Translanguaging pedagogies in early childhood education in Luxembourg: Theory into practice

Claudine Kirsch

Abstract

Calls for multilingual pedagogies have reached early childhood education and some programmes have been implemented in Europe. However, their focus frequently remains on the majority language and home languages are given little consideration. For multilingual programmes to be inclusive and empowering, professionals need to break with monolingual practices based on monolingual ideologies. The resource-oriented pedagogy of translanguaging is one way in which professionals can give space to all languages, leverage children's resources, and contribute to their development.

This chapter presents the translanguaging pedagogy that early childhood professionals developed as a result of a professional development course in Luxembourg. Data stem from observations, video-recorded activities and interviews with four early years practitioners working in a preschool and a crèche. The findings show that the practitioners developed a positive stance towards translanguaging and multilingual education, learned to design a child-centred and holistic multilingual learning environment, and used languages flexibly, deploying translation, switches, and translanguaging. These dynamic language practices facilitated communication, participation, language learning, and well-being. There were differences between the practitioners' flexible language use. The professionals in the preschool did not use pair talk, switched less frequently to home languages, and used languages more strategically than the professionals in the crèche. The chapter gives insights into the implementation of translanguaging pedagogies in early childhood education multilingual contexts.

1. Introduction

Globalisation continues to increase the diversity of the school population. At the same time, the teaching of language and literacy is more tightly regulated and monitored (Dyson & Genishi, 2009). Scholars encourage teachers to adopt a 'language-as-a-resource' orientation (Ruíz, 1984) or build on the students' 'funds of knowledge' (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzáles, 1992) to capitalise on their range of language and cultural resources. The UN convention for the rights of children (Article 30, 1989) also notes the children's right to learn and use home languages at school. But education systems tend to privilege majority languages and legitimise monolingual, monocultural, and monomodal language practices (Seltzer, 2018). This may restrict access to the curriculum of multilingual students. A traditional monoglossic pedagogy neither leverages their resources nor contributes to raising their achievements. Studies systematically show that students of lower socio-economic status and ethnic minority background underachieve compared to others (OECD, 2015).

To tackle these inequalities, educationalists have called for multilingual pedagogies, which are inclusive, empowering, and supportive of social justice and social practice (García, Johnson, & Seltzer, 2017; Weber, 2014). Built on social-constructivist theories, they are learner-centred, call for dialogue, and give students some agency over their language choices. The dynamic and flexible use of one's semiotic repertoire, that is, translanguaging, is considered today by researchers as an essential component of multilingual pedagogies (García et al., 2017). Influenced by critical pedagogies and critical race theory, they attempt to challenge the monolingual ideologies and dominant discourses of language-minoritised children as inferior and deficient. The implementation of translanguaging pedagogies is difficult, among other reasons because practitioners need to have a good understanding of language learning and move away from monolingual ideologies and practices. Professional development is considered to be a key measure to promote change. Evaluation studies of professional development in the field of language learning indicate that training can have an effect on teachers' understanding of language learning, their skills in applying language-supporting strategies, and their practices (Buschmann & Sachse, 2018; Egert, Fukking, & Eckhardt, 2018). The present chapter presents the

translanguaging pedagogies that a preschool teacher and three caregivers implemented in a preschool (formal education sector) and a crèche (non-formal education sector) in Luxembourg while they participated in a professional development course. Early language learning is a challenge in this multilingual country where 62 per cent of the three-year-olds did not speak Luxembourgish as one of their home languages in the academic school year 2016/17 (MENJE, 2018). The findings of this study contribute to our understanding of the implementation of inclusive translanguaging pedagogies in early childhood education and care (ECEC).

2. Translanguaging pedagogies in the early years

Translanguaging has been continuously redefined in education, psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics over the last 20 years, causing Jasper (2018, p. 1) to speak of a 'discursive drift' and a possible loss of meaning. The term refers among other matters to the pedagogical practice of alternating between languages for input and output (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012) and fluid language practices of bilinguals (García, 2009). García et al. (2017) hold that all language users have a unique linguistic repertoire from which they select and combine resources to suit their needs. While the term translanguaging draws attention to the speakers' agentive behaviour and creative practices, it also acknowledges the effects of named languages and language ideologies on language practices and student achievement. García and Seltzer (2016, p. 23) therefore define translanguaging as 'the strategic deployment of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire to learn and develop their language repertoire, and at the same time work toward social justice by equalizing positions of learners'. This perspective has led some educationalists to develop a translanguaging pedagogy, which recognises the existence of multiple languages in educational institutions, attempts to leverage the students' unitary semiotic system for meaning-making and learning, and challenges the dominant ideologies and practices indebted to racist and imperialist perspectives (García et al., 2017).

A translanguaging pedagogy has three interrelated components; stance, design, and shifts (García et al., 2017). Stance is the teachers' commitment to draw on students' repertoires and consider them as resources; design refers to the way in which teachers plan to expose

children to several languages through input, activities or a curriculum that enables them to connect home and school languages; shifts denotes the teachers' abilities to adapt their teaching to the children's needs, for example, through translanguaging. Studies carried out in a monolingual preschool in France, dual-language preschools in the US, bilingual ones in Finland and Israel as well as multilingual ones in Luxembourg show, first, that teachers have a positive stance in that they embraced multilingualism, acted as multilingual models, raised the visibility of languages in the classroom, and encouraged the use of multiple languages (Garrity, Aquino-Sterling, & Day, 2015; Kirsch, 2017; Palviainen, Protassova, Mård-Miettinen, & Schwartz, 2016; Young & Mary, 2016). Second, they designed classroom activities that provided children with opportunities for multilingual and multimodal communication. Third, teachers, even those in dual-language classrooms where the school's language policy requires them to separate languages by time, person or subject, used languages dynamically (e.g. Garrity et al., 2015; Gort & Pontier, 2013). Several studies examined the types and the nature of teachers' language shifts. Gort and Sembiante (2015), who worked with U.S. preschool teachers, and Lewis, Jones, & Baker (2013), who examined the established pedagogy of translanguaging of primary and secondary teachers in Wales, both reported the use of code-switching and translation. According to García (2009), translanguaging can encompass code-switching but the concepts differ. While both refer to a language switch, the former focuses on the practice of moving between languages from the speakers' perspectives and the latter on the languages. Translation was also reported by Mifsud and Vella (2018) and Palviainen et al. (2016). While the preschool teachers in the former study in Malta frequently translated, the teachers in the bilingual preschools in Finland and Israel avoided direct translations to ensure that children listened to all languages and kept engaged.

Translanguaging pedagogies have the potential to be transformative and change the individual, educational practices, and possibly even society. Studies have shown that they promote language learning, general learning, and well-being as well as inclusion (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García & Sylvan, 2011; Lewis et al., 2012; Young & Mary, 2016). Professionals in ECEC settings have been shown to translanguage to facilitate communication and contribute to language learning. Others translanguaged to address the children's needs,

socialise them into new educational practices, help them position themselves, and connect home and school languages (García, 2011; Garrity et al., 2015; Gort & Pontier, 2013; Kirsch, 2017; Mifsud & Vella, 2018; Palviainen et al., 2016; Velasco & Fialais, 2018; Young & Mary, 2016). Others deployed translanguaging to raise the status of minority languages (Gort & Pontier, 2013; Gort & Sembiante, 2015; Palviainen et al., 2016) and challenge dominant practices (Young & Mary, 2016).

The transformative potential of translanguaging pedagogies has been the subject of much debate (Jasper, 2018; Poza, 2017). Weber (2014) suggests that translanguaging can only lead to cognitive, affective, and social benefits if it is framed within critical theories and used with reflection. Van der Walt, Mabule, and De Beer (2001) and García (2009) insisted on the strategic use of translanguaging, calling it 'responsible code-switching'. For language learning to happen, teachers need to monitor the quality and quantity of their language use and plan when to use each language (Van der Walt et al., 2001). García (2009) insisted that teachers and students need pedagogical opportunities to switch from the majority to the minority language and vice-versa. The need to monitor language use was similarly emphasised in early years contexts (e.g. Mård-Miettinen, Palviainen, &. Palojärvi, 2018). Hamman (2018) reported that translanguaging in a dual language context in the U.S. led to unequal participation. The majority language, in this case English, was used more frequently than the minority language Spanish. The English-dominant children had therefore more opportunities to show their expertise. The Spanish-dominant speakers were positioned as different, at times possibly even as less capable. It is therefore important that professionals analyse interactions at the micro-level, monitor language use, and reflect on language switches. The present chapter examines the ways in which early childhood practitioners implemented a translanguaging pedagogy in Luxembourg thereby paying particular attention to language switches.

3. Language learning in multilingual Luxembourg
Luxembourg, a small country that borders Germany, France, and Belgium, has three official languages, Luxembourgish, French, and German, with Luxembourgish being the national language. It is amongst the European countries with the highest percentage of non-national residents. Statistics in 2019 show that 47.5 per cent of the

residents do not have Luxembourgish citizenship (STATEC, 2019). It is therefore understandable that the linguistic landscape in preschools is highly diverse with children speaking Luxembourgish, Portuguese, French, languages of the Balkans and many others (MENJE, 2018a). This cultural and linguistic diversity has historical origins, is compounded by globalisation and reinforced by the high number of commuters, who come daily from the neighbouring countries to work in Luxembourg. As a result, societal translanguaging is the norm: residents use a range of languages depending on the interlocutor and the situation at hand. Multilingualism is also a key educational aim: children learn Luxembourgish, German, and French in the trilingual primary school (MENJE, 2018b). In ECEC, multilingual education became a legal requirement in 2017.

The government and the Ministry of Education (MENJE) took several measures to tackle the rapidly growing linguistic diversity in ECEC. First, they made preschool for four- to six-year-olds compulsory in 1992 and introduced the éducation précoce, an optional preschool year for three-year-olds in 1998. Teachers are in charge of preschool classes while a teacher and a caregiver (qualified educator) team-teach in the précoce. The national curriculum requires the professionals to pay particular attention to the teaching of Luxembourgish, perceived to be the language of integration and the jumping board to German taught in Year 1 and used as a language of instruction. Second, to counteract the consistently academic underachievement of students with low socio-economic status and migrant background (MENJE, 2018b), the government developed the non-formal education sector which takes place in out-of-school educational institutions such as nurseries and day-care centres. The objectives of the non-formal sector include the improvement of school achievement and enhancement of educational opportunities primarily through the use of Luxembourgish by children and the caregivers. Despite this monolingual focus, multilingual practices could be observed (Seele, 2016). Furthermore, as a response to the children's multilingualism and with the aim to encourage language learning as well as an openness towards languages and cultures in society, the Ministry of Education called for multilingual education in the formal and non-formal sectors. The Childhood and Youth Acts passed in 2017 require professionals to develop the children's skills in Luxembourgish, familiarise them with French, and value their home languages. In

2016/17, at the time of the data collection for our study, these projects of language laws figured prominently in the media and many professionals wished to prepare themselves for the anticipated changes.

The present study investigates and compares the translanguaging pedagogies of practitioners working with three-year-olds in an éducation précoce (formal education setting) and a crèche (non-formal setting) asking in particular:

- What are the professionals' perspectives on translanguaging?
- How do they organise a multilingual learning environment?
- When and how do they shift languages?

4. Methodology

The present case-study is part of the larger longitudinal research project MuLiPEC (Developing Multilingual Pedagogies in Early Childhood), funded by the National Research Funds and the MENJE. One aim of this project was the evaluation of a professional development path designed to help practitioners in formal and non-formal early childhood settings deepen their understanding of multilingualism and language learning, develop language supporting strategies, implement activities in several languages, and, finally, design a multilingual learning environment. The professional development path (thereafter PD), had three strands: a 15-hour-course in 2016, coaching, and six network meetings from September 2016 to September 2017. Forty-six practitioners took part in the course and seven in the whole PD. Details of the PD can be found in Chapter 12. Qualitative and quantitative methods were used to analyse the effects of the PD on the professionals' attitudes, knowledge, and practices.

The participants

The participants who are the focus of this chapter are the teacher Ms Clara and the caregivers Ms Jane, Ms Anna, and Ms Sandy. They are all between 30 and 39 and have more than ten years of professional experience. They all speak Luxembourgish, German, French, and English. Ms Carla and Ms Sandy additionally speak Portuguese. Ms Clara learned it from a family member and Ms Sandy has a migration background. Ms Carla and Ms Jane co-teach in an éducation précoce in

a preschool in the south of the country that caters mainly to children with ethnic minority background and low-income families. None of the children spoke Luxembourgish at the beginning of the school year. As a result, the practitioners focussed on Luxembourgish, thereby following the official language-in-education policy. Ms Anna and Ms Sandy worked in a crèche in the centre catering fto bilinguals from middle-class families of diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. The crèche functioned mainly in French because most members of staff were French nationals. As a result, most children developed receptive and some productive skills in French. Ms Anna and Ms Sandy had been hired by the director to speak Luxembourgish and familiarise children with this language. However, neither the children nor their colleagues understood Luxembourgish. They therefore translanguaged most of time, moving between Luxembourgish, French, and some of the children's home languages before the PD. Table 2.1 provides details about the participants.

Table 2.1 Overview of the participants

Teacher	School	No. of languages spoken	Qualification	No. of children	Home languages of children in the institution
Ms Clara	précoce	5	teacher	11	Portuguese, Cape Verdean Créole, French, Serbo/Croatian/Bosnian, Arabic
Ms Jane	précoce	4	caregiver		
Ms Anna	crèche	5	caregiver	15	German, French, Portuguese, English, Spanish, Italian, Swedish, Bulgarian, Hungarian, Luxembourgish
Ms Sandy	crèche	4	caregiver		

Methods of data collection
The present case-study draws on data collected over a period of one year. A research assistant, a doctoral student, and I observed and video-recorded daily rituals as well as storytelling, language activities, and creative activities. The video-recordings lasted between two and

20 minutes. Further data used in this chapter stem from six observations during the six PD sessions where the practitioners discussed video-recordings of their activities. In addition to the observations, the doctoral student Simone Mortini and I carried out 12 semi-structured interviews with the participants, asking among others about the children's and the adults' language use. Table 2.2 gives an overview of the number and types of video-recorded activities per setting and Table 2.3 of all data analysed for the purpose of this chapter.

Table 2.2 Overview of the video-recorded activities in the settings

Number of video-recoded activities	Story-telling	Language activities	Ritualised activities	Creative activities	Singing	Number of days of observations
Précoce	8	13	8	8	6	15
Crèche	5	10	4	6	9	14

Table 2.3 Overview of all data used in the present chapter

Data	Interviews	Video-recorded activities	Observations during the PD
Précoce	5	43	6
Crèche	7	34	

Methods for the data analysis

To answer the first two research questions in relation to the translanguaging stance and design, I drew on the interviews and the discussions of the video-recorded activities in the PD which provided insights into the language use and the participants' perspectives on language learning. In addition, I drew on the 77 video-recordings which were classified according to the setting and type. The classification included storytelling (e.g. a first telling of a story), language activities (e.g. looking at books, retelling of stories, acting out stories, discussion, games), formalised and ritualised activities (e.g. morning circle), creative activities (e.g. artwork), and singing songs. The transcripts were analysed through thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) with a focus on attitudes, practices, change, and purposes of their language use. The triangulation of data (Flick, 2011) revealed some of the

following themes: language learning, communication, the well-being of adults and children, rapport-building, teaching and monitoring of language use.

To analyse the language shifts, I conducted a micro-analysis of all observations, drawing on Seedhouse's (2005) 'sociocultural approach to conversation analysis'. First, I identified the multilingual modes of communication in adult–child interactions and the language-supportive strategies such as narrating, elaboration, repetition or gesturing (Andúgar & Cortina-Peréz, 2018; Gort & Pontier, 2013). To analyse the language shifts in more detail, I then used three categories: translanguaging, translation, and 'home languaging'. Translanguaging refers in my analysis to instances where adults and children make use of their entire semiotic repertoire. Translation refers to instances where a person translates key words or a sentence from a majority language to a home language or vice-versa. 'Home languaging' denotes situations where a practitioner switches to a home language for purposes other than translations. In such moments, the practitioner and the child may use the home language for several turns, rendering the interaction briefly monolingual. The overall conversation is, however, multilingual. My codes thus include translanguaging and avoid the term code-switching used by Gort and Sembiante (2015) and Lewis et al. (2012). While translanguaging, translation, and 'home languaging' refer to cognitive strategies, translanguaging can also denote the very space where participants dynamically use features of languages.

5. Findings and discussion

Reflecting the key elements of a translanguaging pedagogy (García et al., 2017), the chapter in the following sections illustrates the ways in which the four practitioners developed a positive stance towards multilingualism and design a child-centred and holistic learning environment before it explores the language shifts. The influence of the PD on the practitioners' representations and practices is outlined in Chapter 12.

Stance and understanding of translanguaging
All participants were positive about multilingualism in general but sceptical about multilingual education and translanguaging. However,

they developed a positive stance towards flexible language use over time (Kirsch & Aleksić, 2018). The perspectives of the practitioners in each setting will be described in turn.

At the beginning of the academic year 2016, Ms Clara and Ms Jane reflected on their focus of Luxembourgish and realised that they were influenced by the monolingual language-in-education policy and their perceived expectations of parents and teachers. They noticed that they nevertheless made space for multilingualism in free-play where they allowed children to use their home languages. They connected home languages with the children's well-being.

> The children feel more accepted and understood. Furthermore, they are less anxious when you explain what you want in their language. They develop a feeling of safety.
> (Interview Ms Jane, September 2016)

Although both practitioners understood some Portuguese, they only rarely spoke it in the classroom. They did so at the beginning of the school year to give some instructions but the observations in September 2016 showed that they mainly communicated in Luxembourgish although the youngsters did not seem to understand much. Having learned in the PD that translanguaging can improve communication, Ms Clara and Ms Jane began to use languages more flexibly. Once translanguaging had become a legitimate practice, the quantity of the adult–child interactions increased. Similarly to the study of Garrity et al. (2015), all actors learned through these multilingual interactions: in our case, the children developed some vocabulary in Luxembourgish and Ms Jane in Portuguese. She explained that she could not expect the children to be open towards Luxembourgish if she did not position herself as a learner too (interview, May 2017). Apart from developing language skills, the opening up to home languages resulted in a closer relationship with the children and more responsive adults.

> Ms Clara: I do not know how to say it, [I feel] less constrained by the need 'I have to focus on Luxembourgish'. One is freer. One notices more of the children and one can be more responsive at this moment. One knows them better and reacts differently.
> Ms Jane: But they reacted very differently too, I found, because we let them communicate in their home language with us and the children [peers].
> Ms Clara: We were very close to them.

(Interview, May 2017)

The situation in the crèche was altogether different at the beginning of the study. Although translanguaging was a daily practice—sticking to Luxembourgish was impossible because of the lack of language competences of the children and the staff—Ms Anna and Ms Sandy had ambivalent views. Ms Anna, who distinguished between children and staff translanguaging, realised over the course of the PD that children are 'competent linguists' (Flores, 2016), who 'use words grammatically correctly although they mix languages' (interview, May 2017). She observed that translanguaging gave children 'the possibility to express themselves', promoted language development, and enabled them to build a good relationship with the children (interview, July 2017). Regarding her own language use, she had never considered translanguaging as 'bad' but she thought at the beginning of the PD that 'it was not correct' (September 2017). Her views were influenced by the monolingual ideologies of the director of the crèche who encouraged a strict one-person-one-language policy, which contrasted with Ms Anna's practice of shuttling between languages. Upon reflection, she concluded that translanguaging had become so normal that she 'did not think a lot about it' and 'did not find it bad to switch languages'. She also believed that her translanguaging practice had enabled her to become 'more responsive to the children' (interviews, May and July 2017). Ms Sandy similarly changed her views on translanguaging. At the beginning of the year, she translanguaged automatically which she found normal, while also highlighting the importance of language separation to parents. Like the professionals in the crèche, Ms Sandy felt 'relieved' when she learned that translanguaging was a legitimate practice. She reported using her various languages 'naturally' to communicate, help the children make meaning, and ensure that they 'feel safe' (interviews, June and September 2017). In sum, the findings show that the practitioners in both contexts reflected on their language use and its effects, which, in turn, may have contributed to their positive stance towards multilingualism (Egert et al., 2018; Garrity et al., 2015; Peeters et al., 2014).

Designing a multilingual learning environment

By February 2017, the practitioners in both settings had succeeded in designing a multilingual and child-centred learning environment where children encountered multiple languages in planned activities and daily interactions. Their starting points differed yet again. Ms Clara and Ms Jane were used to planning in an interdisciplinary way and needed to learn to became more child-centred. Ms Anna and Ms Sandy were used to working in a child-centred way but not to planning language activities.

From the second trimester, Ms Clara and Ms Jane gave more space to home languages, letting children communicate and communicating themselves in these languages.

> Because we used to say, no, we speak Luxembourgish. (. . .) And we let it happen and we really let them talk in their home languages. During an activity, when you see that children do not understand, then you say it in their language.
> (Interview, September 2017)

Ms Clara and Ms Jane planned a book project which led to the production of books in Arabic, Portuguese, Cape Verdean Créole, French and Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian. Some parents offered translations and others came to school to read these stories. Ms Clara and Ms Jane narrated stories in three languages and reported that the children were 'very motivated and wished to say a lot' (interview, January 2017). In May, they taught a project on butterflies where children observed the development of living caterpillars. They narrated Carle's story of the hungry caterpillar in Luxembourgish and French, sang a Portuguese song, designed their own language games, and organised a range of art activities. They described the children's engagement as follows:

> You can see that the children really experience more and that they take it up in play. The following day, you can see that they are still thinking of the topic. It's impressive. They said during free-play, 'we want to play this' [a language game] and then they automatically used the vocabulary of the book, the story, the topic and they practised among themselves. And somehow, it was all more related, more connected.
> (Interview, May 2017)

In the crèche, Ms Anna and Ms Sandy had always narrated stories in Luxembourgish and French but from February 2017, they revisited

stories during the following days, added games, asked children to act out stories, sang topic-related songs in several languages, organised thematically linked artwork, and used relevant key words throughout the days. They also carried out activities based on a German rhyme to value one of the home languages of a German- and Spanish-speaking three-year-old named Oliver. Ms Anna recounted how this activity helped the boy open up to languages and express himself in his home language which he felt had a place in the crèche.

> He is content now because he opened up, and I found he participated so well in the activities with the snail, where he, I don't know, it seems to me as if felt valued, well, my language exists as well. Since then, Oliver talks, Oliver asks. Actually, he really asks many things, sometimes in German while I answer in Luxembourgish. But he also goes to Ines and asks things in French.
> (Interview, July 2017)

In both contexts, the multilingual environment offered children opportunities to connect different types of activities and different languages used previously only at home or in the institution (Andúgar & Cortina-Peréz, 2018; Gort & Pontier, 2013; Mifsud & Vella, 2018). As seen in the interviews, this language-conducive setting encouraged participation, promoted language development and contributed to children's well-being (García, 2011; Garrity et al., 2015; Young & Mary, 2016).

Analysing translanguaging shifts
The following sections present the ways in which the four professionals deployed translation, 'home languaging', and translanguaging.

Translation
Translation was a common feature in both educational settings. It was necessary because none of the children spoke Luxembourgish in the précoce and only two did so in the crèche. In both settings, translation happened across the different types of activities and throughout the year although its frequency diminished with the children's improving competence in the institutional languages. The four practitioners translated for different purposes, first to facilitate communication and ensure comprehension during explanations and while giving instructions. A typical example depicts Ms Clara requesting children in

14

Luxembourgish to choose 'the most beautiful colour' and draw. When they did not react, she translated these key words into Portuguese for one child and French for the other one (observation, 6 February 2017). The practitioners also translated from home languages into Luxembourgish. This was the case when some children offered utterances in Portuguese during storytelling activities which the professionals repeated in Luxembourgish. The translation enabled the non-Portuguese-speaking children to understand the message and provided input in Luxembourgish. Developing language skills was a second purpose of translations. In Excerpt 1, Ms Sandy and Ms Anna asked the children to describe snowmen on a picture. This fitted into the topic 'snowmen' where they built a snowman and sang songs in Luxembourgish and French. Ms Anna then asked Winston, a Swedish and French speaker, to identify a snowman without feet. The plural of the Luxembourgish word 'feet' is irregular which Winston may not have known. The boy pointed to a snowman with feet. The following conversation took place thereafter.

Table 2.4 Excerpt 1—The snowmen's feet, observation in the crèche, 13 February 2017

	Actor	Description	Utterance (Luxembourgish, French)	English translation
1	Ms A		Wat weis du eis, déi déi keng Féiss hun?	What do you show us, those with no feet?
2	W	points to another snowman with feet		
3	Ms S		Pas de pieds.	No feet.
4	W	points to another one with feet		
5	Ms S		Il a des pieds, lui.	This one has feet.
6	Ms A		Qui n'a pas de pieds, pas de pieds, pas de jambes?	Which one has no feet, no feet, no legs?

7	W	points to a snowman with feet		
8	Ms A	points to the feet	Il a des pieds, regarde. Seng Féiss	It has feet, look. His feet.

Noticing the incorrect answer, Ms Anna repeated her question in Luxembourgish and Winston made another incorrect guess. Ms Sandy tried to help by translating the key words 'no feet' (line 1) into French (line 3). When Winston yet again identified a snowman with feet, she explained that the snowman he pointed at had feet (line 5). Ms Anna asked her initial question again in French, emphasising the word feet and then adding the word 'leg' (line 6). When Winston still pointed to a wrong one, Ms Anna contextualised her utterance. She pointed to the feet on the picture, labelled the word in French and translated 'feet' back into Luxembourgish (line 8). Winston understood and pointed out a snowman without feet. In this event, the practitioners may have helped the three-year-old deepen his understanding of the concept 'feet' and learn the plural of this word in two languages. This example is one of many that shows that the practitioners used a range of verbal and non-verbal strategies to mediate understanding.

Home languaging
These switches happened across activities and throughout the year. However, they were more typical in the crèche than the précoce. Being influenced by the discourse of participation and well-being, Ms Sandy and Ms Anna regularly switched to home languages to be responsive to individual children and, in this way, value home languages, ensure participation, comfort children or get and sustain attention. For instance, the professionals had developed a good-bye ritual for German-Spanish-speaking Oliver. Every morning, once the parents had dropped him off, Oliver took a chair, moved it to the window and waited for his parents to wave to him from outside the crèche. During this time, Ms Anna spoke to him mainly in German. After this ritual, they joined the group and changed language.

Translanguaging
The most frequent use of home languages happened in the crèche during busy lunch situations when Ms Anna and Ms Sandy wished to get immediate attention. Excerpt 2 shows the flexible ways in which

Ms Anna used her semiotic repertoire to get the children to eat and use the cutlery appropriately. Ms Anna sat with a group of four children during lunch time. She initially spoke in Luxembourgish, the language she is supposed to speak, but switched to French, the commonly used language in the crèche, or the children's home language if the children did not respond. Oliver speaks German and Spanish, Tadeo Portuguese, Lia English, and Alice French. Most of them understand some French.

Table 2.5 Excerpt 2—lunch in the crèche, observation in July 2017

	Actor	Utterance (Luxembourgish, French, English, German, Portuguese)	English translation
		This video extract called 'multilingual interactions' is on the project's website https://mulipec.uni.lu.	
1	Ms A	An du hues mech Zopp gefrot, gell, Tadeo? Zopp iessen. Lia och. Tu as goûté?	And you asked me for soup, right, Tadeo? Eat your soup. Lia as well. Have you tried it?
2	A	Tu as goûté?	Have you tried it?
3	Ms A	Try it please. Just try it.	Try it please. Just try it.
4	A	J'ai goûté moi aussi.	I tried it, too.
5	O	Moi, j'ai goûté.	I tried it.
6	Ms A	C'est bien.	That's good.
7	A	Lia mange.	Lia's eating.
8	Ms A	Bien Lia!	Well done, Lia!

In Excerpt 2, Ms Anna addressed Tadeo and Lia in Luxembourgish, asking them to eat (line 1). As Lia did not try her soup, Ms Anna encouraged her in French. Alice repeated Ms Anna's question (line 2) but Lia did still not react. Ms Anna switched to English, Lia's home language, repeating her request (line 3). Alice and Oliver commented in French (lines 4, 5, 7) and Ms Anna praised Alice, Oliver, and Lia in French (lines 6, 8). As Tadeo was still not eating, Ms Anna encouraged him once again in Luxembourgish and Portuguese (line 9). A few minutes later, she tried to teach the children how to use their cutlery appropriately. In Luxembourgish, she encouraged Oliver to use his knife. Oliver repeated the word knife in German. She then added an

explanation on how to use this piece of cutlery in German (line 12). Oliver and Alice tried. Ms Anna praised the boy in German and Luxembourgish before she turned to Alice and praised her in French (line 14). The analysis of this excerpt shows that the children used their home languages while Ms Anna switched flexibly between the children's different home languages whenever she wanted to emphasise her point. She avoided translation. Excerpt 3 from the précoce, illustrates the ways in which both a child and an adult translanguaged while looking at a book during free-play.

Table 2.6 Excerpt 3—book reading in the précoce, observation in July 2017

The video extract entitled 'collaborative book reading précoce' is on the project's website.				
	Actor	Description	Utterance (Luxembourgish, Portuguese, English)	English translation
1	Ms C	pointing	Wat ësst deen?	What does he eat?
2	F		Uvas.	Grapes.
3	Ms C		Drauwen? Jo, et kënnen Drauwen sinn.	Grapes? Yes, these could be grapes.
4	F		Uva, net roud.	Grapes, not red.
5	Ms C		Nee, dat sinn d'Kiischten.	No, these are cherries
6	F	pointing	Kiischt. (. . .) Caracol	Cherries (. . .) Snail.
7	Ms C	pointing	Jo, do ass e Schleeck. En Heesprenger, gell, de sprengt.	Yes, this is a snail. A grasshopper, it jumps, doesn't it?
8	F	pointing	Oh, another one.	Oh, another one.
9	Ms C		Nach een. Schleeck	Another one. Snail.
10	F	moving like a snake on the floor	Oh, cobra.	Uh, snake.

11	Ms C		Nee, et ass keng Schlaang, et ass e Wuerm. Et ass e Wuerm. (. . .) Wat ass dat?	No, it is not a snake, it is a worm. It is a worm. (. . .) What is this?
12	F		Uh, roud e schwaarz.	Uh, red and black.
13	Ms C		Et ass roud mat schwaarze Punkte, mee wéi heescht deen?	It is red and has black dots but what is it called?
14	F		Eu não sei o que é.	I do not know what it is.
15	Ms C		Ah, weess du et net? Dat ass en Himmelsdéierchen. Joaninha.	Uh, you do not know? That is a ladybird. A ladybird.
16	F	pointing	Uh, do! Raup.	Uh, there! Caterpillar.

Felice used Portuguese to label words unknown to him in Luxembourgish (lines 2, 4, 6, 10, 19) or give an explanation in a whole sentence (line 14). He switched to Luxembourgish to mention words he had already learned such as some animals, colours, and numbers (lines 4, 12, 16), and repeated words offered by the teacher (line 6). He also mentioned some expressions in English (line 8), which he may have picked up from peers. In addition, he made use of non-verbal strategies such as pointing (lines 6, 8, 16) and imitating the slithering movement of a snake (line 10). Ms Clara used Luxembourgish to ask questions (lines 1, 3, 7, 11, 13), confirm (lines 3, 7, 9, 13), label, explain and suggest (lines 3, 7, 15), repeat (lines 9, 11, 15), reformulate or elaborate (lines 3, 13), and give corrective feedback (lines 5, 11). She translated key words such as grapes and snail into Luxembourgish, mentioning these words without insisting on Felice repeating them (lines 3, 7, 11). She also translated the word ladybird into Portuguese, possibly to ensure that Felice understood the concept (lines 15). Like

Felice, she also used pointing gestures. This excerpt is typical of situations of dialogic reading and other conversations and illustrates how adults and children weaved together multimodal and multilingual resources to communicate, negotiate meaning, and ensure comprehension. In this productive multilingual space, Felice was able to demonstrate his multilingual competence, encounter new words in Luxembourgish and deepen his understand of some concepts such as caterpillar and worm/snake.

Translanguaging differed in two respects between the précoce and the crèche. First, Ms Anna and Ms Sandy worked in a mainly French-speaking environment, and therefore systematically moved between French, Luxembourgish as well as home languages as illustrated in Excerpts 1 and 2. Second, they worked with the whole group unlike Ms Clara and Ms Jane who often split the class into different groups and worked alone with one group. Working in a team, the professionals in the crèche used 'pair talk' (Gort & Pontier, 2013; Gort & Sembiante, 2015). This happened frequently when Ms Sandy collaborated with her French-native colleagues. The colleague would communicate in French and Ms Sandy in Luxembourgish, avoiding translations. Excerpt 4 is an example of pair talk. Having taught the song 'head, shoulder, knees, and toes', Ms Anna gave instructions in Luxembourgish and Ms Sandy in French, thereby complementing each other. This bilingual space allowed the team to involve all children and manage the activity.

Excerpt 4—song, observation 16 January 2017
    Ms Anna: Nach eng Kéier. [Once again.]
    Ms Sandy: On essaie. [We try.]
    Ms Anna: Nach méi schnell. [Even quicker.]
    Ms Sandy (5 seconds later): Hah, plus vite encore. [Uh, even quicker]

In sum, the analysis of the language shifts indicates that the practitioners made use of translation, 'home languaging', and translanguaging. As such, our findings echo those of Gort and Sembiante (2015) and Lewis et al. (2013). Three types of strategies are used, at times in combination, and the frequency of translanguaging increased (and of translation decreased) towards the end of the academic year indicating that translanguaging practices are influenced by the children's language competence. Contrary to the study in

Wales, all our examples are at least bilingual. Our findings are also in line with those of Mifsud and Vella (2018) and Palviainen et al. (2016) who found preschool teachers translate to some extent.

6. Summary and conclusion

The project's findings illustrate that all practitioners developed a translanguaging pedagogy. They opened up to multilingual education and embraced multilingualism in daily interactions, and planned language activities. This happened both as a result of their deepened understanding of translanguaging and their experience of their newly developed multilingual practice. They observed that children opened up to languages and participated well in multilingual activities. They themselves felt free in their language use, developed a better relationship with children and became more responsive. Like the two multilingually oriented professionals in the study by Salem et al. (see Salem, Braband, and Lengyel this volume), they understood that languages were not only tools for communication and cognitive development, rather, they also helped children mark and develop a multilingual identity. Over the course of the PD, the practitioners developed a child-centred and holistic learning environment that gave children and themselves the space to draw on their linguistic resources and perform (or develop) their multilingual competence. The professionals moved flexibly between languages, drawing on translation, 'home languaging', and translanguaging. The flexible language use of the practitioners in Luxembourg was deliberate and associated with particular aims such as communication, learning, participation, well-being, and recognition of home languages. Similar purposes have been identified in other ECEC studies (García, 2011; Garrity et al., 2015; Gort & Sembiante, 2015; Kirsch, 2017; Pacheco & Miller, 2016; Palviainen et al., 2016). These encouraging findings contribute to the rare literature on translanguaging pedagogies in the early years and may be one of the first that illustrate the use of more than two languages.

Furthermore, our findings pointed to some differences between the settings, for instance the use of the home languages and institutional languages and the opportunities to use pair talk. The practitioners in the précoce communicated mainly in Luxembourgish and used Portuguese, shared by many children, and French as a scaffold for learning. They monitored their language use closely and tried to avoid

automatic switches. They deployed what I would call 'responsible translanguaging' (see García (2009) and Mård-Miettinen et al. (2018) on 'responsible code-switching'). By contrast, the practitioners in the crèche reported using languages 'naturally' and moving flexibly between French, Luxembourgish, and home languages. They seemed to monitor their language use to a lesser extent. Influenced by discourses of well-being and participation, their flexible language use aimed to value home languages and accommodate the perceived needs and interests of the children (Gort & Sembiante, 2015; Young & Mary, 2016). I would like to call this 'responsive translanguaging'. Drawing on research that relates language use to unequal participation (Hamman, 2018), I argue that all practitioners need to monitor their language use and use languages responsibly to ensure the inclusiveness of their multilingual pedagogy.

Although this chapter did not focus on the PD which helped the practitioners develop their translanguaging pedagogies (see Kirsch, Duarte, and Palviainen, this volume), this chapter does illustrate the effect of the PD: multilingual practices have been put into place over a period of a year. Looking at the arising need to monitor language use, one wonders how best to support the practitioners in their process of change. A combination of coaching, feedback on video-recorded activities, and training sessions may ensure their continuous professional learning (Egert et al., 2018).

References

Andúgar, A., & Cortina-Peréz, B. (2018). EFL teachers' reflections on their teaching practice in Spanish preschools: A focus on motivation. In M. Schwartz (Ed.), Preschool bilingual education: Agency in interactions between children, teachers, and parents (pp. 218–245). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3, 77–101.

Buschmann, A., & Sachse, S. (2018). Heidelberg interaction training for language promotion in early childhood settings (HIT). European Journal of Education, 53(1), 66–78.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching. The Modern Language Journal, 94(1), 103–115.

Dyson, A. H., & Genishi, C. (2009). Children, language, and literacy: Diverse learners in divers times. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Egert, F., Fukking, R. G., & Eckhardt, A. G. (2018). Impact of in-service professional development programs for early childhood teachers on quality ratings and child outcomes: A meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research June, 88(3), 401–433.

Flick, U. (2011). Triangulation Eine Einführung [Triangulation: An introduction]. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.

Flores, N. (2016, March 25). What if we treated language-minoritized children like gifted sociolinguists? [Web log post]. Retrieved from https://educationallinguist.wordpress.com/2016/03/25/what-if-we-treated-language- minoritized-children-like-gifted-sociolinguists/

García, O. (2009). Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2017). The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning. Philadelphia: Carlson.

García, O., & Seltzer, K. (2016). The translanguaging current in language education. In B. Kindenberg (Eds.), Flerspråkighet som resurs [Multilingualism as a resource] (pp. 19–30). Stockholm, Sweden: Liber.

García, O., & Sylvan, C. E. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. The Modern Language Journal, 95(3), 385–400.

Garrity, S., Aquino-Sterling, C. R., & Day, A. (2015). Translanguaging in an infant classroom: Using multiple languages to make meaning. International Multilingual Research Journal, 9, 177–196.

Gort, M., & Pontier, R. W. (2013). Exploring bilingual pedagogies in dual language preschool classrooms. Language and Education, 28, 223–245.

Gort, M., & Sembiante, S. F. (2015). Navigating hybridized language learning spaces through translanguaging pedagogy: Dual language preschool teachers' languaging practices in support of emergent bilingual children's performance of academic discourse. International Multilingual Research Journal, 9, 7–25.

Hamman, L. (2018). Translanguaging and positioning in two-way dual language classrooms: A case for criticality. Language and Education, 32, 21–42.

Jaspers, J. (2018). The transformative limits of translanguaging. Language and Communication, 58(1), 1–10.

Kirsch, C. (2017). Young children capitalising on their entire language repertoire for language learning at school. Language, Culture and Curriculum, 31(1), 39–55.

Kirsch, C., & Aleksić, G. (2018). The effect of professional development on multilingual education in early childhood in Luxembourg. Review of European Studies, 10(4), 1–18.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation, educational research and evaluation. International Journal on Theory and Practice, 18(7), 655–670.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2013). 100 bilingual lessons: Distributing two languages in 501 classrooms. In C. Abello-Contesse & R. Chacón Beltrán (Eds.), Bilingualism in a school setting (pp. 107–135). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Li Wei (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. Applied Linguistics, 39(1), 9–30.

Mård-Miettinen, K., Palviainen, Å., &. Palojärvi, A. (2018). Dynamics in interaction in bilingual team teaching: Examples from a finnish preschool classroom. In M. Schwartz (Ed.), Preschool bilingual education: Agency in interactions between children, teachers, and parents (pp. 163–189). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

MENJE. (2018a). Enseignement fondamental. Éducation différenciée. Statistiques globales et analyse des résultats scolaires. Année scolaire 2016/2017 [Preschool and primary school: Inclusion: Global statistics and analysis of school results: School year 2016/2017]. Luxembourg: MENJE.

MENJE. (2018b). Information about the PISA Study 2018. Luxembourg: University of Luxembourg. Retrieved from www.men.public.lu/catalogue-publications/secondaire/etudes-internationales/pisa-2018/brochure-en.pdf

Mifsud, C. L., &. Vella, L. A. (2018). To mix languages or not? Preschool bilingual education in Malta. In M. Schwartz (Ed.), Preschool bilingual education: Agency in interactions between children,

teachers, and parents (pp. 57–98). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. Theory into Practice, 31, 132–141.

OECD. (2015). Helping immigrant students succeed at school. Retrieved from www.oecd.org/education/Helping-immigrant-students-to-succeed-at-school-and-beyond.pdf

Palviainen, Å., Protassova, E., Mård-Miettinen, K., & Schwartz, M. (2016). Two languages in the air: A cross-cultural comparison of preschool teachers' reflections on their flexible bilingual practices. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 19(6), 614–630.

Poza, L. E. (2017). Translanguaging: Definitions, implications, and further needs in burgeoning inquiry. Berkeley Review of Education, 6(2), 101–128.

Ruíz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. NABE Journal, 8(2), 15–34. doi:10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464

Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation analysis and language learning. Language Teaching, 38(4), 165–187.

Seele, C. (2016). Doing education' between monolingual norms and multilingual realities: An ethnography of multilingualism in early childhood education and care. Gloucestershire: E&E Publishing, Stroud.

STATEC. (2019). [Institut national de la statistique et des études économiques du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg]. Etat de la population. [State of the Population]. Retrieved March 13, 2019, from https://statistiques.public.lu/stat/TableViewer/tableView.aspx?ReportId=12853&IF_Language=fra&MainTheme=2&FldrName=1

UN Convention Rights of Children, Article 30. (1989). Retrieved from www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/crc.aspx

Van der Walt, C., Mabule, R., & De Beer, J. J. (2001). Letting the L1 in the back door: Code-switching and translation in science, mathematics and biology classes. Language Teaching Journal, 35(2–3), 123–134.

Velasco, P., & Fialais, V. (2018). Moments of metalinguistic awareness in a Kindergarten class: Translanguaging for simultaneous biliterate

development. International Journal of Bilingual Education and
Bilingualism, 21(6), 760–774.

Weber, J.-J. (2014). Flexible multilingual education: Putting children's
needs first. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Young, A., & Mary, L. (2016). Autoriser l'emploi des langues des
enfants pour faciliter l'entrée dans la langue de socialisation: vers
un accueil inclusif et des apprentissages porteurs de sens. La
nouvelle revue de l'adaptation et de la scolarisation, 73, 75–94.