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Language is, and has always been, at the very core of all learning as in using (any) language to learn, and/or learning to use language.

Yet, for 21st century educators, the role and plurality of language and literacies have never been greater. Indeed, language and pluriliteracies are embedded in the meaning-making and deep learning objectives which underpin the principles of ‘Universal Learning Programme’ (ULP), as developed by the International School of Geneva-La Grande Boissière and UNESCO’s International Bureau of Education. ULP’s learning areas actively support and foster character, passion, mastery and collaboration, as well as the development of all seven of its key competences (including notions of ‘multi-literateness’ and self-agency). Whether considering ULP’s levels of knowledge building, or its necessary skills, processes and strategies, language and pluriliteracies traverse every aspect of learning and teaching crucial to the cultivation of ‘Universal Understanding’.

This report presents longitudinal transdisciplinary research set within the ULP context carried out by Fred Taveau, Head of Languages at the Ecolint School of Geneva to continue as world leaders in such pedagogic change, further research and dissemination of outstanding practice, coupled with a commitment to supporting teacher-led research with university support is critical.

The findings are extremely positive and lay foundations for inspirational ways of learning and teaching additional languages. They exemplify ULP principles and competences. The approach is embedded in academic literacies and making connections across languages (transdisciplinarity). The potential impact of this study on ‘making a difference’ to learners and on learning outcomes for a wide range of learners is fundamental to ULP and the world-leading reputation of Ecolint.

The study weaves distinctive theoretical strands as they impact on organic pedagogic practice; data chart the co-creation of learning spaces (between teacher and learners) where literacies and pluriliteracies evolve, interconnect and advance over time in bilingual classroom learning.

The study presents a meticulous and iterative construction of the language teacher’s Theory of Practice. It contributes to new understandings of what successful bilingual learning can be in under-researched contexts, i.e., language classroom practices.

Whilst this report focuses mainly on the teacher involved, the role of student voice and self-agency alongside co-ownership of learning comes through very strongly. The potential is immeasurable.

The findings demonstrate increases in learners’ measurable outcomes in terms of ‘higher than expected’ levels in writing skills whilst becoming ‘expert literary writers’. Importantly there is also evidence of learners’ transferable deeper learning.

Defining academic literacies within the field of language teaching requires mapping an alternative role for language teachers as creative literary writing subject experts in bilingual education. The study provides a clear pedagogic pathway towards deeper learning which the teacher himself called a ‘big, big shift’. This can be adopted and adapted by other staff.

The study weaves distinctive theoretical strands as they impact on organic pedagogic practice; data chart the co-creation of learning spaces (between teacher and learners) where literacies and pluriliteracies evolve, interconnect and advance over time in bilingual classroom learning.

The study presents a meticulous and iterative construction of the language teacher’s Theory of Practice. It contributes to new understandings of what successful bilingual learning can be in under-researched contexts, i.e., language classroom practices.

Whilst this report focuses mainly on the teacher involved, the role of student voice and self-agency alongside co-ownership of learning comes through very strongly. The potential is immeasurable.

The findings are extremely positive and lay foundations for inspirational ways of learning and teaching additional languages.
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II. THE STUDY

1. Context

11 Background to an on-going pedagogical partnership

Ecolint places great value on both research and professional learning and collaborating with academics has long been encouraged. The research team, formerly at the University of Aberdeen and more recently at the University of Edinburgh and the University of Namur, has enjoyed a rich on-going collaborative relationship with Ecolint over the years. This has involved professional development within the school focusing on CLIL and Plurilingual Education Modules, support for class-based research and staff engagement in higher degrees and partnerships resulting in two members of staff becoming members of the Graz Group (https://pluriliteracies.unc.edu). This high profile European Group formed six years ago to promote new theoretical and practice thinking in bilingual education is funded by the European Centre for Modern languages and the European Commission. Both Fred Taveau and Dunja Chamberlain, Deputy Principal have been practitioner-participants in the ECML/Graz Group and are also lead members of the ECML training team leading professional development programmes across a wide range of European countries for teachers, teacher educators and policy makers in Pluriliteracies education. Practitioner participatory research, including learners as co-researchers in classroom-based research is a priority of the Graz Group.

This study stands alone, however... It is an untold story because it focuses on the work of a language teacher (rather than a subject specialist) and in so doing provides a unique insight into how co-constructed classroom learning can be owned and advanced in partnership with learners to achieve the highest possible outcomes.

2. A fertile research context

Ecolint is a fertile multilingual, multicultural and intellectually curious context for examining connections of theoretical understandings with classroom practices. It provides a context for examining in-depth possibilities and potential of plurilingual learning using “hard to reach” data.

We believe the study makes a crucial contribution to the field of plurilingual learning for several reasons:

- the context for bilingual learning is situated in the language rather than the subject classroom; the language of instruction is a language other than English;
- the teacher and pupils work together as co-researchers enabling the teacher to articulate and interpret with learners how theories can translate into dynamic classroom practices and vice versa (Fullan & Langworthy, 2014); and
- it evidences how teacher exploration and adaptation of Pluriliteracies Teaching for Deeper Learning (PDLT) has the potential to lead to the development of learner language proficiencies (according to internationally-recognised norms) to unparalleled levels.

The phenomenon of change in our increasingly globalised economy and workforce constantly draw attention to the ‘super-diversity’ (Vertovec, 2007, p. 1024) of multilingual and multicultural learning contexts. Resulting ‘messiness’ has led to a ‘myriad of contextual variables that make comparison and generalisation a tricky business’ (Dalton-Puffer et al., 2014, p. 123) as well as continual calls for further research. In particular, an emphasis on the need for an evidence base into more longitudinal micro practices of classrooms in bilingual contexts consistently concludes published studies and articles.

Our case study is situated in the context of bilingual education where a Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) approach is used in specific areas of the curriculum. Coyle (2018) defines CLIL as a ‘dual-focussed educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language’ (2018, p. 1). It is in the classroom where the power dynamics of language-medium pedagogies are played out and require a shared understanding of deeper learning in CLIL classrooms – the positionality of which in this paper may be considered by some to be ‘ontologically disruptive’ – a point to be subsequently explored. In our view, quality learning involves deeper learning, defined as ‘the successful internalisation of conceptual content knowledge and the automatization of subject specific procedures, skills and strategies’ (Meyer et al., 2015). According to the National Research Council (2012), the product of deeper learning is transferable knowledge, including content knowledge, and an understanding of how, why, and when to apply this to answer questions and solve problems.

Much has been written over a couple of decades regarding the hybridity of bilingual education, e.g., García, 2009; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2010; Conaz, Genesee & Gartier, 2013; Dalton-Puffer; Llinares, Lorenzo & Nakula, 2014; Coyle, 2018. As the research base becomes increasingly expansive in CLIL specific contexts, current thinking relevant to its ‘evolution’ pertinent to this study focuses on: experimenting a practitioner interpretation of inclusive literacies approaches as the pedagogic mediator across languages and curriculum; and the distinctive role and contribution of language teachers to bilingual education. These elements underpin our research which to our knowledge is the first longitudinal study of its kind.

“It is not enough that teachers work should be studied: they need to study themselves”

Stenhouse, 1975, p. 143
2. Theoretical Positioning

Two research strands frame this study. The first involves a language teacher exploring a linked literacies approach for developing expertise in literacy writing for younger learners of French. The second charts the teacher’s articulation of a Theory of Practice which emerges whilst translating theoretical principles into pedagogic practice. We believe a Theory of Practice lies at the core of every individual teachers’ thinking and being. In order to contextualise the study, each strand will be analysed from a theoretical perspective prior to the presentation of the case study.

2.1 The role of (pluri)literacies for deeper learning

Increasing amounts of literature (Hornberger, 2003, p. 4) unravel how literacy practices impact on and shape learning from very different perspectives (e.g., Alexander, 2008; Gee, 2008; Hubert, 2013). Yet there remains a disconnect between traditional literacies practices which focus on developing reading and writing skills in the first language (L1) and those which increasingly take account of multiple literacies skills in other languages (L2) and across more advanced learning of different subjects (Huettner & Smit, 2014, p. 165). Morton (2018, p. 53) notes that in bilingual contexts, literacy-based approaches move away from the balancing of content and language forms towards a much deeper integration to support meaning-making across different subjects. This position aligns with Huettner and Smit (2014, p. 165) who identify a gap in ‘disciplines or subject-specific language and genre proficiency’ (Martin, 2009). However, bridging subject and academic literacies points to prioritising the role of increasingly sophisticated discourse embedded in discipline-specific literacies. Mohan identifies a need for:

- a language-based theory of knowing and learning that addresses characteristics of literate language use in all modalities, but a major difficulty lies in the fact that the L2 community cannot as yet readily draw on a theory of language that places meaning and content in the center of its interest. (Mohan et al., 2010, p. 220)

It is precisely Mohan’s call for a ‘theory of language’ which encompasses knowledge construction that led to the conceptualisation of a ‘pluriliteracies’ model for bilingual education. Whilst literature on the nature of discourse and subject literacies in L1 and across languages is well-documented and extensive (overview e.g., Hornberger, 2003; García et al., 2007, Gee, 2015) this has not impacted on reshaping ways in which L1 and L2 literacies together could support the development of integrated learning or CIUL in the classroom.

Moreover, the need to rethink language as a crucial semiotic tool for conceptual development as well as a communication tool, raises questions regarding how learners can access the type of language required to engage in processes of meaning making (Coffin & Donohue, 2018). Surface moves which rely on subject specific vocabulary and phrases alone will not enable individuals to build knowledge, refine skills and demonstrate their understanding – whether the language medium is the L1 or L2 for learners. From this perspective, Firearmers are to engage in deeper conceptual understanding (involving facts, concepts, procedures and strategies) they will need appropriate language, i.e., subject discourse, which in turn requires explicit instruction embedded in subject-specific contexts. As in L1 settings, CIUL contexts have to foster such conceptual understanding and equip learners with appropriate linguistic tools to communicate their understanding through language opportunities – the process of shaping subject or thematic knowledge and experiences through language (Swan, 2008).

Veel (1997) and Polias (2016) usefully define four activity domains common across all subject discourses/thematic areas, but each are culturally distinctive and cognitively distinctive depending on the subject discipline itself doing (procedure); organising information (descriptive, taxonomic, explaining (sequential, causal, rhetorical), functional, consequential explanation and exploration); and arguing (critical, challenging, exposition and discussion). These knowledge-building processes are activated and operationalised through cognitive discourse functions (CDFs) such as classifying, describing, defining, they lie at the interface between thinking (internal building blocks) and language functional building blocks, which are embedded in subject ways of thinking and behaving.

Building on these principles, a Council of Europe funded Initiative Literacies through Content and Language (ECML) led to an early dynamic teacher-learner learning partnerships (Meyer et al., 2018), and coherent vision for pluriliteracies learning across and within languages. This evolved (Figure 2) in terms of inclusive and dynamic teacher-learner learning partnerships (Meyer et al., 2018), where all four elements are integral to bilingual learning.

The aim of PTDL was to make transparent the interconnected and interdependent dimensions of learning which need to be activated and made explicit by learners and teachers working together (Fullan & Langworthy, 2010) in order to maximise the potential of integrated learning. Two dimensions in the first iteration of the PTDL model (Figure 1) focus on enabling learners to engage in knowledge construction (conceptualising) and demonstrating their understanding (communicating through meaning-making (content)) using explicit procedures associated with specific disciplinary literacies and their conventions (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012).

For the purposes of this study, the PTDL model identified key elements needing explicit attention by teachers to focus not only on subject literacies to support conceptual development but also on interrelated specific language functions to activate, sustain and deepen learning (Lantolf & Pueppke, 2014; Mohan, Leung & Slater, 2010; Gibbs, 2014) involving all four dimensions.

For Linzel lies the conundrum. We would argue that classroom realities for CIUL subject teachers do not prioritise the explicit development of subject literacies or cognitive discourse functions required regardless of the medium of instruction. For language teachers, developing awareness of ways in which language functions connect to subject literacies lies outside their regular frame of reference. Finding ways forward in practice is, therefore, fundamental to transforming and validating PTDL from a theoretical model into classroom-oriented ways of learning.
2.2 The role of language teachers in bilingual programmes

Focussing on the PTDL model requires a critical look at the role of language and language teachers. This raises tensions between the ways in which languages are formally taught, learned and assessed as curricular subjects, and an integrated approach to their development aligned with other academic disciplines. When language lessons focus on syntax, grammatical forms and social communication, they are not intentionally designed to develop specific subject literacies. Certainly, understanding language systems is important: learners need to increase their understanding of how the language structures operate – linguistically, socially, culturally in diverse ways and at different levels. However, this is not enough without an understanding of language use within the disciplinary field. Conversely, many subject teachers are unlikely to have an in-depth understanding of how language underpins their own discipline and the demands of task design which enable learners to ‘notice’ language (Juster, 2007), use it to language their learning and develop their linguistic skills and understanding. Moreover, the dominance of English as the medium for learning in bilingual classrooms (Heist & Cavalli, 2016), has marginalised contexts where Languages other than English (LOTE) are used as the medium of instruction (Dale, Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2017) and hence under-represented LOTE teachers in the academic and professional literature (Cross, 2016).

Whilst much has been written about teacher professional learning to encourage the principle of collaboration between language specialists and discipline specialists in bilingual education, little attention has been paid to the specific role of language teachers in developing integrated learning curricula (Rodríguez & Camaratas, 2009). Indeed, Dale, Oostdam and Verspoor’s (2018) recent in-depth study underscores numerous publications’ conclusions: we know little about language teachers since much more attention has been devoted to subject teachers. Their systematic review of the literature from 1989 to 2014 focuses on both pedagogical and collaborative practices of language teachers in bilingual streams. It explores how language teachers collaborate with subject teachers in terms of their ‘position and profile’ (Dale et al., 2018, p. 368), (e.g., supporting subject experts or designing language-oriented tasks). Due to the paucity of studies focussed solely on language teachers, the team reviewed those which addressed ‘convergence’ and included what they term as the ‘family of approaches’ in bilingual education. They selected four inquiry areas for analysis: language teachers’ language, content, pedagogical and collaborative practices in bilingual contexts.

This led to the creation of a framework consisting of two intersecting continua to organise the ‘multiplicity of possible language and content foci’ (Idem, p. 367) to support language teachers in making informed choices (Figure 3). The horizontal continuum travels from ‘content/meaning (when language learning involves form focus and grammatical awareness)’ (Idem, p. 376). The vertical reflects apprenticeship into discourse communities from general 1 ‘culture-specific’ language to more ‘subject-specific’ language (Idem, pp. 376-377). Each quadrant then combines the related theoretical orientations highlighted in the literature review. For the authors, ‘all four quadrants are informed by a theory of knowledge construction’ (Idem, p. 377).

From the literature, Dale et al. propose that language teachers may be positioned in different quadrants ‘with different learners or in different settings at different stages in their career’ (Idem, p. 378 and p. 379). They nevertheless stress that, regardless of a multiplicity of possible language and content choices, language teachers’ understandings of learning and teaching processes are linked to their disciplinary and cultural identities (particularly when they collaborate with subject teachers). This section has highlighted the complexities and impact of ‘changing contextual elements’ (Stfft & Uchida, 1997, p. 460) in the role of language teachers and their professional identities in CLIL classrooms. It identifies the need to confront these challenges and explore how these might contribute to enabling a repositioning of language teachers as critical to moving forward pedagogic agendas in bilingual education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant 1</th>
<th>Quadrant 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content/ Meaning</td>
<td>Language/Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature/ Language Arts</td>
<td>Subject-Specific Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Communication</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture-Specific</td>
<td>4 Subject-Specific Language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: A Framework for language teaching in bilingual education (Dale et al., 2018)
II. THE STUDY

3. Methodological considerations

3.1 The rationale for the current longitudinal research project

The research sought to face some of the challenging questions which tend to remain ‘invisible’. The study, therefore, investigated situated teaching and learning of pluriliteracies skills and deeper learning in bilingual education by concentrating on one middle school French language teacher in situ with his colleagues and different cohorts of his learners as co-researchers, over the span of three years. The research in this report focuses on one year, although the overarching research takes account of several classes throughout a three-year period - as shown in the photographs and illustration. The on-going ‘collaborative research’ (van Lier, 1994) involved data from multi-perspectival school and classroom-based sources, including learner voice reflecting on learning. The study focussed specifically on the case of the language teacher during one school year and examined with him how his practices evolved (e.g., his identity, pedagogical beliefs, understandings, roles, practices and classroom research) when exploring alternative practices with alternative goals.

The research questions were:

- How does enacting a Pluriliteracies approach for deeper learning influence a language teacher’s (re)positioning of his role within a bilingual curriculum?
- What is the language teacher’s emergent Theory of Practice which translates Pluriliteracies principles into classroom practices?

Case study, long used as method and methodology to capture the complexity understanding and enrichment of classroom practices (see, for example, Stenhouse, 1980; Merriam, 1998), remains relevant for its adaptive nature and for the scientific value of context-sensitive research (Schwandt & Galas, 2018). Miles (2015, p. 378) stresses that it ‘seeks to embrace complexity in the account and analysis of practice which is itself complex’. It is exactly the complexity of longitudinal classroom practices which is often absent from the literature. Appropriateness lies in how, as a study of practice, case study supports a ‘study of the practitioners’ actions and their theories they hold about their actions’ (Corcoran et al., 2004, p. 8). In defence of its lack of generalisability potentially perceived as weakness, Miles (2015, p. 378) insists with Wylyarg (2001, 2006) and Thomas (2010) that generalisability is ‘not only unattainable but detracts from the purpose, value and insight to the local, particular and practical that is the strength of case study’.

Our case study was both ‘reflective’ and ‘collaborative’ (Hamilton & Corbett Whitter, 2015); reflective in that it emphasised the language teacher’s personal and evaluative reflection through the methods, types and use of data collected and analysed; and collaborative in how it aligned with our chosen positionality, that of outsiders ‘critical friends’ (Corcoran et al., p. 10) collaborating with the language teacher/co-researcher. Furthermore, co-constructing understandings of the rich data collected was supported by a transactional approach to interpretive inquiry where researchers have ‘personal interaction with the case’ (Huyet, Konny, & Dickerson-Swift, 2014, p. 2). Triangulation and external validation emerged through using internationally recognised testing materials to measure proficiency in language levels. This allowed for further data-driven reflection: it enabled a comparison between teacher expectations and learner achievement in the testing environment.

“...this is a big, big shift from traditional Modern Languages teaching! It’s not to follow a grammatical spine, but to think of what kind of critical thinking and concepts children have cognitively and why not applying them to the L2 classes.” (TR1, p. 1)

3.2 The Study: The language teacher and his context

As underlined from the onset of this report, Ecolint places value on both research and professional learning and collaborating with academics is encouraged. Since 2014, he and the Deputy Principal in charge of the curriculum and monitoring Science in the bilingual stream have been practitioner-participants in the ECMU/Graz Group Pluriliteracies transnational group of educators and researchers, described previously. Both educators were therefore familiar with the theoretical underpinning of PTDL.

The study took place during one school year in a timetabled French language class. The language teacher focused on a cohort of Year 7 (11-12 year old) False Beginner learners in a bilingual stream, where the primary language of instruction was English. Most in the cohort were in their second year of learning French as an L2. There were 22 learners (10 girls and 12 boys). They were from diverse backgrounds (with 11 different home languages other than English) and were in a non-selected, mixed ability group. The French L2 course consisted of 5 periods of 45 minutes per week. The language teacher worked within the ‘boundaries’ of the timetabled L2 course and respected the school’s curricular objectives and obligations. From the ‘General Departmental Units’ (see Appendix I) the French L2 based on grammatical structures and linguistic competences (Je présente, Voyager/ Découvrir l’environnement, Voyager et communiquer) created four specific units of work for language as a subject, i.e., literature and literary writing. These were: literary portraits; landscape descriptions; Gothic Stories; and Travel Diaries. The learners’ other school exposure to French was during their science course.

3.3 Methods

Baseline reflective data consisted of the following:

- Teacher reflective interviews: Three unstructured interviews (Appendix 2) were conducted with the language teacher at the start of the study to enable him to articulate founding principles that guide his work. They explored the language teacher’s pedagogical beliefs, experience, evolution and current practice. The interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim (TR1, 2 and 3).
- Teacher-Researchers learning conversations: Notes were co-produced from 16 learning conversations (one in person and five over Skype) between the language teacher and researchers throughout the study to identify and discuss key strands and principles of his emergent Theory of Practice. See Figure 4 below for an example of co-produced notes. Additionally, conversations were recorded and significant reflective segments were selectively (Davidson, 2009) transcribed (TR4).

Supplementary data collected by the language teacher are referenced by him in the baseline reflective data which illustrated examples from his classroom practice (note: these were not analysed for this study). These included teacher fieldnotes, classroom artifacts, documents and texts as well as the internal use of DULF (Exemplar of studies on language français) French language tests which were administered at several points during the year by the language teacher. The results provided quantitative data objectifying the learners’ progress in certain linguistic skill sets according to internationally recognised norms, i.e., corresponding to the Council of Europe’s Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR).
3.4 Analysis

The data from these mixed sources were varied and rich, but also extensive. Analysis was conducted using a three-stage process, centring the language teacher/co-researcher at a theoretical intersection of both Dale et al.’s (2018) framework (Q1) and the PTDL model (2018) (Q2). Using these two as interconnected analytical tools, an iterative ‘spiral’ of analysis with several ‘loops’ (Creswell, 2013, p. 182) between us as co-researchers with feedback from the language teacher, allowed for inclusive member reflections (Troch, 2010; 2013) as validation of interpretation and co-construction of understandings.

Stage one

First, in relation to Dale et al.’s (2018) framework, the language teacher’s approach to teaching his ‘new’ course did not ‘fit neatly’ into one prominent quadrant; rather, his work seemed to touch upon aspects of all four quadrants. The first stage of analysis, therefore, necessitated widening the elements of the framework, as well as combining them with features of the PTDL model (Meyer et al., 2018). They were thereby centred on the language teacher’s teaching reality presented in Figure 5.

The language teacher’s shift from teaching a more ‘traditional’ language course involved him defining his ‘subject’ as Literary Writing. This choice is placed in Quadrant 1, Literature/Language Arts as a ‘departure point’ linked to the language teacher’s ‘background and preferences’ (Dale et al., 2018, p. 377).

It then allowed labelling the other three quadrants in dynamic relation to the transitioned orientation given to his course. These became:

- Quadrant 2, Language and Communication: Developing language skills: focus on communication and form;
- Quadrant 3, Content Support: Conceptualising literary expertise and descriptive, creative and persuasive writing styles;
- Quadrant 4, Subject-specific language: Developing language skills: focus on genres and discourse functions for literary experts.

Viewing his ‘subject’ through a (pluri)literacies prism further impacted on other parts of the adapted framework. A dashed line around the framework represents ‘all four quadrants’ being ‘informed by’ the language teacher’s translation of a PTDL approach as ‘a theory of knowledge construction’ (Dale et al., 2018, p. 377). Importantly, a central point at the intersection of the axes reflects what the language teacher calls his own evolving ‘mindset’ that is ‘growing or deeper’ (TR4, p. 2) as being at the core of adopting a (pluri)literacies-based approach to his pedagogical practices. Arrows from the core and traversing the four quadrants represent the language teacher’s ‘emergent Theory of Practice’ (TR18, p. 5) on opportunities to foster potential transferability of skills and meaning making to other languages, cultures and subjects.

Stage two

The second analytical stage involved thematic content analysis of the baseline reflective data using the adapted framework as an analytical tool. The four quadrants each served as categories and were populated with data chunks in the form of four display tables (one per quadrant) thereby making the interactive nature of the data evident. Data links and overlaps to other quadrants were identified and added to the tables. Next, a fifth category was created and populated with reflective data related to the language teacher’s Mindset/Pedagogical beliefs/Understandings. This, as emphasised previously, is at the core of the analytical tool and is central to influencing how he has proceeded for adopting and enacting a (pluri)literacies-based approach to his pedagogical practices. It therefore impacts on all four of the quadrants being analysed.

In order to visualise this process, Figure 6 situates the tables superposed onto the analytic tool as an overview. Short extracts of data from each quadrant, as well as of the central data display table are displayed in Appendix 2.
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Table 1: The four PTDL dimensions articulated with the language teacher’s emergent Theory of Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrating Understanding</th>
<th>Generating and Sustaining Commitment and Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose—generating mindset-promoting understanding</td>
<td>affect—engagement—reflectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate their development and progress/expertise as fiction writers involves demonstrating language understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose: developing expertise—literary writers leading fiction writer’s purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptions (e.g. creating a character with life)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement through constant dialogue normalising learner analysis of communication, creativity, concept of expert fiction writer, motivation through revisiting-application ownership of the learning</td>
<td>reduce ‘fear’ of making mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery—sense of achievement through developing ‘pluriliteracies reflex’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making progression visible: making skills explicit (i.e. this is what a writer needs) and gaining a sense of achievement through feedback and peer support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy skills (language knowledge) (e.g. Gothic texts to evoke fear)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential cognitive challenge: real life applications, creatively recognising and using learner maturity (i.e. affect—avoiding patronising and debilitating experience) (Quadrant 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing cognitive challenge: real life applications, creatively recognising and using learner maturity (i.e. affect—avoiding patronising and debilitating experience)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making progress visible: making skills explicit (i.e. this is what a writer needs) and gaining a sense of achievement through feedback and peer support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring—partnership, connectedness, sharing, making progress visible, making skills explicit (i.e. this is what a writer needs) and gaining a sense of achievement through feedback and peer support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generative Learning and Personal Growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scaffolding-feedback-assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching: developing learning across disciplines for transfer and making sense of it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring—awareness of conditions for learning and ways to design it and role of spontaneously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding—articulating concepts (e.g. Gothic;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinements and repositioning in relation to the four quadrants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding should be co-constructed: dynamic scaffolding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Making sense—articulating concepts (e.g. Gothic; reflecting on Gothic; reflecting on Gothic;)
| Scaffolding should be co-constructed: dynamic scaffolding |
| Strategies—iterative scaffolding (Quadrant 2) |
| Strategies—iterative scaffolding (Quadrant 2) |
| Literacy skills (subject knowledge) (e.g. Gothic; |
| Literacy skills (subject knowledge) (e.g. Gothic; |
| Transfer—e.g. from Gothic; to Landscape to Travel Diaries (Quadrant 2) |
| Transfer—e.g. from Gothic; to Landscape to Travel Diaries (Quadrant 2) |
| External assessment |
| External assessment |
| Austin Butterfly type feedback from T, deep reflection and critical self-assessment |
| Assessment—collective agreement for criteria for assessment, protocol for peer and teacher assessment/modeling good practice, use of tools and buddies, checklists and rubrics |
| External assessment—use of Delf to validate achievements demonstrating progression from A1 to B1 |
| 4. Findings and discussion |

Data provide us with deep insights into the teacher’s own professional learning and being (i.e. his identity, pedagogical beliefs, understandings, roles, practices and classroom research) which in turn contribute to a realistic understanding of the development of pluriliteracies skills of his learners. Returning to the two research questions, we now present our findings.

Research Question 1

The first research question examines how enacting a Pluriliteracies approach for deeper learning influences the language teacher’s (re)positioning of his role within a bilingual curriculum.

From the first reflective interview, the language teacher emphatically stated the stage for how he perceives his role, professional identity, and teaching role have transitioned and evolved through enacting PTDL with his learners. He stated:

Well, it’s a big, big shift from traditional Modern Languages teaching! It’s not to follow a grammatical spine, but to think of what kind of critical thinking and concepts children have cognitively and why not applying them to the L2 classes. [TRL, p. 1]
These movements in fact zigzag organically – but purposefully – amongst the quadrants, intertwining them vertically and horizontally. The language teacher positions and repositions himself as (1) a motivator of learner engagement, (2) responds to their needs and (3) scaffolds their developing abilities for doing. Organizing, Explaining, Arguing (cf. Figure 1), thereby mentoring their learning and supporting sustained engagement. The following examples evidence the language teacher’s development of Gothic-style literary writing with the learners and illustrate such organic movement between the quadrants (see Table 2 below).

To summarise, through rethinking his teaching through expanding classroom practices for developing pluriliteracies, the language teacher shifted his role from being a more ‘traditional language teacher’ to that of an expert in literary writing. This transformation continuously required repositioning himself to identify, develop and evaluate the necessary academic literacy skills for empowering his learners to be and become ‘expert’ literary writers. It dynamically shifted ways in which the teacher and learners worked together and the nature of languages used for enacting ‘contextual’PDML approach, which will be further discussed in the next section.

Table 2: Examples of data to illustrate language teacher repositioning amongst the quadrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant 1</th>
<th>Literary/Language Arts</th>
<th>Research Question 1</th>
<th>Examples regarding Gothic-style Literary Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language and Communication with Quadrant 4</td>
<td>Content support</td>
<td>- With the learners, we have created this Gothic and for the purpose of ‘How far can you go when you describe the landscape?’ I mean that’s the first verse we used with anxiety really. What does that imply emotionally? What does that imply internally of response to the environment you are looking at? Is there an interaction between the individual and the environment? All these are quite higher order thinking skills and concepts and yet we never approach them in the language classroom. [TR1, p. 1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrant 3</td>
<td>Content support, intertwining horizontally with Quadrant 3</td>
<td>Subject-specific language</td>
<td>- ...using senses, using not just one, but all the senses, using metaphors, using the vertical and horizontal structure almost of the camera and the different depths of field, [so that] they can apply that without being prompted to any landscape. [TR1, p. 4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrant 2</td>
<td>Language and Communication</td>
<td>Research Question 2</td>
<td>What is the language teacher’s emergent Theory of Practice which translates Pluriliteracies principles into classroom practices? It charts the evolution and experimentation of exploratory as well as adaptive ‘tried and tested’ micro pedagogies. The data illustrate how the language teacher adjusted his regular language learning repertoire into those embedded in the ‘subject’ of Literary Writing. These add further nuances to the PDML synthesis according to the four dimensions presented in Table 1. The four dimensions serve as an analytical framework for the data as four key conceptual orientations emerge: shifting what the learners do as their language learning is extended into subject learning; developing literacy practices guided by PDML principles; facilitating deep learning through pedagogical exploration; articulating his professional understanding and engaging in critical reflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrant 3</td>
<td>Content support, intertwining diagonally with Quadrant 4</td>
<td>Subject-specific language</td>
<td>- ...the idea, for example, with landscapes [is] that, How do you structure in terms of how you’re connecting a tic or a habit or even a physical feature down to a past event? What would we need to do this? ‘We’ll need to write in the past’. ‘Oh, voila. We better work on that!’ [TR2, p. 4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrant 1</td>
<td>Literary/Language Arts</td>
<td>Research Question 2</td>
<td>What is the language teacher’s emergent Theory of Practice which translates Pluriliteracies principles into classroom practices? It charts the evolution and experimentation of exploratory as well as adaptive ‘tried and tested’ micro pedagogies. The data illustrate how the language teacher adjusted his regular language learning repertoire into those embedded in the ‘subject’ of Literary Writing. These add further nuances to the PDML synthesis according to the four dimensions presented in Table 1. The four dimensions serve as an analytical framework for the data as four key conceptual orientations emerge: shifting what the learners do as their language learning is extended into subject learning; developing literacy practices guided by PDML principles; facilitating deep learning through pedagogical exploration; articulating his professional understanding and engaging in critical reflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrant 2</td>
<td>Language and Communication</td>
<td>Research Question 2</td>
<td>What is the language teacher’s emergent Theory of Practice which translates Pluriliteracies principles into classroom practices? It charts the evolution and experimentation of exploratory as well as adaptive ‘tried and tested’ micro pedagogies. The data illustrate how the language teacher adjusted his regular language learning repertoire into those embedded in the ‘subject’ of Literary Writing. These add further nuances to the PDML synthesis according to the four dimensions presented in Table 1. The four dimensions serve as an analytical framework for the data as four key conceptual orientations emerge: shifting what the learners do as their language learning is extended into subject learning; developing literacy practices guided by PDML principles; facilitating deep learning through pedagogical exploration; articulating his professional understanding and engaging in critical reflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrant 1</td>
<td>Literary/Language Arts</td>
<td>Research Question 2</td>
<td>What is the language teacher’s emergent Theory of Practice which translates Pluriliteracies principles into classroom practices? It charts the evolution and experimentation of exploratory as well as adaptive ‘tried and tested’ micro pedagogies. The data illustrate how the language teacher adjusted his regular language learning repertoire into those embedded in the ‘subject’ of Literary Writing. These add further nuances to the PDML synthesis according to the four dimensions presented in Table 1. The four dimensions serve as an analytical framework for the data as four key conceptual orientations emerge: shifting what the learners do as their language learning is extended into subject learning; developing literacy practices guided by PDML principles; facilitating deep learning through pedagogical exploration; articulating his professional understanding and engaging in critical reflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrant 3</td>
<td>Content support, intertwining diagonally with Quadrant 2</td>
<td>Subject-specific language and Quadrant 4</td>
<td>- I ask the students, ‘What are you trying to do? Are you arguing? Are you emphasizing? Are you trying to qualify something? Okay, so, within that, what would you need? And they could sense some starters and then really, then you build up the vocabulary. But once you’ve got this in place, the concept, I would say, the framework of the concept is in place, the child is then ready for communication. [TR1, p. 3]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This benchmarking led to unexpected outcomes: “[T]he expectations for the group at the end of the school year would have been a level A2 for all, with some reaching a level B1 or showing signs of level B2. The analysis showed that most reached level B1 earlier in the year with even some signs of B2 sporadically.” (TR[3, p. 3]) These “results” can be interpreted as indicators of achievement rather than attainment since they are embedded in an ecologically driven dynamic classroom which takes account of all learning dimensions (PTDL). Nonetheless, the levels are indicative of how alternative pedagogies have the potential to lead to advances in progression according to normative measures. Additionally, the language teacher points to affective, motivational effects, for example:

“...I tended to be a bit too directive last year... ‘To be in the mindset of a novelist, a writer, this is what you need to do’. ... But with this year’s group I am trying to get this to come out of them more, so doing in reverse.” (TR[2, p. 1])

This resonates with ULP which emphasizes the need to develop universal understanding of the definition of disciplinary literacies.

For him, it starts with a vision: allowing oneself to move away from any monocultural approach, or national system approach to language teaching... “[T]he emergent Theory of Practice” involves willingness for spontaneity, noticing and engaging in critical reflection: “The difficulty was to translate intuition into practice” (TR[3, p. 2]). It’s a mindset. And you have to be a risk-taker. The moment you go into research there are things you find out about your teaching which are not always pleasant but you move on.” (TR[3, p. 2])

In terms of transforming theories into practices, he asks himself: “How can the learners communicate what is happening in terms of cognition?” He emphasizes that it is crucial when concepts or skills are transferred. “...That’s [in] my view when deeper learning has taken place... when you think you have done and dusted something, the kids will come up with the bridge - opening a door onto something else. And it’s about giving the onus to the children to keep opening the doors.” (TR[2, p. 5])

When a child can move from one concept and take that concept to a completely different context... “...that’s when deeper learning has been taking place. For more important than... ‘oh a nice strong subjunctive there?’” (TR[2, p. 6])

His understanding of the need to develop growth mindsets in his learners is also reflected upon:

“Propelled by the need to ensure that learner achievement is celebrated alongside attainment and to inspire learners to take ownership of a drive to learn, the language teacher suggests that ‘in the end their communicating is being transformed’” (TR[3, p. 2]). “We’ve got a protocol of peer assessment in French and that means criticism is always constructive and positive.” (TR[4, p. 3])

The fourth orientation has driven the language teacher’s Theory of Practice through articulating professional understanding and engaging in critical reflection. “...the difficulty was to translate intuition into practice.” (TR[3, p. 2]) It’s a mindset. And you have to be a risk-taker. The moment you go into research there are things you find out about your teaching...” (TR[3, p. 2])

For him, it starts with a vision: allowing oneself to move away from any monocultural approach, or national system approach to language teaching... “[T]he emergent Theory of Practice” involves willingness for spontaneity, noticing and engaging in critical reflection: “The difficulty was to translate intuition into practice” (TR[3, p. 2]). It’s a mindset. And you have to be a risk-taker. The moment you go into research there are things you find out about your teaching...” (TR[3, p. 2])

For him, it starts with a vision: allowing oneself to move away from any monocultural approach, or national system approach to language teaching... “[T]he emergent Theory of Practice” involves willingness for spontaneity, noticing and engaging in critical reflection: “The difficulty was to translate intuition into practice” (TR[3, p. 2]). It’s a mindset. And you have to be a risk-taker. The moment you go into research there are things you find out about your teaching...” (TR[3, p. 2])

Furthermore, the language teacher’s emergent Theory of Practice involves willingness for spontaneity, noticing and engaging in critical reflection: “The difficulty was to translate intuition into practice” (TR[3, p. 2]). It’s a mindset. And you have to be a risk-taker. The moment you go into research there are things you find out about your teaching...” (TR[3, p. 2)]
5. Conclusions

5.1 A Theory of Practice as the medium for pedagogic transitioning

The outcomes of the study are summarised using the language teacher’s own words as a ‘big, big shift’. It symbolises the language teacher’s own growth-mindset and pedagogical willingness, openness and curiosity to experience that enabled him to stretch his professional identity and rethink his role. It is not a shift from ‘A’ to ‘B’, but rather an evolving dynamic guided both by intuition – a continuous desire to improve his teaching – and new understandings nurtured through the development of a CALL/PTDL theoretical framing for his work. Using PTDL as a guide, his teaching moves around the four quadrants of the adapted Dale et al.’s framework (Figure 4), drawing on more traditional L2 pedagogies (Quadrant 2) whilst providing learners with the conditions for organic growth alongside development of ‘subject’ as well as transferrable literacies.

Constructing his own Theory of Practice was fundamental to pedagogic realities:

Well, it’s almost the thing that, as an L2 teacher, you’ve been waiting for [all] your life and suddenly it’s here. Things which go far beyond [what] any textbook could give you … [W]hen the child starts being able to incorporate how environment can influence the behaviour of a character, and a character can influence the development of the environment, and I can express that – even if there are mistakes, even if grammatically it’s not always sound – I mean we’ve gone into the area of deep learning. [TR3, p. 3]

This study, we believe, acts as a ‘significant contribution’ to encourage what Tracy (2013, pp. 239-240) refers to as resonance with the readers and to ‘bring [some] clarity to confusion, make visible what is hidden or inappropriately ignored, and generate a sense of insight and deepened understanding. The analytical tools were merged in an attempt to address “ontological disruption” and bridge the worlds of language and subject bilingual teachers through a pluriliteracies approach. The data used were gathered by – and with – a teacher-researcher whilst constructing his own dynamic Theory of Practice. The data detail first steps in truly bridging different worlds.

The processes and guidance are there for other practitioner-researchers to take up the mantle – to adapt and adapt research and theoretical interpretation – and most importantly to share the ‘essential practices’ needed for the ‘big, big shift’ in pedagogic understanding.

“...that would be extremely valuable, where learners are guided in setting their own challenging learning goals and where commitment, resilience, mastery and inspiration are expected as normal in the language classroom. As in the study reported on in this document, the PTDL approach would be accessible for all learners, hence celebrating a socially just and equitable approach to language learning and language using.”

5.1 Next Steps

It is essential to value this early study for its potential to change how we see language learning in the middle school curriculum. Such potential cannot be overlooked. Studies such as these raise the profile of language as a core discipline, which elevates its position alongside the science and other STEM subjects. We propose the following next steps, building on and extending the research to include:

- Studies which focus on the learners themselves – their own ideas, views, experiences, which are in line with ULP – so as to tell the ‘languages’ story of the development of learner competencies from a transdisciplinary and multiliteracies perspective.
- A multi-layered learner-focused study to document the development of deeper learning in the language classroom, which resonates with other subject disciplines and hence elevates language learning and teaching as core to the curriculum. Diverse tools and resources - many of which will be co-created and critiqued by learners themselves - to be made visible for other educators and researchers to develop and use.
- Pioneering further expansion of a pedagogic approach that would be 'unprompted by the teacher. That’s when you think ‘this is where pluriliteracies work!’ when the transfers are applied and it’s unprompted by the teacher. That’s when you think ‘this is where pluriliteracies work!’ and it works from one language to another and one genre to another – and one subject to another!” [TR1, p. 2]

“...it works from one language to another and one genre to another – and one subject to another!” [TR1, p. 2]
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### Appendix 1: Programme overview for Year 7 False beginners

**Textbooks and booklets:** « Exercices de vocabulaire en contexte, niveau débutant », « Exercices de grammaire en contexte, niveau débutant », « Upgrade Listening » (Green booklet), « Upgrade Reading » (Yellow booklet)

**Expected Average Level at the end of the year:** A2. Some students should achieve level B1

**General Departmental Units:**
- (1) **présenter**
- (2) ** Voyager / découvrir l’environnement**
- (3) **voyager et communiquer**

#### Thèmes / Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>« Les robots »</th>
<th>« Tout sur moi » : le profil et le portrait littéraire</th>
<th>Le “Gothique” : paysages et personnages en littérature</th>
<th>“Carnets de Voyage” (Travel Diaries)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>« Les robots »</td>
<td>« Tout sur moi »</td>
<td>Le “Gothique”</td>
<td>“Carnets de Voyage”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>birthday, star signs and personalities, family and friends</td>
<td>My plans and ambitions for the future</td>
<td>To describe a Gothic landscape and interior</td>
<td>To describe a variety of landscapes using the 5 senses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop the concept of time in French</td>
<td>To describe a character in the 19th century</td>
<td></td>
<td>To develop an understanding of “Francophonie”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes, dislikes, fears and phobias</td>
<td>To understand the main points of a story told at near normal speed and to be able to rephrase it with one’s own words.</td>
<td>To understand various travel announcements and to be able to purchase travel tickets, to make enquiries...</td>
<td>To present and discuss different aspects of a specific country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What the ideal person would look like.</td>
<td>To start reading aloud making clear connections between combination of letters and sound.</td>
<td>To narrate and describe an imaginary itinerary.</td>
<td>To show ability to transfer skills and knowledge acquired in previous units and to write with much greater autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My plans and ambitions for the future</td>
<td>To tell a story and to captivate an audience.</td>
<td>To understand various travel announcements and to be able to purchase travel tickets, to make enquiries...</td>
<td>To learn how to do the synthesis of a range of documents and to present findings using charts, timelines, maps...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Compétences orales / oral skills

- To present a robot, describing its features and functions.
- To express and justify opinions.
- To ask questions with greater spontaneity.
- To take part in short debates.
- To intervene with greater spontaneity, without being prompted.
- To understand a TV series in French, to summarise key events and to make predictions.
- To do a presentation on all 4 sections with increased fluency and accuracy in pronunciation.
- To understand the main points of a story told at near normal speed and to be able to rephrase it with one’s own words.
- To start reading aloud making clear connections between combination of letters and sound.
- To tell a story and to captivate an audience.
- To understand various travel announcements and to be able to purchase travel tickets, to make enquiries...
- To present and discuss different aspects of a specific country.
- To narrate and describe an imaginary itinerary.
- To express emotions with specific vocabulary.
- To express ideas with greater finesse.

#### Compétences écrites / written skills

- To write a detailed description using colours, shapes, textures and materials.
- To write a short narrative in the Past tense.
- To write full literary descriptions on a range of characters.
- To demonstrate an understanding of progression and an element of subjectivity in a description.
- To use increasingly complex sentences.
- To get familiar with extracts and simplified versions of authentic 19th century literature.
- To write a detailed description of a place respecting set criteria and using at least 2 out of the 5 senses.
- To pick out and reproduce some characteristics of 19th century literature in descriptions of people and places.
- To write a full Gothic story with clear use of paragraphs, punctuation and coherence in the organisation of ideas.
- To demonstrate understanding and use of this specific style of writing.
- To introduce humour in one’s writing to catch reader’s attention.
- To show ability to transfer skills and knowledge acquired in previous units and to write with much greater autonomy.
- To learn how to do the synthesis of a range of documents and to present findings using charts, timelines, maps...

#### Grammaire / Grammar

- Les adjectifs
- Le comparatif et le superlatif (p.88-91)
- La phrase interrogative (p.24-23)
- Passé-Composé (récitations) (p.120-128)
- Les verbes modaux (p.18-21)
- Les connecteurs de temps
- Les conjonctions
- Les pronoms toniques
- Les pronoms relatifs
- Le conditionnel
- Le Futur
- La phrase négative (p.32-42)
- La phrase complexe
- Les adjectifs possessifs
- Les adjectifs démonstratifs
- Les connecteurs de lieux et de temps
- Les prépositions
- Les verbes prédicationnels
- Les pronoms COD et COI (les pronoms personnels complément) (p.102-109)
- Les adverbes
- Les pays et les prépositions.
- L’expression du lieu (p.50-59)
### Appendix 1: Programme overview for Year 7 False beginners

| Apprendre à Apprendre / Learning to Learn | • To learn to develop one’s own lexical, using words of same family, synonyms…  
• To organise French exercise book to maximise learning  
• To set up French blog and to keep electronic portfolio up to date | • Mind Maps  
• To identify criteria between DELF levels to work towards progress | • To keep track of language portfolio.  
• To be able to draw parallels between literatures in French and English of the 19th century  
• Victor Hugo: « Le bossu de Notre Dame » + « Les misérables (extraits)  
• Guy de Maupassant: « La Peur »  
• Mind Maps  
• To identify criteria between DELF levels to work towards progress | • To develop sufficient vocabulary and strategies to be able to discuss one’s work with others.  
• Metacognitive skills: ability to transfer a set of skills from previous unit without intervention from teachers  
• Victor Hugo: « Le bossu de Notre Dame » + « Les misérables (extraits)  
• Guy de Maupassant: « La Peur »  
• Mind Maps  
• To identify criteria between DELF levels to work towards progress | • To keep track of language portfolio.  
• To be able to draw parallels between literatures in French and English of the 19th century  
• Victor Hugo: « Le bossu de Notre Dame » + « Les misérables (extraits)  
• Guy de Maupassant: « La Peur »  
• Mind Maps  
• To identify criteria between DELF levels to work towards progress | • To develop sufficient vocabulary and strategies to be able to discuss one’s work with others.  
• Metacognitive skills: ability to transfer a set of skills from previous unit without intervention from teachers | • To keep track of language portfolio.  
• To be able to draw parallels between literatures in French and English of the 19th century  
• Victor Hugo: « Le bossu de Notre Dame » + « Les misérables (extraits)  
• Guy de Maupassant: « La Peur »  
• Mind Maps  
• To identify criteria between DELF levels to work towards progress | • To develop sufficient vocabulary and strategies to be able to discuss one’s work with others.  
• Metacognitive skills: ability to transfer a set of skills from previous unit without intervention from teachers | • To keep track of language portfolio.  
• To be able to draw parallels between literatures in French and English of the 19th century  
• Victor Hugo: « Le bossu de Notre Dame » + « Les misérables (extraits)  
• Guy de Maupassant: « La Peur »  
• Mind Maps  
• To identify criteria between DELF levels to work towards progress | • To develop sufficient vocabulary and strategies to be able to discuss one’s work with others.  
• Metacognitive skills: ability to transfer a set of skills from previous unit without intervention from teachers |

| Lecture / Reading | Texts in class | Lecture CLE en Français facile, Niveaux 1 et 2 (au choix) | Victor Hugo: « Le bossu de Notre Dame » + « Les misérables (extraits)  
Extracts of « Notes from a Small Island » (Bill Bryson) | Jules Verne: « Le Tour du Monde en 80 jours », Niveau 3  
Extracts of « Notes from a Small Island » (Bill Bryson) | Jules Verne: « Le Tour du Monde en 80 jours », Niveau 3  
Extracts of « Notes from a Small Island » (Bill Bryson) | Jules Verne: « Le Tour du Monde en 80 jours », Niveau 3  
Extracts of « Notes from a Small Island » (Bill Bryson) |

| Lecture indépendante/ Autonomous Reading | PRIX EDELWEISS + Yellow Booklet | PRIX EDELWEISS + Yellow Booklet | PRIX EDELWEISS + Yellow Booklet | PRIX EDELWEISS + Yellow booklet |

| Evaluations / Assessments | • Presentation of made robot in front of the class  
• Written description of robot with evidence of modal verbs + Short narrative in the Past Tense | • Oral presentation at level A2 on all 4 sections.  
• Written production in exams conditions on all 4 sections. Preparation (1st Draft) in French blog.  
• DELF examination at Level A2 (Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing) | • Filmed presentation of either a short Gothic story (can be same or different from written story) or a legend/myth from your country.  
• Detailed description of a Gothic landscape and interior following specific guidelines.  
• Production of a short Gothic story (minimum 300 words)  
• DELF examination at Level A2 (Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing) | • Presentation to the class 3 countries according to a set model  
• Oral narrative of an imaginary itinerary around the world.  
• Production of a Travel Diary according to set criteria for exhibition in Carter Hall, to which parents will be invited.  
• DELF examination at Level A2 or B1 |

| Dives / Miscellaneous | DVD series « Le Café des Rêves » | • School trip to either ruins of Château de Rouelbeau (GE) or Château Chillon (VD)  
• Visit to Mary Shelley’s exhibition in Cologny | School trip to Château de Prangins? tbc | School trip to Château de Prangins? tbc | School trip to Château de Prangins? tbc | School trip to Château de Prangins? tbc | School trip to Château de Prangins? tbc |
Appendix 2: Reflective Interview Questions

**Reflective Interview 1**

(21:27)

- Can you talk a little bit about what you understand with the Pluriliteracy skills?
- Which one of the many skills, or which series might you have concentrated on?
- In terms of yourself as a teacher, if somebody said to you: Explain pluriliteracies and how that influences what you do in the classroom, what would you say?
- What is your understanding of literacies?
  - You know the work of Vost where we’re saying that what you’re doing in class the learner has to do, organize, explain, and then position themselves in terms of being able to justify or argue, or whatever else. How do you see that playing in with the kind of stuff you’re doing? How do you set up your tasks? Does it just emerge, do you purposely set up tasks that enable them to do it?
- Are you there giving the learners support so that they can do this in L1 or in L2 – in English or in French?

**Reflective Interview 2**

(24:10)

- Regarding formative assessment, what goes on in your lessons? How do you give feedback to enable the students to improve?
- Do you do any sort of peer assessment, as well?
- When the learners are asked to prepare and give feedback on somebody else’s work, how does it influence their own work?
- Do you construct rubrics with the learners?
- When do you do your planning, how do you plan then for progression? Do you have a kind of pre-set notion of what progression might be like? Or what does it depend on?
- What, for you, are some of the key behaviours or products that the students have to produce that gives you evidence that they are engaging in deeper learning?

**Reflective Interview 3**

(20:39)

- What are the challenges of being a class-based researcher?
- You have been part of theoretical conversations about pluriliteracies. How do you accommodate a translation of theory into what it means in the classroom? Have you got any thoughts about how you became involved and how you married some of the more academic stuff, which is theoretical but not embedded in classroom practice, to being put into practice, or at least be experimenting with it?
- Some of the work that you’ve been doing is all around what you’ve been doing in your classroom with your learners. And the learners to an extent have been co-researchers because you’ve been involving them directly and openly in that process. What kind of data sets or tools have you used to capture what’s going on?
- What kind of evidence have you gathered as it happened, as it evolved?
- What would you say that you have learned through engaging in this kind of very, very reflective processing of working alongside your pupils? What key lessons have you got from this that you might share with other teachers? What have you got from doing all this?

Appendix 3: Excerpts of thematic data analysis display tables

I. Four categories per each of the quadrants of the adapted framework as an analytical tool

| 3a | 1. Literature / Language Arts  
LITERARY WRITING  
Culture specific (Discourse community) • But not limited to L2  
+ Content / Meaning (Language using is content determined and meaning focused) | Links to other quadrants |
|---|---|---|
| 2 + 3 + 4 | 2. Language & Communication  
DEVELOPING LANGUAGE SKILLS: FOCUS ON COMMUNICATION AND FORM  
Culture specific (Discourse community) • But not limited to L2 (culture)  
+ Language / Form (Language learning involves form focus and grammatical awareness) • But not limited to L2 | Links to other quadrants |
| 3 | - The use of the mind map is a really good tool because it forces the children to think ‘In everything I want to say and to communicate what are the fundamentals?’ [TR1, pp. 3-4] | 3 + 4 |
| - The starting point for mw is connectives because we use connectives for so many – and for an L2 class it’s an ideal starting point – we use connectives for all sorts of different reasons. So whether you’re emphasizing, illustrating, counter-arguing. So that’s why we created this bilingual poster. It’s nothing new. Teachers have been using connectives since the beginning of time. [TR1, p. 3] | 3 + 4 |
| - The vocabulary that is taught quite early on in the year and that is also do with feelings and opinions, she’s questioning, feeling and expressing opinions. And I think that should come at the beginning of the year where you know every year because that’s really what we need to be about having a response. Those rubrics of vocabulary in the two languages that come quite early on, and sometimes additional ones if you’re going to be doing, like we’ve done the diamond activity, so to do this you have to be able to give rubrics on how you negotiate and counter-argue, even if it’s just starting with 4 or 5 expressions. So the language has got to be built in especially with a group of beginners. [TR1, p. 4] | 3 |
| - ‘Language using is content determined and meaning focused’ involves ‘form focus and grammatical awareness’ • But not limited to L2 | |
| - The starting point for mw is connectives because we use connectives for so many – and for an L2 class it’s an ideal starting point – we use connectives for all sorts of different reasons. So whether you’re emphasizing, illustrating, counter-arguing. So that’s why we created this bilingual poster. It’s nothing new. Teachers have been using connectives since the beginning of time. [TR1, p. 3] | 3 + 4 |
| - ‘Language using is content determined and meaning focused’ involves ‘form focus and grammatical awareness’ • But not limited to L2 | |
| - The vocabulary that is taught quite early on in the year and that is also do with feelings and opinions, she’s questioning, feeling and expressing opinions. And I think that should come at the beginning of the year where you know every year because that’s really what we need to be about having a response. Those rubrics of vocabulary in the two languages that come quite early on, and sometimes additional ones if you’re going to be doing, like we’ve done the diamond activity, so to do this you have to be able to give rubrics on how you negotiate and counter-argue, even if it’s just starting with 4 or 5 expressions. So the language has got to be built in especially with a group of beginners. [TR1, p. 4] | 3 |
| - ‘Language using is content determined and meaning focused’ involves ‘form focus and grammatical awareness’ • But not limited to L2 | |
| - The use of the mind map is a really good tool because it forces the children to think ‘In everything I want to say and to communicate what are the fundamentals?’ [TR1, pp. 3-4] | 3 + 4 |

Appendix 3a: Excerpts of thematic data analysis display tables
3c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Mindset / Pedagogical beliefs / Understandings</th>
<th>Links to other quadrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Support</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Content Support</td>
<td>(= Fostering understanding of subject-specific content)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to other quadrants</td>
<td>2 + 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- You can really dig deep with the concept of describing: describing people, describing landscapes. [TR1, p. 1]</td>
<td>2 + 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Using senses, using not just one, but all the senses, using metaphors, using the vertical and horizontal structure almost of the camera and the different depths of field, [so that] they can apply that without being prompted to any landscape. [TR1, p. 1]</td>
<td>1 + 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Most teachers will have some checklists. They tend to be a lot in terms of grammar, spelling. And that's great. We use that as well. But what's interesting is when you try to get the children to focus precisely on the concepts. So if you tell them, &quot;Okay you're going to analyse each other's work in terms of character development and I want you to think, if you read that as part of a novel, what would you bring to get that so much more enjoyable?&quot; You can keep it as vague as this and they will come up with the solutions. [TR2, p. 3]</td>
<td>2 + 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- So the idea, for example, with landscapes is that, How do you structure in terms of words or even in relation to art, when you look at a painting a landscape in a painting, how do you discuss that? [TR1, p. 1]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Whether it's your L1 or L2, there is commonality, if there is such a term, of how you structure what you feel, what you see and whether you have got the foreground, the middle ground or the background, then that's in any subject and yet it's rarely taught explicitly. Thus it's all down to being explicit about these things. And then you realize that what you do in one language is transferable, not just to another language, but to any task. [TR1, p. 1]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The children were able to transfer this conceptualization of the landscape description into this new context totally unprompted. [TR1, p. 1]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What's important is to look at all the different genres, or – sometimes genres, sometimes concepts related to description, where they express with their writing ... and it works from one language to another and one genre to another. [TR1, p. 2]</td>
<td>2 + 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Mindset / Pedagogical beliefs / Understandings</th>
<th>Links to other quadrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject-specific language</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Subject specific</td>
<td>(= Being &quot;apprenticed into discourse of subject&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to other quadrants</td>
<td>2 + 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- So the idea, for example, with landscapes is that, How do you structure in terms of words or even in relation to art, when you look at a painting a landscape in a painting, how do you discuss that? [TR1, p. 1]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Whether it's your L1 or L2, there is commonality, if there is such a term, of how you structure what you feel, what you see and whether you have got the foreground, the middle ground or the background, then that's in any subject and yet it's rarely taught explicitly. Thus it's all down to being explicit about these things. And then you realize that what you do in one language is transferable, not just to another language, but to any task. [TR1, p. 1]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The children were able to transfer this conceptualization of the landscape description into this new context totally unprompted. [TR1, p. 1]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What's important is to look at all the different genres, or – sometimes genres, sometimes concepts related to description, where they express with their writing ... and it works from one language to another and one genre to another. [TR1, p. 2]</td>
<td>2 + 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>