "Brown bear, brown bear, what do you see?" was the guiding activity of the Language Arts lesson described in detail before. As described, *prop-labelling* was used throughout the reading of the book with the use of questions such as "What is this?" and "What colour is this?" and then complemented with an *experiment* on colours.

Guiding Classroom Activities in Transición: Writing and Presenting

The three lessons observed in Transición were always structured around two classroom activities: presenting and writing. *Presenting* was observed twice: each child had to present their story about heroes in front of the class, and I was able to observe three children at the first lesson and two other children at the second lesson. The children read the story in English but switched to Spanish to answer questions from Sandra or their peers about their heroes. *Writing* – the main activity as Sandra believed "*children at this level have to be able to write in two languages*" (Sandra, November 13, 2008: 42; my translation) – was observed three separate times: two dictation exercises and one individual creative writing activity. The dictations were of words children had been working on in other lessons (lessons not observed during my fieldwork) that they had to practice at home and write the following day. For the

first dictation (November 12, 2008), Sandra asked children to go to their desks and sit down in pairs. Each pair was given a small whiteboard and children used their notebooks to dictate the ten new words. One child dictated and the other wrote, then they checked the work together with occasional assistance from Sandra. Differently, on the second observation (November 1,3 2008), Sandra wrote on the board "Dictation List #8" beside the date and then numbers from one to ten in a column. Sandra reminded them they could not look at their neighbour's work, because it was better to do what they knew, and started dictating. Children wrote down the ten words, turned the sheet over, and Sandra collected them. Sandra then wrote the words and each child was observed either saying "Si!" (yes!) or "No" as they realized they had written words correctly or not. The last writing activity I have previously described in detail in the PYP Lesson, with the children writing individually about their own character/hero, only asking for assistance on vocabulary by approaching Sandra.

Chapter Summary

This chapter located FL teaching at each school and exemplified their FL classrooms by describing everyday lessons at both sites. The chapter described in detail a variety of classroom activities that were used across contexts (music, book reading, games, routine, pure instruction, counting, drawing/colouring, prop-labelling and writing) and only used at High Mount Girls Grammar School (scripted play) or The Canterbury School (experiments, brainstorming, Letterland and presenting) explicitly showing their use within

lessons/classrooms as guiding or complementary activities. I argue that this rich description of classroom activities is an important contribution to academic research as it addresses the gap in the current literature on early FL education in two ways: 1. by portraying new data about what happens inside young children's classrooms and 2. by removing the focus of description from individuals' language with examples of dialogue and scripts from lessons to classroom activities which take into account a broad framework that includes (among others) narratives on the actions and language of individuals, the context where the lessons take place, the links between lessons and across classrooms and year levels, and the links to the FL programme and school curriculum in place.

This description leads to Chapter 6 where the descriptions will be used to identify regularities of classroom practices across schools. As such, besides the important contribution made by description per se in this chapter, the rich-transcripts and summaries provided will allow examination by the reader, making clear how data was organised into thematic categories in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 6: REGULARITIES IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM PRACTICES ACROSS SITES

Chapter Overview

This chapter begins by identifying the regularities concerning classroom practices observed within and across the two schools. The chapter is structured around the analysis of the three principal thematic categories identified in response to my research question. These were, respectively: the *aims of classroom activities*; the *model of instruction* (with its categories of instructional practice and classroom organization); and *pedagogical practices* of FL education in early childhood. Each of these three categories is explored and synthesized using relevant literature and the data from this study, including reference to the descriptions of classroom activities given in Chapter 5 and details from teachers' interviews and/or transcripts from other classroom observations. I argue that the classrooms observed at High Mount Girls Grammar School and The Canterbury School during the second semester of 2008 have remarkably similar and consistent practices, and are mainly differentiated only by the instruction of concepts and of teachers' L1/L2 use at The Canterbury School. I conclude the chapter by explaining how these non-contrasting findings raised new questions based on my expectations and implied a further analysis that that was not initially planned for this study.

Aims of Classroom Activities

The first of the regularities I describe relates to teachers' aims for the classroom activities they chose to implement. This is an important construct for comparison because it removes the focus from what people were doing to what people were "trying to accomplish" (Rogoff, 2003, p. 33). I argue that my data shows that the participating teachers had three main aims in their choice of classroom activities: *to teach* language or concepts*; to balance lessons* and to *celebrate*.

Teaching Language and/or Concepts

I argue that a common goal from teachers' planning of the classroom activities was to teach language and a differentiating goal was to teach new concepts as the latter only occurred at The Canterbury School. Firstly, the fact that language was a common goal is unsurprising; what is unanticipated, however, is the similarity between the two research sites in the way this aim was achieved. At High Mount Girls Grammar School, all of the classroom activities (except games, which were used to balance the lessons) were used – at least once – to explicitly teach the French language by focusing on instruction in specific *vocabulary*. This was achieved variously through classroom procedures during routine activities, individual words (usually nouns), short sentences, or using the script from "Cendrillon" throughout various activities. In ELC, Sylvie used activities around two main themes – food and animals – and also reviewed numbers, colours and parts of the body. By contrast, in Prep and Year 1 the activities were designed around the instruction of the script of

“Cendrillon” and children were taught the vocabulary – and the gestures that accompanied the words – through memorizing the text. At The Canterbury School, many classroom activities were also used to teach words and short sentences in English. In Pre-Jardín and Jardín, Virginia and Marta also used vocabulary related to classroom procedures and the topics of numbers, animals, colours, parts of the body, and vocabulary about the weather. In all classrooms however, besides vocabulary, there was an emphasis on teaching explicit literacy in English via the Letterland programme or through dictation, writing and presenting. Secondly, I maintain that an important difference between the two sites – in terms of instruction – was that teachers at The Canterbury planned for classroom activities to teach new concepts. Therefore, content in English and Spanish was integrated within the lessons of each subject and new concepts (i.e. characteristics and properties of artefacts and materials, shapes and heroes) were taught in all the classrooms at this school.

In summary, I found the two schools to be very similar in the way lessons were used to teach language and in the topics of vocabulary that were used with the younger children. These same themes, “classroom procedures, the weather, parts of the body, colours, and numbers” have been documented as “typical topics taught early on in the language-learning sequence” that are “traditionally [used in the] second/foreign language curricula” (Snow, Met, & Genesee, 1989, pp. 206 - 207). By contrast, the patterns of variation rely mainly on the instruction of gestures – in line with the AIM method – at High Mount Girls Grammar School, and the instruction of explicit literacy and concepts – in line with an immersion programme – at The Canterbury School. I argue that these differences are a result of the FL programmes in place at

each school, which in turn correspond to the differences between mainstream education programmes with supplementary FL teaching and immersion programmes where language and content teaching are integrated (Genesee, 1994).

Balance

The second sub-category of teachers' aims I have termed "balance". This sub-category was evident through the way music, games and drawing/colouring were sometimes used – across classrooms and schools – to "*balance* the lesson[s]" (Sylvie, October 15 2008: 10; my emphasis) by giving the children a break from focused study through an enjoyable activity that helped them relax, concentrate, refocus and/or regroup. The use of music to balance lessons was generally part of the routine of greeting and helping the children settle before a more focused activity. In some cases, songs were also used at the end of lessons, not only to conclude but to establish a relaxed environment for the next teacher or subject. At other times, songs – along with games and one example of a drawing/colouring activity – were used to break the momentum of lessons in response to children misbehaving or losing interest in another activity. For example, when Virginia from Pre-Jardín was going over the comprehension check for the story "A Rainy Day" (described in Chapter 5), the children initially responded well but suddenly started to move and chat. Virginia looked at me and made a gesture of discontent with her hands. Then she said (TCS PJ D3:210):

I think it's enough! Ok, listen carefully. I want to see… Martina… what do you want to do with a picture, ok, show me a picture with the story? What do you like of the story? We are going to draw a picture [gestures with hands] about this story [holds book up], 'The Rainy, rainy day'. Do you want to draw a picture?

I argue that this use of classroom activities is of significance because it shows that children's lack of interest and/or concentration operates as a reactive communication strategy through which the children 'contribute' to the lesson by 'rejecting' an ongoing activity and 'demanding' a change to occur. Consequently, children's noisiness and movement might be seen as a change in their role, through which they gain 'ungiven' control in classrooms where they are given few opportunities to contribute (a characteristic of the participating classrooms that will be explained in further detail later in this Chapter).

Celebration

This aim refers specifically to the use of classroom activities to recognise celebratory events that are relevant for the classroom participants. This aim has been briefly mentioned by Huy Lê (1999) in his presentation on English classrooms in Vietnam, where he explained that one of the important roles of music in a FL classroom was to enhance social harmony among students by celebrating birthdays and doing activities that allowed learners to appreciate

being together. In my study, there were two significant celebrations (in both the Australian and Colombian contexts) that were commemorated within the classrooms studied: birthdays (across the two schools) and Christmas (only at High Mount Girls Grammar School as part of the data was generated in December). Children's birthdays were celebrated in the classroom through music and counting by singing "Happy Birthday" in the FL and then a) continuing with the Spanish final part of the song in Colombia or b) finishing with the traditional "hip hip hooray" in Australia. Interestingly, clapping while counting from one to the child's age was done in all the classrooms where this practice was observed, giving teachers another opportunity to reinforce number learning in the FL. Christmas was celebrated at High Mount Girls Grammar School through books, music and drawing/colouring. Children were taught one traditional Christmas song from France and were also exposed to a variety of other traditional songs that were played in the background during other activities. Two different books were used to talk about Christmas characters, and children were involved in drawing/colouring and writing a Christmas card to take home.

Models of Instruction

The second category of regularities I identified across the two research sites I have termed 'models of instruction'. While the concept of 'aims of instruction', discussed above, refers mainly to aspects of FL curriculum, the concept of 'models of instruction' attends to the pedagogical features observed in the classrooms in this study. Rogoff and Toma (1997) have argued that Rogoff's

TOP perspective can be used to "understand a number of formats for instruction" (Rogoff & Toma, 1997, p. 475) and this is the case for this study. However, Rogoff and Toma also point out that this perspective has "special affinity" with a "model of instruction that focuses on people learning through building on ideas with others in shared endeavours" (ibid). In other words, a TOP perspective advocates a model in which teachers – and other guiding adults and peers – "lead and facilitate the [learners'] transformation of participation in the activities" without "fully control[ling] or simply transmit[ting] information" (ibid, p.475). In such a model, both students and teachers are active contributors to determining what to study and to the development of ideas, and as a result, the activities they undertake are "connected explicitly with the history and current practices of the community" (Rogoff, et al., 1996, p. 390). Teachers working in this model, continue playing "a leadership role" (Rogoff & Toma, 1997, p. 488) but creating a classroom that encourages students to address each other as well as adults through a variety of "interactive patterns including discussion, reflection, working together and building on each other's ideas" (ibid, pp. 490- 491). It can be seen that this instructional model is based on a TOP perspective as the theoretical perspective on learning (Rogoff, et al., 1996, p. 389) supports practices that encompass active multi-party participation in sociocultural activities that are relevant for the community.

This model is very different from the more typical and widespread models of instruction: the 'adult-run' (Rogoff, et al., 1996) transmission (transmit and test) model (Rogoff & Toma, 1997) and the 'children-run' acquisition model (Rogoff, et al., 1996). In brief, in the first model, "learning

occurs through transmission of information from an expert" (Rogoff & Toma, 1997, p. 471), and in the second, acquisition takes place through the learners' active exploration of an environment that is setup by the adult but where he/she allows children to learn by themselves with very little supervision or guidance (Rogoff, et al., 1996). These two models "are often cast as opposite extremes of a pendulum swing between unilateral control and freedom" (ibid, p. 389), but they are also "closely related in that they both involve a theoretical assumption that learning is a function of one-sided action" (Rogoff, et al., 1996, p. 389) instead of learning through shared responsibility and participation in changing sociocultural activities.

I found this typology of varying models of instruction provided a useful framework for considering regularities within and between the classrooms in the present study. Thus, classroom activities were coded according to two categories drawn from the TOP literature that helped me identify practices in line with specific models of instruction. The first category was *instructional practice* and the second was *classroom organization*. They were informed by the TOP literature (Chavajay & Rogoff, 2002; Matusov, et al., 2002; Rogoff, et al., 2001; Rogoff, et al., 1996; Rogoff & Toma, 1997) on the specific practices that have been found to be present in the three models of instruction described above. My analysis involved identifying which of these features was in place for each classroom activity, in order to develop an argument about which of the models of instruction predominated in the Australian and/or Colombian setting. Specifically for the *instructional practice* sub-category I looked for the following instructional features:

- Restriction or freedom to collaborate (learners being able to speak with or without teacher permission).
- 'Quizzing' (teacher questioning via known-answer – usually closed ended - questions) or reflection.
- Directive guidance inside or outside the context of productive, purposive activity.
- Attention to one or multiple events at the same time.
- Unilateral or shared defining of tasks, means and goals.
- Shared or unshared responsibility in developing activities.
- Receptiveness or participation.

Similarly, for *classroom organization* I attended to features such as the way teachers encouraged (or not) collaborative work, fostered (or not) individual efforts, or remained as the main addressee (or not) when interacting with learners. These three features provided further sub-categories drawn from Rogoff and her colleagues as well as literature on L2/FL teaching. First, for *collaboration*, I looked for examples of joint learning episodes (Haworth, et al., 2006), such as small group tasks that required discussion and problem solving (Angelonova, et al., 2006), and/or learning activities that children – in pairs or small groups – were able to decide on and "run with little supervision from [the] teacher" (Hatch, 1992, p. 93). Second, examples of *individual*

efforts included students working independently at their desks – or sitting together with a peer but working independently – with the teacher available for help (Hatch, 1992; Rogoff & Toma, 1997), and also presentations made by individuals or pairs of children to the whole class (L'Association Canadienne des Professeurs d'Immersion (ACPI), 1997; The British Broadcasting Corporation, 1983). Lastly, *teacher-as-addressee*, referred to teacher-learner interactions that were essentially dyadic, with the teacher on one side of the dyad and the whole class as the other side (Rogoff & Toma, 1997, p. 474), or teacher interactions with small groups or individuals where he/she elicited "individual or chorus responses [or allowed] students to volunteer or call on them" (Hatch, 1992, p. 93).

As I reflected on the data coded according to these concepts, it was clear there were patterns of similarities – indeed, very little variation - in both the *instructional practices* and the *classroom organization* between the two research sites. The main *instructional practice* that was evident in my analysis I have called: attention to one event at the same time. This was the main characteristic of the instructional practices in all of classrooms in my study. Indeed, there were no examples of activities where learners could pay attention to different events at the same time. In both schools, teachers were nearly always the focus of attention and, in the few instances they were not, the children would still all be doing exactly the same activity (e.g. drawing/colouring, writing, etc. in their desks). Examples of attention to multiple events at the same time are given by Lorenz and Rice (1989), the Department of Education Employment and Training Victoria (2000) and also shown in the video "De ses propres ailes…" (L'Association Canadienne des

Professeurs d'Immersion (ACPI), n.d.) when describing the use of learning centres inside FL classrooms. In the classrooms observed for this study, there were resources laid out around the rooms that children could have easily accessed but they were not allowed to do so without teacher consent (which was never given during my observations); children remained either on the mat or sitting in their desks throughout lessons.

In addition to the homogeneity of classroom activities, in all the participating classrooms across the two schools the *teachers had a fixed role as the expert FL speaker*, which may explain why they retained exclusive control over the selection and execution of classroom activities. Even though teachers' responses from interviews show that children's interests and previous knowledge were considered important, there was no specific description or evidence in the observations of how these were used in the definition and development of activities. In fact, all planning was done 'outside' of the classroom solely by the FL teacher (High Mount Girls Grammar School) or in team work with teacher colleagues from the same year level (The Canterbury School). Children did not contribute in deciding what to learn or how, and their contribution remained passive and receptive throughout lessons except for very few occasions where children moved beyond their role as novices (listeners, imitators and acquirers) by a) rejecting an ongoing activity via noisiness and misbehaviour, obliging the teacher to change the activity (c.f. the balancing role of classroom activities described above); b) selecting the sequence of events within a lesson in Transición at The Canterbury School; or c) receiving permission to briefly lead an activity in front of peers (e.g. choosing the answer to the greeting song at High Mount Girls Grammar

School, page 65; or giving directions to the children in the counting activity with sticks in Pre-Jardín, page 83). I observed only one other episode where children had the potential to take a more agentic role (TCS PJ D4, 450 – 462):

Virginia (V): OK, sit down everybody, stand up everybody… eh… open your hands,

V and Learners (in chorus) (L)[singing]: Open, close them… give a little clap…

Open, close them… put them on your…

V: eyes

V and L [singing]: Open, close them… put them on your…

V: shoulders ….

V and L [singing]… Open, close them… put them on your…

V: Nose [holds arms around body]… [Some children copy her but some touch their noses.]

V: ah…

V and L [singing]… Open, close them… put them on your…

V: shoulders [touching her head] [Again, some children copy her, others look confused, others touch their shoulders.]

V: shoulders, shoulders…

V [holds a child up]: Very good Liliana! [Liliana is touching her shoulders].

V: Ok, sit down.

Virginia added complexity to this song by using gestures that did not correspond to what she was saying and waiting for some children to do the action correctly. Most children copied Virginia even though she was doing an incorrect action (confirming their passive role during songs and/or also showing lack of comprehension of the word “shoulders” in the FL), and only a few understood they were being tricked and touched the correct body part. The episode ended abruptly and I was left wondering if children would have started relying on each other (with peers becoming mediators of learning) rather than continuing to imitate Virginia.

In accordance with the practices I have described above, both teachers and learners across classrooms and schools habitually asked and responded to “display questions” (Hatch, 1992, p. 94) through which learners displayed their knowledge of specific vocabulary (e.g. names, food, colours, numbers, weather, parts of the body and animals). This format was visible in all classroom activities that involved prop-labelling across schools and in the naming activity in ELC at High Mount Girls Grammar School. It was also part of comprehension checks after reading stories (e.g. Virginia asking questions after reading “A Rainy Day”) and was part of the routine of listing days, subjects and others in Pre-Jardin and Jardin at The Canterbury School. In contrast, reflection was not coded as part of any of the classroom activities across schools except for drawing/colouring in Pre-Jardín where Virginia seemed (although her response was not clear when she was asked about this

in her interview) to want this activity to lead children to *individual* reflection about the content of the story “A Rainy Day” and of their knowledge about water. I argue that the learners’ ability to use this activity for reflection was not apparent in the children’s responses (as exemplified on pages 94 - 95) to quiz-like presentations in front of the group, and therefore real evidence of reflection was not present in my data.

Finally, literature on AIM and immersion implies that the context (scripted play and integrated content learning) makes FL learning purposeful for learners. However, I argue that because the children had no direct input into deciding what was going to be studied and how, the learning of thematic vocabularies, the recitation of “Cendrillon”, and the learning about shapes, materials and water had no clear value for these learners. The only exception might be children’s writing and presentations in Transición, where children did not have a ‘voice’ for selecting the activities of writing and presenting as such but had freedom to choose and create their own heroes and were therefore closer to the context through which the FL was being learnt.

The main feature of the *classroom organization* observed during my fieldwork was that interactions in classroom activities were mainly dyadic, with the teacher addressing the children, eliciting responses from them as a class (e.g. Marta asking all the children to tell her what animals and colours appeared on each page of the book Brown Bear, Brown Bear, What do you see?). The teachers occasionally sought responses from individual children (e.g. Sylvie saying hello to each child by name and requiring them to greet her in French in front of the class) with the rest of the class or peers from their

small group waiting for their turn and then for the activity to be completed (further evidence of dyadic interactions). Children demonstrated familiarity with this dyadic format for interacting, as well as with the format of repeating and imitating to learn or practice vocabulary. In general, teachers and children did the activities together but teachers initiated/finished them and controlled their sequencing and pace. Learners therefore mainly listened and observed, followed instructions, repeated words or texts after the teachers, responded to their questions or imitated their gestures. Children were allowed to ask questions or ask permission to go to the toilet throughout activities (mostly raising their hands before speaking) but, when their agenda was not in line with the activity's aim, their interest was usually 'ignored'. This can be seen in the following example when Marta was beginning to explain that they were going to change the properties of the water by adding oil to it, before continuing with experimenting whether objects of different shapes and materials floated or sank (TCS J D3: 368 – 372):

Marta (M): Esto es aceite, oil… de cocinar.	Marta (M): This is oil, oil… to cook.
Pablo: Yo lo use en mi pancake.	Pablo: I use it in my pancake. .
M: Lo usamos para cocinar.	M: We use it to cook.
Mariana: Yo también en pancake.	Mariana: Me too in my pancake.
M: Let's put oil into the water…	M: Let's put oil into the water…

A few examples of individual efforts were also observed across classrooms, specifically when children worked independently at their desks drawing/colouring or writing. In such cases, the teachers were ready to help and most times (except in Transición where Sandra waited for children to approach her when they needed help) they walked around the room asking short questions of the children, writing titles on the children's work, or offering assistance. In addition, one episode revealed children working on identifying shapes and materials in small groups where it was evident that they were "sit[ing] together but work[ing] independently without sharing ideas (Rogoff & Toma, 1997, p. 488). There was no discussion between them, no evident interest in what peers were doing and, in fact, the children stopped working on the activity as soon as the teacher moved away from their table. Finally, one other classroom activity that involved individual efforts, but directed toward the whole class, was when the children presented (read or talked about) the content of their drawings or stories in front of the rest of the class.

Only one example was identified where the classroom organization was more collaborative, that of the dictation exercise in Transición. Although the children were not necessarily building on each other's ideas, and had no control on the selection of the activity, they worked in pairs – with little supervision from the teacher – with one dictating ten words, the other one writing, and then checking the words together.

Transmission

The analysis of *instructional practices* and *classroom organization* I have provided above shows that there were clear regularities in the model of instruction in and across both schools, with little evidence of practices that were in line with a 'community of learners' (Rogoff, et al., 2001) model. Although some practices were slightly more collaborative, active or reflective than others, in general, "when [the] clusters of practices are examined together, in context, they […] reveal the conceptual basis that ties them to one […] model of instruction" (Rogoff, et al., 1996, p. 389), in this case a *transmission model*. Interestingly, this model does not completely correspond with the participants' views on their own teaching. First, the answers regarding their perspectives on teaching and learning cited the importance of reflection and active participation in their classrooms, which are ideas aligned with a collaborative model, and also of inquiry in The Canterbury School, an idea obviously aligned with PYP. However, they also used words like "educating", "directing" and "motivating" to describe their role as teachers, and all these are better aligned with transmission and acquisition models of instruction. I argue that the pattern of classroom practices in the data is consistent with a transmission model, as the teachers mainly provided information that the learners received, retained and then displayed (Rogoff & Toma, 1997, p. 473) via repetition, imitation and answers to teachers' questioning. Teachers therefore checked comprehension via 'quizzing', with evaluations and praise (e.g. "Very good!") when correct answers were given. Also in line with this model, children's attention was focused on a single event that was led – and selected – by the teachers, who mostly acted as one side of a dyad and

expected the whole class to act as the other side. There was very little discussion of children's ideas within classrooms. Teachers controlled children's participation in activities and directed learners' roles and responsibilities (Chavajay & Rogoff, 2002) allowing very little multi-party engagement between participants.

Pedagogical Principles of FL Education in Early Childhood

In the final part of this chapter, I connect my claims so far about the aims of the classroom activities I observed, and the models of instruction I identified, to the pedagogical principles of FL education in early childhood as they are articulated in the empirical literature on FL education (mainly in the primary years as studies in earlier years of formal education seem to be absent from the literature). I do this in an attempt to expand the notion of classroom practices defined using literature aligned with a TOP perspective (as above), incorporating the principles laid out in the (scarce!) literature guiding FL programmes for young children. In order to achieve the purpose of this study, the principles that advance the understanding of FL classroom practices are related with the analysis of the use of a) the environment and resources, b) experiential learning and c) (verbal and non-verbal) language in lessons.

Environment and Resources

A variety of resources have been documented as appropriate tools for FL teaching. In general, most authors agree that the environment itself should

encourage communication and act a as “safe space” for children to take risks (L’Association Canadienne des Professeurs d’Immersion (ACPI), 1997; The British Broadcasting Corporation, 1983). Examples of such environments are usually shown in the literature describing the use of learning centres or activities in FL programmes (see for example Department of Education Employment and Training Victoria, 2000; L’Association Canadienne des Professeurs d’Immersion (ACPI), 1997; Lorenz & Rice, 1989; Stevens, 1983). These learning centres are either divided into learning areas (for example listening, speaking, reading and writing corners), or are designed around a project or activity (e.g. a school event) that the children and the teacher are working on. In both cases, children work in a variety of ways (individually or in pairs, small groups or with the whole class), mostly moving freely around the room with no restriction on the time they need to spend on an area, and are immersed in activities through which they practice reading, writing, hearing, speaking and researching. These environments use new technologies in the classroom such as computers, overhead projectors, digital cameras (Brooker, 2003) “tape recorders with headphones for listening exercises, […] stories read by a language aide, or […] multimedia resources, such as CD-ROMs” (Department of Education Employment and Training Victoria, 2000, p. 11), as well as other various resources of different degrees of difficulty (L’Association Canadienne des Professeurs d’Immersion (ACPI), 1997), that a) allow children to answer their own questions (e.g. dictionaries and scientific books so that children can investigate and answer vocabulary questions by themselves seen in L’Association Canadienne des Professeurs d’Immersion (ACPI), 1997) and b) allow children to hear the FL from someone who is not the teacher.

In the two schools I studied the classrooms were very similar. As described in Chapter 5, there were items (e.g. books, blocks, toys in the ELC, markers, paper, etc.) laid out around the rooms that were within reach of the children but that they could not access unless the teacher asked them to get something. Learners remained on the mat for most of the lesson, facing the teacher who was either sitting on the floor with them or on an adults' chair. Otherwise, they sat on their own chairs close to the other children who shared the table with them but almost never engaged with them during an activity. Sylvie attributed this partly to limitations on the amount of space available in the classroom and partly to the focus on scripted play (Sylvie, personal communication, March 23, 2009, p. 1):

> Interesting for me as I feel very restricted teaching in such a small space [...]. I generally like to move around the class more and use much larger body language and gestures. I felt this wasn't all that evident in the video. This is most likely due to the fact that with the AIM program, much of our time is spent sitting down using gestures and referring to the book so I may have become used to it. Ideally, I would certainly love more space and would get the children moving more too at times.

The resources that the children used were controlled – or at least selected and handed over – by the teacher and were mainly books, pictures, props, paper and writing utensils, and some CDs that were played by the teacher. Thus, the resources themselves were not intended to elicit children's learning but were used instead as aids to teachers in achieving teachers' aims

in classroom activities. As a consequence, the resources used across classrooms did not allow children to investigate nor – except for CDs – did they expose children to hearing the FL from someone who was not their teacher.

Experiential Learning

The literature suggests that teachers in FL classrooms should encourage active participation amongst learners (see for example Angelonova, et al., 2006; Ellis, 1988; L'Association Canadienne des Professeurs d'Immersion (ACPI), 1997; Lim & Watson, 1993; Lipton, Dec 1994, p. 879; Lorenz & Rice, 1989). To do this, one of the suggestions is to plan for hands-on learning (e.g. experiments, excursions, etc.) where children can experience resources and language in a meaningful way. Analysis of the data in this study allowed identification of a few examples of experiential learning only at The Canterbury School that align with this recommended pedagogical principle. These included experiments, creative writing, and the identification of shapes and numbers outdoors. The experiments (sinking/floating objects and mixing colours) could have easily been done with smaller groups to encourage more reflection and discussion rather than give just one possible answer. For example, children could have mixed colours in pairs and come up with their conclusions of the colours they make when they are mixed and then present their results in front of the class. However, the children did engage in these hands-on activities and appeared to enjoy them. The creative writing and identification of shapes and numbers are better examples of hands-on, experiential learning as they complemented ongoing learning activities and

allowed children to explore and discover, coming up with individual responses that were then shared with the rest of the class.

Verbal and Non-Verbal Language Use

Literature on SLA outlines some important characteristics that should underpin FL teaching practice regarding the participants' verbal and non-verbal language use. First, the literature suggests that there tends to be "a time-honoured view that the first language should be avoided in the classroom by teachers and students" (Cook, 2001, p. 402). However, various authors (see for example Cook, 2001; Moore, 2010; Swain & Lapkin, 2000) are re-examining this view and proposing that a) teachers' use of the L1 is important to "convey and check meaning of words or sentences" (Cook, 2001, p. 414), explain grammar, organize the class, maintain discipline, "gain contact with individual students" (ibid, p. 416) and to test students (ibid, pp.414 – 416); b) the students use of the L1 should not be prohibited as it "allows them to make sense of the requirements and content of the task; to focus attention on language form, vocabulary use, and overall organization; and to establish the tone and nature or their collaboration" (Swain & Lapkin, 2000, p. 268), and c) "concurrent language use may provide an effective means through which language and content can become successfully integrated" in the classroom (Moore, 2010, p. 288).

Second, the literature refers to the importance of using movement (Lipton, Dec 1994), gestures and non-verbal representations (Lorenz & Rice, 1989) when teaching young children and/or beginners. Accordingly, songs,

drama, rhymes and games have all been documented as important FL input and activities for the elementary years (see for example AIM Language Learning, 2007; Lipton, 1992; Martin, 1995; Martin & Cheater, 1998; Shtakser, 2001). Specifically, coherent (succinct and consistent) gestural information that goes along with narrative has provided an important basis for two popular FL programmes: AIM (Maxwell, 2004) and "Hocus & Lotus" (Taeschner, 2005): an European model of FL teaching using magic and stories to teach FLs in nursery school.

I identified two patterns of similarities and one pattern of variation in regards to *verbal and non-verbal communication* across schools. Firstly and similarly across the schools, there was at least one episode in all the participating classrooms where teachers used music. However, it should be noted that the use of songs decreased moving up the year levels, with music being an important language input (and classroom activity) in the early years and then only used occasionally in Transición, Prep and Year 1. By analysing the teachers' interviews it seems that all the teachers de-emphasized the importance of music in children's FL learning, as they do not overtly or purposefully use music as an instructional activity but rather as an activity in line with their desire to balance activities or celebrate events in the classroom. Secondly, across classrooms and schools the children were encouraged – mainly via repetition of words, short sentences or text - to use the FL but were also allowed to use their L1 throughout lessons. In both the schools, children were observed mainly using their L1 when asking/responding questions, making comments or chatting with each other. Lastly, there was an important differentiation across schools in the teachers' use of gestures for teaching and

in the consistency of their use of the L1 and L2 while teaching. Sylvie at the High Mount Girls Grammar School was highly consistent in her use of French throughout French lessons. She limited English use to some very specific cases: 1. “reprimanding ‘difficult’ students or those who have diagnosed difficulties or disorders” and 2. “to discuss cultural aspects of France” (Sylvie, personal communication, March 23, 2009, p. 2), such as talking about Christmas Eve in France with the children. The rest of the time, Sylvie used only French accompanied by gestures from AIM, repetition, rephrasing and numerous props to help children understand what she was saying. The gestures – different from non-verbal cues – were always connected with the AIM programme and, as such, they were always consistent with the vocabulary and text that had been learnt or was going to be learnt in a scripted play. At The Canterbury School, gesture was not a common feature of teachers’ practice and teachers were not always consistent in their use of English. In fact, they did not avoid speaking Spanish in the classroom. In their own words, as lead teachers they were meant to speak mainly English with children throughout the day, keeping Spanish to a minimum except when introducing or clarifying concepts because “these need to be clear in the learners’ first language” (Virginia, November 20 2008, 51). Therefore their common practice was to use Spanish for introduction or clarification of new and key concepts from PYP throughout lessons. This meant they used Spanish sometimes for long periods of time (for example during the experiment in which water was mixed with oil and the participants discussed the properties of water in Spanish in Jardín), and briefly at other times by quickly translating isolated words and sentences. Also, English and Spanish

were used interchangeably to reprimand students. An interesting characteristic of the longer observations of episodes mainly in Spanish is that children could obviously ask more interesting, in-depth questions and were therefore louder and less passive in those activities. Teachers then tended – maybe unconsciously – to go back to English as a way to continue with instruction when children's inquiries seemed to be moving beyond the goal of the activity. As such, English was also used by the teachers, consciously or unconsciously, to limit children's input in class.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter I have described the regularities I understood to be present in the classroom practices in young children's FL lessons in the classrooms participating in this study. In doing so, I have made the following main claims. First, that there were three common aims in teaching *a* and/or *in* a FL: instruction of language, balance, and celebration; and one difference in that teachers at The Canterbury School also planned for classrooms activities to teach explicit literacy and concepts. Second, I have shown that although each of the classrooms included a few examples of practices that were more collaborative, active or reflective than others, as a whole the model of instruction observed was that of *transmission*. Third, I have gone on to argue that practices across schools portrayed a limited use of space and resources that is not consistent with established pedagogical principles of FL instruction for young children. Fourthly, and in a similar line, I have shown how the use of music decreased as children progressed through year levels, and teachers de-

emphasized its importance and use as an instructive tool in FL teaching; and have also found few examples of hands-on, experiential learning at The Canterbury School. Lastly, I explained that a significant difference between schools was the teachers' consistency in L1 and FL use, with Sylvie at High Mount Girls Grammar School using very little of the learners' L1 in class, and teachers at The Canterbury School using both the FL and learners' L1 interchangeably throughout lessons.

By this stage of the study, I faced a significant challenge: I had assumed I would observe cultural variation between research sites as they had been purposefully chosen as contrasting linguistic and cultural scenarios. But in reality, as shown above, I had found very few patterns of variation and remarkably similar and consistent practices in line with a transmission model within and across sites. To complicate matters further, one of the differences (i.e. the use of activities for instruction of explicit literacy and concepts at The Canterbury School) can be easily explained in terms of the differences in the FL programmes in place at each school, and the other difference (i.e. the teachers' interchangeable use of L1/FL at The Canterbury School) was inconsistent with the FL literature used to outline pedagogical principles. This conclusion challenged me to engage in a further level of analysis to solve the question of regularities, in an attempt to honour both my theoretical underpinnings and the participants in this study. This analysis is the focus of Chapter 7.

CHAPTER 7: ACCOUNTING FOR MAIN REGULARITIES ACROSS SITES

Chapter Overview

Chapters 5 and 6 have so far addressed the main aims of this study by a) describing the classroom activities used to teach FLs to young children, b) identifying the main characteristics of classroom practices defined in relation to instructional practices, models of instruction and pedagogical principles in early FL teaching, and c) identifying the regularities of these practices across the two participating schools. To do this, Rogoff's theoretical and empirical work has been used to both design the study and to provide a conceptual background for understanding and situating my main claims. I have given a description of the specific nature of the activities through which young children are being taught a FL in relation to the contributions of the classrooms' participants (individual and interpersonal lenses) and also placed the classroom practices within the influences of the institutions (wider community, school and type of FL programme) of which they are part (cultural-institutional lens). Also, I have explained the relevant national policies in relation to language status and FL teaching goals, identified some of the main values and philosophies of the schools, and aligned this with their selection of a specific FL programme (mainstream FL education with AIM / Immersion).

In conducting this analysis and developing my claims in Chapter 6, I have concluded that the regularities found across schools need further explanation. This chapter therefore reflects – via a rigorous analysis of the

documentation and of theoretical and empirical literature – on broader institutional practices than those found in the participating classrooms, in an attempt to understand some of the regularities of FL classroom practices found across schools. The chapter is therefore divided into two sections: one that explains the impact of traditional formats of Western schooling on the transmission model found to be in place at both schools, and one that explains the transmission model and teachers' distinctive use of L1/FL in light of the emergent implementation of PYP at The Canterbury School, and the uniqueness and complexities of utilizing a PYP and early partial immersion curriculum simultaneously.

The Transmission Model as an Impact of the Traditional Formats of Western Formal Schooling

Rogoff and colleagues have argued that persistent and ubiquitous traditional formats of Western formal schooling involve cultural practices that are rooted in the participants' beliefs, expectations, traditions and relations (Matusov, et al., 2002, p. 131). They have described and summarised the practices of formal schooling as having a particular discourse and structural features which – in the strictest and most traditional case – include: teacher-centeredness in the classroom with students being restricted from "informally helping or even speaking to each other without teacher permission" (ibid, p. 131); the use of 'quizzing' and of directive guidance with teachers getting children to produce actions without knowing why; "hierarchically organized interactions in which adult directs children's roles and responsibilities, often in a dyadic structure

even though others are present" (Chavajay & Rogoff, 2002, p. 56); and teachers' unilateral decisions about "which children contribute to class activities, when and [for] how long" (ibid). Specifically in SLA, this format has also been documented by various authors who describe teacher-centred practices and/or refer to the 'acquisition-metaphor' in teaching (see for example Cummins, 1998; Hatch, 1992; Sfard, 1998). Some researchers have identified the prevalence of formal schooling in conventional FL classes, arguing they are very likely to be dominated by teachers using close-ended questions (Ellis, 1988), with the teacher occupying "the role of information-giver and initiator of a dialogue and the students [being] the recipients of information and responders" with "few opportunities […] to talk with one another and to learn from their own use of the L2 or the content material" (Lim & Watson, 1993, p. 391). I argue that this line of investigation allows us to see how the transmission model prevalent at both schools in the present study can be better understood by reflecting on the historical – but ongoing and sometimes conflicting – cultural and pedagogical practices which typify many classrooms across subjects and year levels throughout the world. Indeed, some of these features are an explicit part of the Accelerative Integrated Methodology (AIM) and early immersion programmes that I will now analyse below.

Teacher as Initial Sole Foreign Language Provider in AIM

I have previously explained what AIM is and how it is used to teach French at High Mount Girls Grammar School. This method was invented by Matt and

Wendy Maxwell in Canada and is renowned worldwide because students gain high levels of fluency in the FL and are highly motivated. Significantly for the understanding of the transmission model in place in Australia, the AIM method recognizes that:

> …in a program that promotes communicative competence, it is logical that the teacher should provide students with opportunities to communicate in the L2. However, one must not overlook the rather obvious fact that in order to be able to engage in discussions around topics of interest, a basic level of fluency must be developed. (AIM Language Learning, 2007, para. 4)

AIM therefore acknowledges that the teacher is the sole language provider at the beginning of the learning process, and follows scripted lessons and plays with limited student input and without improvisation. However, AIM has not yet produced plays for early beginners so there is no particular framework for teaching very young children. AIM views this age group as "an opportunity to help them understand what it is to learn a play, to acquire vocabulary through the Gesture Approach and to begin to learn how to manipulate language and learn to question and respond to questions" (AIM Language Learning, n.d., p. 5).

With this in mind, and considering that my study only involved an early learning centre, prep and Year 1 classrooms, it seems logical to have found a teacher-centred classroom focused on vocabulary teaching (specifically on typical topics from traditional FL curricula) in the early learning centre and

beginning scripted play use (with a simplified version of a Cinderella hand-made book which was passed on to her by a former teacher) in both Prep and Year 1. A similar argument may be made for features of an early immersion program.

Teacher-Centeredness and Transmission in Immersion

Many immersion programmes for young children have been criticised for being input-oriented and teacher-centred. The importance of input can be attributed to Krashen's work (specially the acquisition-learning hypothesis and the input hypothesis) as it has highly influenced the theoretical underpinnings of immersion (Campbell, 1984, p. 134; Genesee, 1984, p. 53; Swain, 2000, pp. 97- 98). As a result, and considering that FL teachers are the primary language models (Lorenz & Rice, 1989, p. 73) in the classroom, their role – and the interactions between teachers and learners – has been perceived as providers of 'acquisition-rich' input (Haworth, et al., 2006; Swain, 2000; Tardiff, 1994). In turn, the "students' culture and language" has been "omit[ed] and subordinat[ed]" (Swain, 2000, p. 97) and therefore many French immersion classrooms "have tended to be highly teacher-centred or "transmission-oriented" (Cummins, 1998, p. 3). In these classrooms, teachers:

> …have focused on transmitting the curriculum in such a way that students have had minimal opportunities to use oral or written French for creative or problem-solving activities […] [and have provided] considerably less cooperative learning and project-based work than

was characteristic of regular English language programs (Cummins, 1998, p. 3).

As a result, more collaborative discourses in immersion are increasingly being proposed or documented (see for example Genesee, 1994; L'Association Canadienne des Professeurs d'Immersion (ACPI), 1997; Lorenz & Rice, 1989; Swain, 2000). Despite these changes being relatively recent, there is clearly historically-determined teacher-centred pedagogical practice present in some immersion programmes throughout the world, including the partial immersion programmes observed in Colombia.

The Transmission Model and Teachers' Language Use at The Canterbury School

In the previous section I have argued that traditional formats of Western schooling have come to typify practices at immersion schools worldwide including The Canterbury School. What is interesting about this school however is that their immersion programme is part of the PYP, which does not promote practices in line with a transmission model. This idea therefore generated new questions that lead to the investigation of the historicity of PYP at The Canterbury School in order to clarify this contradiction. In doing this, it became clear that the PYP philosophy had not yet been appropriated by the teachers who participated in my study in 2008. Moreover, by understanding PYP's emphasis on concepts, studying the literature on L2 available from the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) and the literature on L1/FL

language use in early immersion classrooms, I was also able to identify the unique complexities that arise when a school incorporates PYP and early immersion, and the limited state of work to guide and support teachers using these programmes simultaneously.

PYP: An Emerging Philosophy at The Canterbury School

The PYP is an inquiry-based model of instruction in which the teacher's role is to create an educational environment that encourages students to take responsibility, to the greatest possible extent, for their own learning. This means that resources must be provided for each student to become involved in self-initiated inquiry. In the PYP classroom, the teacher facilitates the process of students becoming seekers rather than followers by asking carefully thought out, open-ended questions and by encouraging students to ask questions of each other as well as of the teacher (International Baccalaureate Organisation, 2000, p. 43). The PYP classroom is described as a lively, engaging, reflective, thought-provoking place where everyone actively collaborates. The teachers at The Canterbury School had been incorporating this programme in their practice for over a year when my study took place. They could describe this philosophy with ease and talked about children's active role: "*active with capital letters*"; Virginia, November 13, 2008: 47; my translation; and the importance of "*researching (reading, observing and asking) with the children*" (Sandra, November 13, 2008: 42; my translation) throughout curriculum subjects. In reality however their instructional practices and the way their classrooms were organized were not in line with the model

proposed by the PYP but with a Transmission Model (as showed in Chapter 6). Thus, it is reasonable to think that the practices I observed during my fieldwork were part of an important transition for the teachers from a very traditional transmission model to attempts at more collaborative approaches. Either way, the PYP represented a challenge to the school's historical and traditional way of teaching by placing on the teachers and children new pedagogical principles, which I argue had not yet been appropriated by the participating teachers.

PYP and Early Immersion: A Uniquely Complex Curriculum

PYP and early partial immersion were the two programmes used simultaneously at the school. Children were taught the PYP organizing themes through the mediums of English and Spanish. I argue that this created a uniquely complex curriculum that reinforced teachers' interchangeable use of their L1 and L2, and which has not yet been studied in either programme. This means teachers have not received meaningful guidance for FL education in this school.

In exploring the literature on early immersion I found that an important feature of early immersion methodology is that "the initial focus […] is on developing [FL] *comprehension* skills (Lapkin & Cummins, 1984, p. 62; emphasis in original). Historically, teachers of young children in Canadian immersion classrooms:

> …clearly, patiently and repetitively focus on the development of a basic vocabulary in the new language, relying, with the youngest age groups, on plastic art materials, songs, and animated stories. But from the start, the learning of language per se is made quite incidental to learning how to make and do new and interesting things (Lambert, 1984, p. 12).

Teachers' emphasis is therefore "on oral-aural communication skills during kindergarten and the half of the first grade" (Genesee, 1984, p. 44). Children are encouraged to use the FL but can communicate in their L1 until "the second half of the first grade" (ibid). This "approach results in meaningful verbal interaction based on the realities of the child's life and the relatively concrete, context-embedded activities that occur in a kindergarten or first grade classroom" (Lapkin & Cummins, 1984, p. 61). Literacy skills are then introduced "slowly and only when it is felt that the children have acquired the corresponding oral-aural language skills" (Genesee, 1984, p. 44), and subjects are introduced in line with the mainstream national curriculum using "concrete objects in a highly context-embedded manner" (Lapkin & Cummins, 1984, p. 67) to ease the teaching.

This depiction of early immersion is important because in the Canadian context (where most of the research on immersion education is based) there are no distinct curriculum subjects being taught and teaching is highly contextualised in early childhood education. This is very different from the teaching of young children at The Canterbury School. At this school, even the youngest children's days (3 year olds who are two years younger than the

kindergarten children in Canadian schools) were divided into curriculum subjects that were taught by the lead teacher and also by specialists. In addition, the teaching was mostly not context-based, as the classrooms did not support this kind of learning (as learning centres or activity/play-based activities would) and children were learning complex content in line with the PYP curriculum. So, except for activities where props were used to convey meaning that focused on the teaching *of* English vocabulary and simple text, the teaching of the FL was not in the 'here and now' and was focused on the theme of the unit being studied. In other words, I argue there is a tension between what early immersion theory portrays as relevant FL teaching practice and what the bilingual lead teachers at The Canterbury School actually needed to teach: PYP themes across curriculum subjects.

Furthermore, children in the Canadian context are gradually introduced to more complex vocabulary so that, when more defined school subjects are introduced, their language skills are better aligned with the content they are learning. This is certainly the case observed in the video "Des propres ailes" (L'Association Canadienne des Professeurs d'Immersion (ACPI), 1997) where a second grade immersion classroom is shown designing and working on a project on frogs, with learners having sufficient vocabulary to follow the discussions, ask questions, and write and present in French. Again, this was not the case at The Canterbury School, where the teachers did not focus on oral-aural communication and learners did not appear to have enough FL skills to fully understand the content of the subjects they were learning if these had been taught completely in the learners' FL. Thus, in the few episodes where teachers seemed to use English more consistently (with less code-switching

and translation), there were frequent examples of learners being unable to understand the message that was being conveyed by the teachers. A good example of this has been described in Virginia's reading of "A Rainy Day", when children only truly understood what they could grasp from the pictures in the book. It is fortunate then that teachers at The Canterbury School had no issues code-switching, translating or using Spanish during class as this interchangeable use of the learners' L1/FL allowed them to keep a focus on the concepts weaved in the PYP curriculum and helped learners to fully understand what was being taught. Furthermore, in contrast to Cook's (2001) research on teachers' L1 use (Cook, 2001), Virginia, Marta and Sandra showed no 'guilt' in stating that they continuously used Spanish within their classrooms, and seemed to have no pre-conception of the avoidance view that is still present in SLA. Although their use of Spanish was consistent with some of the strategies of using the L1 positively in the classroom that Cook (2001, pp. 413 - 417) and Moore (2010) propose, their aim was not to use Spanish as a tool for English teaching or to promote "metalinguistic awareness by communicating in the two languages" (Moore, 2010, p. 279) but to view using both languages as a natural practice and thus. Thus, and again differently from the (scarce) research in early immersion, the content that the children needed to study was almost always clarified or introduced in their L1, and their English use was designed to improve mainly via exposure to the language and repetition and reinforcement of particular vocabulary and simple text and formats.

I also argue that in addition to the fact that PYP brings up a focus on concepts that is not aligned with the literature on early immersion, I found that

PYP, as a pedagogical model promoted by the IBO does not provide guidance for teachers implementing inquiry-based teaching in the context of immersion education (regardless of whether it is partial or full immersion). In fact, the only literature I was able to locate in reference to bilingual education is a paper by the IBO that reviewed the literature on L2 learning in primary schools (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2002). The aim of this paper is to guide schools in the implementation of L2 programmes. The paper describes the importance of introducing L2s in primary school, reviews the literature on age and time as factors in learning, defines proficiency, and describes "some features of successful additional language approaches" (p. 13). Through this paper the Organization suggests that a L2 should be included in the curriculum once learners have a solid foundation in their L1 by around the age of seven, through brief and regular daily lessons integrated with other subjects through instruction that enhances real communication. This is clearly very different to the goal of early immersion, but, there is a lack of guidance from the Organization on how to implement PYP at schools with intensive L2 education in preschool and early primary.

Chapter Summary

This chapter has described the broader institutional features impacting on the regularities across sites and presented four main claims. First, I argued that the transmission model prevalent at both schools in the present study can be better understood by reflecting on the historicity and pervasiveness of Western traditional formats of formal schooling as these have informed AIM and

immersion programmes alike. Second, I have shown that the transmission model contrasts with the PYP inquiry-based model, and have therefore interpreted The Canterbury School's classroom practices for young children in light of the transition, emerging phase of recent implementation of this programme in the school. Third, I have located the teachers' interchangeable use of learners' L1/FL (which was found to be inconsistent with most of the FL literature used to outline pedagogical principles) as a natural practice that added "significantly to the enrichment of new concepts and became an active part" (Moore, 2010, p. 290) in facilitating the learners' comprehension of PYP concepts and content throughout curriculum subjects. Finally, I have explored literature on AIM, early immersion and PYP and have shown that they do not yet provide meaningful guidance for teachers using these programmes in the context of early FL education.

CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSION

Chapter Overview

This thesis describes a qualitative comparative education study of FL classroom practices within two schools in Australia and Colombia, framed by Rogoff's TOP approach. I have endeavoured describe the path of my research from beginning (the identification of the research aim) to end (the last level of analysis to explain regularities). The chapters so far have not – except for the Introduction – given many details on my personal struggles and reflections which were also important features of this research. This concluding chapter therefore begins with a summary of the main claims of this study and then brings to light my experiences, while reflecting on the implications and further questions raised by my findings, the dilemmas and turning points, and the strengths and limitations of this research.

Summary of Main Claims

When this research began, the study had a descriptive aim and an exploratory aim. The *descriptive* aim was to detail what happens in everyday cross-cultural FL lessons and classrooms, in order to contribute to a gap in academic research by informing early FL education in classrooms. This was addressed by exemplifying everyday lessons through rich sociocultural descriptions, and also by identifying and describing the variety of classroom activities that were

used in the participating classrooms. The following classroom activities were identified: music, book reading, games, routine, pure instruction, counting, drawing/colouring, prop-labelling, writing, scripted play, experiments, brainstorming, Letterland and presenting. The descriptions were framed with a new theoretical informant to SLA where analyses at the individual, interpersonal and cultural-institutional level (Rogoff, 1995, 1998, 2003) were applied to provide context-rich depictions of classrooms, going beyond the current analysis of classrooms in the L2/FL literature, which focus on the learners' FL use to explain L2 acquisition.

The study also had the *exploratory* aim of identifying and interpreting the classroom practices used in the teaching of FL to young children, in order to detect the regularities of practices within and between contexts. To do this, I proposed 'classroom activities' as an appropriate unit of analysis for the study of FL classroom practices. I argue that this unit preserves the wholeness of the phenomenon, whilst providing a small and clear analytical unit that allows investigation of the complexities of lessons. Classroom activities were then coded through thematic categories (aims of classroom activities, models of instruction and pedagogical principles of early FL education) that I claim are very helpful constructs for the identification and understanding of classroom practices. As a result of this process, I was able to make the following main claims, most of which highlighted (at that stage, inexplicable) similarities in practices at both schools. On one hand, the major similarity was the prevalence of the transmission model of instruction at both schools. Teachers engaged in dyadic interactions, directing learners' roles and responsibilities throughout single events, promoting little multi-party engagement, and

checking that learners had received some of the knowledge they had transmitted via evaluations of answers given by the learners to display questions. Another similarity was that there were three common aims in the teachers' use of classroom activities: instruction of language, balance and celebration. In addition, practices across schools portrayed a limited use of space, resources and hands-on experiential learning that were not consistent with established pedagogical principles of FL instruction for children. Lastly, the use of music in FL teaching decreased as children progressed through year levels, and teachers de-emphasized its importance and use as an instructive tool in FL teaching. On the other hand, the most significant difference was that Sylvie at High Mount Girls Grammar School used very little of the learners' L1 in class, whereas teachers at The Canterbury School used both the FL and learners' L1 interchangeably throughout lessons. The only other distinctive difference was that teachers at The Canterbury School aimed for classroom activities to also teach explicit literacy and other concepts.

The similarities in these findings were unexpected as the study had been designed on the assumption there would be more cultural variation between research sites: they had been purposefully chosen to provide contrasting linguistic and educational scenarios. As a result, a new aim became central to the study: *attempting to explain* why these practices were similar across contexts. Thus, the study turned into an investigation of broader institutional features (i.e. schooling, AIM, PYP and early immersion) which allowed me to come to the following tentative conclusions. First, I argued that the transmission model prevalent at both schools in the present study could be understood by reflecting on the historicity and pervasiveness of

characteristically Western formats of formal schooling, particularly as these have informed AIM and immersion programmes. Second, I claimed that – in light of the recent implementation of PYP and the contrasts between this programme and a transmission model of instruction – teachers at The Canterbury School had not yet appropriated the instructional practices characteristic of the PYP. Third, I argued that even though the teachers' interchangeable use of learners' L1/FL at The Canterbury School seemed to be a natural practice and not intended as a tool for teaching (as is sometimes explained in the literature), this use was helpful for addressing the complexities of teaching a PYP curriculum along with an early partial immersion programme. As such, teachers were better able to focus on the meaning and content of the activities. Finally, I have shown that AIM, PYP and early immersion programmes contain significant constraints that informed the classroom practices of the study participants. AIM positions teachers of young children as their only language provider (sustaining a teacher-centred approach) and does not yet provide the materials and framework needed to implement the programme in the early years. Similarly, early immersion has historically employed teacher-centred practices, and is also based on assumptions of context and activity-based pedagogies of early childhood that are not relevant or meaningful for settings teaching PYP curriculum through the learners' FL. Also, literature from the IBO PYP does not yet refer to different types of bilingual education within schools, only providing guidelines for mainstream education with FL teaching, leaving the teachers at The Canterbury School with no helpful framework to guide their practice.

The Big Surprise: Where is the Contrast?

The arguments above continue to puzzle me as I had envisioned finding significant variations in classroom practices by completing a comparative education study across very different contexts. Having had experience in both countries and knowing that there were so many contrasts between them and between the sites recommended by the local experts (including pedagogical principles informing teaching, national policies and practice of FL teaching, and FL programmes officially in place at the school) I was hoping to find rich differentiating or complementary examples of classroom practices within and across sites. In doing so, I could then deepen the understanding of early FL education. I was certainly not prepared to find such remarkable similarities between classroom practices not only within each of the participating sites but across the two sites. This was a significant and emotionally draining dilemma that I initially perceived as an important limitation of my study. I required a lot of time and discussion with my main supervisor to regain confidence in my study and understand that describing these findings is itself a significant contribution to early FL education. The turning point however was to determine the final level of analysis (Chapter 7) which helped me to move beyond potential disillusion and allowed me to see yet another benefit of using Rogoff's TOP perspective as the main informant to my understanding of children's development and learning.

Benefits of a Transformation of Participation Perspective for This Thesis

I believe that the main strength of this study lies in how I have applied Rogoff's TOP approach, as it provided a theoretical framework for the study of FL education in early childhood settings with clear conceptual understandings, as well as assertive empirical studies that supported the descriptive, exploratory and explanatory aims of this research. As such, I was able to come up with a helpful and clear definition for 'classroom practices': the nature of the activities through which learners are taught a FL in relation to the contributions of the classrooms' participants and the ongoing – and changing – influences of the wider institutions of which they are a part. Work by Rogoff (1998) and Matusov (2007) was complemented with literature on classroom cultures (De Corte & Verschaffel, 2007; Gallego, et al., 2001; Valli & Chambliss, 2007) to propose an appropriate unit of analysis for this study (i.e. classroom activities). I was then able to use a variety of readings which focus on institutional aspects of learning and teaching (Chavajay & Rogoff, 2002; Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003; Matusov, et al., 2002; Rogoff, et al., 2001; Rogoff, et al., 1996; Rogoff, et al., 2005; Rogoff & Toma, 1997) to create a relevant thematic coding (i.e. aims of classroom activities, models of instruction and pedagogical principles of FL education), that permitted a rich interpretation of observations (with and without a video camera), interviews and documents. Furthermore, I was then able to explain some of the regularities in light of the impact of traditional formats of Western schooling that Rogoff and colleagues have studied in detail in some of the studies above.

Suggestions for Further Research

In Chapters 5 and 6 I showed that young children's interests and limited contributions were usually overruled or ignored by the teachers. Thus, their role remained fixed as that of a passive, receptive learner. Examples of children actively cooperating in FL classrooms were found in the video "Des ses propres ailes" (L'Association Canadienne des Professeurs d'Immersion (ACPI), n.d.) and also in a few empirical studies (e.g. Department of Education Employment and Training Victoria, 2000; Lorenz & Rice, 1989), but these examples were of older children who had some basic knowledge of the FL and not of the types of learners described in this thesis. As such, I argue that rigorous studies within a sociocultural framework need to explore and document the classroom practices of young children in their very first years of FL teaching in order to create new understandings that can help practice move beyond the passive image of early childhood in FL education portrayed in this thesis. Comparative studies of alternative scenarios are needed and – considering the unexpected results of this study – a useful criteria for selecting sites could be using various models of instruction (such as the ones explained in detail in Chapter 6) so that practices that are different from those of the 'adult-run' transmission model (e.g. 'children-run' acquisition model (Rogoff, et al., 1996) and/or the community of learners (Matusov & Rogoff, 2002; Rogoff, et al., 2001; Rogoff, et al., 1996)) described on this thesis are also investigated.

Another possible line of research that would improve our current understanding of young children's FL learning, would be to study the earlier years of collaborative classrooms already documented in primary years (such as the ones mentioned at the beginning of this section) to explore whether or not

the teaching is also collaborative in the early stages of learning in these settings. If practices are collaborative, their analysis would create new understandings of how to teach FLs to young children while also allowing children to take a more agentic role. If practices are not collaborative, it could be assumed that a change occurs in subsequent years – as suggested by AIM – once the learners have achieved more fluency. In turn, investigating this transition would be important for a) clearly identifying the constraints that allow teachers to maintain the control of all aspects of FL teaching when young children remain silent, passive and receptive in classrooms; and b) understanding how the changes in practice take place, noticing how teachers and children transform their participation within classrooms in order to engage in a new way. There are many opportunities for further research that are needed in the field of early FL learning, if we wish to truly expand our current understanding of young children's FL learning in classroom settings.

REFERENCES

AIM Language Learning (2007). Research to support the implementation of Histoires en action! Retrieved February 6, 2009 from http://www.aimlanguagelearning.com/index.php/custom_pages/view_page/name/Research_HEA

AIM Language Learning (n.d.). Frequently Asked Questions Retrieved February 6, 2009 from http://www.aimlanguagelearning.com/pdf/FAQ's.v.11.05.web.pdf

Alexander, R. (2000). *Culture and pedagogy: International comparison in primary education*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Angelillo, C., Rogoff, B., & Chavajay, P. (2007). Examining shared endeavors by abstracting video coding schemes with fidelity to cases. In R. Goldman, R. Pea, B. Barron & S. J. Derry (Eds.), *Video research in the learning sciences*. Mahway, NJ: Erlbaum.

Angelonova, M., Gunawardena, D., & Volk, D. (2006). Peer teaching and learning: co-constructing language in a dual language first grade. *Language and Education, 20*(3), 173 - 190.

Baker, C. (1993). Types of bilingual education *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (pp. 149 - 168): Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4th ed.). Cleveland: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Baptiste, I. (2001). Qualitative data analysis: Common phases, strategic differences. *Forum Qualitative Social Research, 2*(3).

Bartram, B. (2006). Comparing language learning attitudes in England, Germany and the Netherlands: some methodological considerations. *Research in Comparative & International Education, 1*(1), 56 - 72.

Beligan, A., Clyne, M., & Lotherington, H. (Writer) (1999). Growing up with English plus [Videorecording]. Melbourne: Language Australia.

Blanck, G. (1990). Vygotsky: The man and his cause. In L. C. Moll (Ed.), *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociocultural psychology* (pp. 31 - 58). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Blunden, A. (2007). Modernity, the individual, and the foundations of cultural-historical activity theory *Mind, Culture and Activity, 14*(4), 253 - 265.

Brooker, L. (2003). Integrating new technologies in UK classrooms: Lessons for teachers from early years practitioners *Childhood Education 79*(5), 261 - 267.

Bruner, J. (1984). Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development: The hidden agenda. In B. Rogoff & J. V. Wertsch (Eds.), *Children's learning in the "Zone of Proximal Development": New directions for child development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bullock, A., & Trombley, S. (2000). *The new Fontana dictionary of modern thought* (Third ed.). London: Harper Collins Publishers.

Campbell, R. N. (1984). The immersion education approach to foreign language teaching *Studies on immersion education. A collection for United States educators* (pp. 114 - 143). Sacramento: California State Department of Education and the Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education.

Carber, S., & Reis, S. (2004). Commonalities in IB practice and the schoolwide enrichment model. *Journal of Research in International Education, 3*, 339 - 359.

Cardenas, M. L. (2006). *Bilingual Colombia: Are we ready for it? What is needed?* Paper presented at the 19th Annual English Australia Education Conference

Chaiklin, S. (2001). *The theory and practice of cultural-historical psychology*. Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press.

Chaiklin, S. (2003). The zone of proximal development in Vygotsky's analysis of learning and instruction In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. S. Ageyev & S. M. Miller (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chaiklin, S. (2011). The role of 'practice' in cultural-historical science. In M. Kontopodis, C. Wulf & B. Fichtner (Eds.), *Children, Development and*

Education: Cultural, Historical, Anthropological Perspectives (pp. 227 - 246). Dordrecht: Springer.

Chaiklin, S., Hedegaard, M., & Jensen, U. J. (1999). *Activity theory and social practice: Cultural-historical approaches*. Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press.

Chavajay, P., & Rogoff, B. (2002). Schooling and traditional collaborative social organization problem solving by Mayan mothers and children. *Developmental Psychology, 38*(1), 55 - 66.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic Structures*. London: Mouton.

Chomsky, N. (1967). A review of B. F. Skinner's verbal behavior. In L. A. Jakobovits & M. S. Miron (Eds.), Readings in the Psychology of Language Available from http://www.chomsky.info/articles/1967----.htm

Clark, B. (November 5-7, 2000). *First- and Second-Language Acquisition in Early Childhood.* Paper presented at the Lilian Katz Symposium: Issues in Early Childhood Education: Curriculum, Teacher Education, & Dissemination of Information. , Champaign, IL.

Clarke, D., Mesiti, C., O'Keefe, C., Xu, L. H., Jablonka, E., Mok, I. A. C., et al. (2007). Addressing the challenge of legitimate international comparisons of classroom practice. *International Journal of Educational Research, 46*, 280 - 293.

Clyne, M. (2007, January 24). Don't let languages languish. *The Australian*. Retrieved February 25 2007, from

http://www.theaustralian.com.au/higher-education/dont-let-languages-languish/story-e6frgcjx-1111112878474.

Clyne, M., Pauwels, A., & Sussex , R. (2007). The state of languages education in Australia. *Curriculum Leadership, 5*(19). Retrieved from http://www.curriculum.edu.au/leader/the_state_of_languages_education_in_australia,19754.html

Cole, M., Cole, S. R., & Lightfoot, C. (2005). Language acquisition *The development of children* (fifth ed., pp. 279 - 317). New York: Worth Publishers.

Cole, M., & Scribner, S. (1978). Introduction. In L. S. Vygotsky, M. Cole, V. john-Steiner, S. Scribner & E. Souberman (Eds.), *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (pp. 1 - 14). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Collier, V. P. (1995). *Acquiring a second language for school*: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the Classroom. *The Canadian Modem Language Review / La Revue Canadienne des Langues Vivantes, 57*(3), 402 - 423.

Correa-Chávez, M., & Rogoff, B. (2005). Cultural research has transformed our ideas of cognitive development. *International Society for the Study of Behavioural Development Newsletter, 1*(47), 7 - 10.

Correa-Chávez, M., Rogoff, B., & Mejía Arauz, R. (2005). Cultural patterns in attending to two events at once. *Child Development, 76*(3), 664 - 678.

Cross, R. (2006). *Language teaching as activity: A sociocultural perspective on second language teacher practice.* Unpublished PhD Thesis, Monash University, Melbourne.

Cummins, J. (1998). Immersion education for the millenium: What we have learned form 30 years of research on second language immersion. *Learning Through Two Languages: Research and Practice. Second Katoh Gakuen International Symposium on Immersion and Bilingual Education.* Retrieved February 1, 2010 from http://carla.acad.umn.edu/cobaltt/modules/strategies/immersion2000.pdf

Dadydov, V. V. (1988). The concept of theoretical generalization and problems of educational psychology. *Studies in Soviet Thought, 36*, 169 - 202.

Daniels, H. (2005a). Introduction. In H. Daniels (Ed.), *An introduction to Vygotsky* (2nd ed., pp. 1 - 31). East Sussex: Routledge.

Daniels, H. (Ed.). (2005b). *An introduction to Vygotsky* (2nd ed.). East Sussex: Routledge.

De Corte, E., & Verschaffel, L. (2007). Analyzing mathematics classroom cultures and practices. *International Journal of Educational Research, 46*, 247 - 251.

de Mejía, A.-M. (2004). Bilingual education in Colombia: Towards an integrated perspective. *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 7*(5), 381 - 397.

de Mejia, A.-M., & Tejada, H. (2003). Bilingual curriculum construction and empowerment in Colombia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 6*(1), 37 - 51.

Delamont, S. (2002). *Fieldwork in educational settings: Methods, pitfalls and perspectives* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Denzin, N. K. (1989). *Interpretive Interactionism* (Vol. 16): Sage Publications.

Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (2011a). At school 5 - 18 Retrieved October 4, 2011, from http://www.education.vic.gov.au/aboutschool/

Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (2011b). Preparing for school Retrieved October 4, 2011, from http://www.education.vic.gov.au/aboutschool/prepare/default.htm

Department of Education Employment and Training Victoria (2000). *Linking LOTE to the Early Years*. State of Victoria.

Department of Education University of Oxford (2011). Professor Mariane Hedegaard Retrieved July 23, 2011, from http://www.education.ox.ac.uk/about-us/directory/professor-mariane-hedegaard/

Donato, R. (2000). Sociocultural contributions to understanding the foreign and second language classroom. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 27 - 50). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Döpke, S., McNamara, T. F., & Quinn, T. J. (1991). Psycholinguistic aspects of bilingualism. In A. Liddicoat (Ed.), *Bilingualism and bilingual education* (pp. 21 - 80). Melbourne: National Languages Institute of Australia.

Dunn, W. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (1998). Vygotsky's zone of proximal development and Krashen's i+1: Incommensurable constructs; incommensurable theories. *Language and Learning*, 411 - 442.

EdSource (2010). Letterland Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://letterland.com.au/about/letterland

Edwards, S., & Fleer, M. (2003). *Theoretical informants of the early childhood curriculum: A historical review* Paper presented at the 11th Annual Australian Research in Early Childhood Education Conference. Retrieved October 16, 2005, from http://images.lib.monash.edu.au/edf2202/04120695.pdf

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. New York: Oxford University Press

Ellis, R. (1988). *Classroom second language development: A study of classroom interaction and classroom acquisition*. New York, Toronto: Prentice Hall.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Engeström, Y. (1999). Activity theory and individual and social transformation. In Y. Engeström, R. Miettinen & R. Punamaki (Eds.), *Perspectives on*

Activity Theory (pp. 19 - 38). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Eurostat Press Office (2009). *European Day of Languages: In the EU 60% of students in upper secondary studied at least two foreign languages in 2007*: Eurostat.

Fernandez, S. (2008). *Teaching and Learning Languages Other Than English (LOTE) in Victorian Schools*. State of Victoria: Department of Education and Early Childhood Development.

Fleer, M. (2008a). Interpreting research protocols - the institutional perspective In M. Hedegaard & M. Fleer (Eds.), *Studying Children* (pp. 65 - 87). Berkshire, England: Open University Press.

Fleer, M. (2008b). Using digital video observations and computer technologies in a cultural-historical approach. In M. Hedegaard & M. Fleer (Eds.), *Studying children: A cultural-historical approach* (pp. 104 - 117). Berkshire, England: Open University Press

Fleer, M., Hedegaard, M., & Tudge, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Childhood Studies and the Impact of Globalization: Policies and Practices at Global and Local Levels*. NY: Routledge.

Fleer, M., Tonyan, H. A., Mantilla, A. C., & Rivalland, C. M. P. (2008). A cultural-historical analysis of play as an activity setting in early childhood education: Views from research and from teachers. In M. Fleer, M. Hedegaard & J. Tudge (Eds.), *Childhood Studies and the Impact of*

Globalization: Policies and Practices at Global and Local Levels: Routledge.

Fleer, M., Tonyan, H. A., Mantilla, A. C., & Rivalland, C. M. P. (2009). Play and learning in Australia. In I. Pramling-Samuelsson & M. Fleer (Eds.), *Play and Learning in Early Childhood Settings: International Perspectives*: Springer.

Francis, N. (Fall 1999). Maturational constraints in language one and language two: A second look at the research on critical periods. *Bilingual Research Journal, 23*(4), 423 - 442.

Gallego, M., Cole, M., & Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition (2001). Classroom cultures and cultures in the classroom In V. Richardson (Ed.), *The Handbook of Research on Teaching* (4th ed., pp. 951 - 997). New York: MacMillan.

Gauvain, M., & The Gale Group Inc. (2003 - 2009). Rogoff, Barbara 1950 - Retrieved August 2, 2011, from http://www.education.com/reference/article/rogoff-barbara-1950-/

Genesee, F. (1984). Historical and theorectical foundations of immersion education *Studies on immersion education. A collection for United States educators* (pp. 32 - 57). Sacramento: California State Department of Education and the Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education.

Genesee, F. (1994). Integrating Language and Content: Lessons from Immersion. *NCRCDSLL Educational Practice Reports* Retrieved March 2, 2010, from www.escholarship.org/uc/item/61c8k7kh

Genesee, F. (2005). *Language development* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth / Thomson Learning.

Gilzow, D. F., & Branaman, L. E. (2000). *Lessons learned: Model early foreign language programs*. Washington DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.

Goldman, S., & McDermott, R. (2007). Staying the course with video analysis. In R. Goldman, R. Pea, B. Barron & S. J. Derry (Eds.), *Video Research in the Learning Sciences* (pp. 101 - 113): Routledge.

Göncu, A., Mistry, J., & Mosier, C. (2000). Cultural variations in the play of toddlers. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 24*(3), 321 - 329.

Gutiérrez, K. D., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of lerning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. *Educational Researcher, 32*, 19 - 25.

Hajek, J. (November 29 2009). Raising Children in More Than One Language, *RUMACCC, Community Languages Australia, and the Ethnic Schools Association of Victoria (inc) and Victorian Multicultural Commission* Melbourne

Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and language education* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Haworth, P., Cullen, J., Simmons, H., Schimanski, L., McGarva, P., & Woodhead, E. (2006). The role of acquisition and learning in young children's bilingual development: A sociocultural interpretation. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 9*(3), 295 - 309.

Heath, S. B., & Mc Laughlin, M. (1994). Learning for anything everyday. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 26*(5), 471 - 489.

Hedegaard, M. (2008a). A cultural-historical theory of children's development. In M. Hedegaard & M. Fleer (Eds.), *Studying children: A cultural-historical approach* (pp. 10 - 29). Berkshire, England: Open University Press.

Hedegaard, M. (2008b). Developing a dialectic approach to researching children's development. In M. Hedegaard & M. Fleer (Eds.), *Studying children: A cultural-historical approach* (pp. 30 - 45). Berkshire, England: Open University Press.

Hedegaard, M. (2008c). Principles for interpreting research protocols. In M. Hedegaard & M. Fleer (Eds.), *Studying children: A cultural-historical approach* (pp. 46 - 64). Berkshire, England: Open University Press.

Hedegaard, M., & Chaiklin, S. (2005). *Radical-local teaching and learning*. Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press.

Hedegaard, M., & Fleer, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Studying children: A cultural-historical approach*. Berkshire, England: Open University Press.

High Mount Girls Grammar School (2007). About our school Retrieved July 3, 2008, from www.highmountgirlsgrammarschool.vic.edu.au/about

Holzman, L. (2006). What kind of theory is activity theory? *Theory & Psychology, 16*(1), 5 - 11.

Huy Lê, M. (1999). *The role of music in second language learning: A Vietnamese perspective* Paper presented at the Combined 1999 Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education and the New Zealand Association for Research in Education. Retrieved November 1, 2009, from http://www.aare.edu.au/99pap/le99034.htm

Intent Community Participation (2011). Intent Community Participation Overview Retrieved 2011, July 31, from http://www.intentcommunityparticipation.com/icp-overview-english

International Baccalaureate Organisation (2000). *Making the PYP happen*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Baccalaureate Organisation.

International Baccalaureate Organization (2000). *Making the PYP happen*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Baccalaureate Organization.

International Baccalaureate Organization (2002). *Learning additional languages in the primary years: A review of the research*. Geneva.

International Baccalaureate Organization (2005 - 2009). Country information for Colombia Retrieved August 26, 2009 from http://www.ibo.org/country/CO/

Jasdzewski, G. (1998). *How Useful Is Connectionism for SLA Research?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of Speakers of Other Languages. from http://www.eric.ed.gov:80/PDFS/ED423704.pdf

John-Steiner, V., & Souberman, E. (1978). Afterword. In L. S. Vygotsky, M. Cole, V. john-Steiner, S. Scribner & E. Souberman (Eds.), *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (pp. 121 - 133). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kauffman, N. (2005). Variations on a theme: Implementation of the International Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme. *Journal of Research in International Education, 4*, 243 - 261.

Kirk, J., & Miller, M. L. (Eds.). (1986). *Reliability and validity in qualitative research*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford; New York: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. (2004). *Applying the Comprehension Hypothesis: Some Suggestions* Paper presented at the 13th International Symposium and Book Fair on Language Teaching (English Teachers Association of the Republic of China). Retrieved January 18, 2008, from http://www.sdkrashen.com/articles/eta_paper/index.html

L'Association Canadienne des Professeurs d'Immersion (ACPI) (Writer) (1997). De ses propres ailes… Vidéocassette et manuel

d'accompagnement [Videorecording]: L'Association Canadienne des Professeurs d'Immersion (ACPI).

L'Association Canadienne des Professeurs d'Immersion (ACPI) (Writer) (n.d.). De ses propres ailes… Vidéocassette et manuel d'accompagnement [Videorecording]: L'Association Canadienne des Professeurs d'Immersion (ACPI).

Lambert, W. E. (1984). An overview of issues in immerison education *Studies on immersion education. A collection for United States educators* (pp. 8 - 30). Sacramento: California State Department of Education and the Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Introducing sociocultural theory. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P. (2003). Intrapersonal communication and internalization in the second language classroom. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. S. Ageyev & S. M. Miller (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lantolf, J. P., & Appel, G. (Eds.). (1994). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*. United States of America: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Lantolf, J. P., & Pavlenko, A. (1995). Sociocultural theory and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 15*, 108 - 124.

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). Introduction. In J. P. Lantolf & S. L. Thorne (Eds.), *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2007). Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Acquisition. In B. Van Patten & J. M. Williams (Eds.), *Explaining Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 201 - 224). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lapkin, S., & Cummins, J. (1984). Canadian French immersion education: Current administrative arrangements and instructional practices. *A collection for United States educators* (pp. 58 - 86). Sacramento: California State Department of Education and the Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (2005). Practice, person, social world. In H. Daniels (Ed.), *An introduction to Vygotsky* (2nd ed., pp. 149 - 156). East Sussex: Routledge.

LeCompte, M. D., & Goetz, J. P. (1982). Problems of reliability and validity in ethnographic research *Review of Educational Research 52* (1), 31 - 60.

Lee, P. (1996). Cognitive development in bilingual children: A case for bilingual instruction in early childhood. *Bilingual Research Journal, 20*(3 & 4), 499 - 522.

Liddicoat, A. (1991). Bilingualism: an introduction. In A. Liddicoat (Ed.), *Bilingualism and bilingual education* (pp. 1 - 20). Melbourne: National Languages Institute of Australia.

Liddicoat, A. J., Scarino, A., Curnow, T. J., Kohler, M., Scrimgeour, A., & Morgan, A.-M. (2007). *Investigation of the State and Nature of Languages in Australian Schools*. RCLCES, University of South Australia/ Canberra: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1999). Theoretical approaches to explaining second language learning *How languages are learned* (pp. 31 - 48): Oxford University Press.

Lim, H.-J. L., & Watson, D. J. (1993). Whole language content classes for second-language learners. *The Reading Teacher, 46*(5), 384 - 393.

Lipton, G. (1992). *Practical handbook to elementary foreign language programs, including FLES, FLEX and immersion*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.

Lipton, G. (Dec 1994). What is FLES methodology?: An overview. *Hispania, 77* (4), 878-887.

Lo Bianco, J., & Slaughter, Y. (2009). *Second languages and Australian schooling*. Camberwell: Australian Council for Educational Research.

Lorenz, E. B., & Rice, S. (1989). *Creating effective foreign language learning environments in elementary classrooms*. New York: The American Forum for Global Education

Lotherington, H. (2000). *What's bilingual education all about? A guide to language learning in today's schools*. Melbourne: Language Australia Ltd.

Mahn, H. (1999). Vygotsky's methodological contribution to sociocultural theory. *Remedial and Special Education, 20*(6), 341 - 350

Makin, L., Campbell, J., & Jones Diaz, C. (1995). Growing up bilingually. In L. Makin, J. Campbell & C. Jones Diaz (Eds.), *One childhood many languages* (pp. 37 - 68). Pymble: Harper Educational Publishers.

Martin, C. (1995). *Young Pathfinder: Games and fun activities* (Vol. 2). London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.

Martin, C., & Cheater, C. (1998). *Young Pathfinder: Let's join in! Rhymes, poems and songs* (Vol. 6). London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.

Martin Jr, B., & Carle, E. (1967). *Brown Bear, Brown Bear, What do you see?...*

Matusov, E. (1998). When solo activity is not privileged: Participation and internalization models of development. *Human Development 41*, 326 - 349.

Matusov, E. (2007). In search of 'the appropriate' unit of analysis for sociocultural research. *Culture Psychology, 13*, 307 - 333.

Matusov, E., Bell, N., & Rogoff, B. (2002). Schooling as cultural process: Working together and guidance by children from schools differing in collaborative practice *Advances in Child Development and Behavior, 29* 129 -160.

Matusov, E., & Rogoff, B. (2002). Newcomers and oldtimers: Educational philosopies-in-action of parent volunteers in a community of learners school. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 33*, 415 - 440.

Maxwell, W. (2004). The Accelerative Integrated Method: A holistic approach to the teaching of French as a second language Retrieved January 11, 2009 from http://www.caslt.org/pdf/aim.pdf

McKinney, J. (2009). What is the AIM? Retrieved September 28, 2009, from http://www.hearsaylearning.com/

McLaughlin, B. (1978). *Second-language acquisition in childhood*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McLaughlin, B. (1992). Myths and misconceptions about second language learning: What every teacher needs to unlearn Retrieved September 5,

2006, from www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/symposia/reading/article6/mclaughlin93.html

McLaughlin, B. (1995). *Fostering second language development in young children: principles and practices*. Washington: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Mejía Arauz, R., Rogoff, B., & Paradise, R. (2005). Cultural variation in children's observation during a demonstration. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 29*(4), 282 - 291.

Ministerial Council of Education Employment Training and Youth Affairs (2005). *National statement for languages education in Australian schools: National plan for languages in Australian schools 2005 - 2008*. Retrieved February 5, 2008, from www.mceetya.edu.au/verve/_resources/languageeducation_file.pdf.

Ministerio de Educación Nacional (2006a). Colombia promueve aprendizaje de inglés Retrieved April 10, 2009, from http://www.universia.net.co/noticias/actualidad-universitaria/colombia-promueve-aprendizaje-de-ingles.html

Ministerio de Educación Nacional (2006b). *Resolucion No. 5360*. Retrieved October 4, 2011. from http://www.mineducacion.gov.co/1621/articles-107559_archivo_pdf.pdf.

Ministerio de Educación Nacional (2009). Promoción Nacional del Bilingüismo Retrieved April 10, 2009, from

http://www.colombiaaprende.edu.co/html/productos/1685/article-158720.html

Mitchell, R., & Myles, F. (2004). Input and interaction in second language learning. In R. Mitchell & F. Myles (Eds.), *Second language learning theories* (pp. 159 - 192). London: Arnold.

Moore, D. (2006). Plurilingualism and strategic competence in context. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 3*(2), 125 - 138

Moore, D. (2010). Code-switching and learning in the classroom *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 5*(5), 279 - 293.

Munoz, O. (1969). *Songs in the foreign language classroom. ERIC Focus Reports on the Teaching of Foreign Languages*. New York: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Myles, F. (1995). Interaction between linguistic theory and language processing in SLA. *Second Language Research, 11*, 235 - 266.

Newman, F., & Holzman, L. (2002). *Lev Vygotsky: Revolutionary scientist* London and New York: Routledge.

Ordonez, C. L. (2004). EFL and Native Spanish in Elite Bilingual Schools in Colombia: A First Look at Bilingual Adolescent Frog Stories *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 7*(5), 449 - 474.

Paradise, R., & Rogoff, B. (2009). Side by side: Learning by observing and pitching *Ethos, 37*(1), 102 - 138.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*: Sage.

Perez, B., & Torrez-Guzman, M. E. (1992). *Learning in two worlds: An integrated Spanish-English biliteracy approach* (1st ed.). New York: Longman Publishing Group.

PYP Planner - Jardin (2008). Santafe de Bogota: The Canterbury School

PYP Planner - Pre-Jardin (2008). Santafe de Bogota: The Canterbury School.

PYP Planner - Transicion (2008). Santafe de Bogota: The Canterbury School.

Rado, M. (1991). Bilingual education. In A. Liddicoat (Ed.), *Bilingualism and bilingual education* (pp. 141 - 197). Melbourne: National Languages Institute of Australia.

Radziszewska, B., & Rogoff, B. (1988). Influence of adult and peer collaborators on children's planning skills. *Developmental Psychology, 24*, 840 - 848.

Radziszewska, B., & Rogoff, B. (1991). Children's guided participation in planning imaginary errands with skilled adult or peer partners. *Developmental Psychology, 27*, 381 - 389.

Raven, J. M. (2003). *Collective Mediation: A neo-Vygotskian perspective of undergraduate interdisciplinary group projects.* Unpublished PhD Thesis, Auckland University, Auckland.

Rhodes, N. C., & Pufahl, I. (2009). *Foreign language teaching in U.S. schools: Results of a national survey*: Centre for Applied Linguistics.

Rogoff, B. (1981). Schooling and the development of cognitive skills. In H. C. Triandis & A. Heron (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (Vol. 4, pp. 233 - 294). Rockleigh, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rogoff, B. (1994). Developing understanding of the idea of communities of learners. *Mind, Culture and Activity, 1*, 209 - 229.

Rogoff, B. (1995). Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: participatory appropriation, guided participation, and apprenticeship. In J. V. Wertsch, P. Del Rio & A. Alvarez (Eds.), *Sociocultural studies of mind* (pp. 139 - 164). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Rogoff, B. (1997). Evaluating development in the process of participation: Theory, methods, and practice building on each other. In E. Amsel & A. Renninger (Eds.), *Change and development* (pp. 265 - 285). Hillsdate, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rogoff, B. (1998). Cognition as a collaborative process *Handbook of child psychology v2* (pp. 679 - 715): John Wiley & Sons.

Rogoff, B. (2002). *How can we study cultural aspects of human development?* Basel, Switzerland ; Sydney, N.S.W.: Karger.

Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rogoff, B., & Angelillo, C. (2002). Investigating the coordinated functioning of multifaceted cultural practices in human development. *Human Development, 45*, 211 - 225.

Rogoff, B., Baker-Senett, J., Lacasa, P., & Goldsmith, D. (1995). Development through participation in sociocultural activity. In J. Goodnow, P. Miller & F. Kessel (Eds.), *Cultural practices as contexts for development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rogoff, B., Baker-Senett, J., & Matusov, E. (1994). Considering the concept of planning. In M. M. Haith, J. B. Benson, R. J. Roberts Jr & B. F. Pennington (Eds.), *The development of future-oriented processes* (pp. 353 - 373). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Rogoff, B., Goodman Turkanis, C., & Bartlett, L. (Eds.). (2001). *Learning together: Children and adults in a school community*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rogoff, B., Matusov, E., & White, C. (1996). Models of teaching and learning: Participation in a community of learners In D. R. Orson & N. Torrance (Eds.), *The handbook of education and human development* (pp. 388 - 414). Oxford, UK: Blackwell

Rogoff, B., Mistry, J., Göncü, A., & Mosier, C. (1993). Guided participation in cultural activity by toddlers and caregivers. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 58*(8, Serial No. 236).

Rogoff, B., Moore, L., Najafi, B., Dexter, A., Correa-Chávez, M., & Solís, J. (2005). Children's development of cultural repertoires through participation in everyday routines and practices. In J. Grusec & P. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization*. NY: Guilford.

Rogoff, B., Moore, L., Najafi, B., Dexter, A., Correa-Chávez, M., & Solís, J. (2007). Children's development of cultural repertoires through participation in everyday routines and practices. In J. E. Grusec & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization: Theory and Research* (pp. 490 - 515). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Rogoff, B., Mosier, C., Mistry, J., & Göncü, A. (1993). Toddlers' guided participation with their caregivers in cultural activity. In E. A. Forman, N. Minick & C. A. Stone (Eds.), *Contexts for learning: Sociocultural dynamics in children's development* (pp. 230 - 253). NY and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rogoff, B., Paradise, R., Mejía Arauz, R., Correa-Chávez, M., & Angelillo, C. (2003). Firsthand learning through intent participation. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54*(1), 175 - 203.

Rogoff, B., & Toma, C. (1997). Shared thinking: Community and institutional variations. *Discourse Processes, 23*, 471 - 497.

Rosenstein, B. (2002). Video use in social science research and program evaluation. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 1*(3), 1 -38.

Ryan, D. (2007). Beating down the language barrier. *The Age,* pp. 4 - 5.

Saunders, G. (1991). The sociolinguistic aspects of bilingualism: bilingualism and society. In A. Liddicoat (Ed.), *Bilingualism and bilingual education* (pp. 81 -140). Melbourne: National Languages Institute of Australia.

Saville-Troike, M. (1982). The development of bilingual and bicultural competence in young children. In L. G. Katz (Ed.), *Current topics in early childhood education* (Vol. IV, pp. 1 - 16). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Schumann, J. H. (1978). The acculturation model for second-language acquisition. In R. C. Gingras (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching* (

ed., pp. 27 - 50). Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Schumann, J. H. (1986). Research on the acculturation model for second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 7*(5), 379 -392.

Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. *Educational Researcher, 27* (2), 4 - 13.

Shtakser, I. (2001). Using music and songs in the foreign language classroom Retrieved August 26, 2009, from http://www.laits.utexas.edu/hebrew/music/music.html

Siraj-Blatchford, I., & Clarke, P. (2000). *Supporting identity, diversity and language in the early years*. Maidenhead: Open University Press

Slaughter, Y., & Hajek, J. (2007). Community languages and LOTE provision in Victorian primary schools: Mix or match? *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 30*(1), 7.1 – 7.22.

Snow, M. A., Met, M., & Genesee, F. (1989). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in second/foreign language instruction *TESOL Quarterly 23*(2), 201 - 217.

Stetsenko, A. (1999). Social interaction, cultural tools and the zone of proximal development: In search of a synthesis. In S. Chaiklin, M. Hedegaard & U. J. Jensens (Eds.), *Activity theory and social practice: Cultural historical approaches* (pp. 235 - 252). Aarhus, Denmark; Oakville, Conn.: Aarhus University Press.

Stevens, F. (1983). Activities to promote learning and communication in the second language classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 17*(2), 259 - 272.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97 - 114): Oxford University Press

Swain, M., Kinnear, P., & Steinman, L. (2011). *Sociocultural theory in second language education: An introduction through narratives*. UK, USA and Canada: MM Textbooks.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: the uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research, 4*(3), 251 - 274.

Taeschner, T. (2005). *The magic teacher. Learning a foreing language at nursery school - results for the project* (M. Simeoni, Trans. English ed.). London CILT, The National Centre for Languages.

Tardiff, C. C. (1994). Classroom Teacher Talk in Early Immersion. *The Canadian modern language review, 50*(3), 466-481.

The British Broadcasting Corporation (Writer) (1983). Horizon: A child's guide to language [Videorecording]. United Kingdom.

The Canterbury School (n.d.). School identity Retrieved September 12, 2008, from www.thecanterburyschool.edu.co/schooli

Thorne, S. L. (2005). Epistemology, politics and ethics in sociocultural theory. *The Modern Language Journal, 89*(iii), 393 - 409

Tierney, D., & Dobson, P. (1995). *Young Pathfinder:Are you sitting comfortably? Telling stories to young language learners*

(Vol. 3). London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.

Tobin, J. J., Wu, D. Y. H., & Davidson, D. (1989). *Preschool in Three Cultures: Japan, China and United States*. USA: Yale University Press.

University of California Santa Cruz (2010). Destiny and development in the Mayan tradition of midwifery Retrieved 2011, July 31, from http://news.ucsc.edu/2011/04/rogoff.html

University of California Santa Cruz (2011a). Home - Barbara Rogoff Retrieved 2011, July 31, from <http://people.ucsc.edu/~brogoff/>

University of California Santa Cruz (2011b). Research - Barbara Rogoff Retrieved 2011, July 31, from <http://people.ucsc.edu/~brogoff/researchpage.html>

Valli, L., & Chambliss, M. (2007). Creating classroom cultures: One teacher, two lessons, and a high-stakes test. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 38*(1), 57 - 75.

Vianna, E., & Stetsenko, A. (2006). Embracing history through transfoming it: Contrasting Piagetian versus Vygotskian (Activity) theories of learning and development to expand constructivism within a dialectical view of history *Theory & Psychology 16*(1), 81 - 108.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, E. Souberman, S. Scribner Eds., M. Cole & M. Lopez-Morillas, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1994). *The Vygotsky reader* (R. Van de Veer, J. Valsiner Eds., R. Van de Veer & T. Prout, Trans.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1997). *Collected works Volume 3: Problems of theory and history of psychology* (Vol. 3). New York: Plenum Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1999). *Collected works Volume 6: Scientific legacy* (Vol. 6). New York: Plenum Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (2005). Interaction between learning and development. In M. Gauvain & M. Cole (Eds.), *Readings on the development of children* (Fourth ed., pp. 34 - 41). New York: Worth Publishers.

Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Towards a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wood, D. J., Bruner, J., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 17*, 89 - 100.

Yasnitsky, A., & Ferrari, M. (2008). From Vygotsky to Vygotskian psychology: Introduction to the history of the Kharkov School *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 44*(2), 119 - 145.

Yelland, G., Pollard, J., & Mercuri, A. (1983). The metalingusitic benefits of limited contact with a second language. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 14*, 423 - 444.

Yelland, G., Pollard, J., & Mercuri, A. (1993). The metalingusitic benefits of limited contact with a second language. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 14*, 423 - 444.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed. Vol. 5). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – EXPLANATORY STATEMENT FOR THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS

<Monash University Letterhead>

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Research Project – Practices in Young Children's Foreign Language Classrooms: A Colombian-Australian Comparison

SCERH Project Number: CF07/2195 - 2007001522

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Ana Cristina Mantilla, a doctoral student from Monash University, working under the supervision of Dr Joce Nuttall and Dr Margaret Gearon who are Senior Lecturers at the Faculty of Education.

My research aims to present a *comparative education study of foreign language arrangements* - within schools - in two countries: Australia and Colombia. The study seeks to understand the classroom activities that foster foreign language learning in early childhood, and identify the patterns of variations and similarities across two case studies (one school setting in Melbourne and one in Bogotá).

<Name>, Language Coordinator at <School Name> has kindly allowed me to contact you through this explanatory statement of my research study. <School Name> has been recommended by <> who is a local expert in foreign language

education in <Colombia / Australia>. Consequently, we have contacted <Language Coordinator's name> who has passed your name to me because you are one of the teachers responsible for teaching children in their first years of foreign language learning in the school.

This study is very relevant because of the lack of existing research on foreign language education in early childhood. Among others, this means that we know very little about how foreign language teachers teach and almost nothing about what really happens inside foreign language classrooms. This study intends to address some of these gaps by working closely to foreign language teachers and collecting data inside classrooms. Your participation as a <Spanish/English/French> teacher of young children would contribute to uncovering the *realities and complexities of everyday classrooms* and help inform research and practice about the variety of *arrangements* used to teach foreign languages.

PURPOSE AND PROCEDURES

Participation in this study involves:

- observing your classroom (participants, materials, set up of activities, environment) while undertaking foreign language activities during two lessons in order to study the classroom activities that foster foreign language learning in early childhood;
- videotaping you while undertaking <Spanish/English/French> activities during four lessons;

gathering data (e.g. planning notes, photocopying texts, newsletters, etc.) and conveying it to the researcher.

2 - 3 hours audio recorded interview at the school reviewing still images from the video, taking notes on the beginning and ending times of the activities you used for <Spanish/English/French> teaching and answering some open-ended questions on the thinking underpinning your selection of foreign language activities and your teaching practices.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

I do not anticipate any stress beyond the normal experiences of everyday life.

CONFIDENTIALITY AND SECURE STORAGE OF DATA

Your confidentiality will be protected with the use of a pseudonym that you will be able to choose. This pseudonym will be used whenever I am referring to you or citing your words in this study. Moreover, no findings will be used for further educational purposes or research unless you have given approval in the informed consent form attached.

Only my supervisors and I will have access to the data I collect. It will be stored for at least five years as prescribed by the University regulations. Written documents will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in my locked office on campus; electronic documents will be stored on a password protected computer; and tapes / CDs (video and audio) will be stored in a locked filing cabinet. After 5 years, all written documents will be shredded, electronic documents will be

deleted from hard drive and tapes / CDs and others will be erased and then disposed of.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether you wish to be in this study or not. You are under no obligation to consent to participation. Even if you agree to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any stage up until the end of the fieldwork phase without consequences of any kind.

If you choose to participate in this study, please return the attached informed consent form according to the instructions on the form. I will contact you shortly after receiving your consent to make arrangements for a mutually convenient time for observation dates, filming and interviewing.

RESULTS

You will receive a copy of the transcript of your interview and copies of Journal publications resulting from this study. If you would like to receive a summary of the findings of the study, you can contact me on

If you would like to contact the researchers about any aspect of this study, please contact the Chief Investigator: Joce Nuttall, PhD Course Director, Early Childhood Education Monash University - Faculty of Education	Should you have any complaint at any time concerning the manner in which this research CF07/2195 - 2007001522 is conducted, please do not hesitate to contact the Monash University Standing Committee on Ethics in Research Involving Humans at the following address:

Peninsula Campus P O Box 527 Frankston VIC 3199 Australia Tel: +[redacted] Fax:+[redacted] 4027 Email: [redacted]	The Secretary The Standing Committee on Ethics in Research Involving Humans (SCERH) Building 3D Research Grants & Ethics Branch Monash University VIC 3800 Tel: +61 3 9905 2052 Fax: +61 3 9905 1420 Email: scerh@adm.monash.edu.au

Thank you,

Ana Cristina Mantilla

Tel: [redacted]

APPENDIX B – INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS

<Monash University Letterhead>

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Research Project - Practices in Young Children's Foreign Language Classrooms: A Colombian-Australian Comparison

SCERH Project Number: CF07/2195 - 2007001522

I agree to take part in the above Monash University research project. The project has been explained to me, and I have read the Explanatory Statement, which I have kept for my records.

I understand that agreeing to take part means that I am allowing the researcher to:

- observe my classroom while undertaking <Spanish/English/French> activities during two lessons;
- videotape my classroom for four additional lessons;

gather data and facilitate it to the researcher.

be interviewed at the school.

I understand that all observations and videotaping will take place in a corner of the room so as not to intrude on the normal activities of the classroom.

I understand that I will receive a copy of the transcript of my interview.

Confidentiality

Your confidentiality will be protected with the use of a pseudonym. Please choose a name that cannot be connected to you or any of your colleagues.

- ❑ The pseudonym I select is: ________________________

Further use of data

Upon completion of this research, the researchers may want to use the data collected in this project for other purposes besides the publication of the doctoral thesis. These purposes include *educational purposes* such as publications in books, journals, presentations to peers or to students in lectures, or in *professional conferences*.

Please tick the appropriate box(es):

- ❑ My language and activities CAN be used for <u>educational purposes</u>.
- ❑ My language and activities CAN be used at <u>professional conferences</u>.
- ❑ My language and activities CANNOT be used for either educational purposes or at conferences.

The researchers might also like to use and / or share the data collected on this study for further research.

Please tick the appropriate box:

- ❑ My language and activities CAN be used in further research projects which have ethics approval.
- ❑ My language and activities CANNOT be used in further research projects without asking me first.
- ❑ My language and activities CANNOT be used in further research.

Name:

Phone Number:

Email address:

__________________________________ __________________

Signature Date

Please return this form to the box located at the school's front desk. I will collect forms from the desk and contact you shortly after receiving your consent form.

APPENDIX C – EXPLANATORY STATEMENT FOR THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL / JUNIOR SCHOOL HEAD

<Monash University Letterhead>

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Research Project - Practices in Young Children's Foreign Language Classrooms: A Colombian-Australian Comparison

SCERH Project Number: CF07/2195 - 2007001522

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Ana Cristina Mantilla, a doctoral student from Monash University, working under the supervision of Dr Joce Nuttall and Dr Margaret Gearon who are Senior Lecturers at the Faculty of Education.

My research aims to present a *comparative education study of foreign language arrangements* - within schools - in two countries: Australia and Colombia. The study seeks to understand the classroom activities that foster foreign language learning in early childhood, and identify the patterns of variations and similarities across two case studies (one school setting in Melbourne and one in Bogotá).

This study is very relevant because of the lack of existing research on foreign language education in early childhood. Among others, this means that we know very little about how foreign language teachers teach and almost nothing about what really happens inside foreign language classrooms. This study

intends to address some of these gaps by working closely to foreign language teachers and collecting data inside classrooms.

<School Name> has been recommended by <> who is a local expert in foreign language education in <Colombia / Australia>. Consequently, we have contacted <Names>,<Spanish/English/French> teachers in <grades> who have kindly agreed to participate in my research study. Their participation as <Spanish/English/French> teachers of young children would contribute to uncovering the realities and complexities of everyday classrooms and help inform research and practice about the variety of arrangements used to teach foreign languages.

PURPOSE AND PROCEDURES

Participation in this study involves:

- observing the teachers' classroom (participants, materials, set up of activities, environment) while undertaking foreign language activities during two lessons in order to study the classroom activities that foster foreign language learning in early childhood;
- videotaping <teachers' names> while undertaking <Spanish/English/French> activities during four lessons;

gathering data (e.g. planning notes, photocopying texts, newsletters, etc.) and conveying it to the researcher.

2 - 3 hours audio recorded interview with <teachers' names> at the school reviewing still images from the video, taking notes on the beginning and ending

times of the activities used for <Spanish/English/French> teaching and answering some open-ended questions on the thinking underpinning the teacher's selection of foreign language activities and teaching practices.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

I do not anticipate any stress beyond the normal experiences of everyday life.

CONFIDENTIALITY AND SECURE STORAGE OF DATA

The school will be de-identified and confidentiality of classroom participants will be protected with the use of pseudonyms.

Only my supervisors and I will have access to the data I collect. It will be stored for at least five years as prescribed by the University regulations. Written documents will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in my locked office on campus; electronic documents will be stored on a password protected computer; and tapes / CDs (video and audio) will be stored in a locked filing cabinet. After 5 years, all written documents will be shredded, electronic documents will be deleted from hard drive and tapes / CDs and others will be erased and then disposed of.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

Parents / guardians will grant consent (or not) for the observations of their children to be used in the data analysis of this research. Parents / guardians and <teachers' names> can choose whether they wish to be in this study or not. They are under no obligation to consent to participation. Even if they

agree to participate, they may withdraw from the study at any stage up until the end of the fieldwork phase without consequences of any kind.

As the <school principal / junior school head> you can choose whether you accept <teachers' names> and their classrooms to be part of this study. If have attached a draft letter authorizing institutional consent in case you wish to give me permission to undertake my research at your school. Once the letter is received, I will contact <teachers' names> to make arrangements for a mutually convenient time for observation dates, filming and interviewing.

RESULTS

<Teachers' names> will receive a copy of the transcript of their interview. In addition, both <teachers' names> and the school will receive copies of Journal publications resulting from this study. If you would like to receive a summary of the findings of the study, you can contact me on

If you would like to contact the researchers about any aspect of this study, please contact the Chief Investigator: Joce Nuttall, PhD Course Director, Early Childhood Education Monash University - Faculty of Education Peninsula Campus P O Box 527 Frankston VIC 3199	Should you have any complaint at any time concerning the manner in which this research CF07/2195 – 2007001522 is conducted, please do not hesitate to contact the Monash University Standing Committee on Ethics in Research Involving Humans at the following address: The Secretary The Standing Committee on Ethics in Research Involving Humans (SCERH)

Australia Tel: +[redacted] Fax:+[redacted] Email: [redacted]	Building 3D Research Grants & Ethics Branch Monash University VIC 3800 Tel: +61 3 9905 2052 Fax: +61 3 9905 1420 Email: scerh@adm.monash.edu.au

Thank you,

____

Ana Cristina Mantilla

Tel: [redacted]

APPENDIX D – DRAFT LETTER FOR THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL / JUNIOR SCHOOL HEAD TO GRANT INSTITUTIONAL CONSENT

<Organization Letterhead>

Permission Letter for "Practices in Young Children's Foreign Language Classrooms: A Colombian-Australian Comparison"

<Date>

Ana Cristina Mantilla
Building A
Faculty of Education
Monash University VIC 3199

Dear Ms Mantilla, Dr Nuttall and Dr Gearon,

Thank you for your request to recruit participants from Ivanhoe Girls' Grammar School for the above-named research.

The project CF07/2195 – 2007001522 has been explained to me and I have received and read the explanatory statement. I hereby give permission for this research to be conducted.

I understand that agreeing to take part means that I am willing to allow the guardians/parents and <teachers' names> to be invited to participate in this study. I also understand that the researcher will observe the classrooms during

two lessons and videotape <teachers' names> while undertaking < English/French> activities during four additional lessons. I agree with <teachers' names> conveying relevant information to the researcher and to being interviewed in the School's premises. Moreover, I agree with the language and activities videotaped in the classrooms to be used in the ways that participants themselves have given consent for.

I understand that <school's name> will be de-identified and the research participants will be given pseudonyms when writing the thesis and including the study's findings in any other publications.

<Please include any clarifications / requests you wish to make>

Sincerely,

<School's Name>

<School's Principal / Junior School Head>

APPENDIX E – EXPLANATORY STATEMENT FOR PARENTS / GUARDIANS OF STUDENTS IN THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM (AUSTRALIA)

<Monash University Letterhead>

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Research Project - Practices in Young Children's Foreign Language Classrooms: A Colombian-Australian Comparison

SCERH Project Number: CF07/2195 – 2007001522

A research study will be conducted in your child (ren)'s classroom by Ana Cristina Mantilla, a doctoral student from Monash University, working under the supervision of Dr Joce Nuttall and Dr Margaret Gearon who are Senior Lecturers at the Faculty of Education.

My research aims to present a *comparative education study of foreign language arrangements* - within schools - in two countries: Australia and Colombia. The study seeks to understand the classroom activities that foster foreign language learning in early childhood, and identify the patterns of variations and similarities across two case studies (one school setting in Melbourne and one in Bogotá). This study is very relevant because of the lack of existing research on foreign language education in early childhood. Among others, this means that we know very little about how foreign language teachers teach and almost nothing about what really happens inside foreign language classrooms. This study intends to

address some of these gaps by working closely to foreign language teachers and collecting data inside classrooms.

I will be observing (two lessons) and videotaping (four lessons) <Name of teacher> inside the classroom on the following dates: <dates>. All observations and videotaping will take place in a corner of the room so as not to intrude on the normal activities of the classroom.

In order to videotape <Name of the teacher> in a natural teaching situation, I recognize that the students' language and activities need to be included in my field notes and videotaped observation. Consequently, your child (ren) might be observed or videotaped as he/she interacts with <Name of teacher> and / or peers in an activity. I am asking for your permission to include your child (ren)'s language and activities during these incidental observations in the data analysis of my research project.

The observations of your child (ren) in this study – while they interact with the <Spanish/French> teacher - would contribute to uncovering the realities and complexities of everyday classrooms and help inform research and practice about the variety of arrangements used to teach foreign languages.

PURPOSE AND PROCEDURES

Giving permission involves allowing the researcher to use the language and activities of your child (ren) resulting from interactions with <Name of teacher> and / or peers in:

- Observations in the classroom while undertaking <Spanish/French> activities during two lessons;
- Videotape of the classroom while undertaking <Spanish/French > activities during four lessons.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

I do not anticipate for your child (ren) any stress beyond the normal experiences of everyday life.

CONFIDENTIALITY AND SECURE STORAGE OF DATA

Your child (ren)'s confidentiality will be protected with the use of pseudonyms whenever I am referring to your child (ren) or citing his/her words in this study. Moreover, no data will be used for further educational purposes or research unless you have given approval in the informed consent form attached.

Only my supervisors and I will have access to the data I collect. It will be stored for at least five years as prescribed by the University regulations. Written documents will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in my locked office on campus; electronic documents will be stored on a password protected computer; and tapes / CDs (video and audio) will be stored in a locked filing cabinet. After 5 years, all written documents will be shredded, electronic documents will be deleted from hard drive and tapes / CDs and others will be erased and then disposed of.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether you wish the observations of your child (ren) to be used in the data analysis of this study or not. You are under no obligation to consent to participation. Even if you agree to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any stage up until the end of the fieldwork phase without consequences of any kind. If you do not wish to participate, the segments of the field notes and videotape when your child (ren) is present will not be used for data analysis / writing of findings.

Please return the attached informed consent form according to the instructions on the form to notify me whether you agree to participate or not.

RESULTS

If you would like to receive a summary of the findings of the study, you can contact me on [redacted]

<table>
<tr>
<td>If you would like to contact the researchers about any aspect of this study, please contact the Chief Investigator:

Joce Nuttall, PhD
Course Director, Early Childhood Education
Monash University - Faculty of Education
Peninsula Campus
P O Box 527
Frankston
VIC 3199
Australia
Tel: +[redacted] Fax:+[redacted]
Email: [redacted]</td>
<td>Should you have any complaint at any time concerning the manner in which this research CF07/2195 – 2007001522 is conducted, please do not hesitate to contact the Monash University Standing Committee on Ethics in Research Involving Humans at the following address:

The Secretary
The Standing Committee on Ethics in Research Involving Humans (SCERH)
Building 3D
Research Grants & Ethics Branch
Monash University VIC 3800
Tel: +61 3 9905 2052 Fax: +61 3 9905 1420
Email: scerh@adm.monash.edu.au</td>
</tr>
</table>

Thank you,

____

Ana Cristina Mantilla

Tel: [redacted]

APPENDIX F – INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR PARENTS / GUARDIANS OF STUDENTS IN THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM (AUSTRALIA)

<Monash University Letterhead>

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Research Project – Practices in Young Children's Foreign Language Classrooms: A Colombian-Australian Comparison

SCERH Project Number: CF07/2195 – 2007001522

The project has been explained to me, and I have read the Explanatory Statement, which I have kept for my records.

Please tick ONE box:

❑ I give permission for the language and activities of my child (ren) to be used for data analysis / writing of findings of this Monash University research.

I understand that the observations of my child (ren) will result from interactions with <Name of teacher> and / or peers in:

- Observations in the classroom while undertaking <Spanish/French> activities during two lessons;
- Videotape of the classroom while undertaking <Spanish/French> activities during four lessons.

I understand that all observations and videotaping will take place in a corner of the room so as not to intrude on the normal activities of the classroom.

- ❑ I do not give permission for the language and activities of my child (ren) to be used for data analysis / writing of findings of this Monash University research.

  I understand that the segments of the field notes and videotape when my child (ren) is present will not be used.

I understand that all observations and videotaping will take place in a corner of the room so as not to intrude on the normal activities of the classroom.

Confidentiality

- ❑ Your child (ren)'s confidentiality will be protected with the use of pseudonyms.

Further use of data

Upon completion of this research, the researchers may want to use the data collected in this project for other purposes besides the publication of the doctoral thesis. These purposes include *educational purposes* such as publications in books, journals, presentations to peers or to students in lectures, or in *professional conferences*.

Please tick the appropriate box(es):

- ❑ The language and activities of my child (ren) CAN be used for <u>educational purposes</u>.
- ❑ The language and activities of my child (ren) CAN be used in <u>professional conferences</u>.
- ❑ The language and activities of my child (ren) CANNOT be used for either educational purposes or at conferences.

The researchers might also like to use and / or share the data collected on this study for further research.

Please tick the appropriate box:

- ❑ The language and activities of my child (ren) CAN be used in further research projects <u>which have ethics approval</u>.
- ❑ The language and activities of my child (ren) CANNOT be used in further research projects <u>without asking me first</u>.
- ❑ The language and activities of my child (ren) CANNOT be used in further research.

Child's name:

Child's date of birth:

Parent / Guardian name:

Your relationship to child:

____

Signature of Parent / Legal Representative Date

Please return the attached informed consent form in the attached envelope to the sealed box located on the front desk of the school prior to the first date scheduled for observations and videotaping: <date>.

APPENDIX G – EXPLANATORY STATEMENT FOR PARENTS / GUARDIANS OF STUDENTS IN THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM (COLOMBIA)

<Monash University Letterhead>

EXPLICACION DEL PROYECTO

Investigación – Prácticas en Salones de Clase de Niños Pequeños: Una Comparación Colombiana y Australiana

Practices in Young Children's Foreign Language Classrooms: A Colombian-Australian Comparison

SCERH Project Number: CF07/2195 – 2007001522

Mi nombre es Ana Cristina Mantilla. Soy una estudiante de doctorado de Monash University en Melbourne, Australia y trabajo bajo la supervisión de dos profesoras/investigadoras de la Facultad de Educación: la Dra Joce Nuttall y la Dra Margaret Gearon,

Mi proyecto de doctorado es un estudio comparativo de las actividades *utilizadas en la enseñanza de idiomas extranjeros en preescolar en Australia y Colombia*. A través de mi investigación busco mejorar la comprensión de las actividades que soportan el aprendizaje de idiomas extranjeros en niños pequeños e identificar los patrones de similitudes y diferencias entre un salón de clases en Melbourne y uno en Bogotá. Mi estudio es importante debido a la falta de investigación sobre educación de idiomas extranjeros en preescolar. Como consecuencia, existe muy poca información acerca de la forma en que

los profesores enseñan idiomas extranjeros y lo que realmente ocurre dentro de los salones de clase. Este proyecto busca generar este conocimiento trabajando cerca de los profesores y recogiendo información durante clases.

La recolección de información será conducida en el salón de clases de su hijo (a) a través de la observación de dos clases y la filmación de cuatro clases adicionales. < Nombre del (la) profesor (a)> será observado (a) y filmado (a) mientras dicta su clase de <Inglés/Francés> en las siguientes fechas: <fechas>.

Todas las observaciones y la filmación se harán desde una esquina del salón con el fin de evitar intrometerme en la rutina normal de los niños y el (la) profesor (a) durante las clases de <Inglés/Francés>. Teniendo en cuenta que su hijo (a) es un (a) participante importante de esta situación natural de enseñaza, es relevante poder observar y tomar notas de las conversaciones y acciones de su hijo (a) en los momentos incidentales en los que interactúe con el (la) profesor (a) y / u otros compañeros durante las clases. A través de este documento, estoy pidiendo su permiso de incluir estas observaciones incidentales en el análisis de data de este proyecto.

Las observaciones de su hijo (a) – mientras interactúa con el (la) profesor (a) de <Inglés/Francés> y / u otros compañeros – son de gran ayuda para conocer las realidades y complejidades de los salones de clase y permitirán informar la investigación teórica y las prácticas de enseñanza.

PROPÓSITO Y PROCEDIMIENTOS

Su autorización me permitiría utilizar las palabras y actividades de su hijo (a) mientras que interactúa con el (la) profesor (a) y / u otros compañeros durante:

- La observación de dos clases y
- La filmación de cuatro clases en el salón mientras que <Nombre del (la) profesor (a)> enseña <Inglés/Francés>.

RIESGOS O INCOMODIDADES

No anticipo para su hijo (a) ningún estrés adicional al causado por experiencias cotidianas.

CONFIDENCIALIDAD Y ALMACENAMIENTO DE LA INFORMACION

La confidencialidad de su hijo (a) será protegida con el uso de seudónimos en todas las ocasiones en las que me refiera a su hijo (a) o use sus palabras en mi estudio. Adicionalmente, los datos recolectados no serán utilizados con ningún otro propósito educativo o proyecto de investigación al menos que usted lo autorice en el formato de consentimiento informado que adjunto a continuación.

Solo mis supervisoras y yo tendremos acceso a los datos recogidos. Estos serán almacenados por mínimo cinco años como es regulado por la Universidad. Los documentos escritos, cassettes y CDs serán almacenados en un gabinete con llave en mi oficina, y los documentos electrónicos serán almacenados en computadores protegidos con clave. Después de 5 años, todos los documentos serán destruidos, borrados y eliminados.

PARTICIPACIÓN Y RETIRO

Usted puede decidir si desea que las observaciones de su hijo (a) sean utilizadas en el análisis de este proyecto. Usted no está bajo ninguna obligación de aceptar participar. Incluso si usted acepta participar, puede retirar su aprobación en cualquier momento hasta la finalización de la recolección de información en el colegio. Su retiro no tendrá ningún tipo de consecuencias para usted o su hijo (a). Si no está interesado en participar, los segmentos de las notas y videos en los que aparezca su hijo (a) no serán utilizados para el análisis y la presentación de resultados de esta investigación.

Por favor devuelva el formato adjunto - según las instrucciones del mismo – para notificar su preferencia.

RESULTADOS

Si desea recibir una copia de los resultados de este proyecto, me puede contactar en [redacted]

Si desea contactar a los investigadores sobre cualquier aspecto de este proyecto, por favor contacto al investigador principal: Joce Nuttall, PhD Course Director, Early Childhood Education Monash University - Faculty of Education Peninsula Campus P O Box 527 Frankston VIC 3199 Australia Tel: +[redacted] Fax:+[redacted]	Si tiene alguna queja en cualquier momento sobre la manera en que este proyecto CF07/2195 – 2007001522 es conducido, por favor no dude en contactar al Comité de Ética de Investigación con Humanos de la Universidad de Monash en: The Secretary The Standing Committee on Ethics in Research Involving Humans (SCERH) Building 3D Research Grants & Ethics Branch Monash University VIC 3800

Email:	Tel: +61 3 9905 2052 Fax: +61 3 9905 1420 Email: scerh@adm.monash.edu.au

Gracias,

____

Ana Cristina Mantilla

Tel:

APPENDIX H – INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR PARENTS / GUARDIANS OF STUDENTS IN THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM (COLOMBIA)

<Monash University Letterhead>

CONSENTIMIENTO

Investigación – Prácticas en Salones de Clase de Niños Pequeños: Una Comparación Colombiana y Australiana

Practices in Young Children's Foreign Language Classrooms: A Colombian-Australian Comparison

SCERH Project Number: CF07/2195 – 2007001522

El estudio de investigación me ha sido explicado a través de un documento con la Explicación del Proyecto, el cual conservo como constancia.

Por favor chulee UNA opción:

- ❑ Acepto que las palabras y actividades de mi hijo (a) sean utilizados en el análisis de data y presentación de resultados de este proyecto de investigación de la Universidad de Monash.

  Entiendo que las palabras y actividades de mi hijo (a) serán el resultado de interacciones con < Nombre del (la) profesor (a)> y / o compañeros de clase durante:

  - La observación de dos clases y

- La filmación de cuatro clases en el salón mientras que <Nombre del (la) profesor (a)> enseña <Inglés/Francés>.

Entiendo que todas las observaciones y la filmación se harán desde una esquina del salón con el fin de evitar la interrupción de la rutina normal de los niños y el (la) profesor (a) durante las clases.

- ☐ No acepto que las palabras y actividades de mi hijo (a) sean utilizados en el análisis de data y presentación de resultados de este proyecto de investigación de la Universidad de Monash.

  Entiendo que los segmentos de las notas y videos en los que aparezca su hijo (a) no serán utilizados para el análisis y la presentación de resultados de esta investigación.

Entiendo que todas las observaciones y la filmación se harán desde una esquina del salón con el fin de evitar la interrupción de la rutina normal de los niños y el (la) profesor (a) durante las clases.

Confidencialidad

La confidencialidad de su hijo (a) será protegida con el uso de seudónimos en todas las ocasiones en las que me refiera a su hijo (a) o use sus palabras en mi estudio.

Uso adicional de la información

Al completar este estudio, las investigadoras pueden estar interesadas en usar la información recolectada en este proyecto para otros propósitos diferentes a la publicación de la tesis de doctorado como *material educativos* (publicaciones en libros, revistas académicas, presentaciones a colegas y /o estudiantes universitarios), o en *conferencias profesionales*.

Por favor chulee la (s) opciones con las que este de acuerdo:

- ❑ Las palabras y actividades de mi hijo (a) PUEDEN ser usadas en <u>material educativo</u>.
- ❑ Las palabras y actividades de mi hijo (a) PUEDEN ser usadas en <u>conferencias profesionales</u>.
- ❑ Las palabras y actividades de mi hijo (a) NO PUEDEN ser usadas en material educativo ni en conferencias profesionales.

Las investigadoras también pueden estar interesadas en usar la información recolectada en este proyecto en otros futuros proyectos de investigación.

Por favor chulee una opción:

- ❑ Las palabras y actividades de mi hijo (a) PUEDEN ser usadas en futuros proyectos de investigación que tengan <u>aprobación ética</u>.
- ❑ Las palabras y actividades de mi hijo (a) NO PUEDEN ser usadas futuros proyectos de investigación <u>sin consultarme primero</u>.
- ❑ Las palabras y actividades de mi hijo (a) NO PUEDEN ser usadas futuros proyectos de investigación.

Nombre del niño (a):

Fecha de nacimiento del niño (a):

Nombre del padre / representante legal:

Relación con el (la) niño (a):

____

Firma del Padre / Representante Legal Fecha

Por favor deposite este formato en el sobre adjunto en la caja ubicada en la recepción del colegio antes de la primera fecha estipulada para la observación del salón: <Fecha>.

APPENDIX I – GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS' INTERVIEW

1. What is your educational background?
2. How many years have you worked as a foreign language teacher? How many years in this institution?
3. What other teaching experience do you have? Any other relevant jobs?
4. When did you start learning to speak <French / English>? Where?
5. Are there any particular reasons why you chose to work in this school?
6. How much <French / English> exposure have your students had at home or in the wider community?

7. Could you please walk me though what happened during the lesson today?
8. Which were the main activities?
9. Who were the main participants of each activity?
10. What were they doing?
11. How would you describe your roles and the children's role in this activity?
12. What language (s) were the participants using? Why?
13. What resources were the participants using? Why?
14. Were there any additional resources that you needed to plan this activity?
15. What was your main purpose in choosing this activity?

16. Can you recall if your purpose was achieved?

17. Were there any constraints / difficulties in planning or executing this activity?

18. How often do you set up this activity?

19. Are there any extensions or similar activities related to this activity?

20. Overall, how do you think the various activities relate to others?

APPENDIX J – SUMMARY OF A TRANSCRIPT FROM A TEACHER'S INTERVIEW

School: The Canterbury School   Year Level: Transición   Teacher: Sandra

Personal experience learning and teaching a FL

Sandra comes from a mixed family as her father is a German immigrant whom (to date) speaks only English with her and her siblings. She is fluent in English and Spanish, but believes that her written English is better than her oral English. She studied at an English/Spanish bilingual school in Santafé de Bogota and graduated in early 1970s. She then studied pre-school pedagogy for two years. She has been a bilingual teacher and tutor for more than 20 years (15 at The Canterbury School). Interestingly, she has home-schooled her three children as she prefers this type of schooling over main stream learning within big groups. At The Canterbury School, she is currently the Primary Years Programme and also the group leader ('jefe de nivel') for all teachers of Transición.

Views on the FL programme in place (PYP) at The Canterbury School

Sandra believes that the PYP makes a lot more sense than any other methodology she has used before (except for home schooling) in her teaching. She likes the fact that the PYP aims to help children become global citizens with empathy and understanding of social problems and "enjoys researching

(reading, observing and asking) with the children" (Sandra, November 13, 2008: 18; my translation). She also likes that PYP is not a static but evolving philosophy, and has found the workshops on collaborative planning (group work with other teachers of her same level) extremely helpful and "rewarding". She explained that the PYP has some organizing themes and sub-themes for all levels, which allow making links between subjects with the aim to learn concepts and not specific content for each subject. She also explained that the 'unity of enquiry' is divided into cycles which are planned collaboratively. Activities which are not "una camisa de fuerza" (obligatory) are chosen in these workshops. At the beginning of each unit, she enjoys brainstorming with the children so that she can then make links with the children's interests.

Description of Lessons

Her lessons usually last one hour and begin at the carpet (to help children concentrate). She uses the whiteboard to list the tasks they have to work on. The children then move to the tables and she focuses in one table at a time. She picks a table leader who is responsible of supporting the classmates. According to her (and to my observations) the children have clearly understood what is expected from them and therefore know what they need to do and how. Sandra highlighted that she tries to speak as much English as she can. She introduces the "basic concepts in English but clarifies in Spanish to ensure the children have understood" (Sandra, November 13, 2008: 38; my translation). She referred to herself as a 'facilitator' and explicitly said that her goal is to "build confidence in the children so that they can become fluent in

English" (Sandra, November 13, 2008: 42; my translation). In Transición, children should be able to write short paragraphs in two languages. She explained that Letterland stopped being used in this year level but references are made to some of the characters to build on children's previous knowledge. She talked about their unit on Heroes and explained that the current activities have to do mainly with writing and then reading what they have written in front of their peers.

APPENDIX K – THEMATIC CATEGORIES FOR ANALYSING FL CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES IN FL LESSONS

- **Aims of classroom activities**

(a) To teach language or concepts.

(b) To balance lessons.

(c) To celebrate.

- **Model of instruction**

(a) Instructional practice - Restriction or freedom to collaborate; 'Quizzing' or reflection; Directive guidance inside or outside the context of productive, purposive activity; Attention to one or multiple events at the same time; Unilateral or shared defining of tasks, means and goals; Shared or unshared responsibility in developing activities; Receptiveness or participation.

(b) Classroom organization – Do teachers encourage collaborative work? Foster individual efforts? Remain as the main addressee when interacting with learners?

- **Pedagogical Practices of FL Education in Early Childhood**

(a) The environment and resources – Does the environment encourage communication? Is technology used? Are there resources that allow

children to answer their own questions? Are there resources that allow children to hear the FL from someone who is not the teacher?

(b) Experiential learning – Are there examples of hands-on learning activities?

(c) Verbal and non-verbal language in lessons – Is the L1 used in the classroom? How and by whom? Do the participants use movement, gestures and/or non-verbal representations?