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I. Education system and educational policies in Germany
The German education system

- **Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC)**
  - Age: 0-3 nursery, 0-6 and 3-6 kindergarten (nursery school), 5-6 preschool in few federal states

- **Primary school**
  - located in the neighbourhood area, normally 1st to 4th grade

- **Secondary level**
  - all different school types without Gymnasium
  - Gymnasium; university entrance qualification „Abitur“

- **Vocational training and schools**

- **Special education sector**
Educational policies in ECEC

- All federal states have introduced curricula for ECEC
- Institutional receptiveness with respect to vulnerable groups: establishing „family centers“ (vgl. Stöbe-Blossey 2013)
- Nation-wide-program for advanced training of educators (Erzieher/innen) (Weiterbildungsinitiative Frühpädagogische Fachkräfte)
- Development of new standards and curricula for vocational and academic training for professionals in ECEC
Educational policies in ECEC

- All federal states have introduced curricula for ECEC
- Institutional receptivness with respect to vulnerable groups: establishing „family centers“ (vgl. Stöbe-Blossey 2013)
- Nation-wide-program for advanced training of kindergarten teachers (Erzieher/innen) (Weiterbildungsinitiative Frühpädagogische Fachkräfte)
- Development of new standards and curricula for vocational and academic training for professionals in ECEC

BUT: Since PISA the public view and educational policies tended to shift from valorising the heritage languages and multilingualism to „German only“ programmes in ECEC (Lengyel&Illic 2014)
II. Migrant children in early childhood education and care (ECEC) in Germany
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Unter 3-Jährige</th>
<th>Davon</th>
<th>3- bis unter 6-Jährige</th>
<th>Davon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insgesamt</td>
<td>Mit Migrationshintergrund</td>
<td>Ohne Migrationshintergrund</td>
<td>Differenz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in %</td>
<td>in Prozentpunkten</td>
<td>in %</td>
<td>in Prozentpunkten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutschland</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostdeutschland (mit Berlin)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baden-Württemberg</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayern</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessen</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niedersachsen</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordrhein-Westfalen</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheinland-Pfalz</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schleswig-Holstein</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutschland</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostdeutschland (ohne Berlin-Ost)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baden-Württemberg</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayern</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessen</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niedersachsen</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordrhein-Westfalen</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheinland-Pfalz</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schleswig-Holstein</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Veränderung 2013 zu 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land</th>
<th>in Prozentpunkten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deutschland (ohne Berlin-Ost)</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baden-Württemberg</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayern</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessen</td>
<td>+13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niedersachsen</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordrhein-Westfalen</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheinland-Pfalz</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schleswig-Holstein</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Quelle: Statistisches Bundesamt, ** Erkenntnisse auf der Grundlage von EU-Quellen
Tendencies towards segregation: 30% of children with a multilingual background attend kindergarten (nursery schools) with 50% multilingual children (ebd.)
- Attendance rate rose in the last two years extremely due to the legal claim for “spots” for children under three years (2009: 20%, 2013: 29%)
- The share of migrant children is small (2013: 17%; without migration background 35%), but raising (vs. 2009:11% MIG and 25% without MIG) (cf. Autorenguppe Bildungsberichterstattung 2014);
- The share is much higher in urban areas such as Berlin or Hamburg (26 %; cf. Statistische Ämter des Bundes und der Länder 2012).
How does access to institutional education (1-and 2-year old children) alter the acquisition of heritage languages? How does it alter identity formation and social education processes?

Which measures do we need to pave the way towards heritage and second language acquisition in the early years?
Subjective theories of parents and educators

Dissertation project (Braband i.prep.): Reconstruction of subjective theories

- Which subjective theories do migrant parents and educators have on multilingual socialisation, language education goals, styles and strategies?
  Which common lines do exist that could be used as „the starting point“ of communication and cooperation in institutional settings with focus for under three year old children?

- Sample: Parents with different migration backgrounds, heritage languages, social status and academic background

- First results: Subjective theories differ strongly within the migrant group; theories on language education and the strategy preferred by parents relate to how successful their own „migration project“ is perceived
The situation in Hamburg – linguistic diversity in ECEC

Cf. IFBQ 2013:13
### Most spoken languages in Hamburg (4-year old children)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sprache</th>
<th>Anteil an der Population (in Prozent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Türkisch</td>
<td>9,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russisch</td>
<td>5,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englisch</td>
<td>4,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persische Sprachen (*)</td>
<td>4,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polnisch</td>
<td>3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikanische Sprachen</td>
<td>2,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabisch</td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanisch</td>
<td>2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbisch/Kroatisch/Bosnisch</td>
<td>1,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanisch</td>
<td>1,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Französisch</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugiesisch</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdisch</td>
<td>0,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanes</td>
<td>0,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italienisch</td>
<td>0,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griechisch</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinesisch</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamesisch</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>andere Sprachen</td>
<td>4,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Farsi, Dari, Urdu, (Afghanisch,) Pashtu
### Duration of kindergarten attendance (KA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of KA</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th></th>
<th>WITHOUT MIG</th>
<th></th>
<th>MIG</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anzahl</td>
<td>Prozent</td>
<td>Anzahl</td>
<td>Prozent</td>
<td>Anzahl</td>
<td>Prozent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-11 months</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>10,4</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>7,4</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>13,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-23 months</td>
<td>2.495</td>
<td>33,2</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>29,0</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>37,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-35 months</td>
<td>2.154</td>
<td>28,6</td>
<td>1.108</td>
<td>28,5</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>28,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 35 months</td>
<td>2.094</td>
<td>27,8</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td>35,1</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>20,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>7.522</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.858</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.606</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cf. IFBQ, 2013: 29
# Kindergarten attendance and language support (LS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of KA</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>WITHOUT MIG</th>
<th>MIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alle Kinder</td>
<td>Strong need for LS</td>
<td>alle Kinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-11 months</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>199 26,4%</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-23 months</td>
<td>2.412</td>
<td>387 16,0%</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-35 months</td>
<td>2.097</td>
<td>213 10,2%</td>
<td>1.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 35 months</td>
<td>2.039</td>
<td>86 4,2%</td>
<td>1.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>7.301</td>
<td>885 12,1%</td>
<td>3.803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cf. IFBQ, 2013: 29
III. Research questions and state of art in ECEC
Research questions and practical challenges

- What makes early childhood education systems with (socially, culturally and linguistically) diverse children successful?
- How can the benefits of multilingualism be activated in ECEC to foster multilingual development, identity formation and educational achievement (in the long run)?
- How should language education and promotion be designed and organized in multilingual settings to meet the needs of children in early education?
- What measures are promising to overcome monolingual professional orientations and the monolingual routines of the institutional system?

Seven fields of action for intercultural receptiveness of institutions in ECEC
Relevance of the macrosystem

The macrosystem has to be reflected, i.e. societal developments such as women’s employment, migration processes, the national political agenda and economic interests (such as the competitiveness of a nation) (vgl. Betz et al. 2013)

BUT:
Educational policy discourse on how to deal with diversity and multilingualism only focusses on meso- and microsystems (practitioners and their relevance in the educational process of (migrant) children and on the family’s contribution for educational success)
Pedagogical quality in ECEC – a critical review from an intercultural education research perspective

Source: Tietze et al. 2012
Pedagogical quality in ECEC – a critical review from an intercultural education research perspective

It is argued that ...

- ...the rationale in postmodern societies should be not to rely on only one underlying perspective to assess and evaluate „supportive actions“
- ...pedagogical quality cannot be defined and operationalized as an construct with universal validity

Quality not in a normative or evaluative sense but rather in a descriptive-analytical sense as configuration („Beschaffenheit“) (cf. Honig 2004)
IV. Language education in multilingual ECEC-settings
An inclusive approach to language education in multilingual settings

- Based on research in four different multilingual kindergarten settings in heterogeneous social milieus in urban areas of Germany (Lengyel 2009, 2012);
- Focus on play situations with peers and professionals and the interactions therein;
- The aim was to develop an observation scheme with a set of criteria designed for plurilingual children and to design an inclusive perspective on language education in multilingual fields;
- The research included 43 plurilingual children aged three to six years.
Why the term plurilingual?

- Introduced by the Council of Europe (CoE 2001, Beaccho 2007);
- Grasps the dynamic and integrated practices of language socialisation;
- Highlights the ability of each individual to communicate, to varying degrees, in two or more languages according to (day-to-day) needs and circumstances such as topic, interlocutors, and social context;
- Underlines the fact that an individual’s languages are in constant interaction and that individuals draw on their full language repertoire and resources to make meaning in context (Lengyel, 2009, p. 27ff.);
- Also includes “monolinguals”, as they too experience plurilingualism.
An inclusive approach to language education in multilingual settings

- Language socialisation perspective; focusing on daily routines and activities (cf. Owodally 2014); tracking the opportunities to learn and the time spent *cognitively engaged* in language learning in early childhood education settings

- Theorizing language education in plurilingual settings is based on aspects of L.S. Vygotsky's sociocultural theory

- Social and cultural setting
- Activity
- Languages in use
- Cognitive engagement
An inclusive approach to language education in multilingual settings

- Education group setting as a community of practice (Lave/Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998; Eckhert&McConnell-Ginet 1992)

- In the case of plurilingual children this concept offers the possibility to identify systematically their opportunities to access the resources and their opportunities for learning the lingua franca

- For institutional education, this is important because it centers on what is most relevant: the pedagogical scope and how to frame the learning environment
An inclusive approach to language education in multilingual settings

- Pedagogical work in multilingual settings then is about co-construction within socio-cultural frameworks, giving children opportunities to construct cultural and linguistic knowledge that is also compatible with social education goals.

- Observing children in play and peer interaction, we can discover how they engage in meaning-making in the specific context and the extent to which they begin to use language to understand and cope with social reality, and engage in problem-solving activities mediated by speech.

- The focus can be turned to the development from “here-and-now language” to the context-reduced speech that is required when talking about something that has yet to happen, or when negotiating characters and imaginative issues in role plays.
Observation

Ch-Ch-I: role play
E-Ch-I: literacy activities; communicating beyond the here-and-now

Social context / community of practice

Play forms, activities, peers

context-reduced speech processes

Construction play monologic: problemsolving mediated by speech

Zeichen-Zeichen

Egocentric talk

Metalinguistic use of language
An inclusive approach to language education in multilingual settings

Focusing on language as a cognitive tool: framing and creating stimulating surroundings and social interactions where children working in their zone of proximal development (Vygotskij, 2002) engage in negotiating meaning toward self-regulation and higher forms of language use (Lengyel, 2009, pp. 144ff., 241ff.).

- Taking up the children’s languages is crucial to paving the way to participation and building plurilingual identities in the community of practice.
- Embracing the languages acquired outside the institution can also occur on a metalinguistic level.
- Discovering whether children engage in code-switching, language mixing, and translating.
An inclusive approach to language education in multilingual settings

- Suggests that supporting plurilingualism in early childhood education means – for all children – to promote activity and interaction in and through the languages that the children come with;

- Means finding out about different varieties and registers, looking at differing language symbols, mixing them, and making them an object of thought;

- Formation of plurilingual identities then is encouraged through social practice and valuation of different languages, varieties, and registers (cf. Lengyel 2009, 2012).
Continuous language education (cf. Gogolin et al. 2011)

Interlinguale Dimension
„Interlingual dimension“

Bildungsbiographische Dimension
„Education biography dimension“

Thematische Dimension
„Thematic dimension“
Which are the visible resources for language education in a single institution?

1. Documentation of every aspect that demonstrates a visual statement of the institution
2. Evaluation of the documented actual state and conditions for language education
3. Developing ideas how to use better the existing resources
4. Changing existing resources, e.g. establishing new resources
Multilingual story-telling (video)

http://www.erzaehlwerkstatt.de/index.html

http://www.foermig.berlin.de/jahrgangsstufe12.html

http://www.foermig.uni-hamburg.de/web/de/all/lpr/hamburg/index.html

WiFF-Material

http://www.weiterbildungsinitiative.de/
Conclusion

- Most educational policy papers have adopted a valorizing position on migration-related multilingualism and identified the need for professional training in this field.
- Mainstream research in ECEC does not account entirely the educational preconditions that come along with linguistic and cultural diversity (exemplified by the discourse on quality in ECEC).
- Theorizing and researching ECEC and language education in multilingual settings from an inclusive perspective allows to conceptualize plurilingualism as a social practice which is valuable for all children and where joint interaction and negotiating of meaning take place.
- Continuous language education – as suggested in the FÖRMIG program – demonstrates practical paths for building hybrid identities and for valorization of different languages, varieties, and plurilingual communication repertoires.
http://www.diver.uni-hamburg.de/
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