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Abstract

With the expansion of bilingualism across the globe, there has been a call for a new framework to investigate student identity associated with more than one language. Bilingual education exists in many forms across the world and studies have examined many aspects of bilingual education, yet few studies exist that examine young student bilingual identity based upon a sound identity framework.

This study investigates bilingual identity negotiation in the setting of one bilingual education program in Australia. The stories of nine bilingual primary students are examined through a questionnaire, interviews and journals. These stories are supported by questionnaire data from the full class of students, observations of the lessons and interviews with the teachers of the classes. The students, whose stories are the main source of data in this study, are from stage three (years five and six) of the school’s bilingual program. They are aged between ten and twelve and have a variety of home language experiences. All students in the study have been enrolled in the dual language/immersion hybrid bilingual French and English program at the school site. The data were collected across a period of six months. All data were collected at the school site, except for the journals, which students completed in their own time at home.

The study develops a new framework of bilingual identity negotiation – the Bilingual Identity Negotiation Framework (BINF). This framework incorporates three important factors that influence student bilingual identity development – socio-cultural connection, interaction and investment. One of the aims of this research was to see how the student self-reporting of their identification with their languages reflects the newly developed Bilingual Identity Negotiation Framework (BINF).

Results of the study support this new framework and suggest that while the three factors of socio-cultural connection, interaction and investment are common to all students’ experiences of bilingual identity development, each student’s experience of identity development is unique. The results indicate that the students had different
experiences in terms of access to interaction in the language(s), investment in sourcing access to the language(s), family support and commitment to language development and connection to culture, and consequently had different experiences of home literacy development. Results indicate that both social and individual factors influence each of the three factors contributing to development of bilingual identity and that access to language is a common feature linking to each of the three components.

This thesis provides a case study investigation of student bilingual identity negotiation, which contributes to research in bilingualism, identity studies, home literacy research and studies of bilingual education in minority and majority language settings.
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1 Introduction

The gift mentioned in the title of this thesis comes from one student’s - Genevieve’s - conceptualisation of what it means to be bilingual. While it cannot be claimed that her conceptualisation is representative of all of the students in this study, it provides an indication of one positive view about bilingualism held by a participant.

This research focuses upon the specific stories of nine students, and the languages they use. It outlines the individuality of the process of identification with bilingualism. Each story is different as each student’s experience with languages varies. Yet there are common themes and threads. The stories of the nine students are supported by data collected from their class of twenty-three students, observations of the classes and interviews with their teachers.

This chapter outlines the aims and background of the study, provides an overview of how the research was conducted and provides the research questions that guided the project. The chapter concludes with an outline of the structure of the thesis.

1.1 Aims of the Research

The aim of this research is to examine how bilingual students identify with their languages and with the notion of being bilingual. The term bilingual has been shown in some literature to mean not only the use of two languages, but also use of more than two languages. Thus the term bilingual also encompasses multilingual notions (Baker & Prys Jones, 1998).

This research examines the ways that bilingual students identify with their languages beyond the school experience and through participating in a bilingual education program. The influences of home and school exposure to language are examined in relation to the students’ attitudes towards home and school language use.

The students in this study learn in a bilingual setting during the school day. Some of the students have monolingual home lives; some have bilingual lives involving two
languages and some involving more than two languages. This research focuses on the ways in which these students identify with each of the languages in their lives and with the concept of being bilingual. Through the use of student self-reporting in questionnaire and interview format a clear picture of the students’ own attitudes towards their home and school language experiences is obtained. The school setting in which these students learn is examined through investigation of the teacher perceptions of the bilingual program and observation of the bilingual and immersion lessons.

Through this research a further aim has been to see how student self-reporting of identification with their languages reflects the new Bilingual Identity Negotiation Framework (BINF) developed through this study. The BINF framework developed in this study indicates that the three combined factors of socio-cultural connection, interaction and investment impact upon student development of bilingual identities.

1.2 Terms/Notions Relevant to the Study

1.2.1 Bilingualism

Bilingualism is a crucial term in this study. Many research projects to date refer to the term bilingualism as the use of two languages. Experts in the field of bilingualism are currently engaging in a dialogue that sees the term bilingualism as one which must encompass a broader range of linguistic experiences in order to describe the complex realities in which many people live today (Cummins, 2007; May, 2007; Spolsky, 2007). This development of the definition of bilingualism acknowledges a way forward that can better encompass the lived realities of speakers of more than one language and indicate the complex nature of their linguistic repertoires. Thus the word bilingual can also be taken to refer to more than two languages:

The word ‘bilingual’ ... can also be taken to include the many people in the world who have varying degrees of proficiency in three, four or even more languages” (Baker & Prys Jones, 1998, p.17).

Many people have contact with more than two languages in their lives and the terms used to describe this have developed in line with the complexity of peoples’ linguistic
experiences. The term bilingualism can now be seen to encompass a range of other terms including multilingualism and plurilingualism (Housen, 2007).

Bilingualism incorporates a broader range of concepts relating to languages than it may have in the past. The terms bilingual/bilingualism continue to be used, with the acknowledgement that there are many influences upon bilingualism and that the terms can be used to refer to two or more languages.

1.2.2 Identity
Identity is another key term in this study. Identity is a complex phenomenon that has been examined and conceptualised in different ways across several fields of research including psychology, sociology, anthropology and sociolinguistics. In this study identity is viewed as being influenced by both social and individual factors and negotiated through interaction. It is seen as a process rather than an endpoint. Language is seen to be a fundamental aspect of an individual’s identity.

More extensive discussion of bilingualism and identity and previous research influential to this study takes place in chapter 2.

1.3 Background to the Study
Through globalisation, migration and increased demographic mobility, bilingualism is becoming increasingly common across the world. Australia is not isolated from the phenomenon of bilingualism as it is a society built upon immigration from many different parts of the world. Therefore a large portion of Australian society has connections to languages other than English in their home and family lives (Group of Eight, 2007). Issues relevant to diaspora communities such as the relationship between their languages, bilingualism and identities are important to consider (Mills, 2005).

In recognition of the diverse language backgrounds of students in NSW, in 2007 the NSW educational system acknowledged that 207,000 students had a Language Background Other Than English (LBOTE), this equates to 27.6 % of the school population in NSW (NSW DET, 2007). The Department of Education and Training of
NSW defines LBOTE as students “in whose home a language other than English is spoken” (NSW DET, 2007).

The language or languages that we speak form an important part of our identity. The way we express ourselves and the words and language we use represent fundamental aspects of who we are in our interactions with other people. For bilinguals the use of two (or more) languages forms an important aspect of their connection to two (or more) cultures and two (or more) backgrounds. This important aspect of identity has been shown to be a factor that affects education for many students with background languages other than the dominant language in their society (Cummins, 1979, 1996, 2000, 2003) and is discussed in detail in section 2.6.2.3.

Early literature searches, while the researcher conceptualised the project, revealed a lack of research incorporating bilingual students’ own stories of language and their individual experiences of languages and cultures. This study therefore aims to investigate the stories of a sample of students involved in one model of bilingual education. Students’ stories of their relationships with languages are explored and their opinions about the influence of their home and school language use are examined. Individual unique pictures emerge, showing the complexity of language identification for these young children. Their stories provide examples of the rich and diverse experiences taking place for students in this one school context.

North American and European investigations of bilingual education have, over recent years, begun to focus more specifically upon student development of identity associated with their languages and the impact that this has upon language learning and wider educational experiences (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003; Martin-Jones and Saxena, 1996; Norton, 2000). A body of research into bilingual education settings does exist in the Australian context (Clyne, 2005; de Courcy, 2002; Fernandez, 1996; Hones, 2005; McNamara, 1987a, 1997; Molyneux, 2005). However, some of that literature focuses upon power issues and there is not a specific focus upon issues of identity development and individual experience of bilingual students. This study aims to address such issues.
Much bilingual education research has shown a dichotomy between additive and subtractive bilingual education settings. Additive and elective bilingual education contexts, where the second language is taught in addition to the first language and where no language is subtracted, can have positive educational outcomes. Subtractive and circumstantial bilingual education contexts, where the second language (usually the main language of the society) is taught with the gradual removal of first language, experience much less success in academically measured terms (Baker, 2006; Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003). There is a developing body of research that is examining how this dichotomy can be addressed to find contexts in which both majority language (the main language in a society) and minority language (a language not officially recognised in the society) speakers experience academic success in a bilingual education context (Garcia, 2007; Helot & de Mejia, 2008).

With a significant presence of languages in many students’ home lives in Australia it is important to see how these languages can be seen, and used, as resources in the students’ academic lives. Research in North America and the UK has shown that through embracing students’ home language and literacy skills and acknowledging their bilingual identities, students can be empowered to take an active role in their education, can capitalise upon skills they already possess in other languages and can experience greater academic success in English language and literacy (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003; Gregory & Kenner, 2003; Kenner, 2000). It has also been shown that some additive forms of bilingual education and the use of transformative pedagogies can assist the development of students’ identities in the school setting (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003; Gregory & Kenner, 2003; Kenner, 2000).

The development of this research project began with a visit to the school involved and observation of the students participating in bilingual lessons. The question arose, during the researcher’s observation, of what exact relationship these students had with each language. The researcher saw the students themselves as the most important focus for the research, while the unique team-teaching element appeared to be an important factor in this educational setting. Thus the questions of how the students connected to the languages both inside the unique educational setting and outside of the school environment arose. Did these students connect with the languages outside of school and, if so, in what ways? To what extent did their language use out-of-
school impact upon their identification with different languages? To what extent did the students think the school environment influenced their views of languages?

This research project illustrates individual student stories of bilingual identity development in a setting that involves students from majority and minority language backgrounds. In this way it contributes to the emerging literature that seeks an answer to the dichotomy between successful “elite” enrichment bilingual programs (programs that teach languages that are viewed as valuable in an additive way) and less successful circumstantial or subtractive programs.¹ The emerging data suggest that dual language programs that involve students from both majority and minority backgrounds in bilingual education settings valuing all languages might be able to address the gap between the successful and less successful bilingual programs.

This study examines bilingual identity negotiation. A Bilingual Identity Negotiation Framework is developed in the study and sheds new light on individuals negotiating dual identities in one NSW educational context. The school’s curriculum is delivered through English and French. An English-speaking teacher is in each classroom full-time, and team-teaches with a French-speaking teacher for between one-third and one-half of each school day.

This study involves students with monolingual and bilingual backgrounds learning in a bilingual education program. It examines some of the identity issues for both students who are learning language for enrichment purposes and those who are learning for language maintenance or to acquire the language of society. While the findings are context specific, the research findings may be of interest to a larger group of schools or students as the national literacy and numeracy (NAPLAN) test results for the school indicate that the school is comparable with the other schools in the Like School Group (LSG).² This does not make the study findings generalisable, but

¹ Some bilingual programs are referred to as “elite” if the languages involved are both seen to be valuable or powerful languages in that context. The use of the term elite indicates that access to these languages is not always equitable. The different types of bilingual education program found in different settings are outlined in more detail in section 2.3.2.
² NAPLAN stands for National Assessment Program for Literacy and Numeracy. It is a national scheme to assess student learning across all states and territories. The NAPLAN website indicates that “The results from the national literacy and numeracy tests will provide an important measure of how Australian students are performing in the content strands of numeracy, reading, writing, spelling, grammar and punctuation.” (MCEETYA, 2009). Schools are grouped into Like School Groups (LSG)
indicates that findings for this school may be of interest to similar schools within the State. The literacy results indicate that the case study school is comparable to the top 25% of government primary level schools in the metropolitan areas of Sydney, Wollongong and Newcastle, a total of 291 schools. (See appendix T for more information).

1.4  **Research Question**

This study addresses the following over-arching research question:

How do students in a bilingual primary school program in NSW identify with their languages (English, French and others) outside and inside the school setting?

This question is answered through five sub questions:

a) What is the nature of students’ language use in the home?
b) How do students view their languages (English, French and other languages)?
c) How do students view bilingualism?
d) How do the students view the school bilingual program and to what extent does it influence their identification as French, Australian or bilingual?
e) How does observed language in the classroom relate to student bilingual identity?
f) How does teacher perception of the bilingual program relate to student bilingual identity?

1.5  **Methodology Overview**

A qualitative approach guides this research project. Within this qualitative approach a case study strategy has been used to focus upon the students at one particular school in NSW. Within the case study several methods of data collection were undertaken because the combination of different approaches “provides richer data than either approach. The alternative approach either validates the data collected through the

---

according to their Socio-Economic Status and location. These groups are considered by the DET and Australian Bureau of Statistics to be demographically comparable and therefore the literacy and numeracy results of students in the LSG are considered comparable.
other approach or complements (adds to) such data.” (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998, p. 95).

The methods of data collection used in this study were selected to best suit each of the research sub-questions in order to answer each question as fully as possible. The first section of data collection focuses on the students’ own reports of their language use and language attitudes. There is a questionnaire completed by all participants, and a journal and interviews completed by a sub-sample of students.

The second section of data collection addresses the final two sub-questions and comprises classroom observations and teacher interviews. Full details about the methodology and justification for the selection of each element are in chapter 3.

1.5.1 Research Participants

The participants in the questionnaire, student interview and journal stages of this study are students from years 5 and 6 (Stage 3) in the bilingual English and French program at one NSW Public School. 23 students out of a class of 40 students gave student and parent/guardian consent. All 23 completed the questionnaire stage of data collection, a sub-sample of 5 students completed the journal and 9 completed the interview.

The four teachers teaching this group of students across the data collection timeframe (November 2007 to April 2008) were the participants of the teacher interview stage of data collection. The full class groups formed the participants of the observation stage of data collection.

1.5.2 The Setting

The common factor for the students in this study is that they all attend the same school. The school offers a bilingual stream of French/English classes throughout years Kindergarten to Year 6 (referred to in this report as the bilingual lessons) and immersion French classes for students who speak French at home (referred to in this

---

3 In the Australian context the term “public” refers to government-run schools.
report as the *immersion lessons* but referred to within the school as Francophone lessons).

The school itself refers to the program as a whole as simply the “French bilingual program”, but for clearer identification the researcher classifies the program as dual language/immersion hybrid. (For a more detailed outline of bilingual education programs see section 2.3.2. For a more detailed description of the school see section 3.3.)

The school is a NSW Government primary school located in a mid-level Socio-Economic Status (Mid-SES) area of a large metropolitan city in Australia. The school is typical of schools in the locality apart from the bilingual program. The school’s bilingual program has developed as a result of the drive of the Principal of the school who designed and implemented the program from Kindergarten progressively through to Year 6. The program was implemented with financial support from a parental group.

1.5.3 Researcher Role

In this research the researcher’s role was as a peripheral-member-researcher (Adler & Adler, 1994). The researcher was previously unknown to the study participants prior to the research project, but throughout the project the researcher was a visible presence in the school and classroom yet not an active or complete member of the school community (Adler & Adler, 1994). This role enabled the researcher to observe the classroom contexts with minimal impact upon the interactions. The students in the school are accustomed to having visitors observe their lessons. Prior to the interviews the researcher had a small amount of contact with classes through the administration of the questionnaire.

1.6 Significance of the Study

This study is significant for several reasons. Firstly, the development of a Bilingual Identity Negotiation Framework (BINF) in this study illustrates its theoretical significance. This study has a different focus to the more commonly found examinations of bilingualism. In many studies of bilingualism there is a strong focus
upon classroom power issues from a teacher and whole classroom perspective (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003; Martin Jones, 1995; Martin Jones & Saxena, 1996; Molyneux, 2005). There is also a focus upon identity issues for adult language learners in prior literature (Norton, 2000, 2006). In addition there are studies from a conversation analysis standpoint (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). Little planned examination of identity from the young student’s perspective within a sound identity framework exists.

This study provides a newly conceptualised framework for the examination of the process of Bilingual Identity Negotiation in young bilinguals. Previous studies focus upon either: issues of connection to language, interaction issues or investment and motivation issues. This new framework combines the three factors of socio-cultural connection, interaction and investment as crucial elements that assist bilingual students to develop a bilingual identity. These notions are more fully described in section 2.6. The framework incorporates both individual and social influences that are essential for development of bilingual identity. The current study moves beyond prior studies of similar issues as it is located within this new framework.

A significant component of this study’s frame is the stance taken towards the examination of bilingual identity. This study frames bilingual identity not as a static entity, but rather, as a process of identification. Such a process is ongoing and changing throughout a bilingual person’s life. Through acknowledging identity in this way the study allows insight into the current process of identification for these students. Obtaining the students’ own reports of their connections with language and bilingualism forms the most accurate way of gaining insight into this process.

In addition this study adds a new perspective to the emerging literature that examines the division between successful “elite” enrichment bilingual programs and less successful circumstantial or subtractive programs (Helot & de Mejia, 2008). This research project illustrates individual student stories of bilingual identity negotiation in a setting that involves students from majority and minority language backgrounds. In this way it contributes a new perspective to the emerging discussion of ways that majority and minority bilingual education might be integrated (Helot & de Mejia,
Much prior literature focuses either upon enrichment language learning settings or upon circumstantial language learning settings.

Research focusing specifically upon Australia is scarce and this study adds to the small body of research that focuses upon the Australian context (Clyne, 2005; de Courcy, 2002, 2006; Lotherrington, 2003; Molyneux, 2005). Research focusing even more specifically upon student identity development associated with bilingualism in Australia is less common (Lotherrington, 2003; Molyneux, 2005). This study provides insight into the importance of bilingualism for one group of Australian primary school students. In this way the research takes a step towards filling a gap in Australian research in addition to developing a new framework examining bilingual identity negotiation. Research looking at bilingual identity is found primarily in the UK, US and European contexts, and yet with the nature of population movement, immigration and the current demographics in Australia, bilingualism is a lived reality for many Australians.

Many young Australians have more than one language in their lives (Group of Eight, 2007) either through their home life, their school life, their family background, their prior learning experiences or a combination of these and other factors. Bilingual education research in other countries has shown the importance of acknowledging students’ identities in classroom experiences in order to maximise their learning opportunities and their self-belief as important factors in the educational system (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003). The majority of research has focused upon students who learn in mainstream monolingual classes with some form of bilingual assistance (Martin Jones, 1995; Martin Jones & Saxena, 1996). The students in this current study have the opportunity to learn in two languages, with two teachers in the classroom, both fully qualified and each a native speaker of one of the languages. This means that this learning context is unusual in its structure, set-up and style.

The context in which these students are learning may offer them unique opportunities to develop and acknowledge parts of their identity that in other learning contexts may not be part of their educational experience. In this way the students form an important case to examine.
1.7 Limitations of the Study

The main limitation of this study is that the findings cannot be generalised to a broader population. By focusing specifically upon individuals in one context this study provides findings about the individuals in this context. It might be possible that the findings can provide implications for individuals in similar contexts, but the findings cannot be applied more generally.

However, the implications from this study may be useful for other schools in the school’s Like School Group (LSG), comprising 291 public schools in the metropolitan areas of Sydney, Newcastle and Wollongong, that have comparable literacy results in the NAPLAN tests (see Appendix V for full results). Students, teachers and parents from these schools with connections to more than one language may benefit from an understanding of these findings.

The other members of the Like School Group are considered comparable to the case study school and might benefit from an understanding of this study’s findings. The NAPLAN results show that in year 5 the case study school average results for spelling and numeracy were similar to the LSG average scores. The school scores for grammar and punctuation were slightly higher than for the LSG (see Appendix V for full data). The use of standardised basic skills tests have been shown in other studies to act as a control measure (Edelenbos & Vinjé, 2000; Schuster, 2005). Therefore the NAPLAN results can be considered to be a useful tool for eliciting the applicability of specific case results to similar schools in terms of literacy development. As the current study focuses upon language skills and attitudes, using a measure of literacy appears appropriate as a tool for looking at the applicability of the results.

Further countering the limitation of generalisability, by focusing upon one specific context in this study deeper insight into that context can be obtained. In research in this field, specific, contextualised studies are commonly found. In this way this study adds to the growing field of studies looking at bilingualism in Australia, but does not provide broad conclusions for all bilinguals in Australia.
1.8 Chapter Overview

In this thesis, the first chapter has provided a general overview of the project. The following chapters report the study in full detail. The chapter breakdown is as follows:

Chapter Two provides a review of relevant literature and past research influencing this research study. It then outlines the Bilingual Identity Negotiation Framework that is developed in this study.

Chapter Three provides a detailed outline of the research methodology. The qualitative approach is explained. The use of a case study strategy is outlined and each of the data collection tools is explained and justified.

Chapter Four presents the results and discussion of the findings from the study. The findings are presented under the headings of the research sub-questions. Within each sub-question individual student stories are presented and discussed and common themes and threads between the stories are indicated and analysed. Links between the findings and the theoretical framework are outlined and discussed.

Chapter Five outlines the reflections and implications arising from the findings. The conclusions are presented in two ways; firstly conclusions are drawn that support the Bilingual Identity Negotiation Framework; secondly, conclusions specific to each of the research sub-questions are detailed. Avenues for future investigation are identified.
2 Literature Review

In this chapter, literature underlying this study is presented and reviewed. In the first third of the chapter, literature relating to bilingualism and an understanding of this term is discussed. The discussion then becomes more focused, examining bilingual education and literacy in bilingual education settings and homes. The second third of the chapter examines literature pertaining to bilingual identity and presents some of the opposing views within identity work and clarifies the stance taken by this study. Following this, the final third of the chapter identifies and reviews prior studies pertaining to both bilingual education and bilingual identity. It is argued that these prior studies fit into three categories—socio-cultural connection studies, interaction studies, and investment studies. This current study develops a framework that incorporates all three of these elements thus adding to the existing body of work. The final section of this chapter incorporates an explanation of this newly conceptualised framework.

Before presenting the review of recent prior studies in the field of bilingual education and identity, it is important to outline the base from which this literature has emerged. To do this, a broader explanation and overview of bilingualism and bilingual education literature is necessary.

2.1 Defining Bilingualism

Previous literature examining the phenomenon of bilingualism takes a number of different stances and makes a number of interpretations of the term bilingualism. It is therefore important to acknowledge some of these stances and definitions and clarify the stance taken in this study through a review of the literature.

Li (2006, p. 1) gives one definition of bilingualism as “a product of extensive language contact (i.e., contacts between people who speak different languages), indicating that a large quantity of contact with both languages is required before a person can be considered bilingual. However, he acknowledges that this definition can
be too limiting, and that although language contact is necessary for societal bilingualism it does not automatically lead to individual bilingualism (Li, 2006).

Baker and Prys Jones (1998) point out that there are a number of factors that might be considered when defining whether a person is bilingual or not. Included in these factors are issues such as how fluent a person must be in each language to be considered bilingual; whether a person must have equal competence in both languages to be considered bilingual (also referred to as being a balanced bilingual); there is also the question of whether a person is only defined as bilingual if they can speak the two languages or whether we consider them bilingual if they can understand, read or write a second language; another consideration is whether language proficiency should be the measure for bilingualism or whether frequency of language use might be a better measure (Baker & Prys Jones, 1998).

As these questions begin to illustrate, defining bilingualism is not simple and this is not an exhaustive list of the issues involved in attempting to decide upon a definition. There are also no definitive or commonly accepted answers to these questions. As Bhatia (2006) indicates, there is no widely-accepted definition of bilingualism or how it should be measured.

Due to the lack of consensus about the definition of the term bilingualism, many different terms are used to describe different types of bilingualism; this often results in confusion and sometimes in misrepresentation of bilingualism. This section of the literature review clarifies the position of this study.

An important point to make in the discussion of bilingualism is that bilingualism in some literature refers to the ability in and use of two languages. In other literature the term bilingualism refers to multilingual competence. This means that a person may have knowledge or experience of three or more languages (Baker & Prys Jones, 1998). Romaine incorporates Weinreich’s 1953 interpretation of bilingualism as “the alternate use of two or more languages” (Romaine, 1995, p.12 emphasis added). Likewise, Grosjean defines bilingualism as “the regular use of two or more languages” (Grosjean, 1982, p.1 emphasis added). In this way the term bilingualism includes multilingualism.
Some theorists believe that in order to be classified as bilingual a person must have equal competence in both languages and some believe that the person must have native-like knowledge and use of both languages. This is referred to as being a balanced bilingual. However, being a balanced bilingual is extremely rare. Most people who have access to more than one language are not balanced bilinguals, as they may have greater knowledge of one form of each language than the other forms. For example, a person could be a fluent speaker of two languages and a competent writer in one of the languages. They are bilingual, although they are not able to write in all of the languages. Romaine (1995) critiques the term balanced bilingual, pointing out that it is a theoretical perspective that has derived from a monolingual point of reference. As this viewpoint does not take account of the real nature of bilingualism, the search for a perfectly balanced bilingual has remained unfulfilled (Romaine, 1995).

Another example that can illustrate the non-balanced nature of bilingualism is that a person may be fluent in academic language in one language and fluent in conversational language in another language (Cummins, 1999). This person could be considered to be bilingual by having knowledge of different genres of language (Blommaert, 2007). Grosjean (1982) believes that bilinguals are seldom equally fluent in their languages, however more traditional views of bilingualism have shown balanced bilingualism to be an important factor. More frequently in recent writing the notion of unequal ability or fluency in the languages has become more commonly accepted (Bhatia, 2006; Grosjean, 1982; Romaine, 1995).

In defining bilingualism, some writers find that a person is only bilingual if they are a functional bilingual. This means that their bilingualism is measured by the ways in which they use the language and the quantity of language use. The concept of being a functional bilingual can be interpreted in a minimalist or maximalist way (Baetens Beardsmore, 1982). The minimalist interpretation means that a person could be considered to be functionally bilingual if they can accomplish a limited amount of activities in a second language with only a certain knowledge of vocabulary and grammar (Baetens Beardsmore, 1982). The maximalist interpretation means that a person would only be considered functionally bilingual if they could conduct all of
their activities in either language (Baetens Beardsmore, 1982). A related simple definition of being bilingual is the regular use of two or more languages (Grosjean, 1982, p1). A minimalist interpretation fits best with the stance of non-balanced bilingualism.

When discussing bilingualism there is also a distinction made between productive competence in language (that is: speaking and writing) and receptive competence (that is: understanding and reading). Some researchers believe that it is possible to be defined as being bilingual if you have productive competence in one language and receptive competence in the less dominant language of your repertoire (Baetens Beardsmore, 1982; Blommaert, 2007).

Some writers define different domains or areas of a person’s life in which they might use or learn a different language (Baker, 2006; Romaine, 1995). A person might be consistent in the settings in which they use each language. For example a person may speak Korean at home with a grandparent, whereas they always use English at work. In this way a person’s different domains of language use may not intersect (Baker 2006). In other scenarios a person may make a choice about which language to use. The choice of which language a bilingual person uses in a particular setting can be influenced by a number of pressures or variables such as economic, cultural or religious influences and in some cases the most influential factor impacting language choice may be economic (Romaine, 1995). For example a speaker of a minority language may need to speak the majority language of the country in workplace or public settings.

In this study bilingualism is viewed as the use of two or more languages, with a minimal competence in one or more domains of each language being seen as sufficient to define a person as bilingual.

2.2 Bilingualism and Young People

There are a number of factors that influence the experience that young bilingual people have of their languages. The first factor of importance to this study is the
influence of family opinions about language learning, maintenance of heritage or background language and overall opinion of bilingualism. The parental and familial views about this impact strongly upon the young person’s view of their languages and bilingualism and their opportunities for language maintenance and learning (Molyneux, 2006; Pease-Alvarez, 2003; Tannenbaum & Howie, 2002; Weisskirch & Alatorre Alva, 2002). The family impact upon young bilinguals is also seen through the language use that takes place in the home. The amount and type of bilingual interaction taking place in the home has a strong impact upon the young bilingual person’s understanding of and attitude towards bilingualism and language.

The second important influence upon young bilingual people is the type of education the young bilingual person receives. The educational context may be monolingual or bilingual, but even in a monolingual education setting there are measures that can be taken by teachers to foster the student’s self-esteem and feelings of power and agency in their languages (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003). The different types of bilingual education commonly found around the world are explained in the following section 2.3.

A third important influence upon young bilinguals is the level of opportunity they have for development of literacy practices in their home language. This can strongly impact upon a young person’s ability and comfort in the dominant societal language as they are able to transfer skills acquired in their home language to the language of education at school (Gregory & Kenner, 2003; Kenner, 2000; Kenner & Gregory, 2003). In addition to the parental/familial opinion about languages having an impact upon a young person’s bilingual identity, so too does their home experience of literacy. (Gregory & Kenner, 2003; Kenner, 2000; Kenner & Gregory, 2003). The access they may have to literacy practices could be in the home or in the school environment, or may in some cases not take place at all. (See section 2.4).

A further important distinction to make about young bilinguals is consideration of the point at which a person develops their bilingualism. Children who develop two languages from birth are known as simultaneous or infant bilinguals and these children are considered to have two first languages (De Houwer, 2006). If a child
learns the second language after the age of three this is referred to as consecutive or sequential bilingualism (Bhatia, 2006).

Following on from this outline of the factors affecting young bilinguals, it is clear that the type of education and opportunity to learn language are important factors for bilingual children. It is therefore necessary to examine the nature of bilingual education and how bilingual education has developed into the current forms available to different students.

2.3 Bilingual Education

This section outlines the major trends in the development of bilingual education and the different types of bilingual education found in different settings across the world, so that the setting of the students in this current study can be placed within both a historical and present-day context.

2.3.1 Bilingual Education in Context

Bilingualism has existed for thousands of years but has been increasingly researched over the last thirty years (Baker, 2006a; Lewis, 1981). Bilingual education has taken place at many points throughout history in different contexts. Issues relating to bilingual education have evolved through political and social change (Lewis, 1981). Therefore examination of bilingual education inherently involves consideration of the political, societal and demographic context in which it takes place (Lewis, 1981).

In the United States and Canada there is a better-documented history of bilingual education than in other contexts. This is also reflected in the quantity of research emerging from the US and Canada relating to bilingualism. The contexts of the US and Canada are, however, very different.

The model of bilingual education commonly seen in the US today is a form referred to as a subtractive model in which a student’s home language is gradually removed from the educational setting with the ultimate aim of monolingual education in English (Bhatia, 2006). Students’ lack of academic success as measured in this form
of bilingual education has been used by politicians in the US as evidence that bilingual education does not work, and as a basis for a drive towards policies of English-only education (Cummins, 2003). Policies such as Proposition 227 in California have severely limited the amount of home language that can be used in a child's education, thus limiting the possibilities for positive forms of bilingual education to be implemented (Cummins, 2003).

The models of bilingual education commonly encountered in the US context are heavily critiqued by writers in the field of bilingualism, because the researchers in this field view the models as poor examples of bilingual education (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003). Such writers argue that the commonly found types of bilingual education lead to inequality in the classroom and inequitable access to education for students from language backgrounds other than English (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003). The following sub-section (2.3.2) discusses different types of bilingual education.

Bilingual education in the Canadian context predominantly follows a model that is considered an additive form of education – adding a new language without detriment to the first (Bhatia, 2006). The Canadian model of immersion bilingual education arose through the St Lambert experiment in the 1970s. In this model of bilingual education the two languages involved are viewed with equal value and importance. The languages used in the Canadian immersion programs are French and English in accordance with the two official languages in the country. However, Canada faces issues of inequality with regard to immigrant languages in a similar manner to the US context. In the US bilingual education commonly involves speakers of minority languages learning English to the detriment of the first language. In Canada the bilingual programs commonly found involve the two official languages, yet there are still limited options for speakers of minority languages to maintain their languages alongside learning English.

The issues of power and equality associated with language and literacy learning are becoming more widely researched over recent years (e.g. Arce, 2004; Bialystok, 2001; Cummins 1996, 2000, 2003; Cumming-Potvin, 2004; Escamilla, 1994; Esdahl, 2003; Heller, 1996; Madsen, 2003; Martin-Jones, 1995; Martin-Jones & Saxena, 1996; Molyneux, 2004; Norton, 2000; Sharkey and Johnson, 2003; Tuafuti and McCaffery,
2005; Wu and Bilash, 1998). However, the focus of the majority of this research into the power issues associated with language use, language recognition and opportunities for bilingual students, is mostly upon students in the United States or comes from other countries but focuses upon the teachers in the classroom rather than the students. There is a need for examination of students specifically and also of contexts other than the US.

Looking to the Australian context, Australia, like the US, has reached its current demographic form as a result of the immigration of people from all over the world. While English has continued to be the only officially recognised language and, in most cases, the only language officially used in schools there are other widely spoken languages in many Australian homes.

The most widely used community languages amongst pre-schoolers and those of compulsory school age (0–14 years) are Arabic, Vietnamese and Cantonese followed by Greek, Mandarin and Italian. At university level 18 per cent of domestic students use a language other than English at home with Cantonese, Mandarin, Vietnamese, Arabic, Greek and Hindi being the most widely spoken (Group of Eight, 2007, p.7)

As the quote indicates, there are a number of languages that are spoken widely in Australian homes. This shows bilingualism to be a lived reality for members of Australian society.

In spite of minimal acknowledgement of bilingualism in official documents, there are a significant number of people who live bilingually in Australia (Clyne, 2005). As Clyne (2005) outlines, the official figures from the 2001 census indicate that 16% of the Australian population and 29% of people in Sydney, and 27% of people in Melbourne use a language other than English at home (p.3). As Clyne (2005) goes on to point out however, “this is almost certainly an underestimate” (p.3). Clyne (2005) argues that the formation of the question in the census does not encompass the many ways in which language may be used, it eliminates a positive answer from people who live alone, and does not enable a positive response from people who speak a language other than English in their relatives’ homes, but not their own home.
In spite of data showing that many people live bilingually in Australia there are relatively few education programs that operate bilingually (see the following section 2.3.2). The political stance towards bilingualism is one factor affecting this.

As the illustration of the US, Canadian and Australian contexts indicates, discussion of bilingual education cannot be isolated from the historical background, political background and societal attitudes that have influenced its development (Baker, 2006; Cummins, 2006; Li, 2006). Differing policies and ideologies about immigration, integration and assimilation at different times have all contributed to the current setting in each society. Dominant beliefs amongst policymakers that a common national language is the best way to develop a cohesive society have led to the current emphasis in Australia and the US upon English and English literacy (Lo Bianco, 2000).

The dominance of an English-only viewpoint has not been consistent throughout history. It has fluctuated in keeping with the political and societal views of the time. Positive attitudes towards languages and bilingualism have faced ebbs and flows and changes in their popularity and acceptability in Australia (for a full and detailed historical review see Crozet, 2008). In Australia there were bilingual schools set up from the early days of European settlement in German and English (Clyne, 2005). There were also bilingual education programmes in the Northern Territory taking place in English and Aboriginal languages. One example was the Hermannsburg Lutheran Mission, which began oral instruction and literacy teaching in English and Western Arrernte from 1896 (Nicholls, 2005). These programs ended during the 1970s. In 1973 Indigenous language bilingual education programs began in the Northern Territory under a Federal government policy (Nicholls, 2005). However, these programs were closed down in 1998.

Moves are being made in Australia towards more recognition of the importance of community and indigenous languages in peoples’ lives. The National Statement for Languages Education 2005-2008 is the first languages document to be approved by all of the State Ministers for Education and the Federal Minister (MCEETYA, 2005). This statement acknowledges indigenous and community languages as important and the learning of languages in general as important for all Australians. However, this
The more recent introduction of the National Asian Languages and Studies in Schools Program (NALSSP) has indicated the viewpoint of the current Federal government that languages are useful for Australia in terms of increasing students' skills in intercultural communication. Communication with Asian countries is seen as particularly important, although there is less emphasis upon the learning of languages for communication with other people within Australia in the initial program documents (Commonwealth of Australia, 2008).

These documents indicate a higher value being placed upon languages and potentially more open acknowledgement of bilingualism and the benefits associated with certain forms of bilingual education in Australia.

Having outlined relevant aspects of the context of bilingual education it is now important to turn to the types of bilingual education that are more commonly found in recent times. In the following section different types of bilingual education are explained. Outlining the types of bilingual education that have been researched allows the current study to be positioned more clearly. The common factor for the students in this study is their educational context. Different types of bilingual education have been shown to have different impacts upon young bilinguals and their identity development. It is therefore important to clarify where this study's context sits within the wider field of bilingual education.

2.3.2 Types of Bilingual Education

There are many different types of bilingual education and due to the many terms relating to bilingualism in general, there is also potential for misunderstanding concerning different types of bilingual education.

The different types of bilingual education can be classified in many ways. One well-known but detailed classification system is that developed by Mackey (1970) that identified 90 different types of multilingual education. Cummins and Corson (1997)
developed a simpler category system involving five types of education with four out of the five focusing upon educational programs for minority students and the fifth focusing on programs for majority students.

- Type I programs involve indigenous or native languages as the medium of instruction
- Type II programs involve the use of a national minority language
- Type III programs involve international minority languages
- Type IV programs focus on the language learning of the Deaf or hard of hearing
- Type V programs involve dominant or majority group students learning bilingual and biliteracy skills (Cummins & Corson, 1997, p. xiii).

Cummins and Corson (1997) indicate that there is some crossover between types II and III and that these types are mostly transitional programs with the aim of guiding the students into academic learning in the dominant language. They indicate that these are the most common types of program in Australia and the United States (Cummins & Corson, 1997).

One even simpler form of classification is to divide bilingual education programs into three categories (Baker, 2006). Baker (2006) labels these categories Null forms of bilingual education, Weak forms of bilingual education and Strong forms of bilingual education.

The Null forms are programs that aim to educate the student to become monolingual in the dominant language of the society (Baker, 2006). Examples of Null forms of bilingual education are forms such as submersion programs commonly found in the US context, where students are immersed into the dominant language with minimal support in their background language.

Weak forms of bilingual education are those that gradually remove the student’s home language from their educational setting with the aim of limited bilingualism with strong skills in the dominant language of the society (Baker, 2006). Bilingual programs that fit into this category are transitional bilingual programs and structured immersion programs. Both of these types of program allow bilingualism in the early
years of the program with the gradual removal of the home language in the school setting.

Strong forms of bilingual education are those that aim to equip students to be bilingual and biliterate (Baker, 2006). Examples of these types of program are dual language programs, Canadian-style immersion programs and some heritage language and maintenance programs (Baker, 2006).

**Table 1: The Three Forms of Bilingual Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Forms (aim – monolingualism)</th>
<th>Weak Forms (aim – limited bilingualism)</th>
<th>Strong Forms (aim – bilingualism and biliteracy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submersion (Structured Immersion)</td>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>Dual Language/Two-way Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structured Immersion</td>
<td>Immersion (as in Canada)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Null or Weak forms of bilingual education can also be referred to as subtractive forms of education as they remove the home language from the educational setting (Bhatia, 2006). In accordance with this term, the strong forms can be referred to as additive, in that they add an additional language without a detrimental effect upon the student’s existing language or languages (Bhatia, 2006). The selection of null or weak forms of bilingual education as the most common forms available in an educational system reflects the political view of the decision-makers in the country towards bilingualism. In the US a monolingual view predominates and there is a common view amongst policymakers that bilingualism can detract from competence in English (Cummins, 2007). The monolingual view sees that bilingualism is the same as having two monolinguals within one person. In other words, it is thought by some that the bilingual person has two sets of language that may be competing for space within their brain. It has been shown by others (Blommaert, 2007; Cummins, 1979) that this is not the case and that the language knowledge of bilingual people intersects, overlaps and that the second language does not detract from the first (Blommaert, 2007; Cummins, 1979).

A monolingual viewpoint also does not take into account the different domains in which bilinguals use each language and the skills that transfer from one language to
another (Cummins, 1979). It also leads to subtractive forms of education such as submersion. This refers to a program where the student is “submerged” in classes in the dominant language in a “sink or swim” style of education. Research has shown that the learning context of submersion programs can frequently lead to failure in the acquisition of English according to the measurement tools in the school system. This is because the nature of the bilingual program is not supportive of the students’ background languages and prior learning and therefore is not inclusive of important aspects of the students’ identities. A submersion program does not acknowledge home language literacy achievement (Lo Bianco, 2000; Murray & Combe, 2007).

The differences between weak or null forms of bilingual education and strong forms have been linked to the issue of interpersonal negotiations associated with different types of bilingual education. A growing body of literature indicates that certain bilingual educational settings can empower or disempower students through either their acknowledgement of, or disregard for, students’ home and background languages, literacy and knowledge (Cummins 1996, 2000, 2003; Gregory & Kenner, 2003; Kenner, 2000; Kenner & Gregory, 2003). These languages, literacies and types of knowledge are now being seen as major aspects of these students’ identities and it is argued that educational success is more likely when these aspects of their identities are welcomed and incorporated into the classroom interaction (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003). A parallel can be drawn between the empowering pedagogies referred to as transformative pedagogies, and the stronger forms of bilingual education. Likewise the less empowering pedagogies may be linked to the weaker forms of bilingual education. Unfortunately for students from many minority language groups, often the only form available to them is to a subtractive form of bilingual education.

In Australia bilingual education is much less widespread than in the US and Canada. The programs that are in place differ from school to school as they have each developed in different circumstances and as a result of different initiatives or have been developed as one-off individual programs. In 2002 a study looking at immersion programs in Australia reported that there were 49 primary level immersion programs in operation across Australia and 14 secondary level immersion programs (de Courcy, 2002). This count included only programs with over 50% of the classroom in the immersion language (de Courcy, 2002). Other Australian research has indicated
approximately 50 schools in Australia that have immersion programs (Moloney, 2008). These immersion programs can be classified as strong forms of bilingual education, but may not be accessible to students from minority language backgrounds. However, as outlined earlier, bilingualism is relatively common for Australian citizens and examination of student bilingual identity development is therefore important.

Following on from the issues raised by the type of bilingual education program that students encounter, there are corresponding issues relating to student literacy. These are explored in the following section. An understanding of the importance of literacy in bilingual education allows us to understand the skills and corresponding empowerment and identity recognition that bilingual students can experience when they use and develop their literacy in both languages.

2.4 Bilingual Education and Literacy

A discussion of bilingualism and bilingual education involves an understanding of how literacy development takes place in bilingual settings. Literacy is defined in a multitude of ways and much discussion continues to take place in the field of literacy about the term's definition (Freebody, 2007; Winch, Johnston, March, Ljungdahl, & Holliday, 2006). The more traditional definition of literacy focuses upon extracting meaning from text and sometimes limits the focus of literacy to the decoding of reading and writing in traditional textual formats (Freebody, 2007; Winch & Holliday, 2006). Some traditional definitions of literacy focus specifically on reading and do not encompass writing (Street & Lefstein, 2007).

Other definitions of literacy focus upon functional literacy, seeing literacy as a technical skill which functions similarly across languages (Baker & Pryss Jones, 1998). This type of definition values literacy only in terms of its usefulness. This can also be referred to as a “skills approach” to literacy (Baker & Pryss Jones, 1998). Other types of approach to literacy include the whole language approach, the construction of meaning approach, the socio-cultural literacy approach, and the critical literacy
approach, with each approach differing in its underlying political stance towards the purpose and nature of literacy in society (Baker & Prys Jones, 1998).

The development of the term *multiliteracies* from the 1994 meeting of The New London Group initiated a discussion of the broadening of the definition of what constitutes literacy to incorporate the multiplicity of linguistic and cultural influences upon many people in society and the increasing quantities of multimedia text-types encountered on a daily basis (Cazden, Cope, Fairclough, Gee et al., 1996; Cope & Kalantzis, 2000; Cummins, 2004; The New London Group, 1995). This discussion has continued and while some writers maintain a more traditional view of literacy, some writers and, indeed, some policymakers have embraced this developing definition of multiliteracies. The Queensland Government’s report on literacy defined literacy in the following way:

> Literacy is the flexible and sustainable mastery of a repertoire of practices with the texts of traditional and new communications technologies via spoken language, print and multimedia. (The State of Queensland, 2000).

Freebody (2007) repeats this definition in subsequent work, finding it to be the most applicable current definition. He argues that this definition takes a step forward from the traditional understanding of literacy, and argues that the new definition is more relevant to current society (Freebody, 2007). There is further consensus over the view that literacy involves the development of skills enabling a citizen to participate fully in work, community and private settings and that literacy also encompasses the traditional types of literacy in addition to social literacy, critical literacy and technological literacy (Cazden et al., 1996, Winch et al., 2006). This wider understanding of literacy has broadened the text types and situations in which literacy skills might be developed.

In earlier work Bialystok (2002), using a more traditional definition of literacy that focuses upon reading skills, outlined the skills that bilingual children develop that impact upon their development of literacy. She argued that children develop literacy skills through three influences: “oral competence with literary forms of language, conceptual development that includes understanding the symbolic notational systems
of print, and metalinguistic insights that allow children to achieve awareness of the phonological forms of language” (Bialystok, 2002, p 166). She proposes that these three background skills are influenced by bilingualism (Bialystok, 2002). This is not to say that bilingual children have better or worse access to developing literacy skills through being bilingual; but rather that their experience of literacy development will be different to monolingual children and that their proficiency in each of the three skills that are precursors to literacy development affects the ways in which their literacy skills develop (Bialystok, 2002).

In accordance with Bialystok’s argument about the links between literacy and bilingualism, Hamers and Blanc (2000) argue that the skills that are developed by literacy are also the skills that develop through bilingual experience. The skills that Hamers and Blanc (2000) argue are developed by bilingualism and literacy are metalinguistic skills and heightened linguistic awareness.

It might therefore be said that in bilingual education settings and for bilingual children, the bilingual students’ proficiency in certain skills in each of their languages might contribute to their development of literacy skills.

Ng and Wigglesworth (2007) argue that any discussion of bilingualism must inherently involve a discussion of biliteracy. They elaborate upon the definition of biliteracy by incorporating ideas put forward by Bialystok and concur that prerequisites to biliteracy are skills such as: oral proficiency, metalinguistic awareness and general cognitive development (Ng & Wigglesworth, 2007, p. 98). The emphasis on the importance of oral proficiency and metalinguistic awareness in this list therefore extends the repertoire of literacy development practices in the home that may be conducted biliterally beyond the more traditional expectation of reading or writing in two languages. The inclusion of spoken language in Freebody’s (2007) broadened definition of literacy opens up the possibility of recognition of conversations about language in bilingual homes as important and valid literacy building tools in addition to accessing written texts in two languages (The State of Queensland, 2000).
In Australian education there has been an emphasis upon English literacy as one of the most important skills for students to acquire. This issue is examined in the Australian context by Lo Bianco (2000), who argues that the underlying ideology in Australian education is one in which literacy is seen as a singular entity valuing English literacy only. Lo Bianco (2000) has argued that the current context is one where English is the only recognised and measured literacy. He has proposed that recognition of other literacies and acknowledgement of their inherently valuable knowledge and useful skills would lead to the empowerment of groups previously seen as educationally disadvantaged (Lo Bianco, 2000).

Recognising only English literacy as important results in an apparent literacy deficit for bilingual speakers and speakers of languages other than English (Lo Bianco, 2000). As several writers point out, a redefinition of literacy to acknowledge current research into literacy practices could incorporate all literacies that children encounter in all languages both at school and at home (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003; Gregory & Kenner, 2003; Kenner, 2000; Kenner & Gregory, 2003; Lo Bianco, 2000; Murray & Combe, 2007). Such a redefinition of literacy may result in recognising the acquisition of skills that are transferable across languages (Cazden et al., 1996; Cummins, 1979; Lo Bianco, 2000; Murray & Combe, 2007). The complexity of this issue arises from the working definition of literacy and from the corresponding measurement, and recognition of, what literacy entails.

Hornberger’s (2004) continua model of biliteracy proposes a framework for research and teaching in linguistically diverse settings. This model may perhaps be one that can overcome some of the issues raised by a monolingual view of literacy. Hornberger (2004) proposes that biliteracy refers to “any and all instances in which communication occurs in two (or more) languages in or around writing” (p. 156). The continua model aims to overcome the many polarised issues within bilingualism and literacy literature such as majority versus minority, oral versus written, oral versus literate and bilingual versus monolingual and a number of other relationships often seen as oppositional to each other. Through using the model of a continuum for each previously oppositional relationship, Hornberger (2004) proposes that learners and users will have more opportunity for biliterate development because their repertoire of skills and experiences will be encompassed within the continua model. In this way
learners’ experiences with literacy in various forms will be considered valid and useful prior knowledge in their development of biliteracy.

Other bilingual literature calls for the integration of majority and minority bilingual education to produce bilingual education models that would be beneficial to all learners (Helot & de Mejia, 2008). This new development sees the future of bilingual education moving away from the division between foreign language education and language learning for minority language students (Helot & de Mejia, 2008). This argument supports Hornberger’s (2004) continua model. In line with this, the current study examines student identity in a setting that educates students in literacy in both a majority and minority language.

In conjunction with the consideration of biliteracy there must also be a consideration of the literacy experiences that learners have in a bilingual home, particularly since home literacy learning is not always acknowledged in the classroom. Home literacy is discussed in the following section.

2.4.1 Home Literacy Practices and Biliteracy for Bilingual Children

Patterns of migration and immigration have led to young people being more frequently educated in languages that are different to the languages used in their homes (Bartlett, 2007; Group of Eight, 2007; Kenner & Gregory, 2003).

Correspondingly a body of literature has developed that examines biliteracy and the importance of the development of literacy in students’ home languages and the incorporation of literacy experiences in all languages into the classroom (Bartlett, 2007; Datta, 2007; Gregory & Kenner, 2003; Hornberger, 2003, 2004; Kenner, 2000; Kenner & Gregory, 2003; Kenner, Gregory, Ruby & Al-Azami, 2008; Lo Bianco, 2000; Marsh, 2003; Martin-Jones & Foster, 2007; McKay, 1999; Warnod, 2006).

Bilingual families have been shown to engage in bilingual literacy practices at home especially for social purposes such as: keeping in touch with relatives abroad; maintaining links with the wider community; religious observance; and supporting cultural interests (Kenner & Gregory, 2003).
The nature of communication and information availability in today’s internet-based culture means that bilingual families can more easily access linguistic and literacy resources in multiple languages from within their homes (Kenner & Gregory, 2003; Marsh, 2003). Ease of access to global communication is improving at a rapid pace. This can be illustrated through the rapid rate at which the resources that children access changes. Today DVDs, mobile phones, SMS, internet phone calls and online networking sites play a much more dominant role in popular culture literacy resources (Marsh, 2003).

Inter-linked with the use of home literacy practices, the development of bilingual students’ biliteracy skills has been argued to be a potential source of improved cognitive abilities, particularly in terms of decoding skills, creative thinking and the transferral of skills from one language to another (Bialystok, 2005; Cummins, 1979; Gregory & Kenner, 2003; Kenner & Gregory, 2003). It has been suggested through these studies that bilingual students with developed literacy skills in their home language have a better understanding of the underlying features of language in general and can use this metalinguistic understanding to assist with decoding or comprehension tasks (Bialystok, 2005; Cummins, 1979; Datta, 2007). The home is seen to be an integral site for development of these skills.

Biliteracy is a fundamental component of language learning for bilingual students. Embracing biliteracy in the classroom can serve not only a support function for bilingual students who use different languages at home and school, but also indicate to them that their learning outside of school is valuable and important in relation to their learning in school. These students need support and recognition of their home literacy experiences in order to function as confident empowered members of the classroom (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003, 2004). As Hornberger (2004) points out, bilingual educators need to “uncover the communicative repertoires (media) that students bring to school and that can serve as resources for their language and literacy development” (p.168).

As the writings of experts in this field indicate, students’ literacy practices outside of the school context can be valuable learning resources for their education in the
dominant language of the culture. There is a need for educators to begin to view home literacy practices as resources that can be used by teachers in the classroom and as useful tools for education (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003; Datta, 2007; Gregory & Kenner, 2003; Hornberger, 2004; Kenner, 2000; Kenner & Gregory, 2003; Marsh, 2003). There is a call for schools to embrace and recognise more unofficial or previously under-recognised home literacy practices in addition to the more traditional literacy practices of reading good books with parents (Gregory & Williams, 2004). Unofficial literacy practices are sometimes not recognised in the school setting, however they are important resources in the development of biliteracy for young bilingual students (Gregory & Williams, 2004; Hornberger, 2004).

Although the majority of studies focusing on biliteracy or bilingualism and literacy are based on US or UK contexts there is also a base of literature in Australia, which has been growing in recent years (de Courcy, 2006; Freebody, 2007; LoBianco, 2000; Luke & Carrington, 2004; Warnod, 2006).

A study of a bilingual French-English primary school in Victoria found that the students’ high achievement in English literacy could be linked to the “whole school approach to literacy in both languages” (Warnod, 2006, p 27). This whole school approach to biliteracy within the French and English bilingual program involved the implementation of a formal French literacy program throughout the school with links to the English literacy program already in place (Warnod, 2006). A number of writers support the notion of the possibility of transfer of literacy skills between languages that enable bilingual students to learn skills in either language and apply them to the other language (Collier, 1995; Cummins, 1979).

In an Australian study Luke and Carrington (2004) investigated the impact of globalisation upon the literacy practices in the small town classroom. Their research investigated the literacy programmes taking place and looked at how they acknowledged the students’ identities, competences and multiliteracies (Luke & Carrington, 2004).

Throughout the literature examining biliteracy there is a clear link to the importance of issues of identity with evidence that acknowledgement of home literacy and
bilingualism practices within the school classroom can lead to positive bilingual identity development (Cummins, 1979; Gregory & Kenner, 2003; Hornberger, 2004; Kenner, 2000; Kenner & Gregory, 2003; Luke & Carrington, 2004). The current study contributes to this group as it examines bilingual identity through students’ home and school experiences of language and literacy. The next section of this chapter further positions this study through a review of the literature examining bilingual identity and the process of identification.

2.5 Bilingual Identity

...contemporary applied linguistic researchers have been drawn to literature that conceives of identity not as static and one-dimensional, but as multiple, changing, and a site of struggle... (Norton & Toohey, 2002, p116)

In this study the ways in which students identify with the languages around them in their home and school environments are examined. Identity literature relating to bilingualism and language learning therefore needs to be explored. The definition of identity used in this study is explained through an examination of relevant literature.

2.5.1 Defining identity

Identity is a complex term and one that has been investigated thoroughly in several spheres of research. In spite of much research and theory existing about the notion of identity, little consensus exists over a precise definition. Lawler (2008), writing from a sociological perspective, states that it is not possible to provide a single definition of identity. She explains that there are multiple ways of theorizing the concept of identity and each leads to a different definition (Lawler, 2008). A definition by Joseph (2006) states “Your identity is, very simply, who you are” (p. 486). However, as he also goes on to elaborate, identity as a term is not so simple to define; who you are comprises many factors (Joseph, 2006). The spheres of psychology, sociology, and anthropology have all delved into the topic of identity in depth.

Within the psychological literature, the encyclopaedia of psychology also acknowledges that identity is difficult to define (Deaux, 2000). Deaux argues that
although identity is used widely across developmental, personality and social spheres of psychology “it is not possible to give a single, simple definition of identity” (Deaux, 2000, p. 222). There are various understandings that are accepted within the field of psychology. Erikson was one of the earliest psychologists to use the term ‘identity’ with predecessors using the term ‘self’. Erikson explained identity as an internal process that takes place from adolescence (Deaux, 2000). He described identity as something that was coherent and consistent throughout adulthood (Holland & Lachicotte, 2007). Similarly some psychologists continue to hold this view of identity as a developmental phenomenon (Marcia, 1994).

In contrast to the Eriksonian view of identity, the psychosocial view of identity is that there is no independent self. Rather, identity is seen as a relationship between the individual and the social world (Josselson, 1994). The anthropological view of identity reflects this psychosocial view of identity by proposing that identity requires comparison with an ‘other’ to exist (Rew & Campbell, 1999). Rew and Campbell (1999) explain that:

Identity — racial, ethnic, religious, sexual, gender, and national — cannot exist in isolation and must take its meaning from the other, and because every individual possesses a number of identities not all of which are relevant in every context, a particular identity is situationally defined in the course of social interaction (Rew & Campbell, 1999, p 10).

It can be seen that across the fields of psychology, sociology and anthropology that although there are sub-fields of theorists with differing interpretations of identity, there are also theorists who converge on a socially constructed definition of identity. This social construction view of identity is one frequently taken in social science fields.

Nevertheless, contention and discussion of the concept of identity and its examination continues across the disciplines. In the field of psychoanalysis, identity is considered to be “a person’s sense of self” (Rangell, 1994, p. 27). In this field of thought a person’s identity is how a person is known to his/herself, while a person’s identification is how a person is known to other people. In this understanding of identity, the self is seen as ‘actual’ while identity is seen as a ‘mental state’ (Rangell,
This interpretation of identity has led to some criticism of social science identity research that undertakes a somewhat different interpretation of identity. This is outlined further in the following sections.

2.5.2 Social Science Critiqued by Psychoanalysts

A division between the ways in which psychoanalysts and psychologists define and examine identity and the ways in which social scientists define and examine identity has been shown (Block, 2006). Block (2006) outlines the criticisms that have been made, particularly in the field of psychoanalysis and psychiatry (e.g. Bendle, 2002 cited in Block, 2006), of the recent increase of social science research focusing upon identity. The main critique is that many social science studies are seen as lacking an understanding of the frame of identity that is well established in the psychiatry field (Block, 2006).

Block’s (2006) thorough discussion of this critique as applied to his own and other research findings, leads him to argue that there are indeed vast differences between the identity research undertaken by psychologists and the research undertaken by social scientists; but that these differences may be positive. Block (2006) provides arguments to show that a psychoanalytic approach to identity is not appropriate for social scientists.

Firstly there is the argument that social scientists investigating identity often deliberately focus on the participants’ lives as current and changing and therefore the research frames used in such studies can be seen as superficial by psychoanalysts (Block, 2006). However, Block (2006) points out that the focus of the social scientist is not upon the inner drives and desires of the participants but rather upon the competing interests involved in living in today’s globalised world. The difference here is based upon the psychoanalytic definition of identity as a mental state (Rangell, 1994). This definition is in contrast to the definition of identity undertaken by other psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists and social scientists.

Yet another argument for a separation between psychoanalysis and social science is that the psychoanalytic approach can be intrusive to participants as it focuses on the
participant's personal inner conflicts or struggles (Block, 2006). Social science research is, in contrast through the use of different frames, less intrusive by using a process of negotiation of identity between the researcher and the participant and focusing upon observable phenomena (Block, 2006).

In summary therefore, the social scientific investigation of identity can be seen as distinct from psychological examinations of identity. In general, social science investigations have different intentions and different foci for examination.

2.5.3 Popular Usage of the Term ‘Identity’

Due to the frequency of the use of the term identity in everyday media we regularly see assumptions about the nature of identity. The work of several writers acknowledges the common assumptions about identity and assists to clarify the complexity of this term.

Firstly, some examples given by Fought (2006) illustrate the assumptions that are implicit in many of our everyday encounters with the concept of identity. She uses the illustration of the television shows which conceptualise, either consciously or subconsciously, individuals' identities as something concrete, but hidden inside to be pulled to the surface and shown through the way we dress (Fought, 2006). This understanding of identity is further shown in numerous self-help books relating to 'finding oneself' (Fought, 2006). In this way such programmes and books are re-iterating the argument that a person’s identity is an almost tangible entity that can be found and shown to the outside world (Fought, 2006).

Continuing this theme of identity as a tangible or concrete object, Block (2006) indicates that the nature of the internationalisation of media and the use of technology today results in a number of identity types being marketed to the public as possible identity choices in the 'cultural supermarket'. This again shows that identity is conceptualised in the media as a choice to make between distinct identity options. The problem with this commonly accepted conceptualisation is the underlying assumption that there are a finite number of identities in existence from which people can select.
The interpretation of identity found frequently in the media and popular culture is in direct contrast to the interpretation of identity as socially constructed. As outlined earlier, the social construction interpretation is widely accepted across several disciplines.

2.5.4 Identity as a Socially Constructed Process

In order to fully investigate identity for the purposes of this research it is therefore necessary to move away from the popular culture notions of identity and to explore the social nature of identity. Holland and Lachicotte (2007) argue that within the social science field there are two predominant orientations to identity: Eriksonian and Meadian. Holland and Lachicotte (2007) argue that the principle difference between the two orientations are that in the Eriksonian view identity is constant and overarching; whereas in the Meadian view identity is multiple and can be contradictory. They argue that Vygotsky’s writing about identity was limited but that the notions he did present about development and agency add strength and show similarities to Mead’s interpretation of “the self as a complex emergent phenomenon, continually produced in and by individuals in their interchanges with others” (Holland & Lachicotte, 2007, p. 104). In this way Holland and Lachicotte situate the social science view of identity firmly in a socially constructed interpretation.

Fought’s work (2006) also contributes to the exploration of identity as socially constructed and links to the writings of Edward Sapir (1912, 1932). Fought (2006) begins her argument with the premise that ethnic identity is a socially constructed category. In this thesis this argument is extended to present social identity as a whole as a socially constructed concept. The majority of writing from social science fields converges on this point, showing that identity is something that is constructed through interaction and negotiation with others (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003; Lave & Wenger, 1991; McNamara, 1987b, 1997; Norton, 2000).

Sapir (1912) theorised about the influence of social forces upon language, arguing that social forces could be seen metaphorically as “parallel in their influence to those of heredity in so far as they are handed down from generation to generation” (p.89). Sapir (1912) proposed that both the influences of the social environment upon an
individual, and the agency of the individual to identify themselves as a member of a group were important. Sapir argued that within the social environment “the various forces of society …mold the life and thought of each individual” (1912, p. 90). He cited some of these social forces such as religion and ethical standards (Sapir, 1912). Sapir (1932) also acknowledged the individuality involved in the process of self-identifying as a member of a group, finding that each individual differs in the extent to which they identify with other members of a group and the “nature of that identification” (p. 360).

Fought (2006) also presents self-identification as a major part of identity, but argues that self-identification cannot reveal the whole picture of a person’s identity, because the wider understandings of the community and society around us help to shape and form our self-concepts and understandings. She theorises that self-concept cannot be entirely separated from the context that a person is in because the context will undoubtedly have an influence upon the development of self-concept (Fought, 2006). This follows a similar direction to the writings of Sapir (1912, 1932) that present both the importance of the individual and also the influence of societal forces upon language and identity.

Norton (2006a), as an accepted expert in the field of identity studies, argues that a socio-cultural theory of identity does not need to be limited to a Vygotskian framework. She discusses much of the recent work that has been undertaken examining identity and language and argues that a broader conception of the socio-cultural nature of identity examination has developed (Norton, 2006a). This broader conception sees the boundary between social identity and cultural identity blurring, and leads to identity as a socio-cultural construct comprising five main characteristics:

1) Identity as dynamic and constantly changing
2) Identity as complex, contradictory and multifaceted
3) Identity as something that constructs, and is constructed by, language
4) Identity construction as influenced by larger social processes of power
5) Identity theory being linked to classroom practice (Norton, 2006a, p. 25).
In her argument Norton (2006a) discusses criticisms of identity work that have noted the lack of reference to Vygotsky and other traditional frameworks of socio-cultural theory. She argues that the direction of identity work has shifted towards a new frame that identifies the complexity of identity construction, the influence of broader societal issues and the importance of links between theory and classroom practice (Norton, 2006a). This current study fits firmly within the body of literature that has emerged over recent years examining identity through this re-worked conceptualisation of identity. Nevertheless some core principles developed by Vygotsky are also applicable to this study’s frame, in particular the notion of mediation in relation to a group, family or community passing cultural norms on to children through interaction (Lantolf, 1994).

The BINF framework developed in this study incorporates individual investment, community investment, socio-cultural connection in terms of group membership, interaction and the influences of the broader community and society. It thus seeks to examine identity within a frame that is in keeping with developments in this field, while adding a differently conceptualised frame of examination.

2.5.5 Components of Identity

There are a number of commonly accepted influences upon identity formation (Fought, 2006). Factors such as gender, age, social class, ethnicity and/or race are commonly cited as key elements (Deaux, 2000; Fought, 2006; Omoniyi, 2006). A number of research studies involving identity use these and other categories in order to analyse their data (Johnson, 2006; Lakoff, 2006). However, recent research has also identified problems associated with using categories and the presumptions that must be made in order to work with such categorisation (Omoniyi, 2006).

Omoniyi (2006) uses the term ‘Hierarchy of Identities’ to explain his argument about the complexity of the composition of identity, and the flexibility of identity which means that different aspects of identity are of differing importance at different moments. He addresses the problems associated with pre-defined categories by focusing upon the process of identification rather than the end-product of identity categories (Omoniyi, 2006). He argues that in any given interaction there is not one
single identity present, selected from a person’s possible identities, but there are a number of different aspects of their identity present; with each aspect having differing levels of importance at any particular moment (Omoniyi, 2006). Omoniyi (2006) uses this idea of “moment of identification” as a frame through which to measure the perspective of self that a person deploys in interaction. In a similar manner Block (2006) also focuses upon the process of identification as less limiting than the term ‘identity’.

Focusing specifically upon teacher identity, Johnson (2006) explains that many previous examinations of teacher identity use a top-down critical discourse analysis approach. This, however, presupposes a number of identities and positions that are made available to a person to take up or discard. A less frequently used alternative is a bottom-up analysis approach that investigates “displays [of identity] rather than impose[s] pre-given categories on the data” (Johnson, 2006, p214). In this way identity is conceptualised as a repertoire of verbal practices that display who the person is during the course of a particular interaction (Johnson, 2006). It does not claim to explain a person’s full identity, only the part that is visible in a given interaction.

Lakoff (2006) separates identity into two parts: major identity and minor identity, citing aspects such as race, gender and sexual preference as components of major identity while other aspects such as musical preference, style of dress and food preferences could be components of minor identity. In the current study the argument put forward is that while aspects of each person’s identity do differ in importance, it is presumptive to say what are the major and minor factors of identity for each person; it may be more appropriate to hypothesise that what is major and minor within any individual’s identity will vary for each and every individual and that although race, gender and sexual preference may well be the most influential factors for many people we cannot presume that this is the case for all people. Self-reporting by each individual is necessary to gain insight into the major and minor aspects of identity.

Tajfel (1982) created a frame within which inter-group relations could be investigated in relation to social identity. He argued that it was possible to investigate certain aspects of identity without looking at a person’s identity in its entirety (Tajfel, 1982).
This is in keeping with the social science tradition of looking at observable or reportable aspects of identity (Block, 2006). Tajfel's (1982) investigation was limited to looking only at the aspects of identity pertinent to the study of group membership. He proposed that by framing the study in this way social identity could be studied without the need to look further into issues of the 'self' in a broader sense or looking into social behaviour in other contexts (Tajfel, 1982). He addressed this limitation by acknowledging that his conclusions would be limited to the context being studied (Tajfel, 1982).

Therefore, in regard to components of identity, the stance taken in this study is that there is not a finite or definable set of components of identity. The components vary for every individual and not all are measurable. However, those that are visible in interaction or through a level of self-awareness and self-expression can be examined (Block, 2006; Johnson, 2006). One widely acknowledged important influence upon identity is that of language. Language is essential to be able to express identity and also forms an important part of social identity, particularly in a study of bilingualism.

**2.5.6 The Influence of Language upon Identity**

'Who we are' relates closely to the language we use. The language or languages that we speak form an important part of who we are. Our languages influence our identity, in particular our ethnic identity or social identity (Deaux, 2000; Thornborrow, 1999). In an investigation of bilingual children in a bilingual education setting, language is a key factor associated with identity.

Fought (2006) cites language as a key element that assists individuals to balance the various roles and aspects of their identities. In this study this point is developed further, to argue that language is a fundamental aspect of identity, but also an aspect that is different for every individual. This reflects the view taken by Sapir (1932) arguing that group membership is different for every individual. Likewise, language and its influence upon identity can be said to be different for every individual.

Language has been theorised as fundamental to national identity (Suleiman, 2006). This study argues that language means something different to every person and while
language may be a factor that links to national identity, this study is based on the belief that each person has a different type of connection to their language or languages; a different level of awareness of the language; and a differing value to place upon that language.

Kanno (2003) in her exploration of bilingual and bicultural identity succinctly explains the agency that each individual person has in relation to their identification with languages:

“by bilingual and bicultural identity I mean where bilingual individuals position themselves between two languages and two (or more) cultures, and how they incorporate these languages and cultures into their sense of who they are.” (p. 3).

This clearly indicates the stance of individual choice and power in selecting an identity position along a continuum of languages. However, in addition to this individual choice and agency, every individual exists within a context and this context has influences upon individual identity.

As Fought (2006) indicates, a person’s understanding of their ethnicity and identity cannot be purely understood from the way in which they express it. A person’s identity cannot be isolated from the context in which it has been constructed and the views and attitudes in the society around that person (Fought, 2006). It is this point which brings to the fore the importance of the influence of language socialisation and Communities of Practice, where expert members of a group or culture teach and assist new members to become more accomplished in linguistic and cultural practices through language use and practice (Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007; Lave & Wenger, 1991). In the case of the current study, the important contexts to consider are the students’ home and school language contexts within the broader national setting.

The process of identification examined in this study operates within the understanding of identity as being the common ground which is negotiated between who an individual sees him/herself to be and who others see that individual to be. This is examined further in the following section.
2.5.7 Learning and Identity

"Learning involves the construction of identities" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p 53)

Lave and Wenger's (1991) discussion of language learning and language socialisation emphasises learning as an inherently social process that involves the construction of identities. They argue that becoming a member of any group or community involves continued interaction and negotiation with members of that group until, not only that individual begins to identify themselves as a member of that group, but also, until the individual learns sufficient cultural and contextual knowledge for others to see them as a member of the group (Lave & Wenger, 1991). In this way the influence upon identity of both self-concept and also recognition by the community is a theme in Lave and Wenger's writing (1991) just as it emerges in Fought's work (2006). These three writers argue that identity is socially constructed. They thus show the importance of both social construction and individual self-concept in developing identity.

Daniels (2001) argues that the focus upon identity present in Lave and Wenger's theorisation of language learning is the element that demarcates their work from other theories that involve ideas of apprenticeship in learning. Lave and Wenger's writing emulates some aspects of a Vygotskian theory of learning, however, Daniels (2001) argues that Lave and Wenger's theory of learning differs from Vygotskian sociocultural theory through its focus upon learning as a social practice without a focus upon pedagogy.

Schieffelin and Ochs (1981) also discuss the role of language in socialisation. They argue that both children and other new members of a society learn cultural rules through interaction (1981). Therefore, the only way to develop an identity as a member of a society is through interaction with other members of that society (1981).

Bayley and Schechter (2003) wrote more recently about the extension of language socialisation theories from focusing upon children's first language acquisition to looking at adults and others learning new cultures. This is a theme reflected in Norton's work (2000). Language socialisation is explained by Bayley and Schechter
(2003) as something that takes place in numerous different contexts such as schools, communities, peer groups and the workplace. They argue that certain identities are made available to individuals to assume or resist, but if individuals find that the options open to them are insufficient they can construct new identity options (Bayley & Schechter, 2003). Duff (2007) also works from a language socialisation standpoint saying:

"Research in language socialization generally recognizes that language and literacy learning involves explicit or implicit socialization through linguistic and social interaction into relevant local communicative practices or ways of using language and into membership in particular cultures or communities, with their own values, ideologies, and activities." (Duff, 2007, p. 310).


Pease-Alvarez (2003), when writing about language socialisation, discusses the importance of parental influence upon children’s bilingual identity development as the parents model and construct roles, dispositions and identities with their children. In support and extension of this point, Gregory (2005) has argued that siblings undertake an important role in socialising younger brothers or sisters into the language community. Siblings can act as important participants in playful or teasing interaction that assists language development and, subsequently, socialisation and development of bilingual identity (Gregory, 2005; Volk, 1998).

So, it may be seen that identity can be developed concurrently with the learning of language and the learning of culture that takes place within a community. This current study works from the premise that identity negotiation is socially constructed and influenced by the interactions and negotiations that a person experiences in their language community or communities.

In order to further clarify the positioning of this current study of bilingual identification it is necessary next to look at the other studies of bilingual education
and identity issues relevant to this research. The following section outlines the influential prior studies of bilingual education.

2.6 Studies of Bilingual Education and Identity

In this section, prior studies related to bilingual education and bilingual identity are reviewed. Subsequently the framework for the current study, which has been influenced by this literature, is outlined. Prior work examining issues of importance to student bilingual identity in bilingual education settings can be grouped into three categories –

- research relating to socio-cultural connection,
- research relating to investment, and
- research relating to interaction.

This study examines bilingual identity through a frame that incorporates elements from all three categories. This study therefore sits alongside these studies but also moves further by using a frame that incorporates the three themes, namely socio-cultural connection, investment and interaction. These three categories have been identified as the three core segments of the Bilingual Identity Negotiation Framework. The framework is explained in the section following the discussion of prior studies (in section 2.7).

2.6.1 The Socio-Cultural Connection Element

Development of a bilingual identity or a connection to more than one language is affected by whether a person identifies themselves as a member of two groups or cultures. This is what is referred to in this study as socio-cultural connection with two groups or cultures. Therefore it is important to outline the literature that has investigated how people become members of groups or cultures. The term socio-cultural connection is used in this study to incorporate the ideas developed through language socialisation literature and also to incorporate the importance of self-identification as a member.
As indicated by the *learning and identity* literature (section 2.5.7) past studies have examined how people become members of groups or cultures through language socialisation (Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). A number of studies have looked at how people learn the rules of a community and that community’s ways of talking. Such studies have shown that younger members of a group become members of that group through communication with and learning from older members (Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). The older members of the group model their language and culture to the younger members and therefore assist younger members to develop an identity as a fellow member of the group. In a bilingual school setting teachers and family members are important role-models of the culture to which students are developing a new connection (Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986).

The importance of the individual’s self-concept as a member of a particular group or groups is of particular relevance to the term socio-cultural connection. The importance of the individual’s self-concept is shown in Tajfel’s definition of social identity as:

> that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership. (1978, p. 63).

An individual’s feeling of membership is unique to that person and carries different significance for each person. This notion of the individuality of identifying oneself as a member of a group and the different ways in which each individual feels that identification is a notion also discussed by Sapir (1932). The definition of social identity outlined by Tajfel (1982) has been re-examined in more recent literature. The social identity development literature has emphasised the importance of an individual’s understanding of their membership of a group upon their social identity. The value an individual places upon that membership also plays a role in their social identity development (Joseph, 2006). In this way Sapir’s (1932) view has been incorporated into the current discussion of language, identity and group membership.
Previous studies associated with socio-cultural connection can be divided into three categories within the identity development of bilingual children:

1) Identity confusion versus identity integration, indicating instances of bilingual children’s experiences of identity development varying along a scale from developing conflicting social identities at one end of the scale to developing different social identities that can co-exist at the other end of the scale.

2) Positive identification with two cultures, indicating successful negotiation of identity as a member of more than one culture.

3) Negative identification with two cultures, indicating difficulties encountered in the negotiation of membership of more than one culture.

2.6.1.1 Identity Confusion Versus Identity Integration

The complex nature of identity construction and the impact of the interpersonal negotiations involved can sometimes result in a conflict of identity for bilingual children who feel a connection to two or more groups or cultures. For example students in one Australian study of a South-East Asian community in Melbourne identified themselves as a fusion of Asian and Australian, although when asked to place themselves on a scale most positioned themselves towards the Asian end of the scale (Lotherington, 2003). Lotherington (2003) found that there was a conflict for these students because society perpetuates the view that Australian means white and the students had difficulty negotiating their identities as first generation Asian-Australians within broader societal structures.

However, another study has shown that if children receive the right amount and quality of exposure to two cultures they can develop integrated identities (Baker, 2002). This means that rather than resulting in a conflict or confusion of identity, children can construct identities that involve multiple cultures integrating with each other. Baker (2002) describes integrated identities as a bridge between two cultures. He argues that motivation and appropriate environmental support enable bilingual children to develop integrated values and beliefs (Baker, 2002). Baker (2002) believes that the appropriate support needs to be available to children at a young age because
2.6.1.2 Positive Identification with Two Cultures

Studies have shown examples of the ways in which children identify positively with bilingualism and with more than one language and culture (Cumming-Potvin, 2004; Diaz Soto, 2002; Martin & Stuart-Smith, 1998; Martinez-Roldan, 2003; Molyneux, 2005; Wu & Bilash, 1998). For example, previous studies have shown that many students who have access to supportive bilingual education contexts identify positively with being bilingual and identify themselves with more than one culture (Cumming-Potvin, 2004; Molyneux, 2005). Molyneux’s (2005) Australian study investigated student views about bilingualism and found that students who were bilingual valued their bilingualism and believed it improved their self-esteem and assisted them to construct a bi-cultural identity. Further positive identification with bilingualism has been demonstrated through the investigation of narratives, where children show themselves as being able to help others through their use of bilingualism (Diaz Soto, 2002; Martinez-Roldan, 2003). Wu and Bilash (1998) examined Chinese background students’ feelings towards Chinese and Canadian people, languages and cultures in year 6 at a Canadian school. They found that students had some negative experiences of using their background language, but in spite of this they identified positively with the language and culture of their background country (Wu & Bilash, 1998). The researchers found that the bilingual program contributed to the development of these positive attitudes (Wu & Bilash, 1998).

The majority of the studies that have indicated either positive or negative reactions to bilingualism have involved circumstantial bilingual students using a bilingual program to maintain home language while learning English. This research has found that often children show a desire to please their parents and thus indicate a valuing of two cultures and bilingualism due to a parental belief that bilingualism is important (Lotherington, 2003; Molyneux, 2005; Pease-Alvarez, 2003). Parental attitudes to English, Spanish and bilingualism were examined through interviews with American parents of Mexican background. These interviews were followed up five years later.
Sixty-three parents took part in the first interview and 39 in the follow-up interview. Most parents had positive attitudes towards bilingualism and believed it would open up future opportunities for their children while maintaining their Mexican identity (Pease-Alvarez, 2003).

2.6.1.3 Negative Identification with Two Cultures

There have been some indications of situations in which young bilinguals react in a negative way to their association with two cultures (Weisskirch & Alatorre Alva, 2002). In the US a study involving 36 bilingual English-speaking and Spanish-speaking fifth grade students used a written questionnaire to investigate the students’ uses of language brokering. It was found that in situations where young children feel they must act as an interpreter or language broker for their family the children demonstrated discomfort with the power reversal involved (Weisskirch & Alatorre Alva, 2002). This power reversal meant that these young children were more linguistically powerful than their parents (Weisskirch & Alatorre Alva, 2002). The children translated for their parents when they were interacting with official organisations, landlords etc and this feeling of responsibility that the children encountered made many of them uncomfortable. The children felt that their parents should have been the ones in control of the situations but the children were essential interpreters in the interactions (Weisskirch & Alatorre Alva, 2002).

However, the study also argued that children’s developing cognitive skills can be used to overcome the discomfort encountered in this type of situation (Weisskirch & Alatorre Alva, 2002). In other words, as the children grew older and developed more cognitive skills their feelings of discomfort in these translation situations reduced (Weisskirch & Alatorre Alva, 2002).

A different element of negative identification is examined in Kanno’s (2003) study of older Japanese students returning to live in Japan. This research illustrates students’ feelings of not belonging in either culture after living abroad for an extended period (Kanno, 2003). Kanno (2003) argues that these students end up with a conflict of feelings as they feel “between” the two cultures. They feel that they are outsiders in both contexts.
2.6.1.4 Overview of Socio-Cultural Connection Studies

In sum, bilingual children have been shown to be able to construct and negotiate identities associated with both of the languages and cultures that they are connected to. In order to do this successfully the children need quality and quantity of experience in both of the cultures and a supportive environment in which language learning is valued by the community and the family. Some students who develop connection to other cultures then experience conflict as they feel between two cultures.

Previous studies have predominantly looked at a small number of students and in some cases only one student (Martinez-Roldan, 2003) or up to three students (Cumming-Potvin, 2004). Those studies that investigated a larger number of students relied upon only one source of data collection predominantly either interview or observation (Diaz Soto, 2002; Weisskirch & Alatorre Alva, 2002; Wu & Bilash, 1998). There are therefore possible methodological issues with some prior studies in this area, including conducting statistical analyses on data from a small sample. This may overlook contextual data and potentially lead to generalisations that are too broad (Weisskirch & Alatorre Alva, 2002). There is therefore a call for more research with multiple sources of complementary data. This study aims to address this gap.

Among the prior studies conducted in a methodologically strong manner looking at student connection with culture or attitude to culture, no studies were found that aimed to focus upon student identity negotiation within a well-developed identity framework. Instead the studies focused upon issues of empowerment, although they also made discoveries about identity through the investigation of empowerment (Molyneux, 2005). This indicates a need for studies that look specifically at student identity issues within a solid identity framework. This current study aims to fill this gap. In the current study students’ socio-cultural connection to different languages is examined through their self-expression about their membership of the different groups.

The investigation of identity requires consideration of interaction and the underlying power negotiations impacting upon identity negotiation. Becoming a member of a
group requires communication and interaction and inherently involved in these interactions are negotiations and opportunities for the empowerment and/or disempowerment of students that reflects broader societal influences and structures. This is examined in the interaction literature.

2.6.2 The Interaction Element
As has been indicated in the earlier sections of the literature review, interaction is an integral part of the negotiation process involved in identity construction (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). Interaction inherently involves interpersonal negotiations and the underlying empowerment/disenfranchisement involved. The influence of this on the examination of bilingual identity is outlined in more detail in this section.

2.6.2.1 Interpersonal Negotiations
Theoretical examination of research on identity formation has shown that power structures exist in society and these are perpetuated or emulated in everyday conversations and interpersonal negotiations. These interpersonal negotiations influence and control the ways in which people are able to negotiate new identities (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Lave and Wenger (1991) indicate that movement towards becoming a fully participating member of a group involves increasing effort and commitment by an individual and also involves the individual self-identifying as a master practitioner of the language involved. The emphasis in this theory is upon the individual as the instigator of change and the controller of progress towards becoming a group member. The individual is therefore influenced by his/her self-concept of his/her identity as a full member of the community.

In language learning, negotiation of meaning has been argued to be an essential skill for students to master. Gee (2003) argues that understanding meaning is an “active” skill that students must participate in. This supports Genesee’s (1987) argument that negotiation of meaning is an essential tool for students to develop to decode and ultimately master a new language.
Children engaged in bilingual programs or home situations which model two or more cultures are required to navigate through the power structures involved in order to begin developing and constructing an identity associated with both groups/cultures. In order to develop a bilingual identity it is necessary for the child to develop empowerment in the new language. Empowerment can be developed through children encountering positive experiences of using each language. In a school setting this can be encouraged through the types of interaction instigated by the educator within the classroom (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003).

The reflection of broader societal power issues within interactions frequently results in the perpetuation of majority languages being regarded as more valuable or important than the minority languages. It often leads to a perpetuation of the terms majority and minority, which indicate a value being attached to a language. However, through recognition of the importance of all languages to the speakers of those languages, it is possible to redress some of the imbalance present in many societies today.

The concepts of symbolic power and legitimate language discussed by Bourdieu (1977) still apply. Bourdieu’s (1977) notion of language as symbolic capital continues to be relevant for bilingual members of a society who are seeking to master the necessary skills in the dominant language of that setting.

The power inequalities present in society do not have to be perpetuated in bilingual settings. However, it requires a conscious effort by educators to ensure that structures of inequality are not replicated in their classrooms (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003). Equality can be encouraged through the ways that the languages and cultures are treated within bilingual settings. Perpetuation of inequitable power structures can also be overcome through community effort to give new speakers of the language opportunities to communicate meaningfully (Norton, 2000 – see investment section 2.6.3).

In writing about bilingual students becoming empowered in an academic setting, Cummins (1999) clarifies his distinction between the two types of language that bilingual students need to develop. Cummins’ (1984, 1999) terms BICS and CALP
refer to Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency respectively. Cummins (1984, 1999) indicates that, generally, BICS skills are more easily and frequently developed for immigrant bilingual children who are learning the majority language as they develop these skills in their everyday interactions inside and outside of school. These children may have less opportunity to develop the CALP skills that they require to be academically successful, as this type of language is often accessed only in the academic setting and must be more explicitly taught (Cummins, 1984, 1999). In bilingual education settings students need access to developing both face-to-face and school-related language skills in the majority language to not be academically disadvantaged. In addition, Cummins (1984) argues that a simple dichotomy between the two terms BICS and CALP can oversimplify the issue, and that language proficiency should be theorised according to two intersecting continuums – from cognitively demanding to cognitively undemanding and from context embedded to context reduced.

Cummins’ (1984, 1999) argument reflects the point argued by Bourdieu that “practical mastery of grammar is nothing without mastery of the conditions for adequate use” (1977, p. 646). Thus knowledge of language is insufficient without knowledge of appropriateness and suitability of language in relation to context. The difference between knowledge of conversational and academic modes of language is an important distinction that young language learners need to develop, thus young learners need skills to be able to differentiate and select appropriate language for different contexts.

2.6.2.2 Classroom Interaction Patterns

Previous studies examining the interaction patterns involved in classrooms with more than one language have shown that the interaction patterns illustrate negotiations of identity and power (Creese, 2006; Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003; Martin-Jones, 1995; Martin-Jones & Saxena, 1996). Many previous studies of bilingual classroom interaction that look into issues of identity and power focus upon the patterns of interaction taking place between teachers in classrooms. The patterns shown reveal the negotiation of identities within the classrooms as influenced by the negotiation of power.
Some studies that examine interaction patterns have investigated the power negotiations in classrooms that have more than one adult present (Martin-Jones, 1995; Martin-Jones & Saxena, 1996). These studies argue that a clear delineation between the roles of ‘main teacher’ in the class and the ‘assistant’ exists. Sometimes the system or school setting imposes these roles upon the teachers.

For example a study by Martin-Jones and Saxena (1996) in the UK used observation and videotaping to examine classrooms where language assistants had been brought into schools with minority languages to assist the class teachers. The system appears to have further marginalised the minority languages because the language assistants are perceived to be low-status staff members. The language assistants develop “we” language, as it is commonly referred to, with the students that results in a feeling of community and familiarity with the students. However, the lack of authority that the assistants have results in their position appearing less powerful and less important than the monolingual class teacher. The nature of power and identity negotiation has further excluded minority members of the community rather than included their input and incorporated their experiences into the classrooms. It has also perpetuated the view of the community language as “minority” by modelling to the students that the monolingual class teacher is more important than the bilingual assistant.

It appears that in classrooms with more than one teacher, previous studies have illustrated that each teacher takes on a different role. Although sometimes the system or school setting imposes roles of main teacher and assistant upon the teachers, at other times the roles are self-imposed through the teachers’ interactions with each other and with the students. The self-imposed roles reflect the teachers’ fundamental beliefs about their roles as teachers (Cummins, 1986).

For example a functional analysis of discourse, in which a classroom teacher and an ESL teacher working with the same class were examined, found that power relations between the two teachers were unequal (Creese, 2006). The study indicated that the roles imposed upon the teachers by the institution positioned the class teacher with higher status than the ESL teacher. It was also shown that each teacher’s self-concept of their role in the class differed, thus influencing the way in which they interacted with the class. The class teacher described her role as to cover the curriculum in a
limited time-frame and not to facilitate or assist with language development; meanwhile the ESL teacher viewed her role as a concurrent one of language development assistance alongside subject matter learning (Creese, 2006). The roles given to, and acted out by, each of the teachers sent messages to the students about the level of importance given to language learning, as a result of the identities that each teacher negotiated in that setting.

2.6.2.3 Transformative Pedagogies

The use of transformative pedagogies (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003) is one way to overcome the impact of a perpetuation of inequitable societal power structures within the classroom. Transformative pedagogy is a method of interacting in the classroom involving interactions between educators and students that encourage collaborative relations of power in the classroom (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003). This means that students are seen as equals in the classroom and as having an equal input to the teacher into the learning process. This theory recognises that the process of identity negotiation is fundamental to the educational success of all students. Transformative pedagogies enable students to analyse and understand social realities in their own lives and communities. Through these processes students develop their identities and become active in achieving academic success (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003). By feeling validated in the classroom and by being able to see how their past experiences of different languages and cultures can be powerful and useful to them, students develop more positive attitudes towards learning and towards the cultures that influence them. Collaborative interactions can assist students to create their own power by assisting students to relate broader social issues to their own lives and experiences (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003; Cummins, Bismilla, Chow, Cohen et al., 2005). These positive interactions enable students to become active decision-makers about their education.

Cohen’s (2008) study of the use of such pedagogies found that the teachers in her study were able to harness students’ linguistic diversity as a resource, even when in a monolingual English learning environment. She found that students were able to use the skills that they had in their first language to engage more deeply with understanding and learning literacy in English (Cohen, 2008). Cohen (2008) argues
that through the use of pedagogies that encouraged students to access their prior experiences and prior knowledge in other languages they were able to access and use their identities fully in learning the majority language of the school environment. The notion of students using their language as a resource is one that appears in several studies of bilingual education settings (Cohen, 2008; Kirsch, 2006; Wells & Nicholls, 1985).

A study by Arce (2004) involving novice Spanish bilingual teachers examined the teachers’ attempts to introduce and sustain empowering pedagogies in a US school through interviews with the teachers and observation of their classes over the course of 15 weeks. The study found that many of the teachers felt isolated and unable to bring up their concerns about inequalities in the school community with their colleagues (Arce, 2004). It was concluded that students in the third grade were already mirroring the types of unequal power relations that are found in the wider society. The teachers expressed their uncertainty about how to address these unequal power relations and how to present a more equal example in their classes (Arce, 2004).

Negotiation of identity has predominantly been examined in bilingual settings through studies of the use of code-switching or language choice (Camilleri, 1996; Kovacs, 2001; Martin-Jones, 1995; Martin-Jones & Saxena, 1996; Muller & Baetens-Beardsmore, 2004). Children and teachers in bilingual settings have been shown to use certain linguistic tools to negotiate identity. The two main tools that both teachers and students have been shown to use in conversation are code-switching and language choice. Therefore the next section will focus upon these two examples of interactional tools.

2.6.2.4 Language Choice and Code-Switching

Code-switching by bilinguals is one of the more frequently researched topics within bilingual studies of interaction. Code-switching is a phenomenon of interaction where bilinguals switch back and forth between languages, often subconsciously (Gross, 2006). This can occur within the same utterance or the switch may occur in distinct sections of interaction (Gross, 2006). The frequency and location of these switches
vary according to many different influences. The switch can involve one word, an
entire sentence, more than one sentence or any number of words in between (Baker &
Prys Jones, 1998; Gross, 2006). The terms code-switching and code-mixing are
generally used interchangeably in recent literature with both terms being used to refer
to intersentential and intrasentential switches (Mahootian, 2006).

Language choice is a more conscious selection of which language to use in an
interaction. In cases of language choice the selected language may be maintained for
the duration of the particular interaction. This language tool is examined in detail
below.

2.6.2.4.1 Language Choice

Language choice has been shown to be a powerful tool that is used in interaction and
therefore is influential upon identity negotiation (Escamilla, 1994; Esdahl, 2003;
Heller, 1996; Madsen, 2003). As young learners develop their social identities,
language is used to identify individuals within the social group.

Language choice was investigated in a Canadian high school where French was the
language of instruction and authority (Heller, 1996). It was found that in this school,
where parents and teachers preferred students to communicate in French, English
became the means for students to display opposition and rebellion to authority. The
use of French appeared to indicate acceptance of the school’s and, by wider extension,
parents’ authority. Therefore Heller (1996) argues that language was used as a power
resource in this setting. In this way it also acted as a means of displaying certain
identity positions in the school context.

Language choice in a Danish school with a large Turkish-speaking population was
investigated to see how language choice was used as a power resource (Esdahl, 2003;
Madsen, 2003). The 7th grade was found to be a pivotal stage at which language
choice patterns changed (Esdahl, 2003). Language choice was found to be a tool for
power negotiation in social groups and this age was shown as a crucial point in
students’ development of a bilingual identity. Students began to negotiate their
positions in the social group and develop identities associated with these negotiations
(Esdahl, 2003).
Another study investigated the use of Spanish and English in various settings around a bilingual school and found that the patterns of use of the two languages conveyed the message that Spanish was second-rate to English in the school environment (Escamilla, 1994). Escamilla (1994) concluded that many exchanges seen to be important and powerful, both in meetings and in other scenarios, used English as the medium of communication. The school in this study had a written policy requiring all communication to be conducted bilingually for the benefit of parents and the wider community. Escamilla (1994) argued that the policy was not followed and inequitable use of Spanish and English occurred in many non-classroom events. This study provides an indication of the types of hidden messages about power that can be portrayed by the nature of language use. The institutional portrayal of languages having differing importance impacts strongly upon young learners’ development of identities associated with these languages.

It is clear that language has been identified as an important tool that can be used in interpersonal negotiations in several different bilingual settings. The other main type of study in which language is shown as a tool for power negotiation investigates code-switching.

2.6.2.4.2 Code-Switching

A number of researchers have investigated code-switching (defined in section 2.6.2.4 as a switch between languages involving anything from one word to a full sentence or a longer interaction; Gross, 2006; Mahootian, 2006) by bilingual students and teachers in school settings and have identified links between this linguistic phenomenon and the negotiation of power and identity (Camilleri, 1996; Martin-Jones, 1995; Martin-Jones & Saxena, 1996; Muller & Bactens Beardsmore, 2004). Research indicates that analysis of code-switching gives insight into the power negotiations that occur between participants in a bilingual environment. These power negotiations influence the identity negotiation and development that takes place.

A study of code-switching in bilingual classrooms argued that asymmetrical power relations exist in classrooms with monolingual class teachers and bilingual language assistants (Martin-Jones, 1995). Inequality of power was indicated through the interactions that the teacher and assistant engaged in with their students and this
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resulted in unequal identities being developed. The two languages were used for
different types of interaction, with the more important interactions taking in place
consistently in English and less significant interaction taking place in the other
languages (Martin-Jones, 1995). In this way English was portrayed as the more
important language.

Code-switching studies usually count the occurrences of spoken code-switch
utterances. This can sometimes omit important contextual data. An example of a
frequency count of code-switching can be seen in a study by Muller and Baetens
Beardsmore (2004) who investigated the speech acts in the “European Hour” in a
multilingual class in Europe. Their study noted the different languages used and
quantified the amount and type of language used. This context was a rich source for
investigation, with the potential for deeper understanding of the students’ language
experience to be developed through more flexible data collection methods. The study
identified code-switching as the main strategy used for communication within a
multilingual classroom which had no shared common language between the students
and teachers.

It has been argued that code-switching is used by bilinguals to construct different
identities in different contexts. According to Camilleri, (1996) in Malta the exclusive
use of Maltese is sometimes seen as being purist while exclusive use of English can
be seen as an attempt to be superior to those who speak Maltese. Code-switching is
therefore used frequently by teachers to be able to identify with the majority of people
in the community without causing offence (Camilleri, 1996).

2.6.2.5 Overview of Interaction Studies

Interaction is influenced by the ease with which a person can use the language
involved in the interaction. The inequality that less competent speakers experience
can be overcome through education and there is evidence that positive pedagogies in
bilingual education settings can redress power imbalances. Bilingual children need to
be educated in a positive environment in which their languages and cultures are
valued and validated in order to view their languages and cultures in a positive light
Studies of classrooms that have more than one teacher in a bilingual context have shown that the relationships modelled in the classroom often serve to perpetuate the imbalances and inequities seen in society (Martin-Jones, 1995; Martin-Jones & Saxena, 1996). Research has shown that the monolingual speaker of the dominant language tends to take a superior role in the classroom with the speaker of the other language taking a subordinate role. This serves to perpetuate the messages of inequality that students in this environment see and hear. In contrast, teachers who model transformative pedagogies can create a classroom setting that models equality.

In interaction bilingual people often make language choices or code-switch. These tools can be used as ways of negotiating different identities in different settings and connecting with different people in different interactions.

A body of prior literature examines young language learners and their interactions in a bilingual setting. However, the studies predominantly examine the pedagogical issues involved or issues involved with teacher identity in the classroom (Arce, 2004; Camilleri, 1996; Creese, 2006; Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003; Kovacs, 2001; Martin-Jones, 1995; Martin-Jones & Saxena, 1996). Studies that have focused upon young students have emphasised power issues more than identity issues and in particular have, in many cases, focused upon code-switching (Camilleri, 1996; Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003; Martin-Jones, 1995; Martin-Jones & Saxena, 1996; Muller & Baetens Beardsmore, 2004).

Bucholtz and Hall (2005) have developed a framework for examining identity as it is produced in interaction. This framework has five principles that frame identity: as a product of language; something that exists on a macro and local level; something that may be indexed linguistically; constructed through the relationship between self and other; and influenced by a combination of intention, habit, interactional negotiation, the perceptions of others and ideological processes (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005). Their framework frames identity as an interactional achievement and thus it is not suitable for this study that frames identity as a process. The framework developed by Bucholtz and Hall (2005) was designed to suit conversational analyses of specific interactions. It is therefore too specific a frame for the current study. The current study does not
focus upon conversation analysis and it examines identity in a broader range of ways, as influenced by socio-cultural connection, interaction and investment.

Prior literature also tends to perpetuate the distinction between majority and minority language learning contexts. There are studies of dual language programs, however these are few in number, have been conducted in a limited number of contexts, and often are based on quite different types of bilingual program (Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Moloney, 2008; Potowski, 2007; Sook Lee, Hill-Bonnet & Gillispie, 2008; The Dual Language Showcase, 2008). There is work emerging that begins to integrate the perspectives gained from majority and minority bilingual education settings and seeks to extend the continua model (Hornberger, 2004) by arguing for the integration of foreign language study and language learning for minority language students (Helot & de Mejia, 2008). However, at this stage this work is primarily located in the US and European contexts and is a relatively new area. There is thus a need for examination of dual language and integrative bilingual education in contexts other than the US and Europe, such as the investigation in the current study.

As indicated earlier, inequalities in language use and empowerment can be overcome through the individual drive to overcome them and willingness of the surrounding community to create opportunities for the individual to develop their language and identity as a member. This is shown through the literature about investment.

2.6.3 The Investment Element

Investment is a term that has been developed to explain the combined factors of an individual’s motivation to learn a new language and community motivation to assist the learner to develop their language (Norton, 2000). Norton argued that previous motivation literature gave insufficient consideration to the societal power structures that filter into everyday conversation (Norton, 2000). Norton (2000) used the term investment to indicate the complexity of the relationship between identity, power and language learning (Norton, 2000). It combines the influence of individual motivation with the influence of power negotiations upon the opportunities available to learners to develop both language proficiency and identity construction. In this way investment acknowledges that both individual motivation and social opportunity for
language development are essential for a language learner to develop their identity associated with language. In this way investment is a broader term than motivation as it encompasses the societal influences that influence language learning in combination with individual motivation.

*Investment* is a term that has been used by Bourdieu (1977) to describe linguistic capacity as something that involves power (or lack of), language competence (or lack of) and he equates language competence with economic value. Bourdieu (1977) argues that by using language appropriately a person invests their capital in the hope of making a profit. In other words, by obtaining linguistic competence a person can more easily achieve their aims. Norton (2000) takes up the term *investment* in a somewhat different way. She maintains Bourdieu’s assertion that language and power are inextricably linked and that new learners need to obtain competence in the dominant language to be empowered (2000). Norton (2000) also adds the argument that both individual motivation and societal opportunity are essential for immigrant language learners to develop their language skills in a new country.

The development of an individual’s identity, especially when it involves overcoming inequality of power or overcoming identity conflict, relies upon an individual having the drive to surpass these obstacles to develop or construct bilingual identity. A large body of research has investigated motivation to learn a language (Dörnyei, 2005; Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001; Ushioda, 2003, 2007) and research has quantitatively measured student attitude, predominantly in the Canadian bilingual context (Gardner, 1985, 1985a). For example Gardner’s Attitude and Motivation Test Battery (1985a) is a well-tested and well-respected measure of students’ attitudes towards their target language and community. Gardner developed this battery to examine English speakers’ attitudes towards learning French and towards the Francophone community in Canada. His battery has been used and adapted by many researchers in different contexts (Masgoret & Gardner, 2003; Oliver, Purdie & Rochecouste, 2005; O’Muircheartaigh & Hickey, 2008)

Ushioda (2003, 2007) critiques prior quantitative work on motivation that sees motivation as an individual phenomenon. She argues that motivation is a socially-mediated process, as well as something that comes from within the individual, and
that in language learning, motivation needs to be viewed in an enhanced way that incorporates “the interaction between the individual and the social learning setting” (p.92, 2003). Ushioda emphasises the important interplay between internal and external forces upon individuals’ motivation to learn language (2003, 2007).

Norton’s (2000) research examining adult immigrants’ experiences of learning English in Canada drew upon the motivational and attitudinal research of Gardner and Dörnyei and acknowledged that the individual’s attitude played a part in the power and identity negotiation process and therefore upon the rate at which they learnt English. She found that some of the participants in her study were more invested in becoming fluent in English because it was necessary in order to be the family’s main communicator with the outside world. This made a large difference in these participants’ development of language and of their feeling of belonging in the community (Norton, 2000). However, the research also showed that individual motivation was not sufficient to overcome the power structures and that community willingness to create opportunities for language learning was an essential factor in the newcomer’s successful learning and development of an identity as a member of the new community (Norton, 2000). In this way Norton’s work (2000) takes on a social frame similar to the work of Ushioda (2003). It also reflects some of the notions that are raised in the language socialisation literature (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986).

In an investigation of a bilingual setting involving children, it is important to acknowledge that student development of a bilingual identity is influenced by the investment that they have in speaking and identifying with two languages. Only students who see a value in the languages and bilingualism are potentially able to identify as being bilingual.

In a setting with young language learners, student investment in learning a language may not yet have developed. Alternatively there is a possibility that children who have grown up in a bilingual context may have an innate level of investment due to them seeing examples of two languages being viewed as important. In the current study, the bilingual students’ understandings of the influences from home and school upon their investment are investigated.
2.6.3.1 Overview of Investment Studies

Investment has previously been investigated predominantly from an adult learner perspective and from a viewpoint of investment as the dominant influence upon identity development in that setting (Norton, 2000). This study provides an examination of younger learners using a revised framework that incorporates investment along with interaction and socio-cultural connection.

Overall, the review of literature shows that prior studies exist that focus upon either social issues of connection to language, interaction issues or investment issues. No study yet combines these related factors to examine identity in a way that acknowledges the complex inter-relation of these three factors. This study develops and uses a framework with the three inter-related elements of socio-cultural connection, interaction and investment. This framework is outlined in the following section.
2.7 Bilingual Identity Negotiation Framework (BINF)

Identities are not static or fixed but rather are constantly being shaped through experiences and interactions. (Cummins, 1996, p15)

The development of a child's identity is a complex process, being a construct of how a person understands their own relationship to the world around them. A person's social identity reflects their relationship with the social world as experienced in families, schools, workplaces etc (Norton, 2000). The process of identity development is particularly complicated in a bilingual context. Previous literature has shown that the development of bilingual identity involves a process of negotiation between the child and those around them — their peers, parents, siblings, teachers and the community (Gregory, 2005; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Norton, 2000; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986; Volk, 1998; Zentella, 1997). Entwined with this negotiation of identity is the interpersonal negotiation that takes place, inherently, in all social interaction including the classroom (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Norton, 2000).

The following figure (Figure 1), which has been developed to illustrate the framework within which this study operates, also illustrates the relationship between an individual’s self-concept and the wider societal influences upon that self-concept. The figure shows that self-concept is developed within a context influenced by broader societal power structures and values and that these societal factors affect an individual’s view of themselves. Within the society and within the individual’s self-concept the negotiation of an identity as connected with language and bilingualism takes place. The diagram illustrates the process of bilingual identity negotiation within the influences of self-concept and the wider society.
Figure 1: *Bilingual Identity Negotiation Framework—within the surrounding impacting influences.*

As the focus of this study is upon the students’ individual identity development as a bilingual learner and/or as being connected to more than one language, the framework focuses upon the central segments of the identity model. It is a bilingual identity negotiation framework (BINF), and contains the inter-linking factors of Socio-cultural Connection, Interaction and Investment. These three factors are essential to the
development of an identity as bilingual and/or feeling connected to more than one language and culture.

Figure 2: Bilingual Identity Negotiation Framework

The literature review has highlighted the influential theories and prior research in the areas of bilingualism and bilingual identity. Through the review of relevant theories and research into bilingualism the factors impacting upon young bilingual learners were highlighted. This has led to the development of this new Bilingual Identity Negotiation Framework, which shows the importance of the combined factors of investment, socio-cultural connection and interaction upon bilingual identity negotiation. Students’ language experiences and experiences of bilingualism are seen as related to the three components of bilingual identity negotiation – these are:

Socio-Cultural Connection – the students’ experiences of language and bilingualism impact upon the degree to which they connect with the culture associated with that
language; this feeling of connection then influences the students’ future experiences of language and bilingualism;

**Interaction** – the students’ experiences of language and bilingualism impact upon the ways in which they interact in their languages; the interactions that students engage in further influence their experiences; and

**Investment** – the students’ experiences of language and bilingualism impact upon their levels of investment in learning language and developing their bilingualism; likewise their levels of investment impact upon their future experiences of language and bilingualism.

In this way the relationship between the three factors and language and bilingualism can be seen as reciprocal, with each relationship continuing to influence the future experiences of the students and their development of their identities associated with the languages.

Similarly the theoretical understandings about *bilingual identity* also impact upon the three components of the framework:

**Socio-Cultural Connection** – students’ experiences of language socialisation and contact with languages in the family and community impact upon the degree to which they connect with, and develop an identity within, the culture associated with that language;

**Interaction** – students’ self-concept and identity construction associated with their language(s) impact upon the ways in which they interact in their language(s) and with whom they interact in different languages; and

**Investment** – students’ self-concept and levels of motivation relating to their self-concept impact upon their investment in language learning and developing their bilingual identity.

Each of the relationships outlined above between the three framework components - socio-cultural connection, interaction and investment - are reciprocal relationships, where the three components also impact upon understandings, and concepts, of bilingualism and identity for bilingual students.

Every bilingual individual has a unique experience of language and bilingualism and therefore the impact of their experiences on each individual is also unique. This study
examines what languages and ‘being bilingual’ mean to the students in the study and how they negotiate their meanings within the framework of bilingual identity negotiation.

The previous literature and the learning context in which this study takes place contribute to the development of this framework as a Bilingual Identity Negotiation Framework. It was anticipated that the experiences of language for some students may in fact be multilingual rather than bilingual. However, as the literature review has shown, the conceptualisation of the term bilingual so that it incorporates two or more languages ensures that this framework encompasses multilingual identity negotiation in addition to bilingual identity negotiation.

This framework sets the context within which the following research question is examined:

**How do students in a bilingual primary school program in NSW identify with their languages outside and inside the school setting?**

This question is answered through five sub questions:

a) What is the nature of students’ language use in the home?
b) How do students view their languages (English, French and other languages)?
c) How do students view bilingualism?
d) How do the students view the school bilingual program and to what extent does it influence their identification as French, Australian or bilingual?
e) How does observed language in the classroom relate to student bilingual identity?
f) How do teacher perceptions of the bilingual program relate to student bilingual identity?

The following chapter outlines the research methodology used to answer this research question.
3 Methodology

3.1 Overview

As outlined in the introduction to this study, the focus of this research is upon bilingual students, how they identify with their languages and how they identify with being bilingual. The review of previous related studies has shown that a qualitative perspective is a widely accepted and appropriate over-arching perspective for language research of this type (Neuman, 2006; Rubin & Rubin, 2005; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The literature review also indicated a lack of rigorous studies using triangulation of data collection to answer research questions using several sources of complementary or comparative data. This study employs five methods of data collection within a qualitative perspective.

The purpose of this study is to gain insight into the students' connections to their languages and cultures and their development of bilingual identities. This purpose is reflected in the research questions, in the design of the study and the data collection instruments. The primary focus upon the students in this study is shown through the instruments that directly access their attitudes and opinions. This is supported by data obtained from the teachers of these students and observation of their classrooms.

Figure 3 provides a pictorial representation of this project's approach, strategy and methods. The diagram shows the layers involved in the design of the project. The project has an overall qualitative perspective, within which a case study strategy has been undertaken. Within the case study are five methods of data collection.
Figure 3: The Research Approach, Strategy and Tools.

The design of the study involves five data collection tools as shown in the diagram.

1. Student questionnaire (see appendix H)
2. Student journals (see appendix I)
3. Student interviews (see appendix J)
4. Teacher interviews (see appendix K & L)
5. Observation (see appendix O and P).

These tools were used to form a case study undertaken from a qualitative perspective. In the following section the rationale for the selection of the methodology is explained.

3.2 Rationale

3.2.1 Qualitative Perspective

A qualitative perspective has been selected as the most appropriate form of research to investigate this project’s questions for a number of reasons. Firstly, a qualitative approach is needed to obtain detailed information about the thoughts, feelings and
attitudes that the students have towards their languages (Rubin & Rubin, 2005; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). It is necessary for the researcher to be visible to the research participants to gain such detailed information (Neuman, 2006). The researcher must interact with the participants to a certain extent to build a sufficient connection with the students that they feel comfortable enough to share their thoughts and feelings. In this way a qualitative approach can access information about issues that are personal to the participants that another approach could not (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). In this study students were asked to speak about their attitudes and their identities.

Secondly, the focus of this study is upon the perspectives of a number of students within a specific context - one school with a bilingual program - and this also suits a qualitative approach (Neuman, 2006; Rubin & Rubin, 2005). It has been shown that looking at specific contexts through individual perspectives can be examined adequately using a qualitative approach (Neuman, 2006; Rubin & Rubin, 2005).

Thirdly the social nature of the topic under focus in this study means that a qualitative approach is a suitable choice. It has been shown, in particular, that qualitative interviewing is the most appropriate approach to examine social phenomena such as bilingualism and bilingual identity (Rubin & Rubin, 2005).

A qualitative view underlies the design of the data collection methods (Rubin & Rubin, 2005; Strauss and Corbin, 1998). Rubin and Rubin (2005) indicate that transforming qualitative data into numbers can remove important contextual data. This could remove the richness and complexity of the data and make the results less informative (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). In a study that focuses upon individual stories of students and their personal feelings and attitudes, the removal of contextual details would devalue the data and depersonalise their stories. Therefore a qualitative perspective is the best way to fully explore the students’ experiences examined in this study.

3.2.2 Case Study Strategy

This study investigates the specific phenomenon of students’ identification with their languages and bilingualism. The students involved are all members of the case study
school’s bilingual program. Within this case study setting, nine primary school students’ experiences are examined in detail. These data are supported by data collected in a questionnaire from the wider class, observation of the classes and teacher interviews. The selection of these various tools within a case study strategy is in keeping with Robson’s (1993) assertion that case study is a strategy used to investigate “contemporary phenomena within its real life context using multiple sources of evidence” (Robson, 1993, p.178).

In this project, recognition of the contextual setting of the data and findings is seen as integral to the development of the rich descriptive picture of these students and their understandings of their identities (Robson, 1993). The students’ experiences of bilingualism and their identities associated with their languages might be different if they were not participants in this bilingual program. Case study is appropriate for this research study because “case studies tend to provide detailed descriptions of specific learners (or sometimes classes) within their learning setting” (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p.171). The examination of these students both in their school setting and out of school is therefore suited to a case study strategy.

This project has been undertaken with students from the one school context, therefore it fits into the specific context factor associated with case study strategies (Robson, 1993). In keeping with collective case study strategies it is possible that understanding the cases in this study will lead to “better understanding, perhaps better theorizing, about a still larger collection of cases” (Stake, 1994). Primarily the understanding of these cases leads to an understanding of the wider school population of which the students are members. This study also incorporates elements of an instrumental case study where particular cases are examined for their insight into particular issues (Stake, 1994). The issue in this study is student identification with their languages and bilingualism.

3.2.3 Researcher Role

In this research the researcher plays a role as a peripheral-member-researcher (Adler & Adler, 1994). The researcher was previously unknown to the study participants prior to the research project. Throughout the project the researcher was a visible
presence in the school and classroom but not an active or complete member of the school community (Adler & Adler, 1994). This role enabled the researcher to observe the classroom contexts with minimal impact upon the interactions. The students in the school are accustomed to having visitors observe their lessons and they therefore take less notice of observers than students less accustomed to visitors in the classroom. It is hoped, therefore, that the students did not significantly alter their behaviour or performance from usual classroom behaviour. In regard to the interview, the researcher was known to the students by sight through the researcher’s observation of classes and the researcher’s administration of the questionnaire with the students prior to the interviews.

3.2.4 Triangulation of Data Collection Tools

Using several sources of data collection was considered to be the best way to investigate the research topic to its full extent and provide convincing answers (Murray Thomas, 2003). Using a number of data collection tools is sometimes referred to as using complementary measures because it is seen that the combination of different data collection tools “provides richer data than either approach. The alternative approach either validates the data collected through the other approach or complements (adds to) such data.” (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998, p. 95).

Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998) indicate that different measures can be used within the same tool (e.g. within an interview using both closed and open questions) or different tools. They believe that distinguishing between qualitative and quantitative measures can be misleading because there is actually a continuum from highly informal/qualitative measures to highly formal/quantitative measures and that most data collection tools fit somewhere along that continuum rather than strictly at one end or the other (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998).

In this study the tools incorporate varying degrees of structure from a highly structured observation schedule and structured questionnaire questions; through to open interview questions and open journals. The questionnaire incorporates question types that could be placed at different points along the formal/informal continuum of
data collection methods with Likert questions and also less structured questions (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998).

The incorporation of tools with characteristics from along the spectrum of structure enables each type of data to complement the others and provide a richer picture of the students’ experiences. The data collection tools are undertaken from a qualitative perspective, but employ varying degrees of structure in their implementation.

In order to ensure the best possible validity of data and to ensure a thorough examination of the topic, the themes that emerged from the analysis of the data from each collection tool were compared and analysed for similarities. Where themes overlapped across data collection tools the names assigned to the themes were reworded to match across each method of data collection. Analysis continued to identify convergence and difference across the different methods. As analysis of each data collection item progressed it became apparent that a number of themes intersected. The common themes are shown in the following table.

**Table 2: Common Themes Across the Data Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication with Family or Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity as Bilingual/Multilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in Activities in Two Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Benefits of Two Languages/Bilingualism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evidence of similar themes across the different data sources indicated support for the findings from each source. The emergence of new and different themes from some of the sources added more complementary data than would have been obtainable from less data collection tools. The data from each tool were considered together in answer to each sub-question and discussed together in the findings. The use of triangulation of the tools provides a more comprehensive and thorough examination of the research questions. The analysis of each individual tool is outlined in the analysis section (section 3.7).
3.3 The Context

The common factor for the students in this study is the school. It is a government primary school with classes from Kindergarten to Year 6. The school is in an area identified as mid-SES. Australian Bureau of Statistics Census data (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2001) shows most residents of the suburb as office workers (93.4%), two thirds of the suburb residents are born in Australia and one third born elsewhere (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2006).

The main factor distinguishing this school from others is its bilingual French/English program. The bilingual program offers students the option to participate in bilingual lessons and the bilingual stream runs in all years (K-6) concurrently with the monolingual English classes throughout the school. When students begin at the school their parents/guardians elect whether to enrol in the bilingual or monolingual classes. In addition to the bilingual classes there are additional French immersion classes on a daily basis for students who speak French at home. These students participate in the bilingual program and also take time out of the monolingual part of the school day to have immersion classes in French. On a daily basis between one-third and one-half of the school day takes place in the bilingual lessons. The immersion lessons take place for one hour per day in addition to the bilingual lessons.

The bilingual program was established in 1999 and now operates in 16 out of the 20 classes in the school. The bilingual and immersion program was developed progressively by the principal of the school in response to demand from parents. It was established for language maintenance for the children of French-speaking parents and for language learning as enrichment for the children of non French-speaking parents. In this way, the program incorporates both language maintenance and enrichment characteristics. Each class in the bilingual stream within the school has two teachers assigned to it. One teacher is English-speaking and a qualified teacher in the Australian school system. The other is French-speaking and a qualified teacher in the French school system. The teachers team-teach for a portion of each school day (between one-third and one-half) and also take the students separately for the time that the French-speaking students have their immersion classes. The French-speaking
teacher team-teaches with one of the partner teachers throughout the day, except for the one-hour per day that he/she teaches the immersion class.

The unique nature of the bilingual program in an otherwise typical primary school for the locality, is therefore an important factor in the examination of student identity associated with languages and bilingualism. The set-up of the program was designed by the principal and therefore is different to other bilingual programs. It incorporates elements of other models – such as the immersion hour and the dual language nature of the bilingual lessons- but the presence of two teachers in the bilingual lessons is unusual. The experience that the students have in this bilingual education program is considered to be a factor that impacts upon student bilingualism and language experience in this context.

### 3.4 Participants

#### 3.4.1 Students

The participants in this study were 23 students in Years 5 and 6 of the bilingual French/English program at the case study school. These students were members of the Stage 3 (Years 5 and 6) composite classes\(^4\) that participated in the bilingual program. Of a population of 46 students, 23 consented to participate in all stages of the data collection. These students were from two classes within the program and in the second stage of data collection were assigned to three different classes. All 23 students completed the questionnaire and from these students nine were selected for the more detailed data collection methods.

---

\(^4\) A composite class comprises students from two different academic years, in this case - years 5 and 6.
Table 3: The Student Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Use with Parents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French only</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &amp; French</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another language only</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &amp; Another language</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other languages cited:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.1.1 Questionnaire Participants

The questionnaire was administered to all students from Stage 3 (year 5 and 6) of the French/English bilingual program at the primary school who consented to participate in the study (50% of the students). Stage 3 was selected as the level at which to administer the questionnaire for several reasons.

Firstly, sampling of the students in Stage 3 at the school indicated that most of them had been enrolled in the program for most of their primary school experience, that is six to seven years. Also being in either Year 5 or 6 they were considered better able to articulate their language experiences than younger students. They were also more likely to have an understanding of how their education may have differed from students at other schools. Their increased length of time in the bilingual program also meant that students had encountered the French language (and other languages) outside of the home for more time and had longer to develop an opinion about their languages. Many students had been in the program throughout all of the primary years.
- Kindergarten to Year 6. Two of the students were more recently introduced to the program having transferred to the school later than Kindergarten. Unless students have a sufficiently high level of French when they transfer to the school they are not able to enrol in the bilingual program. The students who had transferred from other schools were able to speak about the differences between their previous schools and the current one and to explain their opinions about that comparison.

Secondly, the students in Stage 3 (aged between ten and twelve) are developmentally more advanced than younger students as regards self-awareness and more abstract thinking thus assisting them to be better able to respond to questions about self-identity, and to reflect more deeply about their experiences of language (Berk, 2009).

Thirdly, the students were selected from this age-group because their understanding of the data collection instruments would be clearer than younger students’ understanding. This meant that more valid responses could be obtained because the questions were more easily comprehensible to this age-group. The students indicated that they were familiar with the style of question. The questions were adapted from a prior study (Molyneux, 2005). The prior study had three Likert-response options for younger participants (Years K-3) and five Likert-response options for participants in Years 4-6. The students in this current study were of comparable ages to the oldest of the participants in the prior study, therefore all Likert-style items were given 5 response options.

3.4.1.2 Journal Participants
A sub-sample of six students from the 23 questionnaire participants completed a journal of their language use over the course of a week, noting all of their use of French outside of the classroom setting and giving as much detail of how they use the language as possible. Three students from each class in the program were selected by purposive sampling to complete the journal and subsequent interview. Purposive sampling is frequently used in language research and in qualitative research in general. Random sampling in some contexts can produce meaningless or disconnected information when researchers are trying to examine specific phenomena that are not common to all members of the population. Purposively selected cases can be better suited for examining specific phenomena (Mackey & Gass, 2005, Miles & Huberman,
Therefore purposive sampling is suitable for the selection of the journal and interview participants in this instance to ensure that meaningful cases have been examined in detail. The sampling was informed by the questionnaire responses and teacher input. This ensured that students were selected with varying language experiences and language use that covered a range of different experiences of students in this context.

3.4.1.3 Student Interview Participants

The six students from the journal stage of data collection were also participants in the interviews, along with an additional four students – a total of ten students were interviewed. Issues with the recording device resulted in only nine interviews being viable for analysis. Initial examination of the completed questionnaires led to the further four students being selected for interviews in the second phase as it became apparent that more languages were relevant to these students than just English and French. As explained in the prior section, the participants were selected purposively from those who completed the questionnaire. The purposive sampling was informed by the completed questionnaires and teacher input and was considered the most suitable selection procedure (Mackey & Gass, 2005; Miles & Huberman, 1995).

The student participants in the interviews were as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamie *</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>English and French</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth *</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>English and French</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>French and English</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genevieve</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>English and French</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis *</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>German, English and French</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonia *</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>English, Italian, French, Dutch</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>English and French</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt *</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>English and French</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivier *</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>English and French</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each participant is referred to using a pseudonym. The languages used by each student are listed along with their ages at the time of data collection. As the students
were drawn from two different Stage 3 classes, students with an asterisk beside their name were from one of the classes and those without an asterisk from the other Stage 3 class. The table also shows each student’s country of birth.

3.4.1.4 Student Voice
Student voice is a key aspect in the design of this study. The data collection methods for the first four research sub-questions have been selected to enable the students to speak as freely as possible about their connection to and identification with the languages in their lives. Students are the key players in this study, therefore maintenance of their true voices is imperative as they are the owners of their experiences. As Cook-Sather (2002, p. 12) says “because of who they are, what they know and how they are positioned” they are the ones who have the knowledge essential for investigating the research question.

Pavlenko (2006) argues that in investigating bilingual self or identity it is important that introspective data be viewed as valid and legitimate, because such introspective data is the only way to begin to develop understanding of self-perception. Pavlenko (2006) herself uses introspective data to examine the affective elements of being bi- or multilingual. Pavlenko’s (2006) edited volume examines emotion and the self and indicates that in research involving participants’ notions about themselves participant self-reporting is an essential tool. Self-reporting and introspection are considered to be important in this study of student opinion and attitude.

This indication of the importance of student voice has also been shown in a study in the UK investigating student motivation (EPPI Centre, 2005). This study indicated that the only true way to understand student motivation was through directly asking the students themselves and presenting their answers in an accurate way. This study comprised a large review of previous studies on motivation and found that the representation of student voice was noticeable in its absence from the literature on motivation (EPPI Centre, 2005). A similar observance can be made about the literature involving bilingual education and identity issues. The majority of studies involve observation techniques, and focus upon classroom contexts. Only a handful of studies really focus upon the students themselves and upon capturing their true voices and this is a relatively recent development (Gregory et al., 2007; Jones, 2007; Kenner,
2000; Kenner & Gregory, 2007; Lotherington, 2003; Martin-Jones, Hughes, & Williams, 2007; Molyneux, 2005).

3.4.2 Teachers

The second set of participants comprised the teachers who taught these classes of students, in order to obtain more insight into the students’ language experiences in the school setting. The teachers all taught Stage 3 – Years 5 and 6 - composite classes. Due to the data collection period crossing two different academic years, there were two teachers that were constant throughout the study and one teacher who was replaced in the latter stage of data collection in the study.

Table 5: The Teacher Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym and year of participation</th>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Country of Teacher Training</th>
<th>Participant in Observation</th>
<th>Participant in Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michele (2007)</td>
<td>French and English</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luc (2008)</td>
<td>French and English</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna (2007 &amp; 2008)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trish (2007 &amp; 2008)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice (2008)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four teachers were interviewed about the observed lessons. As Table 5 indicates there were three English-speaking classroom teachers and two French-speaking classroom teachers. The French-speaking teachers did not teach the classes at the same time - Michele taught throughout 2007 and was the French-speaking teacher for the first stage of data collection. Luc took over the stage three classes from January 2008. He continued the team-teaching role with the English-speaking teachers. One additional English-speaking teacher (Alice) was added to Stage 3 from January 2008. She was not interviewed as she was new to the bilingual program, only temporarily involved in the program, and only one of her bilingual lessons was observed.

Both of the French-speaking teachers were interviewed to reveal the different perceptions of language use held by individual teachers and also because a number of classroom observations took place in lessons run by each teacher. It was necessary to get all participating teachers’ opinions about the language use in class. The English-
speaking teachers that were interviewed were the same two across both data collection periods – Anna and Trish.

3.4.3 Classroom Observation Participants

Observation of each of the classrooms was undertaken. The participants in this stage of the research were therefore all of the students and teachers in the classrooms concerned.

3.5 Research with Young Children

A number of factors were necessarily taken into consideration due to the age of the student participants in this study. The students in this study were all in Stage 3 (Years 5 or 6) at primary school at the time of the study. Their ages ranged from 10 to 12. In order to gain insight into their thoughts and feelings it was necessary that the research was not seen as threatening in any way and that the students felt comfortable speaking to the researcher. The students were informed that their teachers and parents would not be aware of the answers they gave to any of the questions. This was hoped to prevent, as far as possible, the potential “aim to please” that students might have towards either a parent or teacher. Emphasis was made that there were no right or wrong answers to the questions and that the researcher’s aim was simply to find out the students’ opinions about their languages.

As there was a requirement for students to feel relatively comfortable speaking to the researcher, the researcher observed a number of lessons prior to the interviews so that the students were familiar with the researcher’s presence. The questionnaire stage of data collection also preceded the interviews and provided an opportunity for the students to speak to the researcher about the questions, about why the researcher was in the school and any other queries that the students had. This also made the prospect of the interview less threatening to the students with many of them greeting the researcher by name whenever she was in the classroom. Rubin and Rubin (2005) indicate that observation is a recognised tool for discovering information about cultural topics prior to an interview. The observation can provide information that can be clarified in the interview.
In order to ensure the ethical considerations were met according to the age of the student participants, the ethics application process included a *working with children* police check.  

### 3.6 Data Collection Methods

As has been outlined, the review of literature indicated that the best way of answering all sub-questions fully in this study was through the use of several methods of data collection. The methods selected were:

1. Student Questionnaire
2. Student Journals
3. Student Interviews
4. Teacher Interviews
5. Classroom Observation

As is outlined in Table 6, Research Questions 1a to 1d deal with the students and their voices and therefore the data collection methods involve only the students through the questionnaire, journal and interview methods. Research Question 1e focuses on what is taking place in the classroom and the teacher perception of this, hence the data collection methods involved are observation and teacher interview. The data collection instruments are explained in detail following Table 6.

All methods of data collection were approved by the University of Sydney Human Ethics Committee on the 19th of June 2007 (see appendix A). The methods were subsequently approved by the Department of Education and Training SERAP process on the 6th of August 2007 (see appendix B).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH QUESTION</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION TOOL</th>
<th>ANALYSIS TECHNIQUE</th>
<th>COMPLETED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qa: What is the nature of students' language use in the home?</td>
<td>Language Use section of Questionnaire (Molyneux, 2005)</td>
<td>Quantitative and Qualitative analysis of questions. (SPSS15 used to analyse the Likert-scaled questions and qualitative coding of themes)</td>
<td>23 students from the two stage 3 bilingual classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student journals</td>
<td>Qualitative analysis. Coding according to themes emerging from the data.</td>
<td>6 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student interviews</td>
<td>Qualitative analysis of open answers. Coding according to themes emerging from the data.</td>
<td>10 students: Phase 1 = 6 students Phase 2 = 4 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qb: How do students view the two languages?</td>
<td>Language Attitudes section of Questionnaire (Molyneux, 2005)</td>
<td>Quantitative and Qualitative analysis of questions. (SPSS15 used to analyse the Likert-scaled questions and qualitative coding of themes)</td>
<td>23 students from the two stage 3 bilingual classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student interviews</td>
<td>Qualitative analysis of open answers. Coding according to themes emerging from the data.</td>
<td>10 students: Phase 1 = 6 students Phase 2 = 4 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qc: How do students view bilingualism?</td>
<td>Bilingual Benefits section of Questionnaire (Molyneux, 2005)</td>
<td>Quantitative and Qualitative analysis of questions. (SPSS15 used to analyse the Likert-scaled questions and qualitative coding of themes)</td>
<td>23 students from the two stage 3 bilingual classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student interviews</td>
<td>Qualitative analysis of open answers. Coding according to themes emerging from the data.</td>
<td>10 students: Phase 1 = 6 students Phase 2 = 4 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qd: To what extent do students identify as French, Australian or bilingual?</td>
<td>Student Interviews</td>
<td>Qualitative analysis of open answers. Coding according to themes emerging from the data.</td>
<td>10 students: Phase 1 = 6 students Phase 2 = 4 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qe: How does observed language in the classroom relate to student bilingual identity?</td>
<td>Classroom Observation</td>
<td>Qualitative analysis. Coding according to set codes in structured observation.</td>
<td>Phase 1 = 2 classes Phase 2 = 3 classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qf: How do teacher perceptions of the bilingual program relate to student bilingual identity?</td>
<td>Teacher Interviews</td>
<td>Qualitative analysis according to themes that emerge from the data.</td>
<td>Phase 1 = 3 teachers (1 French-speaking and 2 English-speaking) Phase 2 = 3 teachers (1 French-speaking and 2 English-speaking)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Phase 1 of data collection = November – December 2007
Phase 2 of data collection = February – April 2008.
3.6.1 Student Questionnaire

The full questionnaire comprised three sub-sections, each of which was modelled upon an instrument designed and tested in a prior doctoral study with students of the same age, and younger, in a bilingual program in a primary school in Australia (Molyneux, 2005; For the adapted version used in this study see appendix H). The instrument had minor adaptations to ensure the questions were suited to the language context of the students in the current study. Simple changes were also made to remove any surplus wording from the questions. The languages involved in the current study were different to the original study and therefore the wording was changed from ‘Chinese’ or ‘Vietnamese’ to ‘French’ as required.

Using a previously tested set of questionnaire instruments provided more valid and reliable data than using a previously untested instrument (Neuman, 2006). The adaptation of the instruments increased their suitability to this study and this bilingual context. The instrument also had items added following the same question format of the original questions to address cultural aspects of students’ connection to language.

Each section of the questionnaire was shown to the students and explained in detail to inform students how to complete their answers. The researcher remained in the room to answer any questions during the completion of the questionnaire.

3.6.1.1 Language Use section of the Questionnaire (LUQ)

This section of the questionnaire provided data to indicate students’ language use and choice of language while participating in various activities out of school. This indicated whether students had a need, or a use, for both languages from the bilingual program in a broader context than the classroom.

As shown in the example below, students responded in the LUQ section by placing a cross in the applicable box of a table of language activities. The students could select that they do each activity in: ‘English’, ‘French’, ‘Both languages’ or ‘Other languages’. If they selected ‘Other languages’ the students wrote down what those languages were. During completion of this section some students asked what they should do if they use one language with one parent and one with another. They were
instructed to select ‘Both languages’ or ‘Other languages’ and then to write down which one they use and who with. This section of the questionnaire provided the background data for the ways in which students use language outside of school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>FRENCH</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
<th>OTHER LANGUAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading a book by yourself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working on a piece of your own writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4: Example from Language Use Section**

3.6.1.2 Language Attitudes section of the Questionnaire (LAQ)

The LAQ section of the questionnaire provided data about the students’ attitudes towards the two languages involved in the bilingual program and the relative importance of each language to them. Students were asked to show the level of importance of each statement according to a five point scale (Likert scale) by circling the most appropriate choice from: ‘Very Important’, ‘Important’, ‘Neither Important nor Not Important’, ‘Not Important’, ‘Not Important At All’. Students were asked prior to beginning the questionnaire whether they had seen this format of question before. All students responded that they had and that they knew how to answer them. Students were advised to ask if they had any uncertainties while completing the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>neither important nor not important</th>
<th>not very important</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Figure 5: Example from Language Attitudes Section**

This section of the questionnaire contained the newly added questions specific to the context of this study. One new question item was added based upon a question posed
to students in a prior study of bilingualism in Australia (Lotherington, 2003). This item involves a scale drawn on the page showing being ‘French’ at one end of the scale, being ‘both equally’ in the middle and being ‘Australian’ at the other end. Students were asked to place a cross somewhere along the line to show how they saw themselves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both Equally</th>
<th>Australian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6: New Addition to Questionnaire**
(Lotherington, 2003)

This item was modelled upon a question used by Lotherington (2003) to see how Asian-Australian students in Victoria saw themselves and was used here primarily as a potential prompt for conversation in the subsequent interviews and also for general information about their self-identity. The question was explained to students prior to completion of the questionnaire.

Seven new Likert-scaled questions were also added to this section of the questionnaire. They closely followed the format and wording of the existing items, but differed in that they asked about the importance of cultural aspects of language such as history or learning about how people live in France or Australia.

### 3.6.1.3 Bilingual Benefits section of the Questionnaire (BBQ)

This section of the questionnaire provided data about the students’ attitudes towards bilingualism and their own feelings of being bilingual or monolingual. In this section the participants were given statements about potential benefits of bilingualism and were asked to select their level of agreement with each of the statements on a five point scale, choosing from: ‘Agree Strongly’, ‘Agree’, ‘Neither Agree Nor Disagree’, ‘Disagree’, ‘Disagree Strongly’.
Put a cross on the line above the answer you agree with:

I enjoy being able to do things in more than one language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 7: Example from Bilingual Benefits Section

The students were again asked if they understood how to answer these types of question and the students indicated that they answer this type of question regularly. The items in this section of the questionnaire closely follow the format as in Molyneux’s (2005) original Bilingual Benefits section of the questionnaire. They have been modified slightly for this context to make the stem of each statement shorter for simplification and remove any excess wording.

3.6.1.4 Administration of Questionnaire

The student questionnaire was conducted during class time on days nominated by the school as suitable for data collection. The researcher took the questionnaires to each classroom participating in the research.

In classroom one the questionnaire was conducted in the following way:

- The students who had consented to participate in the research sat at one large table in the class.
- The non-participants sat at another table completing a different class activity.
- The researcher explained the questionnaire and project to the students and handed out the written questionnaire.
- The students were informed that they could ask the researcher at any time if they had a question.
- The students completed the questionnaire at their own pace.
- As the students completed their questionnaires they gave them to the researcher and began the class activity.
In classroom two the students who had consented to participate in the research went with the researcher to an outdoor seating area adjacent to the classroom while the non-participants continued with a class activity in the classroom. The questionnaire was then conducted in the same format as with the first class.

The original version of the questionnaire was conducted individually with the students (Molyneux, 2005). This was not considered to be necessary in this study for several reasons. Firstly the students involved were at the upper end of the age-range of the students in the prior study and were already familiar with the style of questioning. Secondly the students completed the questionnaire in small groups of between 11 and 12 students and were able to receive individual attention from the researcher during the completion of their questionnaires. Thirdly, the sub-sample of students were able to clarify the reasons for their responses to the questions within their interviews. It was therefore decided that individual administration of the questionnaire was not necessary in this context.

3.6.1.5 Justification of Questionnaire

The questionnaire (see appendix H) gathered data for several purposes:

- To identify patterns of student language use out of school (French and English; any other languages the students use at home).
- To identify students’ attitudes towards language learning, and towards the cultures associated with those languages.
- To identify students’ beliefs about the importance of bilingualism.

Each sub-section of the questionnaire addresses one of these purposes:

1. Language Use
2. Language Attitudes

The value that the students place on language learning and bilingualism was examined as an indicator of the ways in which they identify with each of the languages. As the questionnaire is closely modelled upon a previously tested questionnaire (Molyneux, 2005), this improves the validity of the instrument as a data collection tool (Rosier,
The use of questions that use Likert-style response options make the questionnaire more externally reliable than open-ended responses or responses with less than five options (Neuman, 2006).

The questionnaire reflects the conceptual framework. The questions in the questionnaire indicate the students' investment in bilingualism and in learning French. The questions also indicate the students' degree of socio-cultural connection with the community and family through the cultural questions in the questionnaire. The language use questions indicate aspects of the students' interactions. As a result of the questionnaire being developed according to the framework it could be analysed according to the themes that the questions addressed.

A questionnaire was selected as the first step in the data collection as it is a less confronting situation for the participants than the interview might be. It is a format of questioning that the students are familiar with and therefore is a good introduction to the research project. The questionnaire also provides a broad range of data about a larger number of students and provides a starting point for the selection of the sub-sample to participate in the other steps of the research. This is an accepted method of sub-sample selection for qualitative case studies (Rosier, 1997). A questionnaire was selected as an appropriate tool to ask students aged at least ten about their current lives (Wolf, 1997).

The questionnaire provides descriptive information about the students' language use and attitudes (Rosier, 1997). As Rosier points out, setting out statements on a topic and asking for an indication of the extent to which respondents agree or disagree is a frequent way of measuring attitudes and opinions (Rosier, 1997). Collecting questionnaire data is the most common way of examining attitudes and opinions and therefore is a well-established method suited to addressing student attitudes and opinions (Mackey & Gass, 2005). The questionnaire data gathering enables the researcher to find out about information that learners are able to report about themselves (Mackey & Gass, 2005).

The questionnaire was not time-consuming for students to complete, taking less than 15 minutes. This avoided any potential negative effects upon the data due to
respondent fatigue and aided the likelihood of obtaining more accurate responses from these students (Wolf, 1997). Questions about the future were kept to a minimum as these are more difficult for students of this age to answer, however, questions about their current living situation are considered appropriate for students of this age (Wolf, 1997).

Any adaptations of the original questions were minor, and the students in this study are the same age and class-level as the students in the prior study with whom the questionnaire was used (Molyneux, 2005). Therefore the validity of the questionnaire instrument can be considered tested and established to the best extent possible in this context given the small number of participants available from the small field in this study. The small field in this study meant that it was not viable to trial the full questionnaire with a representative sample from this school, as there would be no remaining students with which to run the actual data collection.

3.6.2 Student Journal

The journal method of data collection was developed following the model from a study that investigated adults’ language use when learning English as a Second Language (Norton, 2000). The journal in the current study was a simplified version because the participants were children rather than adults. The journal asked students to complete a chart about their language use (appendix 1). The chart comprised the first page of a journal notebook and the students were able to use their own words to whatever extent they wished, adding open writing to the remaining pages of the journal. The amount of writing students should do was not specified. The students were given the opportunity to elaborate about their language use in as much detail as they liked. Students were invited to draw pictures and write descriptions of their language use if they felt that was appropriate.

3.6.2.1 Administration of Journal

The six students selected to participate in the journal stage of the research sat at one table in the classroom with the researcher. The researcher explained that they were being asked to complete a chart and write as much as they liked about their languages and how they use them at home. At the suggestion of the class teacher the students did
not have to complete the class homework if they spent the time completing the journal so they were not penalised time-wise by participating. The students kept the journals for one week and were asked to fill in the chart each day at home. The students were asked to complete the chart and then, if they wanted to, to draw pictures of themselves using their languages and describe the pictures in writing. They were also told they could decorate the cover pages in any way they wanted to. A number of the students decorated their journals elaborately and drew a number of pictures of their language use. One student filled in the chart and did not add any additional information. One journal was not returned to the researcher, as the student did not bring the journal on the day of the interview. Logistical reasons beyond the researcher’s control prevented the collection of the sixth journal.

3.6.2.2 Justification of Journal

Mackey and Gass (2005) point out that journals are a useful tool for obtaining unconstrained information about the participant’s viewpoint that would otherwise not be accessible to the researcher. Time flexibility is a benefit of journal use especially for younger children whose attention may not be easily focused for long periods of time (Mackey & Gass, 2005). A possible drawback of a journal method is the required commitment from the participants (Mackey & Gass, 2005). This was found on the whole not to be a problem. All students completed the chart in the journal although one was not returned to the researcher. Not all of the students added additional information to the chart, but since it served primarily as a source of information for the interviews this was not problematic.

The journal enabled students to openly write an account of their language use out of school without any risk of leading questions or of closed questions with limited response options. This complements the questionnaire section of the study by enabling students to use their own words and record the information in their own way. Students were asked to write about how they felt when using each language but could do so in as much or as little detail as they like. If they preferred, students could simply fill in the provided chart (appendix I) and not add any free writing. They could write at their own pace as there were no time guidelines for this section of the study. This gave students who are slower at writing the time to write about their languages if they
felt rushed during the questionnaire stage. The open-ended nature of this data collection tool allowed in-depth data to be collected from a smaller sample of participants. This complements the broader data from a larger sample of students obtained through the questionnaire stage of data collection.

3.6.3 Student Interview

The data from the journal and questionnaire stages served as prompts for the questioning in the interview. The data from the first two stages of data collection were expanded by the qualitative interviews with the sub-sample of participants. The interviews provided an opportunity for the students to clarify details of information provided through the journal and questionnaire. Some students began by describing their journals. If the key questions were accessed through the journal explanations the researcher allowed the answers to flow naturally. In this way the students were able to direct the interview in a way that suited them. In cases where the students were less forthcoming with answers the researcher used more prompting questions and elaboration questions.

The interviews were semi-structured in order to obtain a certain amount of consistent information from all interview participants, and also to allow for elaboration applicable to each individual through follow-up questions (Neuman, 2006). The interviews were digitally recorded to allow for exact transcription. (See appendix J for the interview questions and appendix M for sample transcription.)

3.6.3.1 Administration of Student Interview

The student interviews took place in two stages.

Stage One:

The interviews with the first six students took place one week after the administration of the questionnaire, when the students had completed their journals. The format for the interviews was as follows:

- Each student was interviewed individually during class time.
- Each student went with the researcher to a small room adjacent to the classroom where the door was left open to the class.
The student sat at a table with the researcher with the digital recorder on the table.

The students were asked if the interview could be recorded so that the researcher could remember their answers later. All students agreed.

Each interview began with the student’s journal. The researcher asked the student to explain what they had written in the journal and asked questions to elicit elaboration from the students about their entries.

The researcher also had a list of key questions. The key questions were developed as follow-ups to the questionnaire data (see appendix J).

Stage Two:
The interviews with the remaining four students took place in the second phase of data collection approximately two months later. These four students did not complete journals, but were interviewed according to the same key questions as the first six interviewees. The four additional interviews took place to provide in-depth examination of additional students. Ten student interviews enabled a more detailed and fair representation of the student experiences, as the questionnaire results indicated much broader language experiences than had been anticipated. One interview did not record adequately and so nine interviews were analysed. The interviews were conducted in the same format as stage one.

3.6.3.2 Justification of Student Interview

The interviews enabled students who had completed the journal and/or questionnaire stages of data collection to speak openly about their language attitudes.

The students were able to use their own words in open-ended answers to explain their attitudes towards each language and towards bilingualism. This data collection method complements the questionnaire stage, which is more closed in nature. Qualitative and less-structured interviews allow participants “to express themselves in their own terms and at their own speed” (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p173). This was particularly important in this context given the age of the participants (age 10-12). The lack of time pressure enabled students to express their responses in a way that they felt accurately represented their experiences. The use of a semi-structured format was selected as it provided the researcher with a list of guiding questions, while also
retaining the flexibility to digress where appropriate and probe for further information (Fontana & Frey, 1994; Mackey & Gass, 2005; Rubin & Rubin, 2005).

A qualitative interviewing technique was also selected because it is the most appropriate method for examining social processes and for examining issues that are personal to the participants (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). In order to find out how students use, and feel about, language in their own time at home and outside of school they need to be willing to talk about their home lives. For some participants this is very personal information. Qualitative interviewing is appropriate in this context because the researcher “gently guides a conversational partner in an extended discussion...each conversation is unique as researchers match their questions to what each interviewee knows and is willing to share” (Rubin & Rubin, 2005, p4). This gentle process of questioning appropriate to each participant was extremely important to put the students at ease and make sure they were comfortable enough in the conversation to speak about the necessary topics.

It was indeed a different conversation with every student. Although core questions were covered with every participant it was done in different ways according to the students’ needs and personalities. Some students required very little prompting and were happy to talk indefinitely about their language experiences, other answered with one-word answers throughout and required several follow up questions to ensure that an answer was confirmed. This experience is not unusual as it simply indicates the individuality of every person being interviewed. Rubin and Rubin (2005, p14) point out that “some conversational partners are self-revelatory, others more restrained and formalistic. Some need prodding to elaborate; others won’t stop talking”. Rather than this being problematic, on the contrary, in a qualitative interviewing model it simply allows each participant to reveal his/her own personality and experiences.

The interviews followed on from the questionnaire and journal in terms of the topic. Certain questions from the questionnaire were referred to in the interview as a stimulus to obtain clarification for the students’ choices of answer and also as a prompt to ask further questions on the topic of identity. The students who had completed journals were also asked to explain the items that they had written about in the journal. This allowed those who had a lot to say about the items on the journal, but
who had not written about them fully, to add the detail about their language use and opinions. In second language research, basing an interview around stimulus items is a recognised method of assisting the direction of an interview (Mackey & Gass, 2005). It is also useful to use stimulus items as prompts with younger research participants as it provides another focus within the interview and can be less intimidating.

The interviews were semi-structured to increase the validity of the data. By allowing the interview to be flexible and respond to the student’s responses the data obtained are more meaningful and relevant to the study (Mackey & Gass, 2005; Rubin & Rubin, 2005). The same interviewer conducted all of the interviews and this improves the consistency and therefore the reliability of the data collected in comparison with studies that use multiple researchers (Flick, 1998). The researcher was consistent between each of the interviews by using a schedule of core guiding questions that were expanded upon where necessary to follow-up points raised by the participants themselves (Flick, 1998).

The interviews were digitally recorded and this also assisted the reliability of the interview data as the researcher could consistently code the data from each interview after the interviews were complete. It also enabled the researcher to focus fully on the questioning and direction of each interview and to tailor each interview appropriately for each participant (Rubin & Rubin, 2005).

3.6.4 Classroom Observation

The observations were conducted to observe the ways the two languages are used within the classroom by the students and the teachers. In 2007 observations of two Stage 3 composite classes took place. Due to an organisational change in 2008 observations of the three composite classes then took place in the second phase of data collection.

As not all students in the classes had consented to be part of the questionnaire and interview stages of the research the observations could not be video recorded.
A structured observation schedule was developed based upon a schedule used in prior language studies (Ramirez & Stromquist, 1979). A structured schedule provides predetermined codes for observation and is highly organised and systematic (Neuman, 2006). The schedule was developed and pilot tested on one observation of the case study school. A semi-structured observation schedule was also developed for more open notes to be taken in addition to the structured observation schedule (See appendix O and P for the observation schedules). This enabled contextual data that may be omitted by the structured observation, to be recorded.

3.6.4.1 Moderation of Structured Observation Schedule

In order to test the structured observation schedule before use in the classroom, the schedule was pilot tested by the researcher and the researcher’s supervisor for a moderation comparison. Only the researcher conducted the observations used as results for the study.

The researcher explained all aspects of the key and notation to the supervisor. The schedule was tested on video footage taken at the case study school the previous year. A 15-minute segment of a Year 5 lesson was played in real-time and the two observers each completed an observation schedule. The use of actual footage from the same school and same age group of students ensured that the schedule was tested on as similar a context as possible to the real context to be examined.

The schedule was subsequently re-examined by the researcher and the supervisor for improvements. It was decided that the specific observation schedule would be used for the first 10 minutes of observation. The remainder of the lesson would be recorded with a more open version of the schedule. This decision was made in light of the research question to be answered and the nature of the classroom interaction in this context. The speed of interaction in different languages is extremely quick and therefore difficult to code continuously. The original coding system was also deemed to be more complex than necessary for the full period of observation. Therefore a shorter period of this precise observation provided sufficient detail of the types of interaction and more open field notes provided the richer depth of observation also required for this context.
3.6.4.2 Administration of Classroom Observation

The classroom observations took place in the two phases of data collection. The structured observation schedule (appendix O) based upon Ramirez and Stromquist’s schedule (1979) was used. This structured observation schedule was used for the first ten minutes of each lesson that was observed. After the administration of each structured observation, a semi-structured observation schedule was used (see appendix P). This semi-structured observation incorporated the coding from the structured observation schedule when applicable and was supplemented by open notes when more detailed description was required.

The structured codes used for the structured observations and elements of the semi-structured observation were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation codes - teacher</th>
<th>Observation codes - student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - models language</td>
<td>7 - repeats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - gives directions</td>
<td>8 - response (expected)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - asks question</td>
<td>9 - response (open)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - praises/encourages</td>
<td>10 - response in 2 languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - corrects</td>
<td>11 - comprehension shown (physical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - repeats student response</td>
<td>12 - pause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The schedules enabled the researcher to record which language each teacher and student was using in their interaction by using a capital letter E or F (English or French). The coding also enabled clarification of the type of interaction being conducted in each language such as question, closed response, open response, etc by noting the number 1-12 as applicable. The structured observation schedule incorporated coding as the observation took place.

3.6.4.3 Justification of Observation

Classroom observation was selected as a source of qualitative data that complemented and enhanced the other data collection tools in this study in keeping with the triangulation of data collection rationale (Adler & Adler, 1994). Observation was combined with teacher interview to answer the final sub-question because observation
is most useful in combination with other methods (Mackey & Gass, 2005). Mackey and Gass (2005) indicate that observation on its own does not provide information about the decision-making behind actions. The teacher interviews provide the teacher perspective upon what takes place in the classroom and their intentions and expectations for language use and learning.

Classroom observation enabled a deeper understanding to be developed of the language use patterns in the classrooms. Qualitative semi-structured observation was selected in addition to the structured observation to allow unanticipated data to be collected (Lampert & Ervin-Tripp, 1993). Use of only the structured schedule could ignore, under- or over-value particular events or details (Stallings & Mohlman, 1997).

Observation was selected as the first tool to answer the final research sub-question because it provided an “opportunity to collect large amounts of rich data on the participants’ behaviour and actions within a particular context” (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p175). In this case, the behaviour and actions being observed were language use and the context was the classroom.

Narrative description was incorporated into the semi-structured observation for this study (Stallings & Mohlman, 1997). It was selected as a suitable method allowing rich description of the context to take place and unexpected data to be recorded (Stallings & Mohlman, 1997). It also allowed the research to focus upon the pertinent issues.

Both morning and afternoon observations took place to take account of any differences caused by teacher and student behaviour at particular times of day. Observations were also scheduled for different days of the week to allow for changes due to particular events on certain days and to ensure that such events did not influence the data (Stallings & Mohlman, 1997). A number of observations took place on different days throughout November 2007 and between February and April 2008. This repeated observation enabled a deeper and multi-layered understanding to be developed of the language use in the classroom (Mackey & Gass, 2005).

The peripheral-member-researcher role taken by the researcher in this study enabled the researcher to observe the classroom interactions without being a participant,
thereby minimising influence upon the interactions (Adler & Adler, 1994). While the researcher was visible in the classroom she was not an active or complete member of the action. In a school situation where visitors and observers are frequently welcomed into the classroom the students and teachers took little notice of the researcher as she sat in an unobtrusive position in each classroom (Adler & Adler, 1994). This limited, as far as possible, the potential for the researcher’s presence to influence the activities in the classroom. The use of multiple observations also added to the reduction of altered behaviours across the range of observations.

All of the observations were conducted by the researcher and therefore the consistency across each of the observations was as constant as possible (Flick, 1998).

3.6.5 Teacher Interview

The teacher interviews in phase one followed one schedule of questions, and the interviews in phase two followed a second set of questions (see appendix K and L). The teachers selected a time that suited them for the interview to take place. For some it was during their release from teaching time and for others it was in their recess or lunch break. The interviews took place either in an empty classroom or in the staff room when it was empty. The interviews took place seated at a table with the recording instrument near to both the interviewee and the researcher. The teachers were interviewed following the schedule of questions. In most cases the teachers required little prompting to answer each question fully and the schedule served only as a means of direction for the interview.

In phase two of the data collection the interviews were an opportunity for the researcher to ask questions and clarify initial observations about what had been observed in the classrooms. In this way the teacher could explain their perspective and the decision-making behind the classroom occurrences. The teacher interviews in phase two followed closely after the classroom observations and therefore the observations served as prompts for some of the questions.
3.6.5.1 Justification of Teacher Interview

The teacher interviews were selected to obtain insight into the teachers' intentions and perceptions of language use in their classrooms. As this entails their understanding of cultural aspects of the classroom it was anticipated that they might have difficulty explaining some of the occurrences as they appear normal to them and therefore go unnoticed (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). In order to address this, the observations enabled the researcher to watch the interactions taking place and to ask the teachers "for explanations of what they have seen" (Rubin & Rubin, 2005, p10). This ensured that the teacher perceptions of the exact occurrences observed have been explained and allowed for clarification of the decision-making behind the teachers' observed behaviour in the classroom (Mackey & Gass, 2005).

The qualitative nature of the observation and interview techniques used in this section of the study means that the researcher was able to watch the research setting from the sidelines and observe participants in their normal environment. Through the interviews the researcher could understand experiences that could not be observed; namely the language teaching perspectives of the teachers.

Each of the reasons for selecting interviewing as a technique outlined in the student interview section also applied to the reasoning behind selecting interviewing with the teachers (please see section 3.6.3.2 for a more detailed justification of interviewing as a technique in this study).

3.6.6 Timeline of Procedure

As has been indicated there were two phases of data collection across two academic years. The timeline of data collection is shown in the table below.
Table 8: *The Data Collection Timeline*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase One</th>
<th>Phase Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November to December 2007</td>
<td>February to April 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Student Questionnaire (Nov)</td>
<td>5) Student Interviews (Feb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Student Journal (Nov)</td>
<td>6) Classroom Observations (Feb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Teacher Interviews (Nov)</td>
<td>7) Classroom Observations (March)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Student Interviews (Dec)</td>
<td>8) Classroom Observations (April)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9) Teacher Interviews (April)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Coding and Analysis Techniques

The data were coded and analysed according to the type of data collected. The coding and analysis are explained under the headings for each data collection tool.

3.7.1 Questionnaire

The questionnaire stage of this study has been viewed as a precursor to the interview stage of the study, providing data about the students in this bilingual program and showing details of the field from which the journal and interview participants have been drawn.

The population involved in this section of the study was small, therefore the analysis selected involved simple descriptive statistics - percentages and frequency counts - and also thematic analysis of the responses. There are two main reasons that more complex statistical analysis was not selected for this data. Firstly the field for the administration of this questionnaire was small and therefore many of the statistical requirements for a quantitative and large-scale questionnaire were not relevant for this small questionnaire (Wolf, 1997). Secondly the aim of this study was to obtain a rich and descriptive account of specific students in this one context. Complex statistical analyses are best suited to studies aiming to statistically calculate the applicability of their findings to a broader population. This study produces findings about the specific context and not about the broader population.
The data obtained from the questionnaire were analysed in two ways. Firstly the Likert data were analysed to obtain simple descriptive statistics using SPSS. The data items from the questionnaire were entered into SPSS with each question treated as a different variable.

The statistics produced were simple percentages and frequency counts, as the number of participants (23) did not require more complex analytical techniques. The data could be easily viewed and understood following these simple counts and percentages.

The non-Likert questions were analysed thematically to allow for a deeper understanding of the results. The questionnaire questions were grouped into the themes developed during the planning of the questionnaire, in order to facilitate the triangulation of the data with the results from the other data collection tools. Each of the themes was literature driven and corresponded closely to the three strands of the framework. The first stage of theme development is shown in the following table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First stage of coding – literature driven themes</th>
<th>Questions addressing this theme</th>
<th>Framework Link/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Practices at Home</td>
<td>LUQ1, LUQ2, LUQ11</td>
<td>Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with Family and Friends</td>
<td>LUQ3, LUQ4, LUQ5, LUQ8, LUQ13</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy Practices at Home</td>
<td>LUQ6</td>
<td>Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Processes</td>
<td>LUQ7</td>
<td>Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Voice</td>
<td>LUQ7</td>
<td>Socio-cultural Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Activities</td>
<td>LUQ9, LUQ10, LUQ11, LUQ12, LUQ13</td>
<td>Interaction/Socio-cultural Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of French</td>
<td>LAQ1, LAQ3, LAQ5, LAQ7</td>
<td>Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of English</td>
<td>LAQ2, LAQ4, LAQ6, LAQ8</td>
<td>Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Importance of French and English</td>
<td>LAQ9</td>
<td>Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of French Culture</td>
<td>LAQ10, LAQ12, LAQ14, LAQ16</td>
<td>Socio-cultural Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of English-speaking Culture (Australian)</td>
<td>LAQ11, LAQ13, LAQ15</td>
<td>Socio-cultural connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Importance of English- and French-speaking culture</td>
<td>LAQ17</td>
<td>Socio-cultural connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity as French or Australian</td>
<td>ID1</td>
<td>Investment, Interaction and Socio-cultural Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment of Bilingualism</td>
<td>BBQ1, BBQ2</td>
<td>Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Benefits of Bilingualism</td>
<td>BBQ3, BBQ4, BBQ12, BBQ13</td>
<td>Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Benefits of Bilingualism</td>
<td>BBQ5, BBQ6, BBQ7</td>
<td>Investment/Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Benefits of Bilingualism</td>
<td>BBQ8, BBQ9</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Benefits of Bilingualism</td>
<td>BBQ10, BBQ11</td>
<td>Socio-cultural Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of bilingualism for socio-cultural connection</td>
<td>BBQ12, BBQ13</td>
<td>Socio-cultural Connection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the construction of a mind map, a matrix was developed in Excel that allowed the answers from the questions to be inserted into the columns corresponding to the themes that they addressed (see Figure 8).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Literacy at Home</th>
<th>Camm with Family &amp; Friends</th>
<th>Numeracy at Home</th>
<th>Cognitive Processes</th>
<th>Leisure Activities</th>
<th>Importance French</th>
<th>Importance English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LU03</td>
<td>Use English to read alone x2; Use Both langs to read alone x3</td>
<td>talk to parents in English x12, talk to parents in French x1, talk to parents in both langs x6, talk to parents in other language x1, talk to parents in other language x2, no answer x1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction (for group activities)</td>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU04</td>
<td>Use English to write alone x2; Use French to write alone x1; Use Both langs to write alone x1</td>
<td>talk to siblings in English x19, talk to siblings in French x1, talk in both langs x2, talk in English plus other lang x1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU05</td>
<td></td>
<td>talk to friends in English x22, talk to friends in both langs x1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU06</td>
<td></td>
<td>do number/maths work in English x16, do number/maths work in both langs x7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU07</td>
<td></td>
<td>think about things in English x7, think about things in both langs x5, think about things in English and another lang x1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8: Excerpt from Spreadsheet of Questionnaire Analysis**

(See Appendix U)

This enabled a clearer picture of the themes, as supported by the data, to be seen. Once the data were added to the matrix it was possible to see whether any themes could be merged or expanded. The data were reduced as the themes were merged to clearly show the results. The final set of themes following data reduction are as shown in the following table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Questionnaire Themes</th>
<th>Incorporated Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication with Family or Friends</td>
<td>Communication with Family or Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in Activities in Two Languages</td>
<td>Literacy Practices at Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numeracy Practices at Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of French and English</td>
<td>Importance of French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Importance of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative Importance of French and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Importance of French Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Importance of English-speaking Culture (Australian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative Importance of English- and French-speaking culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment of Bilingualism</td>
<td>Enjoyment of Bilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Benefits of Bilingualism</td>
<td>Cognitive Benefits of Bilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Benefits of Bilingualism</td>
<td>Future Benefits of Bilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Benefits of Bilingualism</td>
<td>Communicative Benefits of Bilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of Bilingualism for Socio-cultural Connection</td>
<td>Cultural Benefits of Bilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits of Bilingualism for Socio-cultural Connection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.2 Journals

The journals were examined using a grounded approach to see the results that emerged from the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). As the journals served primarily as a source for questioning in the student interviews, they did not provide as much data by themselves, but led to elicitation of the interview data through student clarification and explanation of the journals. The journals therefore contributed to many of the themes developed in the student interviews, outlined in the next section.
3.7.3 Student Interviews

The qualitative data obtained from the student interviews were analysed through content analysis of the transcriptions from the interviews. An initial review of the transcripts allowed key categories to be determined before detailed analysis commenced, these categories formed the basis of the coding procedure in a grounded theory approach (Anderson, 1997; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The themes were developed using a mind mapping approach that also allowed the links to the framework and links with the questionnaire themes to be deduced. The reduction of themes took three stages for the interview data. The first stage of coding produced the themes shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11: First Stage of Theme Development – Student Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First stage of theme development – Student Interviews</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with Family or Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How bilingual communication occurs in family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How bilingual communication occurs with friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings about two languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity as Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Language Use Affect Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings/ Opinion about bilingual school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings about France/ French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings about English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School or Home more influence on Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humour as Cultural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using these themes each transcript was analysed and responses coded according to the themes. Using a colour-coding key, sections of the transcript were also highlighted to show their links to the framework. In this way a dual analysis took place that enabled a clearer understanding of the themes and possible reduction of data to be developed. The colour-coding key is shown in Table 12.

**Table 12: Framework Colour Coding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Pink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Cultural Connection</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Reference to Bilingual Identity</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. See Appendix R for examples of coding

Data from the interview transcripts were coded using these categories and the colour coding. Through this stage of data reduction themes for analysis were determined (Anderson, 1997).

The second stage of coding took place in Excel with excerpts from the interviews being pasted into columns in the matrix according to the themes that they illustrated. As the data were further analysed the themes were reduced to slightly broader categories to remove any surplus and unnecessary themes (see Figure 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Communication with Family and Friends</th>
<th>Feelings about 2 Languages</th>
<th>Benefits of Languages for All People</th>
<th>Future Benefits of 2 Languages</th>
<th>Identity as Bilingual/Multilingual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Framework Link</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Investment/Socio Cultural Connection</td>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Socio Cultural Connection/Investment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Investment/Socio Cultural Connection</td>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Socio Cultural Connection/Investment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 9: Interview Coding Excerpt**

(See Appendix S)

The themes were merged and the data reduced to group related information together and to enable a clearer understanding of the emerging themes. The second phase of themes was developed as shown in the table below.
### Table 13: Second Stage of Theme Development – Student Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Themes</th>
<th>Themes Incorporated from Phase 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication with Family and Friends</td>
<td>Communication with Family or Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How bilingual communication occurs in family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How bilingual communication occurs with friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings about 2 Languages</td>
<td>Feelings about 2 Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of Languages for All People</td>
<td>Benefits of Languages for All People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Benefits of 2 Languages</td>
<td>Future Benefits of 2 Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity as Bilingual/Multilingual</td>
<td>Identity as Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does Language Use Affect Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to Culture</td>
<td>Humour as Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connection to Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion of School being Bilingual</td>
<td>Feelings/Opinion about bilingual school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School or Home more influence on Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Opinion of Languages/Bilingualism</td>
<td>Family Opinion of Languages/Bilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities in French</td>
<td>Activities in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Benefits/Strategies</td>
<td>Cognitive Benefits/Strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Re-reading and coding of the interview transcripts enabled deeper and more thorough examination of the themes to continue throughout the analysis stage and revisiting the data at regular intervals allowed for further data to emerge from the transcripts, and further data reduction. As the data were analysed further and transcripts were re-read, the final interview themes were created in response to further merging of themes and further data reduction. The final themes were as shown in the table below.

### Table 14: Final (third) Stage of Themes – Student Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Student Interview themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication with Family or Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings about 2 Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Benefits of 2 Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity as Bilingual or Multilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion of School being Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Opinion about Bilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in Activities in Two Languages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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While these interview themes were consistent across all of the student interviews, the data about each student are presented separately in the findings. This is due to each student’s story being so highly individual that to present all of the data together under the themes would de-personalise, de-contextualise and thus de-value much of the importance of the students’ stories. However, the themes are important for viewing trends and similarities across the stories and for enabling the stories to be presented in a manageable and coherent way. Therefore the themes are presented separately with each student’s story presented within each theme.

3.7.4 Observations

The structured observations used pre-determined codes as shown in the Table 15. The codes were used as the shorthand notation during the observations and therefore the first stage of coding after the within-observation coding comprised a tallying of these codes in Excel.

Table 15: Structured Observation Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation codes - teacher</th>
<th>Observation codes - student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - models language</td>
<td>7 - repeats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - gives directions</td>
<td>8 - response (expected)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - asks question</td>
<td>9 - response (open)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - praises/encourages</td>
<td>10 - response in 2 languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - corrects</td>
<td>11 - comprehension shown (physical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - repeats student response</td>
<td>12 - pause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial analysis of the observations assisted the development of questions for the teacher interviews. Following the interviews the observations were reviewed and analysed further by the researcher incorporating the interview responses as a reference. By using an iterative process, categories and themes were developed as they emerged from the data (Lampert & Ervin-Tripp, 1993; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). This enabled the analysis to be more valid as data were not forced into inappropriate categories and unanticipated data were not ignored (Neuman, 2006). Highlighting of the observation sheets took place. All of the observation data were inserted into an excel spreadsheet according to the themes derived from the highlighting stage.
The open observations were coded and analysed after the observation was completed. Therefore themes and codes emerged from the open observations in a grounded way. The observations were analysed separately according to the type of lesson observed. The bilingual team-teaching lessons were analysed as one sub-set of the observations and the French immersion lessons were analysed as a separate sub-set of observations due to the differences in language use in these different class settings. Within each sub-set the language use by each teacher was analysed separately. Student language use in the two different types of lesson was analysed separately as student language use in French immersion lessons was very different to the bilingual lessons.

Across the different sets of observational data several themes developed. Confidence with language, Language as a tool for negotiation, and Importance of the teacher relationship all emerged as themes from within the observations. In a similar way to the journals the observations did not act as a main source of data, they provided an important role as prompts for the teacher interviews and therefore provided evidence of a number of the themes addressed in the teacher interviews, and were clarified through the teacher responses.

This coding was considered the most appropriate given the research questions behind the research. The traditional highly detailed form of discourse analysis was not considered to be appropriate here, as it would focus more upon the individual interactions in extensive detail rather than looking at the whole picture of what was taking place in the classrooms. Detailed interaction analysis was not a focus in this research. The Conversational Analysis (CA) approach was also not appropriate in this study. It has been considered not to fit analyses of bilingual settings because it “ignores social context, including speakers’ identities, in favour of sequential context” (Cashman & Williams, 2008). This study focusing upon bilingual identity required the approach developed in this study that enables the full context and all relevant details to be incorporated into the findings.

3.7.5 Teacher Interviews
The teacher interviews were transcribed and coded following the same procedure as the student interviews. The themes that developed are set out in Table 16.
Table 16: Themes - Teacher Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes from the Teacher Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Use in the Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Linguistic Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability of Subject Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of Bilingualism for the Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Parental Opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The themes remained the same as further analysis took place, as there was not any need to merge or expand the themes.

3.8 Reliability and Validity

The reliability and validity in this study have been ensured as much as possible. In a study framed within a qualitative perspective, Neuman’s (2006) assertion is accepted, that it is more appropriate in qualitative research to ensure authenticity rather than reliability and validity, which are terms appropriated from quantitative research. Neuman defines authenticity as providing “a fair, honest and balanced account of social life” (2006, p.196). This means for Neuman (2006), ensuring that the researcher produces a “portrayal of social life that is true to the experiences of people being studied” (2006, p.196). In this way the use of different sources of data collection in this study ensure that multiple perspectives contribute to the overall answer to each research question. In addition, the student interview results in particular are presented as individual “stories” to remain as true as possible to the students’ depiction of their attitudes and experiences.

Nevertheless it is important to account for some potential threats to reliability and validity. Some threats to reliability and validity cited by Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000, p. 129) are considered applicable to this research and are addressed below. The first threat is that “the researcher, in exploring the present, may be unaware of important antecedent events".
This threat is accounted for in this research firstly through the use of multiple sources of data collection. In this way, while one source of data may omit important contextual or historical issues other sources may contribute this information. Through multiple sources the triangulated findings can be considered a more accurate representation of the current situation. Secondly this research does not aim to report upon the students’ past experiences with languages and bilingualism and therefore there is less importance placed upon antecedent events. The aim in this research is to obtain an understanding of the students’ current bilingual identity negotiation and language attitudes. As bilingual identity is seen in this study to be something that changes continually, it is therefore less relevant to take into account past events.

The second threat to reliability and validity is that “informants may be unrepresentative of the sample in the study” (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000, p. 129). In this study, the use of purposive sampling has been used to select illustrative instances of the language diversity in this setting. While this means that the findings cannot be generalised, as is the case with research of this type, it is considered more important to have a detailed and accurate investigation of the participants in this setting rather than a more random selection of participants that may omit the rich and informative data in this setting. In this way, purposive sampling is seen as the better way to present a true picture of the participants than random selection.

The third threat to reliability and validity is that “the presence of the observer might bring about different behaviours (reactivity and ecological validity)” (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000, p. 129).

This possibility has been acknowledged in this study, and the researcher’s role as a peripheral-member-researcher (Adler & Adler, 1994) has been selected as the least intrusive method of researching this setting. The students and teachers in this setting are accustomed to having visitors and observers in their classrooms. It is therefore considered that behavioural changes due to the presence of the researcher would be minimal. The use of multiple observations at different times, different days and across a period of several months would counteract any change in behaviour that may occur.
The final threat to reliability and validity listed by Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) is that “the researcher might ‘go native’, becoming too attached to the group to see it sufficiently dispassionately” (2000, p.129). Again, in this case, the use of a peripheral-member-researcher role (Adler & Adler, 1994) addresses this threat. The researcher selected not to conduct an ethnography, which could indeed have led to a threat to dispassionate data interpretation. By remaining a peripheral member of the research setting the researcher did not become too involved in the school and its daily life. In this way the researcher was able to maintain sufficient distance to be dispassionate while developing enough rapport with the research participants to receive their stories. This is a fine balancing act, but one that was relatively easy in this setting. The teachers and students were open in their interviews, having seen and spoken to the researcher sufficiently to feel comfortable answering the questions.

In addition to these four points a number of other considerations were taken in this study to make the findings as reliable and valid as possible.

3.8.1 Reliability

A number of factors in the design of this study address the potential problems related to reliability. Firstly, the observation schedule was tested by two observers for moderation and then used by only one researcher in the field. This ensures the consistency and quality of the recording and documentation of the observational data (Flick, 1998). Secondly, the fact that the same observer conducted all of the observations ensures consistency between each of the observations and between the coding choices during the observation (Flick, 1998).

Thirdly the repetition of observations at different times and on different days ensures that across the multiple observations the data obtained were reliable (Adler & Adler, 1994).

An additional factor is the use of multiple interview participants. This ensured that a variety of perspectives were encountered through the interviews. This improves the credibility of the data (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). The interviewing of multiple participants can also address the potential problems of interviewee perceptual
distortion or selective recall (Mackey & Gass, 2005). The digital recording of the interviews further enhanced the reliability of the coding of the interviews as coding could be conducted consistently after each interview (Rubin & Rubin, 2005).

Also improving the reliability of the interviews was the use of the same schedule of questions for each interview. This ensures reliability through the consistency of questioning (Flick, 1998).

In the questionnaire, the use of five response options for each of the questions means there is increased external reliability compared to questionnaires that use less response options (Neuman, 2006).

3.8.2 Validity

The validity of the data has also been addressed through one major methodological measure. This measure is the triangulation of the data collection methods (Flick, 1998; Mackey & Gass, 2005). The use of different and complementary data sources ensures that themes that emerge across several means of data collection are valid results. This has been based on Mackey and Gass’s assertion that triangulation is: “using multiple research techniques and multiple sources of data to explore the issues from all feasible perspectives” (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p. 368). In this way the use of five different data sources to answer the research questions with each sub-question answered by at least two data sources ensures that the issues are explored from multiple perspectives.

Potential validity problems in the observational stage of data collection such as researcher perception, subjectivity or bias, are addressed through triangulation with the interviews (Adler & Adler, 1994; Mackey & Gass, 2005). Quotes from interviews can confirm and enrich the analyses from the observational data and add to the validity of these analyses (Adler & Adler, 1994; Mackey & Gass, 2005).

In addition, the validity of each individual source of data collection was ensured as much as possible. The interviews were semi-structured because the structured element adds validity to the results (Mackey & Gass, 2005; Rubin & Rubin, 2005). In a similar
manner the observational data validity was improved through the use of the structured observation schedule. The questionnaire validity is ensured through its use in a prior study (Molyneux, 2005).

3.9 Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented details of this research study’s perspective, strategy and data collection tools. The data collection tools have been described and justified and the subsequent analysis and coding of data has been explained. The role of the researcher in this study has been outlined, and the reliability and validity of the study accounted for.

The following chapter presents the findings and discussion of the results from this study.
4 Results – Findings, Analysis and Discussion

This chapter presents the findings of the study under each of the research sub-questions. Each question is re-stated as the results for that question are presented. Discussion of the findings takes place after the presentation of the findings. Throughout this report the students are referred to using pseudonyms.

**How do students in a bilingual primary school program in NSW identify with their languages outside and inside the school setting?**

4.1 Qa: What is the nature of students’ language use in the home?

4.1.1 Presentation of Findings - Questionnaire Results

Three data sets were sourced to examine the nature of students’ language use in the home – questionnaire results, journals and interviews. Firstly the Language Use section of the questionnaire provided responses from 23 students enrolled in Stage 3 of the bilingual program. Five students out of the 23 also completed a language use journal over the course of one week and these students along with four additional students were interviewed individually about their language use. The results indicate a variety of language experiences for many students outside of school. The results from each data source are presented separately and then discussed together according to the themes they represent.

The results obtained from the Language Use section of the questionnaire show a variety of different home language experiences amongst the students in this school. This shows that language use at home is a factor for these students’ development of identity. It is also interesting to note the quantity of previously monolingual English-speaking students whose parents have selected to place their children in the bilingual stream at the school. Fifteen out of the 23 students questioned speak only one language at home with either parents or siblings. For 11 of these students the home language is English, for one student it is French and for 3 students it is a language other than English or French. This indicates that some students are enrolled in the
program for enrichment purposes while others (the remaining 7 who speak English and French at home with either parents or siblings) are enrolled for language maintenance.

The students reported the languages that they use for various activities alone and in interaction with others. The bilingual activity was reported within two themes according to the coding of the data: Communication with Family or Friends and Participating in activities in two languages.

4.1.1.1 Communication with Family or Friends

The first theme is Communication with Family or Friends. The questionnaire results can be divided within this theme to show the differences and similarities of language use with parents, siblings and friends as outlined in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicating with:</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French and English</th>
<th>Another language and English</th>
<th>Another language</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents*</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 4.3% did not respond

Bilingualism is shown to be an essential communicative tool in many of the students' families. Of the participants 52.2% (N=12) reported talking to their parents in English. 4.3% (N=1) reported speaking to parents in French, and 26.1% (N=6) reported speaking to parents in both French and English. 8.7% (N=2) reported using another language (not English or French) to speak to their parents and 4.3% (N=1) reported using another language and English to speak to parents. 4.3% (N=1) did not answer.

There is, therefore, bilingualism taking place in the home lives of students in this program. 30.4% (N=7) of the students reported speaking two languages for everyday communication and a further 13% (N=3) reported using a language other than English as the sole language with their parents. In this way bilingualism is shown as a necessary tool for inter-generational communication for some of these students who
use English and French to communicate with their parents. The languages cited by students as being used in the home indicate that a variety of European languages are used by some of the students in this class. French, German, Italian and Portuguese were all cited by the students as languages used at home.

With regard to communication within the same generation slightly less bilingual communication between the students and their siblings and friends is reported in comparison with communication with parents. 82.6% of the students (N=19) reported speaking English only with their siblings. 4.3% (N=1) reported using French only, 8.7% (N=2) reported using both French and English and 4.3% (N=1) reported using another language and English. However, this result is contradicted in the interviews with more bilingual communication reported by the students when talking about their interaction with siblings than reported in the questionnaire responses.

When talking to friends 95.7% (N=22) reported always using English and 4.3% (N=1) reported using English and French. The demonstrated higher levels of reported English language use by the students with their own generation reflects findings that have been reported through research in other language contexts. For example research into Irish language use in Gaeltacht colleges in Ireland has also shown that students use less Irish with their own generation than with their parents or other older generations (Ó Giollagáin, 2007).

A number of students have reported using French and other languages in the home. Some families opting into the bilingual program use English only at home, some use other languages at home, but the other languages are not always French. This may indicate that the families value language learning in general rather than specifically the learning of French.

Further evidence of the bilingual nature of family communication is shown by the students reporting of the languages they use for certain activities. The results showed that 60.9% (N=14) play games as a family in English, 4.3% (N=1) play games in French, 21.7% (N=5) play games in both English and French, 8.7% (N=2) play games in another language and English and 4.3% (N=1) play games in another language (not English or French) (see Table 18).
### Table 18: Results of Student Responses – Playing Games and Listening to Stories at Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French and English</th>
<th>Another language and English</th>
<th>Another language</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playing games at home</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to stories at home</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 30.4% (N=7) that report using both English and another language (French, Portuguese, Italian and German) as a family to play games are the cases that indicate bilingual interaction taking place in the home.

The findings regarding listening to stories at home further illustrate the use of bilingual activities at home. The results show that 78.3% (N=18) reported listening to stories at home in English, 4.3% (N=1) reported listening in French, 13% (N=3) reported listening to stories in French and English and 4.3% (N=1) reported listening in another language and English. The four cases here of storytelling and game-playing taking place in more than one language further show the bilingual home lives of some students and the bilingual home literacy practices that families are engaging in. This type of home engagement with two languages is often not recognised by schools and is a potential tool, if acknowledged, for further learning possibilities in the classroom (Kenner & Gregory, 2007; Martin-Jones et al., 2007). Further support of this indication of home literacy and language use in more than one language is shown through the interview results.

#### 4.1.1.2 Participating in Activities in Two Languages

When students were asked what language they use when doing individual activities, some of the students reported the use of two languages when participating in different activities alone. The questionnaire asked students about the language used when reading alone, working on a piece of their own writing, watching TV or DVDs, listening to music and thinking about things.
Table 19: Student Responses – Language Use for Individual Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>French and English</th>
<th>Another language and English</th>
<th>Another language</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Alone</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Alone</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching DVDs or TV</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to Music</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about Things</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 19 above, 87% of the students (N=20) report using English when reading alone and 13% (N=3) report using both French and English. 91.3% (N=21) use English when writing alone, 4.3% (N=1) use French and 4.3% (N=1) use both French and English. An indication of the importance of technology for young students is shown by 65.2% (N=15) reporting watching DVDs in English, 26.1% (N=6) watching DVDs in both French and English and 8.7% (N=2) watching DVDs in another language and English. This bilingual viewing by 34.8% (N=8) of the students shows that over a third of the students choose to watch DVDs in more than one language. Similarly 78.3% (N=18) report listening to music in English, 17.4% (N=4) report listening to music in French and English and 4.3% (N=1) report listening in another language and English.

In this study it is clear to see that bilingualism plays a role in the lives of a number of the students. A proportion of the students report the use of more than one language in their home lives. This indicates a broader connection to bilingualism than simply experiencing it in the school setting. Students indicated selecting to watch DVDs in multiple languages. This shows a connection to more than one language beyond the scope of the school and beyond the instructions of parents. The students showed that their own initiative is involved in their bilingualism. This is further discussed in section 4.1.4.4 using the interview data that supports this use of students’ own initiative.

An indication of the students’ deeper connection with bilingualism is shown by 26.1% (N=6) reporting that they “think about things” in more than one language (21.7% in
French and English (N=5) and 4.3% in another language and English (N=1)). The main portion of the group reported thinking about things in English. However, 26.1% (N=6) is a notable amount that report that they think in more than one language. This shows bilingualism as an internal and integral thing for a number of these students. The students being able to identify how they think about things, indicates some metacognitive awareness amongst these students (Bialystok, 2005, 2007). However, their levels of metacognitive awareness and understanding were not measured and are beyond the scope of this particular project.

In order to get a deeper and clearer picture of language use amongst the students the journal and interview stages enable a sub-set of the students to explain their language use in more detail and in their own words.

4.1.2 Presentation of Findings - Journal Results

The journals provided five accounts of students' own words to explain their home language use. Out of the five completed and returned journals, three boys filled in the charts. One added a drawing and one added some free writing. One of the girls drew pictures to illustrate her language use and one girl illustrated the journal cover page and stuck on pictures. The girls' pictures showed an attachment to France through an interest in French football teams, French music, French comics, French films and playing games and reading books in French. The following table provides an overview of the activities cited in the students' charts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Pseudonym</th>
<th>Chart Completed</th>
<th>Activities Cited</th>
<th>Additional Writing or Pictures Added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>2 days completed</td>
<td>Watching TV in French (x 1) Cooking from a French recipe (x 1)</td>
<td>“On Monday on the TV I was watching TV in French” “On Tuesday I did the cooking task on my French homework and the rest of the week I did nothing in French outside of French class”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td>7 days completed</td>
<td>Speaking with family in French (x 7) Speaking with friend in French at recess (x 4) Speaking with friend in French after school (x 3) Reading a French book (x 4) Watching TV in French (x 4) Watching a French film (x 1)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genevieve</td>
<td>7 days completed</td>
<td>Talking with Grandma and Aunt (x 12) Cooking with French teacher (x 1) A French play with friends (x 1) Reading a French book (x 1)</td>
<td>“My grandmother and aunt are here from France for three months, and they don’t speak English so I have to speak in complete French”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>7 days completed</td>
<td>Listening to French music (x 1) Talking to mother in French (x 1) Reading a French comic (x 2) Watching a French movie (x 1) Playing a game in French (x 1) Reading a French book (x 2) Practicing a French play for school (x 1)</td>
<td>16 illustrated pages showing the activities listed in the chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivier</td>
<td>5 days completed</td>
<td>Speaking to mother in French (x 8) Speaking to mother and little brother (x 2)</td>
<td>One illustration of speaking to mother in French.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The drawings and writing are explained in the students’ own words in the interviews. Elizabeth’s journal shows her illustration of her use of comic books to engage with French language (see Figure 10). The illustrated cover page from another journal indicates the sport that is watched on television from the French football league. In this way the students’ illustrations are using a visual form to illustrate the contact that they have with French language out of school and some of the home literacy practices that they engage in. Elizabeth in particular shows here that she reads in French, thus engaging in literacy in French in her own time out of school. These resources and skills that are being accessed in the home are skills that can be valuable in the bilingual classroom (Martin-Jones et al., 2007; Kenner & Gregory, 2007). The drawings (e.g. Figures 10 and 11) are not analysed for their content, they are merely used as illustrations to prompt the direction of the student interviews (Banks, 1998).

Other students indicated the everyday nature of their communication in French. Olivier’s illustration showed himself and his mother having an everyday conversation (see Figure 11).
Figure 11: An Illustration from Olivier’s Journal

The picture shows the following conversation:
Olivier: Il y a quoi pour dessert?
(Olivier: What is there for dessert?)
Maman: Du compote ou de la glace.
(Mother: Stewed fruit or ice cream)

This pictorial representation of the student interacting with his mother shows the integrated nature of French language in this student’s life, where it is normal to speak to his mother in French. Each of the connections to French language and culture mentioned in the journals was explored further in the individual interviews, and used as a source of questioning.

The chart sections of the students’ journals indicated a range of ways in which the students connected to French language and culture outside of the school program. Genevieve wrote that she had extended family visiting and French was the only common language and therefore the only means of communicating. This point is one that recurs in many of the student interviews showing the importance of French as a language of intergenerational communication. The journal entry reads:

“My grandmother and aunt are here from France for three months, and they don’t speak English, so I have to speak complete French’
The use of the words “complete French” may indicate the difference for this student between her everyday life of partial French and partial English and her interactions with her grandmother and aunt which are held entirely in French. This student’s chart also indicates her speaking to her grandmother and aunt every morning and evening as well as reading a book in French. In this way she shows the use of reading in French as a home literacy practice, and she shows communication with older generations of her family as a bilingual activity. A study by Gregory et al. (2007) has indicated the important role that grandparents play when they are caregivers to the children concerned. In the settings investigated by Gregory et al. (2007) the task of reading together provides important literacy learning for the children. In this current study the grandparent plays a different role, as he/she is not a primary caregiver, but when they visit for extended periods of time they engage entirely in the French language with the child. This contact includes speaking, but also reading and in this way provides the child with literacy engagement in French along with exposure to the different reading conventions that exist in different cultures (Gregory et al., 2007).

Journal entries by the other students indicate instances of speaking French to one parent, listening to French music, watching French films and reading French books and comics. Gabriel, who had only been in Australia for a year, having lived in France for his whole life, recorded using French to speak with his whole family and also to speak with his friend at recess. His English language use is explored further in the interview results.

The journals provided an indication of the extent to which this sample of students used French out of school and the journals showed a variety of different quantities of French use. In spite of these varying quantities of French being used by the students, bilingualism was nonetheless shown through the journals to be a lived reality for these students in their daily lives out of school. The journals were used to prompt the interviews with the students.
4.1.3 Presentation of Findings - Interview Results

The interviews enabled nine students to speak in more detail about their journals and/or questionnaire answers about their language use.

The interviews served to answer the question: **What is the nature of students' language use outside the classroom?** The language use reported by the students in the interview stage of data collection revealed two main themes of language use in keeping with the themes from the questionnaire – *Communication with Family or Friends* and *Participating in Activities in Two Languages*. The theme of *Communication with Family or Friends* includes all responses from the interviewed students that refer to the ways in which, and the frequency with which, they communicate with their family or friends in each language. The theme of *Participating in Activities in Two Languages* includes the students’ responses about the types of things that they do in each language outside of school.

The students’ use of language outside of school was shown to be as individual as the number of students interviewed. Each student had his/her own story of language use. In order to present each story accurately, the more detailed stories are presented separately within each theme. The less detailed stories are presented in tabular format.

4.1.3.1 Communication with Family or Friends

*Jamie – "We change backwards and forwards"

The diagram below (Figure 12) depicts Jamie’s language use as described in his own words and illustrates the different languages used with different people in his life, and the direction of the language used – i.e. when it is receptive language and when it is productive language. For example, as the diagram shows:

- Jamie speaks to his father in English and his father speaks to him in English.
- Jamie speaks to his mother in English and French and his mother speaks to him in French.
- Jamie and his English teacher speak to each other in English.
- Jamie and his French teacher speak to each other in French.
- Jamie and one friend speak to each other in English and French.
- Jamie and all other friends speak to each other in English.
Jamie and his brother speak to each other in English.

Jamie and his grandparents speak to each other in French.

**KEY**

- = English

- = French

Figure 12: Jamie’s Linguistic World

Jamie explained the language use in his family as integrally bilingual. He speaks French with his mother most of the time and English with his father and his brother. He described a strategy that he uses in communication with his mother when speaking in French saying:
oh it depends. If I can’t think of the word I say it in English and then she says it back to me in French.

This use of a linguistic prompting strategy with his mother is seen as normal for Jamie. Jamie provides further evidence that linguistic strategies are used within their family communication when explaining how whole family conversations take place. Jamie explained that he usually speaks English to his father, and when asked if he ever speaks French to his father he responded that it only happens if he, his mother and his father were having a conversation together. When asked how this would work he explains: “we change backwards and forwards”.

This explanation could indicate that the family code-switch to have bilingual family conversations that all members understand and can participate in. Code-switching is defined as a phenomenon of interaction where bilingual people switch back and forth between languages (Gross, 2006). These switches can involve one word, an entire sentence or any amount of words in between (Gross, 2006). Using this definition, Jamie’s description of the family conversation using the words “we change backwards and forwards” appears to indicate a reference to code-switching.

The integration of the use of the two languages into the interactions taking place in the home is further illustrated by Jamie’s explanation of his brother teasing him. Jamie explained that he and his brother do not speak French to each other unless his brother is trying to annoy him. He explained:

Interviewer: and when you talk to your brother do you ever talk to him in French?
Jamie: no, it’s like except sometimes when he tries to be annoying so he speaks in French and I tell him in English and he’ll say I don’t understand so I say it to him in French and he says I don’t understand

This description of the use of language by the siblings to tease and annoy each other provides a descriptive picture of how languages are used in this bilingual home. It illustrates the complex relationships that exist bilingually and the interactional games that take place within those relationships. The use of these interactional games and teasing illustrates some of the ways in which siblings can act as participants in the
induction of younger members into the culture. In this way older siblings assist the younger sibling to become a member of the community of practice. They do this by playing with language and helping the younger sibling to become more proficient in the language and a more complete member of the culture (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007).

The use of sibling teasing to induct the younger family member into the culture assists in illustrating the way that interaction forms an integral part of the development of bilingual identity. Through interaction that assists the child to become more confident with language the child begins to develop a positive identity associated with that language. The use of teasing also adds to findings that siblings in a bilingual family used teasing to assess younger siblings’ knowledge to see how much language they know (Volk, 1998). Teasing can be seen as a strategy used by siblings to assist each other with language learning in a bilingual context. In Jamie’s case his brother teases him by pretending not to understand his French.

With Jamie’s extended family, French is seen to be a necessity. Jamie explained that his grandparents on his mother’s side cannot speak English and so he always speaks French with them both when visiting them in France and over the phone. When this becomes difficult Jamie uses his mother as a linguistic tool asking her the words that he’s not sure of. This is an illustration supporting the questionnaire data that showed that bilingualism is important to a number of the students in the study for inter-generational communication in their families and home communities. It also shows the use of strategies used to assist bilingual communication. In this case, Jamie demonstrates strategic use of another family member as assistant in the communication.
Figure 13: *Elizabeth’s Linguistic World*

A different picture of language use is explained by Elizabeth (see Figure 13). Her parents are both English speakers, and they lived in France when Elizabeth was younger. While living in France English was maintained at home, while French was spoken at school and in the wider community. Now that the family are in Australia French is actively maintained in the home alongside the English that is spoken.
Elizabeth has older brothers who speak more French than she does as they went to school to a higher grade-level than her in France. She explains that outside of school she speaks French mostly with her brothers, saying she speaks French with: "mostly my brothers because they speak it better than my parents do".

Elizabeth here also illustrates the importance of siblings in assisting younger siblings to develop and practice language (Gregory, 2005). Elizabeth explains that in their family she thinks they use English about 75% of the time and the remaining quarter of communication is in French. As she shows in section 4.1.1.2 - Participating in Activities in Two Languages - they engage in a number of activities in French as a family. Elizabeth has illustrated that again there is an important role played by siblings as the teachers or more experienced members of the cultural group that the younger sibling is developing membership of, and developing an identity in association with.
Gabriel – “With my family I use French”
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Figure 14: Gabriel’s Linguistic World

Gabriel presents yet another story of the use of two languages outside the classroom (see Figure 14). All of Gabriel’s immediate family members are French and he has only been in Australia a year and one month at the time of the interview. He explained that he has only learnt English since arriving in Australia. His English skills are already apparent in the interview as he answered all of the interview questions in English with only one case of negotiation in French and English between the interviewer and student.
Gabriel explained that at home most of the communication takes place in French. He explained that his father speaks better English than his mother and his father sometimes asks him to speak in English to him for practice. In these interactions Gabriel’s father acknowledges Gabriel’s skills in English and this may assist Gabriel’s development of confidence and identity associated with his English language.

At school Gabriel says he speaks mostly English, but outside of class he speaks to two of his friends in French. These two friends both come from French-speaking countries. However, if those three students are in a larger group of friends they speak English so that everyone can understand. As Gabriel said:

```
Gabriel: yeah. If I’m only with him I speak with him in French but if I’m with other friends
Interviewer: you mean in a group
Gabriel: yeah, then... then I talk in English
Interviewer: you all talk in English?
Gabriel: yeah cos, my other friends don’t speak French
```

Gabriel uses different languages depending upon which of his friends he is talking to. He has developed his language skills to be able to use whichever language will best help him to build relationships. Gabriel’s use of language choice in his interactions supports findings by Esdahl (2003). Esdahl indicated that when young bilinguals use language choice “social relations seem to determine language variation” (2003, p. 76). In a related study, Madsen (2003) found that language choice was used to wield power by excluding others or dominating interactions. Contrary to this finding, Gabriel is considerate in his language choice, using his linguistic power in an inclusive way by selecting the most inclusive language for that group of people.

**Genevieve – “I speak fluently in French with them”**

The figure below indicates the language use experienced by Genevieve as described by her in her interview. She uses both English and French with different people in her life.
Gabriel explained that at home most of the communication takes place in French. He explained that his father speaks better English than his mother and his father sometimes asks him to speak in English to him for practice. In these interactions Gabriel’s father acknowledges Gabriel’s skills in English and this may assist Gabriel’s development of confidence and identity associated with his English language.

At school Gabriel says he speaks mostly English, but outside of class he speaks to two of his friends in French. These two friends both come from French-speaking countries. However, if those three students are in a larger group of friends they speak English so that everyone can understand. As Gabriel said:

Gabriel: yeah. If I’m only with him I speak with him in French but if I’m with other friends
Interviewer: you mean in a group
Gabriel: yeah, then… then I talk in English
Interviewer: you all talk in English?
Gabriel: yeah cos, my other friends don’t speak French

Gabriel uses different languages depending upon which of his friends he is talking to. He has developed his language skills to be able to use whichever language will best help him to build relationships. Gabriel’s use of language choice in his interactions supports findings by Esdahl (2003). Esdahl indicated that when young bilinguals use language choice “social relations seem to determine language variation” (2003, p. 76). In a related study, Madsen (2003) found that language choice was used to wield power by excluding others or dominating interactions. Contrary to this finding, Gabriel is considerate in his language choice, using his linguistic power in an inclusive way by selecting the most inclusive language for that group of people.

Genevieve – “I speak fluently in French with them”

The figure below indicates the language use experienced by Genevieve as described by her in her interview. She uses both English and French with different people in her life.
Figure 15: Genevieve’s Linguistic World

Genevieve’s story shows a bilingual home where communication takes place in French and English. Genevieve spoke clearly about her language use and her thoughts and attitudes. She spoke extensively with little questioning required from the interviewer.

At the time of the interview Genevieve explained that she had relations visiting from France for three months. Her grandmother and aunt don’t speak English so she communicates with them entirely in French:

so I speak with them quite a lot in French and I’ve done that practically every morning and every afternoon when I get home. So I speak fluently in French with them.
Genevieve’s story shows a bilingual home where communication takes place in French and English. Genevieve spoke clearly about her language use and her thoughts and attitudes. She spoke extensively with little questioning required from the interviewer.

At the time of the interview Genevieve explained that she had relations visiting from France for three months. Her grandmother and aunt don’t speak English so she communicates with them entirely in French:

so I speak with them quite a lot in French and I’ve done that practically every morning and every afternoon when I get home. So I speak fluently in French with them.
This supports what she wrote in her journal about speaking completely in French with these relations. On a more regular basis Genevieve speaks French to her father and English to her mother, as these are each their first languages. As she explains her use of French with her father she says:

Genevieve: well (laughs) well he talks to me in French, but I sometimes answer back but usually I just answer back in English cos I understand quite well.
Interviewer: OK. So you understand what he says but you don’t always reply
Genevieve: ... Usually on weekends I speak French with my Dad because I'm usually busy with homework and things in the week

When she is asked about her language use with her friends Genevieve says that with one friend she sometimes speaks French but mostly she speaks English with her friends outside of class. In this way Genevieve’s experience of languages both inter-generationally and intra-generationally appears to support other findings that younger generations use bilingual communication with older generations but tend more frequently to interact monolingually within their own generation (Ó Giollagáin, 2007).

Genevieve also spoke about the ways that she thinks in French and English and how she uses this ability to help her understand things in both languages. Genevieve said:

...say if I get a question in French I’ll read it again in my head and then I’ll try to figure it out. Well if I say it in my head if I try to figure out what it is in English my brain’s a bit confused so I do it in French...and I understand it better.

In this extract Genevieve says that she uses both languages to think. She indicates that she uses each language strategically to understand more clearly.

**Louis – “to understand it’s easy”**

Louis’s story shows a different facet of language use within the students in this class. Louis participates in the French bilingual program at school, and speaks German and English at home. Louis said: “I speak with my Dad in German most of the time and
English to my brother and sister and to my Mum’s. His experience of language use is depicted in the figure shown below.
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Figure 16: Louis’ Linguistic World

As the figure shows, Louis uses English, French and German with different people in his life. Louis explained that each of the children in their family speak to their father in German, but speak English to each other and to their mother. Their father’s first language is German and their mother’s first language is English.
When asked to give examples of the types of things he does in German, Louis showed how natural and normal the use of German is for him in the home:

"oh just like when my Dad’s telling me to lay the table for dinner and stuff and telling me to come up and empty the rubbish or something"

Louis explained that whole family conversations always take place entirely in English and they do not switch between German and English if they’re all talking together as a family.

When asked whether he does anything on his own in German at home, Louis said no but that he does read with his father in German. When asked how that works he explains: “Like, we have German books and, like, I read to him and he, like, corrects me if I make any mistakes”.

This is another example of bilingual home literacy practices taking place. It also shows the different reading styles and literacy underpinnings that exist in different cultures. Gregory et al. (2007) show that the literacy practices engaged in with family members in the home language play an important role in combination with school literacy education in the development of language for young bilingual students. The use of literacy in the home languages assists students to develop connection to their cultures. Gregory et al. (2007) show how different cultures use different reading patterns to teach the younger generations. Some cultures use a *repeat after me* style and others use a style where the child looks at the pictures while the older family member reads the words (Gregory et al., 2007). Louis describes a reading style in which he reads to his father and his father corrects the language when a mistake is made.

Louis indicated that he speaks German almost everyday and for about a quarter of the time each day. When the family visit or speak to other relatives still in Germany Louis has to speak to them in German because they don’t speak English. Therefore, like Genevieve and Jamie, bilingualism is necessary for Louis to communicate inter-generationally in his family.
Louis found that it's easy to understand his relatives but harder to speak with them. Matt made a similar point about having difficulty speaking in French in comparison with understanding French. This is shown later in this section. Louis said:

Interviewer: OK and how did you find that speaking in German?
Louis: mmm sometimes a bit hard cos I didn’t know many words, but kind of easy to understand them

Louis further mentioned the difference he experiences in terms of ease of communication between understanding and speaking the language when describing how he feels when he is talking on the phone to relations in Germany: “like to understand it’s easy but sometimes, like, speaking I can’t get the words right and stuff”.

This reference to the different levels of ease experienced between receptive and productive language use reflect the language development of this student. He shows that his listening skills are more extensive than his spoken skills. This reflects the language acquisition process that children experience in their first language (Douglas Brown, 2006).

Louis explained how he used linguistic strategies to cope when he did not know a word in German. In his own words:

um I tried like if I didn’t know a word I tried explaining what the word meant or something or saying a different word that means sort of the same

He used simple terms to describe the strategies he uses to make himself understood when he does not automatically know the required words in German.

Antonia – “I know so much Italian”
Antonia’s language use experiences are illustrated in the figure below as she has explained them. She has contact with English, French, Dutch and Italian.
Figure 17: Antonia’s Linguistic World

Antonia’s story, like Louis’s, shows another facet of the bilingual experiences of students in this context. Antonia is a student in the bilingual program, and at home speaks Italian with her grandmother, English to most of her family and French and English to her father. She also has contact with Dutch through her father. Antonia has spent many of her younger years being cared for after school by her “Nonna”. She explained that at her grandmother’s house her grandmother always speaks to her in
Italian. Antonia likes to tell the full story in her own words and is extremely talkative. She says:

Well my Nonna is Italian and you see my parents work full time so I’m at her house. She doesn’t actually give me answers in English so she gives it to me in Italian and if I don’t understand she’ll give me like one word in English and the rest in Italian. But I lived with her for one year but I actually went to her house everyday so I basically lived with her and I know so much Italian because my Nonno and my sister and my Nonna and my Dad and my Mum they all are they are not fully Italian but can speak really good Italian.

Antonia shows here that she and her grandmother have negotiation strategies that they use to facilitate Antonia’s understanding without her grandmother translating into English. Her grandmother uses a code-switch (Baker & Prys Jones, 1998; Gross, 2006) by putting one word into English to assist Antonia to de-code more complex sentences.

Antonia explains that for a lot of things she doesn’t know the English word because she’s only ever heard the Italian word from her grandmother. She says:

Antonia: but I actually didn’t understand English that well when I was little because like I used to think that my you know the thing that you wrap around just before you go to bed or when you’re cold. Not like a jacket
Interviewer: a dressing gown?
Antonia: yeah a dressing gown I always called that Vistalia because that’s what it is in Italian and instead of ugg boots I call them pantofole and like all this other stuff… and like I don’t call my auntie auntie I call her zia Bianca

Antonia speaks also about how she feels she can understand Italian better than she can speak it. This echoes the points made by Louis and Matt.

Antonia indicates how this home language experience assists her language learning and shows that she has learnt more than she would have at standard Italian language classes. She says:

so yeah and I did go to Italian lessons for one year but it wasn’t they weren’t really teaching me anything they were teaching me things that my Nonna ALWAYS says to me (student’s own emphasis)
Antonia’s grandmother has acted as one of her primary carers and in this role has provided important Italian language skills to Antonia. In this way her story further supports the findings of Gregory et al. (2007) in their research showing the importance of grandparents in bilingual children’s language development.

Antonia has one older sister who is twenty years old. She sometimes speaks Italian to her and is encouraged by her because she thinks her sister speaks such good Italian and will one day take her on a trip to Italy. Antonia’s sister provides an example of the important role played by siblings in inducting younger family members into the culture (Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Volk, 1998).

Antonia indicates the complexity of her linguistic experiences outside of school when she says:

I speak only Italian when I’m at my Nonna’s house and I speak English at my Mum’s and French at my Dad’s because he encourages me to speak French because he speaks really fluent French.

Language use for Antonia is multifaceted. She uses French, Italian and English to communicate with her immediate family. Antonia is another example of a student who needs bilingualism to be able to communicate inter-generationally and in her case it is even more important than for other students because her grandmother plays such an important role in her care at home.

Language Use for the Other Students

The experiences of language use outlined by three other students are presented in the table below.
Table 21: Interview Results – Student Language Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Language Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Megan’s family speak only English in their home however, as is shown in later sections of this report, she does feel partly bilingual. Megan’s brother speaks French but they do not speak to each other in French at home. As is shown in the Activities section Megan chooses to do some activities in French alone at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Matt speaks French with his mother at home and English with his father. His father, who is Australian and mostly speaks English, learnt French while living in France where he met Matt’s mother, who is French. Matt outlines that he probably speaks French about four times a week and for about half an hour each time. So he speaks a smaller amount of French at home than English. He also speaks to his grandparents over the computer using French. Matt explains that he finds speaking French hard although he can understand it quite well. This theme is one that occurs in several stories. Matt says that he would never speak to his sister in French. When he visits France he speaks to his cousins and other relations in French but finds it difficult. Matt finds understanding French easier than speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivier</td>
<td>Olivier, like Matt and Jamie, speaks French to his mother, who is French. He speaks English to his Dad and brothers. Again, like Matt and Jamie he uses Skype⁶ to speak to other relations in French.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students show a variety of experiences of language use with their family and friends. A number of the students speak more than one language in the family home and some speak different languages with different members of their immediate family.

The following section indicates the students’ experiences in terms of their participation in activities in two languages.

4.1.3.2 Participating in Activities in Two Languages

This second theme within the topic of language use is Participating in Activities in Two Languages. The students mentioned different activities that they participated in using their different languages and these activities illustrate more details of each student’s experience with two languages outside of the classroom. As with the first theme, Communication with family or friends, the more detailed stories of each student are presented separately to allow the full story to be shown. The less detailed stories are presented in tabular format.

---

⁶ Skype is a computer program that enables phone calls to be made over the internet.
Jamie – “we have to watch French with her”

Jamie spoke about a number of activities that are carried out in French in their home. The main one for him is watching television. He explained that he watches with his Mum when she is watching the news:

> oh I um, like, we have, um, like, things like the news and all that, cos my mum, um when my mum is, like, watching TV she has to watch French, we have to watch French with her, and she, like, watches the news

Jamie doesn’t always understand all of the words in programmes on television but the more he watches the more he understands. Jamie says that he sometimes likes watching TV in French but it depends what is on. He becomes more enthusiastic when explaining that he watches sport on Eurosport\(^7\) in French. He explained that he watched the whole of the rugby world cup in French and found it better because there are no advert interruptions and there is more coverage of more games.

Jamie: That’s where I watched the whole of the world cup. Cos we don’t have it in English we only have it in French so I watched the whole world cup

Interviewer: with French commentary?

Jamie: yep

Having two languages has therefore become something that Jamie can use to his advantage, in this case pursuing his interest in rugby. He can watch better coverage of the sport in French than he could in English.

Elizabeth – “I, like, picked them by myself”

Elizabeth began explaining her family’s activities in French by talking about how her family play board games together. She says:

Elizabeth: well there was Cluedo which is a game that we have in French and English but I played it in French that day and

Interviewer: and who did you play that with?

Elizabeth: I played that basically with my family except for the oldest brother cos he doesn’t really like games that much

\(^7\) Eurosport is a sports channel on pay TV.
In terms of other activities that Elizabeth takes part in at home, she explained that she watches DVDs in French. When asked whether she feels more comfortable with them in French or in English she explains that they are “basically both the same”. She also listens to French music that her brother brought back with him from when the family lived in France. Elizabeth also reads French comic books. She explained that she finds them funny. She also enjoys mainly watching comedy films, saying that she prefers the ones that were made in France. Her appreciation of humour is discussed in more detail in section 4.3.2.1.

Elizabeth explained that her Mum wants her to begin reading French books, so recently she has started trying books from her brothers’ collections that they read when at school in France. She has a free choice over which books to read and if she doesn’t find one interesting she exchanges it for another. “I, like, picked them by myself and if I don’t like them I put them back and choose another one”.

**Gabriel – “I choose to read them for fun”**

Gabriel does a lot of bilingual activities at home, frequently on his own and by his own choice. He watches TV and DVDs in both French and English, and watches TV on the French TV channel.

When reading alone Gabriel chooses to read books in both French and English. He says:

Gabriel: I read two uh three books in English... Uh two books in English and all the rest were in French.

Interviewer: all the rest in French. The ones that you’re doing in English are they for school or do you choose to read them for fun?

Gabriel: I choose to read them for fun.

As this excerpt shows, Gabriel chooses both French and English books to read in his own time, even after such a short timeframe of learning English (just over one year). When asked why he chose to read *Harry Potter* in English, he said it was because the book was available in English sooner than in French. In this way he used his bilingualism to allow him to read a book he’s been awaiting earlier than he would have been able to if he only read books at home in French. Like Jamie’s experience
with rugby, Gabriel can use his bilingualism to his advantage when pursuing his interests out of school.

Gabriel also showed that he read educational books about French culture in his own time.

Gabriel: yeah, but I'm reading now, I'm reading a book about history
Interviewer: history. French history?
Gabriel: yeah
Interviewer: what sort of period of history is it talking about?
Gabriel: it's I don't know how to
Interviewer: how to say it in English?
Gabriel: yeah it's like
Interviewer: do you wanna say it in French?
Gabriel: Le Moyen Age, I don't know
Interviewer: oh the middle ages?
Gabriel: yeah

As this excerpt shows Gabriel is reading about cultural elements of French history that he does not feel able to express in English. However with a small amount of code-switching with the interviewer Gabriel is able to explain what the book is about. This interactional strategy assists the bilingual student to make himself understood.

Gabriel’s choice of educational activities in his own time is further supported by his description of a DVD that he has recently rented:

Gabriel: uh I rented a film on Earth… like um
Interviewer: a documentary?
Gabriel: yeah a documentary about um green energy
Interviewer: ok
Gabriel: like solar energy
Interviewer: yeah?
Gabriel: and wind energy
Interviewer: Are they talking about what they’re using in France or the whole world?
Gabriel: talking about the whole world and France

The types of activity Gabriel is engaging in assist his cultural understandings about the French and English speaking world and also involve exposure to additional literacy practices to those he experiences at school.
The Other Students’ Experiences of Participating in Activities in Two Languages

The activities outlined by the four remaining students are presented in the table below.

Table 22: Interview Results – Participating in Activities in Two Languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Language Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antonia</td>
<td>Antonia predominantly uses speaking and listening skills at home with her grandmother in Italian and with her father in French, she does not indicate many individual activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Megan, in spite of having no family contact with French, nevertheless attempts to have contact with French in her own time out of school. She says she sometimes reads a French magazine that her brother brings home from high school. When asked how much of it she understands she replied: “Yeah bits and pieces but not the whole thing”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genevieve</td>
<td>Genevieve also mentions reading comic books in her time at home in French and also watching the French cable channel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Matt does not choose to connect as much with French activities as some of the other students. He might sometimes read a French comic but usually given a choice of reading in French or English he would choose English. He does not usually play games or watch TV in French.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>As illustrated in the communication section Louis does not do many activities alone in German. However, he does read in German but does this by reading aloud to his father, who assists when Louis makes a mistake. This indicates home literacy practices taking place for Louis with his father. He, like Gabriel, has opportunities to extend his literacy practices beyond what is learnt in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students therefore show a number of different pictures of language use in terms of Communication with Family or Friends and also Participation in Activities in Two Languages. There are some common threads between the students’ stories as indicated in the following summary and discussion.

4.1.4 Discussion of Findings: Communication with Family or Friends and Participating in Activities in Two Languages

In this section the common themes and findings from each of the stories are further explained and discussed. Within the planned coding themes, a number of sub-themes have emerged. In this section the sub-themes are discussed.

In broad terms the theme of Communication with Family or Friends can be seen to encompass examples of the students’ interaction in two or more languages and also their socio-cultural connection to two or more languages. Similarly the theme of
Participating in Activities in Two Languages illustrates examples of the students' investment in knowing more than one language and also the ways in which they develop their socio-cultural connection to each language.

The accounts of language use begin to indicate the levels of socio-cultural connection that the students each have to the languages that they use in their daily lives. As can be seen from their accounts the students each show different levels of socio-cultural connection to the languages, through the people that they communicate with in the languages and the activities that they pursue in the languages.

The students show that they use different languages with different family members or different groups of friends and this illustrates one of the key components of their formation of a bilingual identity. A number of the students' stories indicate that they speak one language with one parent and another with the other parent. In communicating with extended family and other generations there is also a notable amount of cases where the students converse with grandparents, aunts, uncles and cousins in a different language to the one they use with their siblings.

Some of the students indicate skill at using, selecting and manipulating language in their self-descriptions of language use. For example Gabriel shows how he manipulates interactions to suit the other participants in the interaction (section 4.1.3.1). He selects the language to use in each interaction according to which language the other participant is most comfortable with. He specifically shows that if he is speaking French with friends and additional friends join the conversation who prefer to speak English then the conversation will switch to English.

In a further example, Jamie and his brother engage in teasing in French (section 4.1.3.1). Through this interaction a form of induction into the culture takes place. The older sibling uses language games to increase language use by the younger sibling and in this way assists the younger sibling to develop greater language skills and confidence, thus becoming more inducted into the culture.

The students' accounts of their language use also indicate that a number of the students have a high level of investment in their language learning and place a high
value upon speaking more than one language. This can be seen through the indications that a number of the students choose independently to pursue activities outside of the school that enable them to develop and practise their languages.

The evidence shows that given an open choice, a number of these young students select the language they do not use as much at school for home activities such as watching television, watching DVDs, reading and playing board games. It might be expected that student investment might be a reflection of overall family or parental valuing (and therefore investment in) language learning and bilingualism. However, several of the students indicate their autonomous thinking regarding their investment. For example Jamie indicates that he is fully aware of how important speaking French is to his mother and that he agrees with her point of view. He shows that this is, however, a considered opinion on his part by recounting that he sometimes teases his mother by pretending that languages are not important to him. Another supporting piece of evidence for autonomous investment in language learning is given by Megan who, despite having no family connection to French and therefore no family members with whom to practise her French, actively seeks out opportunities to practise her French at home through reading magazines.

In terms of this study’s framework the use of teasing and testing by siblings illustrates the increased amount of opportunity to practise language that older siblings are offering their younger siblings. This illustrates the investment section of the framework as the member of the culture (the older sibling) offers sufficient opportunity to the new member (the younger sibling) to practise their language. This leads to increased confidence and ultimately increased self-identification as bilingual and feeling of connection to the language.

Within the themes that reflect the framework elements, are sub-themes discussed in the following sections:

- Use of home literacy practices;
- Inter-generational communication
- Domains of language
- Using bilingualism as an advantage
- Negotiating understanding
- Siblings as teachers

4.1.4.1 Discussion of the Data: Use of Home Literacy Practices

The first sub-theme common between several of the stories is the use of home literacy practices. A network of tools is used actively by the students to access their languages and bilingualism outside of school. This is shown diagrammatically in Figure 18. The activities that a number of the students engage in at home indicate that a number of home literacy practices are taking place in these students’ bilingual homes. Even students whose homes are not bilingual – such as Megan – attempt to foster home literacy practices in the other language. In this way they show investment in developing their language skills and socio-cultural connection to two languages and different types of literacy. Thus the use of literacy and language in the home indicates development of identity associated with those languages.
Figure 18: The Network of Language Tools used in Students’ Homes

As the figure shows, the students in this study use a variety of resources to access their languages and bilingualism. They access language through activities that they undertake alone, such as reading books, magazines and comics and watching TV and DVDs; and also through activities that they undertake in interaction with other family members such as playing board games, reading together and watching TV together. In family interactive activities, more experienced speakers of the language assist the younger children with their language development and their development of an identity as a member of the language group (Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007; Gregory, 2005; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Volk, 1998).
In Kenner and Gregory's (2003) research about young students becoming biliterate they cite home language literacy being primarily developed for keeping in touch with relatives, maintaining links with the home language community and supporting cultural interests as well as for religious observance.

From the interviews with the students in this study there is evidence of each of these literacy practices apart from religious observance. The students show that through the development of their biliteracy skills they develop socio-cultural connection, they demonstrate their investment and they engage in interaction.

Almost all of the students with a family connection to the language state that they use the language to keep in touch with relatives. These students say that their extended families tend not to be able to speak English and so use of the home language is essential for staying in touch with parts of their families.

Many of the students support their cultural interests through reading. Louis explicitly indicates the home literacy practice he engages in – reading aloud with his Dad in German. Gabriel indicates supporting his cultural interests through watching documentaries. Elizabeth also watches movies and reads comics to connect with French humour. She explains that she finds French humour funny and this shows a way of supporting her interest in French culture. Jamie connects with the culture through watching the French news and watching sport in French. Megan and Matt read French magazines or comics to connect to the culture.

Kenner and Gregory's (2003) research into biliteracy practices cites work by Zentella (1997) that indicates the impact of technological change on literacy. This observation is supported by the interview data from these students. An example of such changes in technology is the method used to stay in touch with the family members living in other countries. Speaking over the computer using programs such as Skype is cited by the students in this current study as a common method of contact with family members in other countries. Zentella also indicates that literacy is influenced by the accessibility of cable and satellite TV (1997). Most of the students interviewed in this study said they watched the cable French TV channel and others used DVDs to connect with the language they used at home. As Kenner and Gregory write:
These multilingual media possibilities in an otherwise English-dominated world, may help in motivating children to develop their other languages and literacies. (2003, p180)

Indeed this appears to be the case for Megan who has no home contact with French. She uses her older brother’s magazines to try to connect with French at home. This indicates the use of her initiative to access language at home. Improved possibilities for access to satellite TV or other media in French would help Megan to continue her development of French language and literacy. Her use of initiative indicates her investment in the language.

There is also clear evidence of bilingual home literacy practices indicated in the questionnaire results. The reports by the students of bilingual storytelling and game playing with their family members indicate that biliteracy practices take place in a number of these students’ home lives.

Another indication from the questionnaire results is that a number of students report that they “think about things” in two languages. It is important that these bilingual thinking skills are capitalised upon, because as Datta (2007) points out: “By excluding children’s languages and cultures from classroom learning, we are excluding one of the most important issues in education, that is, to develop young children’s thinking skills” (p.14).

Datta points out the importance of students being able to use their literacy understandings from both home and school to be able to best develop strong thinking skills (Datta, 2007).

The second sub-theme common amongst the stories follows on from the use of home language literacy and builds upon the importance of developing the home language to keep in touch with relatives. The next section discusses the use of language with extended family or members of different generations.
4.1.4.2 Discussion of the Data: Inter-generational Communication

Several of the students explained that their extended family living in other countries do not speak English. In these cases the students feel a need to speak the family language in order to communicate fully with these relations. The relations mentioned by the students are grandparents, aunts, uncles and cousins. The students mentioned a need to speak with these family members over the phone or internet and also when they meet in person either in Australia or in the other country. The countries mentioned by students are France, Germany and Italy. This supports the *keeping in touch with relatives* aspect of Kenner and Gregory’s research (2003). The increased availability of technology has made it easier for people to communicate regularly and easily across the globe. As a result young bilingual children have the opportunity and also the need to converse with their extended family in other parts of the world.

For these students bilingualism is a necessity if they want to communicate with some family members. Therefore these students use their bilingual skills for interaction and socio-cultural connection. If they wish to maintain and develop family relationships they need the language skills to be able to do so. When older members of the family do not speak English these students can see a real and pressing need to learn their home background languages, this can potentially result in their investment in learning their languages.

For some students such as Antonia who are cared for by older members of the family, inter-generational communication is an everyday reality. The importance of grandparents as communicators with many bilingual children has been highlighted in some studies (Gregory, 2005; Gregory et al., 2007). In families from certain cultural backgrounds the importance of the role of grandparents in caring for and teaching young bilinguals is better recognised than others (Gregory et al., 2007; Ruby et al., 2007). Yet, in society today an increasing amount of grandparents play a ‘carer’ role for their grandchildren.

In a typical week one in five children (aged 11 and under) had spent some time in the care of grandparents in 2002, and grandparents provided almost a third of the total hours of child care. There were 22,500 families in which a grandparent (or grandparents) were
the primary carers of their grandchildren aged 0-17 years in 2003 (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2005).

In bilingual families this places an important linguistic role in the hands of grandparents. Even disregarding the role of grandparents as carers, grandparents are extremely important for passing on cultural knowledge to young bilingual children (Ruby et al., 2007). This was shown in particular by Antonia’s story. Genevieve also cited communication with her grandmother and a number of the students communicated with grandparents using the phone or internet phone.

4.1.4.3 Discussion of the Data: Domains of Language

Some students spoke of the differences between the ease and difficulty they feel in each of the four skills: speaking, understanding, reading and writing. A number of interviewees expressed how easy it is to understand French or the other language in their home lives but how hard it is to speak that language. Louis, Matt, Jamie and Antonia explicitly state that they find it easy to understand but sometimes hard to speak their language. This indicates the different levels of competence that bilinguals may have in different domains of each language (Baker, 2006; Blommaert, 2007).

Learners of a second language can benefit from a silent period or a period in which language learners focus upon the receptive skills of language before producing language (Krashen, 1981; Krashen, Terrell, Ehrman & Herzog, 1984). This may relate to students’ statements about finding it easier to understand their lesser-used languages than to speak them. Similarly, as Bialystok and Ryan argue, conversation can be a particularly demanding task for second language learners because it requires the fast and automatic retrieval of language (1985). Newer learners of the language can require more time to access and retrieve the language in conversation (Bialystok & Ryan, 1985).

These young bilingual students already speak their home language, but often will hear more complex conversations between older members of their family in which they find it difficult to participate. This may be because there is discrepancy between the types of language that they engage in at school compared to home, or may simply reflect the fact that their receptive skills are more advanced than their productive
skills in the language. It may also be influenced by the stories that several students tell of being spoken to by parents in French or other languages, but parents not insisting upon them responding in French. Genevieve explained that during the week she replies to her father in English because it requires more effort on her part to respond in French. At the weekend when she is less tired and has more opportunity to think clearly she responds to her father in French. Other students such as Jamie and Matt indicated that their French-speaking parent does not always insist upon them responding in French.

Granger (2004) investigates silence in second language learning and proposes that the silent period is more than a linguistic phenomenon. She argues that what takes place during this silent period is, in fact, a period of identity development where the language learner may be moving not only from one language to another, but also from one self to another (Granger, 2004). In this way, the description by these students of less use of spoken language than understood language could signify part of their process of identity development.

The students in the interviews and the questionnaire also cite reading in French and their other languages much more than writing in the language. Again there is a substantially higher level of exposure and practice in the receptive skill of reading than the productive skill of writing. This may reflect their skill levels, it also may indicate that their choices of pastimes favour reading over writing at home. Student attitudes to each of the skills are examined further in the second research sub-question (section 4.2).

4.1.4.4 Discussion of the Data: Using their Bilingualism as an Advantage

Several of the students show through their interviews that they use their bilingualism to their advantage in different ways. In this way, they capitalise upon their socio-cultural connection and their ability to interact bilingually. Firstly for pursuing their interests or hobbies out of school, the students use their different languages to access the best resources. For example Jamie uses his French to access the coverage of the rugby in French, which he finds superior to the coverage available on English-speaking channels.
In a similar way Gabriel uses his bilingualism to his advantage when he chooses to read *Harry Potter* in English rather than French because he is able to purchase it earlier in English. By using his language skills to read in English he is not delayed in reading the next instalment of the series. Gabriel also uses his languages to his advantage when he is with friends. To build relationships Gabriel uses the language that is most comfortable for his friends. When he is with other Francophone students he speaks in French. However, when he and his other French-speaking friends are also in a group with English speakers they all speak English so that all are comfortable. In this way Gabriel extends his social relationships further than if he spoke only French to those friends who understand it. Each of these findings is in line with findings that show students in multilingual learning environments using their language skills as a resource (Kirsch, 2006; Wells & Nicholls, 1985). Kirsch’s research indicates that students in Luxembourg did not see their languages as different systems but as resources that they could access in different ways (Kirsch, 2006). Wells and Nicholls (1985) introduce their collected works on language and learning by describing language as a resource that children need to use purposefully. In a similar manner several of the students in this study are able to use their language skills as a resource that they access in different ways in different settings.

In addition to using their bilingualism as an advantage, students also showed that they develop strategies to ensure that they understand their languages.

### 4.1.4.5 Discussion of the Data: Negotiating Understanding

Each of the examples of negotiation strategies shown by the students in this study are in keeping with Baker’s description of negotiation as something that aids smooth communication such as “feedback, corrections, exemplification, repetition, elaboration and simplification” (Baker, 2000, p. 210). In relation to this Genesee (1987) shows that negotiation of meaning is essential for students to understand and decode language and ultimately master language skills. Negotiation of understanding is also an important element within the BINF framework factor of interaction, and can also assist the development of socio-cultural connection for bilingual students.
Jamie, Louis and Antonia all speak explicitly about the negotiation strategies that they employ to either understand, or make themselves understood, in French, German and Italian (respectively). Jamie and his mother negotiate meaning between themselves as participants in an interaction and Jamie also uses his mother’s expertise as a resource when he is interacting with extended family. When Jamie has difficulty forming a sentence or making himself understood with his extended family he asks his mother for assistance. Further investigation directly observing this interaction would be needed to explore this type of interaction in more detail. However, Jamie’s description of this strategy may indicate one of the potential sources of development of de-coding skills attributed by some research to well-developed biliteracy skills (Bialystok, 2005; Cummins, 1979; Datta, 2007).

Louis explains his own linguistic strategy that he uses to make himself understood when he is in Germany or interacting with family who are in Germany. He explains the strategy he uses to formulate different ways of saying the same thing. If he cannot finish a sentence one way he works out another way to say it using different words and phrases. Thus Louis shows his autonomy, his use of linguistic strategies and his creative thinking to make himself understood. He has described several strategies that indicate development of biliteracy and the use of strategies to overcome a lack of linguistic control (Bialystok, 2005; Bialystok & Ryan, 1985; Cummins, 1979; Datta, 2007).

In a similar way Antonia and her grandmother developed negotiation strategies that enabled them to understand each other in Italian. They used gestures and different types of explanation in Italian to negotiate understanding. Louis and Antonia both show that they were able to negotiate meaning without the use of any English. Jamie used both languages to negotiate meaning. The use of various strategies by these students shows evidence of active understanding of meaning as Gee describes it (2003). Gee argues that “understanding meanings is an active affair” (Gee, 2003, p. 26). In order to negotiate meaning you must be an active member of the interaction and reflect on the experience that it relates to. In relation to this understanding of active meaning making, the students in this study illustrate that literacy is a social practice and in particular that biliteracy is a social practice enacted through interaction with family members.
The development of these skills forms part of their development of identity in conjunction with each language. As young people, these students’ siblings are important participants in their skill development. This is discussed in the following section.

4.1.4.6 Discussion of the Data: Siblings as Teachers

Siblings are increasingly acknowledged as important communicators in the lives of young bilingual children (Gregory, 2005; Volk, 1998). Siblings have been shown to provide important links between home and school language for each other. This has been shown through the use of play talk at home involving school scenarios and also the use of home language in school role-playing scenarios (Gregory, 2005).

In a similar manner, Volk (1998) has shown that older siblings use interactional games and teasing as a means of inducting their younger siblings into the linguistic community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Through teasing and testing the younger sibling older siblings assist them to practise the language and become more proficient in the language and in this way the younger sibling gradually becomes a more complete member of the culture (Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007; Lave & Wenger, 1991). In this way young bilinguals develop socio-cultural connection through their encounters with siblings. They also illustrate the interaction factor of their development of identity.

In this current study Jamie speaks about his brother teasing him in French, Jamie’s brother pretends he doesn’t understand Jamie’s use of French. In this way he prompts Jamie to repeat or re-try his sentence to make himself understood. This shows the use of teasing and testing as pointed out by Volk (1998) that assists young bilingual children to improve their language skills. Through play Jamie further develops his identity as a speaker of French.

Elizabeth also indicates that she predominantly speaks French with her brothers. They are the main source of access to the French language that she has at home as her parents do not speak as much French as them. In this way, for Elizabeth, her brothers
are the main source of induction into the French-speaking world and her means of developing an identity as a full member of that cultural group (Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007; Gregory, 2005; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Volk, 1998).

The questionnaire data show that 17.3% of interaction with siblings is bilingual or in French, where interaction with others is cited as in English. The interviews show that some students do not communicate bilingually with their siblings, some use more extensive bilingual communication and some use limited but complex interaction with their siblings. Thus siblings are a factor of differing importance for each individual depending upon the other sources of access to language that the students have.

In summary, language use in the questionnaire, journal and interview is shown to be varied. Access to language and use of language can be seen as factors affecting the socio-cultural connection, interaction and investment of these students and thus affecting their development of bilingual identity. The following question examines their attitudes towards their languages.
4.2 Qb: How do students view their languages (English, French and other languages)?

This question is addressed by data collected in the Language Attitudes section of the questionnaire and the interviews with students. In a similar manner to sub-question a, in sub-question b the questionnaire answers provide an overview of the attitudes of the students in the bilingual classes. Then the interviews provide in-depth detail about 9 students' attitudes towards English and French and also towards their other home languages. Firstly the questionnaire results are presented, then the interview results, and the discussion of the results follows this.

4.2.1 Presentation of Findings - Questionnaire Results

The theme within which the questionnaire addresses this research question is: Importance of French and English. This theme fits primarily within the socio-cultural connection and investment elements of the framework indicating student development of bilingual identity.

4.2.1.1 Importance of French and English

Overall the students view both English and French as being important languages to learn. Using SPSS15 to do a frequency count of the responses to the questions in this section of the questionnaire provided a clear way of viewing and comparing the results. The first two questions were:

How important is it to be able to speak French?
How important is it to be able to speak English?

The table below sets out the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important/ Important</th>
<th>Neither Important or Not Important</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speak French</td>
<td>60.8% (N=14)</td>
<td>30.4% (N=7)</td>
<td>4.3% (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English</td>
<td>100% (N=23)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the whole the students showed that they feel both languages are important to varying degrees. By plotting the frequencies in a bar chart (see Figure 19) it is clear to see that speaking English is seen by 95.6% (N=22) of the students to be important or very important (one student - 4.3% - did not respond). In comparison speaking French is seen by 60.8% (N=14) of the students as important or very important. Around 30% (N=7) responded neutrally, while 4.3% (N=1) found speaking French not very important. Notably none of the students said speaking French was Not Important At All.
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**Figure 19: Importance of Speaking French and English**

These results for children aged between 10 and 12 show quite strong support for the importance of speaking both languages. As the graph indicates more students find French important than English, but more students find English very important than French. The neutral responses of a number of the students can be seen to be related to French not being as important in their home lives as for other students. In order to examine the breakdown of home language within the levels of importance rated by students, the following charts (Figures 20 and 21) show the languages spoken with parents of the students. These charts indicate that for students who speak both English
and French with their parents, both English and French are predominantly *very important* or *important*. For students who speak languages other than English and French with their parents French is either *important* or *neutral* for them, and English is *important* or *very important*. Speaking English is seen to be *important* and *very important* by all students irrespective of the language spoken with parents.
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**Figure 20: Importance of Speaking English and Language Spoken with Parents**
Figure 21: Importance of Speaking French and Language Spoken with Parents

A very similar pattern of answering is seen in response to the subsequent questions asking about the importance of reading and writing in French and English. As Figures 22 and 23 show, reading and writing in French are believed predominantly to be important with some students finding French very important and some students responding neutrally or finding French not very important. As for the trend for speaking, reading in English is considered important or very important by all of the students. It can be seen that French is reported more highly than English in the important category, but that English is reported more highly in the very important category for reading (Figure 22). This pattern is similar in the writing graph (Figure 23), although more students rate writing in French as very important than did for reading. The same number of students find writing in English very important to the number reported for reading, but one student provides a neutral response for writing in English and two do not answer.
Figure 22: Importance of Reading French and English

Figure 23: Importance of Writing French and English
One noticeable trend, which is later supported in the interview data, is the response to the following two questions:

*How important is it to be able to understand French?*
*How important is it to be able to understand English?*

**Table 24: Importance of Understanding French and English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important/ Important</th>
<th>Neither Important or Not Important</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand French</td>
<td>78.3% (N=18)</td>
<td>17.3% (N=4)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.3% (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand English</td>
<td>95.7% (N=22)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.3% (N=1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table and Figure 24 show that understanding French is seen to be important. It is notable that no students responded that understanding was *not very important*, even though some felt speaking (4.3%/N=1), reading (13%/N=3) and writing (17.3%/N=4) in French were *not very important*.

![Graph showing importance of understanding French and English](image-url)
It appears therefore that being able to understand French is much more important than being able to speak, read or write it for the majority of these students, with the order of importance being: understanding (considered here to equate to the macro skill of listening), speaking, reading, and writing. This may reflect the way in which they use the language in their home lives, with some students using the language to communicate with one parent or with extended family. In some cases the parent or family member speaks in French, but the student response can be negotiated between the student and family member, thus making speaking the language slightly less important than understanding it. The interview data show that a number of the students have developed strategies for making themselves understood when not knowing all the words to form a sentence, and many students feel they don’t speak the language very well (in their opinion) yet understanding it is very easy. This may relate to their valuing of the importance of each skill.

The importance of understanding French in comparison to the other three macro skills (speaking, reading and writing) may also be related to the way in which communication in the classroom occurs, especially for the students who do not use French out of school. The communication patterns in the bilingual classes are such that understanding French is important to be able to participate fully in class activities. However, student response in French is not always insisted upon and as responses can be negotiated in French or English or partly in each language these students may place a higher value upon understanding French than upon speaking, reading and writing in French.

The students who speak French at home are involved in Francophone classes in which all communication takes place in French by the teacher and the students. The students who participate in these classes and also use French at home are therefore likely to value speaking French more than the students in the bilingual program because these students have a double use for their skills: for understanding and communicating in the Francophone classroom and for communicating with family or friends.

The students overwhelmingly find reading, writing and understanding English to be very important or important (95.7%/N=22 for reading, writing and understanding).
One student did not respond to the question about English importance, however, none of the students responded either neutrally or with either of the two negative responses.

In light of these first 8 questions showing the students find the four skills in English more important than French, the students’ responses to question 9 are especially interesting. As Molyneux (2005) explained the design of this question he indicated that this question focuses upon the students’ opinions about learning in each of the languages in contrast to the earlier questions that focused upon the importance of having competence in each of the macro skills in each language. The students were asked to select the one response they agreed with from four options shown in Table 25.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 25: Responses to Relative Importance of French and English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning French is more important than learning English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English is more important than learning French.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both English and French are equally important to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither English nor French are important to learn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This result indicates that ideologically the majority of the students find that both languages are equally important to learn. In comparison it appears that the students may value competence in the individual skills in each language according to their practical usefulness or for their envisaged usefulness in the future. The interview results about the students valuing of the languages can therefore offer more insight into the student’s views beyond the more general questionnaire responses.

4.2.2 Presentation of Findings - Interview Results

Question b: **How do the students view their languages?** can be answered by student interview responses that fitted into the coding themes: *Feelings About Two Languages*, and also *Future Benefits of Two Languages*. Within the theme of *Feelings About Two Languages* are the comments made by the students about English and French and their opinions about those languages, and also about other languages in the students’ lives. In some cases students made comments about more than two languages showing a multi-faceted linguistic background. In other cases students
referred to two languages such as Portuguese and English, or German and English, and for these students French featured less prominently in their lives. As each student's view of languages is different, their responses are presented as separate stories within each of the themes. These stories expand upon the questionnaire results and indicate a more complex picture of these students' feelings and attitudes towards their languages.

4.2.2.1 Feelings about Two Languages

The interviews produced results under the theme of *Feelings about two languages*. The students told their stories relating to French and English and the other languages in their lives. The stories of Jamie, Elizabeth, Olivier, Gabriel, Megan, Genevieve, Mat, Louis and Antonia are presented below.

*Jamie – “It’s pretty easy”*

Jamie expressed pride and enjoyment at being able to speak two languages. When asked how he felt about speaking French he said “I like it”. He said that he felt more comfortable speaking English and when asked how he feels when he speaks French he answered: “confident that I can, that I if I come along a French person I can speak to them fluently, you know”.

Jamie visits France quite often to see the French side of his family. He says he enjoys visiting and speaking to his cousins there. Jamie also describes watching French TV. He says he sometimes enjoys it depending on what is on the TV. He also describes doing his homework in French as being “pretty easy”.

*Elizabeth – “It makes me feel, like, lucky”*

Elizabeth spent some of her childhood in France, with parents that speak mostly English. When she was asked how she felt about speaking two languages Elizabeth said:

Elizabeth: I thought that it was good to be able to speak two languages.
Interviewer: Why do you think that it's good?
Elizabeth: so that I can, like, I don't know so that I can sort of, like, communicate with different people
Elizabeth has been in situations where using both English and French have been important as tools to communicate with people and so she expresses the importance of being good at two languages. For Elizabeth going to school in France provided her with access to learning French at a young age and her parents helped Elizabeth to develop her English.

When questioned further about her feelings about speaking two languages Elizabeth responded positively:

well it like makes me feel sort of, like, smart but, like, ...still it makes me feel, like, lucky and everything, like, being able to know two languages and I can speak them both as well [as each other]

Elizabeth feels lucky to be able to speak two languages and feels that it makes her clever. She shows that she knows that not all children her age can speak two languages and she is proud to be able to. When she was asked whether she feels more comfortable speaking French or English she said she feels the same in both languages.

Elizabeth reads books in English and French, but says that she would probably choose English over French because it's a bit easier. However, she does see the benefit of reading in French because it helps her to maintain her language skills. She said:

well it's, like, pretty interesting like the words that I've forgotten that come back into my head...so yeah I've started enjoying it now.

For her reading is a strategy for maintaining and remembering language that she otherwise does not get to practice. The more she remembers the more she enjoys reading in French. Alongside maintaining her language she becomes increasingly motivated to read more in French.

When Elizabeth was asked what it means to her to speak French and English, she reiterated some of the positive aspects mentioned previously saying:
well I feel, like, proud to know, like, two different languages that I can speak both pretty well and I think it’s, like, a good thing, like, not a bad thing.

In two separate sections of the interview Elizabeth spoke about being able to speak both languages as well as each other. This seems to be a source of pride for her and something that she feels is special. In spite of not explicitly describing herself as bilingual in this section of the interview, Elizabeth’s description of herself as equally proficient in both languages indicates that she sees herself as a functional bilingual (Baetens Beardsmore, 1982). In order to clarify whether Elizabeth saw herself as bilingual, she was asked in a latter section of the interview whether she would call herself bilingual and she confirmed that she would.

When asked if she would continue to speak both languages as she gets older she responded that she would like to, although she doesn’t think she would go back to live in France. Her desire to stay in Australia is mainly because she likes the street she lives in here in Australia more than where she lived in France because there are more children her own age to play with.

*Olivier – “It’s pretty cool”*

Olivier is less forthcoming in his responses than Elizabeth. However, using less words he still expresses ease at speaking two languages and a positive attitude towards speaking two languages.

When asked how he feels speaking French to his mother he responds “It’s easy mostly”. In answer to a question about how he feels being able to speak two languages he responds “it’s pretty cool”.

Olivier says he feels comfortable speaking both English and French but that English is easier “cos I speak mostly English and I was born here”.

While Olivier provided comparatively less-detailed responses in comparison with the other respondents, he nonetheless expresses that it is easy and comfortable to speak two languages and gives a positive response to how he feels about speaking two languages.
Gabriel – “I could help translate”

Gabriel is a much more outspoken student. He has been in Australia and learning English just over a year and yet chooses to answer the interview questions in English and does so with detailed, clear responses.

When he was asked whether he felt going to a school that speaks two languages made it easier coming to Australia he responds “yeah cos it’s Francophones cos they can help you understand”. So he felt able to use the other French-speaking students’ skills as a tool to help him understand everything taking place in the classroom.

Gabriel’s description of the activities that he takes part in at home in both French and English indicate a positive attitude towards both languages. By saying that he chooses to read for fun, it is indicated that his choice to read books and watch DVDs in English and French is due to his own investment in using both languages at home (Norton, 2000). Gabriel communicates with his family in French, but still connects with English literacy at home.

Gabriel also chooses to learn more about French culture of his own accord. His reported viewing of documentaries about current issues in France (such as green energy) indicates motivation to connect with French culture on a deeper level than he may be able to at school. This indicates a positive attitude towards learning both the language and the culture of his home country and further shows his individual investment (Norton, 2000).

He shows a positive view of speaking two languages by outlining that he thinks he could translate for people especially when he is in France because people there do not speak much English. He thinks that would be a useful skill to possess.

Megan – “You feel a bit special”

Megan is also quite outspoken about her languages. She has been in the bilingual program since Kindergarten, but speaks only English to her family. They do not have a background connection to French, yet Megan places a high importance on speaking
French. When asked if learning in two languages is something that other schools should do Megan says:

yeah it'd be great because you know it’s always better learning another thing, you can you know, just different, good.

In response to a follow-up question about whether it matters what language is taught she said “it’s good learning other culture and other languages and stuff.” She expresses the opinion that the language chosen doesn’t really matter, that it is good to learn about any other culture or language.

Megan was asked how she feels about learning French and she responded:

Megan: yeah French is like good. Cos you like can speak more than one language and you feel a bit special.
Interviewer: How does it make you feel special?
Megan: um I guess, like, it means you have something, which most others don’t

Megan realises that speaking two languages gives her a skill that a lot of other Australian students don’t have. She sees this as something special and important.

Megan has this positive attitude towards speaking French even though she doesn’t feel as competent at French as some people. When asked if she feels as comfortable speaking French as she does in English she replies: “no not really. I know more English and French is not my best.” This question was followed up with a question asking whether she enjoys speaking French and she replies: “yeah I like speaking French.” (student’s own emphasis).

Although Megan does not feel that her French is as good as her English, she nonetheless shows enjoyment and pride at speaking some French.

*Genevieve – “speaking more than two languages is a gift”*
Genevieve speaks both French and English at home and expresses enjoyment at learning and understanding the differences between French and English. She places a
high value on both of her languages. When asked what she thinks about learning French she says:

um it’s fun … learning the language is very different to English cos they’ve got all sorts of, like, vocabulary and things like that…it’s completely different

Genevieve’s description of enjoying learning the differences between the two languages indicates a deeper level of understanding and interest in both languages than shown by the other students. She shows that she notices the differences between the languages and is able to make comparisons and connections between the two languages that she speaks. Her indication that it is fun to learn these differences shows a positive attitude to both languages and a positive attitude to learning. This supports the findings of a pilot study in Victoria involving primary school students in a bilingual Hebrew/English program. These students showed an understanding of the literacy differences between the two languages and were able to explain linguistic differences between the two languages (de Courcy, 2006). In this study it indicates that Genevieve is working towards achieving some of the outcomes from the high school French syllabus (Board of Studies, 2003).

When asked if she thinks that speaking two languages is something that would be to her advantage Genevieve responded: “yeah I’d take advantage of that. Speaking more than two languages is a, a gift I guess”.

This response that speaking two languages is a gift shows what a high value Genevieve places upon this skill. She clearly feels that not everyone has the ability to speak more than one language and that it is a skill she is lucky to have.

Genevieve is pleased that other students in the school learn French even if they don’t find it easy or don’t have a connection to France themselves. She says “yeah, it’s good even if they don’t understand I like that they learn it still”.

This indicates that the level of intercultural understanding that other students might gain from language learning helps this French-speaking student to feel more comfortable in the school environment. This is a point that is later echoed in
Antonia’s interview that she finds it good to know that other students value languages and speak other languages at home.

**Matt – “You can, like, keep secrets”**

Matt has a mixed reaction to speaking French. When asked what he thinks about speaking French he says that he thinks it is good and that he would like to use it in his future career in Europe. However, Matt expresses quite a lot of difficulty with French having decided to drop the Francophone immersion classes and just attend the bilingual lessons. He says that he finds the bilingual lessons hard. He can, however, see a fun aspect to speaking two languages. When asked what is the best thing about speaking two languages with his family he responded “um so you can like keep secrets. You can speak French.” He says that the worst thing about speaking two languages is that it is hard. For Matt it is difficult for him to express a high level of enjoyment or appreciation for the language because of the level of difficulty he has with learning the language.

**Louis – “That’s the language that I speak, like, every day”**

Louis speaks German and English at home and also learns in the French bilingual classes. He expresses positive attitudes towards all three languages. He supports a point made by several students that it is easy to understand their home language but sometimes hard to speak or express oneself fully in that language. Louis explains how he felt speaking German in Germany: “mmm sometimes a bit hard cos I didn’t know many words, but kind of easy to understand them”.

He reiterates this point when he is asked about how he feels when speaking German over the phone to his relatives, saying: “like to understand it’s easy but sometimes like speaking I can’t get the words right and stuff”.

Louis was asked how he feels when he speaks English and German and he says he feels the same speaking both. He said that he is more confident in English though: “I feel more confident speaking in English cos that’s my, that’s the language that I speak, like, every day”.
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The way that Louis describes his languages in this extract, illustrates the complexity of the relationships that bilingual students have with their languages (Block, 2003; Garcia, 2007). Louis seems as though he might refer to English as his “first” language, but he stops himself after he says “cos that’s my” and then continues his sentence with a re-phrasing to call it “the language that I speak, like, every day”. This supports a point raised by Garcia (2007) that the terms “first language” and “second language” do not adequately describe what the positioning of their languages mean to bilingual students. Young bilinguals do not necessarily learn their languages in a consecutive order as “first” and “second” implies and, in fact, they may have learnt two or more languages from birth. Louis’ description of English as the language that he speaks everyday does not place his languages in the same hierarchy as the terms “first” and “second” would. He instead makes reference to the frequency with which he speaks each language.

When asked what is the best thing about speaking two languages at home, Louis makes a point similar to the one made by Matt in his interview, that it is a fun way to keep secrets. Louis said:

\[ \text{um probably, like, when there are other people over at your house and you want to speak to your brother and sister and you can speak to them in German and they won’t understand} \]

Louis was asked about his feelings towards French as well as German and he responded: “yeah I enjoy it and it’s kinda hard cos I don’t know much”. French is harder for him than German because he speaks German everyday at home with his father. However he says that he does enjoy it even if it is challenging. This shows that he has a positive attitude towards all three languages.

\textit{Antonia – “They speak, like, all these really cool languages”}

Antonia expresses pride in speaking Italian. She describes that she feel it is important within her family and it’s important to speak Italian to be able to communicate with family members. She does, however, show that it can sometimes be frustrating in the French class when she thinks of an Italian word instead of a French one:
it's like how I said before it's just annoying when I'm doing like French tests because I was doing this French test and I did, like, half the answers in Italian and she was, like, 'well what are these' and I was, like, 'oh they're Italian'.

Antonia found it easy going to Italian classes because she realised that the things she was being taught were words and phrases that she already knew:

and I did go to Italian lessons for one year but it wasn't they weren't really teaching me anything they were teaching me things that my Nonna always says to me (student's own emphasis)

She indicated a level of pride in finding that she already knew a lot of what was being taught. Through anecdotal evidence from Antonia's teacher it was indicated that she has some difficulties in certain learning areas at school. The ability that Antonia has in Italian may therefore be a strong source of pride in her abilities that she does not feel in other academic areas.

Antonia said she feels the same when she is speaking in English and Italian and she likes knowing that her friends and other students at school also speak other languages:

all my friends ... they speak, like, all these really cool languages ... it's just so much better to know that other people speak other languages not just me

It is good for her to know that speaking another language, while making her different from some children, does not make her different to a lot of others who also speak another language. The words "not just me" show that she would not like to be the only one who has this different aspect to their language skills at home. It gives Antonia more confidence knowing that other people speak more than one language.

Antonia thinks that the best thing about speaking three languages is being able to communicate with her family. She shows a value for speaking both Italian and French in her home life. She says:
well my dad and my mum they both know Italian and my Nonna knows Italian and my dad knows French and my cousins know a little bit of French and my sister knows French and my my family overseas know French and Italian as well, so it’s just an advantage if I wanted to speak to them.

In Summary
The students spoke about the ways that they feel about each of their languages. Many of them express positive attitudes towards speaking more than one language. There is a common theme of pride in bilingualism with the students using words such as gift, lucky, special, proud, cool etc to refer to knowing two languages. This is discussed further after the results for the second theme are presented.

4.2.2.2 Future Benefits of Two Languages
The other theme that arises in the interviews that demonstrates the students’ attitudes towards two languages is the theme of the future benefits of knowing two languages. Many of the students mention their future lives in terms of travel or jobs that would benefit from knowledge of another language. Some students also show a definite plan to continue learning languages at high school. In this theme the students’ stories are presented together as their stories were less detailed compared to the previous theme.

4.2.2.2.1 Future Career and Future Study
Jamie plans to become a rugby player. He said that the best world junior player at the time of the interview is from France. Jamie is in year 5 at the time of the interview and plans to continue learning French when he goes to the high school. He said:

yeah um, my brother does [extension French in high school] and he says it’s easy... it’s easy, not as easy as the French the Anglophones people do, it’s a bit harder.

This comment shows that he plans to go into the accelerated French class at the local high school where there is a stream for the students who have been through the bilingual program. This stream takes the students through to a higher level more quickly than the students who have no prior knowledge of French, and enables them to take exams early.
Like Jamie, Matt wants to become a professional sports player when he is older. Matt's father has been a successful sportsman in France and Matt wants to follow in his father's footsteps. He says "um I wanna be a soccer player and if I go to France to play um I can, like, speak French". When asked about learning French in high school Matt points out the importance of parental opinion in this choice. He says he will probably continue with French in high school because "well I like it a bit and plus my Mum would want me to." His mother is French and her opinion is clearly an important factor for Matt. The importance of parental opinion in influencing young students' attitudes to bilingualism has been shown in prior research (Molyneux, 2006; Pease-Alvarez, 2003; Tannenbaum & Howie, 2002; Weisskirch & Alatorre Alva, 2002).

Antonia also acknowledges the importance of parental opinion upon selecting whether to continue learning languages at high school level. She said:

uh well, I have to sort of cos of my dad but I can choose to do more or less but I'm definitely going to do French just not, like, the bilingual level

Antonia will continue with French because it is very important to her father. Although she will continue to learn French it will not be at the accelerated level offered at the local high school. Antonia shows that she also sees language as beneficial for future travel:

my sister told me that she would definitely take me overseas and my dad said that to me as well... yeah but I really wanna go to Canada

Other students also think that they will need their language skills in the future when they travel. Gabriel thinks that it is quite likely he will return to France and he says that the skills he is learning in English will be useful back in France. He said: "I think cos people in France they don't really know how to speak English so I could help translate".

Gabriel can see that his bilingualism could be a useful and practical skill for him to use in France. In terms of her future plans, Megan thinks she will go into the
extension stream for French at the local high school because her brother has and he does not find it too difficult. Megan also thinks that French might be useful in her future career. She plans to be a photographer and thinks that language might be a useful skill for travel.

Genevieve also sees the future benefits of language for a future career. She says:

It’s good to have more than one language because um you can you can get more jobs later on in life ... I like it

When asked if she’ll continue to learn languages at high school, Genevieve again links school study to her future career. She says:

yeah French um, more than two languages opens up your choices of jobs, you could have a job in France and in Australia as well as other countries like um Canada, Quebec, um things like that, so it’s not just France you could get a job in other countries as well.

Genevieve quite clearly shows that she thinks there is a possibility that she will work in other countries in her future. She sees her language skills as beneficial in opening up more opportunities for her as an adult.

4.2.3 Discussion of Findings

The students’ responses relating to the second research sub-question show the students’ evidence of the elements of the theoretical framework. The themes evident from the data presented in this research question show particular links to the investment and socio-cultural connection elements of the framework. The questionnaire theme of Importance of French and English shows the level of investment that students feel towards their languages. Through this investigation of the importance of each language and culture to the students it is also possible to see the students’ indications of socio-cultural connection to each language and culture. The results show that the students predominantly find two cultures to be equally important, thus they show strong indications of connection to both cultures.
From the interview data the theme *Feelings About Two Languages* links closely to the **socio-cultural connection** element of the framework. Antonia specifically shows that knowledge of language and culture is important in order to feel connected to her family. Louis indicates his connection to both languages and cultures through his avoidance of the terms “1st language” and “2nd language” and his use, instead, of the phrase “the language that I use everyday”.

The theme *Future Benefits of Two Languages* indicates the **investment** that students have in knowing and learning each language. This is indicated through the importance they place upon these languages in their future lives.

The students indicate how important it is to them, and therefore, how invested they are in being able to speak their other languages to extended family members. The students also show a more immediate investment in using both French and English within school. For these students the need to be able to understand what is happening in the classroom also leads to a level of investment in learning French in particular.

The results indicate that both interaction and socio-cultural connection are also important factors for these students. The students indicate that speaking both French and English is important to many of them and that they feel special by being connected to more than one language.

The coding themes derived from the framework within which the findings have been presented are: *Importance of French and English, Feelings About Two Languages,* and also *Future Benefits of Two Languages*. These themes indicate students’ socio-cultural connection to the languages, the importance of the languages to them for their interactions and, related to this, their investment in the languages. Within the themes *Importance of French and English* and *Feelings About Two Languages* a number of key sub-themes are evident. These are discussed in the following sections. The sub-themes are:

- Importance of different skills
- Positive and negative aspects of learning two languages
- Different terminology.
Future Benefits of Two Languages remains one theme without any sub-sections.

4.2.3.1 Discussion of the Data: Importance of Different Skills

The questionnaire shows that the students in the whole class view both English and French as being important to learn. The students clearly see the benefit of learning English but also see that learning certain skills in French is also important. In terms of the skills in French, understanding is seen to be the most important skill to have. This reflects some of the contextual factors in the school and home settings of the participants. Firstly it reflects the nature of the school bilingual program that emphasises the need for students to understand the French teacher in the bilingual lessons, but does not enforce responses in French. Secondly it reflects the nature of a number of the students’ home lives in which one parent speaks French while the other speaks English. Some of these parents were found to not insist upon the students responding to them in French, even if they spoke to the child in French. In this way, understanding the language is more important than speaking in more than one setting.

The other skills of reading and writing in French may be valued less because there is less scope to practise them in the school and home environments. In the school environment French literacy is beginning to be emphasised more in the stage three program, but this emphasis is in the early stages of development. The graded reading program has been in place for a longer period of time, but writing is just beginning to receive more focus in the school.

In the home environment students had access to varying degrees of home literacy exposure in French. Some students read, watched TV, watched DVDs and listened to music in French, whereas other students only did this in English. In could be expected that those students with access to literacy in French in the home would be likely to also be those students who valued reading and writing in French most highly. Although students who used French with parents at home did also select the very important options for reading and writing in French, so too did some students who used only English at home. In this way students indicated investment in both languages irrespective of language use at home.
4.2.3.2 Discussion of the Data: Positive and Negative Aspects of Learning Two Languages

The results from the interviews showed that the students all express positive attitudes towards knowing two languages. A few students mentioned some negative aspects but also mentioned positive ones. When asked how they feel about speaking two languages students used terms such as: easy, confident, lucky, fun, cool, good, smart, interesting, proud and special. These terms indicate the high value that is attached to two languages consistently throughout each student’s story. The terms the students have used are certainly not neutral. The terms they have used show a level of belief amongst these students that they are privileged in some way by knowing two languages. There is a level of awareness that this is not “the norm” in Australia, shown by the terms such as: special, lucky and interesting. The students’ descriptions illustrate their socio-cultural connection to their languages.

The students indicated that they feel more confident about speaking two languages when they know that other students do too. The students felt more comfortable with the idea that they have this extra skill when they are in an environment where other students have similar skills, even if those skills are in different languages. The students also showed that they feel happier knowing that other students who are monolingual at home are trying to learn another language. This makes them feel less different and more at ease with their linguistic repertoires.

Research has indicated that in multilingual learning contexts student confidence with language is closely related to their use of language, and that this in turn is influenced by the formal language learning setting that they experience in school (Kirsch, 2006). In line with this research, the students in this study indicated in the interviews that by knowing that others in the school environment value languages and speak other languages they felt more confident and comfortable about their own linguistic skills.

The students used various words to express the positive feelings they have towards speaking two languages. The terms expressed by several students and repeated several times throughout the interviews were: lucky, special and proud. The students indicated awareness that their linguistic skills are different to the average Australian student, and they viewed this in a positive way seeing their skills as something special
that they felt proud of. Pride is a theme that was also noted in Molyneux’s (2004) study that found that students learning bilingually felt the learning setting helped them to develop pride in both their family background and being Australian. Thus this study’s findings support Molyneux’s assertion that bilingual education supports students in feeling proud of their language skills (2004).

The girls in this study express broader reasons behind their attitudes to the languages, with the boys making more practical links between their languages and the potential usefulness of these languages for them in the future. The girls express their pride and pleasure in speaking two languages with less of a link shown between that pride and the practical usefulness of language. The girls speak of the skills that they have being different to other children and therefore something special. Several of the girls make comments that indicate that general appreciation of languages in the school community around them makes them feel more comfortable about their languages.

This indication of the girls’ more broadly expressed connection to their languages reflects the findings of studies that have examined boys and their lower levels of connection to languages (Carr, 2002; Pav, 2006). Studies have shown that in order to be motivated towards languages boys need to experience a practical application of the usefulness of that language in their out-of-school lives (Carr, 2002). An extension of this can be seen in this study where the boys who expressed their positive attitudes to languages also indicated regular connection with the language in their home lives. For example, Jamie and Gabriel indicated speaking to family members regularly in their languages and also expressed positive attitudes towards their languages and bilingualism. The boys who expressed more tension and conflict regarding their languages also indicated lower levels of contact with the languages in their home lives. For example, Matt, who described himself having difficulty with French at school, also indicated lower levels of use of French at home, even though his mother is a native-speaker of French. However, Matt and Jamie, who showed differing responses to French, both spoke about future careers in which French would be useful.

Other research indicates that the difference in attitudes to languages between boys and girls may be related to gendered ideas of vocational value (Oliver et al., 2005). This
assertion also fits well with the findings in this study as Genevieve, Megan, Jamie and Matt expressed opinions that French would be useful to their future careers. Jamie and Matt had a specific career in mind and this fits with the assertion that Carr (2002) makes – that boys must see a practical and tangible use for their French. The boys can envisage a particular career choice that French will be useful for, while Genevieve and Megan have less precise notions of French being useful in general for career prospects.

Some students indicated the importance of maintaining their language skills. Students who had lived in France in the past saw the benefits of learning in a bilingual setting for their language maintenance and expressed pleasure in regaining some of the skills and vocabulary that they had lost in the intervening time.

The students explicitly cited the school program as a place that fosters their language maintenance. It was mentioned that a benefit of being in the school bilingual program is being able to maintain French language more easily and have regular contact with the language. As the literature shows, quality and quantity of exposure to both languages are extremely important in development of bilingualism (Baker, 2002).

Genevieve was quite explicit in her discussion of enjoying noticing the differences between her two languages. This reflects similar findings in another Australian study (de Courcy, 2006) and indicates that Genevieve is developing biliteracy skills that enable her to see and talk about the two languages in terms of their differences and similarities. The development of biliteracy skills is closely related to development of bilingual identity and therefore is an important factor that is shown by this student (Bialystok, 2002; Hamers & Blanc, 2000). She expresses metalinguistic understanding through her comparison of the two languages, and her description of her enjoyment of the process of comparing the languages. In this way her awareness of language may indicate part of her self-concept of bilingual identity.

Some of the student responses indicated some less positive feelings about speaking two languages. However, these were less common than the positive responses and some positive aspects were mentioned alongside the negative ones.
The students who indicated that they find language learning difficult at times were also heard referring to the benefits of being able to speak a 'secret' language. Two students who indicated some negative responses to their bilingualism – Louis and Matt – both referred to the benefits of being able to communicate secretly in front of other people. Louis had experienced some negative reactions to his German background in the past, yet he enjoyed being able to speak in 'code' to his siblings when other people were visiting their house. Matt also had some difficulty with his French and experienced frustration at not finding it easy to learn and maintain.

However, Louis and Matt also see that their bilingualism is a useful tool that they can use to their advantage when they want to talk secretly in front of other people. It is notable that two participants in separate individual interviews mentioned the usefulness of feeling able to speak in code and not be understood by other people. Thus these students exemplify the use of language as a resource (Kirsch, 2006). Louis and Matt use language as a resource to separate themselves from other people who do not speak their other language.

The students' use of an inclusive secret code appeared to be a positive aspect of bilingualism for students who mentioned both positive and negative feelings about their bilingualism. It is possible that these students view being able to speak in secret as a validation of their status as an 'insider' in this exclusive group. It enables them to feel confident in situations that they might otherwise find intimidating. If they are able to communicate with siblings or friends without being understood by others they feel safe, included and that they are capable of excluding others. It is possible that this assists them to feel positively about their languages when, at other times, they feel less confident or competent in their languages. Developing feelings as an 'insider' in such a way can be linked to the research about group and cultural membership where the ideas of insider and outsider status are discussed (Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007; Gregory, 2005; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Sapir, 1932; Volk, 1998). The previous literature emphasises the importance of feeling that you are a member or 'insider' in order to feel comfortable with a bilingual identity (Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007; Gregory, 2005; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Sapir, 1932; Volk, 1998). In this way, the students' use of an inclusive secret language may assist their feelings of socio-cultural connection and thus their development of bilingual identity.
Some students indicated tension in relation to their languages. For example, Antonia indicated that with having several languages that she uses and learns, she sometimes finds it frustrating when she accidentally uses the wrong language. At home she uses Italian and has found that sometimes in her schoolwork and in tests she answers questions in Italian instead of French without realising. Antonia herself and her teachers indicated that she has some learning difficulties in certain academic areas. It is possible that this adds an extra hurdle for her in learning and distinguishing between her languages. However, she expressed pride in speaking several languages and found a level of confidence in her abilities that appeared to counteract some of the negative feelings she had about her ability in other academic areas such as maths. As with some of the data from other students, this expression of pride in her linguistic abilities supports assertions made in other studies that involvement in bilingual education can assist bilingual students to feel proud of their linguistic connections (Molyneux, 2004). Antonia did not appear to have identity confusion which Baker (2002) describes as resulting from insufficient exposure to both (or all) languages involved in a bilingual’s experiences.

One student who reported speaking two languages for as long as he can remember (Louis) showed some evidence that the use of terms such as L1 and L2 or first and second language are not applicable to people such as him. He referred to his languages in terms of how much he uses each language on a daily basis. Thus he refers to quantity of daily use to distinguish between the languages rather than talking about the order in which the languages were learnt. For people who have learnt two languages simultaneously, language order is not relevant or applicable to their experience of languages and this student’s reference to quantity of use offers a different frame of reference for bilingual language distinction. In general, much literature uses the terms L1 and L2 or first, second and third languages. There is a small body of literature beginning to acknowledge that in bilingual and multilingual settings this frame of reference is not suitable (Block, 2007; Garcia, 2007). This student’s interview findings support this emerging literature. By expressing the equal importance of his two languages this student exhibits socio-cultural connection to both languages and indicates aspects of his bilingual identity.
4.2.3.3 Discussion of the Data: Future Benefits of Two Languages

Most of the students interviewed can see future benefits from the languages that they speak. It is possible that they are reiterating opinions first heard from their parents. However, the more detailed and complex responses from students such as Genevieve, Elizabeth and Gabriel indicate that the students are putting these ideas into their own words and are able to express their reasoning behind the comments that they make. It is notable that a number of the future benefits that were mentioned relate to the more imminent high school benefits and the more commonly perceived relevance for future career. The finding that student perception of future benefits influences language attitudes reflects findings by Kirsch (2006), which indicate that students’ goals are influential in the way that they use language and access their language skills to suit their own needs. The students’ perceptions of the future benefits of their language skills thus influence the way that they connect with language now.

As indicated in the discussion of girls’ and boys’ attitudes to languages, the boys in this study who indicated stronger perceptions of the future value of their languages did so with specific future career ideas in mind. The girls spoke of future careers with less specificity and a more general concept of languages as useful career tools. This reflects findings in the literature about language learning that indicates the need for boys to have more tangible ideas about the use of a language in their future in comparison with girls (Carr, 2002).

Although the positive attitudes that a number of these students have towards future usefulness of languages could be strongly influenced by the views that they have heard their parents and other family members expressing, it is also clear that learning in a supportive environment that welcomes different languages and cultures also plays a role in students’ positive attitudes. The students specifically identify the role of the school in making them feel more comfortable with their languages. This reflects the evidence from a number of studies that show the importance of supportive and empowering learning environments for students from all language backgrounds and the influence this has on student identity (Cummins, 1986, 2000, 2003).
4.3 Qc: How do students view bilingualism?

The results from the Bilingual Benefits section of the questionnaire answer question c. Following the pattern set in answering questions a and b the questionnaire answers provide an overview of the attitudes of the students in the bilingual classes and the interviews provide detail about 9 students’ attitudes. The discussion follows the presentation of findings. The findings are presented according to the coding categories that the questions were planned within.

4.3.1 Presentation of Findings - Questionnaire Results

The students’ responses to the Bilingual Benefits section of the questionnaire show a positive trend in their attitudes towards bilingualism and its benefits in their lives.

4.3.1.1 Enjoyment of Bilingualism

The two statements concerning Enjoyment of Bilingualism are:

I enjoy being able to do things in more than one language. (A)
I enjoy learning 2 languages. (B)

The table below shows the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly/Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree/Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>82.6% (N=19)</td>
<td>17.3% (N=4)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>65.2% (N=15)</td>
<td>21.7% (N=5)</td>
<td>13% (N=3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both of the statements received quite similar responses. In response to the first statement (A) none of the students responded with one of the two negative options and the neutral responses were small in number. 82.6% (N=19) agreed or agreed strongly that they enjoy being able to do things in more than one language, and 17.3% (N=4) responded neutrally.
In response to the second statement (B) the responses were slightly less positive. 65.2% (N=15) agreed or agreed strongly that they enjoy learning two languages, 13% (N=3) disagreed or disagreed strongly and 21.7% (N=5) responded neutrally.

The difference for the students between these two statements is that they can see the benefits of being able to do things in more than one language, but for some of the students the process of learning another language is not easy. For the students who find it challenging to learn a language, the process is not as enjoyable as the outcome. A further example of this dichotomy is shown through Matt’s story in the interview results.

4.3.1.2 Cognitive Benefits of Bilingualism

Statements 3, 4, 12 and 13 concern the cognitive benefits of bilingualism. The statements are:

Knowing 2 languages makes me clever. (A)
Knowing 2 languages helps me think better. (B)
Knowing 2 languages helps me succeed at school. (C)
Knowing 2 languages helps me understand the things I learn. (D)

Table 27: Student Agreement with Cognitive Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly/Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree/Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>56.5% (N=13)</td>
<td>39.1% (N=9)</td>
<td>4.3% (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>52.2% (N=12)</td>
<td>34.8% (N=8)</td>
<td>13% (N=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>78.3% (N=18)</td>
<td>8.7% (N=2)</td>
<td>13% (N=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>78.3% (N=18)</td>
<td>8.7% (N=2)</td>
<td>13% (N=3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to Knowing 2 languages makes me clever (A) over half of the students agreed that bilingualism makes them clever (see Table 27). However, over a third responded neutrally. Those who were later interviewed, for the most part, felt that being able to speak multiple languages did make them feel clever.

It is possible that the neutral results relating to cognitive benefits from the questionnaire indicate some of the complexities and challenges faced by these young
students in their understanding of what it is to be bilingual. In a similar manner to Molyneux’s (2005) study, some students appear to demonstrate tension or disparity regarding some of the notions. For students at this age the less abstract notions in the third and fourth statements are easier to respond to than the first two. The students see the benefits for their current lives in school but find it harder to respond to the more abstract notions of general cognitive benefit. The students’ ages may therefore make them unsure as to whether there are cognitive benefits for them, and may lead to neutral responses.

In response to the statement Knowing 2 languages helps me think better (B) a similar pattern was seen to the first statement. Over half the students agreed with the statement. Similarly again over a third were neutral and a small number disagreed strongly. The students may believe that learning two languages does not have cognitive benefits. An alternative interpretation may be that the students disagreeing strongly may be students finding the learning of French difficult, such as Matt or Antonia (shown in the interview results), or they may be students more recently introduced to the program. In anecdotal evidence the teachers indicated that some students were brought into the program quite recently as they had only enrolled at the school within the past year or so. These students may not yet be experiencing the benefits of the educational context that some of the other students value.

In response to the two remaining statements the students’ answers were more positive. The result of 78.3% of students agreeing that Knowing 2 languages helps me succeed at school (C) shows that the students see a benefit of bilingualism educationally. They are not simply seeing bilingualism as a means of communicating with different people. In a similar result Knowing 2 languages helps me understand the things I learn (D) received a high amount of students (78.3%/N=18) agreeing with the statement. The students can see a clear link between knowing two languages and doing well in that school setting.

4.3.1.3 Future Benefits of bilingualism
There was an overall level of agreement that there are future benefits from being bilingual (see Table 28 for results).
Knowing 2 languages might help me at secondary school (A)
Knowing 2 languages might help me get a good job (B)
Knowing 2 languages might help me if I visit other countries (C)

Table 28: Student Agreement with Future Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly/Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree/Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>82.6% (N=19)</td>
<td>8.7% (N=2)</td>
<td>8.7% (N=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>87% (N=20)</td>
<td>4.3% (N=1)</td>
<td>4.3% (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>95.6% (N=22)</td>
<td>4.3% (N=1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statement *Knowing 2 languages might help me at secondary school* (A) received mostly positive responses (82.6% / N=19). The responses to this statement indicate that at Stage 3 the students have a clear idea of what subjects they wish to pursue at secondary school. The students that disagreed may represent the students who said anecdotally that they wished to study another language at high school and were not able to do both. The 82.6% who agreed with the statement are quite likely to be going to the local high school that offers an advanced French program for the students who have been through the bilingual primary program. This accelerated program allows the students to advance in French more quickly and take exams earlier.

The statement *Knowing 2 languages might help me get a good job* (B) also received a strong response. This overall 87% agreement that knowing other languages can help with future career indicates the strong value that the students see their linguistic repertoire having in the future. For students at quite a young age to be thinking about their future careers shows quite a mature attitude amongst these students. This response is supported by the interview results.

The statement *Knowing 2 languages might help me if I visit other countries* (C) received an even stronger response. This almost unanimous agreement (95.6% / N=22) with the statement shows that the students see the value of being bilingual for future travel possibilities.
4.3.1.4 Communicative Benefits of Bilingualism

The communicative benefits of being bilingual were examined in the subsequent two statements. The results are set out in Table 29.

*Knowing 2 languages helps me communicate with my family and friends (A)*

*Knowing 2 languages helps me when I go to the shops, restaurants or other places (B)*

**Table 29: Student Agreement with Communicative Statements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly/Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree/Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>56.5% (N=13)</td>
<td>21.7% (N=5)</td>
<td>21.7% (N=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>34.8% (N=8)</td>
<td>30.4% (N=7)</td>
<td>34.8% (N=8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a mixed response to these two statements owing to the mixed nature of the background of the students in the program. Some of the students are from a French language background and some are in the program for enrichment purposes. The responses to the statement: *Knowing 2 languages helps me communicate with my family and friends* (A) reflect this.

Just over half of the students in the study see bilingualism as beneficial to their family and community communication (56.5%/ N=13), a smaller amount (21.7%/N=5) feel neutral about the communicative benefits and an equal amount (21.7%/N=5) feel bilingualism doesn’t benefit their family and community communication. The neutral responses included some students who use languages other than French and English at home as well as students who speak English or French only at home. The final 21.7% who disagreed with the statement comprised students with a monolingual home background in English who are in the program for its enrichment benefits. In this way the mixture of responses reflects the mixture of backgrounds that students in this program come from – both language maintenance and language enrichment are factors in this setting.
The statement *Knowing 2 languages helps me when I go to the shops, restaurants or other places* (B) was designed to gauge the ways in which the students use multiple languages in the wider community. The relatively equal three-way split between the responses to this statement indicates the different level of opportunity available to students to use their bilingualism in the wider community. This depends upon which language the students use out of school, with some home languages having a stronger presence in the community.

### 4.3.1.5 Benefits of Bilingualism for Socio-Cultural Connection

One statement directly relates to feelings of connection. The statement *Knowing 2 languages helps me feel proud of my connection to French* (A) received quite a positive response, taking into consideration the backgrounds of the students in the study with just over half agreeing or agreeing strongly (see Table 30).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly/Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree/Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>56.5% (N=13)</td>
<td>26.1% (N=6)</td>
<td>17.4% (N=4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For 56.5% (N=13) of the students to feel proud of their connection to French when only 34.7% (N=8) have family connection to that language is a strong response.

### 4.3.1.6 How Students Positioned Themselves on the Identity Continuum

The students were asked to mark a cross on a continuum to show how they viewed themselves in relation to being Australian or French or somewhere in between. The question is shown in Figure 25.

![Figure 25: Questionnaire Item from Language Attitudes Section](image)

Put a cross on the line below to show how you see yourself.

---

French                     Both Equally                     Australian
In response to this question 52.2% (N=12) placed their cross directly above the Australian statement. 17.4% (N=4) placed their cross directly above the Both Equally statement. 8.7% (N=2) placed their cross between the French and Both Equally statements, while 17.4% (N=4) placed their cross between the Australian and Both Equally statements. 4.3% (N=1) did not answer.

These diagrams were used as prompts for the interviews with the sub-sample of students. Their descriptions of their choices are shown in the following section.

4.3.2 Presentation of Findings - Interview Results

Two themes from the interviews contributed to answering question c: How do students view bilingualism? The themes are:

*Identity as Bilingual/Connection to Culture,* and

*Family Opinion of Bilingualism.*

The first theme incorporates comments made by the students referring to feeling bilingual and also ways in which they feel connected to each culture. These two ideas are presented together as they are closely linked in the ways that the students speak about each idea. The second theme presented incorporates the comments made by students about what their family think about being bilingual. As with the previous research questions the stories of each student are presented whereas the full picture would be distorted by segmentation.

4.3.2.1 Identity as Bilingual/Connection to Culture

In each interview the students were asked to describe how they felt they fitted along a spectrum of identity. The spectrum categories differed for each student according to their language experiences. The most common spectrum showed Australian at one end and French at the other (as shown in Figure 25 above). Students explained where they felt they fitted along that continuum. Other students with backgrounds in languages such as Italian or German replaced French or Australian with other cultures or languages they felt were appropriate. This question was prefaced by the question in the questionnaire.
Reference to this visual format of the question in the interview was intended to assist students to visualise what they were being asked to explain. The students then explained why they thought that they fitted in the position that they had chosen and this gave insight into the students’ thoughts of themselves as bilingual.

The students were also asked specifically if they thought they were bilingual. A number of the students believed that they needed to be equally proficient in both languages to be considered bilingual. In this way some students were using an interpretation of balanced bilingualism as their understanding of bilingualism. This idea has been contested in theoretical discussions (Romaine, 1995), but nevertheless is still viewed by some experts as an applicable definition of bilingualism.

In spite of the quite common interpretation amongst the students of bilingualism as balanced bilingualism some students felt strongly that they were bilingual and some felt strongly that they were partly French and partly Australian. Some students connected to cultures other than French or Australian, and their connection as bilingual in association with that culture(s) was examined.

The students described themselves as connected to different cultures in different ways and these connections help to paint a picture of the students’ bilingual identities. Each student’s story is different and so each is presented separately below.

**Jamie – “I’m both”**

Jamie feels strongly that he is both French and Australian. He feels connected to both cultures and to both languages.

Interviewer: So when I asked you in the questionnaire whether you feel French or Australian or somewhere in the middle and you marked a cross

Jamie: In the middle

Interviewer: In the middle? Can you explain why you put that?

Jamie: Oh, cos I um I’m both, cos I’ve got, um half is like completely French and then the other half is like a quarter Welsh, Scottish, English and all that
Jamie stated that he placed himself in the middle of the continuum because he is both French and Australian. He states this in a very matter of fact way as if it is something that is clear to him. Through his answer that he is half French and the other half of him is comprised of Welsh, Scottish and English he is showing that for him his identity is shaped by his family’s background. He sees that he has a family connection to these four cultures and that this makes him a part of each of those cultures.

Jamie said that he thinks that he is bilingual and when asked if speaking both English and French plays a part in him feeling bilingual he said that it does. This indicates that for Jamie language proficiency and quantity of use plays a part in his selection of his position as equally French and Australian. Perhaps if he did not speak as much French as he does then he might not feel such a strong connection to being half French.

Jamie also describes his connection to French culture through his enthusiasm for rugby. He sees the current World Junior player as a role model and since this player currently comes from France Jamie sees a possible future for himself in France following in this player’s footsteps. His future aspirations thus play a part in Jamie’s self-identification as bilingual.

Elizabeth – “It’s funny”
Elizabeth feels that she is partly French and partly English. She has not lived in Australia for as long as she lived in France and so she feels less attachment to being Australian. Elizabeth’s attachment to being English is associated with her parents both being from England and her attachment to being French stems from her use of the language and having lived there. When Elizabeth was asked to explain why she placed herself in the middle of the continuum with English at one end and French at the other she explained: “French and English are basically the most that I feel and Australian’s like sort of, like, new”.

As Elizabeth described in section 4.2 regarding her attitudes towards both languages, she feels proud to be able to speak both English and French and she thinks it is good to be able to speak more than one language.
Elizabeth has only been in Australia for two years and she has been at this school for all of that time. She explains that being in this school has helped her to adapt to life in Australia. She likes school here more than in France because it is not as strict. Elizabeth finds that her schooling is important for language maintenance and building up her proficiency in French now that she lives in Australia with English-speaking parents.

Elizabeth expressed her connection to French culture though her description of what she finds funny in French humour. She reads French comics and watches French movies because she likes the humour. She was asked to describe her understanding of French humour and whether she thinks that it is connected to understanding the culture of France. Her explanation shows that she thinks it is necessary to understand French culture to fully understand the French sense of humour. When talking about the comics that she reads she says the following:

Elizabeth: it's, like, about school and like the way he keeps on failing all of his tests and everything and it's funny
Interviewer: do you think the humour like the way it's funny, is that something that English or Australian people would also find funny or is it something that you sort of have to know France to find funny? Is it specific to France?
Elizabeth: yeah you probably have to know a bit about France to find that funny
...and a bit about the schools and everything

She shows in her explanation that to find the humour in the comic funny you would need to know about France and the French school system because the story is set in a French school and about a character at school. She believes that the humour is based on knowledge of the culture of school and what that means in France. Elizabeth feels connected enough to French culture that she connects with the humour.

At a different stage in the interview Elizabeth spoke about her description of watching French movies in her journal of language use. When she was asked about that she said:

Interviewer: OK what kind of movies?
Elizabeth: well basically comedy
Interviewer: and you watch ones that are made in France or do you tend to watch some American ones but in French?
Elizabeth: no I like the ones that are basically made in France because when they talk they like record over the voice that it was and I find that a bit confusing.

Elizabeth shows that she prefers to watch films that have been made in France. She finds watching films made in other countries that have been dubbed in French confusing. This may be because the culture and language do not mesh together in the same way that they do in a film made and spoken in the one language and culture. Elizabeth specifically chooses to watch comedy films from France, again showing that she feels connected to French humour, and through that shows her feeling of connection to French culture.

Olivier – “Half my family is French”
Olivier was less outspoken throughout his interview than all of the other students. He did however give some insight into his thoughts about his bilingual identity. When he showed his envisaged position on the French/Australian continuum he placed himself in the middle. When he was asked why he chose to put himself there he said: “Australian cos I was born here and, like, French cos I can speak French and half my family is French”.

This answer shows that for him being partly French and partly Australian is influenced by several factors. He feels a connection to Australia because he was born here and he feels connected to France because he speaks the language and he has a family background connection to the culture. In this student’s simple terms he shows clearly what he sees as the factors connecting him to two cultures and this indicates a self-concept of a bilingual identity. The three factors: birth place, language and family background are thus seen as equally important factors in development of a bilingual identity for Olivier.

When Olivier is asked if he thinks that he is bilingual he says that he thinks he is. He also says that it is a term that he would use to describe himself. Olivier has not lived in France but has visited a few times and he says that he speaks French when he is in France.
Gabriel – “I feel totally French”

Gabriel, as has been explained in earlier sections, has grown up in France in a French family. His family have moved to Australia temporarily and have been in Australia just over a year at the time of the interview. When Gabriel was asked about his place on the continuum between French and Australian he said “I feel totally French”.

For Gabriel one year attending an Australian school has not been enough to develop a sense of identity associated with being Australian. He connects totally as being French because his whole life until one year ago has been in France and his family speak and interact in French at home. He sees English as useful to him to succeed and communicate at school, and also as potentially useful when he returns to France to help other people who do not speak English. For Gabriel the factors of birthplace and family background mean that he continues to identify as French. Living currently in Australia is not an identity factor for him at this time.

Gabriel does say that he thinks he is bilingual and that it is a word he might use to describe himself. Yet he does not feel connected to Australian culture as a member of that culture.

Gabriel sees that school in Australia is very different to in France and that this is quite a large cultural difference. When asked in what way it is different he explained: “you do different things and in France kids concentrate more. They don’t talk in class”.

For Gabriel, calling himself bilingual is linked specifically to the use of two languages but for him it does not extend to a feeling of connection to Australian culture. It is possible that the length of time in Australia could influence this distinction. A longitudinal study would be required to conclude about this. Gabriel’s story indicates that identifying as bilingual is a process and he is currently positioned at one point along the continuum, where he believes he is bilingual but does not feel connected to the Australian culture.
Genevieve – “I see myself as French and English”

Genevieve spoke very clearly and in detail about her feelings about language and the ways that she uses French and English in her life. She continues to explain very clearly her attitude towards bilingualism and her identity in connection with both languages.

In response to the question asking her to place herself along the French/Australian continuum Genevieve responded:

> well, cos I was born in Australia I feel Australian mostly, but with French, um cos my Dad’s born in France and I’ve been over there um twice in my life and I can speak the language a lot, I sort of feel like I’m a part of France as well...so I see myself as French and English.

From this excerpt it is clear that Genevieve feels mostly Australian because it is her country of birth. Her connection to feeling French is due to two reasons, her family connection with France and because she can speak French. In this way Genevieve is making a clear link between her ability to speak the language and a corresponding development of identity associated with that language.

Genevieve has cited the same three factors as Olivier as being influential upon her bilingual identity: birthplace, language and family background. In this way it can be seen that, independently, both students have listed these three factors that make them bilingual.

The words I see myself as and I feel like I’m used here show that Genevieve is describing her self-concept in this description and this is a clear indication that she is describing an aspect of her identity (see Figure 1 for a diagrammatical representation of the position of self-concept in association to bilingual identity).

As Genevieve had already shown an ability to explain how she felt clearly, follow up questions were posed to ascertain as full an understanding of her feelings about bilingualism as possible:
Interviewer: Do you think it’s important to you to feel both French and Australian cos you’ve got that connection?
Genevieve: yeah I’ve got two different backgrounds, which I like
Interviewer: So you think that makes you a bit different in a good way?
Genevieve: yeah I’m not just from one culture, from France AND Australia (students own emphasis)
Interviewer: and do you think that helps you to understand people who are from other countries and how they might feel a bit better?
Genevieve: yeah when I talk to people in France they speak fully French and some of the jokes I don’t get or anything but um I do like that.
Interviewer: I guess without living in the country there’s some aspects that you might not pick up
Genevieve: yeah there’s the difference between living in France all your life and living in Australia.

In this extract there are a number of explicit references to Genevieve’s understanding of identity and culture. Firstly she explicitly acknowledges that she has two backgrounds and she labels herself as having two cultures (“I’m not just from one culture, from France AND Australia”). This clearly shows an acknowledgement of bilingual identity through her feeling of biculturality. Secondly, Genevieve clearly links her feelings of belonging to two cultures with an ability to understand people from both cultures. When similar concepts were posed to other students asking them about understanding other people, very literal responses were obtained with the students taking the term “understanding” to mean literally understanding the meaning of the words in French. Genevieve shows a deeper level of interpretation of the term by answering about intercultural understanding and showing that she feels she would understand the jokes more fully if she had lived in that culture. She thinks that because she lives in the Australian culture she might not fully understand the viewpoint and context that the French person was referring to, because there is a difference in understanding between growing up in one country and growing up in another country.

When Genevieve is asked whether she would describe herself as bilingual she answers:
yeah I reckon, cos I, my parents say I can speak French very well and um I’m at the middle standard of French cos I did some tests recently ...and uh yeah and English is fine for me.

From this extract of the interview Genevieve links viewing herself as bilingual with her ability in both languages. She doesn’t appear to think that she needs to have equal ability in both languages but because she thinks she has ability in both it is sufficient for her to describe herself as bilingual. She also takes support from her parents’ opinions that she speaks French very well.

As the earlier extracts show she also feels a connection to both cultures and this strengthens her identification with being both French and Australian.

*Megan – “So you’re, like, different”*

Megan, as has been explained earlier, does not have a family connection to French or speak French outside of school. As she does not have this connection at home, it is interesting in her interview that she describes herself as partly French and partly Australian. When she is asked about the continuum question she says: “I feel a bit of both [French and Australian]”.

When she is asked what she means she finds it difficult to explain, but does make reference to speaking French. She mentions that she’s not that good at French and perhaps in comparison to the students who have lived in France she feels that her language proficiency is not as good. Megan said that speaking two languages makes her feel special and when asked to elaborate on what she means she said:

> well, yeah it does help you and it just makes you feel better of yourself...so you’re like different...and you can say well I speak a bit of French and just to put you on that different side and stuff

She uses the word “side” to show that she feels she is different to people who speak only one language. She sees that speaking two languages puts her in a different space, and she sees these two spaces as “sides”. This may mean that for her there are two distinct positions – monolingual and bilingual – and that it is good to be on the “different side”. On the other hand, she does not explicitly mention only two
positions, just that she feels she is on a different side. This provides a different way of expressing her identity associated with her two languages and might link with the idea of the “third space” that has developed in research into intercultural communication (Kramsch, 2008). The third space is different from being a native speaker of one language or another, and describes a position negotiated by language learners between the two languages and cultures.

When Megan was asked if she thinks she is bilingual she indicated that she thinks she isn’t: “not really, like I’m not that good at speaking fluent French”. She appears to think that her French speaking ability needs to be equal to her English ability in order for her to be considered bilingual. However, she thinks her strength is in understanding French rather than speaking it. She doesn’t believe that possessing ability in one language domain means that she is bilingual. Nevertheless, she has placed herself as both French and Australian on the continuum. This could be interpreted as an indication of tension for Megan about her bilingual identity, in a similar manner to Molyneux’s (2005) interpretation of student interviews. In this way Megan illustrates the tensions, complexities and challenges of bilingual learning and bilingual identity development.

One tension clearly illustrated in Megan’s story is the difficulty of reconciling a feeling of being bilingual and a feeling of connection to two cultures with different levels of linguistic competence in each language. This feeling of tension is one also experienced by Matt and Antonia.

**Matt – “I’m partly French”**

Matt presents another story of identification. He feels predominantly English, but also feels a small connection to French. When Matt is asked where he would place himself on the continuum he answers “um like mostly on the English side”. When he is asked to explain why that is, he says:

> well I lived in England for two years. I was born in France and then we moved to England...and I've been in Australia for 8 years
He was asked whether he feels any connection to France or French and he answered: “like probably like um like a bit more than a quarter”. This extract from the interview shows that although Matt originally shows that he feels most strongly to be on the English end of the continuum, when he is asked how much of himself he sees on each side he sees a bit more than a quarter of his identity as French or associated with France. This is perhaps more than might be assumed without his attempt at quantifying how he sees himself.

Matt feels less of a connection to French than he does to English and he explains this a bit further when he explains how he feels different when he is in France: “it’s hard for you to get friends cos like it’s hard to speak French”.

Matt again in this section of the interview appears to equate his feelings of not connecting with people in France with his feelings of difficulty at speaking the language. For Matt, this is also why he finds the bilingual classes difficult and it likely has an influence upon the extent to which he feels a connection to France. He does not appear to find the language very natural or easy to learn, and so he does not appear to have a very positive attitude towards it. It is not clear whether this difficulty is due to a lesser amount of French being used outside of school than some of his peers. A further investigation into the specific use of language in the home would be necessary to make conclusions about the reasons behind his feelings of difficulty associated with the French language. As is shown in question f (section 4.6), the French-speaking teacher identifies the level of parental support for French language and French homework and the amount of French used at home as the pivotal factor affecting students’ enthusiasm for the French language and their level of ease at learning the more complex language aspects. It is possible that Matt does not use sufficient French at home to make the progress that he desires.

In spite of some of his less positive reactions to French, Matt says he does think he is bilingual. When he is asked what being bilingual means to him he says: “um it means I’m partly French”.

He explicitly states that he does think he is partly French, in spite of the fact that he feels some level of discomfort with speaking the language. When asked how
important it is to him to feel partly French he indicated that it is in part due to his Mum’s opinion. He said “um well my mum thinks, like, it’s very important” and when subsequently asked if his Mum’s opinion is important to him he said that it is.

The tensions that Matt feels between feeling French and speaking French and feeling Australian and speaking English, indicate the level of complexity that negotiation of a bilingual identity entails. Matt shows how sometimes this negotiation can involve some conflicting feelings and attitudes and that this demonstrates the constantly evolving nature of identity. Research has indicated that if students receive equal quality of exposure to two cultures they can integrate the two in their identities (Baker, 2002; Lotherington, 2003). There is also some evidence that is supported in this current study by Megan, Matt and Antonia’s stories, that many young bilinguals feel identity confusion or tension (Baker, 2002; Lotherington, 2003; Molyneux, 2005).

_Antonia – “I'm Italian…I’m also actually Dutch and Australian”_

Antonia’s story of bilingualism is complex with influences from Italian, French and Dutch languages in addition to English in her life. When asked about the questionnaire question involving the continuum Antonia responded:

Antonia: I think I’d sort of fit I don’t actually know because I am Italian and I’m proud to be it and I’m also actually Dutch and Australian so… I’d probably be in the middle of all of them
Interviewer: Of all three?
Antonia: because I do feel Australian a lot because I’ve lived in this country with Australian people but as well I could be a Dutch citizen … and I just know that I have heaps of family in Holland and so I have heaps of family in Italy

This extract indicates how complex the issue of bilingual identity is for Antonia. She has many influences in her life and the negotiation process between all of these influences is complex. Antonia explains that she is Italian and Dutch and Australian. From her description it seems that her strongest connections are to Italian and Australian, from her experiences being brought up by her grandmother and interacting with her and also because she lives in Australia. She appears to associate being Dutch more practically with having Dutch citizenship. She also identifies herself as
connected to Dutch and Italian cultures because she has family in both Holland and Italy.

As Antonia’s description of how she feels continued she began to show an indication of how important looking part of the family culture is to her. She said:

because my family, like, they were born with hair, like, really really dark hair, really really dark eyes, like, olivey sort of skin and they were a bit chubby you know? … but I just think they said I was completely different cos I was born with blue eyes, no hair ... yeah I was completely different, like, I was actually a mix between my cousin and my other cousin ... she’s, like, fair skin and, like, nice eyes like mine, but she didn’t have the same hair colour as me. That’s why I like my other cousin in Holland she sort of looks like me and you can just see the bone structure, so I look more Dutch than anything else

From this long descriptive extract it appears that Antonia views her physical connection with her Italian cousin and the Dutch cousin as an important factor in her feelings of identity. She has pride in being a bit different in the way she looks compared to most of the Italian side of her family, and it is through this physical description of herself and her family that she first shows a feeling of connection to Dutch.

Antonia again reiterates the point made by several students about the difference between speaking a language and understanding it. Antonia does not view herself as fully bilingual because she can understand Italian better than she can speak it. She says:

Antonia: I do know how to speak Italian and I do know how to understand Italian I’m just, like, not, like, fully good at speaking it I’m, like, a bit rough … just because I listen to it, I can answer in Italian like si – yes and at night-time I say bona notte and like all this Italian stuff but that’s like singular things I can’t say, like, a full sentence
Interviewer: But you understand?
Antonia: oh I understand very fully

She clearly feels that her skills in speaking Italian are not as developed as her listening skills are. Her view of herself as bilingual is further explained in the
following extract, in answer to the question of whether she would describe herself as bilingual:

Antonia: mmmm sort of not really cos I know my sister knows, like, so much more than me so I don’t think… she would definitely be a bilingual her range is really good, so I’d consider myself a little bit teeny bilingual but I couldn’t do, like, a full course of Italian and just cos there are Italian words like my nonna uses, like you have to tie up your shoelaces or you have to go to bed or do something for me like that so, like, if I had to do a lesson I wouldn’t understand it that well cos my nonna just spoke to me.

Interviewer: on home type things?

Antonia: yeah

This extract shows several things. Firstly Antonia gauges her ability and bilingualism as something she considers in reference to her sister. As her sister is much older than her (she is 20, Antonia is 10), Antonia sees that her sister speaks a lot more Italian than she does. She therefore sees herself as only “a little bit teeny bilingual” because of her lower language level than her sister’s. Secondly, Antonia makes an important distinction about her bilingualism. She notices the different domains of language that she has in Italian that she has learnt from her grandmother and how this differs to what is taught in academic language courses. She sees this as a deficit and evidence that she is not bilingual. However, as Cummins’ (1999) research shows she is in fact just differentiating between conversational language and academic language. This is frequently a distinction between the different languages of bilingual people, and indicates that Antonia, in fact, has quite a sophisticated understanding of language to be able to distinguish between these two sub-sets of language.

**Louis – “I’m German”**

Louis begins explaining his feelings of identification by saying that he would fit around the middle of the continuum between German and Australian. When asked why he thinks this he said: “cos um I’m German, and but I’ve been living most of my life in Australia so I feel Australian as well as German”.

The way that Louis explains the difference between feeling German and feeling Australian appears as though the German part of his identity is something that is not negotiable for Louis. He says “I’m German” as if that is concrete or definite, and then
explains that feeling Australian is something he sees as being acquired through living in Australia. It sounds from this wording as though the Australian part of his identity is more flexible, being associated with where he lives, and perhaps if he had lived in another country he feels that he could just as easily feel a connection with that country. However the nature of the way he explains being German appears to be something unchangeable or non-negotiable for Louis.

Louis said that he would probably not describe himself as bilingual or multilingual but he would describe himself as being able to speak three languages. It is not clear from his interview whether this is just due to a difference in his interpretation of these different ways of describing his language skills or if there is another underlying reason for him to not see himself as bilingual or multilingual.

In a similar way to the stories of Megan, Matt and Antonia this could be seen as an illustration of the tensions inherent with development of bilingual identity, where language ability and cultural connection do not fit comfortably with each other.

**In Summary**

Each student has quite a definite idea of their feelings towards each language and their ideas of whether they are bilingual or not and to what extent. There are a number of common themes between the students’ stories and also a number of links to the framework of this study. There are also indications of the tensions involved in the issue of bilingual identity. These are explored further in the discussion section following the presentation of data about family opinion.

**4.3.2.2 Family Opinion about Bilingualism**

The next theme that emerges from the students’ interviews about their views of bilingualism is the theme of *family opinion*. The responses from the students about the nature of their families’ views of bilingualism may also give further insight into the development of the students’ own opinions. Many of the students demonstrated that the opinions of their families are important to them, and as such, family opinion may be highly influential upon student opinion and consequently may influence their development of bilingual identity. Two students’ stories are presented individually while the others are presented together.
Jamie – “My Mum says that I’ve got to always stay with French”

Jamie indicates that his Mum in particular thinks that learning two languages is important. Jamie shows a sense of humour and a mild rebellion by saying that he sometimes pretends to his Mum that he doesn’t agree with her about the importance of bilingualism, when actually he does. His interview extract shows that he is only pretending when saying that languages are not important:

Interviewer: Does your family think it’s important having two languages?
Jamie: Yeah
Interviewer: and how do you know that they think that?
Jamie: cos um she says, my mum says that I’ve got to always stay with French because you’ll, I’ll need it in the future
Interviewer: do you think she’s right?
Jamie: yeah (laughs) sometimes I say no but I
Interviewer: you really do?
Jamie: yeah!

This extract shows that Jamie does agree with his family’s opinion. He also reveals some of the tensions that might take place within a family regarding the importance placed upon languages. Jamie is very relaxed and so although he may tease or goad his parents by sometimes saying languages aren’t important to him he does not really have a problem with learning and speaking more than one language. It is possible that in other family situations agreement is not reached with such good humour as Jamie shows.

Jamie also shows that he thinks he’ll continue with French at high school. His older brother already takes part in the advanced stream at the local high school and Jamie says that it’s easy: “It’s easy, not as easy as the French the Anglophones people do, it’s a bit harder’. Nonetheless Jamie’s brother has given him the impression that it will be relatively easy to excel at French at high school, even in the accelerated stream. Jamie thinks that if his brother can do this then so can he. Jamie thinks that his brother’s experiences at the primary school have helped him to find the French course at the high school quite easy.
Elizabeth – "My mum wants me to start reading in French"

Elizabeth’s journal showed her reading in French. When she was asked about this in the interview she said that she has started reading in French because her mother wants her to. Thus her motivation to read at home in French has been prompted by her mother’s opinion.

well I was, like, reading, like, bits of different books because my mum wants me to start reading in French

However, she still has a sense of autonomy over her reading as her mother does not tell her what types of things she should read. Elizabeth said:

I, like, picked them by myself and if I don’t like them I put them back and choose another one

So although the guidance towards reading in French has come from her mother it does not appear to be enforced, or done in a way that makes it feel like a chore to Elizabeth. Elizabeth selects the books from her brothers’ collections. They are older than her and had studied in French schools at a higher level than her when they were living in France. The books that Elizabeth chooses from are ones that were used by her brothers in France for reading skills. Although this activity was instigated by her mother, Elizabeth shows that she is beginning to enjoy it and beginning to see some benefits from this extra reading. She said:

well it’s, like, pretty interesting like the words that I’ve forgotten that come back into my head… so yeah I’ve started enjoying it now

She finds this reading a useful tool for her language maintenance and this leads to enjoyment of the activity for her. Elizabeth shows here that her home literacy practices have assisted her language maintenance as she finds words coming “back into my head”. This indicates that home literacy practices are maintaining and developing Elizabeth’s French and inter-linked with this she experiences more connection with her French identity as she develops her biliteracy skills (Gregory & Kenner, 2003; Kenner, 2000; Kenner & Gregory, 2003).
Other students’ attitudes towards Family Opinion

The other students interviewed showed elements of valuing their families’ opinions about languages. Olivier said he thought his family thought knowing two languages was important. Gabriel also said this and when asked why he thought that they found it important he said “cos they help me to learn a lot of English and if I don’t understand words they help me.” He sees the family support and assistance with his learning of English to be an indicator of their valuing of language learning.

Megan also indicated that she thought the language program was the main reason that her parents had sent her to that school. She said that they had told her: “yeah, they said oh it’ll probably help you when you get a job and and, like, give something that others don’t have”.

Megan, from her previous comments about why languages are good, has clearly taken on some of the opinions she has heard from her parents and made them her own. She uses very similar phrasing when saying what her parents think and what she thinks: “something that others don’t have”.

A number of students have said that their parents want them to continue with languages at high school level. Genevieve said: “yeah, he uh, when I go to high school he [Dad] wants me to go on in my French in lessons and everything”.

Genevieve also gives some insight into her family life, by her explanation that her father prefers her to speak in French but he works a lot and is not always there to maximise her time speaking French:

    um my Dad um prefers me to speak in French but because he he works late hours and comes back at like ten o’clock he doesn’t really mind, but on the weekends he’ll be like speak to me in French and things like that

However, we have seen from Genevieve’s other comments that she places a very high value upon her languages and this, at least in part, reflects some of her family’s valuing of language learning. Her experiences with French could be further enhanced if she were able to spend more time speaking French with her father.
In a similar response to Megan and Genevieve, Antonia shows how important her father thinks it is for her to learn French and that his opinion is the main reason that she wants to continue learning it. She says:

"oh no my Dad told me that, well he didn’t tell me, I didn’t know that in the beginning I was going to have a French teacher but then ... one time cos it was so confusing I said I don’t want to be in French and he said no you have to keep on doing French because he knows that I will like it and I do like it now..."

Antonia views her father’s enthusiasm for her to learn French as encouraging:

"My dad’s, like, really encouraging cos he wants me to learn French, like, he wouldn’t move me [to another school], like, if he could, like, force me to do it, but I wouldn’t be upset to do it because I really like French... but it’s just very hard"

This added comment “but it’s just very hard” at the end of her response shows that Antonia wants to enjoy and do well at the things that are important to her father. In this case French. She unfortunately does not find that it comes easily to her, in a similar way to Matt.

Matt’s comments show that his mother thinks French is very important, as she comes from France originally. When he is asked what he thinks about French he answers: “um well my mum thinks, like, it’s very important”. It seems he doesn’t match his mother’s valuing of French. He does say that what his mother thinks is important to him, but his difficulties with learning French seem to take precedence over this. Matt says that his father also thinks it’s important to keep his French learning up and explains it by saying:

"well he played [soccer] in France for, like, three years so then he learnt it so then he could, like, speak to my mum’s parents and stuff"

Matt can see how French was important to both of his parents and that if he follows a similar career to his father that it could also be useful for him.
4.3.3 Discussion of Findings

This section discusses some of the common factors and themes that have emerged from each of the students’ stories and the questionnaire findings for question e.

The questionnaire themes of Enjoyment of Bilingualism, Cognitive Benefits of Bilingualism and Future Benefits of Bilingualism link to the students’ levels of investment in being bilingual. Enjoyment of bilingualism alongside a belief in the benefits of being bilingual leads to high levels of investment in bilingualism. The theme of Communicative Benefits of Bilingualism links to the interaction element of the framework.

The first interview theme of Identity as Bilingual/Connection to Culture links to the socio-cultural connection element of the framework. There is evidence of a number of students explicitly saying in their own terms that they are linked to two different nationalities/cultural groups. For example Jamie says “I’m both” relating to French and Australian with Australian being made up of English, Scottish and other elements, and Louis says he is both German and Australian. Elizabeth’s description of her connection to French humour in comics and films shows a strong socio-cultural connection to French.

The other theme of Family Opinion of Bilingualism links to the investment element of the framework. The students show overwhelmingly a high valuing of their family’s opinions and, therefore, if the family is invested in being bilingual this appears to be reflected in the student’s levels of investment. The family level of investment also corresponds to the opportunities that the students have for interaction in both languages. As is suggested by Matt’s story, less opportunities for interaction with family members in the language that is less common in the wider community leads to lower investment in the language and less strength of bilingual identification.

Not only do a number of the students identify themselves as bilingual, they also clearly indicate the factors that they see as fundamental to their identification as bilingual. Several students cite the three factors of birthplace, language use and family connection to the culture as being influential upon their bilingual identity. The two factors of birthplace and family connection are closely related to the socio-cultural
connection element of the framework as place of birth and feelings of family connection can impact upon an individual’s feeling of belonging to a cultural group.

The family connection factor also relates to the investment element of the framework as the opportunities available for language use with family and the value placed upon the language by the family are factors that can influence an individual’s investment in learning the language.

The language use factor links to both the investment and interaction elements of the framework. Language use in interaction with family members is regular for some of these students and this relates strongly to their feelings of being bilingual. Language use opportunities within the family are also an important component influencing investment. Therefore the factors influencing bilingual identity cited by these students can be seen through their links to the framework elements. This is illustrated below in diagrammatic form.

**Figure 26: Factors Linking to BINF Framework**
Through the presentation of findings a number of sub-themes could be identified across the different stories and from the questionnaires. These are discussed in the following sections.

4.3.3.1 Discussion of the Data: Factors Affecting Bilingual Identity

The students show clear ideas as to why they are bilingual or why they feel connected to two cultures. In this way they clearly discuss their socio-cultural connection as part of their development of bilingual identity. Across the stories there are common references to the aspects that lead the students to feel connected to two languages and cultures. These common elements are:

- Language
- Family connection to culture/language
- Place of birth

Each student has his/her own concept of why they place themselves at particular points on the identity continuum, however the three elements of language, family connection and place of birth are cited by several different students as the impacting factors upon where they see themselves fitting. Therefore these three factors are cited as impacting upon bilingual identity.

The continuum as a visual representation of the concept of bilingual identity was well-received by the students in both the questionnaire and interview settings and the students who explained their choices verbally explained why they viewed themselves in the way that they did. In the questionnaire most students placed themselves as Australian (52.2%/N=12) while a slightly smaller amount of students placed themselves around the centre of the continuum near the Both Equally label (43.5%/N=10) with four of those ten students placing their cross directly above the Both Equally label.

This indicated that many of the students felt that their identity was not adequately described by the label “Australian”. The students who placed their cross at any point along the continuum indicated some level of feeling that they are bilingual. Language use, family connection and birthplace were the primary factors cited as influencing
this choice. The following question - d - examines in more detail the importance that the sub-sample of students place upon the school as an influence upon their identity development.

The interviewed students indicated that the factors that most strongly influenced their concepts of who they are were the factors: language, family connection to culture or language, and place of birth. Language was shown to be an important factor for the students because of which languages they use and have access to. Language is a commonly accepted factor that has strong influence upon bilingual identity (Deaux, 2000; Fought, 2006; Kanno, 2003; Thornborrow, 1999).

Family connection to culture or language was shown to be important by students saying that their family is from a particular country and that by being part of that family they are also connected to that country. The students also cited family connection by saying that through using the language with family members they feel connected to the culture. The importance of family connection as cited by these students presents a link to the literature that shows identity as something that is always formed within the influences of context and society (Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007; Fought, 2006; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Interaction in the language with family members is cited as a key influence upon socio-cultural connection and thus development of bilingual identity.

Place of birth was cited as an important factor through students saying that they were born in a particular country and therefore they identify with that nationality. As the literature has shown, language is considered to be fundamentally linked to concepts of national identity (Suleiman, 2006). Place of birth can also be seen as an important factor influencing connection to national identity. For students not born in Australia it could be a factor contributing to bilingual identity.

4.3.3.2 Discussion of the Data: Interpretation of the Term “Bilingual”

Some of the students describe themselves as bilingual, such as Elizabeth, Genevieve, Jamie, Matt and Antonia. However, other students such as Olivier and Louis do not see themselves as bilingual. The students who say that they wouldn’t call themselves
bilingual do say that they can speak more than one language and they feel connected to two cultures. There therefore appears to be some difference in interpretation between the students concerning the definition of “bilingual”. All students said that they knew and understood the term. It is clearly a term that is in their vocabulary from several sources: their families; the school environment that openly discusses its self-named “bilingual program”; and their peers.

Although the term is used in the students’ school lives, there are some different interpretations of what it means to be bilingual. Some of the students, such as Antonia and Megan, believe that they need to be balanced bilinguals (Romaine, 1995) in order to call themselves bilingual. Antonia measures her ability against her sister and Megan thinks she is not fluent enough to be bilingual. Some previous research has shown unequal ability between the two languages and differences in fluency are accepted as bilingualism (Bhatia, 2006; Grosjean, 1982; Romaine, 1995). Some of these students use a balanced bilingualism interpretation. Within this theme of interpretation of the term “bilingual” there are further differences in interpretation, as shown in the next section.

4.3.3.3 Discussion of the Data: Domains of Language

Antonia did not classify herself as fully bilingual. However, in her explanation of why she thought she was not totally bilingual (she called herself “a little bit teeny bilingual”) she made explicit reference to the different domains of language. She said she used home/everyday language with her grandmother and not school language. This shows a clear connection to Cummins’ work outlining the difference between everyday conversational language learnt by bilingual students at home (BICS) and the academic language they require to succeed in that language in a school environment (CALP) (Cummins, 1999) and also to Baker’s notions of the different domains of language (Baker, 2006; Blommaert, 2007).

Cummins (1999) has shown that there are two types of language that students develop. He has clarified that these are two distinct types of language skill and that in some cases there is a tendency for immigrant children to develop BICS rather than CALP (Cummins, 1999). Antonia expressed her observation that her language
development at home with her grandmother gave her one particular type of language skill (similar to BICS). However, she felt that the language she knew and used at home would not help her to study the language at a high level. The language she feels she needs to develop could be likened to CALP (Cummins, 1999).

The different levels of comfort or fluency students feel they have in the different skills in each language also influence their decision as to whether they see themselves as bilingual. Several students said that they understand language better than they speak it, such as Matt, Megan and Louis and this may impact upon their self-concept as bilingual or not bilingual. This can again be linked to an interpretation of balanced bilingualism. It has been shown that a person can be considered bilingual with different types of ability in each language and stronger skills in speaking, listening, reading or writing (Blommaert, 2007).

4.3.3.4 Discussion of the Data: The Process of Identity Negotiation

Some students indicated tensions involved with reconciling their bilingual identity. Matt, for example, felt some discomfort in reconciling wanting to please his family and feeling a connection to France with the difficulty that he has experienced in learning some of the more complex aspects of the French language. Matt originally took part in the Francophone classes, however, he found that the grammar concepts covered in these lessons in French were too difficult for him and he withdrew from the Francophone classes to attend just the bilingual classes. In the interview he expressed that he also finds these bilingual lessons difficult. Matt does, however, say that he thinks he is bilingual. For him it appears that there is some tension between the disparity he feels between speaking and using the French language, and the fact that he feels partly French. This reflects the ideas of identity tension that have been explored in previous literature indicating that young bilinguals can experience tension when reconciling the complex factors involved in their bilingual identities (Baker, 2002; Lotherington, 2003; Molyneux, 2005).

Matt’s experience is also similar to the experiences of the students in Molyneux’s (2005) study. The students in that study experienced some tensions between their languages and identities, making statements that appeared contradictory about their
languages but which, Molyneux (2005) argued, displayed the complexity of identity and language for such students and displayed the tensions they experience in reconciling all aspects of their languages and identities.

As is shown in the family opinion section, Antonia feels a desire to please her father through learning French but experiences a challenge in learning it. This might present identity tension for her in a similar way to Matt although, like him, she does describe herself as partly bilingual and as fitting between several languages (Baker, 2002; Lotherington, 2003; Molyneux, 2005). This indicates some of the conflicting factors that Matt and Antonia experience in relation to their bilingual identities. Megan and Louis also expressed elements of tension in their interviews through the comments that they expressed about reconciling their language learning difficulties with their feelings of connection to two or more languages. These illustrations indicate the complex and challenging nature of bilingual identity negotiation.

The students at this age show varying degrees of ability to express their feelings about their identities. Some students make the process of identity negotiation appear straightforward, such as Genevieve, who speaks with conviction, describing her bilingual identity as something definite. Likewise Louis is very definite about his German identity, but gives a less definitive answer about whether he is bilingual.

As mentioned previously, other students such as Matt, Megan and Antonia show that for them the process of identity negotiation is not straightforward and involves tension in reconciling the different elements involved (Baker, 2002; Lotherington, 2003; Molyneux, 2005). The very different stories presented by each student exemplify that the nature of the process of identification is as varied as the number of individuals that speak about it (Fought, 2006). Every person has a different experience shaped by their experiences, background, language exposure, language ability and other factors.

It is notable that Matt used the word "side" to describe where he sees himself in relation to two cultures. This word was not used in any of the questions posed and yet both Megan and Matt placed themselves on a "side". Matt sees himself mostly on the English "side" but also sees part of himself on the French "side".
Megan used the word “side” to describe how speaking two languages puts her in a better position than people who only speak one. She says it puts her “on that different side”. The use of this word might be associated with the visual way in which the concept of identifying with each language and culture was posed, or it might provide some insight into the ways that the students view the division between two different cultures within their own identities. In Megan’s use of the word the answer was not given in response to the continuum question so it is less likely that her use of the word was influenced by the visual cue in the question.

4.3.3.5 Discussion of the Data: Positive Attitudes to Bilingual Education in Any Language

From the full sample of students completing the questionnaire (N=23) a large number do not speak French at home (47.8%/N=11). The questionnaire results showed overall positive attitudes towards bilingualism and towards learning French in spite of the majority of students accessing bilingualism only at school.

There are a number of students in these classes who speak another language at home other than English and French and a sample of these students were interviewed. These students, for example Antonia and Louis, who speak languages such as Italian and German at home appear to value learning bilingually in English and French. It therefore seems that these students see bilingual education as valuable whatever language the program takes place in. It appears to be valued even if the school language is not connected to the students’ home or family background language(s).

Megan, from a monolingual home background, specifically said that she thinks it would be good for all students to learn another language because it is important to learn about other cultures and languages. Bilingual education in a positive form fosters an appreciation of languages and cultures in general (Baker, 2006a). The students in this study such as Genevieve, Louis, Gabriel and Antonia explicitly said that they felt more comfortable in this school because they liked other students also learning languages, and liked knowing that other students speak other languages at home. They also indicated that they are teased less than they were at other schools for speaking other languages. In this way the transformative pedagogies used in this
school translate into a community where there is acceptance of diversity (Cummins, 2000).

4.3.3.6 Discussion of the Data: Bilingual Benefits for Students with Lower Academic Achievement

It appeared from Antonia’s story that the bilingual nature of the school program may impact upon student pride and empowerment related to her bilingualism (Molyneux, 2004). Some of the pedagogies used in the classrooms may assist development of student pride in being bilingual (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003). Antonia’s class teacher described her as having learning difficulties. Antonia was outspoken and descriptive in the interview and indicated pride and self-belief in relation to her language skills. This student with a home language of Italian and family connections to Dutch and French expressed a positive identity within bilingualism. She outlined the positive aspects of being able to speak another language and found support from being in a school context where linguistic and cultural diversity is valued – explicitly saying that it’s good to know other students speak other languages at home.

A student with some academic difficulties appears to be having a positive experience of schooling, perhaps more positive than might be possible without the bilingual school program. She expressed her difficulties with maths, qualifying her statements to show that because she feels a value in her ability with languages that means her difficulty in other academic areas doesn’t seem so detrimental to her self-esteem. It is possible that the empowering pedagogies used in the classrooms assisted this student’s self-esteem to develop (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003). The interviews with the teachers indicated that development of self-esteem was a core pedagogical aim within the classrooms.

4.3.3.7 Discussion of the Data: Technology

Megan has no parental or home contact with French but is enrolled in the bilingual program and identified herself as both French and Australian. She spoke about choosing to watch DVDs in French at home, showing that technology is a valuable tool as a means for students to access language and develop bilingual identity. This student showed her investment in learning bilingually and learning French through her individual motivation to practice language at home. Without sufficient
technological support it could be difficult for some students invested in learning language to access the necessary support and linguistic and cultural examples. The investment that she expresses here relates back to the framework for the study and the work of Norton (2000).

Other students indicated using the Internet for communication and also spoke or wrote about watching DVDs in French. Students also mentioned watching French sport or other programs on satellite television. In this way technology was shown to be an important tool for increasing access to language. The Internet, satellite TV and DVDs can therefore be seen to add to the range of popular culture texts available to young students at home to develop their biliteracy (Marsh, 2003).

Having outlined the sub-themes relating to the theme of Identity as Bilingual/Connection to Culture the students’ responses about bilingualism as it is viewed in their families is now discussed.

4.3.3.8 Discussion of the Data: Family Opinion

All of the students in the interviews indicated valuing their parents’ opinions about languages and being bilingual. Likewise in the questionnaire 82.6% of the students (N=19) said that their parents’ opinions about France and French were either very important or important to them. Some of the students from the interviews placed equal importance upon their languages as their parents, thus showing that parental opinion is an important influence upon young students’ opinions about their languages. This is a point further supported in the teacher opinions shown in question e (section 4.5).

Some students, such as Antonia and Matt, learn French although they find it difficult because they know it is important to their parents. Students who may not see an imminent importance or relevance in knowing two languages seem to trust their parents’ views that they will be glad they know the languages in the future. This supports prior studies that have shown parental opinion to be an important factor in student attitudes to language and bilingual identity development (Molyneux, 2006;
Pease-Alvarez, 2003; Tannenbaum & Howie, 2002; Weisskirch & Alatorre Alva, 2002).

Other students, such as Genevieve, Elizabeth and Jamie, have developed their own opinions and also taken on ideas they have heard from their parents and adapted these ideas into their own form. The students do not appear to simply be reproducing opinions that their parents have expressed because they explain their own opinion in different terms to those that they use to explain what their parents think. Jamie explains how he pretends not to like French at times to tease his mother. This indicates that his awareness of his mother’s opinion and his own views are well developed enough that it has become a source for teasing and joking.

Parents are clearly an important influence for the students, and this reflects the findings in the literature linked to socio-cultural connection that indicate the important role that parents play as purveyors of values, attitudes and linguistic knowledge as young members become inducted into the community or culture (Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007; Lave & Wenger, 1991).
4.4  Qd:  How do the students view the school bilingual program and to what extent does it influence their identification as French, Australian or bilingual?

As the individual stories presented in question c indicate, there are different forms of identification with different languages and different views of bilingualism shown by each of the students in the study. Through the examination of the students’ views about bilingualism in general one theme that emerged from the interviews is the school context and what the students think about the bilingual nature of the school. By examining these data more closely it is possible to gain some insight into the students’ opinions of the school’s impact upon their bilingualism and their connection to being French and/or Australian.

In order to answer sub-question d, the students’ comments about the school and its bilingual nature are examined. The two themes into which the students’ comments are divided are: Opinion about the School being Bilingual within which there is one sub-theme: Opinion about Teachers; and School Impact Upon Identity as Bilingual.

4.4.1 Presentation of Findings

4.4.1.1 Opinion about the School Being Bilingual

Some of the students see the benefits of the school bilingual program as being closely related to their maintenance of the French language. All of the students mentioned the school in some way.

Jamie, for example, said that the school being bilingual was good because: “otherwise I wouldn’t really know French, I’d forget it”. Jamie believes that the school plays a large role in his maintenance of his French language. Jamie also shows that he speaks mostly English in class except in the Francophone classes where he emphasises that he has to use French. He finds aspects of the Francophone classes hard, but also finds it easier in some ways because everyone else is also speaking French.
In his responses Jamie has shown that the school bilingual program plays a key role in his language maintenance. In this way the importance of the school program to this student’s development of a bilingual identity is clear.

Elizabeth also sees benefits in the school program. She said that this school is “heaps better” than the school she attended in France. Like Jamie, Elizabeth indicates that the school program has helped her not only to maintain her French language but also to learn more and develop her language skills further. She said:

yeah because I started forgetting a lot in year four and so it’s helped me remember things that I was taught before... yeah, like, home is, like, sort of practice for, like, what I learned and everything...and yeah school is, like, teaching me new things

Elizabeth can see that different and complementary roles are played by her home and school experiences of language. Home plays more of a consolidation role and school allows her to extend her skills. In this way Elizabeth shows a clear opinion of the ways in which home and school inter-connect in terms of her language maintenance and development. While her home language use enables her to practice and maintain prior linguistic knowledge, the school’s bilingual program enables her to build upon and extend her linguistic skills. Through the key role that school plays in Elizabeth’s language maintenance and development it also plays a key role in her development of a bilingual identity. The importance of language as a factor affecting identity is well established (Deaux, 2000; Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007; Fought, 2006; Kanno, 2003; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Sapir, 1932; Suleiman, 2006). It can therefore be deduced that the school is a facilitator of language learning by being a site of bilingual interaction and therefore the school becomes an important factor in the development of these students’ bilingual identities.

Gabriel also feels that school plays an important role in his language learning. He said: “yeah cos it’s Francophones ... they can help you understand”. Being a learner of English as a Second Language he finds that being with other French-speaking students helps him with his understanding of the English language elements at school. He also feels that his school experience is more important for his language development in English than the help his parents give him at home. He said:
I think it's more helpful if you're in a school because there's only Australian so you can only speak in English... it would be more difficult to keep my French I think [in an all English school].

Gabriel feels that in this school his English is helped, but also that he is able to maintain his French language skills more than he could in an English-only school.

Genevieve makes a connection between learning in the bilingual program and feeling more comfortable about her bilingual background. She said:

if um I go to a school completely just English I say I'm from France and they say that's amazing we're all from Australia... and here it's full of French people so I feel a bit more comfortable.

Other students felt that home and school played equally important roles in terms of their language and feelings of being bilingual. Olivier felt that both home and school had the same level of importance, while Elizabeth and Genevieve clearly explained that both home and school played important roles in their language learning.

For Genevieve having recognition of the importance of French and having other French-speaking people around her at school helps her to feel comfortable with having a connection to France. She feels that school has a bigger impact on her language and how she feels about France than home because at home she can choose which language to speak and at school she has regular daily contact with French language. She said:

[At school] usually I have one hour a day of French, just plain French speaking and at home I have the choice so I reckon school helps me more.

It is notable that in response to a question about whether school or home helps her feel more connected to France she thinks school does because of the regularity of contact with the language that the school provides. She is making a clear link here between quantity and frequency of language contact and a related feeling of connection to the culture (Baker, 2002; Norton, 2000).
Louis makes a link between already speaking two languages and the relative ease that this provides in learning a third language. When asked what he thinks about learning French he says: “yeah it’s kinda fun and it’s easier for me cos I know German”. He elaborates to say that already knowing another language makes it easier to learn French. This comment was supported by a comment made by another student in class (not interviewed, but observed in field observations) who said that learning in the French program helped him to understand more Chinese. This indicates support for the literature that indicates that there is a transfer of skills across different languages and that learning one language can assist you with skills in another language, when the first language is sufficiently developed (Cummins, 1979).

Some students find the bilingual classes difficult. Matt, for example, found the immersion classes so hard that he decided to stop attending them and now attends the bilingual classes only. When he was asked what was hard about the classes he responded: “you had to learn like all this grammar in French and stuff”. He clearly finds the technical aspects of learning the language difficult and as a result he has less daily contact with French at school. This impacts upon Matt’s language maintenance and also impacts upon the identity tensions that he experiences, as his language ability does not remain at a level that is consistent with his view of himself as a bilingual speaker of English and French.

Megan did not explicitly mention a link between the school and her bilingual identity, however, she indicated that the bilingual program is important for understanding other cultures. Antonia’s response followed a similar theme, as she indicated that she feels comfortable in the school environment because there are people from many different countries and backgrounds.

**Opinion about Teachers**

In response to the questions about the school and the bilingual program several students responded about the teachers. The indication from these responses was that these students saw a difference in their language learning experience based upon the teachers that they interacted with. This indicates the importance of the relationships between the teachers and the students.
Jamie found it difficult to develop a relationship with a teacher because teachers changed so frequently. He said that his current teacher was better because she had taught him in year three. When asked why that was better he said:

because I, like, I knew her more and ... sometimes, like, when you have a new teacher it feels like you can’t speak to them cos you don’t know them

Jamie quite clearly explains here that if you don’t feel comfortable with the teacher you may not feel comfortable speaking to them. This could extend for some students into feeling uncomfortable speaking the language associated with that teacher.

Jamie indicated that his teachers had changed frequently throughout his schooling and that this made learning French harder. He estimated that in one year he had as many as five teachers. He said: “It was pretty hard cos they kept on swapping and everything”.

Olivier pointed out that he found it easier to talk to some of his French teachers than others. Megan also shows that she feels more comfortable with some teachers than others with some making her feel shy. This indicates that the relationship between the teacher and student does play a large role in the different levels of comfort that some students have with speaking the language. This also relates to the extensive literature pertaining to classroom power issues and teacher relationships that indicate that students can pick up on underlying messages about their languages and cultures based upon the teacher relationships modelled in their schools (Cummins, 1986, 2000, 2003; Martin-Jones 1995; Martin-Jones & Saxena, 1996).

Other students who appear more confident with their connection to language did not report being affected negatively by the change of teachers from year to year. This may be due to these students naturally being more confident or may be related to their language experiences. Elizabeth has also had five different French teachers, but says she found it equally easy to talk to all of them. The only differentiation she made between the teachers was in terms of their accents, saying: “well, my last French teacher had a Canadian accent but still I could still understand it”.
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Gabriel has found that having a French teacher there has also helped him with his English development. He said: “when I can’t understand a word then my French teacher help[s] me”. This indicates that for a student who is learning English as a Second Language, he finds it easier having the support of a teacher who speaks his first language in the classroom.

4.4.1.2 School Impact Upon Identity as Bilingual

Some students made an explicit link between their identification as feeling bilingual and the school having an influence upon that perception of being bilingual. Jamie said that he would describe himself as bilingual and that he thinks that the school has helped him to feel that way. Elizabeth said she would already feel bilingual without the school but that the school has helped her with the language aspect of feeling bilingual. The interview extract illustrates this:

Interviewer: and do you think that coming to this school has helped you be bilingual or would already have thought you were before?

Elizabeth: I would already have thought, but this ones like helped me like speak more and understand more French… yeah because I started forgetting a lot in year four and so it’s helped me remember things that I was taught before

As shown in the Opinion about School Being Bilingual section Elizabeth feels that both home and school have influenced her feeling bilingual in terms of her language development. She described home as a place to practise the language and school as the place where she learns new language.

Another relevant point shown in that section is Genevieve’s explanation that she thought school helped her to feel more connected to France than home does, because of the regular contact it provides with the language. These findings from the students show a link between them feeling bilingual and being a part of this bilingual program. Other students who did not make such explicit links between school and their feelings of being bilingual still made less explicit connections as were shown in the Opinion of the School Being Bilingual and Opinion about Teachers sections. These themes contribute to the students’ identity development in accordance with Molyneux’s
(2005) findings. He indicated that schools that develop an environment in which bilingualism and bicultural skills are valued, offer students a supportive environment in which to develop bilingual identities. In this current study’s frame the students show that the school is an important site for their development of socio-cultural connection and interaction.

4.4.2 Discussion of Findings

The findings for question d show some indications of the students’ socio-cultural connection with the culture of the school, their interaction with the teachers in the program and the school as a site of French interaction, which also indicates opportunities within the school community to develop investment in language learning and bilingualism.

In terms of socio-cultural connection, the school operates a bilingual program and the students who participate in the bilingual program have developed labels within the school community as “the Francophones” or “the Anglophones”. In spite of the apparently dichotomous nature of these labels, the reality as described by the students is less polarised. Many students identify themselves as bilingual either in French and English or English and another language. There are not any students in this study who place themselves into the labels Anglophone or Francophone. Even Megan who speaks only English at home with her family identifies herself as partly French, therefore not fitting the “Anglophone” label. In her case, the school has assisted her to develop a strong identification with French that has led to her feeling of attachment to both languages.

The theme arising from the students’ comments about their teachers sits within the interaction area of the framework. The students indicated different levels of ease of interaction with different teachers. The results show that the students’ interaction in French at school contributes to their development of an identity as a bilingual person. The students indicated that they feel they develop their linguistic skills both at home and at school. They also indicated that being able to speak the language well plays an important part in feeling bilingual. Therefore interacting with teachers in the bilingual program has an influence upon the students’ exposure to language and in that way is
influential upon their identification as being bilingual. Some of the students cite the school as more important than home in helping them to feel bilingual because of the language contact that they have in the school environment. They also indicate the confidence that they develop in their bilingual identities as a result of learning in an environment where there are other bilinguals and bilingualism is seen as valuable. For example, both Genevieve and Antonia explicitly express this benefit of the bilingual program.

As has been outlined in the framework, investment requires both individual motivation and community support for language development (Norton, 2000). The school bilingual program offers these students the opportunities for language development that they need to be able to develop investment in language learning and in being bilingual. The students identify the school as being a place where they’ve developed their linguistic abilities and their levels of comfort with being bilingual. This is an indication of their development of investment.

The students’ comments about their feelings of being bilingual associated with the school sit within the framework as a whole, but also provide evidence of connection to the culture of the school. The students indicate that the school bilingual program influences their feelings of being bilingual. In particular it helps them to feel that their linguistic skills are sufficient, in their own view, for them to label themselves as bilingual. Most of the students value the school’s bilingual program and think that it is better than attending a school that did not implement such a program. Some students, such as Elizabeth and Louis, who have attended other schools before say that they like the bilingual program much more than their previous schools.

Some of the students think the school program has helped them to feel bilingual even if they would already feel bilingual from their out-of-school experiences. Most of the students also think it would be better to have the same French teacher for more than one year. Prior literature shows the educational setting as integral to the type of language experience that students receive, the resulting confidence that they feel in using the language and, ultimately, the connection to the language and development of identity that results from this experience (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003; Kirsch,
In this way the framework element of socio-cultural connection is enhanced through the school bilingual environment. The students also make comments alluding to the importance of the personal relationship between student and teacher and show that by having a lot of different teachers they sometimes feel shy and less able to speak the language.

The students see three main benefits that they receive from taking part in a bilingual school in relation to their bilingual identities:

- Language maintenance (e.g. Jamie and Gabriel)
- Language expansion (e.g. Elizabeth and Gabriel)
- Acceptance of cultural differences (e.g. Genevieve, Louis and Antonia)

The students explain that by being in a bilingual program they feel supported in maintaining their home language, or one of their home languages. For those students who had exposure to French outside of school in the past and now have less access to the language, the school bilingual program performs not only a language maintenance function but also a language expansion function. In this way it enables the students to learn new and more complex linguistic structures. Additionally the students find that being in a linguistically diverse educational setting makes them feel more comfortable with linguistic and cultural differences. Seeing acceptance of diversity being modelled on a daily basis has meant that these students find this learning environment more comfortable than others that they have experienced (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003).

Some students also say that learning two languages at school helps them with a third language. Evidence gained through the observation stage of data collection revealed a student saying that learning French at school helped him to understand his Chinese more. Louis also finds that learning French at school has assisted him with his German language development and maintenance as he begins to see more similarities and differences between each language. This indicates a belief that language skills can be carried across different languages and reflects Cummins’ (1979) interdependence hypothesis that has shown that skills learnt in one language are accessible to bilingual people in their other language or languages providing they possess sufficient skills in their dominant language. It also indicates development of metalinguistics awareness.
2006, Norton, 2000). In this way the framework element of socio-cultural connection is enhanced through the school bilingual environment. The students also make comments alluding to the importance of the personal relationship between student and teacher and show that by having a lot of different teachers they sometimes feel shy and less able to speak the language.

The students see three main benefits that they receive from taking part in a bilingual school in relation to their bilingual identities:

- Language maintenance (e.g. Jamie and Gabriel)
- Language expansion (e.g. Elizabeth and Gabriel)
- Acceptance of cultural differences (e.g. Genevieve, Louis and Antonia)

The students explain that by being in a bilingual program they feel supported in maintaining their home language, or one of their home languages. For those students who had exposure to French outside of school in the past and now have less access to the language, the school bilingual program performs not only a language maintenance function but also a language expansion function. In this way it enables the students to learn new and more complex linguistic structures. Additionally the students find that being in a linguistically diverse educational setting makes them feel more comfortable with linguistic and cultural differences. Seeing acceptance of diversity being modelled on a daily basis has meant that these students find this learning environment more comfortable than others that they have experienced (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003).

Some students also say that learning two languages at school helps them with a third language. Evidence gained through the observation stage of data collection revealed a student saying that learning French at school helped him to understand his Chinese more. Louis also finds that learning French at school has assisted him with his German language development and maintenance as he begins to see more similarities and differences between each language. This indicates a belief that language skills can be carried across different languages and reflects Cummins’ (1979) interdependence hypothesis that has shown that skills learnt in one language are accessible to bilingual people in their other language or languages providing they possess sufficient skills in their dominant language. It also indicates development of metalinguistics awareness.
through comparing and contrasting different languages (Bialystok, 2005; Board of Studies, 2003).

Since these students report that learning a third language at school helps them with their two other languages, it might be possible that there are benefits for other students learning English as an L2 or L3 in an Australian school setting to learn in a bilingual environment regardless of the language involved. In recent years, a body of research has grown that investigates the effects of bilingualism upon third language acquisition. The literature indicates that bilingualism can have a positive effect on third language acquisition when the educational context is additive and favourable to the minority language (Cenoz & Hoffmann, 2003). In a similar manner, the research of Errasti (2003) in the Basque country indicates that students who are competent in Basque and Spanish and use Basque in a number of domains are more successful at learning English. The linked implication from the findings in this current study is that the school in this study may provide an example of an additive context that may assist third language acquisition for bilingual students.
4.5 Qe: How does observed language in the classroom relate to student bilingual identity?

In order to answer this sub-question students’ and teachers’ language use as observed in a series of classroom observations is reported. Through the discussion of these findings the potential implications for students’ formation of bilingual identities are discussed. As a speaker of French and English the researcher was able to observe and record all interactions in both languages.

Observations of the team-taught bilingual lessons and the immersion French lessons took place across a six-month period. Different days of the week were selected and a full school day was observed for the selected days.

The school day takes place in various configurations as illustrated in Table 31, with changes depending upon other events such as sport, whole school events, assemblies etc.

Table 31: *Examples of the Lesson Configuration in the School Day*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Day – example 1</th>
<th>School Day – example 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bilingual session</strong> – team taught</td>
<td><strong>English session</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>All students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English session</strong></td>
<td><strong>French Immersion session</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students except French language background speakers</td>
<td>All students except French language background speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>French Immersion session</strong></td>
<td><strong>English session</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French language background speakers</td>
<td>All students except French language background speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English session</strong></td>
<td><strong>French Immersion session</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>French language background speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bilingual session</strong> – team taught</td>
<td><strong>English session</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>All students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As outlined in chapter three the observations of both the bilingual lessons and French immersion classes were guided by two pre-prepared observation schedules adapted from prior studies (Ramirez & Stromquist, 1979). See appendices O and P.
Language use was found to be different in the team-teaching bilingual environment to the immersion classes conducted by the French-speaking teacher alone. Accordingly, the findings for the observations of use of language in the classroom are presented separately for the bilingual lessons and the immersion lessons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 32: Number of Observations in each Phase of Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2007 Observations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michèle &amp; Anna Bilingual Sessions (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michèle &amp; Trish Bilingual Sessions (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Immersion Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.1 Presentation of the Data: Language Use in the Bilingual Lessons

Eleven bilingual sessions across the data collection phase were observed as shown in Table 32. The observation periods are described as sessions because they extended beyond a lesson timeframe. The bilingual sessions constitute an entire morning or afternoon session.

There were, naturally, differences in the relationships and interactions between the French-speaking teachers and each of the English-speaking teachers. Examining the teacher relationships in depth is beyond the scope of this study, which primarily focuses upon the students and their bilingual experiences. The relationships are acknowledged as part of the interaction facet of the framework, and impact upon student bilingual identity development.

Through the series of classroom observations it was observed that the teachers each speak their main language almost all of the time. The two teachers in the classroom perform the same tasks as each other – instructing students, questioning students, answering questions, correcting students, and managing behaviour. These types of interaction were all observed as performed by both teachers and for almost all of these occurrences the English-speaking teacher spoke English and the French-speaking teacher spoke French. The teachers did not translate each other’s instructions or
explanations, rather they expanded upon and developed upon the points made by each other.

Occasionally the teacher spoke the language of the other teacher, and in these observations this only took the form of the French-speaking teacher switching briefly to English. The occasions where this did take place were for behaviour management, if management was not working adequately in the other language; for a more detailed explanation of a grammar rule; or to communicate directly with the other teacher who does not speak French. There were no observations of the English-speaking teachers speaking French. This may be because of a lack of knowledge and confidence in that language.

However, one of the English-speaking teachers was observed asking the students and the French-speaking teacher how certain terms in English were said in French and then asking the students to practise those terms. Although she could only interact with the students in English herself, she was encouraging the students to use French and make links between the two languages (Board of Studies, 2003). In this way she indicated her valuing of French as an important aspect of the classroom learning.

Both teachers in both classrooms indicated their valuing of both English and French. The teachers showed that learning in both languages was of equal importance through planning evaluation of the unit of work to take place in both languages. As can be seen from the booklet, shown below (figure 27), that accompanied one unit the evaluation criteria are presented bilingually to the students. This indicates equal and positive modelling of both languages in contrast to a study by Escamilla (1994) in which Spanish and English were shown to have unequal status around the school in spite of a policy of equality. Escamilla (1994) found that English was used for all important meetings and events and for most teacher communication outside the classroom and that this resulted in an undermining of any equality of language that might be presented in the classroom.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation du questionnaire</th>
<th>Classe :</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilisation des adverbes et adjectifs interrogatifs (Proper use of interrogative adjectives and adverbs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pertinence des questions, qualité des réponses (Relevance of the questions, quality of the answers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction de phrases correctes (Constructing correct sentences)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varité et qualité du vocabulaire (Variety and quality of the vocabulary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthographe (Spelling)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production d'un questionnaire dans un style fluide et lisible (Producing the questionnaire in a fluent and legible style)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecriture (Handwriting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propreté et soin du livret (Neatness and clarity of the booklet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondance entre le texte et les illustrations (Matching illustrations with the text)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomie dans le travail (Working independently)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect des échéances (Respecting deadlines)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualité globale de l'exercice (Overall quality of the assignment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentaires du professeur (Teacher's comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto-évaluation de l'élève (Student's self-assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 27: Evaluation Booklet for Unit of Work**

This clear demonstration of both languages being important in terms of evaluation criteria indicates to the students that both languages are valuable and important in this school context, particularly in their classrooms.

One of the English-speaking teachers, Trish, was observed to take a dominant role with behaviour management in her bilingual classes with both French-speaking teachers. One explanation for this could be the high demands upon the French teacher’s time that mean they are not in the bilingual classrooms for as many hours per day as the English-speaking teachers. Due to this time factor it is possible that, with the reduced contact time with the French teacher, some of the students respond more to the behaviour management of the English-speaking teacher. They may see the English-speaking teacher as having more authority or more permanence in their school lives. The dominant role taken by Trish could also be explained by the possibility that she has become used to being the primary behaviour manager in the
room for a large portion of each school day. It may be difficult to relinquish that role in the team-teaching lessons.

Another explanation may be that it is simply the personality of each teacher and the negotiation of interaction in that relationship. However, as stated before, the teacher relationship is not the focus of this study, although it must be acknowledged that interaction negotiations undoubtedly come into play in every classroom and particularly in a classroom with multiple teachers (Martin-Jones, 1995; Martin-Jones & Saxena, 1996). The impact of these relationship factors upon some of the observations does, therefore, need to be acknowledged for their impact upon student identification with each language.

4.5.1.1 Luc and Michèle – The French-Speaking Teachers

Luc mainly spoke in French. He used French for directions, behaviour management, explanations and praising. His use of French was frequently supported by actions, gestures or drawings on the board to support what was being said. For example, in one lesson where there was a game to practise language the teacher drew pictures on the board to support the game. Similar drawing was observed supporting a hangman game in a different class; and a drawing labelled in French was used to support learning in both languages in a lesson on minerals within a unit on the Gold Rush. An example of this is shown in the photo below.

---

8. Hangman is a word game in which students have a limited amount of chances to guess the letters in a word and then guess the whole word. If a student makes an incorrect guess one line is drawn in a figure that develops to show a picture of a stick person hanging from a noose. If enough incorrect guesses are made to draw the full picture the student loses the game.

9. The Gold Rush is a period in Australian history during the nineteenth century when gold was discovered in Australia and the export of gold became a major industry of the time (Australian Government, Culture and Recreation, 2007).
Figure 28: Blackboard Notes - Bilingual Classroom

As can be seen in the photo of the board work (Figure 28) used by the teacher to support the lesson, the teacher uses terms and ideas to match the level of learning that also takes place in English. The labels for the diagram were elicited in French from the students and Luc reinforced this in writing on the board. The English-speaking teacher, Anna, also supported this learning by asking students how they could say some of the English terms in French.

The few occasions on which the Luc used English for behaviour management perhaps indicated the seriousness of the incident at hand. As the French teacher is not in the same classroom at all times of the day it is possible that the students view the English-speaking teacher as having more authority over their behaviour because of the consistency with which each English-speaking teacher is in the classroom. Therefore for the French teacher to be taken seriously enough by some students when managing their behaviour, it appears that he feels the need to explain some points in English to indicate severity.

For necessity of communication Luc was observed in each lesson communicating with the English-speaking teacher in English. As none of the English-speaking
teachers spoke fluent French, it was necessary for the French teacher to ensure smooth communication by switching to English for any communication directly between the teachers. At times the teachers used non-verbal communication through the use of gestures, thus indicating well-developed teaching relationships.

Luc’s responses to student requests for French words or phrases were frequently supported by a visual aid, with Luc writing the new word or phrase onto the board. This indicates the strong focus on literacy that underpins a number of the observed lessons. On several occasions if Luc did not write the sentence on the board he spelt it aloud for the student. Visual literacy is one of the important aspects encompassed in a pedagogy of multiliteracies and is therefore an important aspect of language pedagogy in a bilingual setting (Cazden et al., 1996).

In the lessons observed with Michèle as the French-speaking teacher, she used both English and French. However, she specified the time of year as an influence upon her increased use of English because towards the end of the academic year interruptions, administrative tasks and end-of-year special events disrupted the lessons.

4.5.1.2 Anna & Trish – The English-Speaking Teachers

The English-speaking teachers spoke English all of the time. As these teachers are not bilingual themselves, they were only able to teach in English and communicated with Luc and Michèle in English. However, as pointed out earlier, one of the teachers (Anna) made explicit attempts to find out how things are said in French. She asked the students to teach her words or phrases and would frequently use this model of teacher as learner to elicit French words from the students. In this way she shows that she values French even though she is not able to speak it herself. Anna asked the students to explain what they had learnt in the French part of the lesson to her—thus empowering the students and enabling the students to gain confidence in being able to tell her what Luc has said (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003). She also validates the learning that has taken place in French by showing that it is important to her, and shows a high level of confidence in her position in the class by being comfortable taking on a learner role in the class.
4.5.1.3 The Students

Student language use in the bilingual team-taught lessons was mixed. Students used both English and French in different ways at different times. On the whole, a high degree of understanding of French was shown through the students responding physically to instructions and requests made by the French teachers in French. Also, students often responded to the French teachers in French when that was expected, and usually with a response modelled upon the teacher question. Less frequently, the students were observed responding in French to the French teacher in an unexpected format.

The students with higher levels of confidence in French called out and acted as unsolicited ‘teacher helpers’ by translating instructions into English for the rest of the class if all students did not respond immediately. In this way they use a type of student as teacher role to assist the teacher and assist communication in the classroom (Thompson, 1992). Wiles (1985) also indicated the value of using the student as a teacher or helper in the language classroom to increase students’ learning opportunities.

Some students were observed approaching Luc in the bilingual classes and initiating conversation with him in French. These students were later observed to be members of the French immersion class. As these students have more contact with French through the immersion lessons and more contact with Luc, they were possibly more confident in their French use, more comfortable in their relationship with Luc, and also more used to talking to each other in French in the immersion classes.

Throughout the observations, students were also observed speaking to each other in French at various points in time. However, the students predominantly spoke to each other in English and mostly used French when it was specified to them as an instruction to respond ‘en français’. Nevertheless, the students’ comprehension was evident through individual and group physical responses. It was apparent from the individual responses that the students understood most of the instructions and explanations given to them in French and supported by drawing or writing on the board.
Student confidence with language emerged as a particularly important sub-theme of student language use, linking to students’ socio-cultural connection and investment.

4.5.1.3.1 Confidence with language

The students showed some evidence of risk-taking in their language use. This indicates a degree of confidence in their use of language and also a level of comfort and safety within the classroom bilingual context. For example, one student who was a participant in the bilingual classes who had no home use of French was heard to code switch with newly acquired language in one lesson (Mahootian, 2006). The student was working on the French task using a pencil. Luc instructed the student in French to use a permanent marker to write the sentences. The English-speaking student then responded with the French words and finished the sentence in English: “Marqueur permanent coming up”.

This evidence of half a sentence being produced in each language, with the student using the French language modelled previously by the teacher interspersed accurately into a sentence with English, shows the ease with which some of these students play with language, take risks with language and move between their languages (Board of Studies, 2003). The movement between languages reflects the Board of Studies syllabus guidelines for languages that emphasise the importance of developing skills to be able to move between cultures and make linguistic connections (Board of Studies, 2003). The idea of risk-taking in language learning is closely linked with notions of self-esteem (Brown, 1994). Some theorists believe that the good language learner takes calculated risks and has high enough self-esteem to make accurate guesses about the language (Brown, 1994).

Another example of the ease with which some of these students move between languages involved Anna asking the students how to say certain things in French. In one instance Luc responded with the infinitive of a verb in French. A student then contributed by conjugating that verb accurately in a whole sentence. Although the English-speaking teacher did not understand all of the language she praised the student in English for accurately using the verb just mentioned by the French teacher.
This further illustrates the use of the student as teacher/teacher as student scenario enacted in this particular classroom several times (Thompson, 1992; Wiles, 1985). Anna is comfortable to take the role of learner of French and to allow the students to teach her some French. This role appears to work very well as the students are empowered by their superior knowledge of French in comparison with Anna and thus appear to show more confidence with language (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003). In the role of student as teacher they confidently use French and make use of the bilingual knowledge that they have.

The role of student as teacher has been shown to be useful in cooperative learning tasks (Thompson, 1992; Wiles, 1985). The role of teacher as student is less well-documented, perhaps because of the feeling of powerlessness teachers might experience in such a situation. Anna has a good rapport with the students in her class and enacting a role of teacher as student does not undermine her position in the classroom. Through her ability to take on this role she assists her students’ development of confidence with language.

The students were also observed helping each other with tasks, by asking and answering each other with words in French. In this way they enacted a more traditional role of student as teacher with their peers (Thompson, 1992, Wiles, 1985). The students were seen to comfortably assume the roles of student as teacher by translating, suggesting vocabulary and assisting each other with tasks. In this way they further illustrate their confidence with language.

The students predominantly responded in English to the questions posed in French by the French teacher, but in most cases with the correct answers. This observation seems to support the questionnaire and interview data that indicate that some students understand French well but don’t have as much confidence in speaking it. This mirrors, to a certain degree, the development of young children’s language development in their first language (Berk, 2009; Krashen, 1981). For the students with monolingual home background this possibly reflects Krashen’s theory of the silent period (1981) that states that when learning a language, students need to have an extended period in which they listen to the language but do not produce language. In this way the students develop comfort with the language and take the necessary
time to understand the rules and regulations of language use before producing language. Developing comfort in the language can lead to higher levels of confidence with language.

The use of a silent period prior to language production also links to the development of identity as a member. As the student’s feeling of membership of the language community develops so does the student’s confidence to produce language (Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Thus, by enabling confidence with language to develop prior to language production, the development of identity and membership can occur alongside language learning. For the students who use the language outside of school, the silent period is an unlikely explanation for their language use. The French-background students perform the student as teacher roles when they feel confident. At other times it is likely that they speak less French than English because they are in a minority and do not want to appear different. This is discussed further in sections 4.5.2.2 and 4.6.

The students were observed using their language abilities as commodities that could be used to negotiate a mutually beneficial agreement with other students. Students less proficient in French were able to see other students’ skills as useful to them, and the students with strong language skills could see how this could be traded for other favours. In one example a French-speaking boy asked a classmate in English if he could borrow a pen. The English-speaking boy replied that the boy could borrow the pen if he helped with the answers to the French task. The boy agreed and a deal was struck.

In this example the language ability of the student was used as an advantage and a valuable tool that could be traded. It is notable that the students with less competence in French negotiate a value for the French through the resources that they have at their disposal. Thus language skills became socially valuable. This reflects the literature that has found students in multilingual settings using their language skills as a resource (Kirsch, 2006).

When students find their linguistic skills useful they may develop feelings of pride and confidence associated with their language skills as something that not all students
find easy. This is in line with other findings that show education in bilingual settings assisting the development of pride in linguistic skills (Molyneux, 2004).

4.5.2 The French Immersion Lessons

As has been outlined, the students with home background usage of French participate in French Immersion Lessons for an hour each day. These lessons focus on French literacy, grammar, and upon extending these students’ use of French language further.

At the time of data collection the bilingual lesson system in Stage 3 (years 5 and 6) was experiencing timetabling issues and the details of adding an additional class to the stage were still being organised. This led to some disruption as the teacher did not have a permanent classroom for the immersion lessons and had to use some class time collecting the students from their main classrooms to bring them to the immersion lesson.

In this disrupted period of organising the new lesson format it could have been possible that the students might receive the impression that the immersion lessons are not as important as the general lessons as they do not have a fixed classroom assigned to them, however, as is shown in the findings the students use French consistently despite the disruption and indicate their connection to French.

4.5.2.1 Luc

The French teacher, Luc, is the only teacher present in the French immersion lessons. There is therefore a different dynamic to the one created in each team-teaching class as he is the sole authority figure in the classroom. In these lessons all of the teacher’s talk was in French. There were no observed incidences of code-switching (Mahootian, 2006) and no use of English.

The French teacher used French to give all directions to the students, to explain all of the grammar points, for behaviour management, to make jokes and for all other interaction.
4.5.2.2 The Students

The observations showed clearly that the students speak entirely in French in the immersion lessons. The students were observed responding verbally and physically. They responded physically to indicate their comprehension of instructions. For example responses observed were: nodding, following instructions to do a task and responding to directions about their behaviour.

The students asked all of their questions to the teacher and to the other students in French. The students made comments in French. The students who wanted to disrupt the lesson also did this in French. One student was particularly active in each lesson as he used his fluency in French to ask extensive questions about every task being undertaken, trying to disrupt some of the lesson time.

In one of the immersion lessons the students were taken from the immersion classroom across to the library to choose books to read for their next assignment. During the walk across to the library all of the interaction between the students was in French. In the bilingual lessons these same students were observed speaking predominantly to their peers in English, so this may indicate that the students feel more comfortable using their French language with each other when there are not any students around them speaking in English.

It was clear that not only were the students fluent in speaking French, but also, in this setting where all students had a connection to French and possibly a French speaking identity, the students assumed that all interaction with each other would take place in French. In all of the observations the students were never told to speak in French, yet each of the students spoke in French at all times. The most apparent factor that is different in this setting compared to the bilingual lesson is the absence of monolingual English speakers, which may impact upon the bilingual students’ comfort in communicating in French. In line with this finding, Kirsch’s (2006) study found that students’ confidence affected their language production and that the educational setting influenced levels of confidence. In this current study in a setting where students felt more confident about speaking French they produced more French. Thus this reflects the findings that the educational setting influences the students’ comfort
and confidence and, in turn, influences their production and use of language (Kirsch, 2006).

Students’ feelings of belonging or of not feeling different within the immersion class setting also reveals a parallel with findings from literature looking at investment, which shows that people who are invested in learning and speaking a language are frequently driven by a desire to feel that they belong to a community or group (Norton, 2000). Parallels can also be seen in the literature about the experiences of deaf students where communication difficulties lead to the students being perceived negatively as “different” (Bain, Scott & Steinberg, 2004). Although this prior research has taken place in a different educational setting and with the factor of deafness replacing bilingualism, nevertheless the negative feelings associated with being perceived as different that bilingual students may experience can be seen as similar to the negative feelings experienced by deaf students (Bain et al., 2004; Norton, 2000). The bilingual students in this study appear to feel more comfortable with their French identities in a setting where this is not “different” – in the immersion classes. In the bilingual classes being seen as “different” is something that is avoided by the students, as they choose more frequently to speak in English.

From the observations it was indicated that the students’ pronunciation was consistent even when they did not know the specific word that they needed in French. The students were observed inserting an English word into the sentence or making up a French one and as long as the French teacher understood what they meant he did not focus on correcting the missing word in general conversation. Mistakes were only observed being corrected if it was related to a point that was the focus of the grammar for that lesson.

It is possible that the students find that the immersion lessons are a safe setting where it is expected that they will speak all of the time in French. It might be that many of the students feel more comfortable speaking French in this setting than in the bilingual lessons as everyone else is doing the same and they are not going to be seen as different (Bain et al., 2004; Norton, 2000). Alternatively, in the immersion settings speaking English would show the students to be different.
In the bilingual lessons the Francophone students are generally outnumbered by predominantly English-speaking students, although there is an attempt to make the numbers as even as possible across the different classes in the stage. In the immersion classes the students readily assume their French-speaking identities and the student who was seen causing the main disruption to lessons was noticeable in his constructive use of French to cause disruption. This is a role he was not seen to assume in the bilingual lessons, and perhaps this indicates the level of comfort he feels with the French language and the all-French setting of the immersion lessons.

The quantity of French spoken by the students to each other in the immersion lessons is markedly evident in comparison with the bilingual lessons. It therefore appears that the main difference in the two settings is the presence or absence of students who speak only English at home, and that this may influence students’ levels of comfort and confidence in speaking French in each setting (Kirsch, 2006; Norton, 2000).

4.5.3 In Summary

The observations of language use indicated a number of different findings about the use of English and French in these classrooms. Differences were observed between the amount of French used by the students and teachers in the bilingual lessons compared to the entirely French-conducted immersion lessons. This difference was particularly noticeable because language use was not enforced in either setting, yet there were large differences in the amount of French spoken in each setting.

In the bilingual lessons the teachers each spoke their first language and the students spoke more English than French. Some students did communicate with each other and with the teachers in the bilingual lessons in French without prompting, but the majority of French speaking in these lessons was in direct response to the French teacher.

In the bilingual lessons the students showed evidence of confidence with French through playing with the language and taking on the role of student as teacher to teach French to the English-speaking teacher (Thompson, 1992, Wiles, 1985). The more surprising element of this observation was that the English-speaking teacher was
comfortable to take on a role of teacher as student, something that is less common in classrooms. Some students also showed evidence of using their language skills to negotiate cooperation from other students, exchanging language skills for other commodities.

In the bilingual lessons the teachers’ acceptance of students’ English response until they were comfortable to communicate productively in French may enable students to develop their bilingual identities and identities as members of the French-speaking community as they developed their language skills.

In the immersion lessons the students’ French language skills were more clearly demonstrated as all interaction took place in French including teasing and misbehaviour, perhaps indicating increased comfort in ‘being French’ away from the English-speakers. Thus the link between educational context and amount of language use was shown (Kirsch, 2006; Norton, 2000).

4.5.4 Discussion of the Data: Implications for Student Bilingual Identity Negotiation

Through observation of classroom interaction further information about the bilingual experience of these students has been indicated. The students show, in some cases, stronger interaction skills in two languages than they self-reported in the questionnaire or interview. This indicates that although some students did not comfortably describe themselves as being bilingual, they do possess the skills to be able to be seen as bilingual by others. Being viewed by others as being bilingual forms an important aspect of seeing yourself as bilingual. As the literature about language socialisation shows, a person needs to identify his/herself as a member but also be viewed by other members as a member, before they can form a fully developed identity as a member of a new group or culture (Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007; Lave & Wenger, 1991).

It is possible that through the teachers utilising positive examples of use of both languages in the classroom that the students develop a stronger feeling of acceptance towards being bilingual and having a connection to more than one language. Of
course it is not possible to “observe” whether positive attitudes to language use have an influence upon the students’ identity development. However, the students’ self-reporting of the benefits of the program outlined in question d indicated the ways in which they perceive that they benefit from being in the bilingual program. By comparing these students’ self-reported opinions and the languages observed in the classroom it is possible to draw some links.

For example, as shown in the results of question d in the theme of Opinion of School Being Bilingual, Elizabeth indicated that she believes both home and school have influenced her feeling bilingual in terms of her language development. She described home as a place to practise the language and school as the place where she learns new language. Also shown in that section were the responses from Genevieve, who explained that she believed school helped her to feel more connected to France than home does because of the regular contact it provides with the language. These comments from the students indicate a link between them feeling bilingual and being a part of this bilingual program. The observations support this by showing that through the immersion classes, students have the opportunity to interact comfortably within their French-speaking identities. These interaction opportunities are an important factor for these students developing bilingual identities.

In relation to the students’ feelings about the importance of their relationship with the teachers in question d Jamie quite clearly explained that if he did not feel comfortable with the teacher it was more difficult to feel comfortable speaking the language. This relates to some of the observational data that showed students appearing more comfortable approaching certain teachers and instigating conversation in French with one particular teacher.

For Genevieve, having recognition of the importance of French in the school and having other French people around her at school helped her to feel comfortable with having a connection to France. She indicated in her interview that she believes school has a bigger impact on her language and how she feels about France than home because at home she can choose her language and at school she has regular daily contact with French language. This comment can be linked to the importance of the daily use by the teachers of both languages on an equal basis, as indicated by the
observation data. This point also adds support to the observation that the immersion lessons allow students daily periods of time where they can ‘be French’.

Other comments made by the students during the observation period also indicated some of the positive effects of seeing and participating in a bilingual classroom. The students indicated that they see benefits from having two teachers, each representative of that teacher’s language and culture. They also indicated the importance of each of these teachers for developing their language, and as part of that language development, also developing their connection to each culture.

Age as a factor causing embarrassment, anxiety and issues with feeling different may also contribute to the fact that the students exclusively use French in the French immersion lessons, as shown in the observation results. It is possible that if the students feel less comfortable speaking French in the bilingual lessons they then capitalise more fully upon being able to speak French in the safe environment of the French immersion lessons (Norton, 2000; Wigfield, Eccles, Iver, Reuman & Midgley, 1991). The immersion lessons become an environment where it is acceptable to be French, or an environment where speaking English signifies being different.

It could be seen in some of the bilingual lessons (and is further indicated by the teachers in Question f – section 4.6), that some of the students become more reluctant to be seen as different as they approach adolescence. Literature pertaining to Willingness to Communicate (WTC) indicates that people generally avoid communicating if they feel anxiety or perceive themselves to have low communicative competence (MacIntyre, Baker, Clément & Donovan, 2002, p. 539-540). However, the observations also indicate that in the immersion lessons the French-speaking students are confident to speak entirely in French. This indicates that in a setting where the use of their language is not different, and in fact is shared by all others in that setting there is less of a hindrance to language use, perhaps indicating less anxiety about communicating in that setting and thus more identification with language. This adds evidence to support other studies that show that classrooms with transformative pedagogies can be more supportive environments for bilingual identity negotiation (Arce, 2004; Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003).
There may be tension for these students between the identities that they enact in the bilingual classroom and their identities in the immersion classroom. The students appeared to enact different roles and identities in each setting, shown by the different use of French and English. The teacher reference to students feeling discomfort with being different provides supporting evidence that students at this age may experience tension between different aspects of their bilingual identities (Baker, 2002; Lotherington, 2003; Molyneux, 2005). This may lead them to only take up their bilingual identity in certain safe settings, such as the immersion lessons, and to discard this identity for a safer option in other settings (Molyneux, 2005; Norton, 2000). Alternatively it could be argued that in the immersion classes the “safe” identity option is a French-speaking identity while in the bilingual classes the safer identity option is an English-speaking identity.

The teachers’ perceptions can also provide some insight into the ways that they perceive the benefits of the bilingual program reaching the students and influencing their bilingual identity development. The teachers’ opinions and observations are presented in the following research question.
4.6  Qf: How do teacher perceptions of the bilingual program relate to student bilingual identity?

The teacher interviews provided insight into the teachers’ approaches to teaching bilingually and also provided their views about the students’ experiences of language and bilingualism. See Table 33 for the schedule.

Table 33: The Teacher Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1 Interviews (Nov-Dec 2007)</th>
<th>Phase 2 Interviews (Feb-Apr 2008)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michèle</td>
<td>Luc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Anna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trish</td>
<td>Trish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teachers spoke about the benefits of the bilingual lessons for students and about what they think makes the lessons work. The teachers’ perspectives give more depth to the researcher observations. The dominant theme is self-esteem/confidence. The other benefits are presented in table format. The teachers did not indicate any aspects that they found negative for the students.

4.6.1 Presentation of the Findings: Benefits of Bilingual Program for the Students

4.6.1.1 Self-Esteem/Confidence

A number of the teachers’ comments indicated the importance of self-esteem and confidence in the students feeling connected to their languages and bilingualism. The teachers saw the students’ bilingualism as a potential source for developing their confidence. The teacher comments are shown in the table below (Table 34).
### Table 34: Self-esteem/Confidence Quotes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-theme</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student as teacher</td>
<td>I rely on them to pass on the information to the others when I give instructions... when they go back to their tables and work in small groups the Francophones can help me supervise and translate some of the information if needed so they know I rely on them and I count on their help... having these responsibilities with me gives them an extra reason to be there and to do things right. (Luc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem within pedagogy</td>
<td>We definitely have the child’s self-esteem I guess at the centre of both of our philosophies... so having fun, hands-on learning and self-esteem [are] at the centre [of my pedagogy] (Anna).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building academic confidence</td>
<td>Being bilingual at this age. I don’t know what’s the proportion of human beings who can say that but there are not that many and those of them that have that, that’s a huge advantage. That’s something they need to be proud of. (Luc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think it gives them such a great sense of confidence when they go to high school to go into something, so whatever their level is in other things they’re in this particular group (Trish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other students as support</td>
<td>[Anna]: What I have noticed is this is the largest number of Francophones that I’ve had in any of my classes so they just seem more comfortable speaking French in class because I guess the numbers are greater so they’ve got...[pause]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewer: a support network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Anna]: yeah you’re exactly right.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned in the observation results, confidence with language was developed through the use of the student as teacher role in the classroom, in which Anna asked students to explain French words to her. Supporting this observation, Luc spoke in the interview about using the bilingual students’ skills in a way in which they could teach their peers (Thompson, 1992; Wiles, 1985).

The environment that is developed in the classroom whereby the students feel valued by the teacher through helping the teacher in the classroom, as described by Luc, may assist the students to build confidence in their bilingual abilities and to see this ability as something useful and special (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003).
Similarly, the teachers perceive that student bilingual skills can be used as an asset to assist students who have low self-confidence in their academic abilities. This use of acknowledging the skills that students do have, in order to help them to develop confidence in the school environment is an example of the use of transformative pedagogies in this school setting (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003). The subsequent empowerment that students feel through the acknowledgement of their language skills in this setting may allow them to begin to overcome the negative impact of academic difficulties they may have.

Although not all students in this school have bilingual or multilingual home lives, there are sufficient numbers of students with bilingual backgrounds that this adds to student confidence and student sense of belonging. Research has indicated that in multilingual learning contexts student confidence with language is closely related to their use of language and that this in turn is influenced by the formal language learning setting that they experience in school (Kirsch, 2006). In line with this research, the students in this study showed evidence that they exhibit more confident linguistic behaviour in settings within the school when they are surrounded by other students with the same linguistic background. As indicated in other research settings, desire to not be seen as “different” by one’s peers is an important factor in developing language and being invested in learning language (Bain et al., 2004; Norton, 2000).

As the students develop confidence and pride in their bilingual abilities this may impact upon their choice and action in developing an identity associated with both languages and being happy to describe themselves as being bilingual. This was also reflected in the students’ language use as shown in the observation results. In the classroom settings where the students feel more comfortable and more of a sense of belonging – especially the immersion lessons – they speak more French and have more opportunity to develop their identities associated with French.

4.6.1.2 Other Benefits for the Students

The teachers described other types of benefit that the students appear to gain from their participation in a bilingual school environment (see Table 35).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit for students</th>
<th>Supporting Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of Speakers of Other Languages</td>
<td>They have a great acceptance of other languages and that kind of thing. (Anna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think particularly as most of them go to the high school, they have that opportunity then to go into you know a good level of French to start with and not have to go into beginner French (Trish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they realise now that all the things they learnt previously that it’s helping them now. But I think they are going to realise this more when they are going to be in secondary school and they go in extensive classes ...because it will be easier for them. (Michèle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>when they go off to high school their vocab is quite outstanding you know... in English and French but in French um and it’s words that aren’t like words when you go travelling it’s words that are to do with everyday (Anna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New or advanced French skills</td>
<td>It’s to maintain their level of French or trying to you know because we still have to keep for them the same curriculum as in France (Michèle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Maintenance</td>
<td>I’m just talking about the 3 years that I’ve spent here but I think children react quicker because they have, their brain is always trying to work a bit harder than children who are only talking English all day long. These ones try to to think more you know, I don’t know it’s another mechanism for them (Michèle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Cognitive Processes</td>
<td>so I think that the comments they’ve had from other people about their accents as well has been very positive. (Trish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and I think that at such a young age their accents are so good (Trish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anna: and I guess another benefit is the accent. Their accents are beautiful to listen to cos they’re…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewer: they’ve got a good example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anna: yeah the example of the French teacher but also the francophone kids so they know exactly how the words should sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accents</td>
<td>I think they see it as something special I think, well we do that at our school it’s a special thing and they see it as better than probably what... cos I know at schools with community languages it tends to be RFF and it’s an hour a week or two hours a week you know it’s not the sort of program we have and it’s quite unusual... they’re doing really well in everything and having this extra bonus (Trish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being special or different</td>
<td>These teachers have cited the cognitive benefits that their students appear to have and attribute these benefits to the additional skills developed through bilingualism. The response from one teacher reflects some of the research into the cognitive effects of bilingualism that indicates some students with well-developed literacy skills in their home language can use their understanding of the underlying rules of language to assist with decoding, comprehension tasks and creative thinking (Bialystok, 2005; Cummins, 1979; Datta, 2007).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teachers therefore see a number of benefits for the students that experience bilingualism on a daily basis. These benefits support the questionnaire and interview findings that indicate cognitive, future and bilingual benefits from these students’ experiences. The teachers also cite benefits that lead to acceptance of different cultures and students feeling more comfortable about their different languages. The teacher insights into the students’ classroom experiences help to highlight some of the influential factors in the students’ developing identifications with English, French, other languages and bilingualism.

4.6.2 Presentation of the Findings: Factors that Make the Bilingual Lessons Successful

The teachers mentioned a number of factors relating to their pedagogies and the factors they believe that make teaching bilingually in a team successful. The sub-themes within this section that were used to code the responses are: Team Teachers Needing Similar Pedagogies, Teaching Literacy in Both Languages, Transformative Pedagogies, Using Both Languages in the Classroom, Considering the Age of the Students, Subjects Appropriate for Bilingual Lessons, and Relationships Affecting the Program: i) Teacher-Teacher Relationship, ii) Teacher-Student Relationship, and iii) Teacher-Parent Relationship. These are shown in the table below with the quotes that support them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Theme</th>
<th>What Makes Bilingual Lessons Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Teachers Needing Similar Pedagogies</td>
<td>I was quite excited to be working with Luc. We’ve got quite similar styles and similar ideas and pedagogy I guess so we were able to just slot straight into it. (Anna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Literacy in Both Languages</td>
<td>we started having lessons of ...French literacy and how to write a question or ask a question and become more independent and self-sufficient and that’s a totally different approach so... it’s uh a great addition to what’s happening before and it’s a great transition towards high school (Luc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformative Pedagogies</td>
<td>Everyday we have a little structure that I’ve put together called the vibe ... It’s a series of questions and we have a leader who asks questions to the class and then there’s a recorder that writes down all the responses ...it’s open to any language so then the kids come in with any language and they deliver this exact structure in whatever language so we’ve had Serbian, Mandarin, Italian in past years (Anna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Both Languages in the Classroom</td>
<td>in a perfect world I would expect half English half French but I know they understand most of the things said in French but they can’t talk back, so they will talk back to me in English most of the time and then I respond in French again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering the Age of the Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They used to be excellent and they’re no longer excellent and... that happens sometimes, if they feel different than the others cos they’re not regular students they’re the francophone students and they don’t want to feel different. (Luc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects Appropriate for Bilingual Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maths is easy for the Australian teacher as a team-teaching lesson, but a team-teaching lesson that will help a lot Australian children or English speaking children will be lessons like science because it involves a lot of vocabulary so in those sorts of lessons they will learn more than in maths for example (Michèle)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships Affecting the Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’ve always thought HSIE, Science and Maths sometimes are the best lessons because they allow me to introduce new words and focus on those words and make sure the kids remember them. If we’re doing a basic maths lesson like plus and minus and times there no point because there’s no new vocabulary that students will master whereas when we’re doing something on math lessons on directions we can use map names of towns and roads and all kinds of new words. (Luc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i) Teacher-Teacher Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>we’ll deliver the introduction together, um so that’s it’s not translating at all, I guess it’s a bit like banter I’ll say something and Michèle will say something (Anna)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships Affecting the Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I guess our teaching styles and philosophy of teaching are very similar so we teach the same way. It’s been very very easy, so if the teaching styles are significantly different that’s when it becomes harder (Anna)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships Affecting the Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>you’ve gotta build up that relationship with your French partner as well (Trish)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships Affecting the Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the flow of the lesson it really depends on the teacher you work with (Michèle)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships Affecting the Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>you need to have team teachers with whom you get along and who you can trust. I mean I’m not afraid of doing a lesson that is totally improvised with Anna for example because I know that all it takes sometimes is one look between us and we know how to go on from there (Luc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships Affecting the Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>you have to make sure that the children see them [the other teacher] equally as a teacher (Trish)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships Affecting the Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think maybe why that’s happening [that students are approaching him to talk in French] is Luc, he shares a lot of his own experiences and himself in the lesson so the kids feel that they know him more I guess (Anna)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships Affecting the Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>after two years I kind of know the parents and I know what’s going on at home so I know which ones are really trying to help us do our job and which ones just leave the kids to do it on their own ... help at home makes a huge difference. I really want to tell those parents that they need to talk French to their kids. Sometimes they just rely on us to keep their French going and they don’t speak French at home at all... they need to be exposed to French here and also at home because if it’s only one hour here, ... we can’t make miracles in one hour so ... some of the students are going backwards at the moment... Parents’ support is really a need for us. (Luc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teachers’ responses indicate the complexity and quantity of influences that they see making the lessons work, and in turn, influencing the students’ experiences of language and bilingualism.

Luc can see the benefits of using both languages in the bilingual classes rather than insisting upon the use of French and he shows that the main aim is to maximise the learning opportunities open to the students and to give them the best possible learning experience. Sometimes this can mean not being too concerned about the quantity and/or quality of French being used by the students themselves in interaction. In this way he indicates a valuing of both languages and this acts as a model of the importance of both languages to the students.

4.6.3 Discussion of the Data: How the factors and benefits of the program influence student bilingual identity

The teacher interviews indicate supporting evidence of the students’ interactions and socio-cultural connection with their teachers and classmates. In this way further insight into the students’ bilingual identity negotiation process is provided through the teacher interviews. The findings from this section of data collection and its analysis show that the students see and experience, on a daily basis, interaction in both languages with their teachers and develop their socio-cultural connection to both languages each day. The Francophone students also develop their interaction and socio-cultural connection in French with their Francophone peers and in English with all of their peers on a daily basis.

The teacher interviews have added another facet to the picture of these students’ experiences and illustrate the classroom experiences and the teachers’ approaches to bilingualism in the classroom.

Student investment was shown to relate to opportunities to develop confidence with language and bilingualism. The teachers identify opportunities for the students’ development of confidence and other skills through development of their linguistic competence. The teachers see that the level of parental investment in the student becoming bilingual is an important factor in the students’ language development.
Parents who are less actively supportive of the bilingual program, its lessons and homework tasks, pass on to their children a message that the French language is less important than English. The teachers notice that the students with parents who are more supportive of bilingualism approach the lessons and tasks more positively.

A number of sub-themes emerged from the presentation of the findings. These are discussed in the following sections.

4.6.3.1 Discussion of the Data: Teaching Literacy in Both Languages
The expansion of the program’s classes to include specific literacy classes in French indicates to the students that the school and the teachers value the importance of literacy in French. These classes were introduced in the school after the collection of the students’ questionnaire responses and mid-way through the student interviews. In the questionnaire, English skills were shown to be valued more highly by most students than French skills. It is possible, in line with prior work involving literacy in bilingual settings, that after experiencing literacy lessons in French in addition to English that the students might develop a stronger valuing of French literacy skills (Gregory & Kenner, 2003; Hornberger, 2004; Kenner, 2000; Kenner & Gregory, 2003; Lo Bianco, 2000; Murray & Combe, 2007; Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003). The teachers indicated that they find these lessons particularly important to develop student literacy in both languages and assist their preparation for high school language learning.

4.6.3.2 Discussion of the Data: Transformative Pedagogies - Acceptance of all Language Backgrounds and Self-Esteem/Confidence
One teacher spoke specifically about the way in which she tries to incorporate students’ diverse backgrounds into classroom lessons. She found that all of her students are very open and accepting of people speaking other languages. This is a belief that was supported by the students’ interviews where they spoke of feeling important, special and comfortable using their French. The encounters with language that these students have had throughout the primary years of schooling have led to a general acceptance of other languages and, in this way, opportunities are arising where students’ other home languages and experiences can be brought into the
classroom. These types of experience serve to empower the students and acknowledge the importance of their home language learning (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003).

Student confidence and/or self-esteem emerged as a theme across the interviews. The teachers cited development of confidence and self-esteem as one of the main benefits to students in the program and also a factor that they use to ensure that the program works well. The teachers saw that through school and parental encouragement these students could begin to value the skills that they do possess linguistically and realise that this is something special and useful for them. This reflects, to some degree, findings by Bartram (2006) that indicate that parental attitudes have a correlation to children’s attitudes to language learning.

The students develop their self-esteem through the program in a number of ways. By enacting the role of student as teacher using their French to teach the English-speaking teacher, the students gain confidence and develop their self-esteem. This is a core part of several of the teachers’ pedagogies, as they see student development of self-esteem being of utmost importance in their development of bilingualism. Alongside the students’ use of student as teacher roles, the development of confidence in their academic abilities takes place through participating in the bilingual program. For some students who experience difficulties in other academic areas, being bilingual is something that they can capitalise on to feel more confident in the school setting.

In line with this development of confidence were the reported empowering pedagogies in the classroom. The students were given the opportunity to act as teacher or expert at various times in the classroom and this gave the students the opportunity to see their language skills as something they can teach to others or use to help others without those skills. This can raise students’ confidence in their skills (Brown, 1994; Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003; Thompson, 1992; Wiles, 1985).

The age of students is shown to be a factor influencing the level of comfort, and therefore confidence, that they feel in speaking French in the bilingual lessons. The teachers perceive that the students get embarrassed and “don’t want to feel different” (Bain et al., 2004; Kirsch, 2006; Norton, 2000). Embarrassment and wanting to fit in
are influential factors for students at this age and therefore are likely to impact upon their investment and consequently their development (or lack therein) of bilingual identity. (Norton, 2000; Wigfield et al., 1991). Wigfield et al. (1991) argue that at young adolescence, when students are in the middle years (years 5-8), students experience more anxiety about school and lower self-concept about their ability. It is possible that this would affect the students’ willingness to speak French in the bilingual classroom (Brown, 1994).

4.6.3.3 Discussion of the Data: Relationships Affecting the Program

Relationships are commonly acknowledged by the teachers as important influences in the success of their classes and the experiences of their students. The teacher-teacher relationship is an important model of the importance of French and English for the students in this learning setting. The type of relationship between the teachers can affect the attitudes and opinions of the students in that class towards the languages involved (Creese, 2006; Martin-Jones, 1995; Martin-Jones & Saxena, 1996).

The relationships themselves are not the focus of this study, however, their impact upon the potential for the students to develop positive attitudes towards bilingualism and the two languages is important, and students’ attitudes are influenced by the relationships that they see on a daily basis. The teacher relationship forms part of the interaction element of the bilingual identity negotiation framework.

Another important relationship influencing students’ attitudes towards their languages and bilingualism is the relationship between the teachers and the students. The teacher-student relationship influences student opportunity for bilingual communication, student comfort with the language and student connection to the culture through the teacher. Thus the relationship influences their bilingual identities.

These relationships can be seen to form part of the interaction aspect of the BINF framework through the element of classroom interaction patterns (section 2.6.1.2.2). This study’s findings support and extend the findings of previous studies that have shown inequality in teacher relationships (Creese, 2006; Martin-Jones, 1995; Martin-Jones & Saxena, 1996) and have shown that the roles acted out by teachers in the classroom affect student identity (Creese, 2006). The relationships between the
students and the teachers impact upon the students’ process of identification with the languages used and modelled by those teachers. Luc was seen to have a positive, relaxed relationship with most of the students and his co-teacher reported that his demeanour in the classroom and open nature encouraged the students to approach him and feel comfortable to talk in French.

Through experiencing a positive relationship the students have a role model of French identity and this assists them to see a French identity as something valid and possible for them. Teachers also form one of the important groups for students’ socio-cultural connection because they are one of the groups who model language and induct the students to become members of the language community (Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007; Lave & Wenger, 1991). As students spend a large portion of their time each day in school the importance of teachers as experts, in addition to family members, must be acknowledged.

Parental opinion about language learning and bilingualism is also vital for students to develop positive attitudes themselves towards it. The teachers indicate that they predominantly receive support from the parents of the students, and see the relationship between the teachers and parents as vital. For relatively young students to value the skills that they have, it is of vital importance that their parents model this valuing of skills for them (Bartram, 2006). Family support has been shown in the other sub-questions to be integral to the development of identity as a member of the culture and subsequently as bilingual. The teacher data add further evidence of the importance of family opinion and the family as inductors of younger members into a community or culture (Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Volk, 1998).

4.6.3.4 Summary
In combination with the data taken directly from the students themselves and the observed behaviours and interactions in the classroom, an overall picture is obtained of the factors influencing the students’ identification with each language and with bilingualism. It is clear that this process is a complicated one with a multitude of factors impacting upon the development of a bilingual identity.
The findings indicate that both school and home are important environments for development of bilingual identity. Without supportive modelling in both of these settings students may develop conflict or tension related to their bilingualism. Positive modelling in both home and school contexts can lead to student identification with bilingualism.
5 Implications and Recommendations

In this chapter implications and recommendations resulting from the discussion of findings and the theoretical framework are presented. Each section of the theoretical framework is addressed. The theoretical framework is re-presented first, followed by each of the research sub-questions and their related implications.

5.1 Theoretical Implications

The theoretical framework is re-stated in Figure 29 in diagrammatic form.
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**Figure 29: BINF Framework**

The process of bilingual identity negotiation involves three inter-connected factors that are equally important - socio-cultural connection, interaction and investment (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003; Gregory, 2005; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Norton, 2000; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986; Volk, 1998; Zentella, 1997). Identifying as being bilingual is a process that is influenced by an individual’s experiences relating to these three inter-connected factors. The extent to which an individual progresses along the continuum of identifying as a bilingual depends upon their experiences and opportunities in all three of these areas.
In order to progress through a process of bilingual identity negotiation an individual needs to:

- Be invested;
- Feel connected; and
- Have opportunities for interaction.

Within this process it is important to acknowledge that in progressing through the process of bilingual identity negotiation there are two major factors influencing all three areas of the process (socio-cultural connection, interaction, and investment). There are social and individual factors that impact upon the possibility of meeting all three of these requirements. To be invested in acquiring a bilingual identity requires both social support to develop that identification with bilingualism and individual drive to overcome obstacles in the path to identifying as bilingual (Norton, 2000). In order to feel connected to two cultures and develop a feeling of being bilingual, the community of practice needs to assist the individual to develop their feelings of membership and the community needs to accept new members and the individual also has to self-identify as a member (Lave & Wenger, 1991). In addition, in order to engage fully in interaction experts need to provide opportunities for interaction and individuals also need to act upon and use those opportunities. In this way the importance of both social and individual factors upon developing an identification as being bilingual reflects the interplay of internal and external forces that impact upon motivation in language learning (Ushioda, 2007).

In the following sections each of the three inter-connecting elements of the framework is presented with concluding statements about that particular element.

5.1.1 Socio-Cultural Connection

In order to progress through the process of identification as bilingual, a person needs to feel a connection to both languages and cultures.

In order to develop an identification as being bilingual a person needs to progress from feeling two separate socio-cultural connections with each language and culture
towards feeling a unified, intercultural connection. There is therefore a continuum of connection. Firstly a person needs to develop a connection with each of the languages and cultures separately and as they progress along the process of identification as bilingual they move towards developing a sense of who they are as connected to more than one language and culture.

Students showed that they feel connected to more than one culture in different ways and to differing degrees. Students indicated that they felt connected to a culture through family, place of birth and access to language. Students who had continued connection with family members through that language, who maintained a feeling of connection to their place of birth, and experienced continued access to language, showed identification as being bilingual. Through their development of feelings of group membership to more than one group or culture students also developed feelings of connection to being bilingual (Duff, 2002, 2003, 2007; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986).

Some students showed their connection to two cultures explicitly in their descriptions of themselves as being connected to two cultures and in some cases identified connection to three or more cultures (see section 4.3.2.1). One student showed an equal connection to two cultures through his avoidance of the terms ‘first’ and ‘second’ when referring to his languages. This student instead chose to distinguish between his languages in terms of the amount of time each day spent using them.

Megan, with no home connection to French, nevertheless describes herself as partly French. She thus shows evidence of the socio-cultural connection that is developed by the school setting in particular. Her description of herself as partly French therefore, must be related to the experience of language and culture that Megan has accessed through the school setting. Students expressed positive identification with more than one culture and this shows some similarities to other research in which students have been found to develop positive connections with two or more cultures (Cumming-Potvin, 2004; Diaz Soto, 2002; Martin & Stuart-Smith, 1998; Martinez-Roldan, 2003; Molyneux, 2005; Wu & Bilash, 1998).
5.1.2 Interaction

In order to progress through the process of identification as bilingual, a person needs ongoing access to interaction in the languages and with the cultures.

The students showed how their interactions led to their feelings of being bilingual. Students who indicated communicating and interacting in different languages within their family showed stronger identification as being bilingual. Students who indicated mainly interacting bilingually at school showed less identification as being bilingual. However, some students who interacted bilingually only in a school setting did identify as being bilingual. Therefore the process of identification as bilingual is shown as a continuum where quantity and type of interaction can affect the position of an individual along that continuum.

Students also showed that they engaged in internal interaction through their indications of thinking about things in two languages. This shows a different degree of progression towards identification as bilingual by students who say that they use different languages in their mental processes and can verbalise and describe these processes.

Home literacy practices were shown to be an important strand of the necessary interaction that leads to biliteracy and identification as bilingual. This adds support to the call for more recognition of home literacy practices as important linguistic experiences for bilingual students (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003; Datta, 2007; Gregory & Kenner, 2003; Hornberger, 2004; Kenner, 2000; Kenner & Gregory, 2003; Marsh, 2003). Students in this study indicated a number of different home literacy practices in which their families engaged, including parents reading aloud to children in two languages and playing games as a family in two languages. The biliteracy skills that the students in these families acquired were linked to strong feelings of pride in their linguistic skills. Students' feelings of linguistic ability were linked to stronger feelings of identification as bilingual.
The students also indicated the different types of interaction that they engage in within the school and the different levels of ease they feel with different teachers. This indicates the importance of the impact of the teacher-student relationship upon the opportunities for interaction taken up by students in the school setting.

Students showed through the home literacy interactions they engaged in that social factors were important for interaction to take place. Students also had an individual impact upon their interactions as some chose not to respond to parents and teachers in French at some times.

5.1.3 Investment

In order to progress through the process of identification as bilingual, a person must have investment in learning about the languages and cultures.

The students in this study showed investment\(^{10}\) to varying degrees (Norton, 2000). The students showed that they were invested in learning languages by indicating their initiative to find additional opportunities to interact with and use their languages. The students showed initiative as they spoke about creating language use opportunities at home through their use of DVDs, comics and books in the home environment. This indicated some investment in their languages and in increasing their exposure to the languages.

The enthusiasm shown for languages was also an indicator of the students’ levels of investment in their languages. Some students showed that they felt passionate about languages through their expression, choice of words when describing their language use, and clarity in describing their attitudes and opinions towards their languages. Some students showed that they understood the importance that other people in their lives placed on languages but indicated less individual investment themselves. This reflected findings from other studies that have indicated the importance of family members’ opinions for young bilinguals (Molyneux, 2006; Pease-Alvarez, 2003; Tannenbaum & Howie, 2002; Weisskirch & Alatorre Alva, 2002).

\(^{10}\) Investment is used in this study to signify individual motivation combined with community support for language development and cultural connection. See Section 2.6.3 for details.
Some students showed less investment in their languages. They also indicated less identification with one of their languages and indicated less connection to the term bilingual. The students who were less invested appeared to have less access to one of their languages outside of school through both their own initiative (individual factors) and family and community support (social factors). (See sections 4.1 and 4.3.)

The students also showed investment through their beliefs about the future importance of their languages. By indicating that they saw a future benefit and need for these skills they were indicating a degree of investment in continuing to learn and maintain these languages (section 4.2.2.2). The students also indicated their investment in their languages through their desire to communicate with members of their extended families (section 4.1.4.2). In a number of cases the students’ extended families spoke little or no English. Therefore in order to communicate fully with them the students need proficiency in the other languages of their family. This need leads to their investment in improving their language skills for inter-generational communication in the family (Norton, 2000).

The students also indicated the importance of their family’s opinion to them about language learning. If the students’ parents or other family members themselves were invested in language learning this seemed to be related to a higher level of investment by the students. Family investment also influenced the amount of language contact that students could access in the home, this in turn influenced students’ investment. The students who readily had access to practise the language at home appeared to have a more comfortable relationship with the language. Other students who received less contact with the language at home had more trouble with learning and maintaining the language at the pace they wished (section 4.2.3.2). In turn the students with difficulty in the language became less invested in learning the language. This was one of the main sources of tension shown by some of the young bilingual students. The importance of family opinion reflects similar findings to a number of studies that have found parental opinion to be very important to young bilinguals’ attitudes and opinions (Molyneux, 2006; Pease-Alvarez, 2003; Tannenbaum & Howie, 2002; Weisskirch & Alatorre Alva, 2002).
As the community's support is an essential ingredient for investment (Norton, 2000), so the students showed that for them the school is a site where they can develop their investment as it offers them the opportunity to develop and learn in French. For the students who have prior knowledge of French, the school was cited as the place they can maintain and develop their knowledge of French and consequently their identification with French culture is maintained (section 4.4.1.2).

5.1.4 Bilingual Identity Negotiation Framework (BINF)

The students, as individuals, are all at different points in the process of Bilingual Identity Negotiation. The process is an ongoing and lifelong process. Every individual has a different experience of languages, every individual develops and evolves in their identification in a different way because their language contact, experiences and opportunities increase and decrease throughout their lives.

As some students' experiences have shown in this data, for some people a model of multilingual identity negotiation is more appropriate. However, the BINF developed here encompasses multilingualism within the term bilingual as shown through the examination of the literature (see section 2.1 for a clarification of bilingualism encompassing two or more languages). Therefore the three inter-connected factors apply equally to students developing identities associated with more than two languages.

The study indicated that the model of bilingual identity negotiation is appropriate to exemplify the ways that different students progress towards identifying themselves as bilingual. The data indicated that all three strands of the process were important in enabling an individual to feel that they are bilingual, and that home and school are both important sites for this development. The data also indicated that the three inter-connecting factors of socio-cultural connection, interaction and investment, are all affected by individual and social factors that require the individual to actively pursue their connection to languages and bilingualism, and also require the community around them to assist with that process.
This study also indicated that the three factors of socio-cultural connection, interaction and investment and are all influenced by access to language. Without access to language students cannot develop and maintain the required amount of interaction necessary to develop an identity as bilingual. Likewise without access to language the students cannot develop strong investment in learning the language as it appears out of their reach. Furthermore, without access to language students cannot develop connection to the culture in question. Therefore access to language is a key element in the development of bilingual identity linking all three sub-factors in the BINF.

The indication in this study of access to language being a key factor for bilingual students draws a parallel with Bourdieu’s notion of “access to the markets” (1977, p. 656). He argued that the ability and opportunity to learn the dominant language of a society led to power and success in that setting (Bourdieu, 1977). For young bilingual students the opportunity to engage with both languages to a sufficient degree is essential for them to develop sufficient skills to identify as bilingual. Access to the target language within the home is also a key factor mentioned by Cloud, Genesee and Hamayan (2000) in their understanding of the individual and environmental factors that influence second language learning. Thus this study shows that access to language is a key factor for young bilingual students in a setting more specific than a second language learning environment.

The following section outlines the implications from this study that relate to the individual research sub-questions.
5.2 Implications Related to the Sub-questions

In this section the implications from the study will be presented according to the research sub-question that they correspond to.

How do students in a bilingual primary school program in NSW identify with their languages (English and French)?

According to the students themselves, they identify with a number of different languages.

The languages that the students in this primary school bilingual program identified themselves with were not limited to the languages of the program itself - English and French. Some of the students also identified with other languages used in their home lives and also with the two languages of the bilingual program. Therefore a number of the students demonstrated negotiation of complex bilingual identities involving more than two languages (Baker & Prys Jones, 1998).

Additionally, some of the students who had access to only English in their home lives identified themselves with both languages of the program. In this way they were also negotiating bilingual identities, even though many students interpreted bilingualism as meaning that they needed equal ability in both languages to be called bilingual.

5.2.1 Qa: What is the nature of students’ language use in the home?

Students interact bilingually with siblings, parents and extended family.

Firstly, while the students in this study were predominantly born in Australia (73.9%) any conclusions drawn from this statistic might be misleading in regards to the languages spoken by the students in their home lives. The students in this study spoke of much bilingual access to languages and literacy in their home lives, and presented a more diverse picture than might be expected from the demographic data about these students. This highlights the difficulty that is inherent in demographic questions such as those posed in the census, which cannot easily and accurately be answered by the many citizens with complex linguistic backgrounds. Related to this is the idea of L1
and L2 (first language and second language) not being appropriate terms for students who have grown up with more than one language from an early age (Block, 2007; Garcia, 2007). As Louis indicated, he found it more appropriate to say "the language I speak most of the time". Thus showing that the terms 'first language' and 'second language' did not feel applicable to him. This implication is mentioned further under the implications of question b.

Another important factor to acknowledge relating to the demographics of the students is the fact that a large number of parents have selected to send their children to the bilingual program when they have been born in Australia and perhaps have only access to English at home. In these cases the parents show a valuing of languages and this valuing is recognised and taken on by a large number of these young students. This was also indicated through the interview data that showed almost all of the students indicating how important their family’s opinion about languages was to them in influencing their own valuing of languages. Students, whose parents thought multiple languages were important assets to their skill-set, also indicated that they valued being bilingual. In relation to this, as indicated by the teacher interviews, it appears that if parents do not support the bilingual values at home and instead view the program as a replacement for them speaking bilingually to their children this can hinder the students’ progress in both languages and also negatively impact upon their attitudes towards language learning and bilingualism.

The students showed the importance of grandparents as communicators (Gregory et al., 2007). A number of the students expressed the quantity of interaction that they engage in with their grandparents. One student indicated the role of carer that was enacted by her grandmother and this had a strong influence upon her identification with the Italian language and culture. In a similar manner another student, whose grandmother visited and stayed with the family for three months at a time, also engaged in interaction with her grandmother. This grandmother took on a carer role while in the household and assisted the student in her development of French identity through language use.

Some students indicated that they found it easier to understand their languages than to speak them. This could be linked to second language learning research that has
highlighted silent periods for various reasons, either for linguistic development (Krashen, 1981; Krashen, Terrell, Ehman & Herzog, 1984) or more recently, for identity development purposes (Granger, 2004).

A further implication raised by the first research sub-question was the importance of siblings as teachers of language (Gregory, 2005; Volk, 1998). Older siblings were shown to engage in teasing as a means of interacting bilingually with younger siblings. In this way they assist the younger siblings to develop their language skills and also to become members of the culture through their interaction.

The findings about language use outside of school showed two main themes of language use for the students. Communication with Family or Friends made up the first theme and Participating in Activities in Two Languages made up the second. The conclusions for these two themes of findings can be outlined as follows.

*Communication with Family or Friends* was shown through all of the student data collection tools to be bilingual in a number of cases. Close to half the student questionnaires indicated bilingual or monolingual (non-English) communication with parents. This was supported strongly in the interviews where students indicated a high proportion of communication with parents and older family members in either two languages or a language other than English.

Conversely there was much lower reporting of bilingual activity within students’ own generation. With peers and siblings students overwhelmingly reported speaking and communicating in English, although a few mentioned the use of siblings as sources of language through teasing. This indicates that the students in this study use bilingualism as a tool for inter-generational communication more strongly than for intra-generational communication. This is similar to findings in Ireland that have shown less intra-generational bilingual communication compared to inter-generational (Ó Giollagáin, 2007).

Students indicated a range of linguistic negotiation strategies that they engage in through their family communication. This included strategies such as code-switching,
translating and re-phrasing in order to ensure understanding and getting the student’s own point across.

Participating in Activities in Two Languages was also shown to be bilingual for many students. Students indicated that when performing or participating in tasks alone they chose to use both of their languages at different times. The students indicated watching DVDs, reading, listening to music and also thinking about things in both languages. The most indicative finding of students identifying with their bilingualism and with both languages is the finding that the students “think about things” in two languages. Not only did over a quarter of the students report this in the questionnaire, but also some student interviewees spoke about the ways they think in both languages. This indicates for these students strong identification with both languages and with being bilingual.

5.2.2 Qb: How do students view their languages (English, French and other languages)?

Students find their languages a positive asset – ‘a gift’, ‘special’, ‘lucky’ and ‘cool’.

Students’ attitudes towards their languages indicate firstly that the findings are broader than simply talking about the languages involved in the school program. Secondly, the results indicate that the students have well-developed attitudes towards other languages that have importance and influence in their lives.

The students find understanding language to be more important than speaking it, because they have more strategies at their disposal to make their own meaning clear, providing they can understand the other person involved in the interaction.

The students, on the whole, express positive attitudes towards their languages. They describe knowing two languages as making them: special, lucky, smart, cool; and that it is a gift and gives them a skill that other people don’t have (see section 4.2.2.1). The students who find speaking two languages difficult still find positive attributes that they have gained through their language experiences, such as being able to keep
secrets, and feeling pride in being able to do something quite well even if they generally do not feel as academically able as some other students.

The students quite clearly express the benefits that they think they will have in the future from speaking two languages. For the most part, these benefits reflect the commonly encountered ideas of the benefits of learning languages, such as travel and work opportunities. They also reflect Kirsch’s research findings that future goals play an important role in students’ valuing of their languages (Kirsch, 2006).

One notable finding is that the students have different ways of speaking about their languages, and the relationship between those languages and themselves, than the way languages are generally referred to in textbooks, research and academic writing. As mentioned in question a, often languages are referred to as L1 and L2 to refer to the order in which people have learnt the languages. One student who has encountered two or more languages throughout the whole of their lives referred to languages in a different way in this study. He specified which language he speaks for more time everyday. For this student and others in similar contexts he does not have a first or second language. Neither preceded the other. The languages can be described, and distinguished between, more accurately by referring to the quantity of use of each language.

This provides a more accurate way of representing the importance of two or more languages in peoples’ lives, and reiterates a point made clearly by Block (2007) and Garcia (2007) that the terms L1 and L2 no longer describe the linguistic realities faced by many people. Block indicates that the term L1 is:

“a very crude identity marker for individuals learning a second, third, fourth or fifth language. Many second language learners come to the task as users of two or more linguistic repertoires officially recognized as languages” (Block, 2007, p.190).

Block goes on to question how applicable the terms bi-and multilingual are for these types of students who in many cases have competence in different varieties of different languages and have different types of competence in each language or variety of language (2007). The findings in this study further support Block’s point
(2007), indicating that the students themselves refer to their languages differently to the ways academic writing generally categorises them.

5.2.3 Qc: How do the students view bilingualism?

**Most students view bilingualism as something they connect with.**

Many of the students see themselves as bilingual and connected to more than one language and culture. The students expressed this clearly and indicated that their ideas about who they are in relation to their languages is quite clear-cut in their own self-concepts. Some of the students interpret bilingualism as balanced bilingualism (Romaine, 1995) while others interpret it in a more functional way.

The students indicate the main factors influencing whether they feel bilingual and connected to more than one language as:

- use of language;
- family connection to culture or language; and
- place of birth.

Each factor was cited as a reason why the students saw themselves as connected to both cultures.

Some of the students were reluctant to use the word bilingual to describe themselves. When explored further this could be seen to be a result of the misunderstanding of the term and what constitutes being bilingual as indicated in the conclusions for Qa.

Students who did not see themselves as bilingual spoke of the different domains of language that they possess in each language (Baker, 2006a; Romaine, 1995). In this way students indicated their meta-linguistic understandings about the differences between different types and uses of language, specifically noting the difference between conversational language and academic language (Cummins, 1984, 1999).
Some students experienced identity tension in relation to their languages, when they felt connected to the culture but had difficulty learning the language. Language and culture are, thus, closely linked. To feel connected to the culture in a non-conflicting way students feel the need to use the language with ease. This indicates the need for adequate access to language in order to learn and develop the language at a rate that is in accordance with the students’ feelings of connection to the culture. Tension and conflict were issues that also arose for the students involved in Molyneux’s study of student bilingualism in Melbourne (Molyneux, 2005).

The process of identity negotiation is illustrated through this study’s findings. The different stages at which students find themselves along the process of negotiating their bilingual identities is evident through the ways in which they speak about their identification and the clarity with which they express their opinions.

Several findings pointed to the possibility that celebrating young students’ bilingual skills can be beneficial to their self-esteem and confidence, especially if the student has difficulties or a lack of confidence in other academic areas. One student mentioned this herself when talking about her language skills indicating that her pride in being bilingual made her feel better about her less-developed skills in maths. Similarly the teachers expressed the importance of celebrating students’ bilingual skills for their self-esteem and confidence. Prior literature indicates that educational setting is of paramount importance in relation to student language experience, levels of confidence with language and connection to language (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003; Kirsch, 2006, Norton, 2000).

The students all showed a degree of investment in their languages, indicating their independent choice to use their languages in different ways (Norton, 2000). The students also indicated their extensive use of technology in accessing their languages, and the benefits that this use of technology brings in enabling them to use the language more extensively, for example, the use of an internet telephone for ease of communication or the use of DVDs and other digital media for accessing the language in video or audio format. The increasing exposure young children have to different technologies is becoming acknowledged as an important source of language and literacy development (Kenner & Gregory, 2003; Zentella, 1997).
The importance of family opinion was clearly evident in the students’ own opinions about bilingualism. If the parents indicated a value in learning and using languages the students on the whole also held positive opinions. It appeared that these positive opinions were, however, the students’ own views rather than reiterations of their parents’ views as the students used different language when talking in the first person in comparison with how they described their parents’ and other family members’ opinions. This indicated that their description of their own opinions was not simply a mimicking of the parental opinion, as the thought process was developed enough to phrase their opinion in their own words.

5.2.4 Qd: How do students view the school bilingual program and to what extent does it influence their identification as French, Australian or bilingual?

Students see the bilingual program as vital for French language maintenance and feeling bilingual.

Students see benefits of being in the bilingual program at school. Benefits cited by the students include it being helpful for language maintenance, and also to extend the language that the students have from their home experiences.

The discussion included opinions that viewed taking part in the bilingual program as being helpful to feeling comfortable as a bilingual person. This was explained as resulting from bilingualism being viewed in a positive way in the school environment and cultural differences being accepted by other students more readily.

The students see a benefit of the bilingual program in the form of the regular contact with language and they also link this frequent contact with the language as a factor influencing their connection to culture.

Students identified the benefit of the bilingual program’s assistance with their skills in a third language. In this way students see the value of cross-linguistic transfer of skills (Cummins, 1979), and see the generic benefit of a bilingual program irrespective of the languages used in the home.
Some students believed that both home and school influences were of equal importance in their feelings of being bilingual. Others felt school was more beneficial towards feeling bilingual, but all acknowledged the importance of both contexts upon their bilingualism.

The students identified the importance of a good relationship with the language teacher, in order to feel comfortable and successful in class.

5.2.5 Qe: How does language in the classroom relate to student bilingual identity?

Students mainly use French in settings where they feel safe enacting a French identity.

Student language use inside the bilingual classroom was shown to be predominantly English with French used to respond to the French teacher and some use of student-instigated French speaking. Students responded to the French-speaking teacher in French when specifically asked questions. In the immersion lessons student language use was exclusively in French with no need for any prompting from the teacher. Students indicated clear understanding of French through their physical responses to instructions and their use of expected responses in French.

Teacher language use was almost exclusively in the teacher’s own native language. The French-speaking teacher occasionally used English in the classroom, mainly to communicate with the English-speaking teacher and occasionally for behaviour management. The English-speaking teachers exclusively used English. The French-speaking teacher used drawing and writing on the board to support communication and facilitate student understanding. Through using the supportive tools of drawing and writing on the board, the teacher assists the students’ development of socio-cultural connection to the language and culture by creating a supportive and empowering environment for language learning. In this way support for student development of bilingual identity is shown (Arce, 2004; Cohen, 2008; Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003).
The teacher perceptions of the bilingual program indicated that a conscious choice was made pedagogically to not insist upon student use of French all the time. In this way, communication is aimed to feel more natural and comfortable with opportunities for the students to respond in French as much as they feel able.

5.2.6 Qf: How does teacher perception of the bilingual program relate to student bilingual identity?

The teachers perceive that students can develop their bilingual identities through certain pedagogies in the school environment.

The teachers saw the use of bilingualism as an opportunity for less academically able students to develop confidence and self-esteem in their linguistic abilities. This was seen as something important for all students and self-esteem was placed strongly within the pedagogies used in the classrooms (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003).

One English speaking teacher enacted the role of teacher-as-learner in order to empower her French-speaking students in the classroom. She used this method to enable the students to develop confidence in teaching her language, or explaining French language in their own words. In this way she indicated the importance of French in her classroom and also showed her level of comfort at being placed as the learner. The two elements of teacher as learner and of French being valued in the classroom are important in sending the message to the students that they have skills that are valuable. This assists students to feel more comfortable identifying with French language and culture and to see this as an option that is validated and accepted in this setting. In this way the teacher taking on a role as learner is interpreted in this study as an example of an empowering or transformative pedagogy (Cummins, 1996, 2000, 2003).

Student interaction in the immersion lessons took place entirely in French without any prompting from the teacher at any time. Interaction entirely in French indicated that the immersion lessons provided a safe environment in which the French-speaking students could enact their French-speaking identities. The students did not speak
much French to each other in the bilingual lessons and the main difference between the two settings is the presence or absence of English speakers. It is therefore seen that the immersion lessons provided a comfortable and safe context in which to ‘be French’.

The teachers believe that student age impacts upon the quantity of French that is produced in the bilingual classes. As the students reach stage three in the school they become more embarrassed and more reluctant to be seen as different. This therefore relates to the implication above that sees the immersion lessons become the safe place in which to ‘be French’ while the bilingual classroom becomes the place to ‘be Australian’.

The teachers also see that the parents have an important role to play in students’ investment in learning bilingually. The teachers feel that some parents see the bilingual program as a replacement for them having to speak French to their children. The children whose parents play an active role in their language learning develop their language more quickly and, in relation to that, develop positive attitudes towards languages and bilingualism.

The teacher-teacher relationship is seen to be an important factor in the modelling of both languages to students and showing the importance of each language. The relationship was not examined specifically in this study, however, the importance of team-teaching partners having similar pedagogical ideas and similar teaching styles was shown.

5.2.7 General Implications of the Findings

- According to the students themselves, they identify with a number of different languages.
- Students find their languages a positive asset – ‘a gift’, ‘special’, ‘lucky’ and ‘cool’.
- Most students view bilingualism as something they connect with BUT some interpret it as balanced bilingualism and do not connect with this interpretation.
- Students see the bilingual program as vital for French language maintenance and feeling bilingual.
- Students mainly use French in settings where they feel safe enacting a French identity.
- The teachers perceive that students can develop their bilingual identities through positive pedagogies in the school environment.

The statements overarch each of the questions show that in this study most of the students connected to some degree with their languages. Most of the students identified with the idea of being bilingual unless they interpreted it as balanced bilingualism, which caused them some tension in deciding whether they are bilingual or not.

The students see that the bilingual program they participate in at school plays an integral role in their language development and their identification as bilingual. In the settings where French is common, such as the immersion classes, the students feel comfortable being French and expressing their French identities in that setting.

Thus Bilingual Identity Negotiation is illustrated as a complex, individual process for each student. Some common themes emerge as indicated by the statements above, but the individual stories illustrate how each student connects and identifies in their own way with their languages and bilingualism.

In answer to the overarching question: How do students in a bilingual primary school program in NSW identify with their languages (English and French)? students demonstrated identification with a number of different languages including English and French and they did so in individual ways. Overall they expressed positive attitudes towards their languages and expressed a degree of identification with being bilingual, but every student's experience was individual.

The example of bilingual education shown in this case study context and the positive influence it has upon student identity development shows the importance of moving beyond the current division of enrichment programs and language maintenance programs. As the diverse range of backgrounds of students in this study alone show,
this division between enrichment and language maintenance is becoming less relevant and less of a real situation with population movement and immigration trends. The demographics within this study show students participating in this program from both an enrichment standpoint and a language maintenance standpoint. There are also students enrolled in this setting who have another language other than the two in the program at home. All three categories of students show that they see this bilingual program as beneficial to them.

This supports emerging findings from research in other contexts that call for an end to dichotomies such as enrichment versus maintenance within bilingual education and seek the development of a continuum of bilingual education (Helot & de Mejia, 2008). The examples shown in this study offer insight into one way in which both educational aims within this dichotomy can be addressed through one program and with the result of positive bilingual identity development. Helot and de Mejia (2008) indicate that in most discourse about bilingual education, there is reinforcement of dichotomies between enrichment and maintenance language programs. They also point out that awareness of home languages is still often missing in bilingual programs if the home languages are not the two involved in the program (Helot & de Mejia, 2008). The pride indicated by the students in this study regarding their languages indicates that it is indeed important to acknowledge all language experience and all language related identities within bilingual programs to maximise the opportunities for these students. A school program that truly embraces bilingual education should embrace all languages and incorporate these experiences into the learning environment.

As the results of this study show, the framework of Bilingual Identity Negotiation (BINF) can be used to examine bilingual identity with a range of different students with different language experiences as it includes the three factors common to the negotiations of bilingual identity for all students in this study. In this way students with a variety of language influences were able to express their understandings of their bilingual identities:

e.g. Louis – School languages = English and French;
        Home languages = English and German

e.g. Antonia – School languages = English and French;
Home languages = English, Italian, Dutch.

Researchers have examined how to raise and improve language awareness for minority languages (Young & Helot, 2003). The case study at hand is an example of a successful model that legitimises home or heritage language while also raising the intercultural acceptance and linguistic competence of previously monolingual students. However, it must be acknowledged that this program has done this using a language that is seen as a valuable or even "elite" language. As French is seen by some as being a privileged language usually learnt for enrichment, the question for future examination arises: how can this model be used and adapted to suit all communities to encourage learning and acceptance of languages that are seen as less important to become seen as legitimate?

This program could build upon its successful educational program by incorporating more opportunities for speakers of other languages (not French or English) to bring their skills into the classroom. It would also be worthwhile to see if the teaching and learning model used in this setting could work in a setting using other languages and to see how identity development for students with language backgrounds that may carry less legitimacy in society might take place.

The level of intercultural awareness and understanding illustrated in this setting indicates an important step towards acceptance of diversity that is developed in this program. Through the development of bilingual identities these students experience acceptance within the school environment of their linguistic and cultural differences. A further question for future examination arises of how this positive identity development and acceptance of different cultures and languages can be fostered in settings where the languages involved have different or reduced cultural capital compared to French.

The importance of inner voice in language learning (Tomlinson, 2001) is another implication from this study. A key component of the set-up of the bilingual program in this setting is the allowance of a responsive-only period for the students. This is seen in this context where there is no insistence that students produce language in the bilingual classes unless in direct response to the teacher's question in French. When the teacher speaks in French a response is generally accepted in either language. This
raises a question about whether this period of permissible silence in French might enable development of the inner voice in two languages and thus aid the development of bilingualism. It is possible that it hinders the development of bilingualism as students do not capitalise on all opportunities to speak in French. For students who do not have sufficient exposure to French at home to develop their bilingual identities, the school is the main source of language contact. Thus being invested in taking every opportunity to speak French could result in development of bilingual identity.

Inter-linked with this question is whether a “silent-period” assists the students to develop a more positive connection to the language and to bilingualism through the reduced levels of stress they may feel to produce language before they are comfortable. Students in the interviews explicitly spoke about how they think in another language and use inner voice to work out solutions (e.g. Genevieve – see section 4.1.3.1) and so there is a possibility that this period of potential inner voice development might contribute to the bilingual identity development experienced by some of these students. Further examination of inner voice as associated with bilingual identity development is a possible avenue for future investigation.

Kenner and Gregory (2003) cite suggestions by Sneddon (2000) that negotiation of meaning between multiple languages may provide students with comprehension strategies that are useful in the English mainstream classroom. Both Louis and Genevieve clearly indicate the bilingual strategies they engage in to negotiate meaning and understanding between their languages. These skills, following Sneddon’s argument, may well provide these students with strong skills in English as well as their other language (2000). In this way the findings of this study support the argument that learning in a bilingual setting may be advantageous to students’ development of English language skills. This is a further issue that warrants further examination.

5.2.8 Significance of the Study

The theoretical significance of this study is through the development and application of the BINF. This study has investigated student identity from a perspective
incorporating three important standpoints used in previous studies relating to identity in bilingual settings. Through the findings of the study the newly conceptualised framework is shown to incorporate both individual and social impacts upon bilingual identity.

This study has indicated that the three elements of socio-cultural connection, interaction and investment combined within the framework are all influenced by access to language. Without access to language students cannot develop and maintain the required amount of interaction necessary to develop an identity as bilingual. Likewise without access to language the students cannot develop strong investment in learning the language as it appears out of their reach. Furthermore, without access to language students cannot develop connection to the culture in question. Therefore access to language is a key element in the development of bilingual identity linking all three sub-factors in the BINF.

The findings of this study provide a new perspective of Bilingual Identity Negotiation from young students in an Australian bilingual education context. In this way this study adds a new case study perspective to studies in the Asia-Pacific region investigating bilingualism. In addition, it adds a new theoretical conceptualisation for broader geographic locations.

By using the NAPLAN results (see Appendix V, and section 1.3 for more details about NAPLAN) the school in this study can be positioned in the top 25% of DET Public Schools in Sydney, Newcastle and Wollongong (Group D). Thus the findings are of interest for bilingual students from these 291 schools in NSW.

The findings can also be used to indicate some pedagogical implications from the bilingual learning setting. These are outlined in the figure below.
Pedagogical Implications:

- All languages and cultures that students identify with should be acknowledged and used as resources in the classroom. Different interpretations of “being bilingual” should be acknowledged as valid.
- Students’ home language use and home language literacy experiences should be built upon in the classroom. The important role of siblings could be used more extensively.
- Teachers should capitalise upon students’ feelings of pride in their languages and cultures to build academic confidence.
- Schools should actively involve parents in the language program to aid support between home and school.
- The bilingual program is an important site of bilingual identity development. It is a major source of language maintenance and development. It is important that in this setting teachers act as models of the languages and cultures.
- Bilingual and Immersion lessons need to be environments where it is safe to assume French-speaking, English-speaking or other language-related identities. More extensive use of French and other languages in the bilingual classes may lead to students feeling safer assuming French and other language-related identities in that setting.
- Student age as a factor influencing identity development should be acknowledged. Comfortable environments for enacting all identities are required as students become more concerned with appearing different. The parental role in language attitude should be further developed at this stage and teacher-teacher relationships

Figure 30: Possible Pedagogical Implications

5.2.9 Limitations of the Study

As indicated in the introduction, the main limitation in this study is that the findings cannot be generalised to a broader population. By focusing specifically upon individuals in one context this study provides findings about the individuals in this context.

The implications arising from the study are therefore applicable to the students in the school involved, although they may also be of interest for bilingual students from
within the same Like School Group (see Appendix V). The development of the theoretical framework in this study may contribute to further studies. If used as a frame for studies of other bilingual education contexts it can add to the broader field.

A further limitation is that students may have felt an “aim to please” and thus reported more positive feelings than negative. However, this limitation is countered by the researcher's position as a peripheral-member-researcher, which meant the researcher was not viewed as a teacher in the school, yet the students developed a level of comfort in talking to the researcher. It is anticipated that this role may have overcome any “aim to please” effects.

5.2.10 Future Directions for Research

This research has indicated a number of possible directions for future research to build upon the findings of this study.

- Examination of the teacher relationship within a team-teaching model is a possible area for future examination. This study has shown that the teacher relationship is an important factor influencing the students in this study and their attitudes towards languages and bilingualism. Teacher relationships have been examined in a number of prior studies (Creese, 2002; Martin-Jones, 1995; Martin-Jones & Saxena, 1996). Yet these prior studies have not yet examined a setting where the teachers aim to be seen as equal in the classroom. This setting is suitable for an examination of how this relationship works with two equally qualified teachers in the classroom.

- The newly conceptualised framework used in this study could be used to examine other bilingual students in other settings to assess its applicability in other contexts, particularly those not involving languages considered to be “elite” in that context.

- A longitudinal examination of the students who participated in this study would provide an interesting future study. This study provides a “snapshot” examination of student bilingual identity. A possible avenue of further investigation is how bilingual identity differs over time – two, five and/or ten years. It would be possible to investigate the impacting factors over time upon
development of bilingual identity to see how access to language, socio-cultural connection, interaction and investment may alter.

- A further possibility for future research is to investigate whether the teaching model seen in this context might provide a model for embracing majority and minority language learning in the one setting. As Helot and de Mejia (2008) argue, there is a need to bring these two types of language learning together. If the teaching model seen in this study were used in a setting where one language was not considered “elite” how would the model fare? There is scope for future examination of other bilingual education settings involving team-teaching where one language is considered a “minority” language in that society. To date, much of the research examining dual language focuses upon majority status languages and also focuses upon only one teacher in the classroom. There is therefore potential to address the gap by looking for and examining team-teaching bilingual programs involving one lower status language.

- Another possible direction for research is to examine whether allowing time for a bilingual inner voice or inner speech to develop impacts upon bilingual identity development. The model in this current study indicated that teachers made a pedagogical decision to allow students to respond to the French teacher in English. The time that students take to feel comfortable responding in French could be related to the development of students’ inner voice in French. Studies have investigated the development of inner voice in language classrooms (Tomlinson, 2001). This area of study could be expanded by examination of inner voice or inner speech in bilingual learning contexts.
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Research Project

Title: Negotiations of Identity in a Bilingual Primary School

What is the study about?
This study is investigating how bilingual students identify with each of the languages that they encounter at school and home.

Who is carrying out the study?
The study is being conducted by Ruth Fielding and will form the basis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) at The University of Sydney under the supervision of Dr Lesley Harbon.

What does the study involve?
This study will involve students in years 5 and 6 completing a questionnaire about how they use languages and what they think about these languages. It will also involve a small number of students (2 per class) being asked to complete a chart of how they use the languages outside of school over a one-week period and then to be interviewed about their language use. The final stage of the research will involve an observation and video recording of two classes and a subsequent interview with the teachers of that class.

How much time will the study take?
The questionnaire should take between 30 and 40 minutes for the students to complete in class. The language use chart should take 5 minutes per day over one week to complete and the student interview will take 15-20 minutes and will be audio-taped. The class observation will take 2 lessons (40-80 minutes each) and will involve video-taping of the classes.

Can my child withdraw from the study?
Your decision whether or not to permit your child to participate will not prejudice you or your child’s future relations with the University of Sydney or the school. If you decide to permit your child to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue your child’s participation at any time and this will not prejudice your or your child’s future relations with the University of Sydney or with the school.

Will anyone else know the results?
All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants. A report of the study may be submitted for publication, but individual participants will not be identifiable in such a report.

Will the study benefit me?
Not directly, however it is hoped that the study may promote the profile of bilingual education in NSW and this may be indirectly beneficial to the school and bilingual students in the future.

Can I tell other people about the study? Yes
What if I require further information?
When you have read this information, Ruth Fielding will discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. If you would like to know more at any stage, please feel free to contact Ruth Fielding, PhD Candidate on 9351 6241 or by email at r.fielding@usyd.edu.au.

What if I have a complaint or concerns?
Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact the Senior Ethics Officer, Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on (02) 9351 4811 (Telephone); (02) 9351 6706 (Facsimile) deboddy@usyd.edu.au (Email).

This information sheet is for you to keep
PROJECT TITLE: Negotiations of Identity in a Bilingual Primary School

PARENTAL (OR GUARDIAN) CONSENT FORM

1. ............................................. agree to permit my son/ daughter
............................................., who is aged .......................... years, to participate in
the research project – Negotiations of Identity in a Bilingual Primary School.

Please tick the applicable boxes:

☐ I agree for my child to participate in the questionnaire.
☐ I agree for my child to participate in the audiotaping of interviews.
☐ I agree for my child to participate in the videotaping of classes.

In giving my consent I acknowledge that:

1. I have read the Information Statement and the time involved for my child's
   participation in the project. The researcher/s has given me the opportunity to
   discuss the information and ask any questions I have about the project and
   they have been answered to my satisfaction.

2. I understand that I can withdraw my child from the study at any time without
   prejudice to my or my child's relationship with the researcher/s now or in the
   future.

3. I agree that research data gathered from the results of the study may be published
   provided that neither my child nor I can be identified.

4. I understand that if I have any questions relating to my child's participation in this
   research I may contact the researcher/s who will be happy to answer them.

5. I acknowledge receipt of the Information Statement.
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION STATEMENT - TEACHERS
Research Project

Title: Negotiations of Identity in a Bilingual Primary School

(1) What is the study about?
This study is investigating how bilingual students identify with each of the languages that
they encounter at school and home.

(2) Who is carrying out the study?
The study is being conducted by Ruth Fielding and will form the basis for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) at The University of Sydney under the supervision of Dr Lesley
Harbon.

(3) What does the study involve?
This study will involve students in years 5 and 6 completing a questionnaire about how they
use languages and what they think about these languages. It will also involve a small
number of students (2 per class) being asked to complete a chart of how they use the
languages outside of school over a one-week period and then to be interviewed about their
language use. The final stage of the research will involve an observation and video
recording of two classes and a subsequent interview with the teachers of that class.

(4) How much time will the study take?
The questionnaire should take between 30 and 40 minutes for the students to complete in
class. The language use chart should take 5 minutes per day over one week to complete
and the student interview will take 15-20 minutes. The class observation will take 2 lessons
(40-60 minutes each) and the teacher interview will take 20 minutes.

(5) Can I withdraw from the study?
Your decision whether or not to participate will not prejudice you or your child's future
relations with the University of Sydney or the school. If you agree to participate, you are
free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue your participation at any time. This will not
prejudice any future relations with the University of Sydney or with the school.

(6) Will anyone else know the results?
All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the
researchers will have access to information on participants. A report of the study may be
submitted for publication, but individual participants will not be identifiable in such a report.

(7) Will the study benefit me?
Not directly, however it is hoped that the study may promote the profile of bilingual
education in NSW and this may be indirectly beneficial to the school, its teachers and
bilingual students in the future.

(8) Can I tell other people about the study? Yes
(9) **What if I require further information?**
When you have read this information, *Ruth Fielding* will discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. If you would like to know more at any stage, please feel free to contact *Ruth Fielding, PhD Candidate* on 9351 6241 or by email at r.fielding@usyd.edu.au.

(10) **What if I have a complaint or concerns?**

| Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact the Senior Ethics Officer, Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on (02) 9351 4811 (Telephone); (02) 9351 6706 (Facsimile) or gbriody@usyd.edu.au (Email). |

This information sheet is for you to keep
PROJECT TITLE: Negotiations of Identity in a Bilingual Primary School.

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

I, .........................................................., give consent to my participation in the research project.

Name (please print)

In giving my consent I acknowledge that:

1. The procedures required for the project and the time involved have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.

2. I have read the Participant Information Statement and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my involvement in the project with the researcher(s).

3. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time, without affecting my relationship with the researcher(s) now or in the future.

4. I understand that my involvement is strictly confidential and no information about me will be used in any way that reveals my identity.

Signed:

..............................................................

..............................................................
PROJECT TITLE: Negotiations of Identity in a Bilingual Primary School.

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

1. I, ........................................................................................................... , give consent to the school ..................................................................................

participation in the research project

Name (please print)

In giving my consent I acknowledge that:

1. The procedures required for the project and the time involved have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.

2. I have read the Participant Information Statement and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my involvement in the project with the researcher/s.

3. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time, without affecting my relationship with the researcher(s) now or in the future.

4. I understand that my involvement is strictly confidential and no information about me will be used in any way that reveals my identity.

Signed: .................................................................................................................

Name: .................................................................................................................

Date: ...................................................................................................................
## Language Use Questionnaire - French

Name: 

Age: 
Gender: 
Country of Birth: 
School 
Class: 

Put a cross in the box to show your answer.

What language(s) do you use out of school when...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>FRENCH</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
<th>OTHER LANGUAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading a book by yourself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working on a piece of your own writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with your parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with your brothers or sisters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with your friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing number / maths work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for something in a shop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching DVDs, videos or TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to stories at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing games with your friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing games with your family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Put a cross on the line above the answer you agree with:

How important is it to be able to speak French?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>neither important or not important</th>
<th>not very important</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How important is it to be able to speak English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>neither important or not important</th>
<th>not very important</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How important is it to be able to read in French?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>neither important or not important</th>
<th>not very important</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How important is it to be able to read in English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>neither important or not important</th>
<th>not very important</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How important is it to be able to write in French?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>neither important or not important</th>
<th>not very important</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How important is it to be able to write in English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>neither important or not important</th>
<th>not very important</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How important is it to be able to understand French?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>neither important or not important</th>
<th>not very important</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How important is it to be able to understand English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>neither important or not important</th>
<th>not very important</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Put a cross beside the statement that is the most true for you:

Learning French is more important than learning English.

Learning English is more important than learning French.

Both English and French are equally important to learn.

Neither English nor French are important to learn.
Put a cross on the line above the answer you agree with:

How important is it to know French history?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>neither important or not important</th>
<th>not very important</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How important is it to know Australian history?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>neither important or not important</th>
<th>not very important</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How important is it to know about how people live in French speaking countries?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>neither important or not important</th>
<th>not very important</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How important is it to know about how people live in English speaking countries?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>neither important or not important</th>
<th>not very important</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How important does your family think being French is?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>neither important or not important</th>
<th>not very important</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How important does your family think being Australian is?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>neither important or not important</th>
<th>not very important</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How important is your family’s opinion about France to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>neither important or not important</th>
<th>not very important</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Put a cross beside statement that is the most true for you:

Learning about France is more important than learning about Australia.

Learning about Australia is more important than learning about France.

Both Australia and France are equally important to learn about.

Neither Australia nor France are important to learn about.

Put a cross on the line below to show how you see yourself.

French
Both Equally
Australian
I enjoy being able to do things in more than one language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I enjoy learning 2 languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Knowing 2 languages makes me clever.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Knowing 2 languages helps me think better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Knowing 2 languages might help me at secondary school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Knowing 2 languages might help me get a good job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Knowing 2 languages might help me if I visit other countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Knowing 2 languages helps me to communicate with my family and friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Knowing 2 languages helps me when I go to the shops, restaurants or other places.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Knowing 2 languages helps me feel proud of my connection to French.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Knowing 2 languages helps me succeed at school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Knowing 2 languages helps me understand the things I learn.

<p>| Agree strongly | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | Disagree | Disagree Strongly |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Afternoon</th>
<th>Evening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUNDAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATURDAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIDAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THURSDAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDNESDAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUESDAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Example: Watching TV at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please record on this chart WHEN and HOW you use FRENCH out of class over the next week.
Interview Items – Student Interview

1) Would you explain your language use journal to me (if completed and brought in by the student that day)?
2) What languages do you use at home? How and with who? (refer to questionnaire answer if needed)?
3) Can you give me some examples of the types of things you do in French/other language on your own?
4) What kinds of activities do you do with your family in French/other language?
5) How often do you speak in French/other language?
6) Do you ever speak English with the people you usually speak to in French/other language?
7) How do you feel when you speak French/other language?
8) Do you find French or English more comfortable? When? Why?
9) Do you find French or English easier? When? Why?
10) In the questionnaire I asked if you feel more French or Australian and you marked ........ Can you explain your answer?
11) Is it important to you to feel French and Australian? Why? Why not?
12) Does language play a big role in you feeling French/Australian?
13) What do you think about using both languages at school?
14) Do you use one language more than the other in class?
15) At school are you expected to speak one language rather than another at certain times? When?
16) How do you feel about that?
17) Do you think it is better to learn in two languages or would just one be better?
18) How does being able to speak two (or more) languages make you feel?
19) Do you think having two languages at school has helped you feel both French and Australian?
20) Do you know what the word bilingual means?
21) Do you think you are bilingual? Why? Why not?
22) Do you think school or home have helped you more to become bilingual?
23) Do your family think knowing two languages is important? Why?
24) Do you agree with them?
25) How long have you been at this school?
26) Do you think knowing two languages will be useful in your future?
27) Do you think you’ll learn French or other languages at high school?
28) Have you ever been to France or a French-speaking country?
29) How do you feel you fit in over there?
30) What are the best and worst things about speaking two languages at school?
31) What are the best and worst things about speaking two languages at home?
Interview Items – Teacher Interview #1

1) Can you describe how French and English are used in your classroom?
2) How would you describe your teaching style?
3) Can you describe your teaching philosophy?
4) Can you describe your classroom rules?
5) In what ways do you think your teaching influences the students’ opinions about languages?
6) Do you ever discuss bilingualism or languages explicitly in class?
7) How do you plan your team-teaching?
8) What do you think of the experience it gives the students in French?
9) Do you think both languages are shown as valuable? How?
10) How do you think the students respond to both languages in the school?
11) How do you decide which language to present information to the students in?
12) Do you ever translate what the other teacher has said?
13) How natural does the mix of languages feel to you in the classroom? How do you think you achieve that?
14) Are there any particular classroom activities or topics that work better than others in the two languages?
15) How do you find new students fit into the classroom style?
16) How do students who speak French at home compare to students who do not in classroom interaction?
Interview Items – Teacher Interview #2

1) Thank you for allowing me to observe your lessons – can I ask some questions about what I’ve seen?
2) How are you finding your new team-teaching relationship this year?
3) You said you worked very well with x (the previous teacher), have you had to alter the way you do things very much?
4) What types of planning changes have you made?
5) In what ways do you monitor the progress of your new team set-up?
6) Have you noticed any change in the children’s response to French this year? Why do you think that is?
7) What amount of French do you expect the students to use in the bilingual lessons?
8) Do you think they are doing this at this stage?
9) Do you have any strategies to try and change that?
10) How do you incorporate home languages and cultures in your classroom?

Any other follow-up questions from observation specific to students in each class.
Sample Student Interview Transcript

R: Ok so thanks very much for first of all doing the questionnaire and then the journal – it looks like you’ve worked really hard on that.
S: (laughs)
R: so do you want to start by showing me what you’ve written or shall I start with some other questions?
S: um I’ll start with my week last week
R: OK
S: um well, my grandma and aunt are here from France
R: oh great
S: so I speak with them quite a lot in French and I’ve done that practically every morning and every afternoon when I get home. So I speak fluently in French with them.
R: brilliant
S: yeah and um I’ve been um I did a French play on Friday all in French and that was quite good cos that was involving most of my friends and I did some cooking for homework and um like it was all in French so I had to read it
R: all the recipes were in French?
S: yeah the recipes and um I did, I read a few books in French and um yeah
R: what kind of books?
S: um, sort of like comic books
R: yeah
S: and um they were quite interesting, like um TinTin
R: OK
S: yeah, things like that, yeah
R: are they, so have you lived in Australia for all of your life or have you lived in France?
S: all my life
R: you’ve lived in Australia
S: but I’ve been to France twice now
R: OK, and is one of your parents French?
S: yep my Dad
R: your Dad. So that’s your grandma and your aunt that have come over to visit on your dad’s side
S: yep
R: OK. So your Dad’s quite keen for you to maintain your connection to France and French?
S: yeah, he uh, when I go to high school he wants me to go on in my French in lessons and everything
R: and what do you think about French? Do you enjoy learning it? What’s your opinion on it?
S: um it’s fun, I like, like in, um learning the language is very different to English cos they’ve got all sorts of like vocabulary and things like that
R: yeah
S: it’s completely different
R: so you find it a challenge but in a good way is that, like intellectually
S: yeah it’s a challenge but in a good way
R: OK. Um so when your grandma and your auntie are in France do you ever talk to them on the phone?
S: yeah
R: yeah
S: monthly or weekly
R: OK and how do you find talking to them over the phone in French? Do you do that in French always?
S: yeah I do that in French.
R: right
S: they don't speak any English
R: right, that's a good push for you to use your French
S: yeah
R: so how do you find that? Do you feel quite comfortable conversing with them?
S: um yeah I do, cos um they come over every year in the Christmas holidays so yeah I'm used to it
R: you're used to them and you know them well enough that you don't worry about making mistakes?
S: yeah
R: I think that's the challenge is feeling comfortable enough that you don't worry if you don't know 100%
S: yeah
R: OK so did you put any more detail, or you just did the table is that it?
S: yeah um
R: well it's great that they're here at the moment, that's good timing for me to talk to you about it
S: yeah
R: so um with your Dad at home, do you tend to talk French with him?
S: um
R: much of the time?
S: well (laughs) well he talks to me in French, but I sometimes answer back but usually I just answer back in English cos I understand quite well.
R: OK. So you understand what he says but you don't always reply
S: yeah but I do when I'm. Usually on weekends I speak French with my Dad because I'm usually busy with homework and things in the week
R: in the week yeah
S: mmm
R: it takes a bit more concentration
S: yeah
R: OK um, so you've said here that like when you're thinking about things you sometimes think in French is that something that you switch. Can you explain how that works for you?
S: yeah. Well it's sort of, say if I get a question in French I'll read it again in my head and then I'll try to figure out, well if I say it in my head, if I try to figure out what it is in English my brain's a bit confused so I do it in French, so I'll and I understand better
R: so it connects better for you
S: yeah but mostly in English so yeah
R: oh that's really interesting OK. And sometimes when you're at home do you watch TV or play games in French?
S: yeah we've got um a cable French channel, so I'll I like watching that it's interesting
Sample Teacher Interview Transcript

R: I just want to ask you a bit about how the team-teaching in French and English works in your classroom and how you see it working so could you just give me an overview of how the program works and then I'll get a bit more specific with my questions.

T: sure. Uh so my class is a year 5/6 class, composite class, and we have four francophone uh French native speakers um those kids go out for an hour a day to have intensive French whilst those kids are out the rest are doing the exact same lesson but purely in English.

R: mmm hmm

T: and for a little bit of every day my French team-teaching partner comes and works with me in the classroom and we'll deliver a lesson together.

R: how does that work – do you generally present together or do you separate the class into different groups?

T: mm hmm

R: or a bit or both?

T: yep a bit of both but um the majority of the time Teacher B is my team teaching partner, Teacher B and I will sit up the front of the class together and we'll deliver the introduction together, um so that's it's not translating at all, I guess it's a bit like banter I'll say something and Teacher B will say something, the kids have really good listening skills cos they're listening to the two languages at the one time and we generally go to our desks and do part of the lesson at our desks in either English or French um or perhaps the lesson will involve a little bit of both languages.

R: and do you find that that works quite well, um have you worked with Teacher B long? Sort of, how do you ensure that your interaction works?

T: mmm, for sure, uh so I've worked with Teacher B for just for this year, for one year, so I've been in the program 3 years and I've had four, four different partnerships, um and with Teacher B I guess our teaching styles and philosophy of teaching are very similar so we teach the same way. It's been very very easy, so if the teaching styles are significantly different that's when it becomes harder. Um

R: so have you found with other, in other relationships it's been harder to make a natural flow?

T: harder, yeah definitely definitely, but with Teacher B and I as I say it's quite easy and we use humour a lot and the kids really like that it's easy when you've got that bantering technique, we also have reading groups once a day and in that Teacher B takes a small group of the Anglophone kids and they have I guess intensive French at their level, yes the groups are levelled.

R: I guess is that like graded reading?

T: yep graded reading exactly

R: do you ever sort of explicitly discuss the benefits of bilingualism and the fact that the students are learning two languages and what some of the benefits might be?

T: with the kids?

R: with the students.

T: with the students. Uh yeah it comes up all the time and we've got kids going over, Francophones often go on holidays to France and that type of thing so we're always talking about how beneficial it is to learn a language and yeah it's definitely something we discuss.

R: and getting them to share their experiences when they come back?
T: definitely
R: um so what sort of difference do you think that this experience of learning in this particular style might make to the students?
T: yeh, the first thing as I said is really good listening skills, so they're able to listen to me and listen to Teacher B that kind of thing, uh I think their vocab is quite amazing, that would be the main benefit I guess for the future so when they go off to high school their vocab is quite outstanding you know
R: in both English and French?
T: in English and French but in French um and it's words that aren't like words when you go travelling it's words that are to do with everyday so they've got all of that. It's harder with the sentence structure and the written language but definitely the vocab. It's very very good, that would be the main benefit I think.
R: um would you say that it gives most of them a more positive attitude towards learning a language?
T: oh definitely definitely it's um done in a very natural way it's not intimidating or scary to them so that's one thing um just learning about another culture so they all know everything there is to know about French-speaking countries, and I guess another benefit is the accent. Their accents are beautiful to listen to cos they're
R: they've got a good example
T: yeah the example of the French teacher but also the francophone kids so they know exactly how the words should sound
R: yeah
T: so that's definitely a benefit
R: that's great. OK um so you said that you and Teacher B have quite a similar philosophy of teaching,
T: mmm
R: how would you explain, what is your philosophy of teaching if you could put it in a succinct few sentences
T: (laughs) for sure
R: or some key aspects
T: that learning should be fun, so the kids are enjoying themselves, they want to learn so they want to learn both languages um very hands-on so we don't do a lot of worksheets and that type of thing, it's lots of hands-on and role-making
R: playing
T: yeah doing all that kind of stuff, um we definitely have the child's self-esteem I guess at the centre of both of our philosophies so uh one example uh a boy in our class came at the beginning of the year this year and he'd never done French before so he was crying and he was all upset about it, so Teacher B sat down with him and we modified his homework and and but his self-esteem was always the centre for what we were doing.
R: yeah
T: so having fun, hands-on learning and self-esteem at the centre
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Teacher E</th>
<th>Teacher F</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Comment/Elaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:15</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wrong class – it's joke with them about work. They have to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>Work on April Fool's joke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:25</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Francophones outside with us today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2F</td>
<td>Francophone in cream w. M. Lamont.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Talked out their homework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2F</td>
<td>Continue with AS n/s and illustrations. Most of them have already done one or two pages already.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>were a la place: travailler.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open back to seat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>Where's your book?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2F</td>
<td>Ask how to say 'say next' &amp; 'he knows bateau'. Bruno says 'pardon' then says 'no, non' (not sure).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Julia asks me what a sentence says after asking if I speak French.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Qui a trouvé le petit pénit?&quot; 'I replied 'who found the first target&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>Francophones &amp; HS hypos return to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>Two discussions of who've been misbehaving &amp; that parent meetings are coming up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2F</td>
<td>Comes over to board at board. Corrects a go mistake with pencil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>Hits it out &amp; writes it correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>2 E.S., takes work up to ask for hypos a Q.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       |           |           | 2E      | Julia asks me another Q. "Comment cherche-t-on?"
<p>| 11:50 |           |           | 2E      | Does it for her.                                                                    |
|       |           |           |         | 2 E.S. discuss s/s.                                                                 |
|       |           |           | 2E      | Comes to ask Nicole what he's done in this lesson.                                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Teacher E</th>
<th>Teacher F</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Comment/Elaboration</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:50</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ftr, tr takes time to sit properly on chair</td>
<td>1-Model Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ftr, tr does</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td></td>
<td>3F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Students working quietly on worksheets</td>
<td>2-give Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td></td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>&quot;huh&quot;, E shakes head 'no' in response</td>
<td>3-ask Q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td></td>
<td>3F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Slower</td>
<td>4-praise/enc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td></td>
<td>2E</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>Responds 'no' - clearly understands @ in E</td>
<td>5-correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td></td>
<td>3F</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>Follow up @</td>
<td>6-repeat resp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td></td>
<td>9F</td>
<td>8E</td>
<td>Responds 'oh!'</td>
<td>7-repeat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td></td>
<td>9F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Offers name &amp; looks pleased</td>
<td>8-repeat exp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Praised neatly written work</td>
<td>9-repeat exp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More pleased but no verbal response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Door closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. talks to e.o. in English about timetable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>2F</td>
<td>8E</td>
<td></td>
<td>'question'?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2F</td>
<td></td>
<td>3F</td>
<td>8E</td>
<td>Asks @ in E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8E</td>
<td></td>
<td>9E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Responds in E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>2F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explains how to do exercise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>'ah' &amp; nods head.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In whole class - put names on tip.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sts. begin handing in sheet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Says name as replying.</td>
<td>10-repair in E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- F.T. → Sitting chair at front
- F.T. → Begin to circulate again
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>Open Comment/ Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:05</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>asks to sit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>says &quot;par terre&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St</td>
<td>asks for G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>says not right now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>is drawing on whiteboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>says come &amp; sit on floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St</td>
<td>St. who are slow coming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>talk to St in E while St comes to floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St</td>
<td>noise level gets much higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>gets attention (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>directs (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>explains aim of game - to get 4 digits (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>repeats in(E) - guess 4 digit no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>exemple (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>qu'est-ce que (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St</td>
<td>says 4 digit no. &quot;trois mille, cinq cent, seize, sept&quot; (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>quatre E (correct = 327) (bien = correct no. wrong place) (wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St</td>
<td>says 4 digit no. (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>directs (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>says 4 digit no. (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>directs (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St</td>
<td>says 4 digit no. (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>corrects (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>says 4 digit no. (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>corrects (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>says 4 digit no. (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>corrects (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>new game (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St</td>
<td>says 4 digit no. (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>corrects (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>says 4 digit no. (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>corrects (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St</td>
<td>new 4 digit no. (E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R: So how and who with do you use your French outside of school?
W: Uh my mum. CF
R: Your Mum mostly?
W: Yeah
R: And do you always talk to her in French?
W: Most of the time. HCF
R: Do you ever speak English much with her?
W: Oh it depends if I can't think of the word I say it in English and then she says it back to me in French.
R: So how do you feel about speaking French to your Mum?
W: Uh
R: Do you speak English to your Dad?
W: Yeah and my brother. HCF
R: And your brother.
R: So how do you feel about that? Do you think it's cool to be able to speak two languages or is it a pain sometimes? What do you think?
W: It's cool I like it. F2
R: You like it?
R: So you think you might have a use for it in the future?
W: Yeah FB
R: So you were saying before about
W: The rugby FB
R: that you think you might want to play rugby
W: Yeah in France FB & CC
R: Yeah, because France is quite a good country for rugby?
W: Yeah and they've got the world's best junior player FB & CC
R: Oh have they? And so he's from France?
W: Yeah
R: At the moment?
W: Yeah
R: Oh that's interesting
R: Do you feel more comfortable when you're speaking French or English?
W: English F2.
R: Is that because you speak more English?
W: Yeah F2 & LI
R: Ok.
R: Um... So when I asked you in the questionnaire whether you feel French or Australian or somewhere in the middle and you marked a cross
W: In the middle IB
R: In the middle? Can you explain why you put that?
W: Oh, 'cos I am 'm both, 'cos I've got, um half is like completely French and then the other half is like a quarter Welsh, Scottish, English and all that
R: All sorts
W: Yeah so it's English next (check)
R: Have you been to France much?
W: Yeah
R: And what do you feel when you're over there,
Communication with Family and Friends

R: So how and who with do you use your French outside 2 of school?

2W: Uh my mum.

2R: Your Mum mostly?

2W: Yeah

R: And do you always talk to her in French?

2W: Most of the time.

R: Do you ever speak English much with her?

W: oh it depends If I can’t think of the word I say it in English and then she says it back to me in French.

R: Do you speak English to your Dad?

Feelings about 2 Languages

Investment/ Socio Cultural Connection

R: So how do you feel about that? Do you think it’s cool to be able to speak two languages or is it a pain sometimes? What do you think?

R: Have you been to France much?

W: It’s…. I like it. W: yeah

R: Do you feel more comfortable when you’re speaking French or English?

R: and what do you feel when you’re over there,

W: English W: I like it

R: Is that because you speak more English?

R: do you think you fit in with other children there.

W: yeah cus I’ve got most, all my French side lives there

R: um… so would you say that you’re good at speaking both English and French?

R: you’ve got cousins

W: yeah.

R: and does that make you feel confident or proud of it?

R and other people your age that you hang out with there?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson type</th>
<th>French teacher language use bilingual lesson</th>
<th>English teacher language use bilingual lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bilingual 1</strong></td>
<td>Directions in French: 3</td>
<td>Directions in English: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions in French: 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gives directions for a game in French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repeats essential rules in English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gives an example in French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asks questions in French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrects in French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bilingual 2</strong></td>
<td>Directions in French: 3</td>
<td>Direction in English: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talk to other teacher - English: 2</td>
<td>Talk to other teacher English: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gets students settled and says now listen to FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>checks answers in French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>francophone 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>wraps up the lesson in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bilingual 3</strong></td>
<td>models language french -1</td>
<td>gives directions in English -5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>asks questions in French -2</td>
<td>asks questions in English -2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gives directions in French -2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manages behaviour in french</td>
<td>manages behaviour in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>draws diagram on the board to help students</td>
<td>asks students about their work in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>asks whole class question in French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>probes more in French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gives directions in French</td>
<td>manages behaviour in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gets students to settle down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wraps up the lesson and links back to previous lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gives direction in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Literacy at Home &amp; Friends</td>
<td>Numeracy at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework</td>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUQ1</td>
<td>use English to read alone x20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use Both langs to read alone x3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUQ2</td>
<td>Use English to write alone x21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use French to write alone x1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use Both langs to write alone x1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUQ3</td>
<td>talk to parents in English x12</td>
<td>talk to parents in French x1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>talk to parents in both langs x6</td>
<td>talk to parents in English and other language x1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>talk to parents in other language x2 no answer x1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUQ4</td>
<td>talk to siblings in English x19</td>
<td>talk to siblings in French x1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>talk in English plus other lang x1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUQ5</td>
<td>talk to friends in English x22</td>
<td>talk to friends in both langs x1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do number/maths work in English x16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do number/maths work in both langs x7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUQ6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:
The enclosed graphs and tables are provided to assist schools in meeting the reporting requirements specified in the Commonwealth Schools Assistance Regulations 2005 and the recommendations of the NSW Auditor-General’s Report on Annual School Reports.

1. All primary and central schools should provide information on the band distribution of students in reading, writing, spelling, punctuation and grammar and numeracy in the Year 3 and Year 5 NAPLAN Tests, and a summary of growth in reading, writing and numeracy between Year 3 and Year 5. This information can be provided in graphical, tabular or narrative form.

2. The enclosed graphs can be copied and pasted directly into the Annual School Report template. The inclusion of the State and Like School Group (LSG) comparison columns is optional. Alternative graphs with the State comparison, the LSG comparison and both the State and LSG comparisons removed are available in the adjacent worksheets. Alternative format graphs can be generated from the data tables, if preferred. Inclusion of a discussion of the information provided in the graphs is recommended. If the information is included in tabular or narrative form the tables or narrative should contain the same information as is provided in the graphs.

3. NAPLAN results should not be reported in a manner which enables the results of individual students to be identified. Accordingly, percentage in band, three-year school average, and average growth information should not be reported if results are available for less than 10 students.

4. All schools should provide class size information in tabular or narrative form. The class size table can be copied and pasted directly into the appropriate place in the Annual School Report template. If the information is provided in narrative form the narrative should contain the same information as is provided in the table.

5. All schools should provide information on student enrolment and attendance. This information can be presented in graphical, tabular or narrative form. The student attendance and student enrolment graphs can be copied and pasted directly into the appropriate place in the ASR template. Alternative graphs can be generated from the data provided, if preferred. Inclusion of a discussion of the information presented in the graphs is recommended. If the information is provided in tabular or narrative form it should contain the same information as is provided in the graphs.

7. The staff attendance rate should be reported in the Annual School Report in the manner shown. Additional text can be added, if desired. For privacy reasons, this information should not be reported for P5 and P6 schools.
### Year 3 NAPLAN - Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Band Distribution</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>LSG</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average mark, 2008</td>
<td>439.6</td>
<td>438.7</td>
<td>412.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number in band</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage in band</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School average 2005 - 2007</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSG average 2008</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State average 2008</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year 3 NAPLAN - Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Band Distribution</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>LSG</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average mark, 2008</td>
<td>455.2</td>
<td>445.9</td>
<td>427.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number in band</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage in band</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School average 2005 - 2007</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSG average 2008</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State average 2008</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage of students in bands: Year 3 reading

- **Percentage in band**
- **School average 2005 - 2007**
- **LSG average 2008**
- **State average 2008**

#### Percentage of students in bands: Year 3 writing

- **Percentage in band**
- **School average 2005 - 2007**
- **LSG average 2008**
- **State average 2008**
Year 5 NAPLAN - Spelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School</th>
<th>LSG</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average mark, 2008</td>
<td>518.5</td>
<td>520.0</td>
<td>498.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Skill Band Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in band</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage in band</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSG average 2008</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State average 2008</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year 5 NAPLAN - Grammar and Punctuation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School</th>
<th>LSG</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average mark, 2008</td>
<td>543.5</td>
<td>531.9</td>
<td>504.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in band</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage in band</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSG average 2008</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State average 2008</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of students in bands:
Year 5 spelling

Percentage of students in bands:
Year 5 grammar and punctuation
### Year 5 NAPLAN - numeracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average mark, 2008</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>LSG</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>522.7</td>
<td>518.8</td>
<td>489.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in band</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage in band</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School average 2005 - 2007</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSG average 2008</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State average 2008</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage of students in bands:

**Year 5 numeracy**

![Bar chart showing percentage of students in bands from Year 5 numeracy results.](chart.png)
Like School Groups

NSW provides Like School Group comparison data to assist schools and school communities in evaluating school outcomes. These are included in the School Measurement and Reporting Toolkit (SMART), which is used by schools to analyse results in state and national testing programs, and are reported to parents in Annual School Reports.

All primary, secondary and central schools in NSW except the distance education centres are allocated to Like School Groups (LSGs). The two factors used to allocate schools are socioeconomic status (SES), calculated using the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Socioeconomic Index for Areas (SEIFA) ‘disadvantage’ measure, and geographical isolation, as measured by the ABS endorsed Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA). Analysis of DET data show that these are the two community factors which are most closely associated with average school outcomes.

To calculate a school’s SES measure geo-coding software is used to determine the Census Collection Districts (CCDs) in which each of its students lives. The Australian Bureau of Statistics uses census data to generate an average measure of SES for each CCD. Each student is allocated the SES measure corresponding to their CCD. The school SES value is calculated by averaging the SES values for its students.

The Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA) is used as a measure of geographic isolation. The ARIA value for a location is determined by a formula which measures its distance from population centres of various sizes.

Nine LSGs have been created. There are four metropolitan LSGs differing in SES, and five rural LSGs differing in remoteness and SES. The distribution of LSGs is represented schematically in Table 1.

The Metropolitan schools are those in the Newcastle, Sydney and Wollongong areas. Schools along the coastal belt and near the larger inland centres such as Bathurst and Dubbo make up the Rural 1 category. The Rural 2 group consists of schools in and around the smaller rural centres such as Tenterfield and Coonabarabran. The Rural 3 group consists mainly of schools in the isolated western areas of the state.

The selective schools are allocated to a separate LSG. The partially selective schools are allocated dual LSG status – Selective and the LSG category appropriate for their SES measure and geographical category. It is intended that partially selective schools will compare the outcomes of the students in their selective stream against the outcomes for the ‘Selective’ LSG and the outcomes of the students in their comprehensive stream with the outcomes for students in their other LSG.

Table 2 shows the distribution of schools across the Like School Groups.
Table 1: Distribution of Like School Groups by SES and Remoteness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increasing SES</th>
<th>Metro D</th>
<th>Rural 1B</th>
<th>Rural 2B</th>
<th>Rural 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increasing remoteness

Table 2: The numbers of schools in each Like School Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSG</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro A</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro B</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro C</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro D</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural 1A</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural 1B</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural 2A</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural 2B</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural 3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>