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Abstract

Introduction: Teachers of children who are learning a new language are often told to make 'systematic and judicious' use of their students' first languages (L1s) in the belief that this approach promotes both academic and linguistic achievement. Empirical evidence that underpins the theory supporting this approach is derived, in the main, from research conducted in bilingual schools in the USA and Canada. It is not clear whether the findings of research conducted in these types of school (where learners tend to share the same L1) can be applied directly to the different context of polylingual schools in Britain, where a wide variety of L1s are represented. In part, this uncertainty is because no research on the use of L1 appears to have been conducted in the latter context. In response to this gap in the evidence, I conducted a study to assess the effects of an L1-mediated learning strategy on standardised measures of children's English writing proficiency.

Participants and Methods: The study recruited children for whom English is an additional language (EAL), aged from five to seven, at one primary school in Xxxxxx, UK. Using an unbiased, well concealed allocation schedule, participants were allocated to one of two interventions to be carried out at home with family members: a discussion of the contents of a simple picture book conducted either (a) in the child's L1, or (b) in only English. I assessed the quality of their subsequent written re-telling of the story, blinded to the group allocation of the children, using National Curriculum level descriptors and WIDA English language performance definitions, and compared differences between the two groups in the quality of their writing.

Results: 45 children were assessed as eligible and nine of these were excluded, all but one of which because no translation of materials was available. Thirty six children were randomised, 18 to L1-mediated intervention and 18 to English-only intervention. All but two (both in the English-only group) children received the allocated intervention. Nine children (six in the L1 group and three in the English-only group) were lost to follow-up. The mean scores on WIDA and National Curriculum assessments were very slightly higher in the English-only group, but this difference was not statistically significant in any of the six comparisons made. These differences were not present when median scores were compared.

Discussion: I discuss the challenges of encouraging engagement in the interventions, the sensitivity of the assessment tools, and the size of the study, and I make recommendations for further research.
A note on terminology

Terminology to describe users of more than one language, and the labels given to each of the languages an individual uses, varies enormously in the literature.

For the sake of consistency, I have favoured the term English Language Learner (abbreviated to ELL) as an umbrella term to refer to children who either first acquired a language(s) other than English, who speak a language(s) other than English at home, or who are equally proficient in more than one language (including English). I have deviated from this general rule when referring directly to the official classification in the British education system of this demographic group as English as an Additional Language (abbreviated to EAL) children.

I have also used the term 'bilingual' to refer directly to the pedagogical model of that name (though children at those schools may be users of more than two languages), and to describe individuals who speak more than one language, but among which English may not be included.
I have chosen to label the languages that a child uses as first language (abbreviated to L1) and second language (abbreviated to L2). This is not necessarily intended to convey ordinality of acquisition (though it might), but rather that L1s are the languages commonly spoken at home or among relatives, and that L2s are the languages used in school and/or the wider community.
The Role of the Mother-Tongue: a 17th Century Dispute

"Fifteenthly No scholars that have attained to such a progress in learning as to be able to speak Latin, shall neither within School or without, when they are among the Scholars of the same or a higher form, speak English. And that the Master shall appoint which are the forms, that shall observe this order of speaking Latin, and shall take care that it be observed and due correction given to those that do neglect it."

Mathurin and Hoole (1684)  Adams' Free Grammar School (1656)
The Role of the Mother-Tongue: a 21st Century Redux

Bilingual strategies:

- build on what children know and can do

"We've built in time for our TA to provide a "jog around the text" in Portuguese, for an underachieving group who share that language. This intervention has improved their concentration and engagement during shared reading."

Children with literacy skills in their first language, such as children newly arrived from overseas and children who are learning to read and write their community languages through supplementary education, should be encouraged to use these skills as tools for their learning.

Policy Statement

English will be spoken in all areas of the school throughout the school day from 8am to 4pm (including breaks) by all students (including Primary):

In addition, the ground floor of the Boarding Houses will be an English Speaking Zone at all times.

EXCEPTIONS:

- Foreign language classrooms
- Emergency situations/health issues with the School Nurse.

Implementation.

Secondary Sanctions (to be implemented by all staff):

1. a warning
2. 2nd witnessed incident – school detention
3. 3rd detention results in interview with Head of Pastoral Care/Deputy Head and letter/email to parents
4. further action as necessary.

Bromsgrove International School (2010)
Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Mother-tongues in second language learning - to include or exclude.
For hundreds of years opinion on whether to allow language learners to make use of their mother tongue in the service of learning an additional language has been a source of collective uncertainty. Charles Hoole, in preparing Maturinus Corderius's colloquies in 1684 (see preceding pages), felt it advantageous to present English translations adjacent to the original Latin text. He included his rationale for doing so in the title of his book: "That Children by the help of their Mother-Tongue, may the better learn to speak Latine in ordinary Discourse" (Mathurin and Hoole 1684). At more or less the same time, Adams' Free Grammar School in Newport, Shropshire, incorporated rules into its founding statutes that expressly forbade any use of English by scholars of Latin, and stipulated punishment for anyone who broke them.

More than three centuries later, in an echo of Hoole, a 2006 guidance document on meeting the needs of English language learners in British-curriculum schools encourages the use of children's first languages to help them understand their learning in English. In an almost carbon copy of Adams' Free Grammar School's rules, in 2010 Bromsgrove International School, a British-curriculum school in Thailand, sets out its English only policy for its pupils, stipulating that no other languages must be spoken during the school day, again under threat of punishment.

My experience as a teacher of English language learners (ELLs) witnessing similarly polarised positions on the role of first language (L1) in learning a second or additional language (L2) led me to question why this dichotomy exists. Does either side of this divide enjoy support from empirical evidence? If empirical evidence does exist, is it equally applicable in all educational contexts? If not, what do we need to know in order to advance, if not settle, the debate?

The study reported in this dissertation is my attempt to begin to address this topic. This chapter describes the structure of my dissertation and the steps I took to pursue my general aim.

1.2. The literature review
In a talk given this year at the researchED national conference, Dylan Wiliam, reflecting on the role of research in education, voiced the truism that "In education, 'What works?' [...] is not the right question, because in education everything works somewhere, and nothing works everywhere. The interesting question is 'Under what conditions does this work?" (Wiliam 2014). While hardly a profound statement, it is not immediately clear whether the principle behind Wiliam's maxim has been applied by policy makers in informing their approaches to L1 use in L2 classes in British-curriculum schools. More plainly, are the L1 policies that are advocated for use in British-curriculum schools informed by research conducted in, or applicable to, British-curriculum schools?

To make clear the educational conditions in which I am interested, in relation to the research evidence, I begin my literature review by contextualising the setting of my study. I then explore psychoeducational theories underpinning assumptions about the interplay between the languages spoken by an individual, and the ways in which they have been interpreted to inform pedagogical approaches. As these theories are chiefly informed by research on bilingual models of education, I have focused the next section of the review on describing best-evidence findings on the effects of bilingual schools. Returning to Wiliam's point, however, the policies over which I contend there is uncertainty are advocated for use in non-bilingual schools - demonstrably different conditions to the ones in which the research underpinning the psychoeducational theories informing them are conducted. Therefore, I have located and discussed research on L1 approaches in non-bilingual schools. These can be divided into two broad categories: monolingual L2 schools in which students all speak the same L1, and monolingual L2 schools schools in which many L1s are
spoken. The latter condition, which I have styled 'polylingual schools', is representative of many schools in the UK and therefore is the condition in which I am interested for this study. My review will show that findings related to the effects of L1 approaches in L2 schools are far from certain, in the main because no studies appear to have been conducted in the latter condition - polylingual schools.

1.3. Methodology
Given the apparent lack of research addressing the use of bilingual approaches with ELLs in polylingual British schools, my primary concern is to attempt to find out whether polylingual schools can be considered a condition under which these approaches work. The methodology chapter describes my approach to addressing this aim in a parallel group, randomised trial using a 1:1 allocation ratio after stratification by school class and pre-trial assessment of writing proficiency, with outcomes assessed blind to group allocation. In addition to knowing whether such an approach affects the educational outcomes of the pupils in my study, I am also interested to gauge how straightforward it is to operationalise such approaches. To do so, I used a questionnaire to ascertain the appetite among parents of ELLs for L1 supported approaches, and to gauge how faithfully they and their children adhered to their allocated intervention.

1.4. Results
The results of the trial are presented in this section. The data, analysed using a Mann-Whitney U test, did not reveal any statistically significant difference between the outcomes for children using the L1 intervention and those using the English intervention. In addition, response rate to the parents' questionnaire was so low as to have questionable value in making any confident conclusions related to my secondary aims. The children's questionnaire provoked a greater response rate, and revealed uncertainty regarding the extent to which they adhered to the intervention to which they had been allocated.

1.5. Discussion
In this section I revisit the context and aims of my study and discuss my results. While the results of the trial do not reveal any statistically significant differences between the outcomes in the two groups, I believe that there were factors that influenced the trial's capacity to expose differences, should any have existed. In particular, I explore the influences that the size of the trial, the nature of the assessment tools, and the participants' adherence to their allocated intervention may have had on the conclusions generated by the study.

1.6. Conclusion
I conclude by summarising the findings, suggesting implications my study has for pedagogy in polylingual schools, and making recommendations for future research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review
Synthesising what is known about language interdependence in L2 learning and how this might apply to polylingual schools

2.1. Introduction

The literature on the use of L1 to support the learning of L2 deals with an enormous variety of themes. Among the articles returned in the systematic search I conducted to inform this review were examinations of attitudes and perceptions among policy makers, teachers, parents, students and the laity on the use of L1 (e.g. Alshammari 2011), exposition of theories of the interplay between L1 and L2 (e.g. Cummins 1979), observational studies assessing to what extent and to what purpose students use their L1s (e.g. Moore 2013), case studies on the effect that providing L1 education can have on educational engagement (e.g. Benson 2005), and studies on the impacts of bilingual education (e.g. Krashen and McField 2005). All of these themes have some relevance to my study, but few are related to the specific questions of L1 influence on L2 proficiency. Aside from studies on the effects of bilingual education in its most general terms, it was very rare to find articles that reported on studies assessing specifically the impact that L1 use has on actual L2 production (rather than surrogate measure for such, for example, level of engagement in learning tasks (e.g. Scott and de la Fuente 2008)). Rarer still were studies that looked at this phenomenon in polylingual environments or which addressed the impact of L1 use at home on L2 achievement at school in studies using methods by which causality can be confidently inferred. I found no such studies.

Given the apparent lack of research addressing my specific topic, my approach to this review was to build the case for conducting my experiment by synthesising observations and hypotheses reported in studies on related fields. To begin with it became clear that specific recommendations to use L1 in L2 learning in British-curriculum schools is derived in the main from studies conducted in bilingual schools, from theories of linguistic interdependence and from some studies on L2 learning in de facto bilingual environments. I therefore worked from this position to draw in research carried out in British-curriculum schools on the roles played by the families of ethnic minorities in their children's engagement at school, and the changing face of provision for English language learners (ELLs) in British schools. This synthesis helped to identify gaps in the research literature about L1 supported learning in British schools and to suggest ways in which it might be addressed. To this end, my literature review is structured in the following way. First, I contextualise the setting of my study by describing the way learning needs of ELLs have been met by the British education system since the British Nationality Act of 1948. I then describe theories that underpin the notion of linguistic interdependence. These theories have been largely informed by research on bilingual education, which, perhaps as a result of the heated debate over its provision, has been the subject of a great deal of research. Interpretation of this large body of research has been simplified by a number of best-evidence systematic reviews, using meta-analysis, addressing the effects of bilingual models of education. I therefore have chosen to describe and critique two such systematic reviews as a basis for understanding the assumptions that underpin hypotheses about dual language learning and to contextualise the advice to use bilingual approaches in non-bilingual schools. I will then describe studies on similar approaches in non-bilingual programmes. Finally, I will review studies of family and community involvement in ELLs’ education.

I conclude by arguing that there is a gap in the research asking if and how L1 can be considered a pedagogic tool in L2 learning in polylingual learning environments, and how I aim to address this gap.
2.2. Setting of the Study

The linguistic profile of British state schools, in which this study is sited, has never been more diverse. The number of children in these schools who are learning in English while still learning the language itself has never been larger. Traditional barriers to migration continue to dissolve, bringing increasing numbers of children from across the world to schools in the UK. They join an existing and substantial body of bilingual students, which has been steadily growing since the British Nationality Act of 1948 precipitated sustained migration to the UK. Any one (or more) of at least 360 linguistic varieties represented in homes country-wide are used by an estimated 1,048,301 children between the ages of five and 16 in grant maintained schools in the UK (NALDIC 2013), nearly 16% of the total school population, or one in every six students.

The provision for this ever-increasing constituent of the national student body has passed through (and on occasion, revisited) three broad phases over the last 60 years. These are characterised by Costley (2013) as: assimilation, withdrawal, and mainstreaming.

2.2.1. Assimilation

In the 1950s the common presumption was that the initially rather small number of new arrivals to the UK were English-monolinguals-in-waiting, both linguistically and culturally, and who were therefore best served by being assimilated as quickly as possible into both domains. Teachers adopted what Edwards (1984:50) describes as a "laissez-faire attitude [to meeting their linguistic needs] frequently expressed in the comment "They'll pick up English in the playground."

On the back of growing awareness that the needs of new arrivals to the UK were not being met by such attitudes, the Local Education Act of 1966 authorised funding in an attempt to address them, though there was no central policy. Local Authorities were permitted to spend the money as they saw fit, and calls for action were motivated by a range of philosophical positions on 'solving the problem' of educating the children of immigrants (Costley 2013).

2.2.2. Withdrawal

In the 1970s the government began to recommend full or partial withdrawal of ELLs from mainstream classes for specialist language teaching. This policy was based on the assumption that children with similar learning needs are best served by being grouped together, away from other children (NALDIC 2011).

In the mid 1980s, however, two government-commissioned reports strongly argued against separate provision for ELLs. Both the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) and the Swann Commission drew attention to the racial segregation that was a feature of such an approach and noted that ELLs were given "no access to a normal school environment" (CRE 1986:9). This, they argued, negatively affected their self esteem, socialisation, academic achievement and, perhaps inevitably, language learning. The Swann report urged "formulation of coherent policies for meeting the needs of second-language learners through integrated provision within the mainstream school" (Swann 1985:391).

2.2.3. Mainstreaming

Following these reports inclusion did become a more common feature of English language support, and the broader needs of ethnic minority children became better articulated. However, a 2001 assessment of the condition of EAL support in British schools opens by stating "This paper charts deteriorating state school provision for speakers of languages other than English in the [past] 15 years or so" (Rampton, Harris and Leung 2001:1). Among other things, the paper describes the loss of control for locally tailored provision for ELLs and the introduction of a legally binding, centrally mandated, National Curriculum - a document that has never regarded ELLs as deserving of a coherent strand designed to address their needs.
A case study of EAL provision in England was carried out by the Institute of Education (IOE) in 2009. The study made for bleak reading. Provision was characterised variously as: lacking specialised staff, inappropriate for advanced bilinguals, coordinated by under-qualified staff, conflated with Special Educational Needs, lacking in appropriate training and LEA support, and insufficiently funded and resourced. The situation appears no better five years on. Funding for appropriate support for ELLs was significantly reduced in 2012 (DfE 2012) and EAL now exists “in a state of policy contradictions” (Costley 2013:288).

Costley (2013) notes that positive change for ELLs historically has gained momentum because of work done by schools, universities and professional groups, rather than (or perhaps despite) the actions of central government. More schools are being excised from direct government control through the academisation process, so the responsibility for ELLs comes to lie ever more firmly with their mainstream teachers.

My aspiration in conducting this study is to add empirical evidence that helps to inform pedagogical decisions made by these teachers, and the groups that Costley identifies as catalysts of positive change, so that the needs of their ELLs students can be adequately addressed.

2.3. The theoretical position

2.3.1. Psychoeducational theory of language interrelationships

The seminal work of Cummins in the late 1970s and early 1980s, while not the first to explore relationships between L1 and L2 proficiency (see for example Tucker, Otanes and Sibayan 1970, Skutnab-Kangas and Toukomaa 1976, Swain 1978), is the foundation upon which much of the subsequent work on the interplay between L1 and L2 has been set, and it has been a recurring focus in Cummins' work to date (e.g. Cummins 1979, 1980, 1997, 2001, 2007a). In 1979, Cummins elaborated the developmental interdependence hypothesis. This proposed that the level of competence children attain in L2 is partly a function of the type of competence they have already attained in L1 at the time intensive L2 exposure begins. Thus, children who are already proficient in L1 are likely to become proficient in comparable linguistic competences in L2. Conversely, the development of proficiency in L1 is impeded by education in L2-only environments, and this, in turn, delays development of L2.

In 1980, partly as a reaction to a widespread (see Garcia 1984) and vitriolic (Bethell 1975) rejection of bilingual education in the USA, Cummins sought to clarify the theoretical underpinnings of a pedagogic approach that he believed helped bilingual learners. In so doing he was well aware that, for many, the idea that instruction in L1 promotes English skills more effectively than instruction in English was counterintuitive. If the theory was not adequately explained by its proponents and supported by empirical evidence, Cummins was concerned that education policy decisions would be taken on sociopolitical rather than psychoeducational grounds. In a 1980 paper, Cummins built on the developmental interdependence hypothesis to incorporate a theory of a common underlying proficiency (CUP). In this, he proposed that the cognitive/academic skills underlying the proficiency of bilingual children in one of their languages can be used to support development in the other. He illustrates this in a later publication using the concept of telling the time: children who have learnt to tell the time in L1 need only to learn what labels to apply to the concept of telling the time in L2; they do not need to completely relearn the concept (Cummins 2001). Cummins drew on a number of studies of the effects of bilingual education programmes to inform his theory of CUP.

---

1 Continued failure to grasp this concept is nicely demonstrated in a 1996 letter to the 'Voice of the People' section of the Chicago Tribune, in which the correspondent sets up a straw man thusly: "If someone told you that the best way to learn to play the piano was to practice your football skills, you'd probably think they were crazy. Yet bilingual-education advocates claim that the best way to teach Hispanic children English is by teaching them in Spanish for five to seven years." (Amselle 1996).
Macnammara 1966, Swain 1978, Genesee 1979, Lambert and Tucker 1972, Cohen and Swain 1976, Cummins 1977, Troike 1978 and Legaretta et al 1979, all cited in Cummins 1980), and concluded by condemning the popular call for monolingual instruction as unsupported by the "mass of research evidence" (Cummins 1980:97). He urged the research community to clarify how cognitive/academic proficiency in bilingual children develops, so that those children could be saved from "mediocrity of educational opportunity" (Cummins 1980:98).

Despite Cummins' calls, bilingual education was subsequently outlawed in California (Colvin and Wilson 1998), restricted in Arizona and Massachusetts (Rolstad, Mahoney and Glass 2005), and has been rejected by a number of states in the USA (ProEnglish 2014). Fears of social fragmentation based on linguistic diversity continue to exist (Dawa 2013). Three decades after Cummins' cri de cœur, this makes clear the ineffectiveness of the research community's response.

2.3.2. L1 in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) settings: The plausibility of an alternative approach.

2.3.2.1 Rejecting the monolingual principle
The "monolingual principle" - that all instruction of a foreign language should be carried out in that language (Howatt 1984, quoted in Cummins 2007b:223) - remains firmly entrenched, not just in mainstream schools, but also in other language learning environments. Atkinson (1987) challenged this principle in the context of TEFL teaching. He asked why students' L1s, as a potentially useful component of their existing knowledge and understanding of the world, are variously banned, cautioned against, or simply ignored in English language teaching. He urged reassessment of the assumptions that lead to these practices and, while offering little by way of empirical evidence in support of his theories, posits some "general advantages of judicious use of the mother-tongue" (Atkinson 1987:242), which he hoped might inform any such reassessment.

2.3.2.2. A persistent assumption
Following Cummins and Atkinson, in 2001 Cook brought together psychoeducational theories of L1 and L2 interplay to challenge the dogmatic insistence on banning or marginalising L1 in language classrooms. Writing from the perspective of an EFL teacher in the UK (where L1s represented in classes are likely to be numerous), he echoes Atkinson's assertion that there appears to be no empirically supported justification for the proscription of L1, but rather that it has simply become habit. Like Atkinson though, in the context of a passionately written discourse on the subject, Cook falls short of providing convincing empirical evidence of a demonstrable advantage of L1 use on the production of L2.

2.3.2.3. The death of a dogma?
If Atkinson and Cook served to add the voice of the healthy skeptic to the debate, Butzkamm (2003) sought to use their (and others', e.g. Harbord 1992) 'common sense' interpretations of the issue as a springboard for an updated theory of L1 and L2 interdependence. This, he argued, would restore "the mother tongue to its rightful place as the most important ally a foreign language can have" (Butzkamm 2003:30).

Butzkamm's theory is delivered in a series of ‘maxims', which can be summarised as follows. A learner's L1 is the foundation upon which understanding is built in L2 and therefore should be capitalised on as such; and that using L1 "systematically, selectively and in judicious doses" (Butzkamm 2003:36) can be far more productive than trying to conduct lessons entirely in L2. He supports his theory with a brief mention of research from related fields, including those on bilingualism (Saunders 1988 and Tracy 1996, cited in Butzkamm 2003).

With particular relevance to my investigation, Butzkamm cites an uncontrolled study (Tudor 1987) that suggests that preparation of materials in a student's L1 results in better quality production of
L2. Based on this, Butzkamm suggests that students should take home translations of key materials to allow them to digest the content in their L1 before encountering it later on in class in L2.

Butzkamm concludes by quoting Hammerly's (1991:151) speculative opinion that L2 instruction that "fully takes into account and judiciously uses the NL [Native Language]" can halve the time it takes to learn an L2. Butzkamm notes, though, that 'judicious use', though often advocated (as I have already illustrated, and also for example, Lee 2012, Copland and Neokleous 2011, Moore 2013, Littlewood and Yu 2011, Cook 1999, 2001, Schweers 1999, He 2012, Alshammari 2011, Paradowski 2007, Swain and Lapkin 2000), has yet to be adequately defined.

2.3.3. Translanguaging: A new model for the 21st century

Thus far, the theoretical literature reviewed has tended to cite research evidence from two educational models that encourage L1 and L2 intersection to inform its assumptions: bilingual education, and foreign language education. In these environments a high level of homogeneity of L1 among students can be assumed. In UK state schools with ELL children (the setting for my study), a polylingual environment, where no single language enjoys a majority, is more likely to be the norm (IOE 2009). It is not clear that the evidence generated by research in bilingual schools and in foreign language classes can be applied directly to such polylingual learning environments.

A provisional and developing theoretical model of instruction (Lewis, Jones and Baker 2012), considered with polylingual learning environments at least partly in mind, is "translanguaging" (Baker 2011, Garcia 2009). Translanguaging is characterised by Baker (2011) as teachers encouraging a simultaneous, natural and pragmatic use of both of their languages to negotiate meaning and carry out classroom activities. Proponents of the translanguaging theory suggest that encouraging concurrent use of the linguistic varieties known to a student will result in deeper understanding of curriculum content and promote mastery in both L1 and L2. It is hypothesised, for example, that having to internalise knowledge using L1 then explain that knowledge in L2 may lead to fuller understanding of the subject matter and may result in better development of the weaker language (Lewis, Jones and Baker 2012). However, despite relatively optimistic attitudes towards translanguaging, teachers might want to reserve judgement before embracing the approach, for, as Lewis, Jones and Baker (2012:650) note, "the effectiveness of translanguaging strategies have yet to be researched, evaluated, and critiqued."

2.3.4. Summary of the theory

Psychoeducational theory of L1 and L2 interplay, and in particular the notions of linguistic interdependence and CUP, is broadly accepted as valid by the research community, and bilingual models of education have been developed based on this acceptance. Arguing the sociocultural implications of promoting or denying bilingual students' right to use their L1s is largely thankless because, in many ways, it comes down to one's philosophical view on pluralism in society. However, the argument from academic and linguistic achievement is more objective. The effects of bilingual approaches on academic and linguistic success can be assessed in empirical studies. I now turn to these.

2.4. Empirical research

2.4.1. Introduction

As stated earlier, it is research on bilingual education programmes that has tended to receive the greatest attention from theoreticians interested in investigating whether hypotheses of dual-language development are supported by empirical evidence (e.g. Cummins 1980). Key to the feasibility of bilingual programmes is the presence in the school of a "critical mass" (Slavin and Cheung 2005:250) of students who speak the same L1. In polylingual schools, where there is no such critical mass, application of the pedagogic structure of bilingual programmes is not
straightforward. Even so, the findings of assessments of the effects of bilingual education programmes have been used to justify the use of related approaches in polylingual schools (e.g. DfES 2006). Of course, if cherry-picked elements of the pedagogic approaches used in bilingual schools are to be advocated in polylingual learning environments, they will require their own corpus of empirical research to assess their effectiveness. Research that has attempted to address this type of extrapolation is reviewed later in this chapter. However, because such approaches are largely predicated on the findings of assessments of bilingual education, it is the research evidence from this sector that I will now address.

2.4.2. Systematic reviews of bilingual programmes
Systematic reviews are regarded as the gold standard for locating, appraising and synthesising the findings of studies that investigate the same question (Dickson, Cherry and Boland 2013). A number of systematic reviews, using meta-analyses to synthesise results, have been conducted to assess the effects of bilingual programmes of education. Krashen and McField (2005) identify six of these, conducted between 1985 and 2005, which all suggest a small, positive effect on L2 learning and academic achievement of bilingual programmes over all-English programmes. I will concentrate on just two of these reviews: Slavin and Cheung (2005), and Rolstad, Mahoney and Glass (2005). I have selected these over the others for a number of reasons. First, they are the most recent reviews, and so include studies that reflect the most up to date interpretations of bilingual models of education. In addition, Slavin and Cheung (2005) used the most rigorous inclusion criteria when choosing studies. They performed an exhaustive search for studies that (a) compared bilingual programmes to English-only approaches, (b) randomly assigned participants to experimental or control conditions, (c) used quantitative measures of English performance as their outcomes, and (d) for which the duration of treatment was at least one school year. In so doing, they re-analysed studies which had been included in earlier systematic reviews, and incorporated any studies that met their inclusion criteria. They have thus compiled the most complete and methodologically robust review of those studies identified by Krashen and McField (2005). However, Slavin and Cheung focus only on studies of reading instruction.

I have, therefore, also assessed the review reported by Rolstad, Mahoney and Glass (2005), which goes beyond the impact of bilingual reading programmes to include studies assessing the effects of bilingual education more generally. A discussion of each follows.

2.4.3. A synthesis of research on language of reading instruction for English language learners (Slavin and Cheung 2005).

2.4.3.1. Framing the context
Slavin and Cheung describe the rapid increase in the number of young Americans who speak a language other than English at home. They note that this is coincidental with recent introduction of federal policies, such as No Child Left Behind (US Department of Education 2001), which demand success for all subgroups of children. They note the theoretical justifications for bilingual programmes and use 'best evidence synthesis' to assess whether any empirically demonstrated support exists for such theories.

2.4.3.2. Analysis by study type
Slavin and Cheung distinguish several categories of bilingual programme which I shall present in turn.

i. Studies of paired-bilingual programmes for Spanish-dominant students
Paired-bilingual programmes teach children to read in their L1 and their L2 at different times of day. Ten eligible studies comparing this approach with English-only programmes were reviewed. Two studies were of particularly high quality - Plante (1976) and Huzar (1973) - using random allocation
of students to either experimental or control classes, and lasting for two to three years. Plante (1976) followed children from kindergarten and first grade and found that when tested in second grade those in the paired-bilingual group scored statistically significantly higher in tests of reading in English than children in the English-only group. This advantage lessened by third grade, but had become statistically non-significant. In addition Plante (1976) noted that only one child (3%) in the paired-bilingual group was ’retained’ (i.e. did not make sufficient progress in class and was thus required to repeat the year), as opposed to 13 children (59%) in the English-only group. Huzar's (1973) experiment involved 160 Puerto Rican children who were randomly assigned on entry to first grade to either paired-bilingual or English-only classes and were assessed for English reading proficiency after either two or three years. She found no statistically significant difference in reading proficiency between experimental and control groups for second graders. In third grade, while aggregated results favoured paired-bilingual programmes, they were statistically significant only for boys. They also describe a study by Ramirez et al. (1991) which was beleaguered by high attrition rates and other methodological problems, but which showed statistically significantly higher scores in English reading tests for children in a paired bilingual programme compared to children in an English only programme.

A series of reports on bilingual education programmes by Campeau and colleagues (1975) are discussed by Slavin and Cheung. The authors of these reports were tasked with finding ”exemplary bilingual programmes” (p266, original emphasis) and so must be regarded with caution, as this compromises the wider applicability of the findings. Nonetheless, eligible studies within the Campeau series show a statistically significant advantage in reading proficiency for children in the paired-bilingual programmes compared to controls.

Reflecting the uncertainty in the field and the related importance of systematic reviews to address it, were two studies - Cohen (1975) and Maldonado (1977) - that found no statistically significant differences in performance on a variety of tests of English proficiency between children enrolled in paired-bilingual programmes and those in English-only programmes. Slavin and Cheung also describe a one year study (Campeau et al. 1975) of a paired-bilingual programme where all curriculum content was delivered in both Spanish and English. For example, lessons taught in English in the morning were repeated in Spanish in the afternoon. By the end of the study the paired-bilingual group performed better than the control group but this difference was not statistically significant.

ii. Studies of transitional bilingual education programmes
In transitional bilingual programmes instruction in students’ L1 is gradually replaced by instruction in the target language. For example, in the first study of this type reviewed by Slavin and Cheung, Maldonado (1994) investigated children with learning difficulties who were taught almost entirely in Spanish in their first year, then in equal measures Spanish and English in their second year, and subsequently transitioned to all-English instruction in the third year. He compared their subsequent attainment on a test of basic English skills with that of children who received English-only instruction for all three years. He found that children in the transitional bilingual programme scored far higher on a test of basic English skills than the English-only group. Slavin and Cheung report similar results for a comparable study carried out by Campeau et al. (1975).

Slavin and Cheung also report on a study (Saldate, Mishra and Medina 1985) that compared what they think might have been a transitional model of bilingual education (the study is poorly specified in the original paper) with an immersion programme. They reported that children in the bilingual programme "substantially outperformed" (p270) their immersion counterparts - though they warn that the small size of the study and relatively high attrition rates demand caution in interpreting the results.

Drawing together the studies in this and the previous section, Slavin and Cheung reviewed one study that compared transitional bilingual programmes to paired-bilingual programmes (Gersten and Woodward 1995). In this seven-year longitudinal study, children in paired-bilingual programmes initially outperformed children in transitional programmes on tests of basic English
skills. However, over time this difference diminished, such that by the time they had reached seventh grade there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of the two groups.

iii. Studies of secondary reading
Reading programmes covered in this section introduced bilingual Spanish-English reading programmes in secondary grades for low-achieving Spanish speaking students. In both studies (Covey 1973; Kauffman 1968), students in the bilingual programmes did better in standardised tests of reading than students in control groups. In Covey’s study the difference was statistically significant.

2.4.3.3. Summary and implications
Of the 17 studies located by Slavin and Cheung, 12 favoured bilingual education and five did not find any statistically significant difference between bilingual programmes and other types of programme. Slavin and Cheung make some important comments about the influence that selection for bilingual programmes might play on the perception of their effectiveness. They also call for more longitudinal, randomised-control experiments, as well as qualitative studies, to cast light on the conditions under which bilingual education may be advantageous for English language learning.

The focus of my study is to ascertain whether any of the conditions present in bilingual programmes that lead to improved English acquisition exist in polylingual schools. The relative strength of paired-bilingual reading programmes covered in Slavin and Cheung’s review suggest that encouraging reading in L1 at home might be one way of addressing this aim.

2.4.4. The big picture: A meta-analysis of program effectiveness research on English language leaners (Rolstad, Mahoney and Glass 2005).

2.4.4.1. Framing the context
Rolstad, Mahoney and Glass describe the rapid increase in language-minority children in the US school system. They estimate the number of such children enrolled during the academic year 2000/01 to be approximately four and a half million, an increase of 32% over 1997/98 levels. They note that, while schools are legally required to provide effective programs for ELLs, the choice of the form that this takes has been restricted by states such as California, Arizona and Massachusetts, who have literally or effectively outlawed bilingual programmes. In addition, at the federal level, the repeal of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 and its replacement by the English Acquisition Act of 2002 demonstrates a philosophical shift away from valuing dual-language proficiency in favour of monolingual English proficiency. They describe the ideologically charged nature of debates over what constitutes appropriate education for ELLs; such debates are rarely limited to language proficiency, but embroiled also in issues of "nationalism, immigration and the politics of multilingualism" (p573). Thus contextualised, the aim of their review was to compare the effects of instructional programmes for ELLs in an attempt to clarify "the big picture" (p574) in the debate.

2.4.4.2. Results and implication
Unlike Slavin and Cheung (2005), Rolstad, Mahoney and Glass do not discuss in any detail the characteristics, strengths, shortcomings or implications of each of the studies included in their review. Rather, they produce a table of effect sizes for each of the elements or 'effects' described in their studies. They conclude that their meta-analysis "reveals not only that bilingual education is superior to all-English approaches […] but also that programs designed to develop children's academic use of both languages are superior to programs that aim to use children's home languages to transition them to all-English instruction" (p590). This observation resonates with
Slavin and Cheung's (2005) conclusion that paired-bilingual programmes are more effective than transitional approaches. Taken together, both studies thus lend weight to Rolstad, Mahoney and Glass's closing remark that the actions of states like California, Arizona and Massachusetts and the rapid transition to monolingual English instruction encouraged by the English Acquisition Act cannot be justified on educational grounds, and may actually be harmful.

2.4.5. Drawing conclusions from systematic reviews
The systematic reviews discussed, in line with the conclusions drawn in Krashen and McField's (2005) 'meta-meta-analysis', support the contention that bilingual programmes of education, at worst, do no harm to bilingual children's linguistic and academic development, and in fact are more likely confer a small advantage on their development in both domains.

That said, it does not necessarily follow that findings from research on bilingual education support the principle of systematic use of more than one language in schools where Slavin and Cheung's 'critical mass' of L1 does not exist. In order to assess whether lessons learned from studies of bilingual programmes of education can be applied to other educational environments, some studies have investigated the effects of isolated use of L1 use in otherwise monolingual L2 environments. I will now discuss these.

2.5. L1 use in monolingual L2 learning environments

2.5.1. Study types
Studies on the effects of using L1 in learning L2 in (nominally) non-bilingual learning environments, for example, foreign languages classes in monolingual schools, have tended to focus on two areas. Some have sought to determine how much and to what purpose students use their L1s when engaged in a variety of academic activities. Others have attempted to assess the effects of academic activities that have been mediated in one way or another by students' L1s on the quality of their subsequent L2 production.

2.5.2. Research that seeks to explain for what purposes L1 is used by language learners
Despite studies of this type not providing empirical evidence of the effects of L1 use on the quality of L2 production, their findings have been used to rationalise L1 use in language classrooms. A number of studies have investigated this area (e.g. Alegria de la Colina and del Pilar Garcia Mayo 2009, Carless 2008, Schweers 1999, Kobayashi 2003, Wang and Wen 2002, Storch and Wigglesworth 2003, Murphy and Roca de Larios 2010, Moodley 2007, de la Campa and Nassaji 2009, Moore 2013, Kibler 2010), all of which have come to largely consistent conclusions. By way of illustration, I will describe three such studies.

Swain and Lapkin (2000) gave pairs of Grade 8 French immersion students in Canada two collaborative tasks during which they were free to use their L1 (English). Their analysis showed wide variation in quantity of L1 used across the pairs. However, L1 use was observed consistently as fulfilling three purposes: moving the task along, focusing attention, and for interpersonal interaction. They concluded that L1 "served important cognitive and social functions" (Swain and Lapkin 2000:268).

In another study of L1 use in collaborative learning, Scott and de la Fuente (2008) investigated how pairs of English-L1 university students, learning either Spanish or French, used their L1 when working together. They concluded that L1 was used to facilitate meta-cognitive discussion related to the task, and that discussion where L1 was allowed resulted in much more fluid interactions than in discussions where it was prohibited. Based on these observations they suggested that prohibition of L1 may impose cognitive demands on the learner which in turn reduce the availability of cognitive resources for carrying out tasks.
More recently, van Weijen et al. (2009) asked 20 first-year BA English students whose L1 was Dutch to write essays in Dutch and in English under 'think-aloud' conditions (where participants verbalise their internal dialogue as they write). They found that most common purposes for L1 use were self-instruction and commenting on their own work (what the authors call meta-comments). Other purposes were labelled "goal setting", "structuring" and "generating ideas" (van Weijen et al. 2009:241).

There appears to be little disagreement about the purposes for L1 use when it is permitted in L2 classrooms, and, as illustrated, some have suggested that these functions precipitate both academic and L2 success. In the following sections I discuss empirical studies that attempt to assess whether this predicted success is realised.

**2.5.3 Research that investigates the impact of L1 use on subsequent L2 production in non-bilingual settings**

Studies of this kind have sought to assess whether allowing, or instructing, learners to use their L1 in completing L2 tasks has an impact on the quality of subsequent production of L2.

**2.5.3.1. Allowing L1 use**

In the study by Swain and Lapkin (2000) (see section 2.5.2) a secondary research aim was to assess whether any association could be detected between the quantity of L1 use and the quality of the resulting L2 written pieces. They found negative correlations between quantity of L1 use and quality of written output in both tasks, one of which was statistically significant. These findings are reflected in part by the study van Weijen et al. (2009). They found that the more time spent by writers making meta-comments in L1 during the task the lower quality their L2 writing tended to be.

Like van Weijen et al., Woodall (2002) used a 'think-aloud' protocol to record and quantify L1 use by university students learning either English, Spanish or Japanese as they composed written pieces in their respective L2s. He found a positive association between the duration of instances of L1 use and the quality of written texts when the L1 and L2 were cognate languages (for example English and Spanish), but found a statistically significant negative correlation between time spent using L1 when languages were non-cognate (for example English and Japanese).

It appears from these studies that teachers should be cautious about allowing 'free' use of L1 in their classrooms. Such evidence that exists suggests that this approach may lead to poorer L2 output, or at least that levels of success may be determined in part by 'linguistic distance' (Elder and Davies 1998). However, in the few studies that have assessed deliberate, taught, L1 strategies there appears to be some cause for optimism. I discuss these next.

**2.5.3.2. Instructing students to use their L1**

In addition to studies which have looked for associations between 'free' L1 use and quality of L2 output, there have been some studies that have attempted to assess the effects of deliberate L1 teaching strategies on subsequent L2 production.

Strohmeyer and McGrail (1988) encouraged adult Latino students in Boston, USA to pre-write essays in Spanish. They found that, compared with their previous L2 performance, they went on to "write pieces in English that were considerably more developed than their usual ESL writing" (cited in Auerbach 1993).

Adding more structure to the L1 intervention, in a controlled intervention study in Cypriot school children, Yiakoumetti (2006) compared usual teaching with a novel intervention based on students' L1 (regional Cypriot dialect) on their subsequent production of Standard Modern Greek (the target language). She showed that children whose teachers used the novel intervention performed better on written tasks in Standard Modern Greek than students in the control group.
In a similar study, Paradowski (2007) conducted a controlled experiment with Polish secondary school children. They were taught either using a Language Interface Method, in which grammatical structures of L1 are deliberately and systematically compared and contrasted with those of L2, or taught English grammar following the school's standard practice, that is to say unmediated by their L1. He found that students taught using the Language Interface Method statistically significantly outperformed the comparison students in tests of grammar.

Butzkamm (2003), in the paper I described earlier, suggested that classroom instructions might be more effectively delivered in students' L1 than in their L2. While his motivation was largely for reasons of expediency, Bozorgian and Pillay (2013) sought to assess whether instruction in L1 might have deeper implications for learning. They randomly assigned 60 students studying at an English Language Institute in Iran to receive instruction in listening strategies delivered in Persian (their L1) or to receive traditional listening drills, unmediated by their L1. They found that those taught listening strategies in Persian showed statistically significant improvement in scores on listening tests compared with those in the control group.

In a study of 12 Taiwanese Year 7 and 8 students at three mainstream suburban schools in New Zealand, Fung, Wilkinson and Moore (2003) assessed the impact of 'reciprocal teaching' (an approach where students adopt specific, defined roles in discussions of reading matter), carried out in Mandarin (the students' L1) on the development of their cognitive and meta-cognitive strategies for reading comprehension in English. They concluded that the "data strongly indicate" (Fung, Wilkinson and Moore 2003:26) that their programme led to improvement in the participants' English reading competence. However, their conclusion must be assessed cautiously as their study lacked a comparison group and the study design conflated instruction in L1 with instruction in L2.

These studies suggest that there may be ways in which L1 can be effectively used to promote L2 learning in non-bilingual programmes. Indeed, with regard to the uncertainty described earlier, they may even further clarify what 'systematic and judicial' use of L1 actually means. More research is clearly needed in this area, and in particular studies that use designs from which causality can be more confidently inferred. Studies that assess how teachers can apply these kinds of strategy in polylingual learning environments are noticeable by their absence. If teachers in these types of school are to be confident about attempting such approaches, they need more and better empirical research to inform their practices.

2.6. Home-school partnership

In the final section of this literature review I examine the role of home learning activities in families in which English is not the principal language of communication.

A landmark randomised controlled trial conducted in the late 1970s investigated the effects that reading regularly to parents had on the reading proficiency of children aged between six and eight, attending multiracial, inner-city schools in Haringey, London. Tizard, Schofield and Hewison (1982:1) reported "highly significant improvement" on standardised reading tests of children who read to their parents regularly, compared to children who were either given extra reading instruction in school, or had no intervention beyond normal school practices. Importantly, the improvement was observed regardless of the parents' levels of English proficiency.

In a case study of multilingual primary-aged children in Britain engaged in 'family learning' in community language classes and at home, Conteh (2012) argues that informal, family education contexts capitalising on bilingual pedagogies are conducive to academic success. She advocates more research into the ways children learn in these types of settings and exploration of how they might be operationalised to promote academic success and productive relationships that span family, community and school.
In the context of translanguaging, Baker (2011) suggests that dual-language use for home-based learning tasks may lead to fuller understanding of curriculum content. He suggests that, in order to discuss their learning with parents using L1, children must reprocess content at levels much deeper than mere translation. This, he suggests, results in school-based learning being "expanded, extended and intensified through discussion with the parent in the other language" (Baker 2011:290).

Both Conteh and Baker stress the importance of community involvement in bilinguals’ learning experiences, a facet of which is explored more closely by Kenner et al. (2007). Through several case studies, they investigated intergenerational learning between children and their grandparents in Sylheti-speaking communities in east London. They argue that a 'special relationship' between children and their grandparents exists, which promotes learning at home and fosters academic success at school. They conclude by stating that "this significant contribution needs to be recognised by schools" (Kenner et al. 2007:241).

Gregory (2001) and Gregory et al. (2007) explored the role of siblings and grandparents in ELL children’s learning. In case studies of Bengali families in east London, they investigated the potential that reading with these family members has for developing literacy in both Bengali and English. They describe the complex blending of the norms and traditions of literacy teaching in both cultures (through both story telling and Qur'anic study). They argue that children who are able to take advantage of family involvement in home literacy practices can draw on a wealth of knowledge to guide their interpretation of their learning. They do not provide evidence of a positive effect of these practices on academic achievement however, though their call for research to investigate how bicultural knowledge enhances children's skills (Gregory et al. 2007:22) suggests that they believe that there is one.

The research evidence presented here suggests that home reading activities, both in English and in children's L1s (or a combination of the two) may have positive impacts on their success in school. It also highlights the diverse nature that characterises these interactions in language-minority families, in contrast to the prevailing assumption that this kind of work will be carried out exclusively by parents, using school-sanctioned methods (Gregory 2001). In considering how L1 might be used at home to support L2 work in school it is important to consider the implications of these characteristics.

2.7. Conclusion

Provision for ELLs in the UK has been almost completely decentralised, and the responsibility for meeting their language learning needs is now almost exclusively in the hands of mainstream classroom teachers. If mainstream teachers in polylingual schools are to adequately meet the needs of ELLs they must be equipped with pedagogies derived from well controlled studies that allow causal relationships to be confidently inferred.

Theories of the positive effect that L1 has on L2 learning enjoy widespread support from the research community, in particular because studies carried out in designated bilingual and de facto bilingual learning environments have provided empirical support for them. However, despite suggestions that the principles of bilingual education can be extrapolated into polylingual learning environments, no research appears to exist to support these assertions. Interpretation of the small amount of research that does exist relevant to addressing this need (for example work on translanguaging) is equivocal.

Based largely on observational studies, it has been suggested that the communities to which ELLs belong outside school can play a positive role in academic and linguistic achievement in school. Capitalising on these communities might, therefore, be a way to address successful crossover of bilingual pedagogies in polylingual schools. It might also provide much needed empirical evidence to inform understanding of translanguaging models of education.
In an attempt to address some of the uncertainties revealed in this review, my study seeks to assess the impact that family involvement in L1-mediated home-learning activities has on the academic achievement of ELLs at school.
Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1. Introduction
In this chapter I present the specific research question that I aim to address, I discuss the role of paradigms in informing approaches to empirical research, and I describe the methodology I have adopted in addressing the uncertainty identified in the literature review, including my rationale for doing so. I describe the characteristics of the school and the participants in the study, and explain each step in the delivery of my interventions and how their effects were assessed. I conclude with a discussion of the role of the researcher, ethical considerations, and experimental validity.

3.2. Research question
As demonstrated in my literature review, there is a prevailing assumption that 'judicious and systematic' application of methods informed by research on bilingual models of education will promote academic and linguistic achievement in ELLs in monolingual schools in the UK. However, there appears to be no empirical evidence to suggest how this can be achieved and, if divorced from more holistically bilingual learning environments, whether such approaches result in higher achievement for ELLs. Moreover, there does not even appear to be an adequate articulation of what 'judicious and systematic' actually means.

In the light of this gap in the literature, informed by the findings of studies of home and community assisted learning that I have also described, and in response to the suggestion that previewing learning materials using L1 is advantageous (Gibbons 2009 *inter alia*), my study seeks to address the following research question.

*Does the language with which children discuss the content of a reading book at home with family members have an effect on their subsequent performance on standardised assessments of written English for a written retelling of the same story?*

This overarching question will be addressed using an experimental design addressing the following hypotheses.

\(H_1: \) Previewing the content of a reading book using L1 to discuss it at home affects the quality (as measured by standardised assessments of written English) of a subsequent written retelling of that story.

\(H_0: \) There is no difference in the quality (as measured by standardised assessments of written English) of a written retelling of the story between the group using L1 to preview the material and the group using English to preview the material.

I have chosen a two tailed experimental hypothesis to reflect conflicting conclusions about the effects of L1-mediated activities in monolingual L2 environments.

As the success of the project was contingent on participants’ adherence to the intervention language to which they had been allocated, a secondary aim was to ascertain the extent of that adherence, and whether parents of the participants felt that interventions of this kind are valuable. This was addressed using questionnaires sent to all participants and their parents.

3.3. Research paradigms
The debate in the social sciences over ontology and epistemology has often been fraught. Both 'sides' of some imagined division have been deemed guilty of attempting to skewer their 'opponents' on charges that include gender hegemony, for example "malestream" positivism (Oakley 1998:707), or of misunderstanding the nature of evidence: "the plural of anecdote is not
statistic” (Mulgan quoted in Rutter 2012:15). This “dreadful 1980s culture war” (Goldacre 2013a) is irrelevant. Oakley (2000) gives an account of how actual practices in both natural and social sciences research defy the assumption that researchers occupy one of either side of a binary world of ‘quality’ or ‘quantity’, ‘interpretivism’ or ‘positivism’, ‘naturalism’ or ‘scientism’. I reject the expectation that one must declare an adherence to either one of these positions. As both Oakley and Goldacre have emphasised, it is the research question which should dictate the approach to addressing it (Oakley 1999, Goldacre 2013b), not some perceived membership of a paradigmatic ‘tribe’. By extension, it is the research question, setting, participants and expected outcomes that should inform the ontological assumptions informing the assessment of the external validity of any findings. Knowledge is always provisional and imperfect. If it were not so, so-called ‘positivists’ would not acknowledge the influences of placebo, Hawthorne and research participation effects (McCambridge, Kypri and Elbourne 2014). So-called ‘interpretivists’ would find their work so unique as to not have any applicability beyond the specific circumstance in which it was conducted (after Larsen-Freeman 2000). To debate the minutiae of the philosophical underpinnings informing differing world views is to split hairs. Or, to borrow from Theravada Buddhist teachings, "Conjecture about [the origin, etc., of] the world is an unconjecturable that is not to be conjectured about. That would bring madness and vexation to anyone who conjectured about it" (Acintita Sutta [AN 4.77]).

I am primarily interested in assessing whether something happens, with why something happens set aside for investigation in another study. For this element of my research, I use an outcome that is objective, measurable and can be applied to similar populations. The study is set in the context of the English National Curriculum, where numerical 'levels' as a measure of quality are familiar to teachers and are used universally to assess pupil performance. It is therefore appropriate to use an experimental design, in which comparison groups generated by an unbiased allocation schedule are given different interventions, the effects of which are subsequently compared using a quantitative measure of writing quality.

However, I am also interested to gauge the appetite among teachers, parents and children for exploring the potential for L1 use in supporting their L2 learning. For this element of my study I will rely on my own observations of the things these groups say and do in preparing, conducting and reflecting on the study. While their utterances and actions might be considered substantive, my interpretation of them will inevitably be subjective. An ontological position that combines assumptions in this way is sometimes known as a post-positive approach (Thomas 2013).

3.4. Research methodology: randomised trial

The study design was a parallel group, randomised trial using a 1:1 allocation ratio after stratification by school class and pre-trial assessment of writing proficiency, with outcomes assessed blind to group allocation.

Randomised trials are used increasingly to evaluate social and educational interventions (Mosteller and Boruch 2002) to assess whether a cause and effect relationship exists between an intervention and an outcome (Sibbald and Roland 1998). They are considered by the Cabinet Office Behavioural Insights Team to be the best way to determine whether a policy is working (Haynes et al. 2013), and according to the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) "should be considered as the first choice to establish whether an intervention works" (Hutchison and Styles 2010:7).

Randomised trials differ from other experimental designs in only one key way: comparison groups are generated by random allocation. The random allocation of participants to alternative interventions, or to no intervention, "is the best approach to dealing with and controlling for selection bias, regression to the mean and temporal changes" (Torgerson and Torgerson 2008:22).

2 Levels were abolished by the Secretary of State for Education in mid 2013 (DfE 2013a), but they remain widely used as benchmarks for achievement as schools respond to the challenge of replacing them with alternative, bespoke, measures of proficiency.
Random allocation of eligible participants to comparison groups results in groups with similar characteristics, which differ only by chance. In the context of my study, for example, participants may have differing attitudes to the importance of maintaining their L1 at home, some may speak their L1 exclusively at home while others may feel it more important to maintain an English-only policy. Still others may sit somewhere between these extremes. Random allocation "is the best technique for equating the comparison groups on all variables" (Johnson and Christensen 2014:324), including unknown or unmeasured variables such as language practices at home, before an intervention is introduced. Consequently, this makes it plausible that any statistically significant differences in the outcomes between groups are attributable to the influence of the intervention, rather than something over which the experimenter has no control.

In an effort to report my randomised trial in sufficient detail, transparency and clarity to allow assessment of its validity and replication by others, and as recommended by NfER (Hutchison and Styles 2010), I shall use the CONSORT 2010 guidelines (Schulz, Altman and Moher 2010), with adaptations for randomised trials in education recommended by Torgerson and Torgerson (2008), as a framework for describing the way this trial was conducted.

3.5. Recruiting the school

I was introduced to the school where the study was conducted by one of my tutors at Xxxxxx Xxxxxxx University. I wrote to the head teacher (Appendix 1) inviting her to take part in the study. After her agreement, I followed up my initial letter with a rationale document (Appendix 2) outlining the study, which I subsequently sent to the school's EAL coordinator and the class teachers with whom I would be working.

3.6. The school

Vaughan Primary School is a grant-maintained state primary school, in an ethnically diverse area of East Xxxxxx, serving approximately 450 children aged three to eleven years. According to the school's most recent Equality Statement, 28 different home languages are represented among the student body (see Table 3.1), and children for whom English is an additional language constitute 46% of the total. The school has representatives of 18 different ethnic groups (see Table 3.2).

The school is proud of its multi-ethnic profile. On the first page of its prospectus a quote from a recent OFSTED report is prominently displayed, saying:

"An outstanding contribution to community cohesion pervades the school. It is evident … in the pupils (sic) awareness of what it means to live in multicultural Britain"

This quote is set adjacent to a quote from a parent stating that:

"The school's international status and multicultural intake is a real strength."

On its website, one of the key missions of the school is described as “to facilitate success for every child by … embedding children's learning in the cultures represented at the school.” The school's Anti-Racism Statement declares its aim to "build on the strength of the cultural diversity within our school … and for [all members of the community] to be valued and respected for who they are."

These general aims are articulated in more detail in the school's Community Cohesion and Single Equality policies, where ethnic diversity is clearly seen as an asset, and the school's commitment to meeting the needs of its diverse population is repeatedly asserted. With particular relevance to my study, the Community Cohesion policy states that the school aims to "provide greater
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opportunities for pupils, together with their families, to take part in activities and receive services which build stronger, positive interaction”.

### 3.6.1. EAL provision at Vaughan

The school has an English as an additional language (EAL) coordinator, who has enjoyed a 28-year relationship with the school. Her chief responsibility lies in assessing the English proficiency of ‘new arrivals’ (children who are newly arrived in the UK and who frequently have little or no facility with English) and in providing guidance to mainstream teachers. She gives a small amount of direct support for the least proficient ELLs (for example she works with two new arrivals in Year 4 for 15 minutes per day). This tends to last only for their first two terms at the school, after which their needs are addressed almost exclusively by mainstream teachers. The EAL coordinator cites reduced government funding for EAL support and the absence of formal EAL training, both pre-service and inservice, as key influencing factors in what she characterises as less than optimal support for language learners in the school.

### 3.7. Participants

Through discussion with the EAL coordinator it was decided that the study would be conducted with children in Years 1 and 2 (ages five to seven). Her reasons for recommending this age phase were as follows:

- Level of L1 academic literacy in older children is insufficiently developed to support academic tasks in the home
- Parental involvement in children's learning tends to be higher with younger children, therefore a home-based intervention would be more likely to be acted on
- Number of children with EAL in these year groups was sufficiently high to make a comparative study feasible.

Accordingly, all children classified in the school's records as EAL in Years 1 and 2 were deemed eligible for inclusion in the trial. There were 45 eligible children, representing 17 different languages (see Table 3.3).

Information about participants' allocation to comparison groups, exclusions and attrition is presented in Figure 3.1. Ultimately, 18 children were allocated to the L1 group and 18 children to the English-only group.

### 3.8. Interventions

The premise for my intervention is based on a synthesis of closely related recommendations that recur in the literature. In addition to advice in the published research identified in my literature review (e.g. Butzkamm 2003), educational bodies in the British civil service (e.g. Milton Keynes Ethnic Minority Achievement Support Services 2004, Aberdeenshire Council 2008, Bourne 2002) suggest that using children's L1 to preview materials before encountering them in L2 confers an advantage on children's subsequent success in the use of those materials. One such example is as follows:

> "If possible, use the students' first language to explain the key points of the text; in the case of a narrative, tell the story in the students’ first language prior to having them read it in English.”
> Gibbons (2009:92)

As it would be impractical, if not impossible, for teachers in polylingual classes to act on this recommendation themselves, it is appropriate to investigate whether asking parents or carers to support such an activity at home would convey the advantage implied by advocates of this approach on children's subsequent work in school.
3.8.1 Shared and guided reading

Shared and guided reading are early-literacy teaching strategies in which teachers, parents or carers work together with children "on gaining meaning from print" (Button and Johnson 1997:265). Typically, this is done by an adult making transparent through questioning the kinds of "in the head" (Clay 1991:317) strategies that proficient readers apply automatically while reading. These include, for example, asking children to summarise parts of the story, predict what will happen next, state their opinions about events and characters, and so on. One of the outcomes of shared reading is that children develop a deeper understanding of a text than would be achieved if they read the text independently. Moreover, teaching children how to ask appropriate questions while reading and engaging them in high quality discussion about their books is a statutory requirement of the English National Curriculum (DfE 2013b).

I believe that asking parents to use their L1 to apply these strategies with their children is an appropriate interpretation of suggestions such as Gibbons'. I therefore sought out an age-appropriate story book containing a minimum of text, but which had a clear narrative structure, which could be easily described and discussed by children with their parents in L1.

3.8.2. The book

After consultation with experienced early-literacy teacher colleagues, teachers at Vaughan Primary School, librarians at Xxxxx University and staff members at Waterstones bookshop in Xxxxx I settled on Good Night Gorilla by Peggy Rathman as the text that would form the basis of the intervention. Through vibrant and engaging pictures with a bare minimum of text, Good Night Gorilla tells the story of a zookeeper putting his zoo to bed at night. A full reproduction of the book is in Appendix 3. It has a simple narrative structure which facilitates open ended discussion between children and their parents about the characters, settings and events in the story. I felt that the lack of descriptive text (the only text is direct speech form the zookeeper as he says "Goodnight" to the animals) does not restrict children in their interpretation of events, and, as such, I hoped they would feel at liberty to be as creative as they liked in their written retelling of the story, and thus be in a position to demonstrate their full linguistic repertoire.

3.9. Guidance for parents

3.9.1. Materials

I designed a set of questions and instructions (see Appendix 4) to guide parents in leading a discussion about Good Night Gorilla with their child. These were based on a set of generic questions recommended by the Times Educational Supplement Resource Team as relevant to the 2014 National Curriculum (TES 2011). I then circulated a request on Facebook asking for help in translating these materials into the 18 languages represented by the eligible participants. I also requested help from friends in various countries across the world, a local Indian restaurant run by Bengali-literate friends, a local international school, the Pakistani Society at the University of Manchester, an Urdu-literate teaching assistant at Vaughan Primary School, Lithuanian and Albanian friends in Xxxxx, and the Faculty of Oriental Studies at Xxxxx University. Through these approaches I was able to obtain translations of the instructions and questions in 12 of the 17 languages represented by the eligible participants. I also requested help from friends in various countries across the world, a local Indian restaurant run by Bengali-literate friends, a local international school, the Pakistani Society at the University of Manchester, an Urdu-literate teaching assistant at Vaughan Primary School, Lithuanian and Albanian friends in Xxxxx, and the Faculty of Oriental Studies at Xxxxx University. Through these approaches I was able to obtain translations of the instructions and questions in 12 of the 17 languages represented by the eligible participants in time for use in my study. These were Arabic, Albanian, Urdu, Polish, Portuguese, Panjabi, Bengali, Kiswahili, Dutch, Lithuanian, German and Turkish. The languages for which I was unable to find translators were Konkani, Kurdish, Farsi, Shona and Russian. Consequently, users of these languages were excluded from the trial. For translated versions of the materials see Appendix 5.

3.9.2. Parents meeting

I wrote to the parents of all eligible children, inviting them to attend a meeting to explain the study and to invite them to participate. Acting on the advice of the class teachers on ways to encourage attendance, the letter was distributed twice, once in the week prior to the meeting and once in the
week of the meeting. Class teachers were asked to remind parents verbally about the meeting whenever they saw them at the beginning and end of the school days. A reminder slip was sent home to the parents on the day before the meeting, which also stated that juice and biscuits would be provided, as an additional incentive to attend. The meeting was scheduled for immediately after the beginning of the school day in the hope that parents would be more inclined to attend, as most would already be in the school building, having just dropped off their children. On the day of the meeting, class teachers sought out parents in the building and directed them to the classroom in which I was conducting the meeting. Of 45 families invited, representatives of only eight attended.

I used a Keynote presentation (Appendix 6) to help describe the rationale for the trial and to explain how I expected it to run. Using the English version of the materials described above, I modelled the intervention I wished them to use with their children. Attendees were given an information sheet (Appendix 7) reiterating all of the points I had made in the presentation. Attendees were also invited to sign a consent form (Appendix 8). The information document and consent form were sent home that afternoon with the children of parents who had not attended. All attendees at the meeting signed the consent form. The remaining consent forms were returned over the course of the following week.

3.10. Administering the intervention

One week after the parents' meeting, all eligible children were provided with a small-format reproduction of the book (Appendix 9) and the instructions and questions either in English or L1 translations, with a covering letter (Appendix 10). This told the parents which group their children had been allocated to, and reiterated the instructions. Eligible children who had been excluded from the study were provided with English versions of the materials, but their data were not included in the analysis.

3.11. Assessment task

The assessment task, the rationale for which is described in the next section, was a written retelling of the events in Good Night Gorilla. It was scheduled to be carried out exactly one week after the materials had been sent home, a Friday. However, industrial action taken by teachers in the school during this week meant that this was not possible and so the assessment task was rescheduled for the following Monday. Standardised instructions for carrying out the assessment were given to each teacher (Appendix 11).

On the day of the assessment, all children in each class, including those not in the study, 'shared read' Good Night Gorilla with their teacher, and were then asked to rewrite the story independently. Carrying out tasks of this nature is common practice in the school, and teachers were asked to take a 'business as usual' approach as far as possible. The resulting stories were then assessed on a range of criteria (see below).

3.12. Outcomes

The assessment task was a written retelling of the events in Good Night Gorilla. The open-ended nature of a written task such as this gives participants the opportunity to demonstrate not just their comprehension of the story, but also to build on and embellish that understanding with less literal interpretation of its elements. For example, participants might choose to describe the thoughts and feelings of the characters in addition to providing a physical description of them. The lack of text in the book further facilitated this, as participants were being asked to engage in a synthesis of the physical act of 'reading' the book, their discussions and interpretation of the story at home, and their understanding of the generic narrative structure. It was a creative task demanding that participants drew on all of their receptive and productive linguistic resources. In this way I hoped to provide the children with as full an opportunity as possible to demonstrate their proficiency in English, given the limitations of time and resources.
As a cross check of reliability, the completed tasks were assessed using two different tools, as follows.

### 3.12.1. National Curriculum level descriptors

National Curriculum (NC) level descriptors for writing (Appendix 12) are used as a matter of course by Vaughan Primary School to assess the writing proficiency of their students, and was the tool used to assess the baseline proficiency of the participants. Writing is judged in six domains: Sentence Structure, Punctuation, Text Organisation, Composition and Effect, Spelling, and Handwriting. The full scale ranges from ‘Level W’ (which stands for ‘Working Towards Level 1’), through numerical levels one to eight, and ultimately to a level named ‘Exceptional Performance’. Attainment at each of these levels is, to some extent, dependent on the age of the child. That is to say, the older the students, the higher their expected level of attainment. For the age of the children in my study the expected levels of attainment range from 1 to 3.

Vaughan Primary School uses a version of the NC descriptors that divides each level into three sub-levels. These sub-levels are alphanumeric (1a, 1b, 1c, etc.) but for the purpose of statistical analysis of the results I have converted them into numerical levels (1 being lowest attained level among the participants and 9 being the highest).

The intervention was designed to promote deep understanding of the story, not to develop the more mechanical skills of spelling, punctuation and handwriting. Therefore only Sentence Structure, Text Organisation and Composition and Effect were considered appropriate for analysis in this study.

Sentence Structure is concerned with the sophistication of the sentences in the text, for example whether simple or complex sentences are used, and how sentences are sequenced. Text Organisation looks at how proficient students are with writing for different purposes, for example how well do they apply the features of different genres of writing. Composition and Effect judges the quality of the writing in terms of, for example, vocabulary choices, expression of ideas, and level of detail.

This tool does not differentiate between native speakers of English and ELLs.

### 3.12.2. Writing rubric of the WIDA consortium performance definitions

The WIDA consortium performance definitions for writing (Appendix 13) are widely used in the USA and in international schools worldwide (WIDA 2013, 2014) to assess English writing proficiency, specifically in ELLs. There is some crossover with NC level descriptors, though WIDA levels are designed to be considered in terms of expectations for the age of the student. That is to say, a pupil of any age can achieve the highest score if their work is sufficiently similar to the expectations for their native-English-speaking peers. As a consequence, using WIDA performance definitions satisfies the desirability of using an assessment tool designed specifically for ELLs, and facilitates triangulation of results across both tools.

Writing is judged using three domains which are very similar to the NC domains used in the study. They are called Linguistic Complexity, Vocabulary Usage, and Language Control, and are assessed on a scale of one to six. Linguistic Complexity is concerned with the sophistication of the text's structure, ranging from single words and set phrases at the lowest end of the scale, to well structured, cohesive paragraphs, consisting of a range of sentence lengths suited to purpose, at the top end of the scale. Vocabulary Usage examines the vocabulary choices made by the student. The lowest end of the scale is characterised by high-frequency words from the school setting. Writing at the highest end of the scale contains precisely used general, technical and specialist vocabulary suited to the task. Language Control refers to how comprehensible the writing is, which can be impeded by things such as incorrect conjugation of verbs, lack of control over plural forms,
L1 interference, and so on. Writing in which comprehensibility is significantly impeded by these types of error is at the lowest end of the scale, with writing in which errors of this sort may exist but that do not compromise the overall comprehensibility of the text at the highest end.

3.13. Conducting the assessment

I carried out the assessment of the participants' writing. I have seventeen years' experience of assessing pupils' writing attainment using National Curriculum level descriptors, and three years' experience using WIDA performance definitions. In each tool, attainment levels are presented as a 'descriptor' consisting of a number of statements stipulating the features of writing which must be present for a piece of work to be considered to have demonstrated achievement at that level. Full progression from one level to the next generally requires more time than the duration of my study, and cannot always be demonstrated by assessing a single piece of work. For the purposes of this investigation I therefore accepted evidence in the participants' writing of any statement within the broader descriptor as indicative of attainment at that level.

3.14. Securing unbiased allocation to the comparison groups

Participants were stratified first by class then by existing writing proficiency within class. Names were then drawn from a hat and alternately allocated to the L1 intervention or the English-only intervention (full description of the allocation process is in Appendix 14).

The profiles of the resulting groups are shown in table 3.4.

3.15. Blinding to reduce biased outcome assessment

Blinding during allocation is described in Appendix 14. Blinding during the intervention and assessment stages was achieved as follows. I was the principal assessor. I did not meet the participants during the intervention and assessment. When assessing the writing I was unaware of the group to which the author of each piece had been allocated. I attempted to keep the class teachers blind to the group membership of participants (at least at the time of allocation) by sealing the materials in envelopes addressed to the participants' parents.

3.16. Assessing compliance and attitudes to the intervention

To address my subquestion regarding fidelity to the allocated intervention and appetite for L1-supported home learning tasks, I gave all participants and their parents questionnaires (Appendices 15 and 16).

The parent questionnaires were taken home by the children, in a sealed envelope addressed to their parents, on the day of the assessment task. They were asked to respond before the end of the school year (a week after the assessment). Participating children were guided through reading and responding to their questionnaires with their class teachers in the week of the intervention.

3.16.1 Interpreting responses

In the main, the questionnaires used a multiple-choice design to allow quantitative analysis of the responses. One question in the parents' questionnaire was left open-ended to allow parents to share their thoughts on any aspect of the project. My intention was to scrutinise and analyse responses to this question to assess whether similar themes, concerns, and attitudes to the project and the underpinning assumptions informing it could be inferred. These would be described using a narrative approach. Ultimately however the response rate to the parent questionnaire was so low as to make analysis of this sort too unreliable (see Results section).
Questionnaires soliciting responses about levels of engagement and language use were given both to parents and to children to allow for comparison of answers. Given the stigma sometimes felt by ELLs about their use of L1 (see Discussion), and the strongly held and opposing beliefs about the place of L1 in English language learning, which was the catalyst for this project, I felt that asking both children and parents to report which languages they actually used during the intervention would permit an interesting analysis and would help to inform approaches to parental involvement in any future research projects.

3.17. Ethical issues

I have elected to frame my consideration of ethical issues in the guidance provided by the British Educational Research Association (BERA 2011). My ethics form, as required by Xxxxxx Xxxxxxxx University, is in Appendix 17.

Firstly, it would be unethical to conduct an experiment comparing two interventions the effects of which have already been established. To do so would necessarily deny some participants access to an intervention that had been shown to work, and expose some to an intervention had been shown to work less well, or to be actively harmful. While time did not allow for a systematic review of the research evidence, I nonetheless conducted as complete a review as I was able in the time available to ascertain whether uncertainty existed about my research question. I concluded that there was sufficient uncertainty to justify conducting a controlled trial.

Special efforts were made to protect participants from any potential risks and impacts of participation. Participants were considered too young to give informed consent, therefore assent was sought from their parents and carers. The parents' meeting served, in part, to describe my reasons for wanting to conduct the study and to detail the rights of the participants. In this meeting, I described the justification for the research, outlined the procedure of the study, and explained the measures I would use to keep data about individuals confidential. I informed them of their right to withdraw consent for any or no reason at any time before the data were analysed. I provided parents with my contact information and the contact details of the representative on Xxxxxx Xxxxxxxx University's ethics committee in the event that they wished to discuss the trial further or raise concerns over any aspect of my conduct. These were reiterated in the information sheet and consent form distributed to the parents of all eligible participants.

Gatekeeper consent was also obtained from the head teacher of the school (Appendix 18). All members of staff directly involved in the study were provided with similar information to that given to parents about the purpose and procedures relating to the study (see Appendix 2). Since it would have been impossible to blind participants to the intervention to which they had been allocated, it was unnecessary to consider the ethical implications of deception.

3.18. Role of the researcher

This was a controlled experiment where the role of the researcher is theoretically one of disinterested, outside observer. I was unaware of the specific characteristics (including group allocation) of individual participants until I had completed assessing their post-intervention writing, and I played no part in delivering the interventions or assessment task. However, I had a number of meetings with teachers and other staff at Vaughan Primary School, I delivered a presentation to the parents, and I wrote the parents' information sheet and the rationale and instruction documents for teachers. While I made every effort to stress the continued collective uncertainty over the use of L1 in polylingual schools in an unbiased way during these communications, I cannot completely discount the possibility that I might have introduced experimenter-expectancy effects (Thomas 2013) that influenced the attitudes and actions of those taking part.
3.19. Experimental validity

3.19.1. Internal validity
Every research method faces the possibility of threats to its internal validity. For example, experimenter-expectancy effects or the influence of parental attitudes to L1 use might have influenced the comparison. In addition, participants' allocation to control or experimental group might be met with enthusiasm or disappointment, and consequently influence the way they approached involvement in the study. Similarly, the attitudes of teachers to aspects of the study (beliefs about L1 use, timing of the study in the school year, other aspects of their job competing for time and energy, and so on) may influence the character of their engagement. My choice of a controlled study using a well-concealed, unbiased allocation schedule is a key strategy in attempting to reduce the influence of these kinds of threats to internal validity. To repeat the point I made earlier, allocating participants to comparison groups in this way helps to ensure that any differences, known and unknown, between the groups are due only to the play of chance. Any observed differences in the outcomes between groups can thus be more confidently attributed to differential effects of the interventions, and high internal validity can be assumed. In addition, one of the key threats to the internal validity of the study was whether participants faithfully adhered to the intervention as instructed— that is to say, did they use only L1 or English, as required by their allocation? In an attempt to address this issue I included the child and parent questionnaires to allow for a retrospective analysis of how faithfully the intervention had been applied.

3.19.2. External validity
External validity, or the extent to which the findings of this study are applicable to other environments, populations and situations, is of obvious interest. Indeed, it was my own concern that findings from studies conducted in the context of bilingual environments were being used to advocate the use of L1-supported pedagogies in polylingual environments, a demonstrably different context, that informed my wish to investigate whether that advocacy was justified. No two situations are identical. All research is carried out in the past and is applied in the future. One can never be absolutely sure that observations made in one time and place will be repeated in a different time and place. Nonetheless, I hope to have described in sufficient detail the characteristics of the school, the participants, and my methods to allow the reader to draw informed conclusions about the applicability of my findings to different contexts.
### 3.20. Tables

Table 3.1: First languages represented by pupils at the school with number of speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ebira</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Panjabi</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swahili</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shona</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swahili</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lango</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malayalam</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nepali</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Ethnic backgrounds represented by pupils at the school with number of representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Background</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Ethnic Background</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>White British</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>White &amp; Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Information refused</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any other white background</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any other Asian background</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any other black background</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any other ethnic group</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any other mixed background</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White &amp; Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White &amp; Black Caribbean</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information not obtained</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White &amp; Black African</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: First languages of eligible participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Panjabi</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shona</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konkani</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4: Profile of comparison groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline writing level (Alpha-numerical level in numerical conversion to allow for calculation of mean and median)</th>
<th>L1 Group (n)</th>
<th>English-only Group (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a (4)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c (5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b (6)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a (7)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c (8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 Group (n)</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-only Group (n)</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data are ordinal, therefore mean averages must be viewed cautiously. They are included as an illustrative measure of the average proficiency of each group.
Enrolment

Assessed for eligibility (n=45)

Excluded (n=9)

- No translation of materials available (n=8)
- Sibling (n=1)*

Randomised (n=36)

Allocated to L1-mediated intervention (n=18)
  - Received allocated intervention (n=18)

Allocated to English-mediated intervention (n=18)
  - Received allocated intervention (n=16)
  - Did not receive allocated intervention (n=2)**

Follow-up

Lost to follow-up (n=6)
  - Left school before trial complete (n=2)
  - Absent on day of post-intervention assessment (n=4)

Lost to follow-up (n=3)
  - Absent on day of post-intervention assessment (n=3)

Analysis

Analysed (n=12)

Analysed (n=13)

* to include siblings would have introduced the possibility that they would be allocated to different groups, compromising the fidelity of the application of the intervention for both. Therefore the toss of a coin decided which sibling was eligible. The other sibling received the same materials but was excluded from the analysis.

**one participant withdrew consent, one participant was mis-identified as EAL in school records and was therefore removed from the trial.
Chapter 4. Results

No statistically significant difference between outcomes, challenges to validity based chiefly on adherence to interventions

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter I present the results of the trial and responses to the questionnaire.

4.2. Data

The data for both WIDA and National Curriculum (NC) levels are ordinal. I have converted alphanumerical labels for NC levels to numerical labels to allow statistical analysis. While this is useful to illustrate tendencies within the groups, means derived from ordinal data in this way should be interpreted cautiously.

4.3. Attrition

Of the 45 eligible participants, 36 were allocated to intervention groups, of which 25 completed the intervention and were available for assessment. There were 12 in the L1 group and 13 in the English-only group. With a larger sample size, adjustments could be made to take these missing data into account, for example by applying an intention-to-treat analysis (Hutchison and Styles 2010). However, because of the small sample size of this study this approach is unlikely to produce information that would add confidence to the analysis.

Nonetheless, it is worth briefly characterising the group of participants with missing data in terms of baseline information to illustrate how they relate to the characteristics of participants in general. Subsequently, all statistical analysis will be of only those children who were assessed post intervention. However, challenges to the study related to attrition, alongside issues of participants’ adherence to the interventions to which they had been allocated, will be revisited in the discussion chapter.

4.3.1. Missing participants

The six participants missing from the L1 group are all children in Year 1 and are distributed equally among the two classes in that year group. The means of their NC levels at baseline are noticeably lower than the means for remainder of the group (see Table 1). The three missing participants from the English-only groups consist of two children from the same class in Year 1 and one child from Year 2. The means of their NC levels at baseline are almost identical to the means for the remainder of the group (see Table 4.1). Given the slight difference in the baseline levels of absent participants in the L1 group compared to the rest of the group, one might surmise that their presence would have changed the character of the data set for that group, post-intervention. Given the small number of participants overall, however, this is unlikely to have much of an impact.

4.4. Interpreting the results

Figures 4.1 - 4.4 illustrate the mean and median scores of the post-intervention assessments. As can be seen, there is no clear difference between scores for the two groups.

---

5 See CONSORT flow diagram (figure 3.1, in Methodology chapter) for information on exclusions and reasons of attrition within the study.

6 Tables and figures are presented on pages 42 - 46.
Tables 4.2 and 4.3 illustrate the change in mean and median scores for NC levels pre- and post-intervention for both groups. Here also, there is no clear difference between the outcomes for each group.

Data are assumed to be non-parametric, so to assess whether any statistically significant differences between the outcomes of the two groups exists, I performed the Mann-Whitney U test on the data (Table 4.4).

The critical value of U at \( p \leq 0.05 \) is 41, therefore, the results in all six measures of English proficiency are statistically not significant at \( p \leq 0.05 \).

4.5. Summary of experimental data
The data do not support the experimental hypothesis, therefore the null hypothesis is retained.

4.6. Questionnaires

4.6.1. Parent questionnaire
The parent questionnaire was sent to all 25 parents whose children completed the study. Five were returned, three from participants allocated to the English-only group and two from participants allocated to the L1 group.

Such a low return rate severely compromises the potential to draw any conclusions that might be applied to the group as a whole. The responses from each of these five respondents is included in full in Table 4.5.

4.6.2. Children’s questionnaire
The questionnaire was designed to ascertain whether the participants had faithfully adhered to the intervention to which they had been assigned.

One teacher involved in the trial was unable to find the time to allow the students in her class to complete the questionnaire. Consequently, data are available for nine participants in the L1 group and eleven participants in the English-only group. The results are illustrated in tables 4.6 - 4.8.

4.6.3. Contradictions
Questionnaires with very similar questions were given to both parents and children with the intention of comparing their responses. The small number of responses to the questionnaires contained the following contradictions.

- One parent in the L1 group indicated that s/he had used a combination of L1 and English when discussing the book. Their child indicated that they had used only L1.

- Another parent in the L1 group said that s/he had read the book on most days during the study. Their child indicated that they had read the book every day.

- One parent in the English-only group indicated that s/he had read the book on most days and that they had used only English. Their child indicated that they had read the book once and used a combination of L1 and English.

- Another parent in the English-only group indicated that s/he had read the book on some days. Their child indicated that they had read the book every day.
4.7. Summary of questionnaire data

Low response rates make it impossible to draw any confident conclusions about parental attitudes and adherence to the intervention, though the children’s response shed a little more light on the latter. These will be discussed in the following chapter.
### 4.8. Tables

**Table 4.1: Character of missing participants at baseline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline level of participants who completed the study in L1 group (n=12)</th>
<th>Baseline level of missing participants in L1 group (n=6)</th>
<th>Baseline level of participants who completed the study in English-only group (n=13)</th>
<th>Baseline level of missing participants in English-only group (n=3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sentence Structure</strong></td>
<td>Mean 5.5, Range 6</td>
<td>Mean 3.33, Range 3</td>
<td>Mean 5.69, Range 6</td>
<td>Mean 5.65, Range 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text Organisation</strong></td>
<td>Mean 5.25, Range 6</td>
<td>Mean 3.33, Range 3</td>
<td>Mean 5.69, Range 6</td>
<td>Mean 5.65, Range 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composition and Effect</strong></td>
<td>Mean 5.33, Range 6</td>
<td>Mean 3.33, Range 3</td>
<td>Mean 5.54, Range 6</td>
<td>Mean 5.53, Range 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.2: Mean change in assessment scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Difference between post and pre intervention mean score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1 Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sentence Structure</strong></td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text Organisation</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composition and Effect</strong></td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.3: Median change in assessment scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Difference between post and pre intervention median score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1 Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sentence Structure</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text Organisation</strong></td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composition and Effect</strong></td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Domain</td>
<td>Value of U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDA Linguistic</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDA Vocabulary Usage</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDA Language Control</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC Sentence Structure</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC Text Organisation</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC Composition and Effect</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Responses to parent questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Please indicate how many times you shared Good Night Gorilla with your child over the course of the project</th>
<th>Were you able to use only the language allocated to you when you shared the book?</th>
<th>How important do you think it is for your child to develop his or her home language?</th>
<th>Would you like more opportunities to do activities with your child in your home language?</th>
<th>Please use the space below if you would like to tell me anything else about your experience of the project.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English -only</td>
<td>Some days</td>
<td>Yes, we only used English to talk about the book</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>language? N/A</td>
<td>My daughter really enjoyed reading this book and answering the questions about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English -only</td>
<td>Most days</td>
<td>Yes, we only used English to talk about the book</td>
<td>Quite important</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English -only</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Yes, we only used English to talk about the book</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Most days</td>
<td>Yes, we only used our home language to talk about the book</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>We knew the book already but never looked at the pictures so thoroughly. I think this was a great opportunity and I hope it can be repeated. Thank you for it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Some days</td>
<td>We used some English and some of our home language</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Only if I could make it more interesting for my son to read more of this as he is not interested in learning his own language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6: Q1 How many times did you read Good Night Gorilla at home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1 group</th>
<th>English-only group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not read the book</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read the book once</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read the book on some days</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read the book every day</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: Q2. Who helped you to read Good Night Gorilla?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1 group</th>
<th>English-only group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read it on my own</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad and someone else</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8: Q3. What language did you use when you read Good Night Gorilla?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1 group</th>
<th>English-only group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only my other language</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some English and some of my other language</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.9. Figures

Figure 4.1: Mean scores for 12 participants using L1 and 13 participants using English-only on WIDA assessment

Figure 4.2: Median scores for 12 participants using L1 and 13 participants using English-only on WIDA assessment
Figure 4.3: Mean scores for 12 participants using L1 and 13 participants using English-only on National Curriculum assessment
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Figure 4.4: Median scores for 12 participants using L1 and 13 participants using English-only on National Curriculum assessment
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Chapter 5: Discussion and analysis

Addressing challenges to the study: size, assessment tools and adherence. The role of end users in research

5.1. Introduction

In this chapter, I review the context and aims of my investigation, discuss the findings, and assess them in the light of three key areas in which I feel that my research could be improved: size, assessment tools, and adherence to the intervention.

5.2. Context and aim: revisited

The catalyst for this investigation was my personal experience, as a teacher of ELLs, of the mismatch between advice I was given on L1 use by training consultants and teaching guides (e.g. Gibbons 2009, Bourne 2002) and policies in the schools such as the one in which I taught. These are intended to to minimise or ban outright the use of anything but L2 (e.g. Bromsgrove International School 2011). As I illustrated in the introduction to this dissertation with documents from the 17th century, this dichotomy in attitudes has existed for a very long time.

My search of the literature revealed a fairly strong, empirically demonstrated case for the effectiveness of bilingual schools. Systematic reviews, using meta-analyses, of studies of the effects of bilingual forms of education (Slavin and Cheung 2005, Rolstad, Mahoney and Glass 2005, Krashen and McField 2005) all concluded that bilingual forms of education are associated with a small, positive impact on academic achievement and L2 proficiency. Similarly, some studies conducted in de facto bilingual environments (Yiakoumetti 2006, Strohmeyer and McGrail 1988, Paradowski 2007, Bozorgian and Pillay 2013) concluded that L1-supported teaching and learning strategies led to improved L2 output. These studies all share two potentially important features: (a) L1-supported interventions were directed by teachers, and (b) participants all spoke the same L1.

Where findings from empirical research begin to depart from the general trend described above is when L1 approaches were not directed by teachers but where students are given the freedom to use their L1 as they saw fit. Studies by Swain and Lapkin (2000), van Weijen et al. (2009) and Woodall (2002) all identified trends where unmediated use of L1 was associated with poorer performance in L2. Furthermore, when learners do not share a common L1 (typical of polylingual schools such as the one in which I conducted my research), it is not possible to draw any conclusions about the effects of L1-supported methods as, as far as I am aware, no studies addressing the issue have been conducted.

Despite evidence pointing to the harm done by ‘free’ use of L1, and the lack of studies in polylingual schools, free-use approaches and methods assessed as effective in bilingual contexts are nonetheless recommended for use in polylingual environments (e.g. DfES 2006). I question the validity of extrapolating recommendations for practice based on research conducted in one context for use in demonstrably different contexts without first assessing their effects in controlled studies conducted in these new contexts. Therefore, with the intention of addressing this gap in the evidence, I conducted the investigation reported below.
5.3. Findings
This study did not detect any statistically significant differences between the quality of English writing of children who had been instructed to preview the learning materials in their L1 and those who had been instructed to preview them using only English. Taking these findings at face value, one might be tempted to conclude that it is neither worth the time nor the effort of teachers and parents to create and use L1 learning materials - children do just as well regardless of the language used. One might also conclude that perhaps this approach cannot be considered 'systematic or judicious' in the ill-defined way so often advocated. Moreover, it might be reasonable to conclude that the studies on language interplay that inform theories such as Cummins' (1979) language interdependence hypotheses and Butzkamm's (2003) 'maxims' have been conducted in environments systematically different to the context of my study, such that the findings do not apply. One might then consider whether, rather than the operationalisation of L1s, it is instead the culturally inclusive environment of a bilingual school that leads to higher levels of engagement and therefore of achievement (Benson 2005). Or perhaps the characteristics of children whose parents choose bilingual schools over English-only schools are a more important influence on success at school (Slavin and Cheung 2005). Or perhaps the influence of any number of known or unknown variables could be used to rationalise the success of bilingual pedagogies.

I believe that there are three factors that may have influenced my study's capacity to detect differences between the outcomes of the two interventions, should any have existed. The first two of these are (1) trial size, and (2) the tools used to assess the outcomes. These are relatively straightforward to address in any replication based on this project. The third factor concerns adherence by participants to allocated interventions: attitudes and motivations surrounding the use of L1 in an otherwise L2 environment play an important role in informing the way ELL families view their status as bilinguals and may influence their involvement in investigations into their language practices. I will discuss each of these three factors in turn.

5.4. Size
There is no rule of thumb to guide how large a trial of this kind needs to be in order that differences in outcomes between groups can be considered not to have occurred by chance. Nonetheless, Torgerson and Torgerson (2008) note frequent criticism of trials in education as being too small and thus susceptible to random errors (where findings suggest that there is no difference between groups when in fact there is, or that large differences exist when, in fact they do not). They discuss the various interpretations of sample sizes considered sufficient to allow observation of "important educational differences that an effective intervention might produce" (Torgerson and Torgerson 2008:129), and they suggest ways that appropriate sample sizes can be calculated for different interventions and outcome measures. Gueron (2002) also notes the importance of gathering data on sufficiently large numbers of participants to allow for confident assessments of the effects of an intervention. She, like Torgerson and Torgerson (2008), notes that the nature of the intervention and expectations about the extent of its expected effects influence decisions about how large a trial ought to be. Even with complex calculations based on these and other considerations, decisions about sample size are only ever best guesses. That said, the relatively small sample in my study, coupled with the relatively large degree of attrition, suggests that a much larger sample would be needed if inferences about the effects of the interventions compared are to be made confidently.

5.5. Assessment criteria
The use of National Curriculum level descriptors (hereafter 'levels') to assess the effects of the interventions may also have influenced my study's capacity to detect differences between the performance of the children in the two comparison groups. While levels were designed to provide a common measure of students' proficiency in relation to expectations and national averages for their age, they have come under recent criticism, both from the research community and from government itself. In April 2014, then Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State at the Department for Education, Elizabeth Truss described levels as subjective, lacking in validity, and insufficiently
detailed to accurately describe what children are able to do (GOV.UK 2014a). Robert Coe of Durham University's Centre for Evaluation and Monitoring pulled no punches when he characterised them as "meaningless numbers based on unstandardized, impressionistic, selective and biased judgements that fail to capture true learning" (Coe 2014). This damning assessment of a tool widely used by teachers, schools, Local Authorities and central government to gauge pupil progress and assert school effectiveness is telling.

By being the sole assessor for the post-intervention assessment, I hope to have addressed some of Coe's and Truss' criticism of levels in terms of inter-rater reliability. However, for the measures of change in proficiency pre- and post-intervention, I cannot be so confident. The pre-intervention, or baseline, scores were taken from assessments made by four different teachers, each of whom aggregated observations from a number of pieces of work over time to arrive at individual children's levels of attainment. Meadows and Billington (2005), in their review of the literature on the reliability of assessment of pupils' attainment, conclude that there is an inherent unreliability associated with all forms of assessment, but in particular with those such as the one I used in this project. In the light of this conclusion one cannot say with any confidence that the small, statistically non-significant differences observed between the mean pre- and post-intervention scores in each group reflect any real change in the children's proficiency at all. In a future study this issue might be addressed by having participants carry out the writing task twice, once before being exposed to the intervention and once afterwards. The judgements of a single assessor on these pieces of writing would form the baseline measure of proficiency and the post-intervention measure, thus addressing the issue of inter-rater reliability.

The reduction of the influence of inter-rater reliability notwithstanding, the issue of consistency over time for the same assessor must also be considered. Meadows and Billington (2005) describe a number of studies that have documented variation over time in the severity or leniency of marks given by the same assessor. For example, Pinot de Moira (1999), cited in Meadows and Billington (2005), found that assessors who had been considered lenient at the start of a period of assessment became more severe as they worked their way through stacks of exam papers, and vice versa. White (1984), cited in Meadows and Billington (2005), found that when assessors (unknowingly) assessed the same piece of writing twice, a year apart, the scores they gave agreed in only 20% of cases. Both the variation between different assessors and the variation in one assessor over time might be addressed by having the participants' writing assessed by teams of assessors whose independent judgements act as checks of variability and consistency. However, given that issues of assessment reliability are not unique to me and my small study, it is perhaps beyond the scope of this dissertation to hope to reach a satisfactory solution to the issue.

Even if it were possible to find a way to minimise the influences described above, it may be that levels are just too blunt an instrument to detect changes over a period of just a week. Children are expected to progress by approximately one level every two years (Ofsted 2014). Even when broken down into sub-levels to provide more nuanced descriptions of children's attainment, such as used in this study, it nonetheless seems unlikely that after only one week's intervention this tool would be sufficiently discriminating to detect and describe any differences in outcomes between pre- and post-intervention assessments.

I have similar concerns over WIDA performance definitions as appropriate measures of proficiency for this trial. WIDA definitions are very similar in character to NC levels in that they consist of fairly broad statements defining each attainment band, and their application is based on the observations of whoever is conducting the assessment. Despite claims for their validity and reliability (Yanosky et al. 2012), and the fairly extensive training materials that accompany the assessment kits, they are nonetheless prone to the same issues of subjectivity, interrater reliability, and single-assessor reliability over time as are NC levels. While there is no stipulation in the WIDA materials of the rate at which children are expected to progress along the six bands of attainment, the well established rule of thumb that it takes children who are new to English somewhere between five and seven years to reach academic fluency comparable to their peers (Collier 1989)
suggests that one should not be looking for substantial changes from an intervention that endured for only a week.

My decision in the planning stages of this study to use National Curriculum levels and WIDA performance definitions was appropriate, because, at the time, levels were the universal measure of English proficiency in English state schools and WIDA specifically addresses assessment of ELLs in mainstream English-language schools. It seems clear, however, that a future trial would benefit from either running for a substantially longer period of time, to allow broadly defined indicators of attainment to emerge, or from identifying or designing an assessment tool able to detect and describe very small changes in attainment, or both.

5.6. Adherence

The success of this project was contingent on participants' adherence to (a) implementing the intervention at all and (b) using the language to which they had been allocated. The parent and child surveys were designed to allow participants to report on the extent to which they were able to adhere to these expectations. The very low response rate from parents and incomplete responses from children make it difficult to draw any firm conclusions about the extent to which this was the case. However, it is possible to posit some tentative hypotheses based on data that were returned.

Responses to the children's questionnaire, showed that the number of occasions that the book was read was roughly similar in both groups. Two children in each group indicated that they did not read the book at all, two children in each group indicated that they read the book every day, and the remainder stated that they had read it on some or most days. All but two of the children (both in the English-only group), who stated that they had read the book, said that they had done so with an adult. This implies that guided input in L1 was available to all respondents from the L1 group. However, of the seven respondents in the L1 group who had read the book, three said that they had used only English rather than their L1. These data are derived from fewer than half of the participants in the L1 group, but if they are reflective of a general trend among participants to reject use of L1, there are important implications for the trustworthiness of any conclusion drawn about the interventions.

5.6.1. Engaging parents of ELL children

There were other instances during the course of the study that suggested that adherence might be an issue. The EAL coordinator described the school's relationship with the parents of EAL children as developing, and, at times, challenging. She described difficulties in effective home-school communication, in part because of varying levels of English proficiency among parents, but also as a result of a fear among some that acknowledgement of their English language needs would jeopardise their opportunities in the UK. The low turnout at the parents' meeting at the beginning of the study (eight attendees out of 45 invited) may be an additional indicator of parental attitudes to school initiatives that explicitly deal with children's status as ELLs (though those who did attend all expressed enthusiasm about the project and interest in the underpinning assumptions informing it). A general negative attitude, or at least a lack of interest, among the parents might also have been reflected in the low response rate to the parental surveys. Mrs Andrea\textsuperscript{7}, the team leader of the group of classes with which I was working, echoed the EAL coordinator's thoughts about the difficulty of engaging parents of ELLs. She described having to be much more proactive than with parents of non-ELL children if she hoped to solicit their involvement in school activities.

After the intervention materials had been distributed, Mrs Andrea reported that two parents came to the school to complain. The first queried why they had been given the materials in their L1, saying that at home they spoke only in English. This is not an unusual claim, and indeed I have often seen well-meaning parents encouraged by well-meaning teachers imposing English-only linguistic diets in their homes. If parents have achieved a threshold level of English proficiency themselves then

\textsuperscript{7} pseudonym
there are advantages to this approach, but, if they have not, such practices have questionable value for English acquisition, and certainly deprive children of continued development in L1 (McCabe et al. 2013). The other parent to raise a complaint had evidently been very distressed that her daughter had been included in the study, asserting that she was not EAL and that the school was wrong to have labeled her as such. This reluctance to acknowledge, let alone embrace, EAL status may be a function of the common conflation of EAL with Special Educational Needs (SEN). The report by the Institute of Education, discussed earlier, notes the tendency for EAL children to be placed on SEN registers and for them to be treated in similar ways as children with SEN (IOE 2009). So, rather than acknowledge children's bilingualism as a positive feature of their academic profile to be celebrated (albeit one that may benefit from specific provision), EAL status is viewed as a deficiency to be ashamed of.

Both parents who complained had signed and returned consent forms after being given information about the study. This suggests that they either did not or could not read the information document, and signed the consent form without understanding what they were being invited to take part in. The opinion of Mrs Andrea was that the reaction of these parents reflected a common concern among parents of ELLs regarding the stigma attached to admitting to being users of more than one language. I have described what I view as one of the potential antecedents of that stigma, conflation of EAL with SEN, but I suspect that the reluctance of parents to embrace their children's bilingualism may run deeper.

5.6.2 Dogma and stigma
The nature of the debate over L1-use is not characterised merely by a dispassionate discussion of what works best for bilingual language learners. It is influenced in no small measure by the socio-political prejudices cautioned against by Cummins in 1980 (see section 2.2.1). For example, California's mandate for provision of bilingual education was effectively outlawed after a bill sponsored by Republican gubernatorial candidate Ron Unz was passed into law by a popular vote in 1998. To argue in favour of his bill, Unz applied a misrepresentation of the evidence about bilingual language acquisition (Krashen 1998, Crawford 1998), cast Latinos as victims of bilingual systems (Marshall 1998), and made emotional appeals to equality of opportunity (Fox News 1998). The bill was supported by 61% of those who voted, who, it has been argued, were "convincing that California's language diversity -- especially its Spanish -- was a problem to be eradicated, rather than a resource to be developed" (Carter 2014). The success of Unz's campaign precipitated similar initiatives in Arizona, Colorado, and Massachusetts (Haver 2013). What is interesting about the campaign and its victory is that, in Unz's own words, it was "the most bilingual campaign" ever (Jacobs 1998). In addition to enjoying formal support from Latino organisations (e.g. LatinoBeat 1998), Unz's campaign funded Spanish-language radio adverts urging Latino Californians to vote in favour of the bill. A poll taken two months before the vote showed support for the bill from 58% of Latinos (73% of whites, 74% of Asians, and 66% of blacks also supported it (Jacobs 1998). Given the counterintuitive character of the evidence on bilingual education, and emotional socio-political arguments opposing it, perhaps it comes as no surprise that the voices of those people best placed to benefit from bilingual education joined those of people who had no obvious vested interest in its continued provision.

While the UK has never mandated bilingual education and has never asked the electorate for its opinion on the matter, this hasn't stopped monolingual 'little-Englanders' weighing in with their thoughts on the education of ELLs. Chris McGovern of the Campaign for Real Education feels that the mere presence of ELLs in British schools compromises the education of native speakers of English (Dawa 2013). Tory member of Leeds City Council, Andrew Carter, responding to a decision by a school in Leeds to adopt English as a Second Language (ESL) approaches for its 85% ELL student body, demonstrated his lack of understanding of the issue by saying "I don't see how it's going to be of any use to these young people who will need to be employed to not have English as their first language" (Arkell 2014). Reading the online comments sections of the news reports from which these two quotes are drawn further highlights the negative attitudes that exist in the UK toward English language learners.
Attitudes toward the education of ELLs is just one facet of a position held by some sections of society on ethnic minorities in the UK more generally. A position that has become increasingly visible in recent years. At the time of writing the UK is recovering from a period of prolonged economic depression. The relationship between economic prosperity and racial prejudice has long been established (Beck and Tolney 1990, Ghosh 2011). Anti-foreigner rhetoric has become a regular feature of political debate in the UK, not just from far-right 'fringe' factions, such as Britain First, but also from more centrist bodies, including the British Government. The government's self-imposed target to reduce net migration (BBC 2014a), was reported as increasingly unlikely to be met (ONS 2014) on the same day that one of its MPs announced his defection to the anti-immigration UK Independence Party. He stated, among other reasons for his defection, that "Many of those at the top of the Conservative Party are simply not on our side. They aren't serious about … controlling our borders" (BBC 2014b). The rules for immigration were toughened in 2012, and anyone wishing to apply for settlement from outside of the EU must meet a minimum threshold proficiency in English (GOV.UK 2014b) if they wish their application to be considered.

Given the prevailing attitudes towards immigrants - colloquially and enshrined in government policy - it is hardly surprising that parents of ELLs and ELLs themselves might be reluctant to 'admit' to speaking their L1s. It also seems plausible that they might not wish to engage in activities that draw attention to anything that could be considered a peculiar pedagogical requirement, fearing that this might single them out as part of a 'problem to be solved'.

### 5.6.3. Implications for future research on parental engagement in this study

The implications of my study, especially as I intend to build on the work done here in research leading to a doctoral degree, is that it will be necessary to carry out qualitative research with parents of ELLs at the very beginning of a project. This will aim to assess attitudes to bilingualism in a nominally monolingual society, and to gauge the likelihood of adherence to any intervention that might appear counterintuitive or otherwise 'risky'. In addition, parents should be directly involved in framing the research question and suggesting interventions by which it might be addressed. Gueron (2002), discusses the importance of getting buy-in from participants in order to protect research especially randomised trials, from inevitable strains. She suggests bringing together stakeholders, who in my case would be parents, children and teachers, to find out what they think about the key questions that the research hopes to address. "If people own the question -" she says, "if they see the project as their study that addresses their question - they are more likely to stay the course and help the researchers get the answers" (Gueron 2002:30, original emphasis).

The parents' meeting I held at the beginning of the present study was an attempt to achieve something similar, and I felt that it met some of these aims for those parents who attended. Attendees seemed well disposed to the study, and my presentation provoked some lively discussion. Some parents commented on how important they felt it was to maintain their child's L1, but that they were unclear on how best to do this, and what effect doing so might have on their child's acquisition of English. One parent told me that she was really keen to be involved and would gladly volunteer for any other studies I was considering conducting in this field. A number of thoughtful questions about the trial design were asked. Three parents stayed behind after the meeting had officially concluded to talk more about the issue of dual language acquisition and the challenges they and their children faced. The very fact that these parents attended the meeting might lead one to assume that they are, in some way, systematically different to those who chose not to attend. But, given what I felt to be the success of the meeting, finding ways to encourage universal involvement would seem to be beneficial to any future study.

It would also seem appropriate to soften my approach as an outsider researcher to become more involved in working with families as they implement any intervention. Conteh (2012), Kenner et al. (2007), Gregory (1998, 2001), and Gregory et al. (2007) all spent time with families of bilingual
children observing their home literacy practices (see section 2.6). They noted that the way family members worked with children did not necessarily conform to their expectations, and that children's learning experiences were enriched in ways that differed from the practices promoted or expected by the educational establishment. To be privy to the home practices of participants in any future study would allow me to build sensitively upon them, thus, perhaps, promoting higher levels of adherence and more positive experiences for the families involved.

Similarly, once a sensitively designed intervention has been developed, it would be appropriate to provide ongoing support for families implementing it. Tizard, Schofield and Hewison (1982), in their randomised trial of home reading, initially met with parents to explain the purpose of the study and describe the intervention. They followed this up with home visits, two or three times per term for the duration of the two-year study, during which they observed children reading to their parents and offered advice and corrective demonstrations as necessary. While I demonstrated the intervention in English during the parents meeting, it would have been productive to do so in the L1s of the participants, perhaps by enlisting the help of bilingual research assistants, and making home visits similar to those conducted by Tizard, Schofield and Hewison.

5.7. Conclusion

The notion of 'systematic and judicious' use of L1 and the role it has to play in second language acquisition remains open for investigation. So too does the idea that L1 pedagogies used in bilingual schools can be applied in polylingual schools with the same effects. For planned future research in this area to allow for more confident inferences about the themes discussed, the three areas that I have identified as problematic will need to be addressed, so that inferences about the effects of interventions can be made with more confidence.
6. Conclusion

6.1. Introduction
In this chapter, I suggest potential pedagogical implications based on my experience in conducting this study and make recommendations for further research.

6.2. Pedagogical implications
The suggestion that the L1s of students should be put into service in teaching children who are learning English has widespread support from the research community. It is advocated as pedagogically sound by bodies interested in addressing the needs of ELLs in mainstream British schools. Teachers, although not always clear on how to implement this kind of advice, generally feel that they ought to be doing so. While my study has not been conclusive about the effects of this approach on attainment, it has nonetheless been driven by a research question firmly rooted in the pedagogic concerns of ELLs and their teachers. That is to say, I have addressed a real world question with tangible implications for the success of ELLs in Vaughan Primary School specifically, and mainstream polylingual schools in the UK generally.

I consider it important that the time and effort of teachers, students and parents is not wasted in preparation, delivery and engagement in activities that have not been shown to confer any advantage, either in terms of learning outcomes or in terms of pressure on resources, including time and effort. I have attempted to interpret the oft-asserted, yet vaguely defined, notion of ‘systematic and judicious’ use of L1 in mainstream English classrooms, and have suggested a concrete way of operationalising it. I feel that typical recommendations, such as use of bilingual teaching assistants and bilingual texts, fail to adequately address the requirements of teachers in schools where many different L1s are present. Therefore, I have explored the possibility that equipping parents with some of the transferable techniques teachers use as a matter of course might be productive.

While the guided reading questions used in my study were specific to Good Night Gorilla, the underpinning assumptions about the value of engaging children in high-quality discussions about texts (Clay 1991) informed their formulation, and could be easily adapted for use with other texts. I suggest that training parents in how to engage in these kinds of discussion with their children in L1, and providing parents with exemplar questions and prompts in L1, would be a resource-efficient way of addressing the broader issue. If such an approach was shown to be beneficial, the initially quite intense effort required to establish this kind of relationship with parents, and to generate materials in all the languages represented in a school, would become self sustaining. Pressure on resources would diminish over time and teachers would not need to create bespoke activities in each language for each new book taken home by their students. In addition, parents would be empowered to provide ongoing support for their children’s learning, and schools would show very obviously that they value the L1s of their community.

Of course, this is all hypothetical until adequate research on the effects of such an approach has been conducted.

6.5. Recommendations for future research
In order to follow up on the pedagogical implications suggested above, more research should be conducted to assess their effects.

6.5.1. Qualitative research on parental attitudes
Any success of the approaches I have suggested is dependent on the participation of parents. My study has discussed the importance of involving parents of ELLs in the development of questions
to be addressed. Parents who attended the parents’ meeting and who therefore had an opportunity to discuss their opinions and air their concerns, were, on the whole, very receptive to the idea of helping to address the uncertainty that provoked it. In conducting the research for my PhD, which will follow the conclusion of this MA, I intend to build on the strength of the experience of meeting directly with parents to explore alternative ways to connect with more of them. A key first step in pursuing this line is engaging in qualitative research, designed to ascertain the appetite among parents for L1 supported home learning. In addition, as Gueron (2002) suggests, it would be sensible to provide parents with opportunities to help formulate research questions and the ways in which they will be addressed. If future research is shown to be responsive to the concerns and questions of parents and to value their contributions to it, it is reasonable to assume that any interventions shown to be of value will be more likely to be adopted.

6.5.2. Systematic review
For ethical as well as epistemological reasons it is essential to carry out a systematic review of the relevant existing evidence to assess whether or not the questions developed with parents have already been adequately answered and to ensure that I do not engage in unwarranted duplication.

For my PhD research, I anticipate conducting a literature search using pre-defined search criteria, developing appropriate inclusion/exclusion criteria, assessing the quality of the studies returned, and analysing and synthesising the data to draw rigorous conclusions about what is already known about the focus for future research. In the light of the conclusion of this review I will be in a position to revise and refine my research questions before addressing them.

6.5.3. Randomised trial
A far larger randomised trial than the one presented here is needed to obtain confident estimates of the effects of L1 home learning tasks on pupil attainment compared with L2 tasks. This could be achieved either by developing resources for use with all of the ELLs at Vaughan Primary School, and possibly other schools with ELLs in their community, and to randomly allocate at the level of the student. Alternatively, the questions could be addressed in a large multi-centre trial that uses cluster randomisation to allocate at the level of the class or school to different interventions. Given the issues I have discussed over the assessment tools, such a trial should compare the effects of extended interventions, carried out over as long a period as possible, or use an assessment tool that is capable of detecting very small changes in attainment.

6.6. Concluding remark
Despite an inconclusive study, I remain philosophically well disposed to the idea that L1 can be used to promote academic and linguistic achievement among children who are classed as English language learners in polylingual schools in the UK. The existing research in bilingual schools and on teacher-mediated L1 strategies in other schools is persuasive, although the participants and contexts are almost certainly systematically different to the target population in British state schools. If teachers are to be confident that by acting on recommendations to use L1 supported methods in their classes they are improving the educational opportunities of their ELL students, then more research on how this can be operationalised and whether it works is essential.
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Appendices
Appendix 1: Invitation letter to Head Teacher of Vaughan Primary School

Xxxxxxx Xxxxxxxxxx
XX Xxxxxxxx Road
XXXX
XXX XXX
XXXX XXXXXXX
XXXX XXX XXX
xxxxxx@mac.com

XXXXX XXXXXXX
XXXXXXX Primary School
XXXXXXX XXXXX Road
Xxxxx
XXX XXX

4 April 2014

Dear Ms Xxxxxx

Please allow me to introduce myself. My name is Xxxxxx Xxxxxxxx and I am currently a post-graduate student at Xxxxxx Xxxxxxx University. I understand that Xxxxx Xxxxxx spoke to you on my behalf a week or so ago about the possibility of Xxxxxxxx Primary School helping me in the field study for my dissertation.

The reputation of Xxxxxxxx Primary School and its care and provision for EAL children is excellent, and I am delighted and flattered that you are interested in exploring how you might become involved in my planned project.

I wondered whether we might meet so that I can tell you more about the project and how I hope that you might be prepared to work with me to obtain information useful to teachers in linguistically diverse schools.

I know that you must be very busy and I am very happy to come to meet you whenever is convenient to you.

Thank you again for your interest in my project and I very much look forward to meeting you.

Yours sincerely

Xxxxxx Xxxxxxxx
Appendix 2: Study rationale document sent to teachers

Research Proposal - Xxxxxxxx Primary School

What do I want to find out?

I want to assess the effect of carrying out pre-write activities in EAL children's mother-tongue at home on subsequent production of written English in class.

Why do I want to find this out?

There is a lot of theoretical, and some empirical, research that suggests that using a child's mother tongue to preview material that will be used in class helps them to understand and respond to the same material, later on, in English.

Most of the research has been done in bilingual schools or schools where children share a common mother-tongue. In these types of school it is logistically straightforward to introduce mother-tongue activities in the classroom (for example by using bi-lingual textbooks, or allowing children to discuss their English work with each other in their mother-tongue). Little research has been done in schools, like Xxxxxxxx, where there is a large number of different languages spoken, and therefore where it is more difficult to adopt these kinds of activity.

One possible way to take advantage of mother-tongues in such schools is by asking children to do activities at home in their mother-tongue that will subsequently be followed up in class. My research aims to assess whether doing so has an effect on children's quality of written English. I hope that the results of my research will help teachers of linguistically diverse classes plan appropriate activities for their children.

How will I try to find this out?

1. I would like to assess the starting proficiency in written english of all EAL children in Years 1 and 2 by reading them a simple story in English, then asking them to re-tell the story in their own words. I will then assess this writing using APP level descriptors and a non-National Curriculum measure of English proficiency called WIDA.
2. I will then randomly allocated the children to one of two groups. Each group will be given a simple picture story to take home to read and discuss with their parents over a weekend. One group will have instructions and example discussion questions for parents, written in their mother-tongue. The other group will have the same instructions and questions, written in English.
3. The following week all children will be read the story again in English and asked to re-tell it in their own words, in English.
4. I will assess the children's writing from this activity using the same criteria as for the baseline task, after which children's scores will be analysed to assess whether there is any statistically significant difference between the quality of the writing in each group.

What will I do with the results?

The study will form the basis of my MA dissertation and will be written up and submitted for assessment at Xxxxxxxx Xxxxxxxx University in September. I will provide a summary of the main findings of the study to participants who wish to see them. I also intend to write up the study for submission to academic journals in the field of educational socio-linguistics. All data will be anonymised so that neither school nor participants can be identified.

Xxxxxxx Xxxxxxxx 5 May 2014
Appendix 3: Good Night Gorilla
It's bedtime at 8 p.m.

and the animals are quiet. They're all tucked in bed.

Goodnight, Dear.

Goodnight, Don't forget to turn out the light.

To dream wonderful stories, too!
Appendix 4: Guided reading questions (English)

Shared Reading with Your Child

Read the book all the way through with your child. Enjoy it. Feel free to talk about the story as you read it. If your child asks questions respond to them as you see fit - there are no right or wrong answers. The important point is that you have fun together enjoying the story.

Read the story again, pausing at each page to talk about each part of the story with your child using the suggested questions below. You are welcome to add your own questions and to discuss the story in any way you like with your child.

You can read the story as many times as you like with your child, but please aim to read and discuss it at least once a day this week.

Please discuss all of these and your own questions in English.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Suggested Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Front Cover | Who can you see in this picture?  
Where does this story take place?  
Is it daytime or nighttime? How do you know? |
| 1 | Who can you see in this picture?  
What is the gorilla doing?  
Why is the gorilla taking the keys?  
Describe the gorilla's cage (What colour is it? What is inside it? etc.) |
| 2 | Why is the gorilla getting out of the cage?  
Does the Zookeeper know that the gorilla is following him?  
What do you think the gorilla is thinking? |
| 3 | Who can you see in this cage?  
What will the gorilla do now?  
What do you think the elephant is thinking? |
| 4 | Who is in this cage? What is he thinking?  
What is the gorilla doing?  
Does the zookeeper know what the gorilla is doing? |
| 5 | What do you think the animals are saying to each other? |
| 6 | Remind me what has happened in the story so far? |
| 7 | Tell me what animals you can see.  
Where are they all going?  
Can anyone see them?  
Describe how they are walking. Are they walking loudly/quietly? Are they creeping/stomping/tip-toeing etc?  
Why do you think they want to go to the zookeeper's house? |
| 8 | Where are they now?  
Describe what it is like inside the zookeeper's house? Is it warm/comfy/quiet? |
| 9 | What room is this?  
How is this room the same or different to your bedroom?  
Do you share your room with anyone?  
Do you think it would be nice to share a room with a lot of animals? Why/Why not? |
| 10 | Do the zookeeper and his wife know that the animals are in their bedroom? |
| 11 | Who is saying goodnight on this page? |
| 12 | What do you think the zookeeper's wife is thinking? |
| 13 | Why is the gorilla smiling? |
| 14 | Who can you see in this picture?  
Where are they going? Why are they going back to the zoo?  
Who is taking them? |
| 15 | What is happening in this picture?  
Why is the gorilla saying "Shhhhhhh"? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16</th>
<th>Why do you think that the gorilla is getting into the bed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Who is in the bed now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do you think they are feeling?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why do you think that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Book</td>
<td>Where does this story take place?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When did the story take place?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can you remember all the characters who were in the story?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Which character did you like best? Why?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When you have finished reading ask your child to try to retell the whole story in their own words, in English, telling what happened, describing the scenes, and saying what they think the characters were thinking and saying.
Appendix 5: Translations of guided reading questions

Albanian

Lexim i perbashket me femijen tuaj

Lexojeni librin deri ne fund me femijen tuaj. Shijojeni ate! Jeni i lire te flesni per tregimin gjate leximit te librit. Nese femija ju ben pyetje, pergjigjuni atyre ashtu sic e shihni te arsyeshme - nuk ke pergjigje te drejte apo te gabuar. Gjeja me e rendesishme esht qe jut e argetoheni se bashku duke shijuar tregimin.

Lexojeni tregimin perseri duke pushuar ne cdo faqe per te folur per secilen pjesa te tregimit me femijen tuaj duket perdorur pyetjet e sugjeruara me poshte. Jeni te mirepritur per te shtuar pyetjet tuaja dhe per te diskutuar tregimin ne menyren tuaj te preferuar, si ta mendoni me mire me femijen.

Mund ta lexoni tregimin sa here te ju pelqej me femine tuaj, por ju lutem te synoni per ta lexuar dhe diskutuar te pakten nje here ne dite kete jave.

Ju lutemi te diskutoni te gjitha keto pyetje dhe te tuat ne gjuhen tuaj.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ke mund te shihni ne kete foto? Ku ndodh kjo tregim? A esht dite apo nate? Nga e dini?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perse po del Gorilla nga kafazi? A e din i zoti kopeshit zologjik se perse po e ndjek Gorilla? Cfare po mendon Gorilla sipas just?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke shikoni ne kafaz? Cfare do te beje Gorilla tani? Cfare po mendon Elefanti sipas just?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kush eshte ne kete kafaz? Cfare eshte duke menduar? Cfare po ben Gorilla? A e din i zoti kopeshtit zologjik se cfare po ben Gorilla?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cfare mendoni se kafshet jane duke thene per njeri tjetrin?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me kujtoni se cfare ka ndodhur ne kete tregim deri tani?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku jan ata tani? Pershkuani si ndiheni brenda shtepise te zotit te kopeshtit zologjik?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cfare esht kjo dhoma? Cfare ngjashmerie ose difference ka kjo dhoma me dhomen tuaj? A e ndani dhomen tuaj me ndonje? A mendoni se do ishte mire te ndanit nje dhome me shume kafshe? Perse? Perse jo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A e di i zoti kopeshtit zologjik dhe gruaja e tij qe kafshet jan ne dhome e tyre te gjumit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kush esht duke thene naten e mire ne kete faqe?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cfare mendoni se gruaja po mendon?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perse po qesh Gorilla?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14 | Ke shikoni ne kete foto?  
     | Ku po shkojne? Perse po kthehen mbrapa tek kopshi zologjik?  
     | Kush po i kthen? |
|---|---|
| 15 | Cfare po ndodh ne foto?  
     | Perse po thote Gorilla "shhhhhh"? |
| 16 | Perse mendoni se Gorilla po shtrihet ne krevat? |
| 17 | Kush esht ne krevat tani?  
     | Si mendoni se ndihen?  
     | Perse mendoni keshtu? |
| **Whole Book** | Ku ndodh ky tregim?  
     | Kur ka ndodhur ky tregim?  
     | A i mbani mend te gjith karakteret/personazhe qe moren pjese ne kete tregim?  
     | Cilet karaktere/personazhe ju pelqyen me shume? |

Kur te keni perfunduar leximin pyesni femijen tuaj qe te perpiqet te tregoj tregimin perseri me fjalet e tyre ne gjuhen tuaj, duke treguar cfare ndodhi, duke pershkruar skenat, dhe duke thene se cfare mendojne se personazhet jane duke menduar dhe duke thene.
كرشمة أوقا يع للفلط

أرقاب انكما الفلك يع للفلط عينمسا خтарفا. ملكة يوخفن عفصا و نينا أرقا فهم. و نيما للفلط حفره

استه، نبيا لهيلاء لمعو وبسنا. لا دجوي يلبغا الحجم وأ تطخ فورها يمسالا دا اعشت عماء أوارد.

أصا.

أرقا أصقا قمر طحا فقوه علة دنل لين عز و شدحت معا تنماسلا. تحرطمما ماندا. لدناكما.

اميا خاطا لنفسا أصاكا و هئشقا. تجوفنلبة بن دمغة.

للهماكما أرقا أصقا دعم أرماب غزن. كي يتنما دا بوءا هتارقا. و هئشقما إعاقلا أملحا ترمحاو.

ليوما.

يمنا مىن مادختسا ننسا ماندا و يا افناا ورحا دودا تهجوف مادختسا بكظم لاما.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Suggested Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Cover</td>
<td>نمؤيرةً لعماض، نيا بسحاحاً لئه لغول انينا وألا ذات لفطفرم.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>نمؤيرةً لعماض، نيا بسحاحاً انام لغول انينا انام لخادران بقليانا؛ فحس صدارفنا (ليهم اندا نمبو؛ ظلخاد خأ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>انام جرخادرقنا نم صرفنا له جرخادرقنا انام لخادران بقليانا انام ركفا بقليانا.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>رم مختمم لتدوزياً لداه صرفنا. انام لخادران بقليانا انام لخادران بقليانا انام ركفا بقليانا.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>نمؤيرةً لعماض، نيا بسحاحاً انام لغول انينا انام لخادران بقليانا له حيرام بسحاحاً انام ركفا بقليانا.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>دأ تاناه حلا ولا بطة للاض ب بلا انام لخدمته.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>نيا بسغاننا، فحس صدارفنا نمال بسحاح لوه ويا بسغاننا لد لخادران بقليانا.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>نمؤيرةً لعماض، نيا بسحاحاً انام لغول انينا انام لخادران بقليانا.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>نمؤيرةً لعماض، نيا بسحاحاً انام لغول انينا انام لخادران بقليانا.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>نمؤيرةً لعماض، نيا بسحاحاً انام لغول انينا انام لخادران بقليانا.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>نمؤيرةً لعماض، نيا بسحاحاً انام لغول انينا انام لخادران بقليانا.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>نمؤيرةً لعماض، نيا بسحاحاً انام لغول انينا انام لخادران بقليانا.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>نمؤيرةً لعماض، نيا بسحاحاً انام لغول انينا انام لخادران بقليانا.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>نمؤيرةً لعماض، نيا بسحاحاً انام لغول انينا انام لخادران بقليانا.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>نمؤيرةً لعماض، نيا بسحاحاً انام لغول انينا انام لخادران بقليانا.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>نمؤيرةً لعماض، نيا بسحاحاً انام لغول انينا انام لخادران بقليانا.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>نمؤيرةً لعماض، نيا بسحاحاً انام لغول انينا انام لخادران بقليانا.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
دعا لطهتنا نبذة إدارية القصة، لأساس ألقاط نابعاتها إشعار، أصطفاً كملكاً الخاصة، وقصور رصناها بها

يراه، وسماحاً نهاتعوا لاوقفات أصطفاً وملناها.
গ ।# পড়ুন এবং আপনার শিশুদের সাথে আলোচনা করুন।

স mন% বই ই (আপনার সমানের সাথে পড়ুন। গ || (উপজোগ করুন। যদি আপনার শিশু A-কানের pK করে তাহলে আপনার সাদক্ষিকতার উপর Aলবার Aছ।)

কানে, এখানে A-কানে সত্ত্ব অথবা যে উপর Aন এই। সবচেয়ে grtপূর্ণ% বিষয় এই Aয় আপনারা সবাই মিলে গ || (আন n উপজোগ করতেছেন।

গ || পুনরায় পড়ুন, pতেMকটা pুয়া পড়ার পর একটি ধামুন তারপর Aয় অংশটিক পড়েছেন Aস (S min নিচের pদ t pK =

ব Mবহার করে আপনার সমানের সাথে আলোচনা করুন। শিশুদের সাথে গ || (নিয়ো নিজের মতো আলোচনা এবং নিজ Aধকে pK Aধাগ করতে পারেন।

যতবার ইচ্ছামত বার গ || (আপনি আপনার Aছলোমোদের সাথে পড়তে পারেন, কিন্তু দয়া করে এই স pতে pতিলিন

কমপক্ষে একবার গ || (তাদের উচ্ছেদ পড়ুন এবং আলোচনা করুন।

অনুগ্রহ করে নিজস্ব ভাষায় ওদের মতো করে আপনার নিজের এবং নিচে pদ t pKগুলো নিয়ে আলোচনা করুন।
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>প্রশ্ন</th>
<th>প্রশ্নিত $pK$ সমূহ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gn</td>
<td>এই ছবিতে $t$ =মি কাকে $A_{3}$থতে পাও?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>জানো?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>গরিলা(র থাঁচ(সম্মন ব প %না কর? (এটার র ও কি? এটার $A$ভ ত $র$ কি?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>চিড়িয়াখানার র $K$ ক কি জানে $A$গরিলা( তাকে অনুসরণ করিতেছ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>এই $থাঁচ$ক $A_{ক}$? $A$স কি চিন করিতেছ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>চিড়িয়াখানার র $K$ ক কি জানে গরিলা( কি করিতেছ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$A$তামার কি মনে হয় য়া প $Ig$লা একক আনো$M$র সাথে কি বলিতেছ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>কি $A_{ক}$ক $A_{3}$থতে পাও?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$A$কন $t$=মি মনে কর তারা চিড়িয়াখানার র $K$কের বাড়িতে $A$থতে চায়?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>জির গরিলেশ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>এটা কি মি?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
নারীর কেক এবং তার ৪৩
কি জানে আমার প্রেমীলো তাদের মেয়ের আত্মার?
ইগুলো তাদের মেয়ের অভয়স তাদের?
তাদের কেক বলতেছে এই পৃথিবীতে?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>নং</th>
<th>প্রশ্ন</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ত =মি কি মনাকর চিড়িয়াখানার র কের s কি চিনা করিতেছে ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>গরিলা( একন হাসিতেছে ? )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>এ ই ছবিতে ত =মি কাকে আকর্ষিত করা চায় ? তারা এককাঠামো ধারা ? একন তারা চিড়িয়াখানায় ফিরে যায় ? তাদেরকে এক নিয়ে যায় ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>এ ই ছবিতে কি যা ( তেছে ? ) গরিলা( একন বলতেছে )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>&quot;শ হ হ হ হ হ &quot; ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>গরিলা( একন তে যায় A তামাক কি মনে হয় ? ) এখন বিচ্ছিন্নতে এক ? তারা কি অনুভব করিতেছে ? =মি কি মনে করে ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s mশ% ব ই</td>
<td>ত =মি একন একটা মনে করে ? গ l( A কাঠামো সংঘাত হয় ? ) গ l( কখন সংঘাত হয়েছিল ? )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

একন চাওলার ( ত =মি সবচেয়ে অবশ্য প ছ ন করেছিল ? একন ?

গ l( পড়া A শেষে আপনি আপনার শিদের স mশ% গ l( তাদের নিজের মতো করে পুনরায় বলার জন্ম ম জিনিস করা , বলতে বলুন গ l( তে কি ঘটেছিল , গাছের দ v শ M গ্রাম বা স শনা এবং গাছের চরিত্র লোকে নিয়ে চিনা-ভাবনা ও তাদের কথাপথিক নিয়ে pK করা ) |
**Dutch**

Samen lezen met uw kind


Lees het verhaal opnieuw door, maar pauzeer dit keer op elke pagina om elk deel van het verhaal in meer detail door te nemen met uw kind, met behulp van de suggesties hieronder. U mag uw eigen vragen toevoegen en in discussie gaan met uw kind over het verhaal hoe u maar wil. U mag het verhaal zo vaak lezen als u wil samen met uw kind, maar ik alstublieft op minstens één keer per dag deze week.

En: voer de discussie alstublieft in het Nederlands!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pagina</th>
<th>Suggesties voor vragen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cover</td>
<td>Wie kan je allemaal zien op deze tekening?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waar speelt dit verhaal zich af?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is het dag of nacht op deze tekening? Hoe weet je dat?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wie kan je allemaal zien op deze tekening?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wat is de gorilla aan het doen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waarom neemt de gorilla de sleutels weg?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beschrijf de kooi van de gorilla (welke kleur heeft die? Wat zit erin? Etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Waarom is de gorilla uit de kooi aan het komen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weet de dierenverzorger dat de gorilla hem aan het volgen is?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waaraan denkt de gorilla, denk je?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wie kan je zien in deze kooi?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wat staat de gorilla op het punt te doen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waaraan denkt je dat de olifant aan het denken is?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wie zit in deze kooi? Waaraan denkt hij?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wat is de gorilla nu aan het doen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weet de dierenverzorger wat de gorilla aan het doen is?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wat denk je dat de dieren tegen elkaar aan het zeggen zijn?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vertel me nog eens een keer wat er tot hier toe al gebeurd is in dit verhaal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vertel eens welke dieren je kan zien.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waar zijn ze op weg naartoe?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kan iemand ze zien?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beschrijf hoe ze wandelen. Wandelen ze stil of luid? Zijn ze aan het sluipen of stampen, of lopen ze op hun tenen? Waarom denk je dat ze naar het huis van de dierenverzorger willen gaan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Waar zijn ze nu?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beschrijf hoe de binnenkant van het huis van de dierenverzorger eruitziet. Warm, gezellig, kalm?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Welke kamer is dit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hoe verschilt deze kamer van jouw slaapkamer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deel je kamer met iemand anders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denk je dat het leuk zou zijn om een kamer te delen met een heleboel dieren?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waarom, of waarom niet?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Weten de dierenverzorger en zijn vrouw dat er dieren in hun slaapkamer zijn?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Wie zegt er ‘goedenacht’ op deze bladzijde?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Waaraan denkt de vrouw van de dierenverzorger, denk je?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Waarom glimlacht de gorilla?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Wie kan je allemaal zien op deze tekening?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waar gaan ze naartoe? Waarom gaan ze terug naar de dierentuin?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wie brengt hen er naartoe?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Wat gebeurt er op deze tekening?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waarom zegt de gorilla ‘shhhhh’?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Waarom kruipt de gorilla het bed in?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 17 | Wie ligt er nu in het bed?  
    | Hoe denk je dat ze zich voelen?  
    | Waarom denk je dat? |

| Het hele boek | Waar speelt dit verhaal zich af?  
            | Wanneer speelde dit verhaal zich af?  
            | Kan je je alle personages in het verhaal herinneren?  
            | Welk personage vond je het leukst? Waarom? |

Wanneer u gedaan hebt met lezen, vraag uw kind dan om te proberen het hele verhaal in zijn of haar eigen woorden na te vertellen in uw moedertaal: laat hem of haar vertellen wat er gebeurde, de scenes beschrijven en vertellen wat de personages dachten en zeiden.
Gemeinsames Lesen mit Ihrem Kind


Lesen Sie die Geschichte noch einmal, pausieren Sie nach jeder Seite und diskutieren Sie mit Ihrem Kind die hier vorgeschlagenen Fragen. Sie können natürlich auch gerne eigene Fragen hinzufügen.

Sie können die Geschichte mit Ihrem Kind so oft lesen, wie Sie möchten. Versuchen Sie aber bitte, eine Woche lang jeden Tag mindestens ein Mal das Buch zu lesen.

Bitte diskutieren sie die folgenden Fragen in Ihrer Heimat- oder Muttersprache.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seite</th>
<th>Vorgeschlagene Fragen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Deckseite / Buchumschlag | Wen kannst Du auf diesem Bild sehen?  
An welchem Ort spielt die Geschichte?  
Ist es gerade Tag oder Nacht? Woran erkennt Du das? |
| 1 | Wen kannst Du auf diesem Bild sehen?  
Was macht der Gorilla gerade?  
Warum nimmt sich der Gorilla den Schlüssel?  
Beschreibe den Käfig des Gorillas (Welche Farbe hat er? Was befindet sich darin? usw.) |
| 2 | Warum geht der Gorilla aus seinem Käfig?  
Merkst der Zoowärter, dass der Gorilla ihm folgt?  
Was glaubst Du, denkt der Gorilla in diesem Moment? |
| 3 | Wen kannst Du in diesem Käfig sehen?  
Was wird der Gorilla wohl als nächstes tun?  
Was denkt wohl der Elefant gerade? |
| 4 | Wer ist denn in diesem Käfig? Und was denkt er?  
Was macht der Gorilla jetzt?  
Merkst der Zoowärter, was der Gorilla gerade macht? |
| 5 | Was denkst Du, worüber unterhalten sich die Tiere? |
| 6 | Kannst Du mir noch einmal kurz erzählen, worum es in der Geschichte bisher ging? |
| 7 | Sag mir welche Tiere Du hier entdecken kannst.  
Wo gehen die Tiere hin?  
Kann irgendjemand sie dabei sehen?  
Beschreibe mir bitte, wie die Tiere laufen. Laufen sie eher laut oder leise? Kriechen, stapfen sie oder laufen auf Zehenspitzen?  
Warum wollen sie wohl zum Zoowärter? |
| 8 | Wo sind sie jetzt?  
Wie sieht das Haus des Zoowärters von innen aus? Ist es warm/bequem/leise? |
| 9 | Welcher Raum ist das?  
Sieht es hier aus wie in Deinem Kinderzimmer, oder ganz anders?  
Teilst Du Dein Zimmer mit irgendwem?  
Wäre es nett, Dein Zimmer mit vielen Tieren zu teilen? Warum? |
| 10 | Wissen der Zoowärter und seine Frau, dass all die Tiere in ihrem Schlafzimmer sind? |
| 11 | Wer wünscht denn hier eine gute Nacht? |
| 12 | Was glaubst Du, denkt die Frau des Zoowärters? |
| 13 | Warum lächelt der Gorilla jetzt? |
| 14 | Wen kannst Du auf diesem Bild hier entdecken?  
Wo gehen sie hin? Warum gehen sie zurück zum Zoo?  
Wer bringt sie dorthin? |
|---|---|
| 15 | Was passiert auf diesem Bild hier?  
Warum sagt der Gorilla "Shhhhhhh"? |
| 16 | Warum glaubst Du, geht der Gorilla ins Bett? |
| 17 | Wer ist gerade dort im Bett?  
Was denkst Du, wie sie sich fühlen?  
Warum glaubst Du das? |
| **Das ganze Buch** | Wo spielt die Geschichte?  
Wann hat die Geschichte stattgefunden?  
Kannst Du mir noch mal erzählen, welche Leute in der Geschichte vorkommen?  
Wen magst Du in der Geschichte am liebsten? Warum? |

Wenn Sie das Buch fertig gelesen haben, fragen Sie Ihr Kind ob es die Geschichte noch einmal mit seinen eigenen Worten in seiner eigenen Sprache erzählen kann. Es soll versuchen zu erzählen was passiert ist, die Szenen beschreiben und versuchen sich zu erinnern, was die Charaktere wohl gesagt und gedacht haben.
Lithuanian

Dalinkitės skaitymo malonumu su savo atėnėla

Prisėskite ir perskaitykite visą knygą su savo vaikeliu, nuo pradžių iki galo. Mėgaukitės tuo, įdėkite dalelį savo kūrybos pasakodami, užduodami klausimus. Jeigu mažylis uždavineja klausimus jums, atsakykite juos savo nuožiūra - negali būti teisingo ar neteisingo atsakymo! Svarbiausia yra tai, kad dalinatės ir kartu mėgaujatės istorija.

Perskaitykite istoriją dar kartą, tačiau šįkart stabteldami prie kiekvieno puslapio, ir padiskutuokite apie kiekvieną istorijos dalį naudodami pateiktus žemiau klausimus. Jauskitės laisvai užduoti įvairiausius savo sugalvotus klausimus ir visa tai atlikti kaip tik patys įsivaizduojate.

Skaičyti vaikelui šią istoriją galite kiek tik širdis geidžia, bet būčiau labai dėkingas, jei bent vieną kartą per šią savaitę užvestumėte pokalbį.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Siūlomi klausimai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Front Cover | Ką matai šiame piešinėlyje?  
Kur visa tai vyksta?  
Tai diena ar naktis? Kodėl taip manai? |
| 1 | O ką matai šiame piešinėlyje?  
Ką veikia gorilla?  
Kodėl gorilla siekia raktų?  
Apibūdink gorilos narvą (Kokios jis spalvos? Ką matai viduje?) |
| 2 | Kodėl gorilla išsilaisvina iš narvo?  
Ar zoologijos sodo priežiūrėtojas pastebi, kad gorilla ji seką?  
Kaip manai, ką gorila galvoja? |
| 3 | O ką matai šiame narve?  
O ką gi gorilla darys dabar?  
Kaip manai, ką galvoja dramblys? |
| 4 | Kas šiame narve? Ką gi jo galvoj sukasi?  
Ką veikia gorilla?  
Ar zoologijos sodo priežiūrėtojas pastebi ką veikia gorila? |
| 5 | Kaip manai, ką tarpusavyje šnekasi gyvūnai? |
| 6 | Primink man, kas gi domaus įvyko šioje istorijoje. |
| 7 | Kokios gyvūnus čia matai?  
Kur jie visi eina?  
Ar kas nors juos pastebi?  
Ir kaipgi jie eina? Ar tipena ar pirštu galiukų, o gal trypia irilda?  
Kaip manai, kodėl gyvūnai bando patekti į zoologijos sodo priežiūrėtojo namą? |
| 8 | O kurgi jie dabar?  
Apibūdink zoo priežiūrėtojo namus? Ar čia šilta, ramu, gera? |
| 9 | Koks tai kambarys?  
Kuo tavo miegamasis skiriasi kuo šio kambario?  
Ar daliniesi savo kambarį su namiškiu?  
Kaip manai, ar būtų smagu dalintis savo kambarį su begale gyvūnu?  
Kodėl taip manai? |
<p>| 10 | Ar priežiūrėtojas ir jo žmona numano, jog turi pilną gyvuliukų miegamajį? |
| 11 | Kas sako labanakt šiame puslapyje? |
| 12 | Kaip manai, ką galvoja zoo priežiūrėtojo žmona? |
| 13 | Kodėl gi gorila šypsosi? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **14** | **Ką matai šiame paveikslelyje?**  
Ir ką gi jie veikia? Kodėl gyvūnai grįžta į zoologijos sodą?  
Kas juos ten parveda?  |
| **15** | **Kas vyksta šiame paveikslelyje?**  
Kodėl gorila sako „ŠŠŠŠŠ“?  |
| **16** | **Kaip manai, kodėl gorila atsigula į lovą?**  |
| **17** | **O kas dar guli lovoje?**  
Kaip manai, kaip jie jaučiasi? Kodėl taip manai?  |

**Whole Book**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | Tai visgi, kur visa ši istorija vyko?  
Kada visa tai vyko?  
Ar prisimeni visus istorijos veikėjus?  
Kuris veikėjas yra tavo mėgstamiausias? Kodėl?  |

Kai pabaigsite skaityti, paprašykite savo vaikelio papasakoti istoriją jų pačių žodžiais, su įvairiomis detalėmis - apie tai, kas įvyko, paprašyti apibūdinti įvairias vietas, paklausti ką jie galvojo ar sakė.
Czytaj wspólnie z dzieckiem


Przeczytaj ponownie, zatrzymując się na każdej stronie, aby porozmawiać z dzieckiem o danym fragmencie historii, korzystając z pytań podanych poniżej. Możesz do tej listy dodać swoje pytania i rozmawiać o lekturze w sposób, jaki Tobie wydaje się najlepszy dla Ciebie i Twojego dziecka. Możesz książkę tę czytać tak często, jak tylko Ty i Twoje dziecko macie na to ochotę. Pamiętaj jednak, aby przynajmniej raz dziennie w tym tygodniu przeczytać ją wspólnie i porozmawiać o niej. Rozmawiajcie wg poniższych pytań oraz tych, które sami dodacie do tej listy, w języku, którego używacie w domu.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strona</th>
<th>Sugerowane pytania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Okładka | Kogo widzisz na obrazku?  
Gdzie to jest?  
Czy to jest dzień czy noc? Skąd wiesz? |
| 1      | Kogo widzisz na obrazku?  
Co goryl robi?  
Dlaczego goryl bierze klucze?  
Opowiedz mi o klatce goryla (Jakiego jest koloru? Co jest w środku? itd.) |
| 2      | Dlaczego goryl wychodzi z klatki?  
Co robi goryl?  
Czy opiekun zoo wie, że goryl go śledzi?  
Jak sądzisz, o czym goryl myśli? |
| 3      | Kogo widzisz w tej klatce?  
Co goryl teraz zrobi?  
Jak sądzisz, o czym myśli słoń? |
| 4      | Kto jest w tej klatce? O czym ono myśli?  
Co robi goryl?  
Czy opiekun zoo wie, co goryl robi? |
| 5      | Jak myślisz, co zwierzęta mówią do siebie? |
| 6      | Przypomnij mi, co do tej pory wydarzyło się w tej historii. |
| 7      | Powiedz mi, jakie zwierzęta widzisz.  
Dokąd one wszystkie idą?  
Czy ktoś może je zobaczyć?  
W jaki sposób się poruszają? Czy idą głośno/cicho? Czy czolgają się, tupią, idą na palcach itd.?  
Jak myślisz, dlaczego chcą iść do domu opiekuna zoo? |
| 8      | Gdzie się teraz znajdują?  
Powiedz, jak jest w domu opiekuna zoo? Czy jest tam ciepło/wygodnie/cicho? |
| 9      | Co to za pokój?  
W czym jest podobny a czym różni się od Twojego pokoju?  
Czy dzielisz z kimś pokój?  
Myślisz, że przyjemnie dzieliłoby się pokój z wieloma zwierzętami?  
Dlaczego/Dlaczego nie? |
| 10     | Czy opiekun zoo i jego żona wiedzą, że zwierzęta są w ich sypialni? |
| 11     | Kto mówi dobranoc na tej stronie? |
| 12     | Jak sądzisz, o czym myśli żona opiekuna zoo? |
| 13     | Dlaczego goryl się śmieje? |
| 14     | Kogo widzisz na tym obrazku?  
Dokąd oni idą? Dlaczego wracają do zoo?  
Kto ich odprowadza? |
| 15 | Co się dzieje na tym obrazku?  
    | Dlaczego goryl mówi „Ciiiiliiiiiiii”? |
|----|----------------------------------|
| 16 | Jak myślisz, dlaczego goryl wchodzi do łóżka? |
| 17 | Kto leży teraz w łóżku?  
    | Jak myślisz, jak się czują?  
    | Dlaczego tak uważasz? |
| Cała książka | Gdzie ta historia ma miejsce?  
              | Kiedy to się dzieje?  
              | Czy pamiętasz, kto występował w opowiadaniu?  
              | Któżego z bohaterów historii lubisz najbardziej? Dlaczego? |

Kiedy przeczytasz książkę, poproś dziecko, aby opowiedziało Ci (swoimi słowami, w języku, którego używacie rozmawiając ze sobą), o czym była, co się w niej wydarzyło, o czym były poszczególne jej części, scenki, co sądzi o bohaterach, o tym, co mówi, o czym myślą.
Portuguese
Leitura compartilhada com seu filho(a)


Leia a história de novo, parando em cada página, para falar sobre cada parte da história com seu filho(a) usando as perguntas sugeridas abaixo. Fique livre para adicionar suas próprias perguntas e discutir a história da maneira que quiser com o seu filho(a).

Você pode ler a história tantas vezes quanto quiser com o seu filho(a), mas por favor leia e discuta o livro pelo menos uma vez por dia esta semana.

Por favor, discutas todas estas perguntas (adicionando as suas próprias) na sua língua materna.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Página de frente</th>
<th>Sugestões de perguntas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quem você pode ver nesta foto? Onde é que esta história aconteceu? É dia ou noite? Como você sabe?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Quem você pode ver nesta foto? O que o gorila está fazendo? Porque é que a gorila está levando as chaves? Descreva a jaula do gorila (que cor é? O que está dentro dele? Etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Por que o gorila está saindo da gaiola? O tratador de animais sabe que o gorila o está seguindo? O que você acha que o gorila está pensando?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Quem você pode ver nesta jaula? O que será que o gorila vai fazer agora? O que você acha que o elefante está pensando?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Quem está nesta jaula? O que ele está pensando? O que o gorila está fazendo? O tratador de animais saber o que o gorila está fazendo?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 O que você acha que os animais estão dizendo um ao outro?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Me lembre o que aconteceu na história até agora?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Diga-me quais os animais que você pode ver. Onde todos eles estão indo? Alguém pode vê-los? Descreva como eles estão andando. Eles estão andando ruidosamente / silenciosamente? Eles estão rastejando / pisoteando / na ponta dos pés, etc? Por que você acha que eles querem ir para a casa do tratador de animais?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Onde eles estão agora? Descreva como é dentro da casa do tratador? É calorosa / confortável / quieita?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Que quarto é esse? Esse quarto é igual ou diferente do seu quarto? Você compartilha seu quarto com alguém? Você acha que seria bom compartilhar um quarto com um monte de animais? Porquê / Porque não?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 O tratador de animais e sua esposa sabem que os animais estão em seu quarto?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Quem está dizendo boa noite nessa página?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 O que você acha a esposa do tratador de animais está pensando?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Por que o gorila está sorrindo?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Página</td>
<td>Questões</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14     | Quem você pode ver nesta foto?  
       | Onde eles estão indo? Por que eles estão indo de volta para o zoológico?  
       | Quem está os levando? |
| 15     | O que está acontecendo nesta foto?  
       | Por que o gorila está dizendo “Shhhhhhh”? |
| 16     | Por que você acha que o gorila está indo para a cama? |
| 17     | Quem está na cama agora?  
       | Como você acha que eles estão se sentindo?  
       | Por que você acha? |
| O livro completo | Onde é que esta história aconteceu?  
                        | Quando a história aconteceu?  
                        | Você consegue se lembrar de todas as pessoas que estavam na história?  
                        | Qual personagem que você mais gostou? Por quê? |

Quando você tiver terminado de ler peça ao seu filho para tentar recontar a história completa, em suas próprias palavras, na sua língua materna, contando o que aconteceu, descrevendo as cenas, e dizendo o que eles acham que os personagens estavam pensando e dizendo.
Swahili
Shiriki kusoma na mtoto wako

Soma hadithi zaidi ya mara moja, koma kwa mda mfupi kila ukurasa kwa majadiliano juu ya kila sehemu ya hadithi na mtoto wako kwa kutumia maswali yaliyo chini. Unaweza kuongeza maswali yako mwenyewe na kujadili hadithi katika njia yoyote na mtoto wako.

Unaweza kusoma hadithi mara nyingi pamoja na mtoto wako, lakini tafadhali kusudia kusoma na kuzungumza na mtoto wako vile vile iwezekanazo mara moja kwa wiki.
Tafadhali zungumzeni haya yote na maswali yako mwenyewe katika lugha yako asili.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ukurasa wa mbele</th>
<th>Maswali ambayo hupendekeza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nani ambaye unamuona kwenye picha hii? Hadithi hii ilitokea wapi? Je, ni mchana au usiku? Jinsi gani unajua?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kwa nini nyani mkubwa anatoka kwenywe kizimba chake Je, mlinzi wa Zoo(bustani la wanyama) anajua kua nyani mkumbwa anamfuata? Unafikiri nyani mkubwa anafikiria nini?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unaweza kumuona nani ndani ya hii kizimba Nyani mkumba atafanya nini sasa? Unafikiri ndovu anafikiria nini?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nani yuko kizimbani? Anafikiria nini? Nyani mkumbwa anafanya nini? Jee,mlinzi wa Zoo (bustani la wanyama) anajua nyani mkubwa anafanya nini?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unafikiri wanyama wanaongea nini?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hebu nikumbushe, nini kimefanyika kwenye hadithi mpaka sasa?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Niambie, wanyama gani unaona? Wote wanaenda wapi? Kuna yoyote anaweza kuonekana? Nieleze vile wanatembea? Wanatembea na makelele au kimya. Wanatambaa/wanapenda miguu/kwa kucha za miguu Kwa nini, unafikiri, wanatakuwa kuenda nyumbani kwa mlinzi wa bustani la wanyama?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wako wapi sasa? Nieleze vile viko ndani ya nyumba ya mlinzi wa Zoo (bustani la wanyama). Ni joto/sawa/kuko utulivu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ni chumba gani hichi? Chumba hichi, kina tofauti gani na chumba chako cha kulala Unaishi na yoyote kwenywe chumba chako cha kulala Unafikiri itakuwa kitu kizuri kuishi pama na wanyama wengi kwenywe chumba kimoja? Kwa nini/Kwa nini sio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Je, mlinzi wa Zoo (bustani la wanyama) na bibi yake wanajua kuwa wanyama wako kwenywe chumba chao cha kulala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nani anasema lala salama(usiku mwema) kwenywe ukurasa huu?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Unafikiri bibi wa mlinzi wa Zoo(bustani la wanyama) anafikiria nini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kwa nini nyani mkubwa anacheka cheka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14   | Unaona nani kwenye picha hii  
Wanaenda wapi? Kwa nini wanarudi kwenye bustani la wanyama?  
Nani anawapeleka |
| 15   | Nini kinatokea kwenye hii picha  
Kwa nini nyani mkubwa anasema Shhhhhhhhhhh |
| 16   | Unafikiri, kwa nini nyani mkubwa anaingia kitandani |
| 17   | Nani yuko kitandani sasa  
Unafikiri wanajisikiaje  
Kwa nini unafikiri hivyo |

**Kitabu kizima**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 14   | Hi hadithi ilitokea wapi?  
Hi hadithi ilitokea lini  
Unaweza kukumbua watu wote waliokuwako kwenye hadithi  
Ulimpenda nani zaidi? Kwa nini |

Ukimaliza kusoma, muombe mototo wako akueleze hadithi yote peke yake kwa lugha ya kinyumbani, akuambia chote kilichotokea na akuambie chote kilichosemwa hadithini.
Çocuğunuz ile okuma paylaşımı


Kitabını tekrar okuyun, aşağıdaki önerileri kullanarak her sayfada durup hikayeyi bölümlerini hakkında konuşun. Kendi önerilerinizi eklemekten çekinmeyin ve hikayeyi çocuğunuzla arzu ettiği şekilde tartışın.

Çocuğunuz ile kitabı istediğiniz kadar okuyuyun ama bu hafta hikayeyi en azından güne bir kere okuyup ve tartışmayı hedefleyin.

Lütfen aşağıdaki önerileri ve kendi önerilerinizi evinizde konultuğunuz lisanda tartışın.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sayfa</th>
<th>Önerilen Sorular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ön kapak | Resimde kimi görüyorsun?  
Bu hikayeye nerede geçiyor?  
Gündüz mu gece mi? Nasıl anladın? |
| 1 | Resimde kimi görüyorsun?  
Goril ne yapıyor?  
Goril anahtarları neden alıyor?  
Gorilin kafesini tarif et (Ne renk? İçinde ne var? vb.) |
| 2 | Goril kafesten neden çıkıyor?  
Hayvan bakıcısı gorilin onu takip ettiğini biliyor mu?  
Goril sence ne düşünüyor? |
| 3 | Kafesin içinde kimi görebiliyorsunuz?  
Goril şimdi ne yapacak? Fil sence ne düşünüyor? |
| 4 | Kafesin içinde kim var? Ne düşünüyor?  
Goril ne yapıyor?  
Hayvan bakıcısı gorilin ne yaptığı biliyor mu? |
| 5 | Sence, hayvanlar birbirlerine ne diyorlar? |
| 6 | Bana hikayede şimdiye kadar ne olduğunu hatırlat? |
| 7 | Bana hangi hayvanları gördüğünü söyle.  
Nereye gidiyorlar?  
Kimsenin onları görebiliyorsunuz?  
Nasıl yürüdüklerini tarif et. Gürültüyle veya sesiz şekilde mi yürüyorlar? Sürünüyor, tepiniyor ya da parmak uçlarına mı yürüyorlar vb?  
Hayvanların neden hayvan bakıcısının evine gitmek istediğini düşünüyor musun? |
| 8 | Şimdi neredeler?  
Hayvan bakıcısının evinin içinin nasıl olduğunu tarif et? Sıcak/ keyifli/ sakin? |
| 9 | Bu ne odası?  
Bu oda senin yatak odana ne kadar benzeyor veya ne kadar farklı?  
Odanın başlığı ile paylaşıyor musun?  
Bir sürü hayvan ile odanı paylaşmak sence güzel olur mu? Neden? |
| 10 | Hayvan bakıcısı ve kansı hayvanların yatak odalarında olduğunu biliyorlar mı? |
| 11 | Bu sayfada kim iyi geceler diyor? |
| 12 | Hayvan bakıcısının kansı ne düşünüyor sence? |
| 13 | Goril neden güliyor? |
| 14 | Bu resimde kimi görüyorsun?  
Nereye gidiyorlar? Hayvanat bahçesine neden geri gidiyorlar?  
Kim onları görüntüyor? |
| 15 | Bu resimde ne oluyor?  
    | Goril neden sesiz ol diyor? |
| 16 | Goril yatağa neden giriyor sence? |
| 17 | Yatakta şimdi kim var?  
    | Ne hissediyorlar sence?  
    | Neden böyle düşünüyorsun? |
| Tüm Kitap | Hikyaye nerede geçiyor?  
         | Hikaye ne zaman geçikleştii?  
         | Hikayedeki herkesi hatırlıyor musun?  
         | Hangi karakteri en çok sevdin? Neden? |

Okuma bittiğinde çocuğunuzdan, ailenizde konuşulan lisanı kullanarak, kendi cümleleriyle, hikayeyi baştan tekrarlıyarak, sahnelerde ne olduğunu tanımlamasını ve karakterlerin ne düşünüdüklerini ve ne söylediklerini anlatmasını isteyin.
تیری دیئے اپنی پیچھے کے سواں

اب بہت کم سلسلے کتاب بھریں۔ پہلے کے دو نظر کیا کہ ہمارے سے میں بات کرتا

ام دوسری نوکاری تھی۔ اگر آپ کہا جا کہ فکر کرنا تھا تو میں کس کا جواب دیں۔ یہ بات آپ کو فکر کرنے

عندہ اس کے جواب بھی جنیں۔ ضروری ہے کہ آپ دوسرے کو دلنوں مفت کریں۔

تاپا یہ بناکر اپنا اجرہ کریں۔ اس کے پھر آپ کے نظر کیا دل کی طرح کا ہوتا

یہ سوال قلت نہ ہے ہے۔ آپ اپنی بہت سا فائقے کہ سوال کے جواب کہ بھی کم محسوس

میں بات کرنے کا کوئی سوال نہیں بہت سی۔ میں اپنی بہت سی سائل اپنی کریں ہے

حیف

فائن کرداہ سب سے مفت

آپ کی چوئیں کہ دلنوں کو کچھ اپنی

کیاہ دلنوں کیاہ کہ دلنوں کیاہ ہے?

1. نقویہ کرنا کہ کوئی نفر؟

کودیلا کیا ترمیم کریں؟

کودیلا چاہوں تو کھودیں کو کر جاونمکی?

کودیلا کا حیف ہے کہ سوان ہراتی جیہوں کیاہ جیہوں کہ ؛ کہ ہا کہ اپنے کیاہ ؛

2. گودیلا بھر کر کھودیں کاپر؟

نا دلنوں چاہوں نہیں تو کھودیں مس کا ججا کر دییہ؟

تیپ کے ہیلیاں سے گودیلا نہیں کھودیہ؟

ام بہتہ سے ہیں کہ چاہوں کیاہ کہ ؛

3. گودیلا کیا کھودیہ؟

کہ دلنوں نہیں باتی چاہوں کہ ؛

تیپ کے ہیلیاں سے ہیں کہ چاہوں کہ ؛

گودیلا کیا کھودیہ؟

تیپ کے چاہوں ماری جہاں چاہوں کہ ؛

4. گودیلا کیا کھودیہ؟

تیپ چاہوں ماری جہاں چاہوں کہ ؛

گودیلا کیا کھودیہ؟

تیپ چاہوں ماری جہاں چاہوں کہ ؛
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آپ کہ چیز کسی جاوندی آپ اسے وہسے سے کیا کر دیتے ہیں؟

6. میں سے اسی اسے تب نسیہت سے نہیں تھا تو کیا ان کے ساتھ ہے؟

7. آپ کوئی سا جاوندی دلیل سے ہیں؟

8. تب ساتھ کیا جادوگر ہے؟

9. آپ کا کیا کرنا تعلق دل کے ساتھ ہے؟

آپ کے خیال میں آپ یہ کچھ کچھ کہا چاہتے ہیں؟

8. آپ نے آپ کا سہارہ نہیں؟

9. آپ کا کبھی کبھی جادوگر ہے؟

10. آپ کے اپنے کہا کہ سرکار کی بھی کسی جادوگر نہیں؟

11. آپ کا دل کا جادوگر ہے؟

12. آپ کا کہ یہ کسی دل کا جادوگر ہے؟

13. آپ کا دل کا کسی دل کا جادوگر ہے؟

14. آپ کا دل کا کسی دل کا جادوگر ہے?

15. آپ کا دل کا کسی دل کا جادوگر ہے؟

16. آپ کا دل کا کسی دل کا جادوگر ہے؟

17. آپ کا دل کا کسی دل کا جادوگر ہے؟

18. آپ کا دل کا کسی دل کا جادوگر ہے؟
آپ کے خالی بین دھکیلے کی ہے؟
آپ کے چیگاں کون سوجا ہے؟
کہلے کتاب۔
یہ کتنا کیوان کی ہے؟
کہلایی کتاب کی طرف؟
کیا آپ کو دیکھنے میں کون کون سے کردار کیا؟
آپ کو سب سے ذیلا دے کہ کیا تھی ہیں ان کے کیون؟
کیا آپ کو دیکھنے کرتا ہو تھا؟
ہم باپ کیا کے جاکہی؟
منظر کو میاں کہا اور یہی بہت زیادہ کہا کچھ خالی بین کردار کے سوچا اور کہا تھا

گُرز نانہ بھری ہوا
گُرز نانہ بھر
گُرز نانہ بھری ہوا
گُرز نانہ بھری ہوا
گُرز نانہ بھر
گُرز نانہ بھری ہوا
گُرز نانہ بھر

دوزی راز

196
آپ کی خیال میں ہے ہم ہے کیسی فہیسوں کر دیں؟
آپ نے ایسا کون سوچا ہے؟
کخل کتاب.

پہ کیا حیات کی پچھ؟
تاہم کہ کیا بھی قیم؟
کیا پر قربانی کی پر میں?
کیا پر قربانی کی پر میں?

ہم کہ سب سے نہایت کیسی ہیں کا نہرہاد لینے کے چیونہ؟
ہم آپ کی ایک کوئی کیہاں کوئی نہ ہیں کوئی نہ تھا کہ ہم آپ کہ بی ایس کیا جا نہیں اور اسی

دشمن کیا ساتھی؟ دشمن کیا ساتھی?
ہم شاہبے کیا ساتھی؟ دشمن کیا ساتھی?

خیال میں کردار کہا ہے؟ اور کہا ہے؟
Appendix 6: Keynote presentation to parents
How can I find out more information?

@mac.com
@ .ac.uk

Any Questions?
Appendix 7: Participant information document

Does the language children use to preview school materials have an effect on how well they do subsequently at school using those same materials in English? - Information sheet.

Dear Parents and Carers

Thank you very much to those of you who were able to make it to the meeting this morning. This letter is to reiterate the main points that I made at the meeting and to explain the project for parents and carers who were unable to attend.

What is the purpose of this project?
There are a lot of children in schools in the UK who speak a language other than English at home. For some of these children learning in school using English is a big challenge. As a part of my MA study at Xxxxxx Xxxxxxx University, School of Education, I want to find out how teachers can make learning English less of a challenge for those children.

What question am I hoping to answer?
Some people say that teachers should allow children to use their home language to help them learn English. Other people say that the best way to learn English is to use only English. With your help, I want to find out if either of these ideas is right, or if children learn just as well in either case.

One of the things that some people say is helpful for English language learners is for them to preview learning materials, such as books, using their home language before using them in class. We don't know whether this is true or not because there is very little research that has attempted to find out. I want to find out if giving children books to look at and talk about at home, using either their home language or English, makes a difference to how well they do subsequently at school using the same book.

Why has your child been chosen to participate?
Your child has been chosen to participate because he or she is a speaker of a language other than English at home, who uses English at school. All of the children in Years 1 and 2 at Xxxxxxxx Primary School whose home language is not English have been invited to take part in the project.

What will happen if you decide to participate in the project?
Your child will bring home a book called Good Night Gorilla. It is a short picture book with very few words and a simple plot. Your child will also bring home a sheet of instructions and questions for sharing the book with you. Please use these questions to talk about the book with your child as you read it together, as we did in the meeting this morning.

Half of the children in the project will bring home questions translated into their home language. The other half of the children will bring home these questions in English. If your child has the questions in your home language, please share the book and talk about it in your home language only. If your child brings home the questions in English, please share the book and talk about it in English only. Please share the book every day this week so that your child gets to know the story very well.

At the end of the week your child will be asked to re-write the story of Good Night Gorilla in class, in English. I will then assess the writing to see if there if any differences can be attributed to the language with which the story was previewed. The results of these assessments will not be used by the school or external agencies, or kept on your child's school record. These records will be anonymous and will only be used in the context of this project.

After the activities have been completed at school I will send a survey to parents asking for their thoughts about the project.
What do you gain from participating in the project?
I hope that this project will help teachers of children like yours to choose effective learning activities. By helping with this project you are helping teachers to help children who speak a language other than English at home to do well in school.

Are there any costs associated with participating in the project?
The only cost to you and your child is your time. I have designed this project to be as similar as possible to the kind of activities your children would normally be doing in school and with you at home. I hope this will cause the minimum disruption to normal school and home routines.

Does your child have to take part?
No. Participation in the project is entirely voluntary, and participants can withdraw their consent at any time during the project, without giving a reason. However, I would be delighted if as many people as possible agreed to take part. The more people involved, the more confident we can be in the results of the project, and the more confident we can be in suggesting ways to help children like yours.

If you are happy to take part in the project, please sign and return the consent form attached to this letter.

How will I protect the privacy of participants?
During the course of the project I will not keep a record of the names of any of the children or parents who took part in it. All participants will be assigned a number and a record of their home language, age, and which group (home language or English only) they were assigned to. Responses to the parent survey will be kept anonymous. All data will be kept in an encrypted file on a single laptop, and paper versions of data will be kept securely in a locked cabinet. I will be required to describe some of the key statistics of the school when I write up the project, but I will change its name and use general rather than specific descriptions as far as possible. I hope to publish the results of this project. If I do so I will be required to securely keep the data from the project for 10 years.

How can I find out the results of the project?
The project is due to be finished in late September 2014. I will invite parents to a presentation on the findings of the project in October 2014. I will also provide a written summary of the project and the implications for teaching and learning. The presentation and written summary will be available to anyone who participated in the project who would like to see them.

How can you find out more information?
You are welcome to contact me on xxxxxxxxxxxxxx@mac.com if you would like more information about the project. If you have any concerns about the way that the project has been conducted you are welcome to contact Xxxxxx Xxxxxx, the School of Education's Research Ethics Officer on xxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.ac.uk

I would like to thank you very much for taking the time to read this information sheet and for considering taking part in the project. If you are happy for your child to participate in the study please sign the attached consent form and return it to their class teacher.

Yours faithfully

Xxxxxx Xxxxxxxx
Appendix 8: Consent form

CONSENT FORM

Does the language children use to preview school materials have an effect on how well they do subsequently at school using those same materials in English?

Xxxxxx Xxxxxxxx, MA Student, 22 Xxxxxxxx Rd, Xxxxxx:

Please initial box

1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for the above study and have had the opportunity to ask questions.

2. I understand that my and my child's participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw the data at any time before it is processed, without giving a reason.

3. I agree to my child taking part in the study.

Name of Parent __________________________ Date ____________ Signature __________________________

Name of Child __________________________ Age ____________ Class __________________________

teacher
Appendix 9: Small-format copy of Good Night Gorilla
Appendix 10: Participant group allocation covering letter

**English-only Group**

Dear Parents and Carers

Thank you again for agreeing to take part in my project. Your help is very important and I appreciate it enormously.

Your child has been assigned to the **English Language** group.
Please share and discuss the enclosed book with your child, using the questions as a guide, in **English**.

Please aim to share the book once a day this week. You do not have to use all of the questions each time you read it, and you are free to add your own questions if you like.

Thank you. I hope you enjoy sharing this book with your child.

Xxxxxx Xxxxxxxx

**L1 Group (example)**

Dear Parents and Carers

Thank you again for agreeing to take part in my project. Your help is very important and I appreciate it enormously.

Your child has been assigned to the **Home Language** group.
Please share and discuss the enclosed book with your child, using the questions as a guide, in **Portuguese**.

Please aim to share the book once a day this week. You do not have to use all of the questions each time you read it, and you are free to add your own questions if you like.

Thank you. I hope you enjoy sharing this book with your child.

Xxxxxx Xxxxxxxx
Appendix 11: Instructions to teachers

Does the language children use to preview school materials have an effect on how well they do subsequently at school using those same materials in English?

Instructions for Teachers

Dear Mrs Xxxxxxxxx

Thank you very much again for agreeing to help me with my research project. I hope that, together, we can contribute some understanding to the continuing uncertainty about whether and how children's first language can be operationalised in linguistically diverse schools, such as Xxxxxxxx.

When we met last week I outlined the premise and my intervention activity. This letter is to describe the next steps of the project.

1. Distributing the materials
The children in your class who are identified in the school records as having a first language other than English will all receive a copy of the picture book 'Good Night Gorilla' and a set of guidelines and questions to help their parents, carers or other family members to share the book with them. These instructions are written either in English or in the child's first language (as recorded by the school). I have randomly allocated each child to either the English Language group or the Home Language group.

These materials, plus a short note telling the parents to which group their child has been assigned are in a sealed envelope with the child's name on. Please distribute these to the children on Friday 4 July 2014.

If any children are not at school on that date, please give them their envelope as soon as possible afterwards. For any children to which this is applicable, please keep a record of their names and the dates on which they received the materials.

2. Assessment task
The children should be assessed on Friday 11th July 2014. If, for any reason this date is not possible, the task may be done on an alternative date but it is important that all classes are assessed on the same date.

I have provided each teacher in Years 1 and 2 with a copy of Good Night Gorilla. Please share this with your class in the way you normally would when doing a shared read, prior to conducting an 'imitation' write, based on the principals of Talk for Writing. This should be as close to 'business as usual' as possible for you and your class.

Once the book has been shared and discussed in the normal way, please explain to your children that you want them to re-write the story of Good Night Gorilla in their own words. Again, please provide them with the kinds of instructions and pointers that you would normally use. However, please also stress that this is to be independent work, and therefore you cannot help them with vocabulary choices, spelling, and so on. Please ask them to do their very best, and, as far as practical, allow them to complete their work to their satisfaction.

Once the written task is complete, please ask the children in the project to complete the short survey about how they got on sharing the book with their family. You may need to help read through the questions and explain any points that they are unclear on. It is perfectly acceptable to help them in whatever way you feel appropriate for this part of the task as long as they answer honestly, without any 'leading'.

It is important that I am 'blind' to the names of the children who are in the project when I assess the work. Please, therefore, instead of names to identify who has written each piece of work, write the
children's unique number on their work. I have included a list of the children and their unique numbers as an enclosure in this letter.

3. Parent survey
On the same day as the children's assessment task, please distribute the parental survey to the parents of the children in the project and ask them to return them on Monday 14th July 2014.

4. Encouraging participation
Please gently remind the children in the project that they should be sharing Good Night Gorilla with their family as much as possible; ideally, once a day for the week of the project.

5. Parental inquiries
If there are any inquiries from parents about the project, if you are unsure about how to respond, please feel free to contact me either by email on xxxxxxxxxxxxx@mac.com or on my mobile at xxxxx xxx xxx.

I have left extra copies of Good Night Gorilla with Mrs Camilleri in case any children lose theirs. If possible, I would like all copies of the book returned at the end of the project, please.

6. Additional information
I will come to school on Friday afternoon to collect the assessments. At this time, please could I also have copies of your 'striped' level sheets for each child's current writing level?

Thank you very much for your help. I look forward to seeing the children's work and to sharing the outcome of the project with you in October.

Kind regards

Xxxxxx
### Appendix 12: National Curriculum level descriptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence Structure</th>
<th>Punctuation</th>
<th>Text Organisation</th>
<th>Composition &amp; Effect</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Handwriting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Begins to form simple sentences orally; Aware of form the sequence of letters, symbols and words; Letters are cesuiped &amp; gro spa eft between them as though writing separate spaces words.</td>
<td>Writes own name with the appropriate use of upper and lower case letters or appropriate symbols.</td>
<td>Attempts writing for different purposes, e.g. in role play.</td>
<td>Talks about own writing, Uses pictures, symbols, familiar words and letters in sequence to communicate meaning;</td>
<td>Writes the occasional letter in response to a sound. The first letter of a words is often accurately identified. Begins to use phonic knowledge to help with spelling.</td>
<td>Uses a pencil; holds it effectively; Starts to letters correctly; Mixes upper and lower case letters; Writes from L to R &amp; top to bottom; Groups letters/ symbols; leaves as though writing separate words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses meaningful words and phrases some of which 1 expressnideaske C istructue s; -li n sent ce re There is some control over word order.</td>
<td>May use capital letters and full stops at random.</td>
<td>Thinks of and attempts to write own compositions.</td>
<td>Conveys meaning through simple words and phrases; Some of the writing may still need to be mediated to be understood.</td>
<td>Some of the early key words, in the National Literacy Strategy appendix list 1, are spelt correctly.</td>
<td>Some commonly used letters are correctly shaped but may be inconsistent in their size and orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses simple sentences structure in most of the writing. The structure is usually repeated.</td>
<td>Begins to show an awareness of how full stops are used.</td>
<td>Knows purpose for writing.</td>
<td>Some phrases &amp; simple statements are structured using recognisable words to communicate ideas; Writing can be understood without mediation; Uses some topic specific words.</td>
<td>Spells an increasing number of key words accurately; Makes phonetically plausible attempts at more complex words; Writes some CVC words correctly.</td>
<td>Most words have finger space between them. Most letters are clearly shaped and correctly oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses simple sentence structure throughout writing. The structure is usually A repeated.</td>
<td>Sometimes uses a capital letter and a full stop to punctuate a single sentence.</td>
<td>Makes organisational decisions about placing the writing on the page that are appropriate for the text type.</td>
<td>Uses phrases and simple statements to convey ideas; Makes some choices of vocabulary, including topic specific words; Writing may still be written for the writer, not for the outside reader.</td>
<td>Handwriting is legible despite inconsistencies in orientation size and use upper and lower case letters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements predominantly start with subject and verb although there may not be agreement; Writing is often a list of ideas joined by the word and; Writing resembles 2 span wnrirather oke C languageen th ttt</td>
<td>Some evidence of punctuation conventions are being used to demarcate units of meaning; Uses a capital letter and a full stop to punctuate more than one sentence.</td>
<td>Shows some characteristics of narrative and non-narrative writing, but the form may not be sustained, e.g. stories have a beginning but may not have an ending; Instructions have some imperatives; Makes some connections between ideas; A simple sequence may be evident.</td>
<td>The writing communicates meaning beyond a simple statement, writing is often a list of events. There are characteristics of the narrative or non-narrative form but this is not always sustained; Individual ideas are developed in short sections. Writing for a real purpose shows some awareness of audience; Vocabulary appropriate to the subject matter is used.</td>
<td>Handwriting is legible though there is still some inconsistent mixture of upper and lower case letters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Some sentences are extended and linked through a range of connectives other than 'and' although with some not</strong></td>
<td><strong>The writing communicates meaning with some consistency;</strong></td>
<td><strong>Most words in the National Literacy Strategy appendix 1 are known by sight accurately;</strong></td>
<td><strong>Handwriting is clear with ascenders descenders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sentences are sometimes demarcated by capital letters and full stops, distinguished; but not always accurately.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The organisation reflects the purpose of the writing, e.g. letter, list, story or poem; There is some element of sequencing.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Audiences and purposes; Vocabulary is appropriate to the subject matter and helps express ideas;</strong></td>
<td><strong>Generally, upper and lower case letters are mixed within the word.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of the present or past tenses.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stories have a strong opening and an appropriate ending although they may be simple; Uses simple conventions of non-narrative writing; Vocabulary choices support the organisation of ideas.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary is occasionally chosen for effect.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Some longer words show plausible phonic patterns and can be recognised. Spelling of many common monosyllabic words is accurate with plausible attempts at polysyllabic words.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Much more use of story language is apparent; Uses a range of simple connectives, but the 2ispflukence of ne A lanoguage may still come through, e.g. use of words like 'then' and 'so'; Mainly uses tense appropriate to the task.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sufficient detail is given in both narrative and non-narrative writing to hold the reader's interest; Ideas and events are mainly clear; Uses specific vocabulary in non-narrative writing to explain or describe.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evidence of joining.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Handwriting shows accurate and consistent letter formation and consistency of size; There may be some evidence of joining.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses simple and compound sentences with this simple connectives; Some use of pronouns to avoid repetition; Begins to show 3 somestency in 3 coe sise of the nth u first and third person; Pronouns and tenses are generally used consistently; Uses noun phrases with a greater range of vocabulary.</td>
<td>Mostly uses full stops and capital letters accurately; Punctuation other than capital letters and full stops is often used e.g. exclamation marks and question marks are often used accurately; Evidence of direct speech but may not be demarcated with speech marks.</td>
<td>Events are organised into a clear beginning, middle and end; There are simple connections between ideas that build to a story; Simple overall structure in non-narrative writing includes brief introduction or concluding sentences; Content sections mostly correspond to headings.</td>
<td>The writing shows some evidence of organisation, imagination and clarity; Some words are chosen for variety, interest or effect; Examples of interesting similes are present.</td>
<td>Beginning to spell words containing common prefixes and suffixes.</td>
<td>Handwriting is generally joined, but may distract from the overall regularity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Well-chosen words and phrases are used to connect ideas; There is good use of connectives moving beyond and ‘and’; The basic grammatical structure of sentences is usually correct; Use of pronouns and a variety of sentence openings to avoid repetition. | Uses full stops and capital letters accurately; Beginning to use speech marks for direct speech. | Sequences of sentences extend ideas logically; There is some evidence of paragraphing to organise narrative, Similar information is grouped; Some division between sections are indicated; Layout of non-narrative writing is signalled e.g. by heading, numbering, line breaks or paragraphing. | Writing shows a growing awareness of the reader; Simple imagery is used to create interest and make writing more ‘but’ stimulating; Some relevant detail is B contained within the writing; Vocabulary is interesting and appropriate; Points are dealt with in a sensible order though coverage may be brief. | Spelling is usually accurate, including that of common polysyllabic words. | Handwriting is consistently joined and legible. |
| Variety of sentence structures; and<br>Uses pronouns, tenses, noun phrases, simple<br>adverbs, a variety of adjectives and be<br>3 adversial<br>rb<br>A consistently; Subjects/verbs generally agree; Clauses are linked with words such as 'which', 'so'; Sentence openings highlight main ideas; Uses 1st/3rd person. | Secure use of commas in lists; Begins to use apostrophes for possession; Full stops, capital letters, appropriate in exclamation marks and question marks are used accurately; Speech marks are used to clarify where direct speech begins and ends. | Ideas are logically structured and the writing is drawn to an effective conclusion; There is a simple introduction and conclusion; Layout is consistently signalled e.g. by headings, numbering, line breaks or paragraphing. | Detail is used to create and sustain interest; Imaginative descriptions engage the reader e.g. a combination of adjectives creates a vivid picture; There is more detailed description of characters; Vocabulary is appropriate and becoming more ambitious; There is precise use of vocabulary for effect. | Most longer words are spelt using plausible phonetic structures; Words containing common prefixes and suffixes are spelt correctly. | Handwriting is regular with some flow movement; Letters and words are usually size and position but there may some variation. |
Appendix 13: WIDA performance definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELP Level</th>
<th>Performance Definitions</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Linguistic Complexity</strong>: A variety of sentence lengths of varying Linguistic Complexity in a single tightly organized paragraph or in well-organized extended text; tight cohesion and organization. &lt;br&gt;<strong>Vocabulary Usage</strong>: Precise vocabulary usage of needed general, specific, and technical language. &lt;br&gt;<strong>Language Control</strong>: Comprehensible in all cases; may have a few errors, but these do not interfere with reader understanding.</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Linguistic Complexity</strong>: A variety of sentence lengths of varying Linguistic Complexity in a single organized paragraph or in extended text; cohesion and organization. &lt;br&gt;<strong>Vocabulary Usage</strong>: Usage of technical language related to the content area and consistent use of needed vocabulary. &lt;br&gt;<strong>Language Control</strong>: Comprehensible in all but a few cases; few errors do not impede comprehensibility.</td>
<td>5+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Linguistic Complexity</strong>: A variety of sentence lengths of varying Linguistic Complexity; emerging cohesion used to provide detail and clarity, mostly organized. &lt;br&gt;<strong>Vocabulary Usage</strong>: Usage of specific and some technical language related to the content area; occasional lack of needed vocabulary. &lt;br&gt;<strong>Language Control</strong>: Generally comprehensible in all cases; few errors, but these do not interfere with reader's understanding of the overall meaning; such errors may reflect first language interference.</td>
<td>4+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Linguistic Complexity</strong>: Simple and expanded sentences that show emerging complexity used to provide detail, some organization, minimal copying or adapting. &lt;br&gt;<strong>Vocabulary Usage</strong>: Usage of general and some specific language related to the content area; some lack of needed vocabulary. &lt;br&gt;<strong>Language Control</strong>: Generally comprehensible when writing in sentences; comprehensibility may occasionally be impeded by errors when attempting to produce more complex text.</td>
<td>3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Linguistic Complexity</strong>: Phrases and short sentences; some text may be copied or adapted; little or no organization. &lt;br&gt;<strong>Vocabulary Usage</strong>: Usage of general language related to the content area; lack of needed vocabulary. &lt;br&gt;<strong>Language Control</strong>: Generally comprehensible when text is adapted from model or source text, or when original text is limited to simple text; comprehensibility of original text may be often impeded by errors.</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Linguistic Complexity</strong>: Single words, set phrases, or chunks of simple language; much text may be copied or adapted; adapted text contains original language, lacks organization. &lt;br&gt;<strong>Vocabulary Usage</strong>: Usage of highest frequency vocabulary from school setting and content areas. &lt;br&gt;<strong>Language Control</strong>: Generally comprehensible when text is copied or adapted from model or source text; comprehensibility may be significantly impeded in original text.</td>
<td>1+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 14: Allocation process

Full description of the method by which unbiased allocation to the comparison groups was secured

Participants were first stratified by class. In three of the four classes, they were then divided into two further strata (higher and lower attainment), based on school records of their existing writing proficiency. In the fourth class, existing levels of writing proficiency were sufficiently similar to make stratification unnecessary. The names of the participants were printed on strips of paper, each of which was folded in four so that names could not be read, then placed in one of seven cups, one cup for each stratum. A third party drew the names from the cups in turn without looking into the cups in order that she and I were not aware of how many names remained in the cup as they were drawn. The third party knew nothing of the characteristics of the participants or the study. The drawn names were then alternately assigned to the English-only or L1 group, starting with the English-only and continuing the alternation until all seven cups had been emptied.
Appendix 15: Children’s questionnaire

Name: _

How often did you read Good Night Gorilla at home?

- [ ] Every day
- [ ] Some days
- [ ] Once
- [ ] I didn't read it

Who helped you to read Good Night Gorilla at home? Tick all that apply.

- [ ] Mum
- [ ] Dad
- [ ] Brother
- [ ] Sister
- [ ] Someone else

Which language did you use when you read Good Night Gorilla?

- [ ] Only English
- [ ] Some English and some of my other language
- [ ] Only my other language

Student number: 114
Appendix 16: Parents' questionnaire

Dear Parents/Carers

Thank you very much for taking part in my project about home languages. I appreciate the time and effort you have spent with your child. Your help has been vital to the success of this project. The children wrote their stories today, and I am now looking forward to reading them.

I would be very grateful if you could spare a few minutes to answer some short questions about the project on the attached sheet. Your answers will be kept anonymous and your names will not be used anywhere in my dissertation. Your answers to these questions will help me to assess how successful the project has been and how the information gained can be used in the future to help bilingual children at school.

Thank you again for all your help and I look forward to reporting back to you in October.

Please return the survey to your child's teacher as soon as possible.

Yours faithfully

Xxxxxx Xxxxxxxx
English-only group

1. Please indicate how many times you shared Good Night Gorilla with your child over the course of the project. Please tick the box that applies to you

☐ Every day
☐ Most days
☐ Some days
☐ Once
☐ I wasn't able to share the story

2. Were you able to use only English when you shared the book? Please tick the box that applies to you

☐ Yes, we only used English to talk about the book
☐ We used some English and some of our home language
☐ No, we only used our home language to talk about the book

3. How important do you think it is for your child to develop his or her home language? Please tick the box that applies to you

☐ Very important
☐ Quite important
☐ Not important

Please use the space below if you would like to tell me anything else about your experience of the project.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.
L1 Group

1. Please indicate how many times you shared Good Night Gorilla with your child over the course of the project. Please tick the box that applies to you
   - □ Every day
   - □ Most days
   - □ Some days
   - □ Once
   - □ I wasn't able to share the story

2. Were you able to use only your home language when you shared the book? Please tick the box that applies to you
   - □ Yes, we only used our home language to talk about the book
   - □ We used some English and some of our home language
   - □ No, we only used English to talk about the book

3. How important do you think it is for your child to develop his or her home language? Please tick the box that applies to you
   - □ Very important
   - □ Quite important
   - □ Not important

4. Would you like more opportunities to do activities with your child in your home language? Please tick the box that applies to you
   - □ Yes
   - □ No

Please use the space below if you would like to tell me anything else about your experience of the project.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.
Appendix 17: Ethics form

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Application for ethics approval for a research project involving human participants

Undergraduates and Foundation Degree Students:
Before completing this form, the ethics review checklist (school form HSS.E1) should have been completed to establish whether this additional application for ethics approval is required. If ethics approval is required, you should complete this form, sign it and submit it to the Faculty Research Ethics Officer, Xxxxxx Xxxxxxx at xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.ac.uk. A decision form, E3 will then be returned to you by e-mail.

Master’s Students:
You should complete this form before you start your project and submit it to your supervisor. If he or she is unable to sign it at this stage, the form will be referred to the Faculty Research Ethics Officer, as above, who may seek further information and clarification from you. A decision form, E3, will then be returned to you by e-mail.

All students should refer to the University Code of Practice on Ethical Standards for Research involving Human Participants, available at www.xxxxxx.ac.uk/res/ethics and Faculty guidelines, which are included in the relevant on-line module or course handbook. You should bind a copy of the approved form in your final project or dissertation submission.
1. Name of Principal Investigator (Student): Xxxxxx Xxxxxxxx
   E-mail address: xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@mac.com

2. Name of Supervisor and e-mail address: Xxxxxxx Xxxxxxxx
   E-mail address: xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.ac.uk


4. Project Type (please specify course and give module number): Master's project

5. Background to and rationale of proposed research:
   Despite general philosophical agreement that mother tongue supports the acquisition of an additional language there is a paucity in the substantive, empirical literature to support this position in polylingual schools. I hope to add to the field by conducting an empirical study that informs decisions by teachers and parents of English language learners about how, when and if to use the mother tongue in learning English.

6. 'Gatekeeper' permission
   If you are conducting your research within an organisation external to Xxxxxxxx, such as a school or company, has permission been obtained?
   Written permission from the head teacher of the school in which the study will be conducted has been obtained. Attached.

   Attach a copy of the letter or e-mail giving permission

7. Methods of data collection:
   Questionnaire attached. Data on writing proficiency will be demonstrated through

   Attach a copy of your draft questionnaire, interview schedule or observation guidelines a written task.
8 Participants involved in the research:

Include the target number, age range, source and method of recruitment and location of the research

Children in Years 1 and 2 who are categorised as EAL in the school records of. Approximately 45 eligible participants. Xxxxxxx Primary School, Xxxxxx.

9 Are participants in a dependent relationship (as an unequal power relationship) with the researcher?

If yes, what steps will you take to ensure that participation is entirely voluntary and is not influenced by this relationship?

No. I will act as an outsider researcher.

10. Potential benefits of the proposed research:

I hope to add substantive evidence to the field of second language learning and provide clear advice to teacher and parents on how they might best help their children learn English and therefore improve their access to the British curriculum and their consequent academic success.

11 Potential adverse effects of the proposed research and steps to be taken to deal with them:

These are defined as risks greater than those encountered during normal day to day interactions and could include possible psychological stress or anxiety

I do not envisage there being any significant risks greater than those encountered during normal day to day interactions to any of the participants

12. Plan for obtaining informed consent:

Please attach copy of your participant information sheet and consent form

(Note consent forms are not needed for questionnaires)

I will convene a meeting with parents of eligible participants to explain the uncertainty surrounding the proposed intervention, explain my motivation for carrying out the research, and explain any potential benefits to children for whom English is an additional language. This meeting will be followed up with an information sheet reiterating the points made in the meeting, explaining the rights of participants, and making explicit what participation in the study will entail. All forms attached.

13. Steps to be taken to ensure confidentiality of data:

Outline steps to be taken to ensure confidentiality, privacy and anonymity of data during collection and publication of data

Names of participants will not be collected. Should any reference to individuals be necessary in the subsequent write up, the data will be anonymised.
Debriefing and/or feedback to participants

I will convene a debriefing meeting with parents of participants once the dissertation is complete. Those participants who wish to will be given the opportunity to read the dissertation when it is complete. A summary of the key findings will be written and sent via email or post to any participant who wishes to read it.

Data storage and security

All data will be stored on one encrypted storage system available only to the principal researcher and his supervisor(s).

All materials submitted will be treated confidentially.

I have read and understood the University’s Code of Practice on Ethical Standards for Research involving Human Participants

Signed: Principal Investigator / Student

Signed: Supervisor

Date: 17 January 2014
Appendix 18: Gatekeeper permission

Dear Xxxxxx

I confirm that I am happy for you to conduct research at Xxxxxxxx Primary with regard to EAL language acquisition.

Kind regards

Xxxxxx

> From: xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@mac.com
> Subject: Xxxxxxx Study - FAO Xxxxxx Xxxxxxx
> Date: Tue, 2 Sep 2014 10:32:56 +0100
> To: xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@hotmail.com