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Abstract

This thesis examines the ways in which five bilingual teachers use their two languages in English-medium early childhood services in the Auckland region. Questions regarding the possible mediation of bilingual identities for teachers and children created a further interrogation of teachers’ ‘lived experiences’ of bilingual activity. The research, informed by critical multiculturalism, used a qualitative methodology and Narrative Inquiry that employed a spiral discourse or ‘conversation’ approach for data collection. The collaborative insights from participants and researcher became the foundation for further analysis. Findings revealed that bilingual teachers in the absence of government policy, worked powerfully to construct a critical bilingual praxis to counter deficit discourses of bilingualism in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Teachers’ ‘lived experiences’ illustrated their deep knowledge of bilingualism and the use of two languages as critical linguistic and cultural resources for teaching and learning. As trusted agents for the educational and home language communities, ‘doing self as bilingual teacher’ worked cogeneratively to mediate bilingual identities for themselves and for children.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Aotearoa/New Zealand is becoming an ethnically and linguistically diverse nation with Auckland presenting as the most diverse region in terms of ethnicity, languages and cultures. In a society where linguistic and cultural activities interplay and collide daily in schooling and communities, children use their languages and literacies as the foundation for negotiating identities as members of their communities and as learners (Carr et al., 2001; Cummins, 2009; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2003; Ritchie & Rau, 2009). Aspirations from the early childhood curriculum Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996) to be “confident and competent communicators” (p.9) with “knowledge of the nation’s languages” (p.19) appear to sanction the use of the three official languages, English, te reo Māori and New Zealand Sign Language and their associated identities. Further, these aspirations appear to welcome each child’s use of a home/community language (h/c language).

Bilingualism as a goal for all children of Aotearoa/New Zealand is possible in early childhood education (ECE) services as the principles of Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996) and attendant exemplars of children’s achievements in two languages (Ministry of Education 2004, 2007a, 2009b) provide a frame for ECE teachers to support choices through promotion of English, te reo Māori and h/c languages. Research on effective pedagogies and practices for response to language diversity and bilingual activity in educational settings in Aotearoa/New Zealand traverses a continuum from remedial approaches that serve to extinguish the choice at one extreme to retaining a home or community language and acceptance of bilinguality at the other (May, 2007; 2009; May, McComish & Franken, 2005; Tuafuti & McCaffery, 2005).

The Education Review Office (ERO) predicted in the year 2000 that by 2051
a third of all children will be Pakeha, one third Māori, 21.2% of children will identify as Pasifika and 11.2% of children as Asian (ERO, 2000 p. 10). Aspirations set in the *New Zealand Curriculum, 2007* (Ministry of Education, 2007d) are for all children to participate more actively in Aotearoa/New Zealand’s “diverse, multicultural society and global community” (p.4).

Aspirations from the school and early childhood curricula appear to contest the measures of success in schooling currently set as monolingual achievements in reading, writing and mathematics either in English only or *te reo* Māori only authorised by *The Education (National Standards) Amendment Act 2008*, (New Zealand Government, 2008 No.108, Public Act). Policies such as *New Zealand Curriculum Reading and Writing Standards for Years 1-8* (MoE, 2009f) indicate a determined ignorance of the languages spoken by children with criteria set for English levels only (p.14), and identifying children as English language learners. *The Literacy Learning Progressions: Meeting the Reading and Writing Demands of the Curriculum* (MoE, 2010f) refers to *knowledge of the learner* and her/his culture, language and identity (p.6) in terms of effective practice with reference to Māori but thereafter ignores the language resources of family and child. Ignorance of teachers’ language resources completes the silencing of h/c languages.

**Questions**

Children from bilingual or multilingual families have their linguistic futures hanging in the balance as early childhood teachers, who are the inductors of children into the education system, confront the monolingual/bilingual crossroads regarding children’s opportunities for bilingualism. In this timely study it is my intention to gain insight into the actions and ethical positions that some bilingual teachers take as they engage at these crossroads by proposing and responding to the following questions:

In what ways do bilingual teachers access and use their two languages in everyday practice English medium ECE services in the Auckland region?

What roles do the languages used by bilingual teachers in English medium early childhood services in the Auckland region play in mediating bilingual identities for the teachers? And the associated question: What opportunities do bilingual teachers see for themselves in mediating bilingual identities for children?
Background

Demographic changes

A profile of Aotearoa New Zealand’s ethnic identities from the Census 2006 (Statistics New Zealand, 2007) shows that 51% of people in the Auckland region identify with Pakeha/European ethnic groups, 18.9% identify with Asian ethnic groups, 14.4% with Pacific Peoples and 11.1% with Māori. In the 2006 Census two thirds (66.9%) of Pacific Peoples lived in the Auckland region and 19.7% of children under 15 years of age identified with two or more ethnic groups. Almost one in five people (18.9%) in the Auckland region identified with one or more Asian ethnic groups. Over one third of the population of Auckland (37%) were born overseas (Statistics New Zealand, 2007). Early childhood services mirror this diversity as the Ministry of Education reported in 2006 that at least 73 different languages were being used by children in licensed early childhood education (ECE) services (Education Counts, 2006).

Records of enrolments in ECE licensed services collected by the Ministry of Education for July 1st 2010, show that over a third (37.7%) of all children enrolled nationwide in licensed early childhood services identified as other than European/pakeha, with Māori making up 20% of this group (Education Counts, 2011b). Statistics for Auckland enrolments in licensed ECE services show just under a half (45.76%) of the children (families) identified as other than European/Pakeha with the ethnic groupings of Māori, Pasifika and Asian at 14% each (Education Counts, 2011b). (See Appendix C). One third of these enrolments (34.16%) in the Auckland region represent children who are under three years of age (Education Counts, 2011a). Unfortunately the languages spoken by children enrolled are not part of the data collected by the MoE and the number of developing bilinguals immersed in English medium services at this vulnerable phase of language acquisition and development is not known (Dalli et al. 2011; Genesse, 2008 Garcia, 1991). Dalli et al. (2011) define quality for infants and toddlers as involving teachers who are ‘attuned and interconnected communicators’ and who create environments that avoid ‘toxic stress’ conditions that impact negatively on brain development.

Significantly the ethnicity of teaching staff in teacher-led licensed ECE services recorded by the MoE shows that 28.20% of teachers nation wide identify as other than European/Pakeha (Education Counts, 2011e) (See Appendix E for further detail). Data regarding the ethnicity of teaching staff in the Auckland
region (representing one third of teachers in ECE nationally) reveals that just under half (46.34%) identify as other than European/Pakeha. Teachers identifying as Asian or Other currently make up 25.19% with only 21.15% identifying as Māori and Pasifika (Education Counts, 2011c) (See Appendix E). A significant number of these teachers will be bilingual; however data on languages spoken by teachers is not required or valued in ECE service records.

Projected shifts in demography in education settings (ERO, 2000) are becoming a reality for the Auckland region (see Appendix E) but are not matched by policy. The languages of teachers and children as a way to access resources for bilingual futures and learning and to provide for acquisition and use of h/c languages are largely ignored.

Phillips, McNaughton and MacDonald (2001) reported that nearly half of the children who entered primary schools in South Auckland were bilingual, often speaking a Pasifika language. Their research on emergent literacy shows the negative impact on children’s home/community (h/c) language retention. By the end of one year’s immersion in English medium schooling the developing or ‘incipient’ bilingual children were unable to access home/community emerging literacy they once demonstrated at the Pasifika ECE services.

Many developing bilingual children spend 20 hours a week in an English medium ECE service and may suffer similar disruptions to oral languages. Research on language loss suggests that these children are unlikely to become speakers of their h/c language or be able/willing to pass on that language to the next generation (Fishman, 2001, 2010; Nettle & Romaine, 2000). Cummins (2007, 2009) uses the research from Thomas and Collier’s (2002, 2004) long term studies to argue for the positive academic benefits of continuous bilingual education. Garcia and Kleifgen (2010) confirm that a child’s home language is crucial for long term growth and academic achievement. Skutnabb-Kangas, (2000, 2009) claims that nations offering monolingual educational pathways without bilingual educational choices are complicit in cultural and linguistic ‘genocide’. May (2009) proposes a critical multicultural approach in Aotearoa/New Zealand to ensure that bilingual children/families are accorded the right offered to monolingual children/families in Aotearoa New Zealand, that of choosing to retain their h/c language.
Background

Responses to demographic changes

Aotearoa/New Zealand’s response to demographic changes emerges from reformulation of Aotearoa/New Zealand as a bicultural and bilingual nation-state in recent times as a result of Māori claims for greater self-determination (May, 2001, p.15). The failure of the Waite Report 1994 to initiate a Languages policy meant attention shifted to “raising student achievement and reducing disparity” rather than encouraging bilingualism as a goal (May, 2001; Smith, 2004).

The Languages in Aotearoa: Statement on Language Policy produced by the Human Rights Commission (Human Rights Commission, 2008), but not validated by the MoE, legitimises bilingual activity in education settings. Bilingual teachers in educational settings are considered significant in raising the achievements of Māori and Pasifika children and to counter historical discrimination from social and educational policies the MoE provides initiatives to recruit Māori and Pasifika students into teacher education programmes (Teach New Zealand, 2010).

Language specific state-funded teacher education underway for Māori since 1993 (Partington, 1997, p.194), as well as Pasifika specialisations in teacher education for ECE teachers (Kane, 2005; Tuafuti & Harvey, 2009) supports Bilingual Education in ECE services. Disturbingly, after 25 years of bilingual immersion and two way bilingual and transitional (20-80%) bilingual programmes operating in the schools and ECE services evidence of research on the bilingual teachers’ language use, identities, pedagogies or practices is scarce. The wealth of research funded to inquire into effective practices for raising Māori and Pasifika children’s achievements in English appears to ignore the language resources teachers bring into English-medium settings, privileging attention to culture only (Franken, May, & Mc Comish, 2005; May & Sleeter, 2010; McCaffery & Taliagalu-Mcfall-McCaffery, 2010).

Bilingualism and bilingual activity

Bilingualism and bilingual activity for the purposes of this study refer broadly to the state of using two languages and developing bilingualism and fluency in two languages (May McComish & Franken, 2005). Home or community language is the preferred phrase when discussing a child or teacher’s first language or a mother tongue (Smith, 2004).
May, Hill and Tiakiwai (2004) clarify that *Elective* bilinguals choose to learn an additional language, but not at the expense of the first language. This is an additive form of bilingualism involving a language of prestige. *Circumstantial* bilinguals must learn an additional language to survive or to access schooling and usually their home or community language is not a majority language (p.14).

A goal of bilingualism emerges as high proficiency in cognitive academic use of two languages with secure identity investment (Cummins, 2001, 2009; May, 2009). Conversely monolingualism leads to, at best, tolerance of bilingual activity with bilingualism seen as a problem and research and teaching is directed at remediying the bilingual child’s ‘language problems’. Knowledge about bilingualism is subordinated to a focus on second language learning of English (May, 2009; Jones-Diaz, 2005, 2007). The languages and identities of children and teachers including New Zealand Sign Language (official language) are being negotiated within the education system. McKee (2008) regards the construction of Deaf community members as a having a distinct bilingual identity; however placing teachers fluent in NZSL into ECE or schooling is not yet considered a priority.

Cummins (2000) argues that support for cultural and linguistic capital for each child is both a right and a resource for societies and a child’s fluency in mother tongue is advantageous for learning a second language. The acceptance or rejection or ambivalence of the state of being bilingual is legitimised in the funding initiatives and goals from the Ministry of Education (May, Hill & Tiakiwai, 2004; McCaffery & Taliagalu-McFall-McCaffery, 2010).

**Rationale**

**The value of bilingual teachers**

Language shift and loss for many communities of indigenous languages are still grave concerns. The *Human Rights Commission* (HRC) records that the *Waitangi Tribunal* report on te reo Māori declares a language crisis; the number of Māori children attending Māori-medium schooling has decreased each year since 2004, and the goal proposed by HRC of Aotearoa/New Zealand as a “bilingual nation by 2040” included the development of a national languages policy as a “priority action area” (Human Rights Commission, 2011,
International and national research indicates that bilingual teachers and a linguistically responsive pedagogy can affirm identities, support the first and subsequent language development and generate cognitive and linguistic benefits. The valued partnerships with family and whānau can resist deficit assessment models and outcomes (Baker 2006; Cable, Drury & Roberston, 2009; Conteh, 2007; Cummins, 2001, 2009; Gerrity, 2003; Kenner et al., 2008). Bilingualism makes possible intergenerational connections and sound social and emotional support for the acquisition and retention of cultural heritage (Cummins, 2009; Gerrity, 2003; Jones-Diaz, 2007; Kenner et al, 2008; McCaffery & Tuafuti, 2003; Ritchie, 2009; Taylor, Bernhard, Garg & Cummins, 2008).

Currently, Ritchie and Rau (2009) are calling into question the demand for “full participation” in ECE to halt the inequalities in educational outcomes for Māori (pp 93-95). Citing Durie (2001), they argue that Māori subjectivities grow through speaking, knowing and doing things Māori. As these appear absent from many mainstream ECE services Māori children are denied a positive identity. Participation in ECE services at the cost of the language cannot be validated for Māori.

Data from the state of Pasifika languages as well as current policy guidance by McCaffery and Taligalu-McFall-McCaffery (2010) informs a tenacious argument for investment in h/c languages. Authors believe that an absence of an education policy that sanctions bilingualism is leading to a demise of all communities’ languages with ECE services considered as ‘dangerous spaces’ for bilingual children and families.

Researching in the ‘gap’ and unheralded margins of ECE services demands that this study critically examine policy constraints and levers through the lens of considering bilingualism as an educational benefit and resource in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The voices of teachers’ lived experiences provide a thick description of actions and ideologies illustrating deep commitment and knowledge embedded in this unexplored and undervalued dimension of teaching. These conversations can disrupt deficit narratives regarding bilingual activity and act as a heuristic for all teachers as they respond to the changes in ethno-linguistic demands in ECE services.

This study documents and examines the ways bilingual teachers use their two languages and seeks to identify processes that mediate bilingual identities.
for teachers to offer insights into the opportunities for mediation of bilingual identities for children. A narrative method enables identification of discourses, resources and practices that foster linguistic capital and the ‘funds of knowledge’ (Moll et al., 2002) of bilingual children, families and teachers. Analysis of the ways bilingual teachers and children invest in bilingual identities through home/community language use in a range of English medium ECE services reveals bilingual teachers’ rich linguistic resources and pedagogical knowledge. English medium ECE services are the focus of this study; however the absence of literature on bilingual teachers’ lived experiences and identities prompted exploration of research and debate regarding Bilingual Education (BE) across the ECE and school sectors.

**Organisation**

In Chapter Two a critical survey of Aotearoa/New Zealand educational policies identifies the discursive and political environment in ECE services that may inform bilingual teachers’ activities. The literature review follows in Chapter Three covering current theory, practice and research regarding the intersection of bilingual activity, identities and critical pedagogy. Drawing together literature from a range of disciplines deepens the analysis of teachers’ narratives of bilingual pedagogical activity and provides background to counter the research gap.

In Chapter Four the research methods are described and participants are introduced. The appropriate methodological positions that informed the choice of methods are outlined, and the theoretical perspectives and ethical issues of the narrative methodological platform and spiral discourse used in this study are identified. The findings presented in Chapter Five through the voices of the participant teachers, illustrate the lived experiences of the ways participants use their two languages and document their bilingual pedagogical activity in English-medium ECE services. These data after the initial collaborative analysis and coding illustrate the emerging themes or frames deployed to examine the mediation of identities.

Chapter Six provides an in-depth analysis and discussion of the mediation of bilingual identities for teachers and, in turn, opportunities for mediating children’s bilingual identities. Critical commentary and research from the literature review frames the analysis and implications for practice are identified.
along with the limitations of the study. Chapter Six concludes with recommendations for further research and policy development that could provoke critical inquiry as well as provide guidance for professional teachers in their work to establish socially just educational services for bilingual families in Aotearoa/New Zealand.
Chapter 2

CONTEXT

Status for bilingual teachers and their activity is ‘authorised’ within the socio-political contexts of social policy, and legitimised within the practice of the teaching and learning community. Ministry of Education (MoE) policies have a significant influence on language use and on the linguistic capital (Bourdieu, 1984) of h/c language users in education. Weedon (1997) contends powerful discourses that are generated in ‘established’ social institutions create an impact on construction of self. Davies and Harre (2000) add that the influence of personalised perception of rights and obligations are significant drivers of action. A scrutiny of policies and guidance pertaining to the use of two languages in ECE services details the ‘authorising’ context for bilingual activity.

Impact of policy

The Crown through the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRoC) (United Nations, 1989) is obligated by Articles 29 & 30 to protect the right of each child to use her/his language and to provide guidance for non-discriminatory practices. The Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, United Nations 1993 (United Nations, 2007), Article 15 protects and promotes the use of Māori language and culture (United Nations, 2007). The freedom to use languages other than English, Māori and New Zealand Sign Language (NZSL) is also protected by the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 (Ministry of Justice, 1990, Article 20) (See Appendix D).

The MoE fund licensed ECE services and govern through regulatory
frameworks, criteria for administration and operational activity and by funding Teacher Education and professional development. Policy and funding drive research directions that encourage or discourage language ideologies and practices (MoE, 2010).

Graduating Teachers Standards: Aotearoa New Zealand (NZTC, 2008a) honour Te Tiriti o Waitangi and ‘authorise’ teacher registration and Teacher Education for the MoE. Standards direct teachers to have content and pedagogical knowledge to work with English language learners, to have knowledge of tikanga and te reo Māori and to build effective relationships with diverse families, whānau and learners (NZTC, 2008a). English and Māori are the only languages recorded for teacher registration. The Registered Teachers Code of Ethics, January 2005 (NZTC, 2008b) makes no declaration regarding languages. Commitments advise simply that they are to be respected (NZTC 2008b) (See Appendix D).

The Licensing criteria for early childhood education and care centres 2008 and Early childhood curriculum framework (as amended August 2009: MoE, 2009c) as operational guidance for teacher activity with bilingual children and families specifies support for culture and identity referencing Te Tiriti o Waitangi (MoE, 2009c, p.8). Regulatory enrolment forms with no requirement to record the languages spoken by family or child (MoE, 2009c, p.27) ensures linguistically diverse participants in ECE services are ‘unheard’. (See Appendix D).

Curricula

The New Zealand Curriculum for English medium teaching and learning in years 1-13 (MoE, 2007d) declares that “…Languages and cultures play a key role in development of personal, group and human identities” (MoE, 2007d, p.4). The Inclusion principle recognises “that students’ identities, languages, abilities, and talents are recognised and affirmed …” (p.9) supporting a competency of ‘Using language, symbols and texts’ (MoE, 2007d, pp.12-13). Te reo Māori and New Zealand Sign Language together with English may be studied as ‘additional languages’ following specific guidelines (p.14) but the curricula provided for Learning Languages does not have bilingualism as an outcome.

Te Whāriki (MoE, 1996) informed by UNCRoC and Te Tiriti o Waitangi,
sets four principles of Empowerment, Holistic Development, Relationships and Family and Community and aspirations for children to be “competent and confident learners and communicators ... secure in their sense of belonging and in the knowledge that they make a valued contribution to society” (MoE, 1996, p.9). Teachers support children to “...gain the knowledge of the nation’s languages” (p.19) through “...languages flourishing in their communities...” (p.12). The Communication strand signals that each child’s “...languages and symbols of their own and other cultures are promoted and protected,” (pp.72-81) and “...they have confidence that their first language is valued”; inclusive of te reo Māori and ‘community languages’ (p.76). Children’s bilingual activity appears validated in English medium ECE services. Authorisation of teachers’ bilingual activity is implied. (See Appendix D).

Group Special Education recognises bilingual children with advice for supporting children from non-English speaking backgrounds (MoE, 2008a, pp.40-41) funding application forms accessible in three languages other than Māori and English (GSE, 2010a, p. 8) and funding forms where parent/teacher must indicate the language in which the child is most competent (GSE, 2010b, Part A, Items 6 & 7). (See Appendix D).

The Pasifika Education Plans (PEP) act as indicators of MoE support for children’s bilingualism and the revised PEP 2009-2012 (MoE, 2009g) reveals deficit discourses, identifying children with ‘linguistic and cultural heritages’ as under achievers; the first goal for ECE services sets remedial targets for increasing early access to intervention and support for Pasifika families and children in English literacy and numeracy as a ‘readiness’ for schooling and National Standards. This shift is justified through research evidence from Wylie, Ferral, Hodgen, and Thompson, (2006) and Mitchell, Wylie & Carr, (2009) studies that do not address h/c languages or, in the former, view bilingualism as a competency. Evidence and practice advice by Franken, May & McComish, (2005; 2008) exemplifying cognitive and linguistic benefits for Pasifika children from sustaining bilingualism in the educational settings is omitted (MoE, 2007a). (See Appendix D).

Guidance

The Education Review Office (ERO) mandated to monitor licensed/funded ECE services, uses evaluation indicators for quality that attend to teachers encouraging “children to use their home languages and to extend their
vocabularys in both te reo Māori and English” (ERO, 2004, p.32), and use of texts in h/c languages (ERO, 2004, p.35). Indicators of continuity include “use of home languages, . . . cultural practices”, and “. . . explanations in home languages . . . access to translators and speakers of home languages when appropriate” (ERO, 2004, p.23).

ERO using specialised language criteria evaluated quality in Pasifika ECE services and found that only 14 out of 49 services used quality Pasifika language activity that ensured children develop fluency and identity (ERO, 2007). In contradiction, the ERO review of quality for infants and toddlers in ECE services (ERO, 2009) and the review of quality in ECE services (ERO, 2010) do not use h/c language use as indicators of quality; rather indicators acknowledge culture (p.9) and ethnicity only (p.14).


The MoE ECE website (educate.ece.govt.nz/) exemplifies Spotlight reports, ICT projects and research from the Centres of Innovation documenting bilingual teachers/children in action but the MoE statement on languages shows confusion between ideologies about learning a language as a subject and ideologies regarding Bilingual Education: “. . . moving towards a more bi- and multi-lingual educational model . . . resources . . . to support Pasifika and Asian languages” (MoE, November, 2010). The reader/viewer is directed to sites for learning a language as a subject only.
Ministry of Education data collection on teachers’ language use

ECE services must collect data on ethnicity of children and staff but not the languages spoken; the “Languages of communication used by teachers or educators as well as an estimate of the proportion of total time spent using that language in a designated week, must be recorded” (Education Counts, 2010, RS61K; Q.8 and RS61E, Q.9). Data are estimated in brackets of time that include a choice between bilingual education criteria as 81%-100% of total time or a broad 12% to 80% proportion of total time. The total time or ‘day’ varies with staff rosters within services and between services and the seriously flawed bands for measurement of differentiated language use by teachers (Franken, May & McComish, 2008) invalidates statistics.

The absence of policy and guidance for teachers on ways of sustaining bilingualism or effective practices for use of interpreters or bilingual aides indicates the challenges bilingual teachers must confront. They are reduced to that of ethnic supporters who model cultural ‘responsiveness’ or ‘distinctiveness’ and must forgo their languages (MoE, 2009a).

ECE service providers and member organisations

Teachers may be individual or group members of non-government professional ECE umbrella groups that guide their practices. The New Zealand Educational Institute (NZEI), the employment union for ECE teachers, advocates bilingualism for the Te Tiriti o Waitangi partnership, advising bilingualism offers personal, social and economic benefits to New Zealand and its citizens (NZEI, 2002). Using the Human Rights Commission Right to Education (Human Rights Commission, 2004, p.261) the NZEI Draft policy, 24 March 2010, supports “work towards ensuring Aotearoa New Zealand is a true bilingual and bicultural society” (NZEI, 2010, Section 17. para. 2.2) recommending ‘sustainable’ Bilingual Education and teacher aides for all bilingual children entering school (NZEI, 2010, Sections 15 & 18).

Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa/NZ Childcare Association (NZCA) actively promotes use of Māori to honour Te tiriti o Waitangi and follows NZEI policies closely (NZCA, November, 2010). Similarly, New Zealand Kindergartens
Incorporated *Te Patahi Kura Puhou o Aotearoa* (NZK) a national umbrella group representing 29 of the 33 kindergarten associations aligns with UNCROC and *Te Whāriki*, principles to foster h/c language use (NZK, September 2010). (See Appendix D).

Conversely the *Early Childhood Leadership Group*, an alliance of Auckland, Waikato, Central North Island and Counties Manukau kindergarten associations who merged the traditional kindergarten model with education and care services are responsible for teaching almost 40% of the kindergarten children representing the most linguistically diverse regions. They refer to *Te Whāriki*, principles in their philosophy and operations but without further reference to h/c languages (AKA, 2010). (See Appendix D).

The *Early Childhood Council* (ECC) as the largest representative body of licensed ECE services with 1000 member centres, employing more than 7000 staff serving more than 50,000 children, commits to readiness for school and ECE services as a remedy (ECC, November, 2010). (See Appendix D).

The significant lack of strategic planning and policy for recognition of changing demographics and increased bilingual activity exposes bilingual teachers and children to a range of power relations and pro-bilingual and ‘English only’ ideologies. Teachers must validate, devalue or ignore their own or others’ home/community languages (Cummins, 2000; Kubota & Lim, 2009; Norton, 2000). The rights and obligations regarding language use as perceived by bilingual teachers attending to *Te Whāriki*, (MoE, 1996) and *Kei tua o te Pae* (MoE, 2009b, Book 17) could open up spaces for teachers to negotiate bilingual identities.
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LITERATURE REVIEW

Studies of the ways bilingual teachers use their two languages in everyday teaching do not appear to be a high research priority in the early childhood or primary education sectors regardless of demographic imperatives. Research that features bilingual teachers in ECE Aotearoa/New Zealand has been situated primarily within Pasifika ECE centres and focuses on Bilingual Educational pedagogy and practices.

This chapter presents an overview of possible theories and research that provide context and perspectives for analysis and discussion of findings. Perspectives include: bilingualism as a benefit, socio-historical theory, learning as participation and contribution, selected socio political ideologies and critical theorising regarding the interplay of identities, languages and pedagogical approaches. Research that inquires into the ways bilingual teachers use their languages from Aotearoa/New Zealand, Australia, United Kingdom and Canada is also reported. Theorising the link between identities, languages and pedagogical activities will serve as a foundation for inquiring into bilingual teachers and their use of languages in English medium ECE services that mediate bilingual identities.

In Aotearoa/New Zealand the exploration of the experiences of bilingual teachers in Te Kohanga Reo and Wharekura Kaupapa are emerging (Skerrett, 2010) but views and perspectives of active bilingual teachers and their pedagogical activities in English medium settings still suffer from benign neglect (Cummins, 2009) in educational research.
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Languages and Identities

Language ideologies

As there is no ‘language in education’ policy in operation in Aotearoa/New Zealand (see Chapter Two) and to honour and the Treaty of Waitangi and the grave concerns regarding language shift and loss for many Māori and Pasifika communities (May, 2009; McCaffery & Taligalu McFall-McCaffery 2010) this study will focus on socio-political views of bilingual activity in educational settings including ECE services. The view of children and teachers as ‘bilinguals’ rather than English language learners avoids a monolingual focus on second language acquisition associated with English medium settings (Cummins, 2000; May, Hill & Tiakiwai, 2004, Skutnabb-Kangas, 2008).

A view of bilingualism as a benefit in English medium settings is confirmed by many decades of research in North America, the United Kingdom and more recently Europe Africa and India (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010). Bialystok (from 1986 to 2011) provides two decades of research countering claims of cognitive deficits for bilingual children, and provides evidence for proficient bilingual children and adults having distinct advantages over monolinguals in both linguistic and non-linguistic tasks in schooling. (See Appendix E for details).

Cummins (2001b, 2007, 2009), from seminal work in the field of bilingual and multilingual pedagogies, strongly recommends the use of a child’s first language as a cognitive and linguistic resource as vital for long term academic achievement and for identity work. Cummins’ Academic Expertise Framework as a ‘pedagogy of choice’ is a model of bilingual teaching accounting for the “interpersonal spaces and opportunities for languages and identities to be negotiated” in classrooms (2009, p.264). He argues that teachers have individual and collective choices to work ethically and recommends a focus on languages, their meanings and use, and for teachers to work to maximise cognitive engagement as well as identity investment for children (Cummins, 2009; Taylor, Bernhard, Gard, & Cummins, 2008). This model becomes a useful touchstone for inquiry into bilingual pedagogical activity and identity investments in English medium education.
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Bilingual children in ECE services

Demographic realities (see Chapter One) and bilingual assessment exemplars in Kei Tua o Te Pae (MoE, 2004-2009) provide evidence of bilingual children who may be spending up to 20 hours in English medium ECE services (Education Counts, 2011a). Research shows that Additive bilingualism occurs for children when home/community (h/c) languages are not replaced by the language of ‘schooling’ and are used by family and community regularly. When the language of schooling is based on monolingual ideologies that demand children transition quickly into the use of the school language such as English and where this language is also the lingua franca of the playground and popular culture, then the h/c language is replaced and Subtractive bilingualism occurs (Fishman, 2010; Franken, May & Mc Comish, 2008).

Bilingual proficiency is critically dependent upon the adults and the language environment. Genesee (2008) warns teachers that use of occasional words, cultural artefacts and resources does not create a linguistically responsive environment, particularly for infants and toddlers (p.21). Being exposed to the familial language that is both complex but used in a natural and meaningful way provides wellbeing and opportunities for the young child to settle and thrive (Garcia, 1991).

Dalli et al. (2011) in their review of quality for under two year olds in ECE services report that the disruption to ‘attunement and connection’ between teacher and child results in affective and communicative stress that impact upon infants and toddlers producing a “toxic stress”. Following Gerhardt (2004), the authors advise ‘sensitive and attuned relationships’ with responsive teachers in ECE services can avoid the disaffection and anxiety that impact on the growth of neurological architecture for activity in the brain (cited Dalli et al., 2011, pp.57 & 58).

Currently, neuroscientists and researchers, tracking biomarkers of stress such as cortisol levels, provide evidence of possible harm to infants and toddlers from ‘submersion’ education and care (Gerhardt, 2004 cited. in Sims et al., 2005). Li, Chiou and Lee, (2007) found that cortisol levels of children in Taiwanese ‘language’ kindergartens increased significantly in English only ‘very structured’ programmes. English submersion settings where “no Chinese” is spoken can be a very stressful experience for preschool children (pp.14-18).

Paradis and Nicoladis (2007) documented spontaneous language production
in two language contexts of eight bilingual preschool children who live in bilingual environments (French-English dominant and English-French dominant), showing their confident language choice was influenced by the interlocutor, but more directly by the language perceived as dominant in the context.

**Socio-political trends**

A socio-historical and political view of languages and identities in educational settings identifies languages (cultural tools) and texts as of paramount significance for engaging relationships and learning mediated through participation in the linguistic and cultural communities of educational practice (Rogoff, 2003). Vygotsky (1978; 1986) positioned language as central to learning, and viewed the process as individual, socio-cultural and historical, identifying the roles that symbols and ‘cultural’ tools play as the learner interacts in social activity (cited in Kozulin, 2003, pp.15, 19). Cultural tools are viewed as embodiments of certain ways of ‘acting and representing’ the functions and meanings of things in our worlds (Stetsenko & Arievitch, 2002). Mediation processes then are interdependently connected to the learners’ appropriation and internalisation of ways to use these materials and tools as psychological tools for cognition through language/s. A Vygotskian notion of development is a dialogic process of transformation of self and activity rather than a mere replacement of skills and knowledges (Valsineer & van der Veer 2002). Social interaction with significant others in education is ‘situated’ within the spoken or unspoken goals and intentions of the socio-cultural learning community/ies as well as the value of content (Kozulin, 2003).

**Language, cognition and identity**

It is language and cultural knowledge together that make for meaningful activity that acknowledges children’s subjectivities (Ritchie, 2009).

Sharifian (2009) theorises cognition as the property of cultural groups and proposes that ‘cultural cognition’ operating at the group level engages a ‘collective cognition’ (p. 165). Language is a ‘collective memory bank’ for cultural conceptualisations such as schemas, categories and metaphors that a cultural group uses to conceptualise relationships, histories and embodied experiences: views of the world. He argues that an emergent but distinct
cultural-linguistic coding system of knowing is distributed across a cultural
group who share a language, as well as being individualised by each member
from the particulars of relations, environment and experiences. This notion
of ‘cultural cognition’ substantiates interrelationships between a language and
identity.

Participation and contribution: Belonging and identities

Learning as a participatory process engages identity transformations and
education involves ‘opening identities’ (Wenger, 1998, p.263). Education as
a transformative and mutual development process between individuals and
communities emerges in the participation, forming a trajectory towards a
future. As the learner participates he/she invests in the future of that
community and also invests in ‘self’. What participants learn by participating
becomes part of their identities as learners in those communities and this
identity is the vehicle that carries experiences from one context to another
(p.268).

When the languages and social practices of the learner or teacher do not match
the dominant discourses as in Aotearoa/New Zealand, identities may remain
‘closed’.

Stetsenko and Arievitch (2002, 2004) propose that teaching /learning
interactions engage ‘contribution in participation’. The Cultural historical
activity theory attends to the relationships between teaching and learning
following theoretical ideas from the work of Vygostky and Leontiev (cited
Stetsenko & Arievitch, 2004) and Gal’perin (cited Stetsenko & Arievitch
2002). In socially mediated interpersonal activity the learner/teacher not
only participates but also contributes in social practices and ‘communicating,
thinking, knowing and doing’ work dynamically and interdependently together
within the mediation processes (2004, p. 492). Authors suggest that
in activity the ‘self’ is enacted and acted upon as cultural tools and
technologies such as language are used. Thus intersecting identity/self
and learning/cognition intersects communities of home and ECE service.
‘Contribution in participation’ in a shared language is constitutive of belonging.

Carr (2001) tracked the multiple investments children make in ‘group
identities’ afforded by ‘activities’ in a service. She identified processes that
included complex appropriation of social identities in a socially mediated flow.
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The activity worked as a mediating device in positioning ‘self’ as a learner, performer and friend (pp.528 & 540). Central to a sense of belonging set out as a disposition/key competency in *Te Whāriki* (MoE, 1996) and *New Zealand Curriculum* (MoE, 2007d) and interpreted by Carr et al. (2008) in their explorations of key competencies is the coupling of participation with contribution with a view of relationships that recognise “the cultural and social communities that are part of children’s lives and identities” (p. 49).

Exploring multiple ways ‘of being and belonging’ must include questions of how choice of languages by the teacher/service promotes investments in cognition and linguistic identities for children (Cummins, 2009).

**Language and power in education**

Each language has ‘history and place’ and as Fishman (2010) argues it is not “merely a laundry list of unrelated items” (p.xxvi) rather it is “highly contextualised with ethnicity attracting constant political manipulation and exploitation” (p.xxix). The power of languages to vitalise and control experiences of the world influences the construction of identities with, one’s self identity set in relation to the dominant group and ‘others’ (p.18).

Ball (2010) in her UNESCO report on retention of mother tongue argues that contested areas such as languages are status indexed. She directs attention to the role of early childhood education programmes, maintaining that this is a time of “most rapid neuro-cognitive growth” (p.7). Questioning who is responsible for political decisions that dictate the medium of instruction and languages for preschools, she provides evidence that the majority of children in ECE services do not have access to their mother tongue. (Ball, 2010, p.5).

Ritchie (2002; 2005) analysed the pedagogical responses to the demands to incorporate Māori language and culture following *Te Whāriki* commitments to honour *Te Tiriti o Waitangi*. She identified that teachers require knowledge of the relationships between language and identity for development of a critical praxis to activate socially just outcomes for children. Ritchie (2008) theorising subjectivities constructed by and with Māori children in ECE services reported that many teachers are resistant and lack confidence when facing the challenges of the monolingual and monocultural views of education.

Politics and complex issues compound the low status of minority languages and subtractive views of bilingualism inform education policy and constitutions of
language choice, identities and power (May, 2010, p.511).

**Socio-political frameworks**

Language is imbued with cultural, historical, political and spiritual meanings and is not considered neutral. Language both invests and divests power to individuals and communities (Bourdieu, 1977; Foucault, 1980; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2003; Weeden, 1997). Language users within a community embed and negotiate values, meanings and knowledge through social activity and texts (Cummins, 2001; Hall, 1997) and ‘Discourses’ emerge as beliefs, practices and artefacts that are ‘customised’ as ‘truths’ in everyday talk sustaining or disrupting the power invested in beliefs and practices (Bourdieu, 1977; Gee, 1990, 2001). The impact of local and global textual and popular media activities make education and h/c language communities sites of struggle and contestation of knowledge and power (Garcia, 2007; Pennycook, 2007; May, 2007; 2008).

**Cultural and linguistic capital**

Sociological frameworks for identifying social and cultural power in relation to education and bilingualism make use of Bourdieu’s (1977) view of educational settings as representations of the dominant culture, with the teachers acting as a socialisation agent for the dominant culture (Cummins, 2000; Norton, 2000; 2008). Indices of social power measure successful achievement as access to, and performance of, ‘literate’ capital that matches those of the dominant culture. Languages do not have equal status and negotiation of languages and identities must take place in relation to these power differences. Competence in a language includes the socio-political dimensions, such as the “the right to speak” or the “right to impose reception” (Bourdieu, 1977, p.75).

Bourdieu (1977) argued that language plays a central role in sociological processes in the symbolic and material resources used to make and gain knowledge in society. He notes that associated meanings and values cannot be understood apart from the speaker and that the speaker is always part of a social network of relationships [and discourses]. Social processes are actioned as social and cultural ‘capital’ including linguistic capital within a social field: ‘capital does not exist or function except in relation to a field’ (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 101). The ‘capital’ activated in
bi/multilingual communities and homes/social field or linguistic market can be very different to the ‘capital’ of a structured monolingual English-medium social field. This field, he believes, determines what is valued and powerful, and each adult/child brings with them a social, cultural and linguistic ‘habitus’, the values, dispositions, ways of being and habits from home, to negotiate the field (Bourdieu 1993; Jones-Diaz & Harvey, 2007).

**Identities**

Identities are not only multiple but “in process” and multi voiced according to Kraus (2006). Citing Bruner (1986), he suggests that social identities are performed and narrated through our interactions. The “telling” is the doing or performance of identity. Self and power emerge in the narratives of self, other and agency. Bamberg (2004, 2011) extends this position to include self-appearing as part of the storytelling of belonging, agreeing that identities are at stake in all interactions. Positioning involves choice of how language [and which language] is used. Franken et al., (2004) showed that for children in school personal identity can be signalled in the particular language/s used in relation to peers and pressure to belong to family (use home language) conflicts with that of belonging to a peer group (English as lingua franca). Garcia (2010) agrees that identities are manipulated, performed or imagined and are impacted upon by local and global social activity with each child’s multiple identities manipulated, disrupted or supported by education contexts (p.521).

Makihara (2010) agrees that language as a symbolic resource shapes identity formation; however cultural sensitivities influence the degree of consciousness and language choice in contexts where language/education policies secure the status of the dominant group (p.42).

**Bilingual identities**

According to Norton (2000; 2010) inspired by Bourdieu, investment in second or third languages is an investment in social identities, accruing linguistic and social capital. Home language practices of bilingual children and teachers are dependent upon an acceptance of the complexity of these bilingual practices. Viewing identities as situated, fluid and negotiable, Norton (2010) argues for teachers to attend to the power that enables or constrains particular identities
in educational settings, highlighting language as both location and tool for defining and contesting relationships of power. Teacher and child negotiate identities within ‘language learning’ contexts through pedagogical relations which constitute the power relations, meanings and selves usually in alignment with a social group, culture or position (Cummins, 2001a).

Gee (2000), using a socio-critical analysis, proposes identities can be assigned or legitimised as a position such as ‘teacher’ or ‘student’ within the educational contexts where bilingual identities are enacted. Bilingual teachers may consider their identity as a teacher, bound by registration and codes of ethics, as the primary identity that permits their activity with young children (Gee, 2000, p.103).

A ‘discourse identity’ recognised through dialogue and discourse calls into being the relational self with others sustained through dialogue. Teachers can resist or affirm this institutional or sanctioned identity. Gee (2000) proposes that sharing in goals and particular practices generates an ‘affinity identity’ alongside others who work in a similar way. Choice sits at the heart of this perspective rather than a sanctioned ‘institution identity’ and practices are aligned with what a teacher may want to be, with teachers often seeking out others with whom they have an affinity.

**Mediating identities**

Teachers’ ideologies concerning languages and learning are embedded in the pedagogical actions and the structure of programmes (lived curriculum). Bucholtz and Hall, (2005) in a synthesis of commentary on language and identities propose that identity is an “intersubjectively achieved social and cultural phenomenon” (p.607). Identities are grounded in our ideologies and negotiated within habitual social actions and positioning of everyday interactions and emerge through co-construction. Agency then is both individual and distributed (p.606). Identities in ECE services can be negotiated in the moment of participation in spaces created by teachers’ pedagogical actions and discourses but within the limits of the socially mediated contexts and spaces for contribution (Stetsenko & Arievitch, 2004).

It is in the talk in everyday settings and ‘critical pedagogical moments’ (Pennycook, 2004) that questions of power and authority create subordinate identities that can limit child or teacher. Pressure to take on a ‘natural’ or
more powerful identity of the learning community can lead a child or teacher to abandon a bilingual identity (Jones-Diaz, 2007). Pavlenko and Blackledge (2003) confirm the huge complexities for child and teacher where identities are negotiated through language ideologies and discourses that impose or presume identities. Jostling to a ‘positioned self’ in education settings may include religious or ethnic affiliations as learners seek opportunities for other than linguistic identities, to build new hybrid identities from those imposed/assigned or assumed. Garcia (2010), supporting Makoni and Pennycook (2007), argues that agency involves plural-lingualism and trans-languaging where children and teachers perform and negotiate multi-lingual roles signifying access to social justice, rather than tolerance of bilingualism (p.531).

**Agency**

Agency is the power to act intentionally within social interactions, situations or communities to reconstruct desirable directions or a shift in social outcomes (Holland, Lachiocotte, Skinner & Cain, 1998). Positioning theory constructs ‘self’ as taking up several subjective positions from which to view the world, and to act on responsibilities and relations. Holland et al. (1998) propose that identities and sense of self form through children’s/teachers participation in practices and discourses as well as being a production of how they are positioned in their worlds.

Identities display particular skills, enactment of motives, or the cultivation of particular ways of speaking; they evoke a sense of who one is and so organise one’s behaviour (Holland et al. 1998, pp.281-282). Sloan (2006) agrees that teachers develop distinctive teachers’ identities through the teaching and learning processes (p.125). ECE services are a complex web of histories, knowledges, processes and rituals and teachers are both social products as well as social producers. Identities are constituted through discourse practices and policies as well as through positions made available through ideologies associated with language used in the ECE service.

Arendt (1998) accepted that the roots of learning (and teaching) lie in social action, but drew attention to the way activity and talk reveal a social agent yet that agent is never acting alone (Arendt, 1998, p.184, cited in Nixon, 2001, p.224). Agency, seen as the power to act is never the property of the child or teacher; rather it belongs to the group. Thus in all social actions attention is upon the constitution of ‘we’. Arendt explains that the potentialities of

**Positioning**

Anderson (2009) considers socially constructed learning is about learning ‘to be’. Interactions and teachers’ intentions/goals, as well as the affordances of particular curricular tools and patterns of participation, together mediate opportunities ‘to be’ and ‘to learn’; we are positioned as “certain “kinds” of people within trajectories of knowing and being” (p.291). Anderson argues for the foregrounding of “people as sites for (and not just agents or targets of) acts of positioning” requiring considerable understandings of the social/individual matrix that links locally situated action to ideologies and recognisable ways to be a teacher (p.210 cited in Anderson, 2009, p.293).

Mediation involves the use of particular cultural tools (languages) and cultural artefacts that afford particular subjectivities referred to as an attribution of “kinds”; the ways of being and interacting with cultural tools, artefacts and others. “Kinds” or figured subjectivities emerge from the consistent patterns and coherence of forms of mediation over time and build a ‘recognised way of being’ (Anderson, 2009). Anderson explains that in order to be recognised as kind X [bilingual] who knows Y [two or more languages and perhaps cultures] in context Z [early childhood education service] a teacher or child must “gain access to resources for speaking and acting in those ways and then be seen to ‘seem’ like kind X (bilingual teacher/child) by others” (p.293).

**Pedagogy that engages bilingual identities**

Principles and practices of dignity, liberty and social justice frame Giroux views of emancipatory pedagogies (1993) and these views align with Te Whāriki principles (MoE, 1996). Giroux (2006) constructs educational settings as agencies for social mobility and ‘culture’ are constituted by the school/schooled community and dominant society (p.6) Hegemonic activities mask the complexity of the cultural and linguistic activities but dialectic models of education provide emancipatory possibilities and civil society/teachers can
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reform, shape or limit discourses (p.23). Theories of resistance unlike static theories of cultural reproduction, involve human praxis that connects not only with histories [and languages] but also futures.

Identifying the operation of power and positionings, as well as texts and symbolisations that regulate education means teachers can forge a space to redefine terms (Giroux, 1993, pp.4-5). Through critical questioning of discourses a teacher can resituate ‘Self’ representations and ‘be’ the ‘other’ (p. 60). Narratives and voices of opposition provide multiple voices and create possibilities for teachers to build a standpoint that not only opposes but also enables (p.126). In Giroux’s ‘border pedagogy,’ and ‘border crossing’ the teacher is the ‘cultural worker’ engaging language/s as important terrains for questioning and for offering particular notions of agency and identity (p.88). Bilingual teachers as “critical public resources” create individual agency and take up the responsibilities of social agency (p.184). The idea is not to idealise or romanticise differences, rather it is to be open to the complexities and tensions, to interrogate and not just to celebrate them.

Sleeter (2010) warns that when complexities and political tensions arise from political/critical analysis, a ‘safe’ cultural analysis is sought, as teachers avoid exposing unjust social relations for fear of political backlash from the powerful in society. Thus “pedagogies of indifference”, Lingard (2010) argues from his research, show lack of contextualisation and complementarity and “fear of difference” by teachers but productive pedagogies work with cultures and languages and create a grounded and contextualised pedagogy to address social justice (p.175).

May and Sleeter (2010) argue for a critical multicultural pedagogy in Aotearoa / New Zealand to avoid the ‘cultural’ and ‘liberal multiculturalism’ (p.5) where each individual must negotiate a place in a diverse nation. Difference equated with tolerance and considering each other as equals they argue, ensures the researcher/teacher can ignore the power relationships that drive material inequalities. ‘Identity’ choices available through access to h/c languages in educational settings are considered not democratic in Aotearoa/New Zealand.
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Visibility

Over the past decade Government funded literature reviews and Best Evidence Synthesis (BES) reports have inquired into effective pedagogy and practices that enhance educational achievements for bilingual children (primarily Māori and Pasifika). Exemplars of effective strategies for supporting the languages and identities of indigenous and migrant families and children in English medium settings often exemplify Māori education. Alton-Lee (2003), Biddulph, Biddulph and Biddulph (2003) and Gorinski and Fraser (2006) agree that teachers’ pedagogies are central to working critically with children and families from diverse linguistic backgrounds and recommend bilingual aides. Franken and McComish (2003a, 2003b) also support the work of bilingual aides for children who are English language learners. Franken, May and McComish (2008) identified a significant absence of researched understandings of bilingualism resulting in poorly informed teachers and policy makers (p.15) and language ideologies informing education policy promote subtractive bilingualism and rush the child into English. They argue for the use of bilingual support to provide all bilingual children with academic skills and cultural recognition (p.87).

Conversely Farquhar’s (2003) synthesis of best practices and effective teaching for ECE services for “maximising learning outcomes and reducing disparities amongst diverse children” (p.1) subsumed the languages of children and teachers into constructs of culture and ethnicity (pp.17 & 19). Language is conflated with English; however the languages of teachers appear to manage mismatches and continuity between home and educational settings (pp.23-24). Farquhar cites evidence from Te Kōhanga Reo studies (Hohepa et al., 1992, cited, p 24) showing the advantages of close relationships for children in Te Kōhanga Reo, with interactions that exemplify whanaungatanga and embed ‘cultural’ practices (tikanga) through a shared language. Languages used by teachers or children are not explored further.

Meade’s (2008) Expressions of Interest on future research in the ECE sector reiterates concern over the lack of teachers’ knowledge about bilingualism and biliteracy and effective pedagogies for sustaining two languages through disruptions and transitions to schooling. A place for bilingual teachers is identified as Meade argues that response to changing demographics and
learning two languages is necessary for many preschoolers in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Evaluations of Kei tua o te pae (MoE, 2004-2009b) professional development by Stuart, Aitken, Gould and Meade, (2008) using case study methodology and surveys with 26 services found poor support for Pasifika languages. Regardless of exemplars of bilingual activity in Kei tua o te Pae publications and professional development, bilingual assessment practices and assessments of bilingualism were not common (p.106). Researchers did not explore the languages spoken by teachers.

Peters (2010) in her extensive review of literature on transition to school raises concerns regarding effective practices with linguistically diverse families. She questions the value of current transition practices for children from immersion Bilingual Education into English only schooling. She identifies lack of knowledge and understanding of bilingual activity and additional language learning, assessment in English only and the engagement of families ‘funds of knowledge’ during transition to school as complex issues for children and families. These significant challenges for teachers and policy makers are in need of further research (pp.31-33).

Voices from bilingual communities

Ritchie (2009) endorses the role of te reo in early childhood education for Māori viewing children’s language as integral to identity and recommends that enacting respect and inclusion requires a ‘revisiblising’ and normalising of Māori language and cultures (p.8). Ritchie and Rau (2006) followed up the paucity of use of Māori language by focussing on fluency in te reo Māori as central for identity in their Teaching and Learning Research Initiative.

Meade, Puhipuhi, and Foster-Cohen (2003) reviewing inter-relationships between children’s language acquisition and cognitive development for Pasifika Bilingual Education services and identified the scarcity of resources and knowledge on bilingualism and second language acquisition available for teachers and families. The MoE appeared to confuse the distinctions between offering two languages (Samoan/English) for instruction and a bilingual service where the medium of instruction is the Pasifika language (Samoan) (p.37). The absence of a clear policy on Pasifika languages education in the early years was a considerable concern to the community.
Mara (2005) identifies the double-edged challenges faced by Pasifika bilingual teachers: that of improving quality as well as taking ownership of their own cultural pedagogy. She identified that access to qualified Pasifika bilingual teachers in Pasifika ECE services is not always available for families choosing to retain h/c languages whereas use of Pasifika h/c languages in English medium services is not ‘authorised’.

The Families Commission report by Broome and Kindon (2008) explored access to ECE services for 41 participants from migrant and refugee families were selected from six distinctive linguistic/cultural groups across Aotearoa/New Zealand. Two key community members and three ECE teachers were also interviewed. Participants identified the lack of support for their languages and cultures in ECE services and expressed deep concerns about the loss/preservation of their own languages. Several who faced grave difficulties trying to take on English themselves whilst being the main support for culture and language for the family voiced a preference for providing their own childcare. Concerns included ECE teachers’ lack of knowledge and support for the cultural and linguistic wellbeing of their children. Recommendations included professional development for teachers regarding work with diverse families including elders and a “…greater cultural diversity in the trained ECE teacher workforce” (p.42).

Guo (2004; 2009) explored the ethics of intercultural research in ECE services, as during research with Chinese immigrant parents she received many questions from parents regarding their children’s progress. As a bilingual researcher she could clarify and interpret assessments for parents who were unsure whether their children were making satisfactory progress as communication with teachers was limited (2009, p.137).

Chan (2006a) found that when young Chinese children, fluent in mother tongue, were unsure of the communication culture of an ECE service, they refrained from participating or responding to talk in English or home language (p.36). Chan (2006b) believes bilingual teachers can support transitions for Chinese children from the home culture to the culture of the centre.

Kaur (2010) notes little acknowledgement of children’s home languages and identities in her small study in ECE services with children from India in a public kindergarten. Her fluency as a bilingual teacher enabled the sharing of assessments of children in home languages and affirmed the use of h/c languages to strengthen relationships with parents.
Concerns regarding the intensification of diversity in the ethnic identities of teaching professionals are emerging in Auckland amongst bilingual teachers. Rana (2010) identifies the explicit discourses of ‘difference’ operating in ECE in Aotearoa/New Zealand in relation to Indian student teachers.

The challenges of being a bilingual child and family member emerge as multiple and complex without the ‘voice’ of the bilingual teacher. However the challenges faced by the bilingual teachers in ECE services in Aotearoa/New Zealand are also multiple and complex.

**Bilingual teaching is challenging**

Distribution of power and resources such as linguistic capital operates in ECE services and impacts on teachers and children. Identities are experienced in multiple and contradictory ways and teachers and children adapt their talk according to the social field shaped by language ideologies and legitimised practices embedded in every day pedagogical actions (Robinson and Jones Diaz, 2006). A discourse of ‘English language learner’ can assume that each child/adult speaks only one language ignoring complexities for children who may be negotiating two or three linguistic codes interdependently. Opportunities for bilingual children to develop bilingual identities appear constrained by personal and pedagogical views of the child as a language learner rather than a user of languages (Jones-Diaz, 2007; Ritchie, 2009) and bilingual teachers are constructed as functioning in only one language at a time (Cummins, 2009; Norton 2010).

**Bilingual teachers are visible**

*Centres of Innovation* (COI) established projects with Bilingual Education services, and began documenting the pedagogical activities of their bilingual teachers. Strengthening Māori identity through a renewed focus on language use in a COI project *Te Kōhanga Reo o Puau Te Moananui a Kiwa* 2003-2006 by Pohatu, Stokes, and Austin (2006) focussed on teachers’ language use. The A’oga Fa’a Samoa with many children as new learners of Samoan took up the research project as a COI in 2003 (Podmore, Wendt Samu, & A’oga Fa’a Samoa, 2006) where bilingual teachers and researchers explored ‘language’ practices and continuity of Samoan through transition to school.
This concern for language retention and bilingual futures is not matched in research within English medium services.

**English medium ECE services**

The *Centre of Innovation* project guided by Haworth et al. (2006) followed a developing partnership between a kindergarten and a Samoan community Pasifika service, *Upu Amata*. Teachers endorsed an additive perspective to bilingual education (p.16) but questioned when and how to include English for diverse learners. Data from notes and written documentation of activity as well as Learning Stories demonstrate the mediating force of a fluent speaker-bilingual aide and the value of code switching to support meaningful mediation between teachers and children (Haworth et al. 2006, p.46). Teachers worked across communities and languages to endorse a sense of *belonging* within a ‘community of learners’ (p.49). The bilingual teacher aides’ views of their language use for mediating learning in the kindergarten were not central to the study.

Cullen et al., (2009) analysed contexts and material for evidence of co-construction, shared knowledge creation and revisiting of learning. Video data of teacher-child and child-child interactions proved invaluable for identifying pedagogy and strategies. Bilingual aides using Samoan activities and cultural texts legitimised the use of Samoan within the English medium setting as well as working as interpreters and cultural brokers. Revisiting Samoan context activities in the English medium context proved invaluable, as culturally familiar visual material became the vehicle for learning English and the use of Samoan. Cullen et al. (2009) conclude that effective bilingual programmes require use of cultural practices of the language communities and involve members of the extended community; Samoan used by teacher aides was not translated and views were not documented (pp.50-53). Insights are invaluable, but children are viewed as ‘learners of English’ rather than bilingual (Jones-Diaz, 2007; Lingard 2008).

Peters, Hartley, Rogers, Smith and Carr (2009) in the COI project trace the value of illustrated Learning Stories for sustaining learner identities for children as they transition to school. They specifically included examples of children’s ‘funds of knowledge’ and teachers/researchers identified the portfolios as ‘virtual backpacks’ that provide opportunities for a child to own the revisiting of his familiar ways of being a learner from *home* and kindergarten, within
the new school setting where initiating conversations in English appeared challenging (pp. 6 & 7).

**Bilingual teachers and safe spaces**


Languages as resources rather than as a problem challenged the deficit/compensatory models of literacy development in many English medium settings in Canada, Australia, United Kingdom and Aotearoa/New Zealand where historically bilingual families were ‘prescribed’ participation in English medium ECE services as a remedy.

Gerrity (2003) detailed work by bilingual teachers using h/c languages with refugee families in the English medium ECE service at the Centre for Refugee Education in Mangere. Bilingual educators employed to orient families and children towards the new education system enabled restorative practices through respect, trust and use of complementary pedagogy aligned with families’ cultures and languages (Gerrity, 2003). When languages and cultures are included in practices, community and family members can participate, pedagogy can be clarified, and empowering assessment and learning can be achieved (2003, p.35). Guided by principled partnership and collaboration with families, children’s confidence and competence in their languages and practices emerge in the Learning Stories (p.36). Access to the families’ ‘funds of knowledge’ is enhanced and deepened through bilingual educators who are pivotal to children’s choice of language and sense of ‘belonging and being able
to make a contribution’ (Carr et al. 2001). The goals of provision of ‘safe places’ and reciprocity of identities are achievable; “Our journey together is strengthened, our learning enhanced and our lives enriched because of the tireless work of these women.” (Gerrity, 2003, p.37).

Bilingual teachers in action internationally

International literature documenting evidence of bilingual teachers in action in settings that have some similarity to the Aotearoa/New Zealand context indicate that Gerrity’s work is representative of a bold shift towards legitimising bilingual teachers as mediating agents for children’s identities, languages and learning.

Australia

The seminal work begun in 2003 by Jones-Diaz (2003, 2005, 2007) documented bilingual parents, teachers and childrens perspectives on their languages and identities and adds rich evidence. Jones-Diaz (2003) initiated research on language retention and bilingual identities of children, parents and teachers from the diasporic Latin American Spanish speaking communities in Sydney to examined bilingual support for bilingual preschoolers provided by bilingual support teachers (BT) for children in transition English and school. Similar to the study by Cullen et al. (2008), the BT were unqualified (p.315-316). Jones-Diaz (2007) employed Bourdieu’s (1991) sociological theory of negotiation of power within ‘language markets’ and ideas of identities as fluid, dynamic and multiple (Hall, 1997; Bhabha, 1994) to analyse interrelationships between language retention and identity. Six parents’ experiences of identity negotiation and language retention in a pilot study highlighted the complexities of multiple identities and confirmed homes and educational settings as contexts for transformation and struggle for childrens identity work. Data included children’s views of experiences as bi/multilinguals in home and school/ECE service, and surveys and interviews with parents and teachers to gain their perspectives and aspirations about linguistic futures for children. Children’s ‘voices’ revealed the complexities they faced and confirmed that home language speakers (mostly mothers) were children’s only access to resources for language retention (Jones- Diaz, 2005, p.23 & 26) and aligns with parents’ concerns from the Family Commission’s study (Broome & Kindon, 2008). Children dealt
with the diasporic nature of their lives, often conflating culture and language and taking up homogenous identities such as ‘Spanish’. Others identified as Australian, constructing themselves as ‘normal’ monolingual children, and some declared multiple identities, weaving parents’ national origins and languages together with locating themselves as ‘Australian’: evidence that social structures and construction as monolinguals not bilinguals, influence children’s desire to ‘fit in’ (Jones-Diaz, 2007).

Of the 34 practitioners from ECE services and schools, 18 were bilingual or multilingual, but only a quarter had used their languages to support children’s h/c language (Jones-Diaz, 2007, p.257-258). Multicultural policies, celebrating culture and languages and tolerating h/c languages in the transitional phase of learning English were reported. Regardless of a language rights rhetoric, teachers’ support for bilingualism focused on children’s self esteem only through discourses of developmental psychology, an uncritical adherence to dominant English only discourses (p. 260).

Caregivers’ and teachers’ ideologies about languages impact on each child’s linguistic habitus and significantly influence language retention and identities (Jones-Diaz 2007, p.175). Jones-Diaz concluded that the bilingual child was constructed as ‘lacking English’ as teachers prioritised socialising and uptake of the dominant social capital and linguistic norms. Children’s identities were constructed in ‘the natural authority’ of mono-lingualism on a pathway to “cashing in the home language for English…” (Jones-Diaz, 2007 p.283). She says that teachers must recognise ‘linguicism’ and avoid individualising languages and assigning identities such as, ‘second language learner’ and ‘Spanish’, and build discourses regarding language as encompassing a ‘community’ and communication (Robinson & Jones-Diaz, 2006 p.122).

United Kingdom

Barron (2007; 2009) explored the negotiation of ethnic identities in the Nursery schools and homes in the north west of England. He identified the monolingual and mono-cultural pedagogies of the teachers created boundaries preventing participation of bilingual children. The teachers appeared ignorant of the participation complexities bilingual children encounter and did not recognize the key brokering role of bilingual staff or their own discriminatory practices (Barron, 2009, p.347). Negotiating identities at nursery school
involved bilingual children’s partial or non-participation due to the ‘fixing’ of marginalised identities (Barron, 2007, p.751). He argues for recognizing the complexities of work with bilingual children and employment of bilingual staff to support children who experience ‘disidentification’ (p.350) but warns legitimisation for this brokering work requires fully qualified bilingual staff.

Bilingual teachers

One of the first studies of bilingual teachers (BT) in English medium settings was undertaken with 17 bilingual teachers in primary schools in the UK. Conteh (2007) viewed pedagogical activity through a socio-cultural paradigm with heightened attention to the place of culture, identity and language as central to learning (Cummins, 2001a, 2009). Most teachers interviewed were speakers of Urdu/Punjabi, representative of the languages of the children. Four bilingual teachers worked as co-researchers and interviewers enabling Conteh to explore bilingual teachers’ views and roles.

BT had diverse views on bilingualism but all considered that a child’s culture, language and home experiences must be valued in the classroom. Several viewed their role as supporting children’s bilingual wellbeing and creating home-school links. Negotiating the negative attitudes of parents and colleagues towards languages other than English and the value of bilingualism were very demanding but most BT said personal experiences strengthened ways to confront monolingual discourses and racism. They positioned themselves and children as bilingual learners (Conteh, 2007, pp.464-466).

Conteh and Brock (2010) reiterate these findings commenting that the low status of bilingual assistants (unqualified) meant bilingual teachers were often (mis)recognised. Bilingual assistants had lower status or were not regarded as ‘proper’ teachers (Conteh & Toyoshima, 2005, p.28). BT identified a heightened awareness of language structures and grammar and recognised this awareness in bilingual children. They drew on their distinctive personal and professional identities and language knowledge in the face of societal pressures (Conteh & Brock, 2010, pp.10-11) and built deep relationships with bilingual children enabling them to co-construct their own learning and perform their identities (p.12). BT work intensively to recognise and value children’s bilingualism, often working covertly to model bilingualism or use h/c languages, but raised concerns about the lack of support for their role. The authors argue for a pedagogy that deepens understanding of the
strong relationships between language and identity primarily through bilingual teachers who can provide a “safe space” for bilingual children to develop in English medium settings.

**Bilingual teaching assistants**

The gap in research data regarding the ‘realities’ of bilingual teaching assistants (BTA) as mediators of learning in the U.K. led researchers Cable, Drury and Roberston (2009) to establish a video project ‘A day in the life of a bilingual practitioner’: visual data and interview material of the BTA’s ‘day’ analysed with the participants. BTA worked not only as interpreters but also as cultural advisors or insider informants for children and families. As boundary crossers and connectors who recognise and use a child’s ‘funds of knowledge’ (Moll et al. 1992) they mediated new cultural practices and learning. Assistants believed their knowledge of the children and families as well as personal experiences as a new migrant and language learner developed ‘language’ sensitivity. Knowledge of the education system and their community/affinity led BTA to view children and families as rich and knowledgeable, generating physical and emotional closeness (Cable et al., 2009). BTAs are active in disrupting monolingual schooling practices that undermine bilingual children’s identities and language use. Interim conclusions show dominant discourses and practices in reception classes are designed to foreground English and can marginalise bilingual practitioners’ work, their languages and their bilingual identities. Cable et al. (2009) identify the gap between policy rhetoric and realities for bilingual children, echoing the findings from research by Jones-Diaz (2007) and Barron (2007, 2009).

**Additive multiliterate activity**

In contrast to the deficit views of experiences of bilingual activity, Kenner and Gregory documented h/c languages in home and schooling sites in East London. Kenner (2000; 2004) viewed bilingualism as ‘complex and simultaneous’ and revealed the complexities of the linguistic repertoires and semiotic engagement between bilingual children, their grand parents families and bilingual teachers/bilingual assistants (Kenner & Kress, 2003). Additional intergenerational studies by Gregory, Long and Volk (2004) identified complex processes and inter linguistic and intercultural mediation experiences of a
bilingual child with a home language speaking grandparent or sibling. They argue that this syncretism is a two-way scaffold for accessing new hybrid identities and literacies with dynamic potential for bilingual children as both teachers and learners.

Recently, Kenner, Gregory, Ruby and Al Azami (2008) in the East London study with second or third generation bilingual children designed activity and materials with BTA from the community school and class teachers to provoke the use of Bengali. Children were comfortable speaking home languages in the playground, but not in the class. Children’s linguistic and conceptual processes and knowledges (linguistic capital) as well as any shift in children’s identities as learners were recorded. The value of their action research project for supporting children’s bilingual identities in rather scary ‘monolingual spaces’ stimulated bilingual teaching assistants to reconceptualize themselves as teachers (p.122).

Al-Azami, Kenner, Ruby and Gregory (2010) in a further iteration of this project detail transliteration of the Bengali script with children (7-9 year olds) who had oral fluency in the home language but little script experience. In collaboration with community language schools and researchers, BTAs partnered the class teacher in planning for children to record their oral Bengali in Romanised script. Assistants liaised with community schools and worked as ‘teacher’ to ensure all children in pilot groups could use oral Bengali to construct texts. In depth metalinguistic activity, conceptual transfer as well as enjoyment of the use Bengali and English affected identities and views of selves as bilingual learners (p.122). Evidence of the possibilities of bilingual and multilingual ‘safe spaces’ for bilingual children alongside bilingual teachers indicated mediation of bilingual identities.

Canada

Taylor, Bernhard, Garg, and Cummins (2008) in a very similar project detailed the use of ‘identity texts’ in 70 case studies drawn from a Multiliteracy Project in Toronto with 24 elementary and secondary schools promoting multimodal, multilingual and critical literacies in English medium settings. ‘Identity texts’ with South Asian multigenerational immigrant families involved dual language authoring with children and families engaging their histories, literacies, and languages (p.274-276). Researchers and teachers report a transfigured role for family members as biliteracy supporters within the classroom by normalising

Taylor (2008) in a similar study in Montreal reports an unexpected shift in discourses for nine bilingual/multilingual teachers following interactions with children where teachers’ personal linguistic identities and capital were used to scaffold bilingual children’s literacies (p.103). Values and identities were renegotiated as teachers reflected on experiences with children’s multiliterate language repertoires. Reflective dialogues of teachers’ re-storyed personal histories revealed that they had reconceptualized children’s biliterate capital and became re-sensitised to the ‘else-whereness’ of being a migrant (p.108). Revisiting experiences as a migrant enabled a critical awareness of competing discourses and bilingual teachers using h/c languages could co-create ‘safe spaces’ for bilingual children to explore their histories through multiliteracies (p.112).

This chapter has reviewed literature and research from Aoteaora/New Zealand and internationally that can inform this study of the lived experiences of bilingual teachers in English medium ECE services. It has identified some of the possibilities and constraints currently influencing the views of bilingual activity and the value of a critical bilingual praxis. Knowledge of the interrelationship between language learning and identity formation is required by policy makers and teachers in ECE services to provide language choice and space to negotiate identities. The following chapter reports on the method and methodology of this study.
Chapter 4

METHODOLOGIES AND METHOD

Introduction

This study of bilingual teachers aims to open up a rarely explored area of teaching and learning for recognition and inquiry: the ways bilingual teachers use their languages in English medium early childhood settings. Also embedded in this inquiry is the mediation of bilingual identities for bilingual teachers and bilingual children. This study will also ‘make visible and audible’ the ordinary and extraordinary activities of bilingual teachers in a way that provokes critical inquiry into the activities of the ‘taken for granted’ or hitherto unrecognised practice of bilingual teachers in action with children in early childhood educational settings in Aotearoa New Zealand. A theoretical frame and methodological approach acknowledging multiple perspectives has required a participatory method that ensures a research partnership based on mutual respect.

In this chapter I will discuss the theoretical perspectives and constraints that generated the selection of a suitable methodological approach and the considerations that informed both the methodology and the research methods. A brief comment on critical theory and qualitative methodologies introduces features of the Narrative Inquiry approach and the spiral discourse method for data collection and analysis. Participants are introduced and selection and collection processes are documented. A description of the particular but customary research procedures concludes this chapter.
Frame for action

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child with reference to acting in the best interests of the child (Office of the Commissioner for Children [OCC], 2010) in particular Articles 29 and 30 is an explicit frame for this study. Secondly, a review of the literature concerned with bilingual activity and teachers’ personal and professional identities (see Chapter Three) indicated that narrative and discursive aspects emerging from teachers’ stories were central to the concerns of this study (Bakhtin, 1981; Bamberg, 2004, 2011; Bruner, 1991; Gee, 2001). Methodological approaches, common to research literature that elicit the lived experiences of teachers, are characterised by their qualitative and narrative methodologies (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Connelly & Clandinin, 1999; Sfard & Prusak, 2005; Watson, 2006). Qualitative approaches attempt to examine the subjective views of the inner worlds and experiences of people as they are located in time and context (Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007). To progress this inquiry into ways bilingual teachers use their languages and mediate their bilingual identities in English medium early childhood education (ECE) settings it was necessary to select from qualitative methodological approaches. An explanation of the narrative inquiry methodology chosen will introduce the selection of the methods used and clarify alignment with the research questions.

Critical theory

Critical theory provides the baseline paradigm for this study and informs the methodology and method selected. At the heart of critical theory is the insistence on critique of assumptions and taken-for-granted practices, rejecting the concept of the social world as a given (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000). Critical theory challenges lived ideologies and interpretations, seeking to overturn notions of the neutrality and objectivity of accepted ‘knowledge’ and power in education (Foucault, 1974). Critical theory can direct attention to self and social action in order to bring to light underlying operations of positioning and power relative to social justice (Friere, 1974; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000). Attention to languages as powerful mediators of ‘selves in relationship’ demands that the study critically explore the realities of ‘identity’, work, and values that are taken for granted within the lived experiences of ECE bilingual teachers in English medium settings (Bourdieu & Waquant, 1992).
Critical theorising can also offer empowering insights for research participants. Research based on critical theory enables contemplation and reflection of experiences and demands that inquiry is value laden, making use of local knowledges and the expressions of participants and researcher (Denzin, 2001). Critical multiculturalism (May & Sleeter, 2010) is also a valuable complement to this theoretical frame as children and teachers in monolingual educational settings in Aotearoa New Zealand can lose control over access to home languages and heritages (May, 2007).

Qualitative methodology

Qualitative methodology fits with the critical positioning and sociological topic of this research. It has been used to illuminate and interpret social actions or structures within educational settings from subjective viewpoints, with the role of the participants positioned alongside the researcher (Denzin, 2001; Flick, 2007). The principles of flexibility, reflexivity and openness allow empirical data to emerge from the communication between researcher and participants with opportunity for all involved to contribute their views. Thus constructions of reality and ways of representing that reality can be viewed from within the temporal and historical contexts of peoples’ expressions and activities (Creswell, 2007). Flick (2007) notes, “qualitative research becomes a continuous process of constructing versions of reality” (p.19).

A key tenet of qualitative research is respect between the participants and researcher. The methodology used included opportunities for participants to gain control over both the collection processes and decisions about what constituted ‘data’. Lather’s (1991) qualitative paradigm views research as both praxis-oriented and emancipatory for all involved, where both researcher and researched are changed (p.52). Where the locus of control is shared, the assumptions and working theories of researcher and participants inform each other and knowledges are then subject to review and change (Bishop, 1996; Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai, & Richardson, 2003; Flick, 2007).

The nature of this study demanded an open-ended inquiry approach that combined the foregrounding of the participants’ knowledges and meaning making as well as reflection upon their everyday lived experiences (Flick, 2007).
Narrative inquiry

Narrative inquiry is well established as a research methodology in the social sciences especially in the field of education. There are many different pathways within this methodology, however the commonality is the study of stories or narratives, or descriptions of a series of events or diverse life experiences (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007).

The value of a Narrative Inquiry (NI) methodology for exploring ‘identity’ through stories/narratives means feelings of affiliation and identity can be spoken about and cohered into a past, present and future. Bruner (1986; 1991) suggests that the conscious constructive processes we live everyday are a narrative achievement. The element of reciprocity in dialogue means that the larger discourses and dominating issues can be seen in everyday lived experiences and small stories.

Advantages of Narrative Inquiry as a research methodology

*Flexibility*

Flexibility makes NI fitting for any investigation of complex and evolving experiences where multiple perspectives exist, while the opportunity for multiple lenses respects the multiple perspectives of teachers. Flexibility is also characteristic of the range of methods of data collection used which include conversations, semi-structured interviews, and the documenting of personal histories. Narrated and re-storied events can be sequenced into a logical narrative form or reported in descriptive writing. Flexibility also allows the researcher to generate texts (oral and written) that contribute to ‘new’ understandings of the social actions and beliefs studied (Connelly, Phillion, & He, 2003).

*Reflexivity*

Stories can make the familiar strange giving opportunity to form social identities and place ‘selves’ in the social narratives of personal and professional communities (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Somers & Gibson, 1994). Clandinin, Pushor and Murray-Orr (2007) recommend that teachers move past
the telling of stories of as practice to that of re-telling stories as inquiry. The complex nature of educational activity portrayed allows teachers to glimpse themselves ‘in action’ and can provide a scaffold or point of reference for transformation for teacher and audience (McVee, 2004). NI ‘shows rather than tells’, jolting the readers/listeners out of their complacencies (Chase, 2005, p.671). Interrelationships between theory, method, and data can be sustained Moen 2006 p.232).

Openness and collaborative relationships

Narrative Inquiry gives a voice to both the researcher and the participants. Differences in languages, position, and status can make it extremely complex to give voice to diverse knowledges and truths Bishop, 1996; Pihama, Cram, & Walker, 2002). Issues of power are located in how research begins, the initiation of concerns or questions, the paradigm and methods the advancing of particular interests or privilege in terms of benefits, and accountability and representation (Bishop et al., 2003; Chase, 2005).

Narrative inquiry demands that the subjectivities and unique voices of participants be represented in line with the intentions of the study. The reductionist approach of stories without contexts of time, place and relationships is avoided as the narrative serves as the intersection of time, place and connection (Clandinin & Connelly 2000). Andrews (2007) explored stories across languages and cultural groups by using NI to give voice, and document cultural or social groups’ understanding of the social or organisational conditions in their lives. Storied conversation accentuates the continuity of experiences, and collaborative storying and small stories from within a conversation act as exemplars of social action illustrating the constructed realities of participants. Finally, the understanding of the value of narratives as a representational tool for sharing information is well established within the discourses and everyday practices of early childhood teachers in Aotearoa New Zealand (Carr et al. 2000).

Method

This section of the chapter introduces the selected methods and design that dictated the procedures and protocols for data collection and guided analysis
of the narratives.

**Recruitment of participants for the study**

My interest in bilingualism in the early childhood sector in New Zealand has led to professional associations with teachers in Auckland who are actively bilingual. From this network of bilingual teachers I made a purposeful selection of four registered teachers who regularly advocate for and use their second or ‘home’ language/s when teaching within an English medium licensed ECE service and within their professional work with teachers. A fifth teacher, who expressed interest in the study and who met the criteria of being a registered and practicing bilingual teacher in an English medium early childhood setting, joined the group.

**Participants**

The five participants were bilingual and biliterate teachers and practised in English medium early childhood settings in Auckland. Two participants were in public kindergartens and three were in community early childhood care and education centres. The number and diversity of languages of the participants was not intended to be representative of the demographic of the wider population of bilingual teachers in New Zealand. Each participant also had experience of the New Zealand education system as a parent of school aged children. The participants were not known to each other, but were aware that the research project involved five teachers.

*Profiles of participant teachers*

Shelley (real name) is fluent and literate in English (mother tongue) and has been using New Zealand Sign Language (NZSL) regularly for the last 12 years of her career. She has 20 years’ experience in a range of kindergarten settings, including leadership positions, and completed her Diploma of Teaching, Bachelor of Education, and Diploma of Special Education in New Zealand. She was prompted to learn NZSL through teaching experiences with families and children from the Deaf Community. She views using NZSL as integral to the provision of an inclusive environment for children and her Diploma in Special
Education has provided professional knowledge and strategies for working with children with special needs. She teaches in a sessional kindergarten and uses NZSL to communicate and create signed stories with the children, and to provide professional support and NZSL resources for NZSL in the ECE and Primary sectors.

Anu (real name) was born and educated in a multilingual community and state in India. She speaks five languages fluently, Tamil (mother tongue), Telegu, Kannada, Hindi (languages of India), and English (language of her schooling). She has conversational fluency in Malaylam and Marathi. Anu is literate in Telegu, Kannada, Hindi and English and as result of schooling and cultural influences can also write Sanskrit. Anu uses a Tamil dialect at home but makes use of Hindi regularly in her community and ECE centre. Anu is an experienced teacher who has held preschool leadership positions in India after completing a Masters in Child Development and a Teaching Diploma. She continued her teaching career in ECE services in New Zealand, completing a Graduate Diploma of Teaching ECE and her Bachelor’s Degree. She currently holds a leadership position in a multiethnic, full day early childhood education and care centre. Anu uses her four languages regularly and has created commercial ECE resources and professional development to support six languages of the Indian community for her own and other ECE centres.

MF (pseudonym) speaks the Niue language as her mother tongue and lived in Niue for her first five years. She is literate in both Niue language and English. Although schooled in English, MF was immersed in the Niue language at home and in her community. MF works hard to keep mother tongue as her home language and uses the Niue language where suitable in the programme. She works closely with the Pasifika families and encourages culturally and linguistically relevant activities. MF is a teacher with several years experience as a teacher aide in a multiethnic kindergarten who later completed her Diploma of Teaching (ECE). She has held a position in multiethnic kindergarten settings for three years and has completed her Teacher Registration.

Fiona (real name) is a fluent speaker of Cantonese (mother tongue), Mandarin and English. She is literate in Chinese and English and experienced in the commercial world. Fiona is a teacher with several years experience in early education and care centres and completed her Diploma of Teaching ECE in New Zealand. She speaks Cantonese at home and in her community, and
her current position in a multiethnic full-day early education and care centre means she makes use of both Cantonese and Mandarin regularly. Fiona also provides professional discussion around bilingualism with her colleagues.

Htwe Htwe (real name) is a fluent speaker and writer of Burmese (mother tongue) and English. She speaks Burmese at home and takes a lead role in her community and is an experienced translator and interpreter. Her secondary teacher’s career began in Burma and, since arriving in New Zealand, Htwe Htwe has completed her Diploma of Teaching ECE. She has been working bilingually for nine years in educational settings in New Zealand, initially as a teacher aide and interpreter in primary schools, then teaching for six years in education and care centres. Currently she holds a position of responsibility in a full-day early education and care centre and uses her Burmese regularly with family and children who are speakers of the language. Htwe Htwe has worked to create professional development and resources for centres regarding culturally responsive education and care.

Contact and consent procedures

Upon oral confirmation of interest in the study, I provided each participant with written information regarding the study, a written invitation to join the study, and a request for informed consent. I provided a second information form and request for informed consent for the institution or governing body of the centre where participants were employed (see Appendix C). This form stipulated that the research activity would not involve the children or community members from the participant’s ECE centre. It reiterated to participants and employers/governing bodies that the focus of the study was the unique linguistic repertoires and patterns of professional use of the languages of the participant only. A representative of the governing body for two participants confirmed through email that the participants were free to participate in the study. Representatives of the remaining three governing bodies indicated verbally or indirectly through the participant their approval. Data collection took place within each participant’s non-contact or own time.

Participant self-report

After the initial discussion of the research process I used a participant self-report to collect demographic detail regarding professional contexts and the
languages spoken and read. In the interests of developing a continuum that described degrees of bilingual activity, I asked participants to estimate time spent, contexts, audience, and purposes for the use of their respective languages. This information established the range and depth of possible bilingual activity (see Appendix F). Whilst collecting signed consent forms I arranged an initial ‘Conversation’ session with each participant to establish a time and place to begin the first cycle of the three ‘Conversation’ sessions for data collection. Subsequent sessions were arranged at the completion of each recorded session or by email or telephone.

Data collection and analysis

The intention of my study involved inquiring into the ways each participant made use of her languages in everyday teaching through collecting personal narratives of ‘lived experiences’. A narrative inquiry approach and this intention directed the choice of collaborative storying through ‘interview as chat’ following a ‘spiral discourse’ design.

Spiral discourse

Spiral discourse requires that narratives collected are ‘re-presented’ for collaborative analysis by participant and researcher. Through a sequenced repetition of recording and transcribing of ‘Conversations’ / ‘interview as chat’, transcriptions are returned to participants for their reflective analysis and comment. Key points noted can be revisited in the following session for reciprocity of meaning making and collaborative activity (Bishop, 1996, 2005). The spiral discourse design keeps the emphasis on meanings, culturally appropriate processes and power relations and opens up the lived experiences and social constructions of the reality of both researched and researcher.

Detailed explanations of perspectives, actions or intentions are shaped by and filtered through linguistic and cultural lenses and are rarely revealed in ‘conversation’ (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 21). The spiral discourse enabled me to respect and to include the beliefs, practices and languages of researcher and researched. I was concerned to use empowering approaches to the generation of knowledges (Lather, 1991). Effective application of a spiral discourse design in an educational setting is evidenced in the Te Kotahitanga research project in Aotearoa New Zealand (Bishop et al., 2003). Collaborative
storying (Bishop, 1996) as a Kaupapa Māori strategy later termed ‘spiral discourse’ was used to authorize and give voice to (Year 9 & 10) Māori students through stories of their lived experiences in secondary schooling. Narratives from principals, teachers and whānau were also gathered. The richness of previously unheard authentic voices and the empowering research processes were pivotal to the success and uptake of a 10 year Kotahitanga project. Stories were successfully used to document language histories with bilingual student teachers for presentation (Harvey, van der Hor & Zaki, 2008; Tuafuti & Harvey, 2009).

Negotiation of meanings and the context of the relationship between researcher and participant were paramount for this study. Meanings that bilingual teachers assigned to their activities needed to be elicited from their narrations of ‘lived experiences’ constituted as data (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007; Goodfellow, 2004; Phillion & Connelly, 2004).

Small stories

Bamberg (2011) places great value in attending to ‘small stories’ in chat declaring that fixity can be avoided and the contradictory positioning and identities, ‘held simultaneously’ can be identified (p.24). My attention to participants’ ‘small stories’ offered a way out of essentialising positions and languages of participants and allowed for multiple positions rather than a theorised and fixed designated enactment of bilingual identities (Bamberg, 2004; Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008). Teachers’ experiences with stories are well developed in ECE services (Carr, May & Podmore, 2000).

Medium, time and place

English was used as the medium for invitation, negotiation of informed consent, and for the data collection spiral of ‘conversations’ and transcriptions. Participants were able to code switch or code share (NZSL) to reference cultural artefacts or to use specific metaphors or terms and these were translated into English. Two transcribers, who are fluent speakers of English, were selected for their considerable experience in qualitative research. Each ‘conversation’ session was between 30 to 70 minutes duration. The choice of venue was negotiated to ensure that recordings were made without disruption
and/or in familiar surroundings such as an adjacent classroom, a lunchroom and a public library.

**Procedures**

Three conversation sessions were conducted with each participant between November 2009 and August 2010. No formalised starter questions were used, as each participant appeared eager to talk about their bilingual activity. This ‘narrative’ data constituted the primary source of data for the study. The oral component of each session was recorded on a digital recorder, and later transcribed. The participant received a digital file (mp3) and several days later, a copy of the written transcription. The participant was encouraged to check, edit and highlight words or note interactions that may have disturbed or delighted. The transcript was also analysed by the participant for points of interest that might serve as beginning points for deeper inquiry in the subsequent conversations. The second conversation was recorded and the transcript returned to the participant for reflective comment. This spiralling process was repeated for the third and final conversation sessions with each of the five participants. As researcher and collaborator, I noted significant concepts or actions as I read and reread each transcript. The spiral nature of the restorying of the transcripts gave both participant and researcher opportunity to identify words, themes or stories from our own cultural, linguistic and professional knowledges creating stopping points for further negotiation (see Appendix I for sample transcript).

The collaborative nature of the activity and the trusting relationship encouraged participants to use idiosyncratic ways of expressing and storying narratives about practices, reflective of the distinctive languages and cultures of their lives (Andrews, 2007). My prior ECE teaching experiences and familiarity with professional discourses were useful to inform my probing into a topic or to affirm a ‘small story’ or vignette offered by the participant (Bamberg, 2004; Chase, 2005). My personal experiences with a particular situation or ethnic community served to enhance listening from an empathetic position (Noddings, 1996).
4. Methodologies and Method

Data analysis

The sequenced revisiting of the unmarked transcriptions of a first order narrative (Creswell, 2007) as the primary source of data allowed for identification of discourses, stories and cultural representations unique to each participant and her linguistic and professional context (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007). A critical curiosity and emergent analysis of the first transcript made it possible to enter the participant’s discourses and to share meanings. In common with work by Bishop et al. (2003), ‘interviews as chat’ conducted in a dialogic and reflexive manner “facilitated ongoing collaborative analysis”; a spiral discourse (p.226).

Open coding

The inductive collaborative process used established an open coding, with emergent points informing the next conversation session (Creswell, 2007; Flick, 2007). My initial open coding of each transcript identified thick descriptions of critical moments of teacher action which were annotated and named (Creswell, 2007). The emerging conceptual points were allocated active terms to signal activity and maintained as discrete to each participant. This avoided a presumptive cross pollination of conceptual points across participants (Riessman, 2001). Points annotated by the participant became points for further clarification, a memo for sharing an exemplar story and dialogue triggers for the second conversation (Creswell, 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005).

Up to 14 most significantly occurring conceptual points using the analytical lenses of researcher and participant emerged through mutual coding of each narrative and these became indicative categories. Each participant committed to the mutual coding activity and conducted subsequent coding sweeps through data. Conceptual categories signifying teacher/participant in situated action, for example settling and associated properties such as care and trust evolved through subsequent conversations and were noted for significance (Creswell, 2007).
**Method**

*Focused coding*

After three conversation sessions, the emerging patterns of each participant’s situated activity and ways of using two languages involved a focused coding of the significant conceptual point leading to naming of activity categories on the spreadsheet. This graphic worked as a way for me to gain insights into a path through the rich data toward salient categories as I confirmed or expanded patterns (Charmaz, 2001; Clandinin & Murphy, 2007).

Alongside this categorising of activity I had also bracketed and coded segments that could sit alone as small stories or narratives that exemplified the categories selected. To manage the data, a series of colours were initially used to identify the participant and sequence number of each transcript. Later, participants’ transcripts were individualised by allocating a font colour as a coding mechanism for referencing sources as a way of tracking and managing data when selecting excerpts for interpretation and discussion.

*Integration*

An individualised table of categories and significant patterns was returned to the participants for further collaboration and dialogue. A comparison across the five spreadsheets containing the record of category intensity for the fifteen ‘conversations’ was a first step in integration and merging of the data into 12 salient themes representative of recognised enactments of bilingual activity (see Appendix H).

At this point I could move from open coding to consider analytical frames and theoretical ideas regarding identity formation and bilingualism that had emerged from the literature. Axial coding of themes involved confronting the complex interplay of the multiple perspectives rather than a generalising activity (Fine & Weiss, 2005). External and sociological conditions and structural influences on the relationships, time and place impact upon each participant and distinctive narratives of bilingual teacher in action emerged (Clandinin, Pushor, & Murray-Orr, 2007; Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). The accompanying ideologies and beliefs of each participant were identified as ways of generating possible mediational spaces for identity construction and theorising. This was complex as identities are multiple, fluid and situated thus elusive or uncharted in literature (Ollerenshaw & Creswell, 2002).
Discourses, personal experiences and agentic ways of being that drive transformative pedagogical action were teased out and exemplified through narrative and counter narrative derived from the small stories in the data (Connelly, Phillion, & He, 2003). The lenses set by the questions, polished by theoretical frames from literature on identity and bilingualism, were used for interpreting the ways languages used by bilingual teachers mediated their bilingual identities. Secondly, theory sampling from the literature regarding children’s bilingual development indexed opportunities that the bilingual teacher provided for mediating children’s bilingual identities.

Interpretation and representation

Positioning

“Cross-cultural research is, at its heart, a deeply risky venture” (Andrews, 2007, p.507). Conversations without the constraint of set questions enabled themes peculiar to the participant and her lived experiences to emerge, and small stories gave voice to the emotion and intentions of a participant that may otherwise have been lost within the strictures of an English frame. Czarniawska (2007) recommended that narratives not act as simplifications of complex activities, as they connect to past, present and future through relational activity. The telling of stories has a profound effect as the affective elements are presented and listener and storyteller are momentarily connected to the speaker’s past, present, dreams and hopes (Ahn, 2004; Bruner, 1990). Some narratives or ideas may be encouraged or discouraged so fixing meanings or generalising from small stories situated momentarily in our dialogue was not possible initially (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990).

Ensuring rigour and credibility

All participants were able to verify their transcripts after each conversation cycle, and as a result could alter concepts or categories. Metaphors used to assist conceptualisation could stand up to translation and worked as a device for revealing cultural knowledges. Participants were able to review the excerpts from their transcripts that were used verbatim as illustrative narratives or small stories before the final editing for publication.
Narrative inquiry using a method of spiral discourse gave participants opportunity to voice perspectives and engage in open-ended dialogue while avoiding the capture of factual truths. Oral and written texts of the conversations allowed for a tuning in to voice and redirection in underlying assumptions within conversations around a topic. This meant previously unforeseen positions gained attention and verification (Andrews, 2007; Polkinghorne, 1995). Participants were kept informed about the progress of the study and there were no conflicts of interest.

**Ethical considerations and legitimations**

This study met the criteria for the University of Waikato Ethics consent process and was approved on 5th October 2009. The details of the identities of the participants have remained safeguarded within the study and names of participants and centres are not disclosed. Participants were able to choose a pseudonym if desired and transcripts were treated with respect. The confidentiality statement from transcribers ensured confidentiality regarding records and transcripts (Appendix D). Guidance from Noddings (1996) in terms of framing research within an ethics of care reminded me that respect and identification of unequal positions are paramount. I reviewed the research representations and interpretations for any compromise in equity and fairness with participants and supervisors. Where possible, cultural perspectives and linguistic heritages were respected through the protocols of the spiral discourse design for data collection and analysis.

**Summary**

This chapter has provided a review of theoretical perspectives that informed the methodological approaches for the study as well as a description of methods and analysis. Recruitment of participants, their profiles and ethical considerations regarding the research activity were also detailed. The use of a qualitative methodology and the use of the Narrative Inquiry approach with a spiral discourse/collaborative storying method for collection and direction of analytical processes fostered collaboration and respect across the diversity of cultures and languages for the participants and researcher. The following chapter reports the findings and may serve to illuminate the ways that bilingual
teachers work in English medium early childhood services to create “a linguistic market place that legitimises the use of languages and dialects spoken by the children and families [and teachers]” (Robinson & Jones-Diaz, 2006, p. 123, my addition).
Chapter 5

FINDINGS: STORIES OF LIVED EXPERIENCES

Introduction

This study explored the ways five bilingual teachers access and use their languages in everyday practice in English medium ECE services in the Auckland region. The attendant questions: What roles do the languages used by bilingual teachers play in mediating identities for teachers? and What opportunities do bilingual teachers see for themselves in mediating bilingual identities for children? acted as heuristics for analysis of the lived experiences the teacher participants shared in their three sequential conversations.

In this chapter I identify significant features of the linguistic environments in which the five teachers accessed and used their languages with children and families and report the findings. Collaborative analyses of conversations of the participants’ everyday practices identified twelve bilingual pedagogical actions (BPA) considered as ways in which languages are accessed and used. The twelve significant categories of bilingual pedagogical actions merged into four themes or frames:

- Ideologies / knowledge about bilingual development,
- Cultural brokering or bridging,
- Pedagogy and policy,
- Meaning making.
Each frame recognised some of the twelve significant categories of bilingual pedagogical actions described and illustrated in the findings. These twelve bilingual pedagogical actions will be described and exemplified under the four main frames. The bilingual pedagogical actions (BPA) considered by each individual teacher as most significant within her conversations of lived experiences are then reported as evidence of access and use of h/c languages. Pedagogical actions that demand bilingual activity are also recognised as possible sites for mediating the bilingual identities of the teachers and children. The final section documents the significant frames and categories of actions for individual participant teachers. These are profiled in descriptive narrative and constitute the rich material for discussion and interpretation in Chapter 6.

**Contexts for bilingual pedagogical actions**

Diversity of linguistic environments is not uncommon in the Auckland region and the ways teachers are using their languages is influenced by the linguistic and ideological contexts of each ECE service as well as their own fluency. The discussion of bilingual fluency in home / community (h/c) language activities led four of the five participants to agree that their fluency enabled them to conduct sustained conversations and to read in their home language as well as to participate in community activities. Shelley considered her competency with Sign and NZSL to be less than fluent as she did not participate in the culture of the Deaf Community. Self-assessment of bilingual activities by each participant indicated a cluster of diverse practices at the ‘very strong’ end of the scale representing effective support for bilingual children (see Appendix F). As we progressed through our conversations and analyses I became aware of the inadequacy of a simple table to account for the dynamic and diverse approaches and practices of these bilingual teachers.

**Bilingual pedagogical actions frames: Examples of categories and dimensions**

1. **Knowledge / ideologies about bilingualism**

Theorising about bilingualism emerged as the most significant dimension of bilingual pedagogical activity as participant teachers spoke of their ideologies
and understandings that informed professional practices regarding bilingual development and the value of retaining the h/c language. Theories and subject knowledge negotiated within the English medium socio-political context and linguistic environment occurred as a rationale for actions. The teachers’ talk of BPA included the knowledge used to guide parents and colleagues who adhered to discourses regarding the negative impact of bilingualism. Teachers did not mention guidance from the Ministry of Education, but declared significant advocacy for the use of h/c languages and language retention when issues raised by family and colleagues identified educational success as being ‘English only’. The major dimension here was role modelling bilingualism.

1.1 Role modelling bilingualism

All participants were conscious of the value of being a role model of h/c languages. A heightened awareness of providing ‘permission’ for the bilingual activity of children, families and colleagues through role modelling use of h/c language was acknowledged.

2. Bridging / culture broking

The pedagogical work that frequently demanded h/c language use by teachers appeared as culture broking or bridging between home and service cultures. Knowledge of h/c language and cultural communities was considered essential for this work. Teachers spoke of explanations required for every day practices and negotiating and interpreting the culturally specific actions by children or parents that were mis-recognised or misunderstood by colleagues. Settling children and families, building relationships, affirming children’s identities and spiritual wellbeing demanded bilingual pedagogical actions. Few teachers spoke of formal interpreting and translating as this work was embedded in bilingual pedagogical activity. Three teachers spoke explicitly of social justice, equity, and all teachers referred to critical reflection on discourses and practices. Bridging on behalf of the service was significant too, as four bilingual teachers spoke of explaining the socio-cultural tenets of pedagogy, of assessment, of play and the absence of “schooled” literate activities and addressing issues of discrimination.

Bridging and working as a cultural broker integrated the following dimensions.
2.1 Relating to family and children

The talk and responsiveness required for building relationships was a consistent dimension in BPA with families. The use of h/c language occurred daily at drop off and pick up times for three teachers and included exchanges of family information as well as clarification of the programme. Three teachers shared that parents made use of the bilingual teacher as a ‘trouble shooter’ or ‘sounding board’ for decisions or issues associated with the education of school aged children and two teachers spoke of supporting domestic and ‘settlement’ challenges with families. This dimension overlapped with the settling and interpreting dimension of bridging activities employed to maintain relationships.

2.2 Interpreting and translating

Three teachers made brief reference to interpreting whilst explaining actions such as enrolling families, making sense of administrative details, relating to families, and settling children. Isolated incidents of working as an interpreter did not feature; rather the use of h/c language appeared to be the default medium for communication. Families need to become acquainted with ‘customs and cultures’ of an ECE service, such as being rostered as parent help or being expected to leave a donation in a particular place, and three teachers spoke of the importance of the bilingual teacher as interpreter/translator for family participation. Each participant teacher spoke of bilingual children requiring h/c language support as part of settling and being affirmed.

2.3 Settling and caring / trust

Effective support for children in transition times between home and service and between service and school involved bilingual teachers’ timely use of h/c languages. Three teachers made note of the need for slow and continuous development of trust and empathetic support using caring ‘talk’ in the child’s h/c language. Two teachers spoke of being directed to this work by other teachers when a bilingual child had become ‘unsettled’ and anxious.
2.4 Affirming identities / respecting child

Using h/c language to affirm and to give due respect to a child’s identity as a member of an ethno-linguistic group appeared part of everyday interactions and was referred to by four teachers. Guidance, praise and provocation were reported explicitly in three teachers’ talk of using BPA with children and parents. Metaphorical or direct references to familial activity explained by two teachers acknowledged the child’s culture and home. Three spoke of affirming actions as using culturally specific knowledge and connection to each child’s family members or community, through personalised attention to a child’s funds of knowledge. Children and families reciprocated affirming actions and three teachers spoke of feeling respected.

2.5 Spiritual and cultural values

This dimension includes embedded religious or spiritual practices subsumed within a particular language (and discourse) that impact daily on teachers and learners. Implicit and explicit ‘teaching’, referred to by one teacher, was embedded within joint activities as integral to shared cultural conceptualisations. Another teacher identified cultural values within all her bilingual pedagogical actions.

3. Pedagogy and policy activity

Conversations in h/c languages regarding the policies and pedagogical decisions were informed by pedagogical and language development ideologies. Each bilingual teacher reported having advised families and colleagues in matters directly relating to the value of bilingualism and to allay fears about language learning processes. Three teachers referred to bilingual pedagogical actions as both planned and spontaneous activity central to teaching. Often the lack of policy created a need for strategising for the use of h/c language. Ideologies implicit within the discourses and knowledge regarding education in New Zealand were negotiated daily as part of each teacher’s work. Pedagogy and policy activity integrate the following dimensions or categories of actions.
3.1 Representing own community

All bilingual teachers spoke of the complexities of their multiple roles as community representatives. Identity work considered significant by four teachers included being conscious of teacher status / position, being role models for possible achievements and for h/c language use. Four of the five bilingual teachers took the role as representative of a specific ethno-linguistic group or community but recognised too that colleagues and parents assigned them representative identities. Stories of the demand to be a speaker of her h/c language and sometimes the ‘voice’ for that community or a defender of community practices emerged in three teachers’ conversations. All participant teachers spoke of critical knowledge of cultural and linguistic discourses and theories as support for this significant responsibility. Four teachers spoke of being proud of their cultures and languages, and of working hard to meet expectations of ‘identity as a teacher’ from both the h/c language community and the professional ECE community. Two teachers spoke directly of positioning and balancing the tensions of these demands and protocols.

3.2 Affirming identities / respecting self

Achievements as qualified teachers featured in the talk of four teachers who worked inter-culturally and bilingually. Three teachers were conscious of the use of h/c languages in the public domain of the English medium ECE service, and reported a heightened awareness of professional undertakings when working in a teaching team. Two spoke of confronting marginalising discourses that positioned them automatically as a community member and bilingual. Four teachers agreed that their use of h/c languages in any context affirms and respects their own ethno-linguistic backgrounds and identities. Each teacher referred to personal experiences and identities as a language learner; however three used personal experiences with parents, teachers or children to support BPA and relationships. Although one teacher noted some lack of respect and affirmation of BPA from colleagues, four of the teachers agreed that membership of their ethno-linguistic community and use of h/c language was supported by their status of being ‘teacher’ affirmed their own identities.
4. Making meaning / concepts teaching / learning

Each teacher stated that use of home / community languages was a significant but implicit expectation of teaching, essential for providing a scaffold for a child to access concepts and for learning. Only one referred directly to Te Whāriki but all teachers talked of adding examples or information of a culturally specific nature to enhance meaning making. The inter-subjective nature of relationships in h/c language can mean familiar schematic frames or cultural conceptualisations for understanding phenomena can be shared between teacher and child. Four teachers spoke of using h/c languages and cultural conceptualisations to make sense of unfamiliar concepts presented in English.

According to one teacher the use of sign language provided stimulation as well as semiotic references that served to deepen both multimodal and multimedia literacies and understandings of a storied or experienced abstract concept.

Significant bilingual pedagogical actions: The lived experiences of five teachers in English medium ECE services

The twelve categories of bilingual pedagogical actions that were most commonly cited by the five teachers constituted the significant frames for bilingual activity and possible identity work. The relative significance of these frames of bilingual pedagogical actions for each participant was indicated by the frequency of the occurrence of particular categories of BPA. The rating of the most frequently mentioned BPA in the conversations of individual participants showed distinctive and coherent patterns of significance. Individualised and unique frames of bilingual pedagogical actions compiled by selecting the four most significant BPA over three conversations allowed me to construct a voiced or narrative commentary of the ways each bilingual teacher used her languages. In this way the integrity and uniqueness of each teacher’s lived experiences of h/c language use and of the diverse contextual influences upon each bilingual teacher can be preserved.
Anu’s story of bilingual pedagogical actions

The talk and stories that represent the most significant BPA for Anu as Head Teacher in her service are associated with policy, ideologies and advocacy for bilingualism with families and staff in her ECE service.

Policy and pedagogy
She talked of deliberately employing bilingual teachers and making use of the languages of the administration staff as well as instigating home visits where outreach to a migrant family provided guidance and support for a child’s transition.

We do home visits...we’ve done one with a Pakistani girl and one Chinese girl...they just want settling...so we thought going into their home and getting that list of words just common words and that really clicked. Just making that connection with them going home and coming back and actually using those words and phrases...straight away we put it into practice...the whole [home] language is still there...the parents are very proud.
(Anu, conversation 2, p.6)

Transition strategies she noted included establishing lists of common phrases or words in a child’s h/c language for teachers to use as well as liaison with the junior teacher for transition to school. Anu talked of her key policy of surveying parents’ views and expectations as a way to meet concerns regarding use of h/c languages and the uptake of English.

...Some parents [say]...‘No, we don’t want [teachers] to know that language’...they have an attitude. ‘That’s okay, we speak English, my child can speak English and we don’t need to speak our home language here’ but eventually they get round to knowing the importance of having that home language. Even if you ask them their home language or the state they come from then instantly they say ‘oh but we speak English at home so there’s no problem, you can speak to my child in English.’
(Anu, Conversation 2, p.8)

Ideologies / knowledge of bilingual development
Anu referred to her philosophical and theoretical position as grounded in
experiences from her own family and study. The storying of previous experiences of applying strategies for maintenance of h/c language with her son revealed her awareness of the challenges to identity and language retention for children in a New Zealand education system.

Here...we realised that my son was forgetting Tamil...he didn’t hear much of Tamil at home...we realised we’ve got to shift back to speaking home language...make an effort to speak it at home...he didn’t want to speak in Tamil...we went through this thing about being able to be proud of what you are...he’s come to the point ...where he’s really proud...a sense of belonging, a sense of identity. So he started using it so he’s kept his Tamil...the same thing happened with the younger one when he was born...we decided we have to keep the language going.

(Anu, Conversation 1, p.3)

Anu spoke of how her personal experiences combined with her knowledge of theory regarding additive bilingualism established exemplars of good bilingual practice. She commented that common praxis contradictions and tensions such as negative attitudes regarding h/c language use could be countered by strong philosophical and pedagogical views regarding the value of h/c language, adding that she used these as part of her public activity in the ECE service. Anu spoke of engaging in professional dialogue with colleagues and families about research regarding additive bilingual policies and thereby helping to initiate shifts in teacher’s attitudes. She said her view of an inclusive curriculum included children’s use of their h/c languages.

...Because it’s the dominant cultural capital versus the child’s cultural capital, where the child is coming from to promote and help them keep up their identity... I think that was important for me and therefore the vision of my centre came about [I am] trying to empower teachers because that’s really important.

(Anu, Conversation 2, p.1)

The attitudes, and the knowledge behind the attitudes, for both teachers and families were identified by Anu as central to maintenance of identities and languages.

It’s coming out significant [in the transcript]...attitude towards languages. A lot of people wouldn’t [use two languages]...and
that’s really important, teacher attitude, people’s attitude you know… a lot of people think it’s not important but… if you’re a bilingual child you’re bound to be more receptive to other languages… I guess it’s your re-development and… cognitive development… as well it [cognitive development] improves for bilingual children… all theory based.
(Anu, Conversation 3, p.3)

Cultural broking, relationships and affirmation of the child’s / bi and multilingual identities
Anu spoke of her significant work as a cultural broker or bridge to affirm children’s bilingual identities through strong family relationships. She detailed her guidance for teachers to use their language-specific resources and texts, often created with, or contributed by, families. Contextual constraints in English medium services, she said, positioned teachers as guides for bilingual activity.

Even the grandparent who used to come and drop the child off… he started speaking in English since he’s come to the centre because he would wait, stay with the child and interact with the teachers and he actually wrote us a couple of Chinese stories and drew pictures and made a story book for us…
(Anu, conversation 2, p.6)

A child’s identity as a member of a bilingual family surfaced regularly in Anu’s conversations and she often stated the significance of building family relationships. She spoke of policy changes that affirmed and respected a child’s languages and cultures in everyday practices and sought to avoid ‘tokenism’. Anu reported that she is developing a language policy alongside her established literacy policy.

…That sense of children understanding … recognis[ing] and respect[ing] their mother tongue … we want to celebrate who they are and where they come from and I think that’s a really important sense, for the child himself or herself and for the whole group.
(Anu, Conversation 1, p.4)

Anu invited respect for family knowledge and culture and believed that positioning herself as a multilingual and employing bilingual teachers and
bilingual staff provided substantial support for h/c languages. She spoke of significant use of Māori fostered through the whanau of a child at the service and also of significant actions for affirming not only a child’s cultural capital but also for normalising linguistic identities. Anu declared that professional responsibilities were intimately tied to a goal of positive biliterate outcomes modelled and promoted with bilingual children in the ECE services.

I said, “So what is strawberry called in Chinese?” And so he told me what it was and then I repeated and then he asked me something else and then he said do you know what this is called and so the dad was there as well and we were playing this game again and he turns around and says ‘Anu, I think you need to write it down and make your list so you can remember.’

(Anu, Conversation 2, p.3).

Anu identified that the study of theory, along with her experiences teaching as a multilingual in New Zealand and in her country of origin, have generated her depth of knowledge about effective practices regarding preschoolers’ bilingual development. Her advocacy for her own and others’ multilingual identities and being her ‘selves’ emerged in the small stories of teaching in her multilingual ECE service.

...For our Christmas party yesterday, we had 10 different languages that we sang and the kids just picked up the languages, the pronunciations and the tunes... It was amazing in fact I recorded...produce[d] some CDs for parents to take away...and the parents loved it because they came and taught the children how to sing and we wrote it down and if I didn’t know how to pronounce it [a word in a song] I just put it in Hindi so I don’t pronounce it wrongly.

(Anu, Conversation 1, p.5)

It’s almost like doing two jobs. It’s the teaching aspect and then the aspect of actually promoting the home languages and in other centres.

(Anu, Conversation 1, p.10)
Fiona’s story of bilingual pedagogical actions

In Fiona’s talk of ‘lived experiences’ as a bilingual teacher, the significant dimensions of bilingual pedagogical actions often focused on the policies and protocols of professional engagement. She stated that her own challenging experience of settling in New Zealand as well as her experience taking on a third language were invaluable. Fiona also relied on her qualified teacher status to legitimise her bilingual work with children.

Policy / pedagogy

I speak two different languages, Mandarin or Cantonese and... now English. From my own experience I know and understand how people they go to a new environment, totally new culture, new language, how nervous and anxious and that for Asian people, for Chinese... I understand those parents and those children so I just really want to help them. I want to help them to feel that happiness I’ve already got.

(Fiona, Conversation 2, p.2 & 3)

Fiona spoke of the valuable opportunities for children in the education system and said she made use of prior experiences of settling and her ideologies about retention of cultural and linguistic identity in her role as guide for parents and children. Her allegory of the children swimming from a small tributary (of home language and culture) into the larger river of New Zealand culture and English illustrated the essential role of the teacher-guide. Her metaphor of children as small fish who could be ‘swept away’ or ‘drowned’ in the deep river illustrated her serious commitment to be a skilled guide.

...I think they are very lucky they come here and... build... relationship with teachers and slowly get... settled in their education system from the beginning... once they go to primary school they can just open to their teachers and the parents they will have more confidence to talk to teachers... more like here’s the mainstream and they just come from like little stream... they all need to come here, they need to swim but if you just swim by yourself you know, it will be really hard, probably you’re lucky, you’re smart and you can swim, that’s good... but I believe there’s still lots of people... they don’t know. They... need to have a guide
Significant bilingual pedagogical actions

and the guide you know just like okay swimming for them you know just watch, just help them if they have any proble ... try for the shallow [water] you know...[until] they already got that courage. (Fiona, Conversation 2, p.4)

Cultural broking and bridging

Policy and professional bridging were central, in Fiona’s view, to any bilingual activity. She spoke of the challenges of being a bridge or cultural broker with colleagues and parents and highlighted contextual constraints on her use of h/c languages. Fiona said that the tensions and balancing act required in relation to colleagues and parents were significant when using her h/c language.

I won’t set up a time for me to speak in another language - you know you can’t... When you need to say it you need to say it. I’m quite lucky because the other qualified teachers understand... after I talk to the parents and the children if I get the chance, if another teacher is there I will just tell her what is happening here... then also they know the information. I like to share the information so we work here as a team. (Fiona, Conversation 1, p.4)

Fiona spoke of the ‘rightness’ of her actions in terms of the professional dimensions of being a registered teacher and caring person.

...If somebody understood this situation and also understood the local, the community, families, you ... can help them to understand each other and give these teachers more support. [B]eing a professional means you treat everyone equal. Equality is actually very important ... because you can’t just [say] okay the colour is different, the language is different, they can treat them differently ... but for those ... who speak my language or speak their home language of course that’s ... natural, they feel close to you and because they don’t understand English ... being a teacher I need to respond to that ... and ... parents as well ... just for like [the] settling period. (Fiona, Conversation 3, p.5)
Fiona deepened her explanation of the challenges of being the bilingual guide and cultural broker and spoke of the inherent identity tensions of being a bilingual role model, noting it was important to position herself as an equal.

\[\ldots\text{Anybody in the world has to be proud of his own identity. If you don’t know your own identity, you don’t know where you’re from and what you want to be. I think it would be really hard to survive in the world. So for me it’s really important I know where I’m from. I’m proud of my character, my background\ldots I have to think about okay we are equal\ldots you need to show them [parents] okay I’m not just like baby sitter\ldots I’m a teacher. I’m here to educate and care for your children and also for parents, probably sometimes [it] took a while for them to accept the different bilingual teacher.}\]

(Fiona, Conversation 3, p. 1 & 2)

\[\ldots\text{I put some articles there for staff to read and to get more understanding. [At] another place – my colleague was not very happy for me to speak Chinese with another Chinese boy and she said ‘Oh, you shouldn’t say that because we don’t understand.’\ldots I felt quite upset. That hurt my feelings because I’m trying to do my job, you know what I mean?}\]

(Fiona Conversation 2, p.5)

\textit{Ideologies / knowledge of bilingual development}

Fiona spoke of the role of bilingual teacher as involving well-informed cultural and linguistic bridging activities using h/c language and English for children and families.

\[\text{There’s\ldots this little boy – 4\frac{1}{2} – nearly time to go to school in 6 months, and he’s learning - picking up English\ldots before\ldots he refused to speak English because he was not very comfortable\ldots so now sometimes he’ll come \ldots ask me to help him to tell another child or tell another staff something \ldots I encourage \ldots say ‘okay, – come and speak to this girl – we can say it together’ and I’ll teach him how to say it in English.}\]

(Fiona, Conversation 1, p.3)
Fiona spoke of using her theoretical knowledge with parents and selects articles on bilingualism to validate her professional bilingual activities.

When parents...say I want my son to learn more English...oh my son doesn’t understand English, I say don’t worry because children they are genius, they are very smart, pick up languages. For us it’s like second language. For them just like...more like dialect, different areas dialect, they don’t think they’re second languages... I just explain to parents about the language learning and sometimes I even photocopy some articles yeah to give to parents to read so they will understand okay this opinion is from experts.

(Fiona, Conversation 2, p.6)

Fiona considered that negotiating positions of collegiality was important and spoke of teachers being responsible for their actions and attitudes and needing to role model acceptance for children’s and teachers’ languages and identities and she referred to ‘the sense of belonging’ as validated by Te Whāriki.

Yes, when the parent and you have a little chat and [the child] sees your smiling face ‘oh, this is not dangerous – I can trust this person... See...my mum is smiling. It’s very important that trust is there. The children sometimes are nervous...from the experiences they see – how teachers treat each other then they will learn how to treat their peers.

(Fiona conversation 1, p. 3 & 6)

...You know trust, respect, the open relationship between you and the colleagues or between you and the parents are very important...being professional teachers...have to focus on that because children...see your teachers and your parents you know they are very happy to be together, also that affect[s] children’s wellbeing belonging...not everything in the Te Whāriki.

(Fiona, conversation 2, p.1)

Role modelling

Fiona declared that her teacher’s professional knowledge and status and her own sense of identity were pivotal to a pedagogical positioning that allowed
action as a bilingual teacher. She spoke of bringing two languages and her valuable perspectives from the ECE and Chinese communities so that she had ‘four eyes’ to work with and understand children.

...I cannot be a positive role model because [if] I feel shame of my own concerns, that’s not right. I believe when you feel proud inside you can show people how confident you are and people will see from your face, from your action[s]...some people...first time they won’t trust you but when they see [me working]...after I finished my training, after the registration, after...work in different centres...[with] different colleagues...and the life experience...also the professional development, all together now I can be confident to do better job for parents, for children. I could say this [work is] not very easy.
(Fiona, Conversation 2, p.8)

...[In] the Chinese...tradition we need to work hard and actually in this case we need to work harder to prove ourselves because it’s not that easy [even with]...parents...brought up round the same culture as you. It’s hard...we need to be the professional teacher...work harder...to show other people...I did contribute to this centre, communicate [in] society, I give my best...I am working harder than other staff here. I have to...because [it’s] more like I have four eyes.
(Fiona, Conversation 3, p.2)

**Htwe Htwe’s story of bilingual pedagogical actions**

Htwe Htwe talked of how her considerable experience in negotiating refugee experiences as well as her prior experiences and status as a secondary teacher enabled her to work in an informed and compassionate way as a qualified teacher for ECE. She spoke of a depth of experience that generated rich background resources for her to draw on when working with families from diverse ethno-linguistic groups. She recognised that families and children bring their ethno-linguistic histories as well as experiences as refugees into the ECE service. Htwe Htwe suggested that her most significant bilingual pedagogical actions involved being a cultural broker and bridge for children and families.

*Cultural broking / bridging and trusted interpreting*
Htwe Htwe spoke of her deep awareness of the refugee histories of children and families, and positioned herself as a familial figure taking the role of ‘elder’ or wise community member.

I just prefer to be Auntie Htwe... the way of respecting... way of being friendly – it’s not strange anymore. Because it’s like Auntie Htwe is my mum’s friend or my mummy’s sister... So we’re already having some relationship... not only the Burmese children, other children also call me Auntie Htwe; I need to be a role model for them as an auntie... auntie/children relationship. Yes they feel safe and secure here because... one of [their] home language speakers is here, and the parents... feel safe... this is the good thing about the home language... it makes it more of a good relationship... and not only the children but the adults as well in the community.

(Htwe Htwe, Conversation 2, p.4)

She spoke of negotiating constraints and tensions associated with other teachers’ lack of knowledge of working with h/c languages and cultures and she described her work orienting families and children towards bicultural and bilingual lives.

Like I’m a middle person, a bridge between the parents and the school... [the teacher, she can [know] “oh I need to do this or that for him...” and, the parent also, from me, to get to know more about the school... better for that child... [with] no language so can’t express or communicate. So they [teachers] don’t know what’s their experience back home or what’s going on at home or what she can do better for the child. So it’s both... two ways.

(Htwe Htwe, Conversation 1, p.2)

Htwe Htwe spoke of the way in which other teachers can mis-recognise children’s activities. Her stories provided valuable illustrations of the value of the cultural and linguistic knowledge embedded in BPA that is central to effective learning and teaching.

... The class teacher says ‘oh Htwe, he needs a speech therapist or something’... I say no because he’s talking, he’s [using his] voice at home... why he’s not talking here? He’s very shy and if
he says something there’s going to be a mistake or someone will be laughing . . . sometimes the teacher say[s] something he didn’t know – he’s not sure – he’s not doing it. And then he . . . feel[s] guilty or ashamed, that sort of thing . . . makes him silent . . . Because the teacher[s] . . . didn’t know you . . . they can’t connect.

(Htwe Htwe, Conversation 1, p.2)

Htwe Htwe recounted the story of four Burmese boys playing cooking and making a bowl of ‘food’ as an example of her bicultural knowledge brokering the cultural knowledges for the boys and teacher.

Four Burmese boys playing together . . . three boys cooking . . . in a bowl nicely with a stick as a spoon. So they put it together on a tray and they give it to the [fourth] boy. The boy is sitting on a chair. So they . . . very respect [fully] . . . give to the boy and . . . he just take[s] the bowl and he just walk[s] off . . . [The teacher] . . . thought oh, these three boys just work together to make the sand and everything in a bowl, very nice, and he’s just [a] bully and take[s] it away from them . . . as soon as they heard [the scolding] it got so scary for them. I asked . . . they say ‘no, this is playing like in our temple’ so . . . he’s a monk . . . So [the] monk is going to be eating first and he needs to be respected . . . after he finished . . . they can have it. So they prepare . . . for him and he’s special. He can take whenever he wants . . . they’re playing their cultural way, they talk in their own language.

(Htwe Htwe, Conversation 1, p.3)

Ideologies / knowledge of bilingual development

A bilingual teacher’s cultural and theoretical knowledges and status amongst colleagues and community is vital for bilingual activity to flourish. Htwe Htwe theorised:

I’m a secondary school teacher in Burma, so I know . . . Burma education and how to teach children . . . [t]he Burmese family understand. So I learn here and I just make it balance . . . our Burmese way and here . . . compare it, and explain to the parents what the education is like here for ECE. So it is very important that I should be qualified. I need the knowledge . . . the theory knowledge
Significant bilingual pedagogical actions

and the curriculum...
(Htwe Htwe, Conversation 1, p.3)

Htwe Htwe recounted how her prior knowledge and experience provided stories as guidance for colleagues to understand the role h/c languages play in settling children, and to build relationships for participation in learning.

...Teacher’s role is...you need to help settle the child first...with the language – they come close, they’re going to play and they’re going to be happier and they can grow up with their full bilingual...Experience teaches us so...yes making sense with the children – ‘they’re okay, they’re happy’, ‘oh yes, Auntie Htwe – she knows what I’m saying’.
(Htwe Htwe, Conversation 3, p.3)

Htwe Htwe declared that any time was the right time for h/c language use and viewed languages as communication tools for fostering cultures, mediating identity, and learning. Bilingual activity, she stated, required constant modelling and ideological guidance in a society that values monolingual education.

...Through the language we have knowledge about our culture...we’re going to keep the language as well as the culture [they’re] all relating...I like all the family and children...to be educated...to be a good family and...get into this society (good citizen)...Also in the centre [for] other families to use their own language, and other staff member[s] to just use their language...some Burmese...think there are other people around so we need to use the English. But...[then recognise] I’m okay to use it because Auntie Htwe is using it.
(Htwe Htwe, Conversation 2, p.10)

...Some parents thought English is more important for learning...Some bi-lingual teachers, they know the language but they don’t use it...because they’re not very confident to use it...But for me, I just use it, and I’m just showing how easy it is [to] communicate.
(Htwe Htwe, Conversation 1, p.6)
Htwe Htwe spoke of bilingual actions informed by theories of learning and bilingualism, narrating stories of children and a teacher code-switching as a way to get to cognitive engagement and intersubjectivity.

...They talk to me in English...I speak English, and then the Burmese language again... So we’re not correcting, we just appreciate that they are speaking to us. They’re just trying to communicate and so we’re not stopping that. That communication makes it flow and it makes friendships and makes a positive [learning] environment.

(Htwe Htwe, Conversation 3, p.5)

Representing community

Htwe Htwe believed languages and heritage speak of identity and spoke of positioning herself as representing her Burmese community. She guided all teachers, families and children to feel confident to practice cultural activities, to wear traditional clothes, attend to spiritual and cultural teachings and use their languages. Graduation, according to Htwe Htwe, offered opportunities for being proud of achievements and to represent the whole community as a qualified Burmese teacher.

...I’m going to wear my Burmese costume...and when all the people come and see ‘oh, it’s a Burmese lady graduating in ECE’. So I’m going to [be] proud of myself as a Burmese...the traditional costume is very rare and so is very special. It’s showing that I am a Burmese...a Burmese Early Childhood teacher.

(Htwe Htwe, Conversation 2, p.11)

Htwe Htwe spoke of merging her traditional values of respect and valuing of education with current ideas from early years education study. She acknowledged that her bilingual pedagogical actions indicated to families what was appropriate and valued in the ECE service. Her responsibilities as a community representative and as an ECE teacher were informed by theory and currency of practice and additionally by her experiences with dominating societies.

Volunteer...[are]...applying for Early Childhood diploma or certificate...so it’s good to get more bilingual teachers ...so we
can encourage everyone to use the bilingual language and home language. I have to be the best, then they will follow I’m... need[ed] to be strong... I need to be a role model for my daughter and also a role model for our community people
(Htwe Htwe Conversation 2, p.12)

Policy, pedagogy and affirming self

Htwe Htwe spoke of her roles as bilingual teacher and cultural broker / bridge, interpreter and community representative. She initiated policy shifts and strategies to support families and children to promote bilingual identities in the education system:

...Now we’re doing the transition time for the children – 5 years old – we just go with them so I can translate to them, and the parents also have more confidence to go into the school, talk to the teacher, so it makes more sense to them.
(Htwe Htwe, Conversation 1, p.5).

Htwe Htwe agreed that knowledge and experiences informed her community education for women and children, and she oriented families towards bilingual and bicultural social activity so as to be beneficial for citizenship.

I’ve got a big involvement... children... see me at the temple at the community events. I’m just modelling... [for] Burmese [children] to get enjoyment in our events and our traditional culture. And also I just educate them [parents] to learn... how we going to stay in this new society... [through] workshop[s] or meeting.
(Htwe Htwe, Conversation 1, p.5)

She talked of herself as teacher/informer promoting her language, identity and community to educate teachers and to raise awareness of the other.

I... wanted them to know I’m from Burma... this is my mother language. If you didn’t say it... they wouldn’t know... they want to know where you are from and how you say things in the home language.
(Htwe Htwe, Conversation 3, p.7)
The interrelationship between h/c language use and identity emerged in her metaphorical story of language as the food to nourish a community, conveying to parents and teachers her compassionate intentions and the rightness of bilingual pedagogical actions. She advised that taking on a new language must never be rushed.

...The language is like food – like we’re eating our traditional food, it’s so tasty and so delicious ...feel full. If you go to a foreign country the food is totally different...okay, you need to eat, you’re hungry you just feed up but you’re not satisfied and feel like [it’s] not enough or something’s missed out. And the food that you are eating is not your food – it makes you full but [not satisfied] ...build up [with the new food] not...rushed...we have our traditional food stores and we go there and we have a lot...tasteful and filling so after...we have our food...try the foreign food...yes, it’s going to be okay. So the language...it’s like the food.

(Htwe Htwe, Conversation 1, p.4)

MF’s story of bilingual pedagogical actions

MF spoke of being a member of a Niuean Pacific Island community group where language is endangered and how bilingual activity was vital for language retention. She shared her history of challenging experiences as a Niuean speaking child in New Zealand schools. These informed her bilingual pedagogical actions in an English medium ECE service and now as a registered teacher many responsibilities required decisions about her language use and identity. Knowledge of language and identity, who she is and her place in her own community had most significance. MF recounted the value of language for identity as this was part of her pedagogy because of a history with parents who spoke only Niuean. She lived with having to confront the discourses of English only for schooling success and said she owed her Niuean fluency to her parents’ insistence that the Niuean language only was spoken at home. MF spoke of a strong bilingual identity that honoured her family heritage and elders and also gave her status in the community.

[Language]...it’s part of where I come from. I suppose I’m quite lucky because mum and dad are always speaking to me in Niuean
and I manage to keep it going... I came from Niue when I was about five or six years old.
(MF, conversation 1 p.3)

...It was expected I’d speak Niuean at home and then when I’m at school I’m expected to speak English... I feel it would be awkward if they are [Mum and Dad] speaking to me in Niuean and I reply back in English... I think it would be quite rude too... It is about respect as well...especially with the elders, isn’t it?... I would put it [fluency] down to Mum and Dad. Their strength and their belief...value your culture and who you are.
(MF, conversation 1, p.8–12)

Representing community and self

MF spoke of negotiating her position as a representative of the broader community of families with Pacific Island heritages. Pasifika parents sought her out, rather than her colleagues, when they were concerned about their child, because they experienced an affinity with her through the respect for or use of Niuean language.

I’m representing our community so I think it is important to maintain ethical behaviour, upholding the professional standards, being friendly and approachable but maintaining your professionalism... Confidentiality of the children and the parents, what they discuss stays in the centre but also keep head teacher informed so she knows what’s going on... When you’re talking to Niueans...you are aware of what you’re saying, you don’t discuss others...keeping it in confidence and that’s a major issue...the Niuean community is really small. Everybody knows everybody. So it’s not pressure or anything...it’s just how you handle it. Be discreet. It is hard though.
(MF, conversation 2, p.7 & 8)

The ECE service and Niuean communities overlapped and MF found herself being recognised as fluent, which she said, made her proud of her bilingual identity.

Yeah it makes me feel proud that I can actually speak my own language, I can keep it alive and teach it to the children...it helps
with the children as well as for the parents. I can contribute my language. that others certainly can’t speak. It’s putting myself out there really. Trying to make the families comfortable it just comes naturally.
(MF, conversation 3, p.3)

However, MF explained, traditional respect protocols must also be followed, in order to uphold a teacher’s status. Children who use ‘aunty’ are advised to use her name.

…but ‘It’s Aunt MF’… I think for me it won’t be that respectful I would think if they start calling me aunty. aunt will be like home.
(MF, Conversation 3, p. 14)

Because elders play an important part. I think that plays a big part because if you lose the language you’re losing part of yourself, you lose your culture really. Yes. it’s all about expectations isn’t it. about identity who you are and where you come from really.
(MF, Conversation 1, p.6 & 7)

MF talked of her teacher status and professional commitments and positioned herself as teacher in her own community, aware of the complexities and responsibilities of teacher status in two cultures.

You carry the whole weight on your shoulders. But. because my mum is quite well known and now she tells everybody how proud she is of me, and what I’ve gained [teacher registration].
(MF, Conversation 3, p.8)

She spoke proudly of being one of the few registered Niuean bilingual teachers working in English medium settings.

Professional standards. maintaining it and confidentiality that’s a biggie. I’m aware. of my responsibility to the community, to the parents and whanau, to the children and to other professionals so it’s a huge thing isn’t it. I also feel I’ve stepped up because I’m fully registered. I actually feel good, a big achievement.
(MF, Conversation 2, p.15)
I got through it all... it was challenging... My mum has got so much confidence in me. You need that support... you need to have someone say you can do that... [be bilingual] I think you’d lose your heart as to where you are really... because that’s your identity. It’s who you are.
(MF, Conversation 3, p.13 & 16)

Policy and pedagogy

MF said she included her Niuean culture and language and the value of bilingual activity in her pedagogy in her registration folder and the mentoring teacher commented that her promotion of children’s languages was a good idea.

In my appraisal as well... [I wrote of] how I like to promote children’s language, their culture in the centre... show[ing] that you are proud... that you are Niuean. We’re just a tiny dot on the map. Sometimes we’re not even there, that’s how small we are.
(MF, Conversation 2, p.10 &11)

Yes, I think that plays a big part because if you lose the language you’re losing part of yourself, you lose your culture really... It would be about identity. It would be about who you are and where you come from really.
(MF, Conversation 1, p.7)

MF acknowledged that many Pasifika families struggled to maintain their h/c language and cultural identities/heritages in the past and spoke of strategies that respected parents.

Well we do have a few Niuean families and when they come I make a point of speaking Niuean to them. I feel it just makes them feel more welcomed and just like ‘them’. I’m not ‘up there’ I’m just the same level as them. I feel it would make [the centre] more approachable and I’d be more approachable that way. And it keeps my language going. It’s good practise for my language as well.
(MF, Conversation 1, p1)
5. FINDINGS: STORIES OF LIVED EXPERIENCES

...Promoting...children’s languages in the centre...[with] language books...seeing their own language...in print. It gives them that sense of belonging and they love it...parents just come and sit down and read...just looking...gives...them that sense of belonging the writing, [in] their language...culture books, like hair cutting ceremonies... Some boys...have grown their hair and I have to explain to them that’s because they’re going to have hair cutting ceremony... I do need to explain it to teachers because they’re not aware of hair cutting ceremonies.

(MF, Conversation 2, p.12)

Ideologies / knowledge of bilingual development

MF said she confronted the complexities of most Pasifika communities’ range of fluencies in h/c languages. Often viewpoints on bilingualism and their responses to use of heritage languages were negative as many parents were not allowed to use h/c languages in the New Zealand or the Niuean education system and remained monolingual.

...you don’t want to be like you’re pushing it... You’ve got to think is that going to be comfortable with them or not? How are they going to take that? [Being] sensitive to how the children respond...also the parents as well. Then there’s that role model...to think about it all the time... How I behave – that’s such a big issue.

(MF, Conversation 1, p.7)

MF said it was not enough simply to be bilingual, as beliefs about the value of maintaining h/c languages had to be negotiated through knowledge of resources, practices and theory. She relied on her experiences as a language learner and on subject knowledge gained from her study.

...First language is the most valuable and I support children’s first language when they come to kindy. They...soon pick up English but it’s their first language that would suffer... We...invite parents to come and read a language book during last mat time...we’ve had Tongan...Samoan [and]...I get to read...a Niuean story.

(MF, Conversation 1, p.12).
Significant bilingual pedagogical actions

... I’m still talking to children in Niuean... One of the children, sitting on the mat... [teacher] was doing a cooking experiment with them and he [the child] just turned around and said to me ‘MF can I have an inu’. Inu is the drink and I said of course you can go and have a drink. (MF, Conversation 2, p.2 & 4)

I’ve started... Niuean language Learning Stories... I know that parents can speak Niuean and... included their language in their Learning Stories - just something simple... and the mum understands it. Yes, they love it. (MF, Conversation 1, p.3).

MF spoke of how both her knowledge of bilingual development theory as well as her teacher status enabled her to undertake the role of bilingual guide for Pasifika New Zealand born parents who were not fluent in their heritage languages.

... You’ve got to be confident in your own language anyway, in your first language, to be able to learn another language... maybe it’s been forced really, the English had been forced onto some children. (MF, Conversation 1, p.8 & 9)

MF spoke of negotiating challenges when colleagues had different views about bilingual activity. She referred to the tension of the commitment to being respectful and yet to use her h/c language spontaneously, and to be herself when teaching.

Speaking Niue... it comes naturally when families come in... when children hear my language I think that it demonstrates that it is okay for them to use their own language at the centre as well. I mean there’s nothing wrong with speaking your own language. It’s a way of communicating especially with people who’ve got English as a second language. (MF, Conversation 2, p.1).

Yes it’s a commitment that I have to the children and of course the parents and whanau and then there’s the whole community. I
think the big thing there is the respect I have, especially respect for parents; [and] they’re going to do that to you in return.
(MF, Conversation 3, p. 7)

Shelley’s story of bilingual pedagogical actions

Shelley provided insights into her bilingual pedagogical actions using Sign (her version/dialect of NZSL) as an early childhood teacher stating communication for learning and meaning-making lay at the heart of her work. She shared the background stimulus for her use of Sign and spoke of earlier work with an ECE service community that included deaf community members. Ethical concerns, she said, over communication barriers with such families were overcome by her elective uptake of ‘Sign’. She noted that this suited her personal preference for multi modal communication and kinaesthetic learning.

[I] have a slight receptive language disorder that I’ve acknowledged, but I’m more kinetic than aural. I’m a visual learner so I find aural languages quite difficult to do... It started because I felt as a teacher I should be able to communicate with... parents because they tried so hard and were so patient with me when I didn’t get it, because even when I learnt the alphabet... that finger spelling does not help you.
(Shelley, Conversation 1, p.1 & 4)

Sign language as a bridge to meaning making

Shelley spoke most often of the socio cultural theories and ideas that informed her focus on inter subjectivity and explained that using Sign demanded deeper meaning making.

Inter subjective connecting is long lasting and impacts upon a child’s set of tools for meaning making... that whole connection, very expressive. There’s an overlapping between the signing and the puppetry, and the story telling.
(Shelley, Conversation 1, p.7)

So when I do the puppet shows and I’ll say ‘I’ll pick a puppet’ and I have a sign for each puppet – the three year olds just know every
Significant bilingual pedagogical actions

Shelley talked of experiences in identifying children with communication challenges.

...Sign language is a bridge for children with English as an additional language ... and a really big bridge ... with children who have got receptive language disorders ... they'll often instinctively sign ... to kinaesthetically do it ... children can learn to ask, at nine months ... through gesture, they can sign it ... Children who have [a] hearing [problem] that isn’t identified ... are affected by background noise.

(Shelley, conversation 1, p.1-3)

Shelley recounted the dramatic shift in articulation and communication for some children, such as a child from a Pacific Island family.

...He loved the sign language so much ... she [mother] said to him one day ... ‘go next door to get something from ... uncle’s.’ ... [As] it was quite late he said he couldn’t and he signed ‘it was far too, too, dark and he was too scared’ ... He felt he could actually get his message across far stronger than saying ‘I don’t want to do it’.

(Shelley, Conversation 1, p.1)

Shelley reported that the feedback shows Sign is valued.

[W]e often get asked what are you doing for other cultures ... we’re just being ourselves ... We talk about capable children ... these children trust us, they have a dialogue with us, they get to know us like we get to know them, we share a lot of ourselves.

(Shelley, Conversation 2, p.6)
I think relationships and integrity of listening [are supported]...like when I’m story telling ...it becomes very powerful ...children anticipating and adding things. If I’m signing something...children actually understand...[and] start to ‘read’ what I’m going to sign...becom[ing] like a two-way thing...[an] integration.
(Shelley, Conversation 2, p.3)

Ideologies / knowledge of bilingual development

Shelley explained that knowledge from training as a teacher of the Deaf and earlier experiences with the Deaf community became integrated into a multi sensory or kinaesthetic pedagogical approach that legitimised use of ‘Sign’ with all children.

I think it’s tuning into an instinctive way of children learning and making meaning...adds a level of excitement... It’s just an extension of making sense of the world. Sign language is so dramatic; it’s a whole body language...the adjectives are almost done by the body, so what better [way] for 3 and 4 year olds to learn to communicate than through an expressive body language.
(Shelley, Conversation 1, p.1 & 6)

Shelley spoke of pedagogical ideas and practices that identify connecting and deepening meaning making as being aligned with seeing children from the Deaf community and their language as a bilingual.

...It’s the pedagogy around the connection with meaning ...communication ...there’s a lot of research that says...bilingual children have more opportunity to make meaning. They’ve got cognitive structures in place to search for meaning...and work almost at a meta level... Stories [I tell]...children are connected quite closely with the communication tools. They can talk about their communication tools... It heightens their understanding that what they’re using is a language...most children don’t realise they’re speaking English or whatever but...their understanding that language can be spoken or a language can be like this...as if they are bilingual... Children say, ‘what did she say?’ They understand there’s another way of saying something using another language.
(Shelley, Conversation 3, p.4 & 5)
Shelley articulated justifications for use of Sign as an inclusive practice or bridge for meaning making for all children as well as for the Deaf community.

...It's a really wonderful bridge to those young children coming in... when I sign a story... it captures the visual learners, the kinaesthetic learners... and still covers the aural learners because there's an anticipation with the signs and they get a buzz... They're 3 years old and they will remember them [signs] the next day... Of course young children with deaf parents have to take on a huge responsibility as often they're interpreter for their families... If families don't learn to sign that [deaf] child is actually isolated from their own family.

(Shelley, Conversation 2, p.1 & 4)

\textit{Policy and practices}

Shelley insisted that her integration of sign language into her everyday curriculum meant that she positioned herself as a user of two languages. She talked of the culture of her ECE service as being dominated by the mediation processes involved in using several modes and many visual and oral texts endorsed by her spontaneous use of sign.

[For] Sign Language Week... I said remember... you know... not clapping because they can't hear but... I did a whole mat with my voice off and they had to lip read with my signs. It's the quietest mat time we've had for a long time because there was just silence, utter silence.

(Shelley, conversation 3, p.5)

Shelly spoke of advocating for Sign through her use of a pedagogical approach that focused on mediation of meaning. Her personal identity as ‘bilingual’ she believed countered the discourses of disability and monolinguality in ECE services.

...I use it because sometimes something in sign language is just perfect.

(Shelley, Conversation 2, p.3)

Shelley recounted that teachers from the Primary sector in a workshop on storytelling and Sign said they could not deal with children who didn’t answer
their questions or contribute and asked how evidence of ‘silent’ children’s knowledge emerged in Learning Stories.

Believing ‘those children have no language,’ . . . she [a teacher] said ‘How do you know . . . about their wonderful mathematical skills and this and that, when they don’t answer a question?’ I said ‘because I watched them’.

(Shelley, Conversation 3, p.17)

Shelley reported that English-only literacy activities were often debated and that her personal identity as a ‘bilingual’ Signer worked to counter discourses that advocated that reading and writing only in English made for school success. Shelley said this narrowed opportunity for deep meaning making at a meta level and talked of children’s fascination with using a symbol system triggered through Sign. She recounted examples of children’s exploration of the alphabet and phonemic patterns stimulated by Sign.

... [The children]... not so interested with the alphabet but they’re hooked into the numbers on the sign language and 100 and really hooked into . . . in the numbers side of it and if I’m story telling and I don’t sign it’s really lacking to them now.

(Shelley, Conversation 3, p.2)

... [The child] starts signing the letter she thinks it might start with and then she starts sounding it out. So she’ll see something and then go I think that might be an ‘h’ or it’s got an ‘h’ in it . . . Half the time she doesn’t realise she’s signing it. Then she starts sounding it out so it goes relationship, sign, sound. And because of the phonetic hook on finger spelling does for spelling.

(Shelley, Conversation 3, p.6)

Shelley emphasised that stories and storying in multi-modes sat at the heart of all communication for teaching and learning.

When you have two possibilities, when you have two languages if you like . . . you get opportunity for a deeper connection with the children.

(Shelley, Conversation 3, p.1)
Summary

I have briefly reviewed the findings from research conducted with five bilingual teachers and through analysis have identified the key frames or themes from the conversations and narrative data. Categories or dimensions of bilingual pedagogical actions resulting from coding are described and illustrated with examples taken from transcripts. The relative significance of these dimensions and emerging frames or themes are taken from rating the frequency of a teacher’s bilingual pedagogical actions. These identified and individualised results are presented for each participant teacher. The twelve bilingual pedagogical actions documented provide evidence for a deeper inquiry into the features and affordances of h/c language use that may mediate a distinctive bilingual identity for each teacher. The profiles from participant teachers’ conversations indicated individual patterns of significant bilingual pedagogical actions within common frames of Ideologies / knowledge about bilingual development, Cultural brokering or bridging, Pedagogy and policy, and Meaning making that appeared as sites for identity work. Opportunities for mediating bilingual identities for children appeared possible in the stories of ‘lived experiences’. The rich data is opened up for further interpretation through reference to research and the theoretical views of identities, bilingualism pedagogy and mediation presented earlier in the literature review. In the following Chapter Six, the ways that the five participant teachers use their languages will be discussed to foreground the processes that mediate bilingual identities for teachers. This discussion will also suggest the opportunities teachers create for mediating children’s bilingual identities.
5. Findings: Stories of Lived Experiences
Chapter 6

DISCUSSION

The research question for this study required an account of the ways in which bilingual teachers use their languages in English medium settings. The associated questions asked how these ways of using language might mediate bilingual identities for bilingual teachers and provide opportunities for mediating children’s bilingual identities.

In the previous chapter I presented a discussion of the qualitative data generated from the collaborative analysis and category coding of the conversations with the five bilingual teachers. An integration of categories provided evidence of the significance for teachers of specific activities. Significant activities emerged as four common frames or themes for the bilingual pedagogical activity (BPA) for each of the five participants. These frames were: Ideologies / knowledge about bilingual development, Pedagogy and policy, Cultural brokering or bridging, and Meaning making.

In this chapter these frames are interrogated in light of socio-political theories and evidence from research as a way to gain insights into the mediation of bilingual teachers’ bilingual identities. Insights into the mediating processes activated with children and families leads to identification of possible opportunities for mediating bilingual identities for bilingual children. The findings are discussed under the frames in the hierarchy of significance, to tease out the inter-connections between language activity and identity processes.

Talking with teachers about the ways they use their languages revealed the idiosyncrasies of the cultural and linguistic patterns of relationships within each ECE service. Dimensions or categories identified as actions give a sense of the interactive and contextualised nature of these activities (Lingard, 2010).
The findings reveal that ideological constructs as mental processes inform bilingual pedagogical practices (BPA) and occur significantly throughout each teachers’ conversations and stories of practices. These constructs or mental processes are considered as distinct dimensions but are embedded in the BPA’s in this study. As Stetsenko and Arievitch (2004) argue “Making choices, taking moral stances and other so-called ‘mental processes’ can and should themselves be conceptualized as activities (Arievitch, 2003) through which people position themselves among other people and vis-à-vis important, and inevitably moral, matters of life” (p.496).

Bilingual pedagogical action frames

Ideologies: Knowing about bilingualism

In the conversations that constitute the data for this study every bilingual teacher shared her ideological beliefs about bilingualism. The place of h/c languages in English medium settings and talk of ideologies emerged as the most commonly occurring frame or theme. Findings show that key ideologies include beliefs that: language is central to identity; languages are necessary for participation in and access to cultural community and to preserve cultural traditions; a strong h/c language is necessary for child’s learning before taking up schooling in English. Participants viewed access to and use of h/c languages as an ethical commitment and each endorsed an additive bilingual approach (Baker, 2006; Cummins, 2001b).

Data indicated that ideologies about bilingual development that affirmed the centrality of languages to identities and cultures were the most significant frame for four of the five teachers, with the fifth teacher considering ideologies as significant only. Given the diversity of languages, ECE services and teaching experiences of the participant teachers, the emergence of ideological views as the most significant frame or theme was unexpected. Literature reviewed earlier indicates concerns about the lack of teachers’ knowledge about bilingualism. Franken, May and McComish (2008) and May, Hill and Tiakiwai (2004) stipulate that teachers’ knowledge about bilingualism constrains bilingual children’s access to h/c languages and that deficit views of a bilingual child’s possible achievements result from poor knowledge and an acceptance of monolingual discourses. Norton (2010) advises that it is the policy makers and teachers’ ideologies about languages that dictate what is
Bilingual pedagogical action frames

possible for children, teachers and bilingual assistants.

Promoting bilingualism

Four of the bilingual teachers spoke of initiating or participating in discussions with parents and colleagues regarding maintenance of h/c languages; “... when we get to know the parents and they become comfortable with me, I do tend to talk to them about the importance of home language” (Anu, conversation 1, p. 2). They confronted views such as bilingualism as harmful for learning, as well as views that position the child as a learner of English only and not as a speaker of two languages who participates in two linguistic communities. Jones-Diaz, (2007) identified the view of the child as a learner of English as contributing to the deficit view of a child’s competencies. Three bilingual teachers recalled their own painful experiences as learners of English and each of these felt that accessing and using theory, knowledge and histories of bilingual development provided power and authoritative explanations. “... I just explain to parents about the language learning and sometimes I even photocopy some articles ... to give to parents to read so they will understand okay this opinion is from experts” (Fiona, Conversation 2, p. 6).

It seemed that considerable ideological reflection was employed by these bilingual teachers to justify their position as promoters and models of h/c languages. Bourdieu (1977) argued that the linguistic habitus and cultural capital each child brings to an educational setting or social field are the tools for making meaning and negotiating some cultural capital that gives the child access to power. If the social field excludes h/c linguistic habitus, privileging English only, then disempowerment and questioning of the home cultural capital may occur. A teacher’s BPA may disrupt the normalised discourse regarding English only for success. Well-attested theory emerged as a ‘safe’ and strong platform for teachers who negotiate the use of h/c languages in an English-speaking milieu. Jones-Diaz (2007) reported that children and teachers in her study spoke of the impact of the teachers’ beliefs and actions. Rejection of problematic linguistic and cultural identities from home as Jones-Diaz (2007) discovered, can mean that children opt for less troublesome and ‘Anglicised’ identities.

The data indicated that the bilingual teachers take an ethical stance in relation to discourses that promote monolingualism, as each works with a ‘bilingual discursive identity’. Bilingual teacher/participants do engage this
discursive identity, modelling and arguing for bilingualism or use of Sign language. Gee (2000) advised that this identity perspective can be ascribed or achieved through deliberate marshalling of resources. As Fiona says, “I believe when you feel proud inside you can show people how confident you are [using h/c language] and people will see from your face . . . from your action” (Fiona, Conversation 2, p.8). Htwe Htwe urged bilingual teachers to use their languages. “…they know the language but they don’t use it . . . because they’re not very confident to use it . . . But for me, I just use it, and I’m just showing how easy it is” (Htwe Htwe, Conversation 1, p.6). Such modelling must open up the ‘linguistic market’ (Bourdieu, 1977) for speakers of the teacher’s language/s and for the teacher herself, recognised as a bilingual teacher who strengthens bilingual identity activity (Holland et al. 1998).

**Teacher status**

The data included a subscript of ‘teacher status’ as a strong platform for talk and action. Respect for the role of teacher appeared very important for four teachers, as Fiona suggests “…you need to show them okay I’m not just like baby sitter. No not at all. I’m a teacher. I’m here to educate and care for your children and also for parents, probably sometimes took a while for them to accept the different bilingual teacher…” (Fiona, Conversation 3, p.2). The notion of an ‘institutional identity’ perspective (Gee, 2000, p.103), means dialogue and teacher discourses accord status and respect, adding power for the teachers’ position in an English medium setting and legitimising teachers BPA. The ‘qualified’ status appeared important in studies by Conteh (2007) and Cable et al. (2009) as bilingual assistants identified that without a teaching qualification they lacked power and influence. Jones-Diaz (2007) found in her community study that ‘unqualified’ practitioners lacked power and influence. Mara (2005) noted that qualified Pasifika teachers are highly sought after in New Zealand.

**Close relationships**

The findings indicated that close relationships with bilingual children developed as aspects of identity are called into being through consistent use of h/c language. Gee (2000) refers to this perspective as an ‘affinity identity’ where allegiances are chosen, resulting in closer relationships through shared
h/c languages and small stories of practices. Htwe Htwe, Fiona and MF ‘feel’ this affinity and closeness. “One little girl . . . didn’t come for two weeks last term before we finish, she came back today . . . she [the mother] said to me, ‘I want to go back. Come back . . . I miss MF, I want to go see MF and I think she misses me too mum.’ ” (MF, Conversation 3, p.9). Cable et al. (2009) reported close relationships between child and bilingual teaching assistants when heightened engagement with the child occurs. Bilingual pedagogical activity in close relationships can involve dialogue over ideological practices with others and reflects an individual but fluid agency that may provide mediating processes for sustaining bilingual identities for teachers. As a consequence this could reinforce h/c language use by family and child and build bilingual subjectivities (Holland et al. 1998). The reciprocal nature of this as suggested by Arendt (1978) incurs a distributed agency with families.

**Prior experiences**

A final finding in relation to the *Ideologies* frame is the impact of prior experiences. Each teacher brought as language learner and settler who found a place in an ‘others’ community. Four teachers referred to their personal experiences of settling, of retaining h/c languages and of taking on the monolingual system. The fifth spoke of early challenges as a learner in the narrow education system. The significance of teacher status then appeared as a coherence point for integrating theory with prior experiences. “...I’ve been through the hard times and now I can see some parents, also children now they’re at that stage so I just want to help them” (Fiona, conversation 2, p. 3). Taylor et al. (2008) discovered that bilingual teachers developed closeness to children when sharing their own histories with children and families. The findings showed that personal experiences of being ‘othered’, of not quite fitting in, provoked inquiry into ideologies about languages. Lack of trust was still common for two teachers as Fiona, says, ‘...some people . . . first time [meeting a bilingual teacher] they won’t trust you but when they see . . . [my practices] . . .” (Fiona, Conversation 2, p.8).

**Pedagogy and policy**

The second frame emerging from findings showed evidence of each teacher devising a bilingual pedagogy and strategies informed by ideologies regarding
bilingual processes to guide their actions. Strategies and associated rationale were referenced consistently in the bilingual teachers’ talk of everyday practices, particularly in the dimension of settling processes.

Settling, belonging and trust

The bilingual teachers viewed the child as member of a family and community, and as the findings showed, PBA are vital for establishing relationships with family that ensure trust and a sense of belonging in the ECE service Community. “It's not just because you’re there that this child’s going to suddenly be improved in their language - you’re using your teacher knowledge and your strategies and the understanding about what it means to transition from one culture to another . . .” (Htwe Htwe, Conversation 3, p.3).

Strategies for settling were a significant dimension of this frame for three teachers. Anu, Htwe Htwe and Fiona had instigated settling policies with particular repertoires for working alongside a bilingual family and child. The teachers talked of feeling for the child and family and referenced their own personal experiences. Bilingual praxis (knowledge and BPA) used for connection and to ‘story’ the child’s learning progress seemed to establish trust. “Yes, when the parent and you have a little chat and they see your smiling face “oh, this is not dangerous - I can trust this person” . . . It’s very important that trust is there.” (Fiona, Conversation 1, p.3). Four of the teachers had strategies for enrolments and settling using h/c languages and reported a heightened awareness to the ‘unsettled’ family. “…When the children have really got upset, they do need someone who looks like them . . . and speaks like them . . . someone who’ll understand. So it makes them feel comfortable.” (Fiona, Conversation 1, p.2).

Anu initiates home visits for unsettled children in an effort to establish relationships and trust. The teachers’ stories indicated that building trust through affective ‘listening’ responses in h/c languages with children and parents was vital. “Because it’s a big thing for the family, not only for the children - for the family these transition times. The settling time - it can take a long time to settle” (Htwe Htwe conversation 3, p.2). Trust, shared learning histories, often as anecdotal small stories about a child and a critically reflective stance informed the core of three teachers’ pedagogical approaches (Cummins, 2001; Giroux, 1993). Shelley stated that it is important to close the gap between theory and practice, “We talk about capable children . . . these
children trust us, they have a dialogue with us, they get to know us like we get to know them, we share a lot of ourselves” (Shelley, Conversation 2, p.6). Ritchie and Rau (2009) and Li, Chiou and Lee (2007) write of the psychological and spiritual effects of distrust, when language and culture are ignored. Gerrity (2003) confirms that trusting relationships through knowing the child and sharing everyday stories establishes a complementarity between family and centre for learning and teaching.

Advocacy and mediation

Each teacher played a significant role as an advocate for bilingual families or the Deaf Community as well as for the use of h/c languages. “Yes, taking longer to cope and to fit in know the centre, and ‘why do they do this and that?’ - they don’t know. And some teachers are too busy to advocate. What’s their background? What’s their language? What’s their cultural way of doing this or that?” (Htwe Htwe, Conversation 2, p.7). As Cable et al., (2009) identified, advocacy for bilingual families was a central task of the bilingual assistants. Conteh (2007) found that bilingual teachers had to work hard to counter negative attitudes towards bilingualism. Htwe Htwe, Anu and Shelley provided professional development for colleagues regarding bilingual activity with children as part of their advocacy. Fiona and MF worked to inform members of their teaching team of the advantages of bilingualism and went beyond ‘celebrations of culture’ to take up a position as an advocate for bilingualism (Giroux, 2006).

Stories of the complexities and tensions that existed for some teachers who positioned themselves as the central contact for a bilingual child/ren and h/c language speaking family involved confronting the ‘naturalised’ monolingual approaches that misrecognise linguistic interdependence as dependence (Barron, 2007). A bilingual child could prefer the teacher who speaks her h/c language and may appear ‘dependent’ upon the h/c language teacher. Fiona and Htwe Htwe and Anu spoke of colleagues and sometimes parents voicing concerns about this ‘problematic dependency’. Jones-Diaz (2007) found in her study, children without h/c language support and differentiated guidance in h/c language developed a preference for monolingual identities resulting in poor retention of h/c language.

Shelley, Anu and Htwe Htwe present their credentials as experienced and powerful teachers who counter resistance to apparently differentiated linguistic
support with stories from practice and well articulated ideologies (Bamberg, 2004; Bruner, 1986). They spoke of initiating policies for transitions from home to schools, and the employment of bilingual teachers or linguistically sensitive adults as part of an ethical commitment to families. Giroux (1993) proposed that any critical work undertaken in educational settings requires not only individual action (using h/c language) but also a commitment to take social action. He charged teachers to step into the perspectives of ‘others’ to initiate and provision ethical environments.

MF identified that the role of the bilingual teacher required professional sensitivity in terms of questions from Niuean parents, in and out of the ECE service. Mediation involves critical pedagogical moments (Pennycook, 2004) such as Fiona dealing with a teacher who doesn’t approve of home languages or Htwe Htwe dealing with the teacher who misunderstood the boys’ ‘temple’ play. Critically reflective stopping points and exploration of pedagogical responses can lead the teacher to position herself as employing a bilingual praxis using contextualised linguistic and pedagogical knowledge in action. ‘Political frames’ and societal discourses about languages of colleagues or parents led to each teacher appearing to ‘authorise’ her beliefs and practices through reference to ideologies, professional principles and ethics. Lingard (2010) sees knowledge and ethics as the foundation for pedagogies of difference that do not ‘fear difference’.

**Teacher status**

Countering contention invoked a dimension in this frame that indicated teacher status was often in the foreground. Norton (2010) and Cummins (2001, 2009) argue that access to power enables ‘bilingual identities’, viewing language as both location and tool for defining and contesting relationships of power. Shelley initiated using Sign with hearing children, as a way of mediating learning and promoted the pedagogical justifications. Anu, as leader, modelled her achievement and status as an effective multilingual teacher consistently promoting h/c language use. “It’s almost like doing two jobs. It’s the teaching aspect and then the aspect of actually promoting the home languages [here] and in other centres” (Anu, Conversation 1, p.10). Small stories of prior experiences as a bilingual teacher indicated that Anu was confident modelling three languages and commanding resources, as she spoke of orchestrating access for teachers and parents to use their h/c languages.
Htwe Htwe and MF also made use of prior experiences and the hard won status of being a teacher in New Zealand. “Its showing that I . . . a Burmese Early Childhood teacher” (Htwe Htwe, Conversation 2, p.11), and MF shared “I got through it all . . . it was challenging. I have known of some Niueans who are teaching in Niue . . . go on to absolutely different jobs . . . the study is too hard” (MF, conversation 3 p.13). Cable et al. (2009) and Conteh and Brock (2010) found that the ‘qualified teacher status’ gave bilingual teachers more power than bilingual assistants when negotiating a position alongside English speaking teachers.

**Social and linguistic agents**

Two teachers reported on border crossing points where they actively initiated a shift in ECE service practices in assessment. Teacher status legitimised the use of h/c languages and Learning Stories for colleagues, family and child as vital for opening communication and learning. “[S]ome bi-lingual teachers, they know the language but they don’t use it . . . because they’re not very confident to use it . . . But for me, I just use it, and I’m just showing how easy it is.” (Htwe Htwe, Conversation 1, p.6). Current evidence shows the poor uptake of bilingual assessments in Learning Stories despite excellent models (Stuart et al., 2008). Four teachers spoke of authentic and respectful Learning Stories through the use of BPA for assessment. Gerrity (2003) confirms that effective and empowering assessment is possible when h/c languages are used. Guo (2009) agreed that h/c language assessments by bilingual teachers storied recognition of children’s progress are effective. Cummins’ work with Taylor (2008) indicated that effective bilingual activity must include investment in the child’s identity and cognitive development through planned use of h/c language.

Social agency regarding the use of h/c languages according to Robinson and Jones-Diaz, (2006) does require confronting monolingual expectations and discourses. Teachers talked of repositioning selves in response to child and colleagues, citing bilingual activities in an English speaking ECE community required protocols for using h/c languages. Protocols generated strategies for use of BPA that built into policy for settling, transitions and assessment. It appeared that in the absence of ‘rules for engagement’, the public negotiation of power can create ‘public’ tensions. Fiona believed “. . . trust, [and] respect, the open relationship between you and the colleagues or between you and the parents are very important [part of] . . . being professional teachers . . .” (Fiona,
Linguistically responsive pedagogy

The findings suggested that a linguistically responsive pedagogy or bilingual praxis included the negotiation of resources and texts as part of BPA, with repertoires that position bilingual teachers as ‘biliterate’. Anu, MF and Htwe Htwe described collaborations with families for book reading and routine activities with family members using h/c languages. The ‘discursive identity’ activates when bilingual teachers respond to concerns regarding formalised English literacy (Gee, 2000). Teacher status is referenced again for positioning a bilingual teacher as ‘knowledgeable’ regarding the value of h/c language texts for meaning making and connections to heritage. Franken et al. (2008) have identified the value of teacher or teacher aide sharing the h/c language of the child and family for learning.

According to Gerrity (2003) bilingual teachers work with an ‘ethics of action’, using a principled approach to use of h/c languages and texts. Critical pedagogical activity appeared central to BPA (Giroux, 1993). Fiona noted the ethical complexities, “[B]eing a professional means you treat everyone equal. Equality is actually very important ... because you can't just [say] okay the colour is different, the language is different, they can treat them differently ... but for those ... who speak my language or speak their home language of course that's ... natural, ... being a teacher I need to respond to that” (Fiona, Conversation 1, p.4).

A critical pedagogy championed by Moll et al. (2002) and Taylor et al. (2008), where teachers who are speakers of h/c languages make use of children’s ‘funds of knowledge’, appeared as ‘normalised’ for four teachers. Bilingual activity reported by Al-Azami et al. (2010), where child and teacher’s linguistic capital are validated through transliteration and co-construction of texts in h/c languages resonates with the BPA of identified by teachers. A contextualised linguistically responsive pedagogy as suggested by Cummins, (2009) and Lingard (2010), matches teachers’ accounts of their everyday BPA.
Bilingual pedagogical action frames

Cultural brokering/bridging

Evidence from three teachers indicated ‘bridging’ as a third significant frame or theme for bilingual activity. BPA according to all teachers are part of ‘everyday’ interactions with families and children when sharing a language in common. Htwe Htwe identified the bridging role as the most significant for her and similar to the two other teachers, tried to find her own pathway for crossing borders. “So I learn here and I just make it balance - in our Burmese way and here - so . . . compare it, and explain to the parents what the education is like here for the Early Childhood. So it is very important that I should be qualified. I need the knowledge. I need the theory knowledge and the curriculum and all the teaching and learning . . . practice” (Htwe Htwe, Conversation 1, p.3). As in Bamberg’s (2004) study, negotiation of borders through small stories of self as teacher who effectively manages multi-layered belongings emerged in teachers’ talk of their rather complex border crossing.

Border crossing

Three bilingual teachers identified responsibility, commitment and trust as central values in their ‘border crossing’ activity. Both MF and Fiona talked of the complexities of ‘managing’ the border crossing, as being the h/c language speaker in the English community and the English speaking teacher in their own language communities required responsibility for ‘in confidence’ talk. Findings revealed that these teachers attended to confidentiality and protocol demands from two communities. Conflicting discourses about education and care incurred critical reflection on judgements. MF noted “Professional standards . . . maintaining it and confidentiality that’s a biggie . . . I’m aware . . . of my responsibility to the community, to the parents and whānau, to the children and to other professionals . . . ” (MF, Conversation 2, p.15). MF and Htwe Htwe, each with smaller communities of speakers, were well known and each found herself dealing with familiar ‘crossings’ that involved guiding children in terms of the expected respectful behaviours in context such as the temple or ECE service. Three teachers spoke of tensions that arose with colleagues where BPA ‘took too much time’ and appeared to favour children. Trustworthy community liaison people are identified by Conteh (2007) and Kenner (2004) as vital for family partnerships however policy is often not in place to ‘authorise’ h/c language activity.
The bilingual teachers in this study appeared to position themselves and BPA ‘beyond the gate’ of the ECE service as engagement communities required attention. For Cummins (2009) identity investment established within teaching and learning activity leads to relationships the community. Kenner et al. (2008) in their project with teachers and bilingual assistants structured their bilingual partnerships in small groups to ensure that power and position were open to negotiation. Htwe Htwe and MF talked of being trouble-shooters and guides in the community. Htwe Htwe’s found that her status as teacher and elder provided agency in the community and she used this to work powerfully in the ECE service.

**Bilingual praxis**

The bilingual teachers described how they were spontaneously translating, explaining and sharing stories of children in action as learners, guiding children and family members through BPA in h/c languages. Experienced in both community and ECE service cultures and languages, they were taking on the role of cultural and linguistic guides, ‘border crossing’ between communities as children (and families) negotiated ways of ‘being a learner’ in English-medium services (Biddulph et al., 2003).

Language is seen as central to cognition by Sharifian who argues that cultural cognition uses language as a ‘collective memory bank’ for cultural understandings of past and present (Sharifian, 2009). A child and or family’s schema or conceptual mapping is socially constructed through the familiar or collective cognition in the h/c language. Several teachers had stories of BPA that included discussion and debate over cultural views of education, pedagogy, and in particular the meaning of child-initiated play. Guidance regarding ideologies about learning and bilingual development required considerable intersubjective discussion with families. School practices, transitions and English literacy concerns were integral to many exchanges. MF advised a parent “...keep encouraging him with Niuean language because sooner or later he’ll pick up the English ... you’ve got to be confident ... in your first language, to be able to learn another language” (MF, Conversation 1, p.8), as she encouraged the development of concepts in the stronger h/c language first and promoting acceptance of linguistic interdependence (Cummins, 1986, 2001).
Positioning

Each teacher’s BPA acted as a transformative investment in the ECE community and for each teacher’s ‘bilingual teacher identity’. Three teachers spoke of sharing stories with families making use of BPA and engaging a sense of ‘affinity identity’. Anu positioned herself in her stories and in the ECE service having languages as resources for teaching and learning whilst Fiona and Htwe Htwe spoke of being ‘known’ as the bilingual teacher. MF spoke of Pasifika families admiring and rather envious of her fluency in Niuean h/c language. In the conversations with four teachers who belonged to an h/c language community, teacher status and position appeared to emerge from a teacher accepting recognition as ‘bilingual teacher’. These teachers negotiated their power and positions, being a particular ‘kind’ of community member and a particular ‘kind’ of teacher, recognised as able to work with bilingual children and families (Anderson, 2009; Holland et al., 1998). Shelley presented her self as the Sign teacher in her stories of practice. Individual agency that transforms into social agency, Giroux (1993) believes, is built upon knowledge of the discourses in each community and from ‘being the other’.

Bilingual teachers in the study chose to be ‘other’ and to be a recognisable community member and, as Gee (2000) and Kraus (2006) suggest, this is complex and slippery work. Cable et al. (2009) referred to the bridging role as being an ‘insider informant’ and noted special connections between child and bilingual teaching assistant. Anu, who grew up in multilingual environments, views multiple identities as part of everyday teaching, and spoke of strong endorsement for bilingual teachers and administrators to ‘be themselves’. Integral to this frame and the positioning as cultural broker, guide, go-between or bridge, are the dimensions of affirming self and representing h/c language community.

Affirming self/representing community

Data reveals this frame was significant for four teachers as having a ‘position’ in the community with explicit or implicit positioning as ‘teacher’. Four teachers, fluent in h/c languages, indicated this fluency and position as teacher meant being recognised as ‘knowledgeable’, and this affirmed self and eased the process of negotiating a position as a community representative and as teacher. Belonging is negotiated and affirmed or qualified in both contexts
Identities: Recognition

Ann expected recognition as a multilingual teacher as she promoted her own communities through advocating and facilitating professional education regarding Indian languages and cultures. Teacher identity, affinity identity and positive discursive identity emerged from her bi/multilingual activity. She is recognised as working for ‘Indian’ community teachers and children and valued by families (Kaur 2010; Rana, 2010).

Htwe Htwe declaring her affinity identity (Gee, 2000) had positioned her self in her talk as a recognised guide and teacher for the community, being interpreter, trouble-shooter and facilitator of workshops for women. She believed in and modelled pride in her identity as well as spiritual beliefs in work at the temple. Htwe Htwe’s specialist knowledge of refugee restorative practices meant she was recognised as a ‘proxy’ member of several communities, an example of distributed agency and of her ‘expertise’ being recognised and self-recognition (Anderson, 2009). MF spoke of the challenges of being a fluent Niue speaker and community member as she balanced ‘teacher identity’ and community protocols. “Then there’s that role model that you have - to think about it all the time - isn’t it? How I behave - that’s such a big issue . . .” (MF, Conversation 1, p.7).

Fiona positioned herself as being a trustworthy and respectful representative of her Chinese community acknowledging an affinity with her community, however she required the teacher status or institutional identity (Gee, 2000) to negotiate a position with colleagues. Fiona considered that she ‘works harder’ to meet the expectations of being ‘the teacher’ in both linguistic communities.

Findings show that Shelley positions herself on the margins of the Deaf community, but demanded recognition as an advocate for Sign through her BPA and by facilitating professional education regarding Sign and storytelling. The ‘affinity identity’ perspective alongside the ‘institutional/teacher identity’ may cohere as a recognisable bilingual identity as Anderson (2008) following Holland et al. (1998) suggests that being part of a ‘figured world’ means becoming that ‘kind’ of teacher with that ‘kind’ of social agency in that ‘kind’ of social context.
Social agency and bilingual identities

The findings indicated that social action and bilingual activity make for an intricate co-dependent and inter-dependent positioning for each teacher. Evident in the talk of crossing borders were the community/identity references such as ‘proud to be’, ‘honour’, ‘respect’ and ‘commitment to families’. Cable et al. (2009) and Kenner (2004) noted these sentiments in community language settings (complementary schools). Such talk in is often the reserve of teachers in Bilingual Education as evidenced in the research from COI studies (Podmore et al., 2006; Pohatu, et al., 2006). Three teachers facilitated professional activities to educate and inform colleagues; being recognised as teacher, as community member as well as a critical ‘social’ agent in terms of discursive activity, creates possible spaces for identities to be negotiated. Norton (2008) adheres to the idea that teachers are socialising agents for their educational communities. Being a fluent speaker of Niuean, MF was often called upon to represent not only her community, but to be the face of Pasifika in her professional community. Shelley considered her work as promoting recognition of the New Zealand Sign Language community.

In terms of Bourdieu’s (1993) theory of construction of cultural capital and engagement of linguistic capital, these bilingual teachers may model a ‘bilingualistic habitus’ and open up space in the ECE service’s monolingual ‘social field’ through the socialising aspects of their h/c language use. Jones-Diaz (2007) considered this language activity as countering ‘linguicism’. Teachers talked of negotiating micro relations as well as the macro-society positions as advocates for bilingual selves and communities through their use of BPA. As Giroux (2006) states, these bilingual teachers were “...taking a stand without standing still...” (p.209).

Making meaning

Finally in the findings the rather taken-for-granted meaning making processes framed action with BPA as locations for learning and teaching. Shelley considered meaning making as most significant for her activity with Sign as she creates interest and deep engagement with ideas and concepts in this ‘other’ mode of meaning making. Shelley talked of purpose and consistency in the use of Sign positioning herself as bilingual, as well as signalling for each child to consider ‘others’ languages and ways of making meaning. Sign accompanies
story telling and exchanges at mat time as a ‘mediating force’ for meaning as it provides a unique increase in modal density (Poveda et al., 2008) to complement semiotic activity for hearing children. Shelley presents evidence in her stories that this is also valuable for hearing bilinguals. Semiotic activity embedded in h/c language use can create inter-subjectivity and meaning making within the participant teacher’s everyday activities at the interface between the social and individual dimensions of each teacher’s contribution of BPA (Stetsenko & Arievitch, 2004).

**View of the child as bilingual**

Four of the five teachers storied their view of the child as a competent and able bilingual using evidence from membership or deep knowledge of the child’s community as h/c language appeared to deepen connections and relationships. Each teacher had stories of children’s learning experiences and every day talk in h/c languages and considered that their mediating activities meant created inter-subjective access for children to the learning contexts within ‘English’ activities and resources. Anu, Htwe Htwe, MF and Fiona each had stories to tell of identity investment and their use of h/c language texts, stories, songs, histories and cultural practices (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Lee & Anderson, 2009).

The teacher participants in the study considered that they could ‘mediate meanings’ and avoided simplistic intercultural responses and translations. Making use of cultural conceptualisation can contribute to a collective cognitive activity in two worlds (Sharifian, 2009). Taylor et al. (2008) in Canada and Kenner et al. (2008) in the UK in significant research into biliteracy activity with bilingual children agree that ‘dual language’ texts are only effective when bilingual adults reinforce the investment in children’s identities as well as their cognitive engagement. When children’s learning is considered to be accessible and enabled through the use of h/c language, investment in bilingual identities can occur for learners within their in storied lives (Carr, 2001, 2010).

Cummins (2001a, 2009) argues for a linguistic pedagogy to endorse the child’s identity investment alongside the cognitive investment for schooling success. The teachers in this study also shared how their positioning includes BPA work ‘beyond the gate’ of the ECE service. Each bilingual teacher created a choice for bilingual children to access home or community language and English through the many ways of using two languages in an English medium setting (Cummins, 2009; May, 2009)
Significance - bilingual identities for teachers and children

This study provides evidence that the participant bilingual teachers worked powerfully with a heightened awareness of ideologies within their border crossing activities as representatives of two communities. Teachers negotiated ways of being a ‘bilingual teacher’ within stories and talk in everyday practice and built agentic activity relating to critical and informed use of h/c languages and provision of resources in English medium ECE services. Giroux (2006) recognises language[s] as both “object[s] of mastery and a subject[s] of understanding”, terrains where people negotiate their identities and relationships between ‘selves’ and ‘others’ and relationships with their worlds (p.192). Certainly the multiplicity of identities revealed in the conversations with five teachers in the study showed each could articulate their intentions for individual and social action as a bilingual. Ways of being bilingual documented in the conversations indicate five significant and interdependent identity processes as key acts between ‘selves’ and ‘others’ that lead to a complex mediation of their bilingual identities. These are:

- Experiences in the world
- Knowledge of the worlds of teaching and learning as a bilingual
- Trusted member of communities
- Social actions - distributed agency and the cogenerative principle
- ‘Doing’ self as bilingual as the ‘leading activity’.

Experiences in the world

Firstly teachers bring their own affective experiences and knowledge into discursive responses to the place of bilingual activity in education. Each has sought some explanation and delved into theory building knowledge and ideological positions through considering theory in light of personal experiences (Taylor, 2008). Familial experiences and teaching practice knowledge strengthens purposeful negotiation of a bilingual teacher identity.
6. Discussion

Knowledge of the worlds of teaching and learning as a bilingual

Second, there is an interdependence of teacher identity and ‘achieved’ authority and discursive identity with personalised critical ideological knowledge for positioning ‘self’ as a knowledgeable and powerful bilingual teacher where the medium is English. Giroux (2006) cautions that although knowledge of self and other is first step to establishing a critical pedagogy, power negotiation must ensure ability to move from individual to social agency, as the teacher is a ‘critical social resource’ and ‘cultural worker’ (p.184). Agentic and powerful bilingual teachers used bilingual stories of ‘everyday’ with children to forge a safe space for children to ‘locate themselves’ and their futures (p.64). Authority and knowledge to act and goals of social justice, involve the bilingual teacher knowing the education community as well as her own community. Gerrity (2003) recognised that authentic complementarity was gained from deep engagement and knowledge of both communities.

Trusted member of communities

A third key process in action is that of trustworthy self as knowledge of her own community leads a bilingual teacher to engage in trustworthy affective responses through her affinity or shared identity (Gee, 2000; Gerrity & Harvey, 2005) whilst sustaining the trust of the ECE service community. The conductive thread of ‘knowing’ between these identities appears to be h/c languages. Knowing histories as well as knowing the ‘narratives’ of ECE teaching community orchestrates rather than fragments identities. Recognition of a bilingual identity for self and others leads to negotiating this bilingual identity and countering other discourses regarding language use. Each teacher has conceptualised Te Whāriki principle of empowerment as working for teacher, child and family, and findings show that teachers appeared comfortable being recognised as a certain kind of a teacher ... a bilingual teacher.
Social actions - distributed agency and the cogenerative principle

Bilingual teachers’ positioning in interactions with others creates a recognised or expected pattern over time. Children, colleagues and families know the teacher as ‘bilingual teacher’ and this recognition of being a certain ‘kind’ of teacher, as Anderson (2009) explains, plots agency and power. It is in the actions and contributions of the teacher ‘being bilingual’ in relations with others, that agency arises. In her view this agency and power is located with the teacher in this act of being. The bilingual teacher is the site for agency. Arendt (1978) cautioned that as agency is relational in activity and must be constituted as ‘we’ - agency, distributed and intersubjective. Experiences do heighten sensitivity to the ‘other’ within border crossing as moving from ones own position to see anothers perspective has become a ‘way of being a bilingual teacher’ in English medium settings (Giroux, 2006).

I propose that there is a cogenerative principle in operation when knowledge (community and teacher / ideological and pedagogical) enables powerful positioning for bilingual teachers, which in turn can open up spaces for h/c languages to flourish in everyday activity. Thus the teacher, recognised as the ‘bilingual teacher’ through her determined contribution in public / social acts of BPA, is identified with and co-identifies bilingual children and families, legitimising the use of h/c languages as a tool for learning and teaching. The bilingual subjectivities constructed through these complementary relations forge identities (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005).

‘Doing’ self as bilingual as the ‘leading activity’

Distributed agency (Arendt, 1978) in social interaction confers power and position for being bilingual through the cogenerative processes of h/c language use creating conditions and affordances that could mediate bilingual identities for teacher and child. Holland et al. (1998) propose that children’s identities and sense of selves are formed through their participation in practices and discourses, as well as by positions ‘offered’. I propose that the intersubjective processes such as personalised h/c language use and storying in action with children mediates identities of ‘being bilingual’ and contributes shared positioning as ‘bilingual’ for children. It is the leading and active contribution of the bilingual self and the purposeful activities that produce
social environments that in turn are reciprocally producing collective practices; opportunities and ‘places’ are cogenerated within ‘languaging’ that engages the bilingual teacher as an agent of social transformation in ECE services (Stetsenko & Arievitch, 2004).

As Stetsenko and Arievitch (2004) argue this is not about ‘free choice’, in this case to use the h/c language, rather the teacher is driven by the lived experiences and invests actively in creating futures where children and themselves not only participate but also make a contribution (p.486). The consistent bilingual activity and practices of the teacher (being herself as bilingual) changes the linguistic social field or place for children and families to engage their linguistic habitus and linguistic capital essential for learning (Bourdieu & Waquant, 1992). Connecting with a ‘collective cognition’ that is associated with belonging (Sharifian, 2009) and ‘being-together-with’ means reciprocally produced conditions ‘stemming from’ but also ‘participating in and contributing to’ the bilingual teacher’s h/c language use for teaching and learning (Stetsenko & Arievitch, 2002, 2004).

Border crossing that involves deepening understandings of the relational nature of one’s own politics and personal investments, languages, and knowledges is well established in these participant teachers’ practices (Giroux, 2006, p.61). The cogenerative principle of a teacher being her bilingual self and ‘doing self’ becomes a ‘leading activity’ (Stetsenko & Arievitch, 2004) contributing to and distributing agency that creates ‘safe places’ and opportunities for mediating bilingual identities for bilingual learners and for themselves.

**Pedagogical implications**

A central focus of bilingual teachers and their use of two languages appeared to be articulating their ideological positions. They initiated pedagogical activity that generated bilingual praxis (theory knowledge and activity) and authorised the use of h/c languages for teaching and learning. In the absence of informed policy or guidance, access to knowledge and professional guidance has become the responsibility of the teachers themselves. Successful bilingual activity heightened their critical awareness of discourses about languages that could constrain belonging and identity for themselves and children.
Pedagogical implications

Teacher knowledge and research: View of teacher as bilingual

In this study the participant teachers appeared the prime source of information and pedagogical advice for socially just activities with families in early years education. Few bilingual children can access Bilingual Education; teaching a language as a subject is not effective for bilingualism or language retention (McCaffery, 2010; May, 2009). Research by May et al. (2004) and McComish et al. (2008) reiterates the importance of a teacher’s specialised subject knowledge about language learning, bilingual development and languages for learning as part of effective practices with ‘linguistically diverse’ children and families. Thus pedagogical knowledge and strategies for working justly with bilingual children in English medium settings appear as a necessity for all teachers. Evidence from the evaluation of Kei tua o te Pae (Stuart, Aitken, Gould & Meade, 2008) indicates the scarcity of articulated bilingual practice and stories indicating that many bilingual teachers may feel ill equipped in terms of ideological or pedagogical knowledge to counter monolingual discourses. Accessing articulate and powerful bilingual teachers and their pedagogical knowledge and experiences in English medium settings is an urgent area for documentation and research.

Questions are raised regarding lack of policy from Ministry of Education and the Teachers Council. Bilingualism as problem to be remedied through immersion in English is in conflict with the view of h/c languages as the tools and resources for learning and teaching as highly acceptable for English speakers but not for bilingual children in New Zealand education settings.

Ministry of Education and policy: Gaps and silences

The severe gap in advice and policy from the Ministry of Education regarding development of bilingualism in the early years for authorising bilingual futures for all children (including Māori) remains. Guidance from the MoE does not identify the ECE service and teachers’ knowledge as playing a central role in how parents and children will view selves and schooling. Culturally responsive teaching is recommended in the push for bilingual children to participate early in ECE (MoE, 2009g). Demographic changes are so significant that such a gap in literature and reliance on the ethical commitments of teachers alone is in contradiction of international and national instruments regarding the right to mother tongue resources for learning and teaching.
Research into language ‘diversity’ has constructed bilingualism as an issue that needs to be ‘resolved’ in ECE services (Cullen et al., 2009) on arrival at school (McNaughton, 2002) or in schooling (Alton-Lee, 2003). Structured teaching and measurement of English literacy with overtones of a deficit view of bilingual activity and language retention currently identifies the bilingual child and family and by association, the bilingual teacher as problematic (Conteh, 2007; Jones Diaz, 2007). Clear policy leadership from the MoE regarding bilingual goals following Human Rights Languages Policy statement (HRC, 2008) honours commitments made by the Crown to the people of Aotearoa/New Zealand, and can ensure choice for children to be members of their families and their communities.

* Critical linguistically responsive pedagogy and policy in ECE services

COI work has come to the edge of exploring bilingual activity and development, yet bilingual identities appear to be appropriate for only those children who are able to access h/c language dedicated centres. An acceptance of the central place of ideologies and practices that support ‘identity as a bilingual’ is still linked serendipitously to ethical interpretation of the principles of *Te Whāriki* (MoE, 1996) combined with the activity of well-informed bilingual adults. Linguistically ‘safe places’ are available for some children and teachers but how many ‘unsafe places’ exist for bilingual teachers and in turn for bilingual children and families? Critical questions tracking the significant gaps in professional knowledge regarding a critical linguistically responsive pedagogy must be asked of researchers, teacher educators, Teachers Council, and the Ministry of Education who are complicit in constructing monolingual futures for bilingual children.

* View of child as bilingual

Constructing the child as ‘bilingual’ demands research, resources and practices in collaboration with h/c language communities to search out knowledge of bilingual development. Children’s languages recognised in part by *Kei tua o te pae* (MoE, 2004-2009) are often not articulated as central to learning. The special relationships attested to in this study evolve through intentional and purposeful consideration of *languages for learning*. Families and children build...
identities through trust, self-belief and knowledge essential for ‘being, ready willing and able’ (Carr et al., 2001) as a learner where linguistic affordances and contexts could foster bilingual activity (Carr et al., 2010). Can bilingual children learn bilingually in New Zealand or does learning equate with English-only futures? Can views of the child as bilingual and use of bilingual Learning Stories and documentation of bilingual achievements occur through regulated engagement of bilingual teachers and adults? What happens for the child and her languages and learning histories when she is unable to access h/c language connections and conceptualisations between 7:30 and 5:00 each day in ECE services?

Ethical stance and advocacy: Teacher status

The status of bilingual teachers often rests upon their ability to fit in and to manage linguistic and community challenges on behalf of the ECE service, rather as a trouble-shooter and interpreter only. Evidence shows the rich possibilities of engaging a bilingual teacher who can support bilingual children to be bilingual learners and to ‘belong’. Choice is an ethical responsibility and a pedagogical opportunity (Cummins, 2009), and these bilingual teachers articulated that they had no moral choice but to be bilingually engaged with family and child as they conceptualised the four principles of Te Whāriki as framing teaching and learning in “an environment that is characterised by well being and trust, belonging and purposeful activity, contributing and collaborating, communicating and representing, exploring and guided participation.” (MoE, 1996, p.45).

Concluding statements and recommendations

Recognising the bilingual teacher as bilingual recognises the bilingual child

The active silencing of teachers and children’s languages make ECE services complicit in coercing and providing a singular linguistic identity for children and communities (Giroux, 2006; Cummins, 2009). Reconceptualising the child as having a bilingual future and identit/ies is mandated in UNCROC and expressed in Te Whāriki, principles. Actioning the promises set out therein
provokes research on languages spoken by teachers and learners. The challenge comes as a personal and professional call to teachers to be more informed about bilingualism and to practice in an equitable and just manner. Cummins (2009) recommends that any investment in a child’s cognitive development must be accompanied by an equal investment in a child’s identity development through close attention to the languages used, the critical use of languages, and a focus on meaning and creativity.

**Recommendations**

Authorisation of the use of h/c languages in educational settings does require legislation such as New Zealand Languages policy to guide education policy that includes commitments made in *Te Tiriti o Waitangi*. As a consequence biliteracy and production of dual language texts as criteria for success in educational achievements for school leavers may ensue. The exemplary pedagogical activity evidenced here in this study serves as both innovation and provocation to create conditions that legitimise bilingual identities. The following recommendations follow from the findings of this study:

- Teachers Council, teacher educators and all education sectors ensure recognition of teachers’ languages in registration to signal that bilingualism is a legitimate goal for all New Zealand education settings.

- MoE collects data on the languages spoken fluently by teachers in each educational sector to identify and make effective use of teaching professionals’ as key resources.

- Teachers Council and teacher educators ensure teacher qualifications include deep knowledge of bilingual and biliterate development with critical linguistically responsive pedagogies as criteria for ethical commitment.

- Each teacher to take up the challenge to use his/her languages and knowledges to build a personal ‘kete’ of expertise to share, as just being bilingual does not equate with being a linguistically responsive practitioner.
Concluding statements and recommendations

- Professional networks and ECE services document evaluate and disperse pedagogical evidence regarding bilingual activity and effective practices.

- MoE fund research on languages for learning and teaching contextualised for the Aotearoa/New Zealand social environment to inform strategies and resourcing as part of a Languages policy for all education settings.

- Researchers ensure that they recognise and respect languages and heritages by identifying languages spoken by children and teachers in any research data.

- Families and children’s use of home/community language and English and choice to be bilingual/multilingual is operationalised by teachers and families.

Recognising the bilingual pasts, presents and futures of New Zealand

A languages policy in each ECE service framed by UNCROC, HRC (2007) and Te Whāriki (MoE, 1996) principles can honour the languages of children as probable rather than possible sites for learning ensuring bilingual children can join the community of learners as creators and contributors. Choice to retain a language and heritage through critical linguistically responsive practices in educational settings in New Zealand will honour local and global commitments for teachers, learners and families.

Limitations

This study, whilst concerned with bilingual identities, was conducted entirely in English. This is a limitation in terms of possible meaning exchange and access to deeper knowledge and teachers’ motivations and beliefs. A follow up action research project can add the linguistic dimensions required to tap into semiotic processes and cultural conceptualisations within particular languages and relationships.
Whereas limitations on participant number and selection processes may invite consensus of activity and philosophies, a breadth of selection and increase in number of participants could constrain depth of inquiry and power sharing. A third limitation may be the lack of ethnographic detail and observation of teachers in action. Video material, interpretation and translation may offer richer detail to embody stories of the bilingual activity. Further research using multi-modes and multi-media is recommended. The temptation to over interpret the conversations and small stories of lived experiences of each teacher’s bilingual activities remains a challenge for researcher and participants as these conversation histories invite revisiting.

Conclusion

The study of bilingual teachers’ ways of using their languages examines critical pedagogy that includes rather than excludes. Bilingual teachers are inclusively engaging with pasts and futures in an empowering way as might be expected when ethical commitments and the four principles of Te Whāriki (MoE, 1996) become guides for action. Their work appeared to create learning environments that encouraged families and colleagues to access marginalised ideologies regarding bilingualism and to see language as an investment in cognition and identity (Cummins, 2009; May, 2009; Norton, 2010). In contributing selves to social, historical, cultural and linguistic practices the bilingual teacher could work co-generatively with children’s identities in activities. Using her two languages could mediate her ‘selves’ and bilingual identities when teaching (Gee, 2000; Seifert, 2004). Teachers activate and invest in bilingual identities for themselves and safe spaces for choice and action are possible for any bilinguals in the bilingual teachers realm of influence. Bilingual ‘histories’ and bilingual ‘futures’ are accessible for bilingual children in English medium settings.

The voices and actions of the bilingual teachers ‘spoke’ of h/c language as a lifeline for bilingual children in the fast flowing ‘mainstream’ educational setting. The participant bilingual teachers believed that the many ways they use h/c languages and their stories of children ‘being themselves’ as learners can nourish the bilingual child as a learner and as member of h/c language community, ensuring he/she does not go hungry but is enabled to contribute and ask for more!
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Stories of identities and linguistic possibilities of bilingual teachers working in English-medium early childhood services in the Auckland region
Researcher: Nola Harvey
Supervisors: Professor Margaret Carr and Dr Sally Peters

Purpose
This research is conducted as partial requirement for Master of Education. For this project the researcher has selected the qualitative method of narrative inquiry to conduct research on the topic. The stories and experiences of participants and their valuable contributions to ECE in Aotearoa New Zealand as bilingual teachers will be collected through recorded conversations and data gathered from a focus group meeting. The following information is designed to provide you with details about the nature of my research. This information acts as an invitation and will also enable you to make an informed decision about your possible participation in this study.

What is this research project about?
Background information:
Aotearoa New Zealand is counted as one of the most linguistically diverse nations of the world and the early childhood education sector in Auckland with up to 73 languages spoken presents exciting and challenging multi ethnic and multilingual context for learners and teachers. Professional commentators and policy makers nationally and internationally are considering the challenging prospects of identifying professional practices in the early years, suited for culturally and linguistically diverse nationhood.

Research aims:
This research aims to examine the unique contributions bilingual teachers make in the early childhood education context in Aotearoa New Zealand. In my research I hope to identify the ways in which bilingual teachers make use of their languages through the collation and analysis of the stories and experiences of participants, each one a bilingual teacher within an English medium but linguistically diverse early childhood education context. There is much to learn for the early childhood sector from exploring and reflecting together upon the detail of teachers’ lived experiences as bilingual practitioners as they work with children and families across languages and cultures on a daily basis. Professional commentators and policy makers seeking wise practices to match these changing demographics can gain insight and inspiration through listening to the ‘voices’ of teachers representative of this linguistic diversity.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:
In what ways do bilingual teachers access and use their two languages in in everyday practice English medium early childhood services in the Auckland region?
Sub questions
What roles do the languages used by bilingual teachers in English medium early childhood services in the Auckland region play in mediating bilingual identities for the teachers?
What opportunities do bilingual teachers see for themselves in mediating bilingual identities for children?

What will you have to do and how long will it take?
Your participation would involve an initial brief meeting to discuss the research process followed by completion of three ‘Conversation’ sessions of up to 60 mins and participation in a focus group with three or four bilingual teacher participants to bring up and discuss points of interest that have emerged for you from these earlier conversations. Each ‘Conversation’ session will be recorded on audiotape and later transcribed and returned to you, the participant, as a talking point for the next ‘Conversation’. The conversations within the focus group will also be recorded on audiotape and key ideas will be selected by the participants and researcher to support the final analysis and summary for the thesis.
Conversations and focus group sessions will take place outside of working hours and in the teacher’s own time. Data collection will not be conducted at or involve the teacher’s ECE service facility.

You can withdraw from the study at any time up until the second “conversation session” by providing written notification of your intent to withdraw.

Please do not hesitate to contact my supervisors or me for further clarification and information.

What will happen to the information collected?
Confidentiality and anonymity
Only the researcher and supervisors will be privy to the notes, documents, recordings and the paper written. Afterwards, notes, documents will be destroyed and recordings erased. The researcher will keep transcriptions of the recordings and a copy of the paper but will treat them with the strictest confidentiality. The audiotape transcriber will have agreed to keep in confidence, all records and notes of conversations through completion of a confidentiality statement. No participants will be named in the publications and every effort will be made to disguise their identity unless otherwise agreed.

The details of the conversations, transcriptions and the focus group discussion will remain as confidential. A group contract will be designed in collaboration with the participants to ensure the information discussed within the focus group remains confidential to the group. Within the report the names of neither the participants nor the centres will be disclosed, and where appropriate pseudonyms will be utilised. Anonymity for an individual participant can be waived on formal written request to the researcher.

USE OF FINDINGS:
The predominant use of the data collated will be for the purpose of meeting the requirements of a Masters in Education three paper thesis. In addition, these findings may also be used in future articles and publications.
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If you take part in the study, you have the right to:

• Refuse to answer any particular question, and to withdraw from the study before the second “conversation” session when participant and researcher begin interim analysis of the data.
• Ask any further questions about the study that occur to you during your participation.
• Be given access to a draft summary of findings from the study prior to the focus groups, to contribute further perspectives on the data gathered and have access to the final summary when it is concluded.

Who’s responsible?
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I also understand that I am free to withdraw from the study before the second ‘conversation session’, or to decline to answer any particular questions in the study. I understand I can withdraw any information I have provided up until the researcher has commenced analysis on my data. I agree to provide information to the researchers under the conditions of confidentiality set out on the Participant Information Sheet.

I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the Participant Information Sheet.

Signed: __________________________________________

Name: ____________________________________________

Date: _____________________________________________
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I agree to my responses being tape recorded.

Signed: __________________________________________
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An effective bilingual teacher from your service has been selected to participate in this research study in her own time. This information advice and consent form is to provide some ethical assurance for the community members from the ECE service.

Purpose
This research is conducted as partial requirement for Master of Education. For this project the researcher has selected the qualitative method of narrative inquiry to conduct research on the topic. The stories and experiences of participants and their valuable contributions to ECE in Aotearoa New Zealand as bilingual teachers will be collected through recorded conversations and data gathered from a focus group meeting. The following information is designed to provide you with details about the nature of my research. This information acts as an invitation and will also enable you to make an informed decision about your possible participation in this study.

What is this research project about?
Background information:
Aotearoa New Zealand is counted as one of the most linguistically diverse nations of the world and the early childhood education sector in Auckland with up to 73 languages spoken presents exciting and challenging multi ethnic and multilingual context for learners and teachers. Professional commentators and policy makers nationally and internationally are considering the challenging prospects of identifying professional practices in the early years, suited for culturally and linguistically diverse nationhood. Professional commentators and policy makers seeking wise practices to match these changing demographics can gain insight and inspiration through listening to the ‘voices’ of teachers representative of this linguistic diversity.

Research aims:
This research aims to examine the unique contributions bilingual teachers make in the early childhood education context in Aotearoa New Zealand. In my research I hope to identify the ways in which bilingual teachers make use of their languages through the collation and analysis of the stories and experiences of participants, each one a bilingual teacher within an English medium but linguistically diverse early childhood education context. There is much to learn for the early childhood sector from exploring and reflecting together upon the detail of teachers’ lived experiences as bilingual practitioners as they work with children and families across languages and cultures on a daily basis. Professional commentators and policy makers seeking wise practices to match these changing demographics can gain insight and inspiration through listening to the ‘voices’ of teachers representative of this linguistic diversity.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:
In what ways do bilingual teachers access and use their two languages in everyday practice in English medium early childhood services in the Auckland region?
Sub questions
What roles do the languages used by bilingual teachers in English medium early childhood services in the Auckland region play in mediating bilingual identities for the teachers?
What opportunities do bilingual teachers see for themselves in mediating bilingual identities for children?

What will participants have to do and how long will it take?
In this study participants will be required to meet with the researcher on at least 5 occasions:
1) Initial invitation to participate with discussion of the study and the spiral discourse procedures culminating in gaining written consent to participate. 
2) Each will need to complete a self-report on his/her use of mother tongue in everyday early childhood teaching practice. 
3) Three sessions: audio taped ‘conversations’ up to 60 mins. This will involve the participant in reading the transcript of the previous conversation before the following session. 
4) Meet for a focus group with fellow participants (1-2 hrs max.) This will be audio taped. 
5) Review of material/narratives to ensure participant’s ‘voice’ and perspective is accurately represented.

It is anticipated that the interviews and reviewing will take up to 15 hours of each participant’s time. Participants in the study will have the right to refuse to answer any particular question, and can withdraw from the study at any time up until the second “conversation session” by providing written notification of intent to withdraw.

Participation would involve an initial brief meeting to discuss the research process followed by completion of three ‘Conversation’ sessions of up to 60 mins and participation in a focus group with three or four bilingual teacher participants to bring up and discuss points of interest that have emerged from these earlier conversations.

Each ‘Conversation’ session will be recorded on audiotape and later transcribed and returned to the participant as a talking point for the next ‘Conversation’. The conversations within the focus group will also be recorded on audiotape and key ideas will be selected by the participants and researcher to support the final analysis and summary for the thesis. Conversations and focus group sessions will take place outside of working hours and in the teacher’s own time. Data collection will not be conducted at, or involve the teacher’s ECE service facility.

What will happen to the information collected? 
Confidentiality and anonymity

Only the researcher and supervisors will be privy to the notes, documents, recordings and the paper written. Afterwards, notes, documents will be destroyed and recordings erased. The researcher will keep transcriptions of the recordings and a copy of the paper but will treat them with the strictest confidentiality. The audiotape transcriber will have agreed to keep in confidence, all records and notes of conversations through completion of a confidentiality statement. No participants will be named in the publications and every effort will be made to disguise their identity unless otherwise agreed.

USE OF FINDINGS: 
The predominant use of the data collated will be for the purpose of meeting the requirements of a Masters in Education three paper thesis. In addition, these findings may also be used in future articles and publications.

Participants have the right to: 
- Refuse to answer any particular question, and to withdraw from the study before the second “conversation” session when participant and researcher begin interim analysis of the data. 
- Ask any further questions about the study that occur during participation. 
- Be given access to a draft summary of findings from the study prior to the focus groups, to contribute further perspectives on the data gathered and have access to the final summary when it is concluded. 
- Advise the researcher of any foreseen potential for socio-emotional or linguistic disturbance

Your support for this valuable study and professional interest in quality educational settings for bilingual teachers and learners is significant for the Aotearoa New Zealand early childhood education sector.

If you have any questions or concerns about the project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:

Researcher: Nola Harvey
n.harvey@auckland.ac.nz
09 6238899 ext 48455
Supervisors:
Prof. Margaret Carr
margcarr@waikato.ac.nz
07 8384466 ext 7854

Dr. Sally Peters
speters@waikato.ac.nz
07 8384466 ext 8386
CONSENT FORM FOR EMPLOYERS (GOVERNANCE BODY/LICENSEE) OF BILINGUAL TEACHER FROM SERVICE, PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY, TALKING OURSELVES

Study title: Talking ourselves.
Stories of identities and linguistic possibilities of bilingual teachers working in English-medium early childhood services in the Auckland region

Consent Form for Governance/body/licensee

I have read the Employer Information Sheet regarding the requirements of a teacher from our early childhood service community participating in research for this study and have had the details of the study explained to me. My questions about the study have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I also understand that facilities of this early childhood service will not be used in this study. I acknowledge also that no other member of our early childhood service community will be involved in any way in this study. I give permission for the selected teacher to participate under the conditions of confidentiality and anonymity set out on the Participant Information Sheet.

I agree to .................................................................. a teacher at ......................................................... participating in this study under the conditions set out in the Employer Information Sheet and Participant Information Sheet.

Signed: 

Name: 

Date: 

Researcher’s Name and contact information:
Researcher: Nola Harvey  
n.harvey@auckland.ac.nz  
09 6238899 ext 48455

Supervisors Name and contact information:
Prof. Margaret Carr  
margcarr@waikato.ac.nz  
07 8384466 ext 7854

Dr. Sally Peters  
speters@waikato.ac.nz  
07 8384466 ext 8386
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Transcriber and Notetaker Confidentiality Form

TRANSCRIBER AND NOTE TAKER CONFIDENTIALITY FORM

This confidentiality form will be stored for five years before it is destroyed

Study Title
Talking our selves.
Stories of identities and linguistic possibilities of bilingual teachers working in English-medium early childhood services in the Auckland region

Researcher: Nola Harvey
Supervisors: Professor Margaret Carr and Dr Sally Peters

I agree to keep all records, notes, conversations and taped material in safe storage while they are in my care and to keep all contents confidential to myself and the researcher, Nola Harvey.

Signed________________________________

Name_____________________________________

Company_________________________________

Postal address_____________________________________________________________

Email_____________________________________

Date_____________________________________
Appendix C: Ethnic groups in ECE, July 2010

Figure C.1 Enrolments in licensed ECE services by Ethnic group: National. 1 July 2010. Annual ECE summary report 2010 (Education Counts, 2011b).

Figure C.2 Enrolments in licensed ECE services by Ethnic group: Auckland. 1 July 2010. Annual ECE summary report 2010 (Education Counts, 2011b).
Figure C.3  Teaching staff at licensed teacher-led ECE services by Ethnic group: National. 1 July 2010. Annual ECE summary report 2010 (Education Counts, 2011c).

Figure C.4  Teaching staff at licensed teacher-led ECE services by Ethnic group: Auckland. 1 July 2010. Annual ECE summary report 2010 (Education Counts, 2011c).
Appendix D: Chapter 2 Context

i) New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990

“Non-discrimination and minority rights: Article (20), Rights of minorities.
A person who belongs to an ethnic, religious, or linguistic minority in New Zealand shall not be denied the right, in community with other members of that minority, to enjoy the culture, to profess and practise the religion, or to use the language, of that minority” (Ministry of Justice, 1990, Part 2., p.6).

ii) Graduating Teachers Standards: Aotearoa New Zealand (New Zealand Teachers’ Council, 2008a)


Standard One sets out Professional knowledge and a requirement for graduating teachers to “(d) have content and pedagogical content knowledge for supporting English as an additional language learners to succeed in the curriculum” (Std.1, d).

Standard Three requires graduating teachers to have; “...understanding of the complex influences that personal, social, and cultural factors may have on teachers and learners.” (Std.3, a), “...knowledge of tikanga and te reo Māori to work effectively within the bicultural contexts of Aotearoa New Zealand.” (Std.3, b) and, “...an understanding of education within the bicultural, multicultural, social, political, economic and historical contexts of Aotearoa New Zealand.” (Std.3, c).
Standard Four, requires graduating teachers to demonstrate professional knowledge “to plan for a safe, high quality teaching and learning environment recognising and valuing diversity.” (Std.4, c); “…proficiency in oral and written language Māori and/or English…relevant to their professional role” (Std.4, d) and to attend to the ‘emotional safety’ of learners (Std.4, f).

Standard Five sets out requirements for knowing “…how to communicate assessment information appropriately” to learners, families and staff (Std.5, c).

Standard Six sets out professional values and relationships with learners and members of the learning communities, demanding recognition of “…how differing beliefs and values may impact on learners and their learning” Std.6, a); “…knowledge and dispositions to work effectively with colleagues, parents/caregivers families/whānau and communities” (Std.6, b) to “…build effective relationships with their learners” (Std.6, c) and, effective engagement with diverse learners (Std.6, d) with “…respect for te reo Māori me nga tikanga a-iwi …” (Std.6, e). Teachers must make a commitment to the teaching profession and New Zealand Teachers Code of Ethics/Nga Tikanga Matatika, in Standard 7 (New Zealand Teachers’ Council, 2008b).

iii) The Registered Teachers Code of Ethics, January 2005

The Registered Teachers Code of Ethics, January 2005 (NZTC, 2008b). Four fundamental principles that must govern teachers’ actions and interactions are the principles of autonomy, to honour and defend rights; justice obligates teachers to share power and prevent abuse of power; responsible care concerns actions that do good and minimise harm to others and the principle of truth holds a moral obligation for teachers to be ‘honest with self and others’. Te tiriti o Waitangi is also acknowledged.

Registered teachers have a ‘primary obligation to learners’ and within this ‘to nurture capacities of all learners’ towards an ‘informed appreciation of the fundamental values of a democratic society’. The moral framework suggests that teachers make a Commitment to learners and, a) relationships in the learners ‘best interests’, catering for e) ‘the learning needs of diverse learners’ and promoting f) ‘physical, emotional, social, intellectual and spiritual wellbeing of learners’ (New Zealand Teachers’ Council, 2008b Com. 1).
Further ethical considerations are a Commitment to parents/guardians and family/whānau to actively promote equal opportunity of all (Com. 2), and a broad ethic of Commitment to society to prepare ‘students for life in society’ fulfilling this obligation through “a) actively support policies and programmes which promote ‘equality of opportunity for all” (New Zealand Teachers’ Council, 2008b Com. 3).

Commitment to profession through “d) promotion of sound education policy, e) open and reflective professional culture”, and to treat “f) colleagues and associates with respect” (New Zealand Teachers Council, 2008b, Com. 4).

iv) Group Special Education

Group Special Education (GSE) must abide by Te tiriti o Waitangi, the Education Act 1989, the Human Rights Act 1993, the Privacy Act, 1993, the National Education Guidelines, the New Zealand Curriculum and Te Whāriki.

The earlier ‘business plan’ Better outcomes for children: An action plan for GSE 2006-2011 (MoE, 2006) identified that each child must gain, a “...strong sense of personal and cultural identity” (p.11). Intervention teams are expected to foster an environment where children and families can “...express their views and have their culture, language and mode of communication respected” (p.13) by providing experiences that include aspects of culture and community (p.15) with teachers that can enhance children’s sense of identity (MoE 2006, p.16).

The revised Plan: Special Education Business Plan (MoE, 2009g), sets three areas for action related to dimensions of children’s presence, participation and learning in educational services. Early intervention and management of behaviour are seen as particular goals for ECE services. The ‘culture’ of specialist staff for Pasifika and Māori is considered significant but languages and identities are not highlighted (MoE, 2009g). Absent from both business plans is recruitment of skilled bilingual staff to support bilingual families. Criteria are for ‘staff’ that are responsive to Māori and Pasifika cultures and families (MoE, 2006, p.22; MoE, 2009g, p.7).

Regulations guiding teachers and educators include criteria relating to culture and language support.

Regulation 43, *Curriculum standard* (MoE, 2009c) advises teachers and educators to respond to children’s strengths and capabilities, to provide a positive learning environment that “…encourages children to be confident in their own culture…(iv) respects and acknowledges aspirations of parents, family, whānau collaborate with parents family, whānau regarding decisions making in relation to learning and development.* (p.8). *Criteria 2, 3 & 4 state that teachers and educators must attend to “children’s learning, their interests, whānau, and life contexts, . . . nurture reciprocal relationships…”* (MoE, 2009c, p.8). Criteria relating to support for a child’s culture and identity are as below.

**Criteria 5.** ‘The service curriculum acknowledges and reflects the unique place of Mori as tangata whenua. Children are given the opportunity to develop knowledge and an understanding of the cultural heritages of both parties to Te Tiriti o Waitangi’ (MoE, 2009c, p.8).

**Criteria 6.** The service curriculum respects and supports the right of each child to be confident in their own culture and encourages children to understand and respect other cultures (MoE, 2009c, p.8).

**Criteria 7.** Inclusion policy states “The service curriculum is inclusive, and responsive to children as confident and competent learners. Children’s preferences are respected, and they are involved in decisions about their learning experiences.” (MoE, 2009c, p.9).

**Criteria 8.** “The service curriculum provides a language-rich environment that supports children’s learning” (MoE, 2009c, p.9).

Regulation 47 regarding *Governance, management and administration (GMA)* requires that a service “1.b. (i) regularly collaborates with parents and family or whānau”, and “1.d. Provide information about the operation of the service.” (MoE, 2009c, GMA 10), the regulatory enrolment form has no requirement to record the languages spoken by family or child (p.27).
vi) Te Whāriki: He Whāriki Matauranga mo nga Mokopuna o Aotearoa Early Childhood Curriculum

Te Whāriki: He Whāriki Matauranga mo nga Mokopuna o Aotearoa Early childhood curriculum (MoE 1996) developed in 1993-1995 with a bicultural framework and the curriculum for Māori medium settings with guidance from Te Tiriti o Waitangi, in four principles Empowerment, Holistic Development, Relationships and Family and Community.

The aspiration for all is children set as building, “competent and confident learners and communicators... secure in their sense of belonging and in the knowledge that they make a valued contribution to society” (MoE, 1996, p.9). Children are expected to “...gain the knowledge of the nation’s languages” as they grow in the use their cultural tools (p.19). A bilingual component of the document meets the obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, to address the rights of Māori to determine a Māori curriculum for and with Māori, as well as signalling the obligation of pakeha to foster Māori language and tikanga.

Language guidance of “different cultures and languages flourishing in [communities [of] Pacific Island peoples and the support of Tagata Pasefika, is part of the ‘distinctive patterns’ and work towards bicultural goals of the Te Whāriki (MoE, 1996, pp.11, 12, 17). Attention to cultures, heritages and stories and symbols (written and artistic text activity) of other ethnic groups is suggested in Adults responsible and teaching and learning relating to the Contribution strand (MoE, 1996, pp.12, 27, 64-67).

Children’s identities are considered in terms of the view of development and learning capabilities (pp.21-22, 25), for the Wellbeing strand (pp.46-47). Home languages and cultures as central to a child’s education are included in the strand of Belonging where ‘languages’ are signified (p.56). Adults’ responsibilities in relation to Māori and teachers include, “…understanding issues relating to being bilingual” (p.73).

Responsiveness to children and families and whānau in terms of guidance for teachers and educators is set out as each child’s, “…languages and symbols of their own and other cultures are promoted and protected,” and this attention to languages is signalled clearly throughout the Communication strand (pp.72-81) and that “…they have confidence that their first language is valued;” and directions to incorporate te reo Māori and “community languages” (p.76).

Direction is provided for teachers to seek out adults who are representative of
Māori and Tagata pasifika to support Māori and Pasifika children’s belonging (p.54-55). *Te Whāriki* is a curriculum with bicultural goals for children in Aotearoa New Zealand, where “…they experience the stories and symbols of their own and other cultures” (MoE, 1996, p.78).

### vii) *Pasifika* Education Plans (PEP)

*PEP 2008-2012* sets out the compulsory education policy that included actions for *Goals 4 & 5*, relating to pedagogy, assessment and resources for new learners of English. Education sector-wide goals directed at bilingualism are *Goals 16 & 17* indicated “…building strong *Pasifika* language foundations through *Pasifika* language curriculum and resource development” and increasing “…effective teaching for *Pasifika* bilingual students in a range of settings…”. The six support actions showed government commitment relating to effective bilingual teaching, resources and assessment tools for *Pasifika* languages. *Goal 16* included actions for the development of a *Pasifika* languages strategy framing bilingual goals for children other than indigenous Māori. (MoE, 2008b).

*Pasifika Education Plan 2009-2012 (MoE, 2009g) replacing PEP 2008-2012 (MoE, 2008b)*

*PEP 2009-2012* (MoE, 2009g) foreword from the Minister of Education states the focus as lifting *Pasifika* achievement in numeracy and literacy through “participation in high quality and culturally responsive early childhood education,” referenced to National Standards in literacy and numeracy.

*Goal 1* for ECE has a focus on increased participation “that prepares them well for school,” (MoE, 2009g) and for parents.

*Goal 3*, “Effective engagement of parents in ECE services responsive to parents’ and childrens’ cultures and languages,” (MoE, 2009g, Goal 3, ECE).

*Actions* include several areas of governance and intervention to monitor ECE links to literacy and numeracy professional development contracts for schools (*Act. 6*), trial *Pasifika* parent mentoring with emphasis on improving literacy and numeracy skills (*Act. 10*), assistance for *Pasifika* families to better engage with ECE and transition (*Act. 11*). The recruitment and retention of *Pasifika*
teachers are included in (Act 768).

The PEP 2009-2012 (MoE, 2009g) sets ‘cultural responsiveness’ of teachers and schools as a goal (Goal 5) in compulsory education and surprisingly the terms EAL or support for ESOL are no longer evident.

The Compass for Success for PEP 2009-2012 (MoE, 2009g) preamble cites drawing on strong cultures, identities and languages, as ‘levers for change’ for resolving problems with the achievements of Pasifika students such that they fit into the NZ education system.

The Minister of Education states in the foreword the goal is also to “…enhance the overall reputation of the New Zealand education system, as well as improving our country’s productivity and economy.”

The Secretary for Education states this can embrace the cultural needs of the Pasifika students and is reliant on the “…foundation skills…for success in school…”, provided by participating in high quality ECE (MoE, 2009g).

viii) ECE service provides and member organisations

Teachers may be individual or group members of non-government professional ECE umbrella groups. Union membership is also a valuable service for professional teachers in ECE. The New Zealand Educational Institute (NZEI), the employment union for ECE teachers, has shown strong and continuous advocacy and support for bilingualism initially for the Te Tiriti o Waitangi partnership with te reo Māori in ECE. The union has a parallel Māori structure, called Miro Māori, stating that being able to communicate in two languages can offer major personal social and economic benefits to New Zealand and its citizens. (NZEI, 2002). In recent years using the framework of the Human Rights Commission Right to Education (Human Rights Commission, 2004, p.261) and the addition of the Komiti Pasifika group supports and advocates for bilingual education in ECE services and schools. NZEI Draft policy, 24 March 2010, Section 18, notes that bilingual education must be ‘sustainable’. A recent addition is the attention to advocacy for teacher aides for all bilingual children entering school (NZEI, 2010, Section 15, para 2.3).

The professional teachers’ umbrella group Early Childhood Council has representatives on “the Early Childhood Advisory Committee (ECAC),
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New Zealand Qualifications Authority industry advisory groups, Ministerial Committees, Regional MOE consultation groups” (ECC, November, 2010). ECC is affiliated with Education Forum, BusinessNZ, and Vision Schools, which operate outside of the ECE sector to influence educational policy from the private business sector. Validation of the languages or bilinguality of practitioners is not registered on the website. Recently the CEO Peter Reynolds commenting on MoE policy said for ECC “... growth potential [for the industry] lay ... with the many thousand of low-income families currently receiving nothing... It is these children whose lives can be turned around if they are sent to school ready to learn, but it is these children least likely to be getting any help in the form of early childhood education.” (Reynolds, 2010 [ECC website] 19 April 2010).

Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa/NZ Childcare Association (NZCA) a significant professional group held in high esteem by many Māori and Pasifika bilingual teachers states: “Every child in New Zealand has the right to know and enjoy the dual cultural heritage of Te Tiriti o Waitangi partners along with his/her own cultural heritage” (NZCA, November, 2010). Acknowledgement of bilingual teachers through the two specialised networks for Māori and for Pasifika teachers is well established through support for bilinguality with tertiary educators and facilitators in the ECE sector.

New Zealand Kindergartens Incorporated Te Putahi Kura Puhou o Aotearoa (NZK). Human Rights Commissioner Rosslyn Noonan, in her address to the New Zealand Kindergarten Association Conference 2010 cited Article 29 of the Convention of the Rights of the Child and applauded the NZK for workshops that fostering cultures, languages and heritages of families and children. (NZK, September 2010).

ix) Early Childhood Leadership Group

The Early Childhood Leadership Group is composed of: The Auckland Kindergarten Association and its all-day subsidiary KINZ; the Central North Island Kindergarten Association and its all-day operation CNI Early Education Services Trust; the Waikato Kindergarten Association and its all-day operation Early Education Waikato; and the Counties Manukau Kindergarten Association, and its all-day operation Early Learning Counties Manukau.
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Bilingualism

Benefits of bilingualism

In studies comparing monolingual with bilingual children in biliterate activities bilingual children are shown to have higher levels of discernment, indicating high levels of executive control awareness. French-English and Chinese-English four and five year olds, in a test of executive functioning of cognitive processes demonstrated cognitive strategies/experiences gained from learning in two languages (Bialystok, 1997; 1999). ‘Theory of mind’ tests with bilingual preschoolers and six year olds showed increased abilities with perceptual motor functioning, cognitive controls and task conflict resolution (Bialystok & Senman, 2004; 2005; Goetz, 2003). Bialystok and Viswanathan (2009) countered critics by showing bilingual advantages can override the effects of immigrant status and Barac and Bialystok (2011) refuting evidence from intelligence tests, confirm that learning in two languages provides metalinguistic and cognitive benefits unavailable to monolinguals.

Models of bilingual development

Cummins (2000) clarified the differences between basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP), now referred to as conversational proficiency and academic proficiency. The former is when children are immersed continuously in a language or when basic oral fluency is underway before school, whereas academic proficiency includes lexical and other knowledge that continues to develop throughout a lifetime. A cognitive proficiency framework, supported by Baker (2001), sets out the relative cognitive and contextual demands and has been extended to explain the increasing complexity of language demands at higher academic levels (Cummins 2000 p.67). Cognitive processes developed in one language are available for additional languages and the interdependence of first
and subsequent languages and cross-linguistic transfers occur in relation to cognitive and metacognitive processes.

Baker, (2003); Hornberger, (2002) and Pennycook, (2007) believe that the complexities of simultaneous bi/multilingual processes are lost in Cummins sequenced view of bilingual learning and argue that where two languages are taught separately, a monolingual ideology is promoted. In response to these critiques, Cummins devised and applied the Academic Expertise Framework to account for the “interpersonal spaces and opportunities for languages and identities to be negotiated” (Cummins 2001a, p.264). His model advises that focusing on languages, their meanings and use, must maximise cognitive engagement and identity investment for children.

Interdependence of one language with another is also tied to views of proficiency in Cummins’ (1979) early work on the Threshold Hypothesis. His emphasis on the interdependence model of language and cognitive ability in bilingual children foregrounded proficiency in each language as the mediator of cognitive advantages for enhanced multiliteracies in the dominant language (Bialystok, 1991; Cummins and Corson, 1997; Cummins, 2000, 2006; Garcia, 1991; Kenner, 2004; Taylor et al. 2008). Advantages include access to the scripts, texts, and literacies afforded by two or more languages and cultures, as well as linguistic and cultural capital generating greater cross-cultural relations. (Garcia, 2009; Jones-Diaz, 2007; Moll, Saez & Duvorin, 2001). Significantly, however, where the languages have low status in relation to the dominant language/s of schooling then these advantages are not evident (Cummins, 2000; Nieto, 2010; Franken et al., 2008; May 2007, 2009; May & Sleeter, 2010).

**Ecological view**

An ecological model of bi/multilingualism proposed by Hornberger (2002) suggests “bi/multilinguals’ learning is maximised when they are allowed and enabled to draw from across their existing languages and skills.” (p.607). She devised a Continua of Biliteracy using an ecological model with recognition of the pluralilingualism emerging from Europe and the notion of pedagogical activity involving ‘translanguaging’ (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Garcia, 2007; Makoni & Pennycook, 2007).
Effective bilingualism

Advantages accrue for bi/multilinguals when additive bilingualism occurs in the educational setting and h/c languages are not replaced by additional languages (often of state schooling). Conversely, subtractive bilingualism occurs when the structures and implications of the programme ensure the additional language replaces the h/c languages. Subtractive bilingualism is associated with assimilation policies and the loss of the home cultural practices, often generating intergenerational distances (Cummins, 2000; Baker, 2006; McCaffery & Tuafuti, 2003; Nieto, 2010).

May, Hill and Tiakiwai (2004), using Hornberger’s (1991, p.68) typology, delineate aims and resourcing characteristic of Bilingual Education, stating that a view of ‘bilingualism as a problem’ creates a ‘transition to English’ and a subtractive approach. Where the orientation is towards language rights, language maintenance, language is viewed as a resource, and enrichment programmes such as Te Kohanga Reo and some immersion or two-way Pasifika or Chinese bilingual services, follow a strong additive approach (May, et al. 2004; McCaffery & Taligalu-McFall-McCaffery, 2010). The hallmark of effective Bilingual Education is the goal of biliteracy in two languages with both languages used for content teaching consistently for up to six years within an empowering pedagogy (Franken et al., 2004; May et al., 2004; Thomas & Collier, 1997, 2002).
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Self assessment of effective bilingual support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Effective Bilingual Support</th>
<th>Less strong</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides a positive climate and environment for children's languages and cultures.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives children positive messages in range of ways about the value of being bilingual.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to use some greetings and phrases.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages children to reply and use their own language.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses some songs in the programme.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a relevant collection of songs and music resources.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive interactions with parents / caregivers on language and cultural matters.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages parents to enrol in language maintenance objectives.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has rich music language and cultural matters incorporated in the everyday programme.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranges visits from family and members of children's cultures and languages.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages children to read / write and draw in their own languages.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides useful written chunks of vocabulary and phrases for children to use.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses books and stories in children's own languages.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes use of community materials and resources with ease.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets language functions objectives and plans to support learning and teaching goals in these through language activities and routines.</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks to children andParents / caregivers in their own language / languages.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translates material.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organises professional development support for fellow staff and self relating to bilingualism.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocates in public / policy meetings for bilingualism.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F.1: Teacher Criteria for Effective Bilingual Support
Appendix G: Chapter 5
Example of transcript

Interview 1 (p.7) 6/7/10

Nola: Do you get a sense that you have set up a culture if you like, in the centre, so that when you step away from there, no matter where you went you’d do the same sort of thing?

I think so, yes, and hopefully since it’s started now it will live on.

Nola: Because it’s quite something to find yourself in that role and have a particular philosophy or desire and skills and ability, but also to be able to put that in place in a child care particularly. Did you have any doubts about how to go about that to begin with?

I didn’t, but sometimes, like even looking at the common words and phrases, common communication sentences wondered which ones should we include and which ones should we not? There was this one *********** mum who came in and I said how would you say ‘really good’ or ‘very good’? although we don’t say ‘really good girl’ you know, that’s what they relate to quite often.

Nola: Yes, the most common phrases, yes.

And she said ‘oh just say ‘very good’ and she’ll be fine with that’ and I said ‘okay’, but trying to get a list of some common words and phrases what do we really need? What are those common sentences that we might use? So coming up with that, and getting the teacher, early we were working there was just the 2 of us, so getting her on board as well was quite a challenge because she had this philosophy of English and that’s the expectation of the parents and that is what we are going to do, and I said ‘okay, I understand where you come from but it is really important if a child...’ and also the expectations from the teachers as well of ‘why is this child not speaking in English? Why is she not responding?’ and I would tell them ‘give the child some time. The child has been exposed to a different language at home. You can’t expect this child
to understand what you are telling him’. Especially at mat times and other times as well, getting frustrated because a child is not responding, frustrated because a child is not participating you know? Think about it. This child has just been exposed to one language and English is such a foreign language for this child. And firstly the environment, and we would be probably be really threatening for the child, a whole new language

**Nola: Very unsettling.**

A whole new language would be quite unsettling so that’s when they understood ‘okay, we should be speak’ I said ‘no speak English but also if you know the home language don’t hesitate to use it’.

When I wanted to appoint a third teacher, that’s the reason I had ***** as a third teacher because my advertisement went out as ‘Asian teacher’ I want a teacher who can speak one or more Asian languages.

**Nola: So that’s really a principle you’re working behind isn’t it?**

Yes, and because I found at that stage we had quite a few Asian families and we couldn’t communicate. We need to bridge the gap. That’s why we decided. And our Licensee was very supportive and that’s why we went and appointed a third teacher as an Asian teacher. We actually took it up as contractual basis we tried it for 6 months and then they renewed it for 6 months, and then we gave her the permanent position at the end of a year. And we said it’s working really well because most of the families, you know, the grandparents bring the child in and they don’t speak any English and to be able to communicate with them it was a real block with language, and just having her opened up so many gates of communication.

**Nola: So you found that you’re really looking for the bilingual teacher in these sorts of environments where actually the child can get the most out of the centre.**

Yes, absolutely.
# Appendix H: Chapter 5

Bilingual activity – significant patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chat</th>
<th>Relating / Family</th>
<th>Trust / care</th>
<th>Making meaning</th>
<th>Teaching / learning</th>
<th>Affirming identity</th>
<th>Teacher / self respect</th>
<th>Interpreting / translating</th>
<th>Representing community role model</th>
<th>Role modelling bilingual</th>
<th>Bridging / cultural broker</th>
<th>Knowing / ideologies about language</th>
<th>Pedagogy / policy</th>
<th>Spirituality / values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table H.1  Shelley: Bilingual activity – Significant patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chat</th>
<th>Relating / Family</th>
<th>Trust / care</th>
<th>Making meaning</th>
<th>Teaching / learning</th>
<th>Affirming identity</th>
<th>Teacher / self respect</th>
<th>Interpreting / translating</th>
<th>Representing community role model</th>
<th>Role modelling bilingual</th>
<th>Bridging / cultural broker</th>
<th>Knowing / ideologies about language</th>
<th>Pedagogy / policy</th>
<th>Spirituality / values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table H.2  Fiona: Bilingual activity – Significant patterns
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Relating / Family / child</th>
<th>Settling Trust / care</th>
<th>Making meaning Teaching / learning</th>
<th>Affirming identity Child / respect</th>
<th>Affirming identity Teacher / self respect</th>
<th>Interpreting / translating</th>
<th>Representing community role model</th>
<th>Role modelling bilingual</th>
<th>Bridging / cultural broker</th>
<th>Knowing / ideologies about language</th>
<th>Pedagogy / policy</th>
<th>Spirituality / values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table H.3  Htwe Htwe: Bilingual activity – Significant patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Relating / Family / child</th>
<th>Settling Trust / care</th>
<th>Making meaning Teaching / learning</th>
<th>Affirming identity Child / respect</th>
<th>Affirming identity Teacher / self respect</th>
<th>Interpreting / translating</th>
<th>Representing community role model</th>
<th>Role modelling bilingual</th>
<th>Bridging / cultural broker</th>
<th>Knowing / ideologies about language</th>
<th>Pedagogy / policy</th>
<th>Spirituality / values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table H.4  MF: Bilingual activity – Significant patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Relating / Family / child</th>
<th>Settling Trust / care</th>
<th>Making meaning Teaching / learning</th>
<th>Affirming identity Child / respect</th>
<th>Affirming identity Teacher / self respect</th>
<th>Interpreting / translating</th>
<th>Representing community role model</th>
<th>Role modelling bilingual</th>
<th>Bridging / cultural broker</th>
<th>Knowing / ideologies about language</th>
<th>Pedagogy / policy</th>
<th>Spirituality / values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table H.5  Anu: Bilingual activity – Significant patterns
Appendix H

Teachers talk of bilingual pedagogical actions: Most frequently associated categories (aspects of the main four frames).

5 teachers considered *Ideologies* as significant
3 teachers considered *Pedagogy and policy* as most significant
3 teachers considered *Cultural broking* as significant
2 teachers considered *Representing community* as significant
2 teachers considered *Affirming own identity* as significant
1 teacher considered *Role modelling* as significant
1 teacher considered *Affirming the child’s identity* as significant
1 teacher considered *Meaning making* as significant