



## Exploring bilingual pedagogies in dual language preschool classrooms

Mileidis Gort & Ryan W. Pontier

To cite this article: Mileidis Gort & Ryan W. Pontier (2013) Exploring bilingual pedagogies in dual language preschool classrooms, *Language and Education*, 27:3, 223-245, DOI: [10.1080/09500782.2012.697468](https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2012.697468)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2012.697468>



Published online: 04 Jul 2012.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 814



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 8 View citing articles [↗](#)

## Exploring bilingual pedagogies in dual language preschool classrooms

Mileidis Gort\* and Ryan W. Pontier

*School of Education and Human Development, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL, USA*

*(Received 25 October 2011; final version received 22 May 2012)*

In this paper, we present an analysis of the language practices of four Spanish/English dual language (DL) preschool teachers, focusing on the ways in which the teachers mediate bilingual interactions with students and distribute Spanish and English across different classroom discourse functions. Findings reveal teachers' flexible and strategic use of each language to support children's developing bilingual competencies as well as to negotiate several communicative, academic, and management functions. Findings further illuminate the utility of bilingual speech/interaction as a communicative and academic resource and suggest that a strict language separation approach, as traditionally implemented in DL programs, may be at odds with the natural social interactions of bilinguals who draw on a number of communicative strategies, including codeswitching and tandem talk, to construct meaning.

**Keywords:** bilingual teachers; classroom interaction; codeswitching; teacher talk; pedagogy; preschoolers

### Introduction

In dual language (DL) programs, children from two different language backgrounds are integrated with the goals of developing bilingualism and biliteracy in the target languages, academic achievement, and cross-cultural understanding (Christian 1996). This model of additive bilingual education, wherein children's native languages are highly valued, their language knowledge and experiences are considered resources for thinking and learning, and they have the opportunity to add a second language to their repertoire, relies heavily on the notion that teachers can create contexts that promote children's engagement in authentic interactions (Christian 1996). Such interactions are expected to support children's language and academic development in the highly contextualized and scaffolded contexts of DL classrooms.

Because at different points throughout the day, students in DL programs are immersed in a language in which they may not yet be proficient, the role of the DL teacher is particularly complex and challenging. When children with emerging proficiency in the instructional language are grouped together with proficient speakers of that language, the task of the teacher is to orchestrate the sociolinguistic, sociocultural, and academic context in ways that support both groups of learners (Valdés 1997). This means that teachers have to thoughtfully respond to students' needs in ways that make the content comprehensible to language learners while ensuring that it is engaging and challenging to proficient speakers. To be effective, DL teachers have to be knowledgeable about bilingual development, including sociolinguistic and sociocultural variables affecting the DL acquisition process. Additionally, DL teachers must have highly sophisticated linguistic and pedagogical skills

---

\*Corresponding author. Email: [mgort@miami.edu](mailto:mgort@miami.edu)

in order to use the instructional languages strategically and effectively to support students' meaning-making (Christian 1996; Valdés 1997; Lindholm-Leary 2001). Given the paucity of research on the practices of early childhood DL teachers, however, we lack a coherent understanding of DL preschool teachers' language choices and uses, including their strategic use of two languages, in support of young children's emergent bilingual/biliterate development and meaning-making. Following others in the field (Edelsky 1986; Moll, Saez, and Dworin 2001; Gort 2006, 2008; Escamilla 2006; Reyes 2006, 2008), we define *emergent bilingualism* and *biliteracy* as, 'the ongoing, dynamic development of concepts and expertise for thinking, listening, speaking, reading, and writing in two languages' (Reyes 2006, 269), which include young children's use of their cultural and linguistic experiences to construct meaning with teachers, peers, and others in their environment (Whitmore et al. 2004).

In this paper, we present an analysis of DL preschool teachers' language practices in bilingual interactions (i.e., interactions that involve the use of two languages) with emergent bilingual children of Spanish and English home language backgrounds. We explore the nature of teacher talk, focusing specifically on the ways in which teachers mediate bilingual interactions with students and distribute Spanish and English across different classroom discourse functions to create contexts for meaning in support of young learners' emergent bilingualism. To this end, we explored the prevalence, nature, and utility of bilingual pedagogies in DL early childhood contexts. The following questions guided our investigation:

1. How do teachers mediate bilingual interactions to support students' participation and meaning-making in Spanish- and English-medium preschool activities?
2. What are the functions of teachers' language practices in bilingual interactions?
3. What language choices do teachers make in bilingual interactions with children?

### **Theoretical perspectives**

We situate our study within social-interactionist (John-Steiner, Panofsky, and Smith 1994) and sociocultural (Vygotsky 1978) perspectives to understanding bilingual pedagogies in an early childhood Spanish/English DL program that is guided by a policy of language separation. These related frameworks foreground how children learn language through interactions with more skilled speakers in their immediate contexts. Further, these perspectives take into account the social and cultural contexts in which people engage, and the multiple encapsulating layers of contexts in which language is situated, to examine their participation and outcomes.

Dual language program design draws from theoretical and empirical work in second language acquisition (SLA). In particular, the input-interaction-output model for language learning (see Long 1996; Gass and Selinker 2001; Block 2003; Mackey 2007) posits that interaction between second language (L2) learners and native (L1) or [more] proficient speakers promotes language learning through negotiation for meaning; modified, comprehensible input; and opportunities for learners to produce language and to test out new hypotheses about the way language works (Swain 1985; Pica 1994; Long 1996; Gass 1997; Mackey 2007). This model for language learning is supported by empirical research, which has found a positive relationship between opportunities to interact and [second] language development (see Mackey 2007 for a review of relevant studies). Thus, according to social-interactionist perspectives, the development of bilingual language skills requires

spaces where learners can engage in meaningful linguistic interactions in each of the two target languages and can observe the authentic use of both languages in the context of natural communication through everyday activities that require language use to achieve the communicative task (Lafford and Salaberry 2003; Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz 2005).

Influenced by the work of Vygotsky (1978), sociocultural theory shifts the focus from the individual learner to the social activity of dialogic interaction and provides a lens for understanding microprocesses of language learning in action. Sociocultural theory is primarily concerned with distributed cognition and consciousness as mediated through social interaction and cultural artifacts. Through social interactions between speakers with varying levels of proficiency, language becomes a cognitive tool that, ‘mediate[s] internalization . . . and that externalize[s] internal psychological activity, resocializing, and recognizing it for the individual’ (Swain 2005, 480). Thus, a sociocultural framework foregrounds how children learn language as they interact with and interpret their world within their culture and in their social group through socially mediated activity (Wertsch 1998). The children’s environment and purpose provide the sociocultural context within which they construct meaning.

### *Sheltering interactions in DL classrooms*

Interactions between teachers and students constitute the fabric of the curriculum in the early childhood DL classroom. In support of at least one of the goals of DL education – bilingual proficiency – teachers are expected to create classroom contexts which provide both structured and unstructured opportunities to engage children in real-life conversational interactions in each of the target languages at different times throughout the day (Christian 1996). Research suggests that a reciprocal interaction model of teaching, in which teachers engage in genuine dialogue with students and facilitate, rather than control, student learning, encourages the development of higher-level cognitive skills (Doherty et al. 2003) and is associated with higher student achievement (Levine and Lezotte 1995). In these dialogic exchanges, effective DL teachers use sheltering strategies to promote comprehension, provide meaningful and comprehensible language input in each of the target languages, and support language interactions between children from different language backgrounds and between themselves and the students.

Sheltered instruction is an approach in which teachers modify and mediate instruction to make language and content comprehensible to students learning in a second language. Developed to support sustained periods of monolingual instruction, sheltering requires that teachers use a combination of strategies to facilitate student understanding without resorting to translation. According to Lindholm-Leary (2001), teachers optimize input in the target language by adjusting their speech to the comprehension level of the learner and making it interesting, relevant, and slightly challenging. In the case of emergent bilinguals, teachers make input comprehensible in the early stages of second language acquisition through the use of various linguistic and paralinguistic strategies, including slower, clearly enunciated, simplified, and repetitive speech oriented to the ‘here and now’; highly contextualized language and gestures; systematic comprehension and confirmation checks; visual reinforcement of concrete and abstract concepts (e.g., pictures, charts, graphs, realia, film/video, graphic organizers); and scaffolded connections to prior knowledge (Echevarria, Short, and Peterson 2011). Sheltered instructional strategies have been shown to support [second] language acquisition and provide access to the core curriculum for emergent bilingual learners (Howard et al. 2007).

***Translanguaging as bilingual pedagogy***

Translanguaging, ‘the act performed by bilinguals of accessing different linguistic features or various modes of what are described as autonomous languages in order to maximize communicative potential’ (García 2009a, 2009b), is a common, natural, and distinctive feature of bilingual behavior (Zentella 1997; Reyes 2001; Hornberger 2005a) that shows the flexibility and versatility of bilinguals as language users. Research demonstrates that bilinguals translanguange as a way to make meaning in their multilingual worlds, and that they engage in hybrid language use, a ‘systematic, strategic, affiliative, and sense-making process’ (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, and Álvarez 2001, 128) and normative expression of bilingualism. For example, bilingual teachers use translanguaging to expand language boundaries (Martin-Beltrán 2010), to create multiple opportunities for language learning (Martin-Beltrán 2010), to represent authentic situations that reflect the multilingual communities outside of the classroom (Levine 2003), to transmit information (Creese and Blackledge 2010), and to perform identities using the linguistic signs at a learner’s disposal (Creese and Blackledge 2010).

A review of the literature on hybrid language practices in the second/foreign language classroom suggests that the concurrent use of two languages as a pedagogic resource can support student learning (e.g., Lucas and Katz 1994; Canagarajah 1995; Macaro 1997, 2001; Lin 2000, 2006; Cook 2001; Heller and Martin-Jones 2001; Martin 2005; Jaffe 2007; Ferguson 2009). This line of research illustrates how bilingual pedagogies can support various linguistic, educational, affective, and sociocultural functions. For example, teachers incorporate the use of students’ native language in the second/foreign language classroom to convey meaning; to orient students to learning strategies; to explain grammatical structures and linguistic features (e.g., through contrastive linguistic analysis); to make relevant connections between the academic content and students’ experiences; to reveal and to elucidate errors; to alert students to important new vocabulary; to make personal contact with individual students; and to organize/manage the class. These and related bilingual practices allow teachers to model authentic (i.e., real-life) bilingual behaviors and to create spaces where both languages are treated as resources for learning, thus promoting bilingualism and a bilingual language repertoire as normal and natural.

Commenting on the pedagogic potential of translanguaging, Hornberger (2005b) contends that: ‘bi/multilinguals’ learning is maximized when they are allowed and enabled to draw from across all their existing language skills (in two+ languages), rather than being constrained and inhibited from doing so by monolingual instructional assumptions and practices’ (607). Similarly, Garcia and Kleifgen (2010) argue that teachers, ‘meaningfully educate when they draw upon the full linguistic repertoire of all students, including language practices that are multiple and hybrid’ (43). According to Cook (2001), the value of using strategic bilingual pedagogies in ‘official’ monolingual language learning contexts (e.g., second/foreign language classrooms, DL programs) can be evaluated according to their efficiency (i.e., Can something be done more effectively through the use of one or both languages?); their support for learning (i.e., Will learning be promoted by using both languages?); their authenticity (i.e., Do participants feel more comfortable using one language versus the other for particular topics or functions?); and their external relevance (i.e., Will the integration of both languages help students master specific [language] uses beyond the classroom?).

Despite a strong research base on the complexity and richness of translanguaging as a normative and intelligent expression of bilingualism (Zentella 1997; MacSwan 1999; Woolard 2004; Lee, Hill-Bonnet, and Gillispie 2008; García 2009a, 2009b; Creese and Blackledge 2010; Martin-Beltrán 2010), and the pedagogic utility of bilingual classroom

speech as a communicative and academic resource (e.g., Lin 2000, 2006; Cook 2001; Martin 2005; Jaffe 2007; Ferguson 2009), widespread suspicion and conflict remain on the part of DL school leaders and teachers with regard to the concurrent use of two or more languages as a sanctioned pedagogic practice. Dual language education researchers have traditionally argued against bilingual language practices in the classroom, insisting instead that a language separation approach (i.e., sustained periods of monolingual instruction in each language) provides learners with the opportunity to produce extended discourse in which they must make their language coherent, accurate, and sociolinguistically appropriate (Swain 1985; Lindholm-Leary 2001); gives students the opportunity to more fully develop two languages within parallel monolingual contexts (Howard et al. 2007); and helps combat 'the natural tendency of minority language speakers to shift to the majority language' (Cummins and Swain 1986, 108). Despite the lack of empirical research that has examined the effects of separated language instruction on the development of bilingualism in dual language programs, this practice has been widely accepted and employed. Such parallel monolingualism (Heller 1999) or dual monolingualism (Fitts 2006) models for bilingual instruction are grounded in monolingual assumptions prevalent in SLA research, which has traditionally focused on the acquisition of one target language and conceptualized L1 and L2 development as separate and sequential rather than continuous, simultaneous, and reciprocal. In contrast to monolingual approaches to dual language education, a bilingual pedagogy makes the most of the linguistic and cognitive resourcefulness of emergent bilinguals and employs methods and practices that utilize and extend these resources to further develop bilingualism and biliteracy (Gutiérrez et al. 2001; Dworin 2003; Arthur and Martin 2006; Michael-Luna and Canagarajah 2008; Garcia and Sylvan 2011). The present study aims to contribute to our collective understanding of effective instructional practices for emergent bilingual learners by examining dual language teachers' use of bilingual pedagogies in support of young, emergent bilinguals' participation and meaning-making in Spanish- and English-medium preschool activities.

## Method

### Setting

The study was situated in two preschool classrooms within an additive Spanish/English DL preschool program in a multilingual and multicultural community in the southeastern United States. One of the preschool's primary goals was to expose children to authentic experiences in each of the target languages, Spanish and English. At the time of data collection, the school was in its second year of operation and working to define and systematize its dual language approach. The school, which operates year-round and follows a similar schedule throughout the year, serves approximately 130 children, ages six weeks to five years old, who represent a variety of cultural, home language, and socioeconomic backgrounds. The school offers a variety of cost options to meet the community's needs: 25% of families pay tuition based on an annual income scale, 25% of families pay full tuition, and 50% of families receive tuition support from county, state, and federal subsidies. For example, the school serves children who qualify for Head Start and Early Head Start, as well as Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten (VPK) programs.<sup>1</sup> The average preschool class size was 14.

Two teachers were assigned to each preschool classroom. At the time of the study, the DL preschool program followed a language policy of separation (i.e., parallel/dual monolingualism) through which teachers were encouraged to model monolingual use of

each target language and discouraged from moving between, or mixing, languages. Teacher pairs were free to implement their own choice of language separation strategy. In the two preschool classrooms, the two teacher pairs applied the language separation policy in unique ways. In one classroom, the two target languages were distributed by time (i.e., morning/afternoon) so that both teachers spoke English in the morning and Spanish in the afternoon when leading whole group activities and interacting with children individually and in small group settings. This approach to language separation created a (generally) *monolingual* instructional language context wherein the same language was used by both teachers during specific times of the day; however, because both teachers actively used each target language for instruction and in social interaction with the children and each other at designated times of the day, they served as bilingual models of the program's target languages (albeit ones who kept their languages [mostly] separate).

The teachers in the second classroom adopted a 'one-teacher/one-language' approach, so that one teacher served as the Spanish language model and the other served as the English language model at all times. Each teacher in this classroom took turns leading large group activities as the target language of large group instruction alternated on a weekly basis. This meant that the Spanish-model teacher led large group activities during alternating 'Spanish' weeks, and vice-versa. In small groups and individual interactions, each teacher used her designated language throughout the day to communicate with children and each other. This approach to language separation created a *bilingual* instructional language context, wherein both languages were used concurrently throughout the day as both teachers were generally present and involved in small and large group activities, albeit to different degrees. In this classroom, each teacher served as a monolingual model of one of the DL program's target languages (although both teachers demonstrated receptive bilingual skills when interacting with students and colleagues who addressed them in their non-designated language).

### **Participants**

The four teacher participants were Latina females whose ages ranged between 27 and 53 years old ( $M = 37.42$ ,  $SD = 11.96$ ) and who had completed two-year degrees and earned certification in early childhood education. Teachers were native speakers of Spanish and bilingual in Spanish and English. They demonstrated great commitment to the DL program, including the language separation policy as enacted in their particular classroom, and enthusiasm for their role as partners in children's emergent bilingual and biliteracy development. Their teaching experience ranged from 5 to 21 years ( $M = 10.25$ ,  $SD = 7.37$ ).

Ages of child participants ( $n = 28$ ) ranged from 4;0 to 5;7 ( $M = 4;7$ ,  $SD = 0.42$ ) at the beginning of data collection. Children reflected the community's diversity in terms of cultural, ethnic, linguistic, and socio-economic background, and represented a range of language proficiencies and early literacy experiences, as would be expected in dual language, multi-age, preschool classrooms. Home languages included Spanish ( $n = 22^2$ ), English ( $n = 3$ ), Arabic/English ( $n = 2$ ), and Portuguese/English ( $n = 1$ ). All but one child participant had been enrolled in the program for at least one academic year prior to data collection.

### **Data collection**

We focused our investigation of teachers' language practices in the highly interactive contexts of *Read-aloud* and *Show-and-tell*, two typical preschool large-group activities. *Read-aloud* is a planned oral reading of a book that exposes [child] listeners to a variety of

literary genres and story topics, fosters critical thinking, and supports children's language and literacy development. Through *Read-alouds*, teachers model the use of reading strategies that aid in comprehension and help children make personal connections to the story being read. In *Show-and-tell*, children take turns orally describing and showcasing a personally relevant item they have brought from home to their peers and teachers. Children's oral descriptions require the execution of a number of literacy skills that include planning, organization, meaning generation, and self-monitoring. The teacher guides and encourages children to elaborate their descriptions through scaffolded questioning, and invites peers to engage with the presenter and each other through their own questions and commentary.

We employed ethnographic tools to explore teachers' language choices and functions in bilingual classroom interactions in the contexts of Spanish and English *Read-aloud* and *Show-and-tell* activities. In ethnographic-based research, researchers collect varied and in-depth data for a period of time and interpret these data using rich contextual and situational information (Harry and Rippey 2009). Our main data collection technique was systematic teacher and student observation in the natural setting of the classroom, which we conducted over a period of six weeks during the preschool's summer session.<sup>3</sup> Specifically, we used digital video recordings and ethnographic field notes to document teachers' and children's naturally occurring language use across the focal activities. In all, we recorded 15 *Read-aloud* (6 English, 9 Spanish) and 8 *Show-and-tell* (6 English, 2 Spanish)<sup>4</sup> sessions across the two classrooms. These sessions lasted between 30 and 45 minutes each and represented approximately 15 hours of video data in total.

### Data analysis

Video recordings were transcribed verbatim soon after each observation by the second author, a Spanish/English bilingual doctoral student in language and literacy education, and verified for accuracy by a second bilingual graduate research assistant.<sup>5</sup> Transcripts, representing individual sessions of focal activities, included all intelligible teacher and child utterances and ethnographic field notes describing the instructional context and teacher and child [non-verbal] behaviors. Data analysis was based on the qualitative analysis model proposed by Miles and Huberman (1994) and included the iterative steps of data reduction, coding, categorization, concept mapping, and theme generation. A microethnographic approach allowed for a reflexive and recursive analytical process, combining a focus on how people use language and other systems of communicating in constructing classroom events with attention to social and cultural processes (Bloome 2004).

We defined the interactional unit of analysis as a *bilingual interaction* between at least one teacher and one child, or a series of conversationally tied utterances involving at least one teacher, one child, and the use of two languages. After identifying all bilingual interactions across English and Spanish activity sessions, we analyzed transcripts repeatedly and rigorously with attention to the verbal aspects of each bilingual interaction and cues to contextualization. This level of analysis involved an examination of teachers' *productive* language mode (e.g., bilingual, monolingual), the form of teachers' talk (e.g., translation, paraphrase, elaboration, repetition), and whether the teacher was initiating a codeswitch (i.e., the use of features of two languages within an utterance or conversation; Genesee 2009) or responding to a child's use of the non-target language by switching codes. A bilingual language mode was defined as bilingual speech produced by an individual teacher participant (i.e., speech involving a codeswitch or departure from the language of instruction/designated language) within the interactive unit. Alternatively, a monolingual

language mode was defined as monolingual speech (in the target/designated language) by an individual teacher-participant within the interactive unit.

The next level of analysis focused on the role that teachers' language mode assumed for the children's social construction of meaning. In this stage, in-depth qualitative analyses of teachers' language practices were conducted in order to better understand the functions of teachers' language in support of children's emergent bilingual/biliterate development. The coding scheme for the forms and functions of teachers' language practices in bilingual interactions was informed by a review of relevant theory and research and developed through an emergent and axial coding approach (Strauss and Corbin 1990). Two coders trained in classroom-based ethnographic approaches to data collection, preparation, coding, and analysis – the second author and a graduate student peer – engaged in the iterative process of code generation, assessment of goodness-of-fit between the codes and the data, and code revision, until codes were adequate to describe teachers' language practices within and across the focal activities and classroom contexts. To increase the credibility and consistent identification and labeling of the resulting codes, the first author acted as critical friend (Schuck and Russell 2005), challenging the codes, descriptions and examples, asking for clarification, and offering alternative interpretations of the data. This procedure yielded 91.4% agreement.<sup>6</sup> Coding disagreements were then resolved through discussion amongst the two authors. Three broad categories of language functions emerged: communicative, management, and academic (see Appendix 1 for an overview of the coding scheme, including subcategories, descriptions, and examples of each). After coding and establishing the categories, we engaged in the final stage of analysis where we searched for patterns within and across the two classrooms in order to locate comparative trends in our data.

## **Findings**

Our analyses elucidate the ways in which the teachers' interpretation and enactment of 'language separation' shape bilingual interactional spaces for participation and meaning-making in Spanish- and English-medium activities in the two focal classrooms. We begin this section by illustrating the ways in which teachers distribute Spanish and English across different classroom discourse functions to create contexts for meaning in support of young learners' emergent bilingualism and biliteracy. Then, we describe the nature of bilingual pedagogies in each classroom (i.e., 'language-by-time-of-day' and 'one-teacher/one-language') by presenting findings related to teachers' language choices in bilingual interactions with students – with particular attention to teachers' adoption of monolingual versus bilingual language modes.

### ***Functions of teachers' language practices in bilingual interactions with students: an overview***

Findings suggest that teachers used each language strategically and flexibly to accommodate their students' needs as well as to negotiate several communicative, academic, and management functions. Across English- and Spanish-language activities in the two focal classrooms, teachers' monolingual and bilingual language practices predominantly served the functions of affirming students' oral productions, redirecting behavior, providing academic vocabulary, asking students questions to clarify their statements/contributions, comforting students, and providing new information in order to expand children's schema.

*Scaffolding communication through bilingual interactions*

Although the children generally used English across activities conducted in either language to offer explanations, share comments, ask questions, and answer teachers' questions, teachers accepted children's contributions in either language while scaffolding their participation in classroom activities and modeling the use of the target language. Teachers facilitated children's oral interactions within and across the focal activities by affirming students' statements (e.g., the teacher responds to a student's comment by saying 'yes', 'very good', or repeats the student's utterance in an effort to show its validity) and asking questions to clarify what students said (e.g., the teacher repeats or reframes the student's contribution in question form) through the use of monolingual speech in the target language of instruction (or teachers' designated language). Other communicative functions of teachers' monolingual language practices in bilingual interactions with children involved alerting a child to the code being used and directing a child's attention to the meaningful part of a question (i.e., helping a child to understand what the teacher was really asking). Teachers' bilingual language practices (i.e., bilingual speech) served similar functions: to affirm students' statements, to ask students questions to clarify their ideas, as well as to return to a previous conversation.

*Providing academic support through bilingual interactions*

The most prevalent academic function of teachers' monolingual language practices was providing relevant academic vocabulary in the target language, such as a student saying 'rectangle' during a Spanish *Read-aloud* and the teacher responding, '*Si, un rectángulo*' [Yes, a rectangle]. Other academic functions included assessing a student's knowledge (e.g., 'What's the story about?') and asking students to make predictions (e.g., 'What do you think is going to happen next?'). The most prevalent academic function of teachers' bilingual language practices was to provide new information in order to expand a child's schema, such as when a student did not think that a girl could portray Peter Pan, and the teacher explained – through the use of bilingual speech – that there are many ways to portray the roles of characters in theater. Teachers also used codeswitching to assess student knowledge and to provide academic vocabulary in the target language.

*Managing students and activities through bilingual interactions*

The most prevalent management functions of teachers' monolingual language practices were pacifying a student (e.g., a student says that she cannot see the book during a *Read-aloud*, and the teacher responds, '*Yo te voy a mostrar*' [I'm going to show you]) and redirecting a behavior (e.g., a teacher notices that a child is inattentive and says, '*Tienes que prestar atención*' [You need to pay attention]). When teachers used codeswitching to manage the classroom or activity, it was primarily to redirect a behavior.

*Teachers' language choices in bilingual interactions with students*

In this section, we use selected excerpts<sup>7</sup> from the classroom video transcripts to illustrate the ways in which teachers from the 'language-by-time-of-day' and 'one-teacher/one-language' classrooms navigated bilingual interactions with children through the use of monolingual and bilingual language practices (see Table 1 for a breakdown of total instances of monolingual and bilingual modes in each classroom). Teachers' distribution of Spanish

Table 1. Breakdown of language mode by classroom.

	Classroom		Total
	LBTOD <sup>i</sup>	OTOL <sup>ii</sup>	
Monolingual	31	45	76
Bilingual	34	5	39
Total	65	50	115

Notes: <sup>i</sup>Language-by-time-of-day; <sup>ii</sup>One-teacher/one-language.

and English across different classroom discourse functions created contexts for meaning in support of young learners' developing bilingualism and meaning-making. Regardless of whether teachers adopted a monolingual or bilingual language mode (i.e., used monolingual or bilingual speech), they actively participated in bilingual interactions with children in both English- and Spanish-language activities. Teachers did not reject children's attempts at communication in either language and rarely prompted children to explicitly use the target language (i.e., the language designated for the particular time of day or the language designated to that particular teacher).

#### *Sheltering bilingual interactions through monolingual instructional practices*

As is typical in most DL programs, particularly in the early years when students are still in the process of developing each of the languages, the students in the two focal classrooms exhibited a range of bilingual proficiency. In order to support students' developing and varied language skills, model the designated target language, and scaffold students' participation in the highly interactive contexts of *Read-aloud* and *Show-and-tell*, teachers balanced children's varying linguistic needs by drawing from a repertoire of relevant sheltered instructional strategies. Across both classrooms, teachers maintained a monolingual language mode (i.e., used monolingual speech in the target/designated language) in the majority of bilingual interactions (76/115, or 66%); these interactions were documented primarily when Spanish was the language of instruction (72/76 bilingual interactions, or 95%).

*Monolingual instructional practices in the 'language-by-time-of-day' classroom.* Teachers in the 'language-by-time-of-day' classroom maintained a monolingual mode in 31 of the total 76 bilingual interactions, or 40.8%. Most of these interactions (27) occurred when Spanish was the language of instruction, while only a few (4) occurred when English was the language of instruction. When operating in a monolingual mode, teachers primarily affirmed students' statements, although they also translated what students had said into the target instructional language, clarified what students had said by asking a question, and redirected a behavior. These functions were similarly prevalent in each language of instruction.

Below, we highlight a representative interactive unit, within the context of a whole group *Read-aloud* activity in the 'language-by-time-of-day' classroom, in which the teacher maintained the use of the target language and successfully integrated a number of sheltered instructional strategies in support of students' comprehension of and engagement with the story. The *Read-aloud* activity was conducted during official Spanish classroom time. Students sat on the floor, in a circle, in an open area of the classroom designed for various

whole group activities (e.g., *Morning circle*, *Story time/Read-aloud*, *Show-and-tell*). In this arrangement, each student had an unobstructed view of the teacher, the book she was reading, and all other students present, allowing access to oral, visual and physical cues. The teacher selected the Spanish picture book, *Froggy se viste (Froggy Gets Dressed)*; London 1992, 1997)<sup>8</sup> for this particular *Read-aloud*, a recursive story about all the cold-weather gear one must wear on a snowy day to be protected from the elements, and the potentially comical process of having to take off some or all of those articles of clothing if any piece is forgotten. The book contains rich examples of onomatopoeia and alliteration, repetitive phrases, and vocabulary relevant to cold weather. The excerpt begins approximately halfway into the *Read-aloud*, after the main character, Froggy, has gone out to play in the snow but has been called back by his mom several times because he has forgotten to put on an article of clothing. To facilitate student understanding in general, and support second language learners in particular, the teacher<sup>9</sup> uses the book's illustrations, gestures, and her own body for visual reinforcement, as well as various linguistic and paralinguistic strategies:

In this excerpt, we see the orchestration of multiple sheltered instruction strategies, including linguistic, paralinguistic and extralinguistic cues, which provided relevant language

---

1	Teacher	{reading from book and mirroring the main character's actions by looking at herself from head to toe} 'Froggy se miró de arriba abajo ...' ( <i>Froggy looked at himself from top to bottom</i> )
2	Teacher	'y dijo ...' ( <i>and said</i> )
3	Teacher	{continues reading text on that page, and as she mentions each article of clothing, she points to the relevant part on her own body where each piece is typically worn} 'Tenía puestos los guantes, tenía puesta la bufanda, tenía puesta la chaqueta, tenía puesta la camisa, tenía puestos los pantalones, tenía puestas las botas, tenía puestas las medias.' ( <i>He was wearing his gloves; he was wearing his scarf; he was wearing his jacket; he was wearing his shirt; he was wearing his pants; he was wearing his boots; he was wearing his socks.</i> )
4	Teacher	{continues reading text on that page} 'Levantó la mano a la cabeza' {she raises her hand to her head in an exaggerated slow movement}. ( <i>He raised his hand to his head.</i> )
5	Teacher	{continues reading text on that page} 'Sí, tenía puesta la gorra' {she taps her head a few times}. ( <i>Yes, he was wearing his cap.</i> )
6	Lucas	He forgot <his gloves>!
7	Teacher	{continues reading text on that page; last line} <'¿Qué le podía faltar?'> ( <i>What could he be missing?</i> )
8	Lucas	He forgot his gloves!
9	Teacher	No, los tenía los pantalones {sic}. ( <i>No, he had his pants.</i> )
10	Teacher	¿Qué no se puso Froggy? ( <i>What didn't Froggy put on?</i> )
11	Nicolas	La chaqueta. ( <i>His jacket.</i> )
12	Teacher	Froggy se puso las medias {she touches her shin area to indicate where one would place socks}. ( <i>Froggy put on his socks.</i> )
13	Teacher	Y después se puso los pantalones {she traces her hand from her ankles to her hips}. ( <i>And later he put on his pants.</i> )

---

---

14	Teacher	¿Qué se pone uno debajo de los pantalones? ( <i>What does one wear under her pants?</i> )
15	Javier	Underwear! {Teacher points to Javier in affirmation.}
16	Elaine	Underwear?
17	Sabrina	Underwear.
18	Teacher	Yo creo. ( <i>I think so.</i> )
19	Teacher	No sé. A ver. ( <i>I don't know. Let's see.</i> )
20	Teacher	{turns page, continues reading} ‘“La ropa interior”, dijo riendo su mamá.’ ( <i>Your underwear’, his mom said laughing.</i> )

---

learning support for an integrated group of students with varying levels of proficiency and experiences in the instructional language. The teacher’s use of visual reinforcement in lines 3, 5, 12 and 13 (i.e., pointing to the body parts where the various articles of clothing are typically worn); gestures in lines 1 and 4 (i.e., facial expressions to augment the dialogue); and paralinguistic cues (i.e., use of narrative inflection patterns, change of pitch to represent dialogue of different characters) facilitates understanding and engagement. Although the teacher appears to misunderstand Lucas’ suggestion that Froggy had forgotten his pants (lines 7 and 8), she rephrases the text language in line 7 (¿Qué le podía faltar? [*What could he be missing?*]) into a simpler structure which identifies the subject in line 10 (¿Qué no se puso Froggy? [*What didn't Froggy put on?*]). To further support children’s comprehension, the teacher repeats some of the steps Froggy followed in getting dressed – again with visual reinforcement – to help children pinpoint which article of clothing had been forgotten (lines 12 and 13). Finally, the teacher’s question in line 14 (¿Qué se pone uno debajo de los pantalones? [*What does one wear under her pants?*]) further scaffolds children’s meaning-making by drawing on their own experiences to answer a text-based question, the answer to which was not immediately obvious from the book’s picture cues.<sup>10</sup> Children’s responses indicate that they were able to make relevant connections and accurate interpretations, albeit not in the target language.

*Monolingual instructional practices in the ‘one-teacher/one-language’ classroom.* Teachers in the ‘one-teacher/one-language’ classroom maintained a monolingual mode in 45 of the total 76 bilingual interactions, or 59.2%. All of these interactions occurred when the Spanish-language model was leading activities. However, unique to this classroom was the bilingual sociolinguistic context created by teachers’ ‘tandem talk’ practices (Lee et al. 2008). Tandem talk is defined as a type of collaborative bilingual practice where a pair of speakers coordinates the use of two languages so that each maintains the use of monolingual speech in a bilingual conversation, as evidenced below.

In the following excerpt from a Spanish-week *Show-and-tell* activity in the *one-teacher/one-language* classroom, the students are seated in a circle with the two teachers sitting on opposite sides of the circle. As children’s turn to present their *Show-and-tell* object comes up, they move to the center of the circle to tell other members of the class what they have brought, describe the object while it circulates among the other children and teachers, and explain why the object is special to them. The excerpt features Daniel, an emergent bilingual child who speaks Spanish and English at home:

---

1	Teacher 1	¿Qué trajiste? ( <i>What did you bring?</i> )
2	Daniel	Reloj. ( <i>Watch.</i> )
3	Teacher 1	Un reloj. ( <i>A watch.</i> )
4	Teacher 1	¿De quién es el reloj? ( <i>Who's on your watch?</i> )
5	Daniel	De Shrek. ( <i>Shrek.</i> )
6	Teacher 1	De Shrek. ( <i>Shrek.</i> )
7	Teacher 1	Okay, ¿puedes enseñárselo a los niños {teacher points around the circle}? ( <i>Okay, can you show it to the children?</i> )
8	Teacher 1	Un reloj de Shrek. ( <i>A Shrek watch.</i> ) {Daniel shows the watch to Oliver.}
9	Teacher 1	Pasa al próximo niño. ( <i>Pass to the next person.</i> ) {Daniel moves to Miranda to show her the watch. He then goes from student to student, showing his watch.}
10	Teacher 1	Daniel.
11	Teacher 1	¿Y qué es lo que el reloj hace, Daniel? ( <i>And what does the watch do, Daniel?</i> ) {Daniel continues to move about the circle showing his watch}
12	Daniel	{looks at his watch while seated in front of Teacher 2} It's eleven sixteen.
13	Daniel	Sixteen.
14	Teacher 1	Son las 11 y 16 {looking at and responding to Daniel in affirmation}. ( <i>It's 11:16.</i> )
15	Teacher 2	Okay, pass it around.
16	Teacher 2	{checks the time on Daniel's watch} It does say it's 11:16!
17	Teacher 1	Muy bien. ( <i>Very good.</i> )

---

The bilingual interaction illustrates teachers' coordinated monolingual practices in support of children's developing dual language skills. The excerpt begins with a monolingual exchange between the Spanish model teacher (Teacher 1) and Daniel (lines 1–11). Through their conversation, it is clear that Daniel understands the teacher's questions and directives, and it is established that Daniel brought a Shrek-themed watch to share with the class. After moving about the circle allowing a few students to gaze at the watch, Daniel stops in front of the English model teacher (Teacher 2) and announces the time according to the watch, in English (line 12: It's eleven sixteen), subsequently repeating the last number (line 13: Sixteen). Teacher 1 recognizes Daniel's statement and provides both the relevant vocabulary and the syntactic structure for giving the time in the target instructional language, Spanish (line 14: Son las 11 y 16. [*It's 11:16.*]). Teacher 2 contributes to the interaction by repeating the time in English (line 16: It does say it's 11:16), a move that both affirmed the student's statement and reinforced relevant vocabulary (time and numbers). Teacher 1 concludes the interaction by showing praise for Daniel's participation in the activity (line 17: Muy bien. [*Very good.*]). Through the coordinated integration of monolingual Spanish and English speech, the two teachers modeled relevant lexical and syntactic structures for

time expressions in both languages, while utilizing and extending their linguistic resources in support of children's emergent bilingual development.

#### *Codeswitching as a strategic pedagogic practice*

Teachers adopted a bilingual language mode (i.e., used bilingual speech, or codeswitched) in 34% (39/115) of bilingual interactions with children. By strategically drawing on both Spanish and English, teachers scaffolded students' emergent language and literacy skills and further modeled the utility of bilingualism for constructing meaning. In conjunction with sheltered instruction strategies, teachers integrated the use of both target languages to introduce or reinforce relevant vocabulary, to expand a child's schema, to assess a child's knowledge or understanding, to affirm students' contributions, to ask questions to clarify students' ideas, and to alert a child to the target instructional language (or the teacher's designated language).

#### *Codeswitching as instructional practice in the 'language-by-time-of-day' classroom.*

Most interactional units that included teacher codeswitching, 34 out of 39 (87.2%), were observed in the 'language-by-time-of-day' classroom. Of these instances, 24 occurred when English was the language of instruction, while 10 occurred when Spanish was the language of instruction. Teachers in this classroom used bilingual speech primarily to affirm a student's statement or to redirect a behavior, although they also asked questions to clarify students' ideas and helped students make connections.

The following excerpt, which highlights a teacher's bilingual language practices, comes from a Spanish *Read-aloud* of *La asombrosa Graciela*<sup>11</sup> (*Amazing Grace*; Hoffman 1991). The book is about a young Trinidadian girl who loves acting and overcomes adversity to win the role of Peter Pan in the school play. Graciela takes on the roles of several historical, cultural, and fictional figures, including Joan of Arc, an infamous pirate, and Anansi the Spider. As was typical for *Read-aloud* sessions, the children were seated in a large circle on the carpet, in an open area at one end of the classroom. Children faced inward so that each child could see all of the others. Teacher 1 sat cross-legged in the circle in order to showcase the book's illustrations as she read and interacted with students about the book. Teacher 2 also sat cross-legged in the circle directly across from Teacher 1, intermittently interjecting comments to help scaffold children's learning. In this bilingual interaction, Teacher 2 departs from the target instructional language (Spanish) to help one student make a connection to prior experiences and, thus, support student engagement:

---

1	Teacher 1	{reading from book} 'Navegó los siete mares con una pata de palo y una cotorra.' ( <i>She sailed the seven seas with a wooden leg and a parrot.</i> )
2	Teacher 1	¿Quién sabe qué es una cotorra? ( <i>Who knows what a parrot is?</i> )
3	Caterina	¡Yo! {raises hand}. ( <i>Me!</i> )
4	Teacher 1	¿Qué es una cotorra, Caterina? ( <i>What is a parrot, Caterina?</i> )
5	Caterina	Es un pajarito tiene todo a colores {sic}. ( <i>It's a little bird that has all the colors.</i> )

---

---

6	Teacher 1	Es un pájaro con todos los colores. ( <i>It's a bird with all the colors.</i> )
7	Teacher 1	Que los piratas generalmente se los ponían en el hombro. ( <i>The pirates usually put them on their shoulder.</i> )
8	Joaquin	Hey!
9	Joaquin	Pirates!
10	Teacher 1	Mhm.
11	Teacher 1	Aquí está pretendiendo que es un pirata. ( <i>Here she's pretending that she is a pirate.</i> )
12	Teacher 2	<b>Like your pirates.</b>
13	Teacher 2	<b>Joaquin, like your pirates.</b>
14	Teacher 1	Aja. ( <i>Uh huh</i> )
15	Joaquin	Yeah, but my pirates don't have a thing {a parrot}.
16	Teacher 1	Hay diferentes tipos de piratas. ( <i>There are different kinds of pirates.</i> )

---

In this excerpt, the teachers demonstrate strategic flexibility in their coordinated language practices in order to support student learning and engagement. Lines 1 through 7, although heavily dominated by teacher talk and text reading, represent sustained target language use in alignment with the program's language separation policy. However, Teacher 1's contextualization of the connection between pirates and parrots in line 7 (Que los piratas generalmente se los ponían en el hombro. [*The pirates usually put them on their shoulder.*]) prompts a child (Joaquin) to make a relevant personal connection between the academic content (i.e., the story being read) and his own experiences, which he expresses in English (lines 8 and 9: Hey! . . . Pirates!). Teacher 1 acknowledges this connection in lines 10 and 11, while maintaining the use of the target language, Spanish (Mhm. Aquí está pretendiendo que es un pirata. [*Here she's pretending that she is a pirate.*]). In support of Joaquin's observation and personal connection, Teacher 2 codeswitches to English to acknowledge his contribution and demonstration of active engagement with the text (lines 12 and 13: Like your pirates . . . Joaquin, like your pirates.). The negotiation of meaning continues in English as Joaquin asserts that the pirates that he is familiar with are not accompanied by parrots, unlike that which is portrayed in the book (line 15: Yeah, but my pirates don't have uh a thing {a parrot}). In line 16 (Hay diferentes tipos de piratas [*There are different kinds of pirates*]), Teacher 1 maintains her use of the target language, Spanish, to expand Joaquin's and his peers' existing schemata (i.e., their current understanding of pirates and how they might be depicted in stories) and to support their language learning.

*Codeswitching as instructional practice in the 'one-teacher/one-language' classroom.*

The remaining five out of 39 documented bilingual interactions (12.8%) involving a teacher codeswitching from the target instructional language (or the teacher's designated language) were observed in the 'one-teacher/one-language' classroom. These rare instances of codeswitching, or departure from the teacher's designated language, were produced by the Spanish language model. Codeswitching in these instances was used to redirect a child's behavior, to provide relevant vocabulary, and to affirm students' statements/contributions to the interaction.

In the following excerpt, we see an example of flexible bilingualism as an instructional strategy to engage students. Specifically, the Spanish-model teacher integrates the use of bilingual speech to provide relevant parallel bilingual vocabulary in support of children's

participation in a *Show-and-tell* activity. The focal child presenter, Evelio, who speaks Spanish at home, had recently begun to showcase his emerging English skills in classroom interactions with peers and both Spanish and English model teachers. In this *Show-and-tell* activity, Evelio shared with his peers a set of miniature sports balls that included basketballs and soccer balls, among other types:

---

1	Teacher 1	Okay, Evelio, ¿qué tú trajiste? (... <i>what did you bring?</i> )
2	Teacher 1	<Cuéntame>. ( <i>Tell me.</i> )
3	Evelio	<They're> balls.
4	Teacher 1	Son pelotas, sí eso es. ( <i>They're balls, yes that's right.</i> )
5	Teacher 1	Pero, ¿qué tipo de pelota es ésta? {pointing to small basketball} ( <i>But what kind of ball is this one?</i> )
6	Evelio	This is for the {unintelligible}.
7	Teacher 1	¿Para soccer? ( <i>For soccer?</i> )
8	Teacher 1	¿No crees que son del <b>sport</b> básquetbol? ( <i>Don't you think they're for the sport of basketball?</i> )
9	Evelio	Basketball?
10	Teacher 1	<b>Basketball.</b>
11	Teacher 1	¿Tú crees que se parece a una pelota de básquetbol? ( <i>Do you think that it looks like a basketball?</i> ) {Evelio and a few other students nod and/or say yes in unison.}

---

The excerpt begins with a typical *Show-and-tell* question and prompt by the Spanish model teacher (lines 1–2: Okay, Evelio, ¿qué tú trajiste? [... *what did you bring?*] Cuéntame [*Tell me.*]), which serve as an invitation to the presenter to begin describing his special object. After Evelio introduces the items collectively (line 3: They're balls), the teacher confirms Evelio's statement (line 4: Son pelotas, sí eso es. [*They're balls, yes, that's right*]) and asks a follow-up question to help expand his description (line 5: Pero, ¿qué tipo de pelota es ésta? {pointing to small basketball} [*But what kind of ball is this one?*]). Based on the teacher's response in line 7 (¿Para soccer? [For soccer?]), Evelio appears to misidentify the item as a soccer ball. Until this point, the interaction involved bilingual dialogue in which the teacher maintains the use of monolingual speech in her designated language, Spanish, while the child participates in the activity through English. This pattern changes, however, with the teacher's integration of English and Spanish in her clarification question to Evelio (lines 8, 10, and 11: ¿No crees que son del **sport** básquetbol? [*Don't you think they're for the sport of basketball?*] ... **Basketball?** ... ¿Tú crees que se parece a una pelota de básquetbol? [*Do you think that it looks like a basketball?*]). The teacher's use of bilingual speech not only demonstrates an acknowledgment and acceptance of Evelio's use of English in the activity, but also appears to be a pedagogic strategy to introduce key parallel bilingual vocabulary terms (i.e., básquetbol/basketball). Evelio's participation in the activity and children's collective affirmative responses to the teacher's last question (line 11: ¿Tú crees que se parece a una pelota de básquetbol? [*Do you think that it looks like a basketball?*]) intimate their engagement and comprehension (i.e., meaning-making) in two languages.

## Discussion and implications

Our analysis of teachers' language practices with preschool-age emergent bilinguals provides insights into the complex dynamics involved in bilingual classroom interactions and illustrates how DL preschool teachers mediate these interactions in support of children's learning. These findings advance our understanding of the nature and utility of bilingual pedagogies – specifically hybrid language practices such as codeswitching and tandem talk – in early childhood contexts that provide dual language experiences to preschool-age children from Spanish and English home language backgrounds.

The data highlight the 'pedagogical context of bilingual education and the [teachers'] explicit philosophy of language choice/use' (Jaffe 2007, 69), evidenced by teachers' varying interpretation, adaptation, and implementation of the DL program's language separation policy (by time of day or by teacher). Teachers in both classrooms facilitated student comprehension and communicative engagement through the use of sheltered instruction strategies while maintaining the monolingual use of the target/designated language. Communication was generally successful in properly scaffolded bilingual interactions, and served as evidence that – at a minimum – children displayed receptive bilingualism, even when they did not produce extended oral language in both languages. Teachers supported children's engagement with classroom activities and their developing DL competencies by sheltering instruction through various linguistic and paralinguistic strategies, including adjusting their rate of speech and making it comprehensible through the use of simplified syntax and repetition, gestures, and visual reinforcement of concrete and abstract concepts (Echevarria et al. 2011).

Teachers in the 'one-teacher/one-language' classroom carefully orchestrated the collaborative use of their designated languages in ways that illuminated and modeled the utility of bilingual speech/interaction as a communicative and academic resource. In keeping with the language separation policy in this classroom, the teachers maintained their respective languages in bilingual dialogue through structured tandem talk. Their coordinated speech overlapped just enough so that students who were at the earliest stages of second language acquisition could understand enough of what was being said. In contrast, students who were further along in their bilingual development were more likely to understand the interaction in its entirety. The teachers' systematic [monolingual] use of their designated language established their identities as 'monolingual' Spanish or English teachers. However, their very participation in coordinated bilingual dialogue and acceptance of and responses to children's contributions in either language revealed their bilingual competencies. As such, our findings show that: 'multilingual competence emerges out of local practices where multiple languages are negotiated for communication [and that] competence doesn't consist of separate competencies for each language, but a multicompetence that functions symbiotically for the different languages in one's repertoire' (Canagarajah 2011, 1).

Similarly, teachers in the 'language-by-time-of-day' classroom engaged in coordinated bilingual interactions with students while systematically maintaining the monolingual use of the designated instructional language (i.e., English in the morning and Spanish in the afternoon). This type of teacher–student tandem talk involved a pattern of information, confirmation, questioning, recasting (sometimes with translation), and/or summarization with added information. Subsequent research might further investigate the nature and utility of teacher tandem talk in DL classrooms where teachers enact various interpretations of language separation.

Although they most often maintained the designated language, teachers in both classrooms sometimes engaged in codeswitching for a variety of classroom discourse functions.

Through codeswitching, teachers not only created safe spaces for students to adopt their emerging bilingual repertoire for learning purposes, but also collaborated with students in using their developing bilingual repertoire as a resource (see Creese and Blackledge 2010 for similar findings). Teachers showed an awareness of their students' emergent bilingualism and practiced flexible bilingualism in a pedagogic context to involve students in instructional activities. Additionally, they helped students make connections to out-of-school experiences, introduced parallel bilingual vocabulary, and used bilingual label requests, repetition, and translation across languages. As such, teachers modeled authentic bilingual behaviors according to the needs of the context and the local situation through the strategic and flexible integration of their dual language skills (Zentella 1997; Genesee 2009; Canagarajah 2011).

Our findings reveal how a bilingual pedagogy is much broader than teachers' codeswitching practices, however (García 2009a, 2009b). Indeed, it encompasses the '*multiple discursive practices* in which bilinguals engage in order to *make sense of their bilingual worlds*' (García 2009a, 45; italics in original). The implications for linguistically diverse schools that adopt a dual language model are significant. Teachers in DL programs are faced with the task of designing classroom spaces and activities that foster language practices that approximate authentic interactional contexts existing outside of school (Hayes and Matusov 2005; Lee et al. 2008). Our findings corroborate previous research that suggests that a strict language separation approach, as traditionally implemented in DL programs, may be at odds with the natural social interactions of bilinguals, who typically draw on a number of communicative strategies, including translanguaging, to construct meaning (Perez 2004; Hornberger 2005a; Gort 2006, 2008; García 2009a, 2009b; Creese and Blackledge 2010; Martínez 2010). Findings support the notion that the integration of two languages can be a useful pedagogic practice in promoting the DL development of emergent bilinguals. When evaluated in terms of their efficiency and effectiveness in supporting student learning, and their authenticity and application beyond the classroom (Cook 2001), bilingual pedagogies appear to support various useful linguistic, educational, affective, and sociocultural functions.

## Notes

1. The Head Start and Early Head Start programs, funded by the United States Department of Health and Human Services, provide comprehensive education, health, nutrition, and parent involvement services to low-income children from birth to age five and to their families. Programs are administered locally by non-profit organizations and local education agencies such as school systems. The Voluntary Pre-kindergarten (VPK) program is a state-funded voucher program for all children residing in the state who are four years of age on or before September 1, regardless of family income level. A child remains eligible for this program until the beginning of the school year when s/he is eligible for kindergarten. A parent may select any participating provider in the county or multi-county region served by the local early learning coalition.
2. This number includes students from Spanish/English bilingual homes where there was at least some usage of English.
3. The summer session mirrored the 10-month academic program, including the daily schedule, curriculum, teaching practices, and use of instructional materials.
4. *Show-and-tell* activities were scheduled in the morning in the 'language-by-time-of-day' classroom, and thus were always conducted in English.
5. Graduate students had received training in classroom-based ethnographic approaches to data collection, preparation, coding, and analysis.
6. Agreement data were obtained by using the following formula:  $(\text{number of agreements} / [\text{number of agreements} + \text{disagreements}]) \times 100$  (Girolametto et al. 2000).

7. In all excerpts, text language is shown in quotations, translations to English are shown (*italicized and in parentheses*), researchers' notes are included {in curly brackets}, concurrent speech is shown <in angle brackets>, and departures from the target instructional/teacher designated language, or codeswitches, are **bolded**.
8. This picture book is a translation of the English original.
9. Although both teachers generally participate in *Read-aloud* activities, this particular session only involved one teacher.
10. On this page, Froggy is shown standing outside in the snow and wearing a winter coat, cap, scarf, gloves, pants and boots.
11. This picture book is a translation of the English original.

## References

- Arthur, J., and P. Martin. 2006. Accomplishing lessons in postcolonial classrooms: Comparative perspectives from Botswana and Brunei Darussalam. *Comparative Education* 42, no. 2: 177–202.
- Block, D. 2003. *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Bloome, D. 2004. *A microethnographic perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Canagarajah, A.S. 1995. Functions of code switching in the ESL classroom: Socialising bilingualism in Jaffna. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 16, no. 3: 173–96.
- Canagarajah, S. 2011. Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. In *Applied linguistics review*, Vol. 2, ed. L. Wei, 1–27. Berlin: DeGruyter.
- Christian, D. 1996. Two-way immersion education: Students learning through two languages. *Modern Language Journal* 80, no. 1: 66–76.
- Cook, V. 2001. Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 57, no. 3: 402–23.
- Creese, A., and A. Blackledge. 2010. Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal* 94, no. 1: 103–15.
- Cummins, J., and M. Swain. 1986. *Bilingualism in education*. London: Longman.
- Doherty, R.W., R.S. Hilberg, A. Pinal, and R.G. Tharp. 2003. Five standards and student achievement. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice* 1, no. 1: 1–24.
- Dworin, J.E. 2003. Insight into biliteracy development: Towards a bidirectional theory of bilingual pedagogy. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education* 2, no. 2: 171–86.
- Echevarria, J., D.J. Short, and C. Peterson. 2011. *Using the SIOP model with Pre-K and Kindergarten English learners*. New York: Pearson.
- Edelsky, C. 1986. *Writing in a bilingual program: Habia una vez*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Escamilla, K. 2006. Semilingualism applied to the literacy behaviors of Spanish-speaking emerging bilinguals: Bi-illiteracy or emerging biliteracy? *Teachers College Record* 108, no. 11: 2329–53.
- Ferguson, G. 2009. What's next: Towards an agenda for classroom codeswitching research. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 12, no. 2: 231–41.
- Fitts, S. 2006. Reconstructing the status quo: Linguistic interaction in a dual-language school. *Bilingual Research Journal* 30, no. 2: 337–65.
- García, O. 2009a. *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O. 2009b. Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In *Social justice through multilingual education*, ed. T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A.K. Mohanty, and M. Panda, 140–58. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O., and J.A. Kleifgen. 2010. *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English language learners*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- García, O., and C.E. Sylvan. 2011. Pedagogies and practices in classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *Modern Language Journal* 95, no. 3: 385–400.
- Gass, S. 1997. *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gass, S., and L. Selinker. 2001. *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Genesee, F.H. 2009. Early childhood bilingualism: Perils and possibilities. *Journal of Applied Research on Learning* 2, Special Issue, Article 2: 1–21.

- Girolametto, L., L. Hoaken, E. Weitzman, and R. van Lieshout. 2000. Patterns of interaction in integrated day care groups. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in the Schools* 31, no. 2: 154–67.
- Gort, M. 2006. Strategic codeswitching, interliteracy, and other phenomena of emergent bilingual writing: Lessons from first-grade DL classrooms. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy* 6, no. 3: 323–54.
- Gort, M. 2008. “You give me idea!”: Collaborative strides toward bilingualism and biliteracy in a two-way partial immersion program. *Multicultural Perspectives* 10, no. 4: 192–200.
- Gumperz, J., and J. Cook-Gumperz. 2005. Making space for bilingual communicative practice. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 2, no. 1: 1–23.
- Gutiérrez, K., P. Baquedano-López, and H. Álvarez. 2001. Literacy as hybridity: Moving beyond bilingualism in urban classrooms. In *The best for our children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino students*, ed. M. de la Luz Reyes and J. Halcón, 122–41. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Harry, E., and M. Rippey. 2009. Achieving a balance: Ethnography or ethnographic methods? In *Qualitative research methods in special education*, ed. J. Paul, J. Kleinhammer-Tramill, and K. Fowler, 15–32. Denver, CO: Love Publishing.
- Hayes, R., and E. Matusov. 2005. Designing for dialogue in place of teacher talk and student silence. *Culture and Psychology* 11, no. 3: 339–57.
- Heller, M. 1999. *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. London: Longman.
- Heller, M., and M. Martin-Jones, eds. 2001. *Voices of authority: Education and linguistic difference*. Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Hoffman, M. 1991. *Amazing grace*. London: Frances Lincoln Children’s Books.
- Hornberger, N. 2005a. Student voice and the media of bi(multi)lingual/multicultural classrooms. In *Language, literacy and power in schooling*, ed. T. McCarty, 151–67. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hornberger, N. 2005b. Opening and filling up implementational and ideological spaces in heritage language education. *Modern Language Journal* 89, no. 4: 605–9.
- Howard, E.R., J. Sugarman, D. Christian, K.J. Lindholm-Leary, and D. Rogers. 2007. *Guiding principles for DL education*. 2nd ed. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Jaffe, A. 2007. Codeswitching and stance: Issues in interpretation. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 6, no. 1: 53–77.
- John-Steiner, V., C. Panofsky, and L. Smith. 1994. *Sociocultural approaches to language and literacy: An interactionist perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lafford, B.A., and M.R. Salaberry. 2003. *Spanish second language acquisition: State of the science*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Lee, J.S., L. Hill-Bonnet, and J. Gillispie. 2008. Learning in two languages: Interactional spaces for becoming bilingual speakers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 11, no. 1: 75–94.
- Levine, D.U., and L.W. Lezotte. 1995. Effective schools research. In *Handbook of research on multicultural education*, ed. J.A. Banks and C.A. Mcgee Banks, 525–47. New York: Macmillan.
- Levine, G.S. 2003. Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire study. *Modern Language Journal* 87, no. 3: 343–64.
- Lin, A. 2000. Deconstructing ‘mixed code’. In *Language and education in post-colonial Hong Kong*, ed. D.C.S. Li, A.M.Y. Lin, and W.K. Tsang, 179–94. Hong Kong: Linguistic Society of Hong Kong.
- Lin, A. 2006. Beyond linguistic purism in language-in-education policy and practice: Exploring bilingual pedagogies in a Hong Kong science classroom. *Language and Education* 20, no. 4: 287–305.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. 2001. *DL education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- London, J. 1992. *Froggy gets dressed*. New York: Penguin Books.
- London, J. 1997. *Froggy se viste* [Froggy gets dressed], trans. O. Blanco. New York: Penguin Books. (Original work published 1992.)
- Long, M. 1996. The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In *Handbook of second language acquisition*, ed. W. Ritchie and T. Bhatia, 413–68. London: Academic Press.
- Lucas, T., and A. Katz. 1994. Reframing the debate: The roles of native languages in English-only programs for language minority students. *TESOL Quarterly* 28, no. 4: 537–62.

- Macaro, E. 1997. *Target language, collaborative learning and autonomy*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Macaro, E. 2001. Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal* 85, no. 4: 531–48.
- Mackey, A. 2007. *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A series of empirical studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MacSwan, J. 1999. *A minimalist approach to intrasentential code switching*. New York, NY: Garland Press.
- Martin, P. 2005. 'Safe' language practices in two rural schools in Malaysia: Tensions between policy and practice. In *Decolonization, globalization: Language-in-education policy and practice*, ed. A. Lin and P. Martin, 75–99. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Martin-Beltrán, M. 2010. The two-way language bridge: Co-constructing bilingual language learning opportunities. *The Modern Language Journal* 94, no. 2: 254–77.
- Martinez, R.A. 2010. *Spanglish* as literacy tool: Toward an understanding of the potential role of Spanish-English codeswitching in the development of academic literacy. *Research in the Teaching of English* 45, no. 2: 124–49.
- Michael-Luna, S., and A.S. Canagarajah. 2008. Multilingual academic literacies: Pedagogical foundations for code meshing in primary and higher education. *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 4, no. 1: 55–77.
- Miles, M.B., and A.M. Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Moll, L.C., R. Saez, and J. Dworin. 2001. Exploring biliteracy: Two student case examples of writing as a social practice. *Elementary School Journal* 101, no. 4: 435–50.
- Perez, B. 2004. *Becoming biliterate: A study of two-way bilingual immersion education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pica, T. 1994. Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning* 44, no. 3: 493–527.
- Reyes, I. 2006. Exploring connections between emergent biliteracy and bilingualism. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy* 6, no. 3: 267–92.
- Reyes, I. 2008. Emergent biliteracy in young Mexican immigrant children. *Reading Research Quarterly* 43, no. 4: 374–98.
- Reyes, M. de la Luz. 2001. Unleashing possibilities: Biliteracy in the primary grades. In *The best for our children*, ed. M. de la Luz Reyes and J.J. Halcon, 96–121. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Schuck, S., and T. Russell. 2005. Self-study, critical friendship, and the complexities of teacher education. *Studying Teacher Education* 1, no. 2: 107–21.
- Strauss, A., and J. Corbin. 1990. *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Swain, M. 1985. Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In *Input in second language acquisition*, ed. S.M. Gass and C.G. Madden, 235–53. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. 2005. The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, ed. E. Hinkel, 471–83. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Valdés, G. 1997. Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review* 67, no. 3: 391–429.
- Vygotsky, L.S. 1978. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*, ed. and trans. M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, and E. Souberman. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wertsch, J.V. 1998. *Mind as action*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Whitmore, K.F., P. Martens, Y. Goodman, and G. Owocki. 2004. Critical lessons from the transactional perspective on early literacy research. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy* 4, no. 3: 291–325.
- Woolard, K. 2004. Codeswitching. In *A companion to linguistic anthropology*, ed. A. Duranti, 73–94. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Zentella, A.C. 1997. *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Walden, MA: Blackwell.

### Appendix 1. Overview of the coding scheme, including subcategories, descriptions and examples

Codes	Description	Examples
<b><i>Forms of teacher language</i></b>		
<u>Translate</u>		
Translate	Literal translation of what student or teacher has just said	Student: Rectangle. Teacher: Rectángulo. [ <i>Rectangle.</i> ]
Paraphrase	Summarized or restated translation of what student or teacher has just said	Student: Sometimes for tennis to wipe her sweat with it. Teacher: El sudor, para guardar el sudor. [ <i>Sweat, it's to soak up your sweat.</i> ]
Elaborate	Elaborate/extend a student's idea/utterance in other language	Student: Indians. Teacher: Sí, le imitaba que era un indio. [ <i>Right, he was pretending to be an Indian.</i> ]
<u>Maintain</u>		
<u>Repeat</u>		
Repeat	Exact repetition of the child's or teacher's statement	Student: Y azúcar. [ <i>And sugar.</i> ] Teacher: Y azúcar. [ <i>And sugar.</i> ]
Paraphrase	Reword what the child or the teacher has said (in same language)	Student: Sometimes for tennis to wipe her hand with it. Teacher: You're right, it's to hold your sweat.
Elaborate	Elaborate/extend a student's or teacher's idea/utterance in the same language	Teacher: ¿De quién es el reloj? [ <i>Who's on your watch?</i> ] Student: De Shrek. [ <i>Shrek.</i> ] Teacher: Un reloj de Shrek. [ <i>A Shrek watch.</i> ]
<b><i>Functions</i></b>		
<u>Management</u>		
Refocus class's attention	Teacher makes a comment to get students' attention so that they know they should be focused	Teacher: Okay, Evelio está hablando. [ <i>Okay, Evelio is talking.</i> ]
Correct a behavior	Teacher tells a student what to do as a result of the student behaving in an inappropriate way	Teacher: Vete para atrás para que todo el mundo pueda ver. [ <i>Move back so that everybody can see.</i> ]
Pacify a student	Teacher makes a comment that calms/pacifies a student or groups of students	(A student thought he was missing out on a turn.) Teacher: Él va a compartir ahora. [ <i>He's going to share now.</i> ]
Give permission	Teacher gives a student permission, usually permission to take a turn	Teacher: Dime, Vivian. [ <i>Tell me, Vivian.</i> ]
Ask for assistance	Asks a student to help her with something	(A student had just found some tape for the teacher.) Teacher: Okay, give it to me.
Assist a student by providing cue to participate	A phrase that informs the student that s/he can begin speaking or participating	Teacher: Vamos, Lukey. [ <i>Let's go, Lukey.</i> ]
Provide student with suggestion/assistance	Teacher provides directions to student, usually of physical nature	Teacher: Why don't you stand up here so everybody can see you? (Teacher then rotates student to face class.)

(Continued)

Codes	Description	Examples
<u>Communicative</u>		
Affirm	Affirm a student's statement or provide positive reinforcement	Student: I have a grandma named Nana. Teacher: Tú tienes una abuela llamada Nana. [ <i>You have a grandma named Nana.</i> ]
Clarify	Teacher doesn't hear or understand what the child said, or teacher isn't sure she has understood the information correctly and is checking her understanding of what the child said	Teacher: What (did you say)? Student: I never read that book. Teacher: ¿Nunca lo has leído? [ <i>You've never read it?</i> ]
• Ask question to clarify what student said		
• Answer student's question		Student: What he do? Teacher: Está imitando a Juana de Arcos. [ <i>He's pretending to be Joan of Arc.</i> ]
• Explain a process/procedure	Teacher details what is happening	Teacher: So, si tú tienes un triángulo, tú vas a buscar en la clase algo que se parece a un triángulo. [ <i>So, if you have a triangle, you are going to search for something in the classroom that looks like a triangle.</i> ]
Continue	Continue/return to a previous conversation	Teacher: What do you think she has to do for the cake to be bigger? (Side conversation ensues about the cake, but not in regards to the quantity of ingredients that must be added.) Teacher: But you think she has to do the same amount of material that she used to make the cake? Teacher: The story is in Spanish.
Scaffold by alerting a child to the code being used		
Scaffold by directing child's attention to meaningful part of a question, help a child understand what a question is asking	When a sentence is ambiguous the teacher restates or manipulates the sentence, or places emphasis on a word to draw a student's attention to the intended focus of the question/statement	Teacher: ¿Qué piensan que dijo? [What do you think he said?] (A student answers, but in reference to a different character.) Teacher: Pero, ¿qué piensan que dijo Lío? [ <i>But what do you think Leo said?</i> ]
<u>Academic</u>		
Provide relevant academic vocabulary	Provide vocabulary that students most likely do not already possess	Student: Because there's a balloon. Teacher: Un globo. [ <i>A balloon.</i> ]
Provide new information to expand a child's schema	Teacher explains something that adds to student's existing knowledge	(While discussing theater productions and what a student thinks pirates look like . . .) Teacher: Hay diferentes tipos de piratas. [ <i>There are different types of pirates.</i> ]
Assess a student's knowledge	Ask a student to demonstrate what she knows	Teacher: ¿De qué se trata tu libro? [ <i>What's your book about?</i> ]
Ask for a cause/effect relationship		Teacher: ¿Y qué pasa si no te pones una camisa? [ <i>And what happens if you don't put on a shirt (when it's cold outside)?</i> ]
Ask a student to make a prediction		Teacher: ¿Y qué creen que va a pasar ahora? [ <i>And what do you think is going to happen now?</i> ]