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Overview

• Context Luxembourg
• Multilingual pedagogies & iTEO project
• Translanguaging
• Findings of the iTEO project

The language situation in Luxembourg

At the social level
• Three administrative languages: Luxembourgish (L), French (F), German (D)

At individual level
• 60.2% of the nursery children do not speak Luxembourgish as a home language on school entry
  → Diverse linguistic landscape: L, G, F, P, I, E as well as the Balkans’ languages

Languages in the education system

• Trilingual education system:
  – Luxembourgish at the “précoces” (3 to 4-year-olds)
  – Luxembourgish from nursery (4 to 6-year-olds)
  – German from Year 1 (6 to 7-year-olds)
  – Oral French from Year 2 and written from Year 3

• Emphasis on Luxembourgish in nursery

• “Multilingual education”
  (Obama & Cutler, 2011, 201)

• Monoglossic perspective, languages learned in a linear and compartmentalised way (Gretsch, 2014).

• Results of longitudinal assessment studies: not all children have equal opportunities

• Project iTEO addresses the need for the development of innovative didactic methods in order to manage the diversity and heterogeneity in Luxembourgish schools

Information about the nursery classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class 1</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with Luxembourgish citizenship</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children speaking Luxembourgish in home</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which bilinguals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages spoken at home</td>
<td>L, F, P, Sp, So, I, A</td>
<td>L, F, P, E, I, B, So</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diversity of languages  ➔ language pairings not always possible in class
Inclusive multilingual pedagogies

- Multilingual pedagogies (García & Nelson, 2011; García & Wei, 2014)
  - Are inclusive and empowering (the teachers’ responsibility, Peček, 2014)
  - Are supportive of social justice and political participation
  - Provide spaces for dynamic and transglossic language arrangement
  - Focus on the (flexible) use of languages as media of instruction
  - Give children a choice and some agency when it comes to language use

- Two core pedagogical principles:
  - Attention to social justice
  - Attention to social practice

Project iTEO

- The iPad App iTEO
  - Records and edits oral language
  - Automatic replay materializes and objetifies language encourages reflection on language use


- Learning languages through collaborative storytelling on iTEO
  - Focus on literacy
  - Language learning perceived as a dynamic, social, cultural, cognitive and emotional process
  - Focus on collaboration and dialogue
  - Respect for and capitalization on children’s linguistic background/ TL as “normal”
  - Voice, audience
  - Agency, control, responsibility over the task


Collaborative storytelling and language learning in the nursery

Narrating, listening, playing, having stories written down, “reading”, acting out stories

Different groups of children, different materials, different languages


Language on iTEO (1)

Once upon the time there was a princess and she has, uh, she lived in a land, that was not very beautiful. There came a prince. He was very handsome and, she, uh, he wants to marry her.

D: Then a baddie arrives. And he destroy everything with his mega, mega knife. He destroy the house. And he destroy everything. With (?), four, five (?).

J: And then, hey, Keeko, do you give me this?

D: Yes, and then he said

J: Yes

D: No.

J: And then he tries to be a baddie, he can, he killed the man.

And now the story is over.
Participants

Research questions
- How do teachers and children use ITO in their daily practice?
- In what ways does ITO contribute to change language learning practices?

Participants
- 2 primary school classes (Year 1/2)
- 2 nursery classes

Overview

- Context Luxembourg
- Multilingual pedagogies & ITO project
- Translanguaging/using one’s entire linguistic repertoire
- Findings of the ITO project

One of the foci of our research project

- In what ways do nursery children develop their linguistic repertoire through ITO? When and how do they translanguaze in collaborative storytelling events?
- To what extent do young bilinguals translanguage in collaborative tasks?
  - Williams, Baker, Jones & Lewis (2012): TL generally with the more proficient ones.
  - García & Kano (2014): different strategies depending on proficiency.
- When and how do children translanguage?
  - Strategies for pupil-initiated TL have been identified but more research is needed.

Methods

- Observation
- Video-recording of children’s collaborative storytelling.
- Semi-structured interviews with the teacher and the class.
- Semi-structured interviews with parents.
- Regular conversations with the children.

Data analysis

- Grounded theory
- Instances of TL
  - Categories: languages, people involved, context, task, reason.
  - Based on 80 stories and 2 interviews.

Using one’s entire verbal and non-verbal linguistic repertoire / Translanguaging

- Garcia (2009:45): “For us, translanguaging are multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their linguistic worlds. Translanguaging therefore goes beyond what has been termed code-switching, although it includes it, as well as other kinds of bilingual language use and bilingual contact.”
- Lewis, Jones, Baker (2012: 656): “Languaging is regarded as the "holistic process through which we gain understanding, make sense, communicate, and shape our knowledge and experience through language".”
- Blackledge and Creese (2010): “… make meaning, transmit information, and perform identities using the linguistic signs at [their] disposal to connect with [their] audience in community engagement.”

Insights into pupil translanguaging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aims</th>
<th>Strategies / situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build background knowledge to help students in the meaning-making process</td>
<td>Ask questions, hypothesis, give explanations, clarify the meaning, make links. Translate, paraphrase (r). Read and write multilingual texts (X).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use multimodality (v, v9)</td>
<td>Translate (c, c2). Model (c5). Gather information &amp; discuss content in different languages (c7). Use glosses when writing, making annotations (c8).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Insights into pupil-initiated translanguaging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aims</th>
<th>Strategies/ situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>García &amp; Wei, 2014</td>
<td>• Possibility to communicate together (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Written communication (A, L, M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Differentiate and adapt to sby’s needs”</td>
<td>• Help a peer (A, L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity investment and positionality</td>
<td>• Mark identity (A, M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Convey one’s voice (A, L)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Findings: Extent of TL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class 1</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luana (P)</td>
<td>Jim (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amin (S)</td>
<td>Daniel (F, I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christina (P)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All children use TL
- Apart from one child, TL instances occur in the majority of their storytelling events (47 events)

The data are based on 86 storytelling events

Languages used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Luana</th>
<th>Amin</th>
<th>Jim</th>
<th>Daniel</th>
<th>Christina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourgish</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Children drew on a range of languages
  - Multilingual country
  - Languages of their peers
  - New technologies (Russian)
- TL depends on the child and on the "space" and develops over time

Findings continued: TL situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Numbers of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manage task</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative task</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translanguaging</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct knowledge</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differenciate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstructing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- use of pointing and other body language
- language pairings

Identity performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of text</th>
<th>Translanguaging no. of times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own creation (G, F, E, P)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song (F, P, E, Sp, Russian)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count, tell the time</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate a story</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on an event/experience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“In this translanguaging space, children’s language practices are brought together in ways that not only develop an extended bilingual repertoire capable of deeply involving them cognitively, but also a more sophisticated metalinguistic awareness that would enable them to negotiate these extended linguistic repertoires.

That is, in these translanguaging spaces linguistically diverse students are able to co-construct their language expertise, recognize each other as resources, and act on their knowing and doing.”

(García & Wei, 2014, 75)

Discussion: TL situations

Similarities with other authors

- Multimodality (Velasco & García, 2014)
- Deferral (“postpone” - Olmedo, 2003; Velasco & García, 2014)
- Translation/paraphrase (Olmedo, 2001; Velasco & García, 2014)
- Voice (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Caragapan, 2011; Velasco & García, 2014)
- Chat (“communication with friend” - Creese & Blackledge, 2010)
- Management of the task
- Collaborative talk (Lewis, Jones & Lewis, 2012; García & Wei, 2014)
- Evaluation

Discussion

- New perspectives on TL in “super-diverse” classrooms
- Contrast with the TL strategies of children in primary school (e.g. different languages, different interpretation and appropriation of the ITO collaborative storytelling task)
- Cummins on how to address inequalities:
  - literacy engagement
  - identity performance
- Role of professional development
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